

Jan.
First

New Review

Ten
Cents

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. IV.

10c. a copy

Published on the first and fifteenth of the month.

\$1.50 a year

No. 1

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
CURRENT AFFAIRS:			
Leaders	1	SCHNITZLER'S VIENNA	14
Socialist Terms of Peace; French Socialists and the Union Sacrée; A Federal Conspiracy Law.		Jacob Wittmer Hartmann	
Notes	3	"THE WEAVERS"	16
THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION	5	Floyd Dell	
Austin Lewis		BOOK REVIEWS	17
RECENT INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING	8	Fear and Conventionality; Undercurrents in American Politics.	
PREPAREDNESS AND THE SOCIALISTS	9	A SOCIALIST DIGEST	18
L. B. Boudin		Socialist Peace Terms in Congress; The American International Corporation; The Nation in the New International; "Japan's Plans to Invade America"; German Labor Unions and the Party.	
EDUARD VAILLANT	13	CORRESPONDENCE	21
Louis Marteau		From Alexandra Kollontay; Walter Lippmann.	

Copyright, 1916, by the New Review Publishing Ass'n. Reprint permitted if credit is given.

Current Affairs

Socialist Terms of Peace

THE Socialist Party of America is to be congratulated on its good luck in having in Meyer London a representative who truly represents the sentiment of the great majority of its membership with respect to Peace, and who will do justice to its character of a true Peace Party. It is fortunate for the Socialist movement of this country that Congressman London believes neither in the historical mission of Germany to conquer the world so as to be able to impose upon it its particular brand of "Kultur," nor in the moral duty of the Allies to rid the world of "Prussian Militarism."

"Comparisons are invidious,"—and we do not, ordinarily, like to make any. But we cannot help thinking in this connection about "what might have been,"—and we shudder at the thought that some Milwaukee Leader or an anti-German fire-eater might have been in London's place. We may, therefore, congratulate ourselves both for what we have as well as for what we haven't in Congress.

The introduction of the London Peace Resolution in the U. S. Congress is undoubtedly an event of the first magnitude. Its introduction in the Senate by Senator Lane of California shows how seriously it is taken by Congress itself. We have therefore a right to hope that some tangible practical results will come from it. But even if it should not have the *immediate* result intended to be achieved thereby—if Congress should refuse to pass it, or the president fail to act upon it—it will nevertheless have done an immense service to the cause of Peace, by largely offsetting the great damage done that cause by Pres-

ident Wilson's preparedness message, and by serving as a clarion call to the Socialist parliamentarians of other neutral countries. It is also to be hoped that it may serve as a reminder to the Socialist parliamentarians of some of the warring countries of how far they have wandered from the path of true Socialist internationalism.

It is, therefore, greatly to be regretted that in stating the terms upon which peace ought to be concluded, Comrade London should have committed some errors which are likely to detract from its value as a crystallizer and unifier of Socialist sentiment in this country as well as abroad. We realize, of course, that it is well-nigh impossible to draw up a set of peace terms that would satisfy all Socialists, including those of the warring countries; or that would be sure of immunity from the charge of being "pro" this side or that side. Any adequate list of peace terms involves questions on which many Socialists could not agree even in peace times, and it is therefore folly to expect that anything like "unanimous consent" could be obtained at this time, when passions run high, for any such list. Nevertheless a list of peace terms could be drawn up which would reduce the elements of friction to a minimum by the observance of the following rules: (1) Include only such demands for which it may be claimed that most Socialists would agree on in times of peace when there are no "sides" to be taken, such as most of the demands contained in the resolution of the Copenhagen International Socialist Congress on the subject: (2) Exclude all questions not directly involved in this war, as their inclusion would only complicate matters and obviously make the conclusion of peace more difficult; (3) beware of the inclusion of any of the slogans of the contending parties or their partisans.

We are sorry to say that Comrade London has not followed these rules, and that his peace terms are therefore far from satisfactory. We shall probably return to the subject again, and discuss it at greater length, giving the entire list the careful consideration which it undoubtedly deserves. But there is one thing on that list to which we must call attention here and now—the fifth demand, labelled “Freedom of the Seas.” We are afraid that the inclusion and retention of this demand among the terms of peace advocated by our party through its representative in Congress may go far to vitiate the splendid effect of the London Resolution. “Freedom of the Seas” is either meaningless or a fraud. It is in fact a slogan of the German Imperialists, intended to catch the unwary and to cover up some of their objects in this war—objects which as far removed from freedom of any kind as Imperialism is from Socialism. In a notable discussion in the *Neue Zeit* between Karl Kautsky and Eduard David, Kautsky exposed the pretensions of this alleged “freedom” and proved it the fraud that it is.

It is a thousand pities that Comrade London should have been caught unawares and induced to include this bogus freedom among his peace terms—thereby helping the dissemination of a German Imperialist fraud, and exposing his fine efforts on behalf of a true and just peace to the suspicion of partisanship.—B.

French Socialists and the “Union Sacrée”

A FEW months ago, Louise Saumoneau, secretary of a small group of Socialist women in Paris opposed to the war, *Comite d'Action pour la Paix contre le Chauvinisme*, was arrested by the French government on a charge of anti-militarist agitation. According to available reports, the French Socialist press and the party have not protested against this violation of a citizen's right to free expression.

This is in line with an attitude of the French Socialists that is doing them a great deal of harm in the international movement, and that reflects seriously upon their Socialist integrity. They seem to take a sort of morbid pride in abiding by the “Union Sacrée”—the French counterpart of the German “Burgfrieden”—while pointing out that the bourgeois classes are continuously and persistently violating the spirit and letter of this inter-class peace.

Waiving the matter of principle, temporarily—the principle that under no conceivable circumstances should Socialists suspend the class struggle—we shall discuss it as a matter of policy. It is admitted that the bourgeois classes are not abiding by the “Union Sacrée,” that they are taking advantage of the war to entrench their social and political power; and, in many cases, to transmute into unholy

profits the woes of the nation—demonstrated by the scandals recently aired in the Chamber of Deputies. This should convince the French Socialists that acquiescence in the “Union Sacrée” is not alone a violation of Socialist principles, but a direct menace to the safety of the nation. The bourgeois does not change his nature in time of war: he is ever the predatory beast battenning upon the needs of the nation; and only the working class—the class struggle waged relentlessly—can make the bourgeois class toe the mark of straight dealing.

The French Socialists profess to believe that the defense of their country involves a Socialist duty—an international duty. All the more reason why they should not weaken their stand by the abandonment of Socialist principles implied in suspending the class struggle. The defense of their country—which in their opinion is not a defense of France primarily, but a defense of Europe and the world from a recrudescence of Napoleonic domination by force—the favorable Socialist conditions they expect from a victory of the Entente Allies,—all would gain immeasurably by uncompromising adherence to Socialist principles and the class struggle.

The argument that the class struggle would hamper national defense seems to have no justification in the facts of the present situation—surely has no justification in history. The wars of the French Revolution are a case in point. At a time when the nation was in danger of being overwhelmed by invasion, at a time when the conduct of the nation's affairs was still largely in the hands of a class that was bent upon rule or ruin, it was the class struggle waged intrepidly and even ferociously, that saved France from annihilation. If the revolutionists at the time had acquiesced in a “Union Sacrée,” if they had lacked the courage to do and die, the annals of France would not record the glorious achievements of '93.

Rosa Luxemburg has stated another theoretical and historical justification for not suspending the class struggle during war:

“There is a necessary and dialectic relation between class struggle and war. The class struggle develops into war and war develops into the class struggle; and thus their essential unity is proved. It was so in the medieval cities, in the wars of the Reformtaion, in the Flemish wars of liberation, in the French Revolution, in the American Rebellion, in the Paris Commune, and in the Russian uprising in 1905.”

The real point, however, is that the French Socialists have proven themselves nationalistic. They have not as yet come out in favor of Imperialism, as the German Socialists have; nor does there seem any chance of their doing so. But nationalistic they have been, and their acquiescence in the “Union Sacrée” proves it. Their actions and their words

indicate on the whole that the nation occupies as important a place in their thinking as the class struggle. The French Socialists could have gone into this war with a revolutionary Socialist sanction; but they preferred to act in harmony with a nationalistic sanction. Participation in the war need not necessarily have carried with it participation in the bourgeois iniquity of Chauvinism and "peace between the classes."—*F.*

A Federal Conspiracy Law

PRESIDENT WILSON in his message to Congress, among other things, calls attention to the recent activities of foreign agents in this country, plotting strikes and crimes against property and lives. Masquerading as friends of Peace and Labor, the plotters have given the enemies of Labor the opportunity eagerly looked for by our long headed capitalists. The *N. Y. Times* announces triumphantly that "there will be no difficulty in carrying out the President's desire to have the Federal laws extended so as to reach those plotters against the peace and well-being of the nation who are now amenable in many cases to laws of individual states only."

Unfortunately, that forecast is correct. Mr. Wilson will enact a severe conspiracy law with no more difficulty than Theodore Roosevelt had with his Anarchist Law after the murder of President McKinley. The alleged friends of Labor will now reap the harvest they have sown, with the assistance even of some of our own comrades who were led foolishly into booming some very ill-smelling affairs and organizations. Gompers deserves full credit for disowning Labor's false friends mixed up with these conspiracies. It is a pity that in this matter some of our official spokesmen were less clear sighted and less courageous. The *NEW REVIEW* called attention to the spurious character of some of the acts done in Labor's name. But its warnings could not prevent the consequences.

These consequences we must now face. We are going to have a Federal Conspiracy Law. It will be enacted as a strong weapon against foreign plots and conspiracies. Once on our statute books, it will stay there just as Roosevelt's anarchist legislation stays there. The panic will pass; its fruits will remain. That is the most deplorable part of the whole business. For in times to come the Federal Conspiracy Law will be invoked against Labor. Nobody that knows the American capitalist class and its political tools in office and on the bench need cherish any illusions on that score.

No matter how guarded and restricted the wording of the new law may be, it will be "interpreted" and "construed" by our courts, the same courts that discovered that the Sherman Anti-Trust Law could

be used far more effectually against labor unions than against law defying trusts.

We shall have in future the powerful and thorough-going federal machinery set in motion whenever strikes and the like disturb "the peace and well-being" of our ruling class, euphemistically called "the nation."—*O.*

British Laborism Triumphant?

ORGANIZED Labor in Great Britain is coming into its own. It has refused to submerge its identity in the interest of the government and the war, and is compelling its recognition as a part of the governing system of the nation.

In a speech in the House of Commons last month, Minister of Munitions Lloyd George declared in so many words that the winning of the war depends upon whether Organized Labor would "allow" the government to do certain things:

"We want eighty thousand skilled men and from two to three hundred thousand unskilled men for these new [munitions] factories. . . Upon the supply of labor depends, I think, our success in this war. . . . Here only organized labor can help us. . . . The whole question depends on organized labor. Unless it allows us to put unskilled workers on the work which hitherto has been the monopoly of skilled labor we cannot perform this task."

The nature of this appeal, the complete absence of the former threats of compulsion, may be a shrewd and politic move on the part of Lloyd George. But at the same time it would never have been uttered if the unions had not the whip hand of the government. More than the strike of the Welsh miners, it shows the determination of Laborism to impose its will *along conservative and nationalistic lines* upon the government—to secure a share in the governing system of the nation. The indications multiply that the war will leave Laborism stronger economically and politically than any other class in Great Britain.

And, simultaneously, it shows an intensification of the cleavage between skilled and unskilled labor. The central point in Lloyd George's appeal is that organized labor allow the government "to put unskilled workers on the work which hitherto has been the monopoly of the skilled." In other words, Laborism is not sticking up for a class demand, but for a *caste* advantage.—*F.*

Mexico and Reconstruction

CLOSE observers of the Mexican situation realize that while the triumph of Carranza removes the immediate danger of intervention, Mexico's sovereignty and future are being threatened in other ways. One of these ways—the most threatening—is foreign financial pressure. Mexican resources are mortgaged to foreign capital. That Carranza realizes the necessity of Mexico being inde-

pendent of foreign financial control was attested during the revolution when he financed his movement with Mexican money, and refused the financial assistance of foreign concessionaires. A recent decree of Carranza's concerning the redemption of notes in gold, and the storm aroused, is symptomatic of the new danger. "Official communications" to our State Department report threats to close the foreign banks in Mexico City and the destruction of Mexican credit. The embassies in Mexico City, after unsuccessful attempts to influence Carranza directly to rescind the decree, have made "vigorous representations" to our State Department. This is the first skirmish in a war of finance that involves the integrity and future of Mexico. American Imperialism has not yet given up its rapacious desire for the complete control of Mexico—an ideal country for the export of capital. The task of political and economic reconstruction in Mexico depends completely upon how thoroughly the schemes of foreign capital can be thwarted.—F.

The Newest "Impossibilism"

THE great argument against the old S. L. P. and "Impossibilism" generally, was that they considered nothing mattered but the fight against capitalism, the overthrow of capitalism. The chief point at issue was the question of reform—whether Socialists should go in for reform or should not. One side dismissed the whole question with an emphatic negative; the other side with an emphatic positive. And the Socialist reformers argued that you cannot fight capitalism without fighting the *manifestations* of capitalism. The gyrations of time has brought this peculiar change: the very people who argued against the policy of fighting for the overthrow of capitalism alone, are now using that argument in dismissing the question of preparedness. "Preparedness isn't a fundamental, we must get back to fundamentals; let's fight capitalism and stop bothering with that manifestation of capitalism, 'preparedness.'" That is the way they argue, these old "opportunists" turned "impossibilists."—F.

The Working Class or Capitalism?

THERE is a strong group of pacifists and some Socialists who are placing reliance upon the forces of capitalist internationalism for the ending of war. The argument is that nationalism—economic nationalism—is the cause of war, while internationalism makes for peace. The argument forgets the essential fact that only one aspect of capitalist internationalism makes for peace; that, like national capitalism itself, international capitalism is compounded of various tendencies, some of which make for war and some for peace.

Imperialism, for example, is essentially belligerent, commerce as such essentially peaceful. The

commercial forces bringing nations closer together economically make for peace; but Imperialism, while also an expression of the capitalist revolt against the bonds of nationality, separates nations and makes for war. This indicates the necessity for a study of capitalism—in its national and international aspects—and the forces making for war and peace.

The Socialists who expect the end of war through the forces of capitalist internationalism err as much as the Socialists who maintain that Imperialism is a necessary transitional stage to Socialism. And their common error is this: instead of relying upon the development of *the power of the working class*, they rely upon the development of capitalism. The former is dynamic, Socialist, the latter mechanistic, Utopian.—F.

Where is the Marx of Yester-Year?

IN a recent issue the Milwaukee *Leader*, arguing against the internationalists, says:

"They don't want Socialism according to Marx. He indorsed national defense; a national militia; universal military education; Socialist partisanship in international problems for definite national governments offering the best outlook for working class growth; voting for the least objectionable old party candidate when Socialists were out of the running; centralization of power in the hands of the party executive; and affiliation of Socialists with the most representative labor unions for the purpose of supporting their most advanced members."

If the *Leader* has any self-respect or any respect for the Socialist movement, it will prove these assertions by citing book and chapter.—F.

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 Giovanitti	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	JULIUS HEIMAN	LOUIS C. FRAINA
President	Treasurer	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.

The A. F. of L. Convention

By Austin Lewis

I.

"The labor movement is the greatest movement the world has ever seen. It is not bounded by geographical lines. It has no political boundaries nor religious limitations. It is as wide, deep and broad as the whole world and has the world of injustice and wrong to overcome. The gleam of light in the future is guiding us all aright to the goal of highest conception of justice."

THE above statement of Samuel Gompers is in itself an epitome of the proceedings of the convention of the American Federation of Labor. You may irreverently dub it flap-doodle, but Mr. Gompers is very emphatically the Federation. On every important question he characteristically and dogmatically voiced the evident sense of the delegates. He was re-elected unanimously, for there was no opposing candidate, though Adolph Germer asked to be recorded as voting in the negative. This sort of thing indeed appears to be characteristic of the organization, and to meet its intellectual requirements, for such generalities oozed oilily and persistently throughout the proceedings, and even then the reservoir was not empty.

Pauline Jacobson, the ablest and the most reliable interviewer on the Pacific Coast, thus reports Gompers in the *San Francisco Bulletin*:

"I dare anything within the limits of this organization—anything. The rank and file have but to show the way. And there is no end to which it will not lead."

"Then you differ from the Socialists, the I. W. W.?"

"Only as to tactics," insisted Mr. Gompers, "there I differ absolutely. This is the only practical machine, and the only one which makes for an industrial democracy. . . . What better service can I render than to help the workers to live as well as they can here and now. I feel I can be of greater service to the workers by leading them step by step in the direction of their goal, slow but sure, meeting the problems on the industrial field from day to day, than by hastening and thereby gaining nothing. . . . We stand for achievement and that is more than any of the rest can say. We are the only machine that accomplishes anything."

You note the frequent reference to a machine. The comparison is not forced. Its mechanical regularity was practically perfect. It registered true every time. External conditions affected it not. It might have been advertised, like a good watch, to show no variations in any climate. As an organization devoted to the property interests of certain organized crafts, it seems to be quite adequate. It has also a sort of automatic mechanism which rebels

against any interference with its cogs and wheels even from the inside. Thus when a delegate from Oregon and one from Wisconsin asked for the appointment of a committee to investigate labor conditions in their respective states for the purpose of devising a plan of wider industrial organization, the machine groaned aloud.

This was practically the only instance where the new came into dramatic conflict with the old and I quote Pauline Jacobson's description, as giving a better idea of what occurred and what was involved than any amount of abstract discussion possibly could:

"As the impassioned voices of the young radical leaders became intensified in persuasion, the veteran faces of the vice-presidents on the platform clouded more and more with angry scowls. Hard and dogmatic, like high priests jealous of a waning power, they flung back words of denunciation.

"We ask nothing more than an investigating committee," pleaded once more the voice of the young radical leader.

"The voice of the old order rang from the platform, now in implication of sedition and treason.

"The voice of the young radical lost now for the first time its note of persuasion. It became hard, angry and as dominant as the voices on the platform. 'Is that declaration of Rochester, is that document, I say, to cover us now and forever?'"

"What more was said I know not. The voice of the young radical rose higher and higher. The next I know, President Gompers was on his feet. His face grew clouded. He struck out angrily.

"I notice when you want anything, you exact your pound of flesh!"

In such an atmosphere little of human value could be accomplished or said.

The speeches of the fraternal delegates from Great Britain, C. G. Ammon and E. Bevan, are generally considered to have been the most effective expressions of international labor. The former is an excellent speaker, a member of the Independent Labor Party who puts the older socialist view most forcibly and strongly. He is interesting as representing the new type of British labor leader, brought up under socialist influences, a product of the school begun by the old Social Democratic Federation. These new men are incomparably superior to their predecessors in mental grasp and potential statesmanship, and the old fashioned British Liberal politician must find them very hard to meet. Ammon explained the labor situation in England in a very satisfying manner. If the mass of British labor is

as positive and as well grounded as he reports, results should soon be manifest. The retort to the demand for conscription, that the British workman is ready and willing to put his life at the service of the nation as soon as the capitalist and landlord are ready to give up their property to the nation, was received with great applause. But the convention did nothing to show that it comprehended the value of a similar stand in this country. In fact, as we shall see, its attitude on the military question was just as unsatisfactory as its stand on other matters.

Bevan in explaining the South Wales coal strikes, said:

"They thought because the men were out fighting; because the trenches were filled with miners from South Wales; because the minds of the men were filled with the suffering, loss, and death and rapine of war, that they would be able to trade upon that fact and make their profits and keep their men in the mine. The miners have worked loyally and honorably since the concessions were granted. I am very pleased the men took the attitude they did because there was a time not very long ago when the employers would have succeeded but they cannot succeed now. The man who is making money out of the war is being regarded in the old country as a man only fit to be socially ostracized. People shun him."

The above is about the sole contribution of the convention on the human side. I am by no means alone in this opinion. Thus one paper sums up the situation: "Two weeks spent in convention, and the only big expressions came from a few lonely socialists and the two fraternal delegates from Great Britain." But what could one expect? Do great expressions arise in a convention of small business men gathered to protect their small business interests?

II

One correspondent, endeavoring to find comfort, writes:

"One hopeful sign gave a little encouragement. Industrial unionism would not down. It came up continually. There is no doubt that had the delegates been free from the influence of the executive council and President Gompers, they would have passed every industrial idea that came up."

The wish is here distinctly father to the thought. As a matter of fact, industrial unionism played a very insignificant part in the convention. The only occasion when it may be said to have appeared at all in any live form was in the incident above described when the delegates from Wisconsin and Oregon voiced their opinions that those states could not be organized by the usual A. F. of L. methods. We have seen what became of them.

The question of jurisdiction was that which most frequently engaged the attention of the convention. These questions came thick and fast, thick and fast

enough indeed to show that though the convention might ignore the outside economic fact, the latter was determined to pursue the convention. The American Federation appeared to be shaking, almost at times dissolving, indeed, under the assaults of the new technology which was so remorselessly playing havoc with the peace of the peddlers of labor power.

"Jurisdictional disputes are of the greatest importance," says one of the socialist defenders of the A. F. of L. So undoubtedly they are, if viewed from the proper angle, for the constant disputes and the multiplicity and diversity of them show that something is persistently and unceasingly gnawing away the underpinning of the structure.

The jurisdictional fight, involving the carpenters and the iron workers in the building trades, for the carpenters made jurisdictional claims over men assembling and dismantling machinery in buildings; the fight between the tunnel and subway workers and that between the carriage and wagon makers, were referred to the committee on adjustments. This reported in favor of revoking the charters of the offending organizations. It was a logical conclusion and, indeed, unavoidable under the craft theory, for these organizations had unquestionably gone outside of their jurisdiction and had in the uncompromising language of the early days of the labor movement "scabbed" on the other workers.

It was said in defense that the industrial changes of recent times and the terrible competition for jobs had caused this invasion. It was no mere selfishness, no desire to take the bread out of the mouths of other men, but the fierce competitive struggle for existence itself which had caused certain unions to set up a claim to jurisdiction over work which had hitherto been claimed by other unions. An organization must find work for its members even if it has to foray on its neighbors. Such was the defense and its practical merit is undeniable.

So President Gompers took the floor to resist the decision of the committee on adjustments. "I am opposed to revoking charters," he said. "If we carry out the recommendations of the committee on adjustments and revoke the charters of these organizations where are we going to end? The American Federation is not safe from disintegration and failure."

Was it therefore concluded that an industrial organization must be substituted for the present craft organization? By no means. It was just here that the correspondent, whom we have quoted, made his mistake. Against the idea of industrialism the Federation would set that of amalgamation.

These amalgamations are already being rapidly created. Thus in the lithographic industry, lithographers, lithographic press feeders, printing pressmen and poster artists have all been amalgamated.

Several such amalgamations have also taken place in various phases of the lumber industry. But in all this there is no sign of industrial unionism. Quite the contrary. It is an effort to save the craft by broadening its base. It is recognized that the craft subdivisions will not hold good against the force of industrial evolution, but the idea is to save the organization and the organization job, the latter in particular, as long as possible.

On the other hand, wherever there was an industrial organization, even in embryo, and it came under the notice of the Federation, it received its quietus. Thus, the bakers' locals were required to turn back the teamsters to the teamsters' locals, and the street railroads were ordered to turn over any metal trades men whom they had organized to the metal trades organization. Resolutions which advocated the reorganization of labor were voted down with enthusiasm and the policy of the Federation was plainly stated to be one of consolidation and amalgamation along existing lines.

Since the above was written this policy has been more completely stated by Supervisor Andrew J. Gallagher, for several terms President of The San Francisco Labor Council and one of the most influential labor men in the State. He says: "I am of the opinion that the most important action of the recent Federation of Labor Convention was the urging of closer affiliation and in some cases amalgamation of unions of allied crafts. If the organizations honestly endeavor to bring about such amalgamations I believe that jurisdictional disputes will in time become a thing of the past and the American labor movement will go forward by leaps and bounds."

III

When we look at the political efforts and the declarations of the convention we discover a field to which the economic determinist would point with rapture. Social psychologists, students of the Great Society and all seeking theoretic thrills should not overlook another opportunity to observe the effect of the political reaction from the economic fact, as represented by the American Federation of Labor in 1915. To follow it through all its phases and divagations, to get the curves and adumbrations of this fearful thing, would take a book. There is here no opportunity to do more than touch the high places. It is a pity, for there are psychological abysses that one would gladly explore and innocent looking crevices of graft on the edge of which one pauses smiling but shivering. The political reaction is a nightmare.

The Shipping Act was naturally a subject of much interest in the leading port of the Pacific and the home of Andrew Furuseth, a fine upstanding fellow and a lovely fighter. It suggested of course the whole question of the merchant marine on which subject

the First Vice-President introduced a resolution which carried. Its effect was a demand for the immediate creation by the United States government of a merchant marine to be manned by American seamen, under conditions which would make an effective naval reserve. The establishment of a shipping board was demanded for the building and purchase of vessels by the United States government, to be operated for the development of our foreign trade, under conditions that will give safety to the traveller, and freedom to the seaman, and to be available as an effective naval auxiliary for the protection of our country in time of war.

On the question of military preparedness and war the convention was most amusedly at sea, not that there was any lack of oratory, far from it, but there was a tremendous lack of definiteness. So that the President, always ready to put his experience at the disposal of his associates, delivered himself as follows:

"I would not use force but the world's boycott against the nation that goes against the conscience of the nations of the world.

"We are living in a Republic but a Republic does not assure protection and peace. The people who would not defend the institutions of liberty and peace are not worth having a Republic.

"I am against militarism but I deplore the fact that the children in our public schools are not getting the proper physical training. We want to eliminate the evils of maladministration of military affairs. We want to see that the great masses of the people are trained and organized so that they will be able to control the forces of our country in the interests of justice and humanity."

Of course, all who read this will be perfectly familiar with the fact that the American Federation is not in favor of employing political action to secure industrial results. It is a matter upon which numbers of us perhaps will have no quarrel with the Federation and one can therefore quote Mr. Gompers' statement on the legal eight hour day with more satisfaction than some of the other utterances. He said:

"I know we don't get the eight hour day as fast as we want it. I am just as impatient as are you delegates. But the growth must come by natural means. Some are afraid of battle and believe that they can do things by dropping a ballot in a box. They forget that power is gravitating from the ballot box to the economic field more and more. We must fight not by pieces of paper but by the scars of battle, the hunger of stomach. We must preserve our freedom to fight, the freedom to achieve. I shall never consent to anything else."

But to analyse the various political measures proposed would be a task which would carry me far beyond the limits of an article. Suffice it to say that

the convention went on record as favoring the following measures:

A government bureau of safety, better laws governing workmen's compensation and employers' liability, political liberty for civil service employees, an eight hour day for all government employees, the elimination of the speeding up system in arsenals and dockyards, government ownership of the homes of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, old age pensions for government employees, better pay for post office clerks, popular government through the initiative, referendum, and recall, and government manufacture of stamped envelopes. Legislation was also favored to prohibit army and navy bands from competing with civilian musicians.

There is the list, as complete as I am able to make it, but there may be some more of the same sort. At any rate, it is sufficiently complete to indicate the political mind of the convention.

The initiative, referendum, and recall in the conduct of Federation unions was defeated. It does not appear that criticism can be rightly directed against this decision. We have been all through the throes of that agitation in the unions of the State of California, particularly in the Building Trades. The most valuable opinions are, I think, against the proposed measures, and as a fighting organization if only fighting for a commodity standing, the convention would appear to have acted wisely in throwing out the proposed measure.

IV

A quite enlightening discussion arose on unemployment, enlightening not as regards unemployment but the convention. Resolutions were adopted which called upon municipalities to furnish shelter and food for destitute unemployed during the winter months. To these resolutions Joseph Cannon objected upon the ground that this constituted charity, and that the workers wanted justice and not charity. One seems to have heard something like that before. But President Gompers, always ready to help matters along, suggested very sweetly that for the municipalities to do this was not charity because it was done by the people for the people. It would have been advantageous for Mr. Gompers to have had a little experience with San Francisco aid to the unemployed during a recent hard winter.

Resolutions were passed favoring the resumption of the battle for the unionization of Los Angeles at an early date. And also one urging the organization of migratory unskilled labor.

In this connection two interesting questions arise. Is the organization of the migratory unskilled by such a body as that whose activities have been described above even thinkable? And, again: What would happen to the American Federation of Labor if the migratory unskilled should actually be organized?

The Recent Increase in The Cost of Living

IN the course of its study of the Cost of Living of the Working Classes in 1912, the Board of Trade of Great Britain compiled a table of the course of prices in the principal commercial and industrial countries for the period 1900-1912. This table consisted of index numbers of retail prices for the most part in the different countries, based on computations made by the British Board of Trade from official sources, the year 1910 being taken as equal to 100.

The *Labor Gazette* has carried these computations forward, as far as possible, in the following table for the years 1913 to 1915 inclusive. Where the figures are missing for the past two years, it has been impossible to secure official data:

Country	1900	1905	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915
Gr. Britain	100	103	109	109	115	115	117	—
Austria	100	108	126	128	135	—	—	—
Hungary	100	122	129	137	—	—	—	—
Belgium	100	110	122	128	132	—	—	—
France	100	97	104	117	115	—	—	—
Germany	100	114	127	128	130	—	—	—
Holland	100	102	115	117	121	116	119	*140
Italy	100	99	114	118	120	122	—	—
Norway	**100	100	108	111	119	120	—	—
Russia	100	110	118	119	130	—	—	—
U. S.	—	***82	93	92	97	100	102	—
Japan	100	132	132	139	154	155	—	—
Canada	100	111	135	136	151	141	151	—
Australia	*100	101	103	103	116	113	118	127
New Zealand	100	109	109	108	112	114	121	*131
India	100	77	88	84	98	—	—	—

*—6 months or less.

**—1901: 1900 data not available.

***—Owing to a revision of the index number of retail prices of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, comparative statistics cannot be given for years prior to 1907. The increase in the price level in the United States, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics index number, was 24 per cent.

The following table shows the increase in per cent. of the price level in these countries for the periods named:

Country	1912 Over 1900	1913 Over 1900	1914 Over 1900
Gr. Britain	15	15	17
Austria	35	—	—
Belgium	32	—	—
France	15	—	—
Germany	30	—	—
Holland	21	16	—
India	98	—	—
Italy	20	22	—
Norway	19	20	—
Russia	30	—	—
Japan	54	55	—
Canada	51	43	52
Australia	16	13	18
New Zealand	12	14	21

Preparedness and the Socialists

By L. B. Boudin

THE discussion of the subject of preparedness in the Socialist press has, so far, had one tangible result: it has shown that we—that is the vast majority of the party membership, those who recognize the validity of the “accepted” socialist doctrines—are confronted with a very unpleasant dilemma: *we must either accept preparedness or confess ourselves bankrupt.* The Socialist Party must either follow Russell into the preparedness camp, or abdicate its role of guide and adviser in the working class of this country.

The reason for this unfortunate situation is very simple; although it will probably be quite surprising for those who have not watched closely the currents of Socialist opinion in this country within recent years. Strange as it may seem to those who regard Russell in the light of an apostate, that erstwhile popular idol of the Socialist masses in this country has simply drawn the logical consequences of our “accepted” revolutionary doctrine. With the result that those of the purveyors of official Socialist doctrine in this country who want to be honest with themselves and others, state frankly that the only way to escape Russell’s logic is not to argue with him, and the only way we may escape being for preparedness is by shutting our eyes to it, evading the issue.

In an article published by Joshua Wanhope in the *Sunday Call* for December 8th, 1915, in answer to a statement made by Russell in the *San Francisco Bulletin*, the situation is summed up thus:

“We are all involved in this contradiction as well as Russell, and we cannot delude ourselves that we have escaped it merely because we have not written about it as he has.

“There may be some Socialists perhaps who would stand against ‘preparedness’ under any conceivable circumstances, but they are not many, and their cause is hopeless at present at any rate. And their position is not ‘the Socialist position’ any more than Russell’s is.

“What, then, is the Socialist position on this matter? *Is there any?* And is there any that does not involve this contradiction? That gets rid of it? We doubt if there is, but, if so, we should like to have it resolved. *It has certainly never yet been done.*”

And after having thus certified to our intellectual poverty, Wanhope offers the following “solution” of the practical problem confronting us:

“Then what are we to do? ‘Take sides,’ with militarism or pacifism, wrangle about ‘preparedness’ or ‘unpreparedness’? . . . Or shall we, *turning our*

backs upon this question, buckle to for steady and persistent work for Socialism?”

Of course, Wanhope realizes that this is no solution of a difficulty but a certificate of impotency, and he has the moral courage to admit it. Says he:

“This is no answer, says our critical reader. *We do not pretend that it is.* But if it is not, *what is the answer?*”

And in an article which he published in the *Call* three days later in answer to my note on “Preparedness and the Socialist Party,” in the Current Affairs department of our issue of December 1st, Wanhope says:

“We want more light. Has Comrade Boudin any to shed? If so, let him turn it on at once and lighten our darkness. . . We acknowledge the inconsistency—the contradiction. Who can formulate a solution that involves neither, and is practicable—a position that can be reasonably and consistently maintained? If Comrade Boudin can do it and get it over, the writer will be the first to acknowledge him the master-mind of the Socialist movement of America—nay, of the world.”

The situation must be indeed a dreadful one when one journalist offers to another—and one Socialist to another—to recognize him the master-mind of the world if he should find a way out. And the task imposed a hopeless one. I shall not, therefore, attempt to find “a position that can be reasonably and consistently maintained,”—particularly in view of the fact that “reasonableness” cannot be defined, and no one but the U. S. Supreme Court is supposed to know what it is. But I shall try to shed some light on the subject, and perhaps find a position which is at least *consistent* without leading straight into the preparedness camp.

So let us begin at the beginning. What is the argument that Russell advanced in favor of preparedness that has so discomfited us? If we examine the Russell argument closely we shall find that it consists of two basic positions: (1) That war is inevitable; that it is of the very essence of capitalism to breed wars,—it is the nature of the beast. (2) That in the event of war it is the duty of Socialists to stick to their nation, or at least defend it when it is attacked. Both doctrines are supposed to be “accepted Socialist theory,” and the first one particularly revolutionary. When the two are put together, there is no escape except in preparedness,—or in the clouds. But if either one of them should prove incorrect, the force of the Russell argument is broken, and we may perhaps find the solution of which Wan-

hope despaired. How about them, then? Can either of them be safely attacked by a Socialist? And if so, which?

My answer to this question is: neither of these two doctrines is true, at least not in the current or "accepted" sense, in the sense in which it is used in the discussion on war and preparedness. This may sound startling, particularly so as to the alleged revolutionary doctrine that capitalism—competition—of necessity breeds war. And authority may be quoted against me, as well as the fact that they are "universally accepted" among Socialists. I will concede that they are generally "accepted," but I categorically deny that either of them is either true or revolutionary.

The fact is that capitalism *as such* is neither warlike nor pacific, or, rather, sometimes warlike and sometimes pacific, depending entirely on the stage of development and surrounding circumstances. The salient point which is important for us here is that there is no *inevitability* about war, such as is supposed to flow from the very existence of the competitive system. History proves conclusively that a highly developed competitive society can get along very nicely—and very profitably to the capitalists—without war. I have discussed this matter at some length in my book, *Socialism and War*, where I have attempted to back up my assertion with some proof by a reference to historical events, and I shall refer the reader to that book for the proof.

That does not mean, however, that we are through with our difficulties. It is true that capitalism *as such* does not produce war. When, therefore, Russell says—as he did in his Philadelphia speech—"You have refused to abolish the competitive system, therefore you *shall* have war, and be vanquished unless you prepare," he is wrong. But, as I have stated, it is also untrue—as some others assert—that capitalism is essentially pacific. It has its warlike epochs. And, unfortunately, we are living in one of them. The particular stage of capitalist development in which we—the vanguard nations of capitalism—are living, is such as to make our ruling class extremely prone to warlike adventures. Hence, the phenomenon commonly called "Modern Imperialism." In a certain, limited, sense, it may therefore be said that at *our stage* of capitalist development wars are "inevitable,"—in the sense, namely, that there is a strong tendency in that direction, which, if unchecked, is "morally certain" to bring on a catastrophe. But this tendency, like most tendencies of social and economic development—some times referred to by Marx as "laws" of social evolution—is liable to be modified or entirely checked by counter-tendencies brought forward by the same process of evolution. In the present instance, the "inevitability" of war depends on whether the warlike tendencies of our ruling classes will be permitted to free-

ly run their destructive course, or will be checked by the counter tendencies of the working class. To be more exact: on whether the working class will follow the lead of its "betters," or develop a "foreign policy" of its own.

"But," Comrades Russell and Wanhope might interrupt to ask, "what difference does it make, from a practical point of view, whether capitalism *as such* produces wars, or only capitalism at a certain stage of development, as long as it is at *our* stage of development? As long as you concede that *we live* in one of capitalism's warlike eras, what care we about the rest of capitalism's history, past or future? *We are practical men*, and we are concerned with a very practical problem: What shall *we* do in view of the warlike character of the capitalism of *our* days?"

"Nor is your assurance about the possibility of checking the warlike tendencies of *our* capitalistic epoch by the workers adopting a certain policy of much *practical* consequence. We have heard of such "policies" before. There was, for instance, the famous "policy" of the general strike. No one can gainsay the claim that if the workers of the world had adopted that "policy" war would have been absolutely impossible. And yet, we did not even have to wait for the present war in order to find out the purely utopian character of the proposal. It was pointed out many years ago: It would depend for its success on the concurrent action of the workers of all the nations involved in the conflict; and of *that* there could, in the nature of things, be no assurance in advance.

"We live in the United States, and address ourselves to the working class of the United States on a practical problem confronting it, *now and here*. In order that your policy, whatever it may be, may be considered reasonable, it must be such as not to depend for its salutary effect upon the concurrent action of the workers of the nation with whom this nation may be involved in war."

I concede the force of the objection and the justice of the condition imposed; and propose to meet them. The means must be adequate to the objects sought to be accomplished. The advice which we give to the working class of this country must be such that if followed by *them* alone will avoid the danger ostensibly sought to be avoided by preparedness. But that requires a consideration of the nature of that danger,—of the purposes and objects of modern imperialistic wars.

According to Wanhope—and he evidently expresses the "accepted" view of the subject—the purpose of war is plunder; and the danger to any nation therefore naturally increases with its wealth—with the increase of the amount of plunder which it offers to a conqueror. "If," says he, "a nation weak in armaments happens to be wealthy, it is a fair mark

for more powerfully armed neighbors." As we are a wealthy nation, and expect to be even wealthier after the great European conflict is over, some other nation, probably the winner of the present war, "will fasten a quarrel upon us so that it may plunder us through force," if we should remain unprepared to meet it in a passage at arms.

If the major premise of this syllogism be correct, the situation would be indeed hopeless. It is evident that nothing that the working class of this country could do, no "policy" it could adopt, could in any way prevent our well-armed and plunder-hungry "neighbors" from looting us.

Fortunately, for these blessed United States of ours, and for the working class of this country, Wanhope's pivotal assumption is utterly untrue. Modern wars are not undertaken for the purpose of plundering the conquered territories, but for the purpose of *developing* them capitalistically. It is therefore not the "wealthy"—capitalistically highly developed—countries that are the "fair mark" of the rapacious imperialists, but the "poor"—capitalistically undeveloped—countries. China is a much more desirable object of attack for the prospective imperialistic conqueror than the United States. If we are ever attacked, it will not be due to the allurements which our wealth will offer to the greediness of some modern conquistadore, but to the uses to which we shall be putting our surplus-wealth—to our own "developing" and "civilizing" enterprises, which may come into conflict with the "enterprising genius" and "civilizing mission" of some good "neighbor" of ours, far away from our own shores.

It is also quite likely that we may be involved in war even before the "developing" enterprises of our capitalists shall have crossed the path of similar enterprises undertaken by the capitalists of some other imperialistic nation. For the "civilizing" spirit of modern imperialism has generated among the highly developed nations a mad rush for the appropriation of hitherto *capitalistically unappropriated* territories as their very own and particular "spheres of influence" in the "civilizing" process—for what Chamberlain called "pegging out claims for posterity"—and our "claims" may come into conflict with those of some other nation. Such a claim is, for instance, the Monroe Doctrine. There are other things which may conceivably *involve* us in war, or subject us to *attack*; but none of them have anything to do with our possession of great wealth at home—they all belong to the domain of World Politics.

The question therefore arises: What interest has the working class in the World Politics of the Nation? And this brings us to the consideration of the second basic position of the argument for preparedness, namely, that the working class must "stick to the nation" in case of war, or at least defend it in case of attack.

This part of the preparedness argument does not enjoy as good a reputation for revolutionarism as the inevitability-of-war doctrine, but it is undoubtedly part of what is called the "accepted" socialist position in this country. Such well-known leaders of the Socialist Party as Berger, Hillquit, and Untermann, as well as a host of lesser lights, have declared it to be good Socialist doctrine.

The fact is, however, that in its broader formulation this doctrine is in flat contradiction of the theory of the class-struggle, which is of the very essence of the Marxian teaching. And even in its narrower formulation—limiting the claims of the Nation upon its working class only to the case of its being attacked—it is quite out of harmony with the true spirit of the class-struggle theory—and could not have been entertained by the founders of Scientific Socialism.

The nationalistic argument in favor of merging the working class in "the nation" in case of war, proceeds along two lines: the "cultural" and the economical. It is claimed, on the one hand, that "the nation" constitutes a cultural entity, having a "spirit" of its own which is the very life-blood of the national culture; that this national spirit and culture are the pre-requisites of any general culture,—in fact the only means by which a general culture can be developed and that the working class of each nation must therefore cherish, love and protect this national culture in order to help the forward march of civilization. On the other hand, it is claimed that the economic interests of the working class of any nation are bound up with and dependent upon the economic interests of that nation; and that the workers must therefore protect the welfare of their nation in order to protect their own material interests.

Both of these claims are wholly unfounded, at least in the sense given to them by the nationalists within and without our ranks.

It is true that modern nations—when the word "nation" is taken in its ethnical significance, and kept carefully apart from its other meanings—present certain cultural characteristics, which may perhaps entitle them to be regarded as cultural entities. But this cultural character, far from being of the essence of "the nation," is only a comparatively recent acquisition even of the oldest of them all—brought about by certain historical conditions, and bound to disappear with the disappearance of those conditions. And these conditions as well as the cultural peculiarities to which they gave birth are now actually disappearing at a constantly accelerating pace.

That the economic interests of the working class are bound up with the fortunes of "the nation" is only true, if at all, in the most narrow and selfish sense,—resulting in a narrow and short-sighted pol-

icy. It is only in the most narrow and selfish sense that the welfare of the working class is bound up with "the nation" whether in times of peace or war. And it is opposed to the *real* interests of the working class. It is the conflict, ever-present in our movement and in the life of the workers, between *immediate* interests and ultimate or "long-run" interests. Excessive care for immediate interests has always been the cause of the short-sighted policies of our opportunists, and the rock upon which the solidarity of labor has always split. It is the immediate interest that makes the blackleg. It is the same kind of interest that requires the working man to "stick" to or defend *his* nation. But there is no real identity of interests between the working class and the capitalist class of any nation *under any circumstances*. *The working-man has no nation.*

That does not mean, however, that the working man has no interest in the struggle going on among the nations—that the subjugation of one nation by another is a matter of indifference to him. On the contrary—that is a matter of the greatest concern and deepest interest to him. But his interest is of quite a different kind from that of the nationalistic patriot. He is not interested in this struggle as the member of a nation struggling with other nations, in which his concern is for the victory of *his* nation; but as a member of a class engaged in a great historical struggle with another class, and his concern is for the victory of *his class*. He must therefore view the struggle of the nations not from the point of view of his nation, but from that of his class,—and the result may be entirely different from, and even opposed to, that desired by his nation.

In the struggle for its emancipation the working class is evolving a culture which will be superior to all national cultures, and developing a psychology in which national allegiance will play no part. But for the time being nations, "national culture," and national feeling exist—and among the unenlightened the latter amounts to a great possession. These are facts which we must take into account. Not in the politician's sense, indeed: flatter them and cater to them, in the alleged "interests"—the immediate interest, of course—of the Socialist movement. On the contrary, we must fight them in an unceasing, unflagging, and relentless fight. But at the same time we must watchfully guard their freedom of expression—and protect them against violence from their own kind. As long as nations, national cultures, and national self-consciousness do exist, we must not permit one nation to dominate another; nor any national culture to prevent another from freely manifesting whatever life there is in it and freely developing whatever elements of future life it may contain.

This fight is enjoined upon the enlightened working class both by the "material interest" of its struggle for emancipation, as well as by the complex of ideas which constitute the intellectual and moral means of that struggle commonly referred to as "general principles." The general principles of the Socialist labor movement favor freedom in all relations of life, and are opposed to any and all kinds of oppression. We are therefore opposed to the domination of any portion of mankind by another no matter on what distinction the same may be based, whether it be sex, religion, race, nation, color or "previous condition of servitude."

The requirements of our "liberty loving" general principles are most ably seconded by the material necessities of the class-struggle. In order that the class-struggle may be properly carried on—in order that the great majority of the working class may see its presence and understand its meaning—the field of battle must be clear, the vision of the hosts of labor must not be obscured by the smoke of other battles. Any other struggle, whether of sexes, or religions, races, or nations, must interfere with the struggle of the classes, by crossing its path and masking it. The only way of avoiding such struggles is to secure freedom for all. Struggles of nationalities—as distinguished from struggles between nations—can only be avoided if no nation is permitted to dominate another.

Our interest in war is therefore not limited to the desire to prevent it or terminate it as speedily as possible. It goes beyond that; we must see to it that the temporary struggle between two nations should not be turned into a permanent national struggle by the conquest by one of the combatants of any territory wholly or predominantly inhabited by the "nationals" of the other combatant. If, therefore, "our" nation should be threatened with conquest it is our duty to defend it. But it is our duty as Socialists, not as national patriots. It is our duty not because our nation is threatened with such fate, but because *a* nation is threatened. And in so far as it lies in our power we must do likewise by *any other* nation.

The consideration of "our duty to our nation" in connection with the real dangers threatening it, must, therefore, lead us to the following conclusion: What we are really interested in defending is *not* threatened, and what is threatened we are not interested in defending. The only difficulty that remains is that our ruling class may pursue such a policy with respect to the matters fraught with dangers of war, as to *incidentally endanger what we are interested in defending*. This difficulty can be met by the working class of this country formulating, and consistently adhering to, a foreign policy of its own. An outline of such a policy will be presented in "our next."

Eduard Vaillant

By Louis Marteau

ANOTHER Titan has fallen,—Eduard Vaillant is dead.

Five years ago, when Vaillant was reaching his seventieth birthday, Franz Mehring, the great German Socialist historian, said of him:

“Of him, as of our own Bebel, it may be truly said that to write a history of his life means to write a history of the Socialist and labor movements of his country.”

A disciple of Proudhon in early life, he became a follower of the famous revolutionary leader Blanqui during the days of the Paris Commune in which both played highly important roles. After the fall of the Commune he fled his native country, and the death-sentence meted out to so many of his comrades was pronounced against him in his absence. Later a general amnesty was granted to the heroic leaders of that unfortunate revolutionary enterprise; Vaillant thereupon returned to France, and became one of the chief leaders of the Socialist movement, and one of the most conspicuous men in the public life of that country. At the last presidential election he was the Socialist candidate for president of the French Republic. Upon the assassination of Jaurès on the eve of the outbreak of the present war, Vaillant became his successor as chief editor of *L'Humanité*.

But his activities were not confined to the French Socialist movement. He joined the old International very soon after its organization, and took a very active part in its affairs during the entire time of its existence. At the Hague Congress of 1872 he was one of the principal leaders of the Marxist forces against Bakounine. In 1889 he officiated at the birth of the Second International, presiding at the International Socialist Congress held in Paris during that year. And ever since then he has been a familiar figure at the International Socialist Congresses, and for many years he represented France on the International Socialist Bureau.

In all the trials and tribulations of the French Socialist movement as well as in the great fights in the Second International he was to be found commanding a division of the revolutionary wing; although the unity of the movement has always been one of his chief concerns. He was not a strict Marxist of the Guesde type, but his fiery revolutionary instinct stood him in good stead in these conflicts; aided, perhaps, by his early Blanquist affiliation and training. So in the great struggle against Socialist Ministerialism during the first years of this century, he was one of the principal fighters against the forces

of opportunism,—at the French Congresses as well as at the International Congress at Amsterdam. At the Copenhagen Congress of 1910 he advocated a declaration in favor of the “limited” General Strike as a preventive against war, and was co-author with the late Keir Hardie of the famous Vaillant-Keir Hardie resolution on the subject, which occupied the attention of that Congress and was to have been one of the principal topics on the agenda of the Vienna Congress of 1914.

The joint authorship of this resolution was one of the most interesting things about it. Vaillant and Keir Hardie were as different as two men could possibly be from the Socialist historian’s point of view. One, a combination of the scholar-philosopher and middle-class revolutionist; the other, a typical representative of the rugged and sturdy working class, and a canny Scot at that, guided in his actions principally by his large fund of common sense. In the Socialist movement they stood almost at opposite poles: Vaillant, as I have already stated, was always to be found on the extreme left; while Keir Hardie and the Independent Labor Party of which he was the founder and leader, were almost as regularly to be found among the groups making up the right wing of the movement. And yet there was something which the two men had in common, and which accounts for their joint authorship of this resolution, an immense fund of pure idealism, and a lack of what is commonly called the “sense of historic realities”—a phrase which often covers faintness of heart coupled with the faculty of applying corner-grocer business calculations to the great problems of the labor movement—which permitted them to dream dreams and gave them unbounded confidence in their ability to turn their dreams into realities.

Then came the war—and the two men went widely apart. On the surface of things Keir Hardie stood by his guns of Copenhagen, while Vaillant abandoned the fort. But we need not be hasty in our conclusions. Whatever we may think of their actions, when judged by the abstract standard of Socialist science, if any such there be in this matter, there can be no doubt that Vaillant, too, remained true to himself, in the course upon which he embarked. His were not the considerations of the petty politician in our ranks, the man who enters upon the consideration of great questions from the point of view of the next election or the necessities of his “constituency.” He remained the same idealist still, dreaming dreams as heretofore. But an idealist overwhelmed by a great catastrophe, embittered by the loss of long-cherished illusions,—dreaming the dream of being engaged in a great and sacred fight against a dread monster who was responsible for the shattering of his previous ideals and the rude awakening from his previous dreams.

Schnitzler's Vienna

By Jacob Wittmer Hartmann

THERE is no European living who is more pre-occupied in all his literary labors with the phenomena of sex than Arthur Schnitzler,—and yet we read him. Before the appearance of his "Professor Bernhardt," his collected works had already come out in several large volumes (four volumes of plays and three of narrative productions), and they are concerned almost exclusively with the eternal feminine and with the male's reactions thereto; yet it would be difficult to find seven volumes anywhere that make more engaging reading and give more lasting artistic pleasure than these of Schnitzler's.

I have never been in Vienna, and therefore the only Vienna I know is that of Herman Bahr, Max Burckhard and Arthur Schnitzler; but it must be a place not without charm. It is surrounded, apparently, by dense forests, into which lovers stray on Sundays, or, if they be of the leisured classes, on any day of the week, and in the forests are occasional clearings traversed by smooth white roads, roads peopled with hosts of bicycling groups and bordered by lonely inns with glass verandas and aproned waiters. At many there are evening performances of cabaret shows or vaudeville acts. Into one of these Mr. Breiteneder strays to see his lost love appear on the stage after a long illness: she has become blind and for a long time he has not dared to call on her, as he fears to behold her as she now is and once was not. She is blind, but her mother leads her on the stage and she sings her little couplets dutifully. Some one has told her that Mr. Breiteneder is present; after the show he joins all the actors at a little supper and Marie, after a few pathetic little sentences, leaves them and falls from the balcony into the yard and is killed.

Somewhere in the suburbs there are villas and they can be rented too; George von Wergenthin has some difficulty in finding one that is good enough to be the birthplace of his child; thither he takes Anna Rosner, who is to be its mother, although she is not his wife, and who has gently whispered to him how strange it is that somewhere there is a house, although they know not where it is, in which their child is to be born, and that no doubt the house already stands. And when it is born, stillborn, George von Wergenthin feels free to wander whither he pleases; he accepts a post as conductor of the opera at Schwerin, and thinks but seldom of Anna Rosner. This is a very sentimental story. Long after, he returns to visit her in Vienna. He sends her flowers, and tells her of his plans, the great things he is going to do. "How ambitious he is!" she chides him

jocularly as the hope dies out of her heart, the hope that perhaps he might marry her after all. For it is hard for her to resume her piano lessons again, to bend for hours over stolid and untalented pupils, to relinquish forever the prospects of existence long and uninterrupted by the side of her beloved. But off he goes: life is hard and the artist needs stimulus and cannot waste himself on any one girl, though he be tempted sore to do it.

That book is called "The Road of Deliverance" (*Der Weg ins Freie*). Schnitzler perhaps thought it right to act thus: but then why does it end with such a wrench, why does he make all the plans of an ambitious composer seem vain and petty by the side of the ambition of this poor girl to keep her lover forever? And the lover well knows that there will be other girls, in fact, there is another just before his child is born. What is the peculiar view of life that enables men to write things like these so heartlessly? And how serious are their love affairs in Vienna, if every mother's son of them, and many a father's daughter, is thoroughly well aware during the course of such an infatuation, that it will last for a while and end with a scene or with no scene, and is meanwhile on the lookout for prospective successors to the present mate?

Schnitzler is himself a physician, and if anything is certain from his manner of treating the physical and moral peculiarities of his literary creatures, it is that he must be a most seductive doctor. Gentleness, ease, delicacy, neatness, are words barely fine enough to describe the unusual sweetness of tone that seems to be characteristic of his outlook on life and his attitude towards his fellow man. Often his short stories are written in the first person, the first person being a physician who is called in to watch the progress of a certain case, and the atmosphere of gentle consideration that seems to envelop the doctor-raconteur cannot but endear him to all his patients. Now the physician necessarily accepts life as it is. Men are foolish, and women, too, they get into all kinds of trouble and their illnesses are of often self-imposed; yet the physician's duty is to cure them. They have children, very often when it might be better for them not to have them, but the physician must keep the children alive. Men become old and worn and feeble, and, alas! how often malevolent also, but to the physician they are all as injured children, whom he must wheedle and humor into good behavior, if possible. No more interesting example of Schnitzler's full acceptance of everything in life can probably be adduced than the short story "The Bachelor's Death" (*Der Tod des Jung-*

gesellen). Three middle-aged men are summoned out of bed late at night, in various parts of the city, to visit an old friend, whom they know to be dying. When they arrive at his bedside, he is no longer alive. But they find awaiting them a message from the deceased, a message written many years ago, informing them that he has had physical possession of the wife of each of the three. He appears to have taken a sort of malicious pleasure in picturing to himself, years in advance, the look that would come to the faces of his friends when they should have grasped the facts. Of two of these men the wives are still living, and they decide, each for himself, and without much pity for the other, to say nothing about the matter to their wives, to let bygones be bygones. People have accepted life before, but never with quite so little fuss.

In another story I am spending a short vacation in Denmark, where I have the rare good fortune to meet a lady with whom, in a small Austrian town, I had once fallen in love. I had been living at her house as a boarder for some time, with her and her husband. Then, a day before I was to leave them, our mutual affection had become so strong, that we had flown to each other's arms impetuously. I observed the husband approach the room and walk away when he became aware of our presence; of course I had left the house immediately, and had never known what had become of the poor woman. Now I am to know. On a little outing which I now take with her, she lets me know that her husband never even so much as mentioned the thing to her: and she informs me of this not in words, because she herself has no suspicion that her husband even saw us on the occasion of our offense, but by her simple acceptance of the fact that my departure was due to some other reason! She still appears to be passionately in love with me, but I have no desire to go out with her or indeed ever meet her again. (*Die Frau des Weisen.*) Instances of this kind could be multiplied: they seem to point to an unusual gentleness in the nature either of Schnitzler's Austrian characters, or in the makeup of the physician's mind. Those who have seen his "Literature" performed by the Washington Square Players know how easily the protagonists of that playlet forget the amusingly perfidious indignity that each has perpetrated on the other. Not only may I deceive others gaily and unscrupulously, but I must take a sort of melancholy satisfaction in being deceived myself. My gentle Austrian intonations must bathe my friends in an atmosphere of the most perfect sweetness, I must tell them of my infidelities in the most tearful and affecting manner, and we must all of us, all the world of us, love the lover deceived and deceiving.

In 1912 Schnitzler produced a play without any lovers and without any sexual infidelities. "Professor Bernhardt," a comedy in five acts, has only one

female character, and she, a nurse at the hospital, disappears for good after causing the trouble on which the play is based. There is dying in the hospital a girl who has contracted a sepsis as the result of a case of criminal malpractice. A hospital interne, who has a love of injections, administers one to the girl, which seems, in spite of its superfluity, to be providing her with the hour of greatest pleasure she has ever experienced. She feels everything quickened within her and believes her lover will come, and take her home with him. The nurse, without the knowledge of the hospital Director, Professor Bernhardt, calls a priest, and right then and there, the old question of whether one should first call the priest or the doctor to a dying man, is fought out on the needlepoint of this carefully prepared situation. Bernhardt informs the priest that to go to her now would mean admitting to her the fact that she is dying, and thus deprive her of an illusion that would enable her to depart this life in joy. The girl hears of the coming of the priest, and dies with the terrified words: "And must I really die?"

People who think Americans are crafty and sophisticated politicians and opportunists will regard us as men of unusual honor and correctness, if, after reading this play, they believe that its conditions are typical of any large European population. The entire intricate political constitution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is suggested with telling effect. Statesmen of the utmost delicacy and intelligence primed with all the culture of an ancient continent and a declining power to discriminate in view of the growing complexity of human life, go through all the motions of guiding the difficult situation that arises out of the little dispute between the conscientious physician and the zealous priest. Bernhardt goes to prison for two months, but on his discharge has already been made so popular by the fact that his case has been taken up by one of the rising political parties, that he seems once more to control the situation.

Now, is it necessary or important for Bernhardt to go to jail, and thus deprive the institution of which he is the head, of its proper direction for two months, and, if so, what was the principle that was thus being vindicated? The right, I should say, of a dying girl to remain ignorant of the fact that she is dying, provided such ignorance gives her pleasure. I do not know whether I really need to say any more; is this not the central weakness and error of the whole Schnitzler view of life? Far be it from me to value, except from this same standpoint of the dying girl, the words of comfort the priest was likely to bring her, and let us not insist on telling the truth always when such knowledge could be of but questionable use to a man who is on his deathbed; yet,—am I my sister's keeper to the extent that I know so well what is good for her, that I may take

upon myself all the consequences, in this world, I mean, of excluding a public servant who believes his ministrations may be of value to her?

Schnitzler might have written all his finely-wrought constructions ten generations ago, for all they contain of the new thought of the times. But when it comes to the "eternal verities," and perhaps the only eternal verity is the existence of male and female, he clothes them in language of a smoothness and temptingness that elevates the rude and barbarous German to an artistic level hardly ever attained by another tongue. If, however, you want the active and virile ideas that succeed in making life uncomfortable today, and if you want them in Vienna, you must go to the works of Herman Bahr and Max Burckhardt. And about these men I hope to be able to say something another time.

"The Weavers"

By Floyd Dell

IF you have not gone to see "The Weavers," as presented by Emanuel Reicher and his company at the Garden Theater, you have made a great mistake. But you are not altogether to blame. You have perhaps read the play a long time ago and forgotten what it is like; and in the meantime you may have read what has been written about it, and got a feeling that it was one of those very great works of tragic art which you would prefer to respect at a distance.

I will confess that I did not want to go to see "The Weavers." I had read it, forgotten it, and believed what was said of it. I thought it was a tragedy. I thought—

Let me tell you what I thought. I thought that Hauptmann had approached the labor problem in the spirit of Sophocles, that is to say in the spirit of making a splendid and pitiful spectacle out of human miseries. I thought that the degradation, the exploitation, the starvation of the weavers of Silesia was to be made heartbreaking and nothing more. I thought that their revolt was to be shown as a desperate, hopeless, futile struggle, ending in despair.

In short, I thought Hauptmann was a damned artist. . . . But he isn't. He is a regular human being. In "The Weavers" he had an opportunity to do the old tragic trick. He tossed it aside, and did something new and splendid. Mr. Reicher, as the person responsible for the production, had an opportunity to foil the dramatist (as Grace George has ingeniously foiled Bernard Shaw, in turning "Major Barbara" into "Salvation Nell"); but Mr. Reicher is a regular human being, too. He resolutely turned his back on that opportunity to draw the facile tear, and produced a joyous and wonderful play.

For "The Weavers" is a joyous and wonderful play. I do not refer merely to the fact that it is packed from end to end with delightful comedy. I mean that it does not deal with starving weavers just to show that starvation is a pitiful and terrible thing; it deals with starving weavers in order to show that even among the most miserable, most oppressed, most apparently spiritless class of workers there is a spark of resistance, that can be kindled into revolt. The weavers, like the tailors, are a traditionally unmilitant class. Yet even in such souls can burn the fire of revolt. That is why the play deals with them.

From the first act to the last there is a steady unfolding of the latent heroism of those miserable souls, a heightening splendor of noble enterprise. Act One ends with a mere murmur of mingled self-pity and sullen anger from the workers at an announcement of a cut in wages. Act Three ends with them mocking the police and singing the prohibited song of revolt. Act Four—they storm the manufacturer's house, its inmates fleeing before their terrible and joyous laughter like dead leaves before a storm-wind; they wreck the house—a beautiful thing to see—and cry: "The new day has come."

Act Five is crucial. Here is a chance for Sophoclean effects, for pity, for terror, for heartbreak, for all the poor little tragic effects of the patrician amateur who believes that life is a spectacle arranged for his contemplation by higher powers, and who has vast amounts of sorrow to waste on the efforts of poor human creatures doomed to failure. By this time the audience is in love with the strikers; in love especially with a drunken little weaver called Old Baumert. What could be easier or more effective in the facile old tragic style than to bring in all the weavers dead on stretchers, poor Old Baumert among them; the soldiers triumphant; the strike quelled: and say, as it were to the audience, "such is life—cruel, pitiful, but still beautiful, and ah! how impressive a spectacle."

The stage is set for that. The soldiers have come. The strikers are making ready to charge them with clubs and pitchforks. An old weaver, a good Christian, warns them of their folly, and refuses to join them; his wife taunts him as a coward and takes her place in the ranks of the rebels. He sits at his loom, doing his duty to God and the king. The strikers make a rush. There is a volley—

The mob wins. The soldiers are driven out of town. Another rich manufacturer's house is sacked.

The revolt does not fail.

Very probably it did, afterward. It may be that Old Baumert got a bullet in his stomach, so recently filled for the first time with chicken and champagne. It may be that the woman who left her husband's side to join the strikers, was killed. What of it? That only means that the struggle has to be taken up

by other men and women, begun anew. They would not have paraded their deaths before us as matters of importance; and neither does the dramatist. Their revolt was all that they would have had remembered of them, and that is all we see. It is the story of a triumph—a splendid triumph of the human soul over its oppressors.

Compared to that, mere tragedy is stale and foolish.

The play ends with a joke. A tragic joke, if you

will, but still a joke. A stray bullet from a soldier's gun comes through the window and kills the good Christian weaver, sitting there doing his duty to king and country.

It is a magnificent play. It has in it the modern spirit of action and of high ironic laughter, such laughter as goes with action and does not inhibit or destroy it. It is a play which says "Yes!" to Life. Why do people slander such a play by talking about "tragedy"?

Book Reviews

Fear and Conventionality

THIS is a delightful and dangerous book.¹ Delightful — for Elsie Clews Parsons shares with Thorstein Veblen the gift, denied these many years to all others writing in English, of being at once pleasant and profound, erudite and agreeable; and she has not neglected, as Professor Veblen recently has, to use that gift. Her new book makes an easy captive of the reader weary of, let us say, the heavy illiteracy of psycho-analytic treatises. A civilized mind succumbs gladly to the allurements of its pages. It is a pleasure to be convinced by this book. But it is a dangerous book. If you wish to continue to be comfortable, you must not believe it.

Let me explain. This is a book on manners—manners as an expression of a state of soul. It collects instances of what is done and said among the Book-laks of Borneo (or tribes quite as unknown to you and me), and collates them with what is done and said under similar circumstances by ourselves. It ranges our conventions along with those of the Chinese, Hindus, ancient Egyptians, modern Turks, Afghans, Iroquois, Fijians, Pygmies, Igorrotes, Melanesians, Wagogoos, Southerners, and the Tshi-Speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast of West Africa; and underlying all the superficial similarities and dissimilarities of custom, it finds a common human motive in them all. That motive is the one announced in the "Fear."

Why do I, in common with the Fijians, dislike to make new acquaintances? That is explained to me in the chapter on "Not Taking to Strangers." It is made still more clear in the chapter on "Introductions." It is explained that we, the Fijian and I, and many other estimable people, resent the irruption into our neatly arranged world of an unknown force, whose nature, habits

and wishes are mysterious and presumably hostile to us. But when the Fijian is informed as to what totem the man belongs, and when I am told that Mr. Smith is a poet, we feel easier. I know what a poet is like: no longer a suspicious mystery, he slips into the place in my world where I keep poets. If he comes from Chicago, I am quite relieved, for I have lived there, and Chicago people are regular people; and if he knows any of my friends there, he is one to whom I may speak without circumspection. Or if he come from any quarter of the earth, and speak a kind of English that I do not more than half understand, and say that he is a Socialist, I will treat him for the moment like a long-lost brother. In each case I will have been relieved of the trouble of finding out what he is really like.

This theme is pursued through chapters on "Travellers," "Hospitality," "Caste," "Chivalry," "Calling," "Entertaining," etc., and it is made sufficiently clear that the motive of all the ceremonial observances under description is a reassuring compromise between our dread of strangers and our gregariousness. The strangeness of the stranger is disguised under a class aspect; he is reassuringly a "gentleman," a "guest," a "friend," or an "acquaintance." As such his conduct is prescribed by rules or assumptions more or less rigid if sometimes unwritten and subject to change. Any departure on his part from these rules or assumptions of conduct forces the rest of society to reckon with him as that mysterious, peculiar and much to be feared thing, a personality: which is bad manners.

But it is in the chapters on the conventions between the sexes, in marriage, and in family life that the fear-explanation is most striking. Certainly it is the association of the sexes, in and out of marriage, and in the intimacy of parents and children,

that there is most danger of the personality breaking loose under the compulsion of love from its class disguise and exhibiting itself in all its disturbing nakedness: and it is precisely here that the rules or assumptions are the most stringent. A man must be a "man." A woman must be a "woman." A wife must be—no, just *is*—a "wife." A child is, in despite of heaven and earth, a "child."

All of these terms are clotted unrealities; they do not even have the relation to the facts that the term "dog" has to a dachshundt, a wolf, a collie, a bulldog and a greyhound; but the effect is somewhat the same as if all these animals had to conceal their specific appearances and behave like an abstract dog that had died and gone to heaven. A "woman"—in the conventional meaning of the term—there never was such a thing, thank God! But there is Mary and Jane—only it takes courage and tact and trouble and energy and a love of reality, not to speak of a love of Mary and Jane, to find them beneath the "woman"-mask.

Before marriage, the sexes have been kept ignorant of each other, separated by physical and psychological barriers. Marriage itself is a device to secure a companionship "immune to the disturbing influences of personality." How effective a barrier between any man and woman, how comforting a preventive of his even having to face the terrors of her actual personality, is afforded by the single conception, to mention no other, of "chastity." And as for children, what parent knows anything about them? Such a multitude of comfortable misrepresentations are bound up in the one word "child," and made to seem true in the guardedly conventional association of children and parents, that they might be races living at different ends of the earth.

I said this was a dangerous book. It does not deal in ideas which can be reposefully assimilated. There is a sting in them. It might be endurable if it were pointed out that we—you and I and all of us in our various fashions—shield ourselves with conventions because it is too much trouble to deal with

¹) *Fear and Conventionality*. By Elsie Clews Parsons. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.50, net.

realities. It would be endurable to think that we live in a world of lying shadows instead of a world of blazing truths because, after all, our energies are limited. We could bear to admit ourselves lacking in strength. But we cannot bear to admit ourselves lacking in courage. We have put up with conventions because they were convenient: it is only when convenience becomes apparent as a form of cowardice that we feel ashamed.

In a last chapter the author sketches the outlines of "An Unconventional Society." It is beautiful, and it is also "terrific and appalling." I am not fit to live in it . . . Are you?

FLOYD DELL.

Undercurrents in American Politics

THIS book¹ has nothing in common with those that massacre United States history by presenting it as a succession or accumulation of official acts and dates. While there is ample evidence of the author's extensive and detailed knowledge of facts, the aim is to interpret the material. The general title covers two separate series of lectures, of which the first three deal with industrial and the last three with political undercurrents.

In the treatment of our industrial alignment of forces and influences, the entering wedge is the distribution of wealth along occupational lines. To cite one fundamental instance—the United States did not become a democracy by the adoption of the Constitution; the change from the oligarchy of Colonial times really occurred around 1820, as a direct result of the land policy of Alexander Hamilton which had given rise in the Middle West to a large body of independent farmers; it was these self-made Westerners that finally outweighed the aristocratic forms and precedents of Colonial times; their arrival to political powers is recorded by the election of Andrew Jackson, and it was this administration that gave us the essentials of our present political democracy, including universal suffrage.

The treatment of political undercurrents or the "unseen government" while it is very suggestive is less fortunate in the mastery of material because Hadley failed to discover the necessary "entering wedge".

In the absence of a theory of class antagonisms and interests and its political expression in the shape of party government, he assumes that political machinery inherently serves a univer-

sal ideal and not a class purpose. In short, the implied point of view is that a party should represent the harmony of capital and labor and the failure to do so is supposed to be a corruption or "perversion" of party rule. This leads not alone to confusion but to insoluble problems because it becomes necessary to ascribe to party government evils that really are inherent antagonisms of the capitalist system. Thus a party which is corrupt and one which is reactionary are treated as synonymous and this error permeates the entire treatment.

To cite just one instance of what is supposed to be corruption:

"It is extraordinary easy for a man to become convinced that a thing that will put him and his friends in public office is good, for everyone else".

Whereas the fact is that all parties distribute employment in one form or another, the honest ones on a basis of competitive merit—the dishonest ones by privilege.

The last lecture deals with practical

conclusions, so that the purpose of the author is not merely academic. To solve "perversion" of government it is recommended that we henceforth depend more upon the selection of experts and specialists. Furthermore we ought not to tyrannize such men by the recall after having chosen them but should give them a fair opportunity to show what they can do. "We must not keep nagging them."

No reference is made to the distinction between the expertness and the interestedness of these specialists; it seems to be taken for granted that expert knowledge and disinterested service are synonymous.

The sum and substance of these devious mental windings is that we have here another attempt to remove executive government further from legislative control. In other words, where the scientific solution of an economic situation means capitalist dissolution, the logic of capitalism calls for self-preservation by arbitrary means.

MAURICE BLUMLEIN.

A Socialist Digest

Socialist Peace Terms in Congress

CONGRESSMAN Meyer London having introduced a resolution calling upon President Wilson to convene a congress of neutral nations for the purpose of peace action, the Socialist party has decided to initiate a campaign in favor of the resolution. A committee consisting of Eugene V. Debs, James H. Maurer and Morris Hillquit was elected to personally urge President Wilson to support the peace measure.

London's resolution follows:

Whereas, the people of the United States, while neutral, cannot be indifferent to the fratricidal conflict which is devastating Europe; and

Whereas, the longer the war is continued the more does the code of physical force replace every other code of human conduct; and

Whereas, the war has brought about a state of fear in the minds of millions of American people which menaces the normal development of this nation, and beclouds the real issues which confront our generation by the artificial issue of "preparedness" against an unvisible and unnamable enemy;

Whereas, a declaration by the national legislature of the greatest neutral nation in the world in favor of an immediate conference of neutral nations will strengthen the hand of the President of the United States in his efforts for international peace; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that the President of the United States be and he is hereby called upon to convene a congress of neutral nations which shall offer mediation to the belligerents, and which shall sit in continuous session until the termination of the war; and

Be it further resolved, that it is the judgment of the Senate and House of Representatives that a durable peace can be established if the following principles shall be made the basis of discussion in said congress of neutral nations:

First—Evacuation of invaded territory.

Second—Liberation of oppressed nationalities.

Third—Plebiscite by the populations of Alsace-Lorraine, Finland and Poland as to their allegiance or independence.

Fourth—Removal of the political and civic disabilities of the Jewish people, wherever such disabilities exist.

Fifth—Freedom of the seas.

Sixth—Gradual concerted disarmament.

Seventh—Establishment of an international court of arbitration, with the commercial boycott as a means of punishment for disobedience.

1) Undercurrents in American Politics. By Arthur T. Hadley. New Haven: Yale University Press. \$1.00 net.

The American International Corporation

APPARENTLY this concern is to begin the industrial invasion of foreign markets with a modest \$50,000,000. Actually the financial strength of the shareholders is somewhere in excess of 100 times fifty million. In fact the basis of organization shows the true relation between nominal capitalization and actual capital.

The stock is not for sale to the public but is distributed so as to assemble into a closed corporation the largest financial industrial powers of the country, e. g. Standard Oil, U. S. Steel, the National City Bank, Morgan, Armour, Kuhn Loeb, etc., etc. To insure the supremacy of financial capital in general over any one industry or industrial group it is further stipulated that half of the shares only can go to the industrial participants and one half is to be offered to the stockholders of the National City Bank.

The active direction is to be in the hands of a number of expert "managers" whose positions are considered confidential to such an extent that the following special provision has been made to identify their personal interest and ambition with their corporate activity: \$1,000,000 worth of stock is set aside to be owned by the active managers exclusively and this stock receives a dividend of 20 per cent., the remaining 80 per cent. of the earnings constituting the dividend for the 49,000,000 worth of shares.

The participation of the public is deferred to the point where the Company has succeeded in acquiring foreign enterprises whether railroad, mining, public utility, etc. "It can organize such enterprises, start them as going concerns, offer their securities to the public or it can hold and operate these companies as subsidiaries and sell its own securities to the public based on these properties."

Under no circumstances is the undertaking to be regarded as a conventional addition to the list of incorporations. Instead of the consolidation of an industry by corporate trustification, we have here for the first time a co-ordinated gathering of trusts on a national scale for the international conquest of fields of exploitation. The departure is new in scope, purpose, size and form and is destined to become historical.

The moral tone by which the new imperialism is to be made a popular ideal is as significant as the material factors.

The National City Bank in its monthly circular after explaining that "internal development will go on, and even be promoted and placed upon a

surer basis by foreign investments which create profitable trade, open up new supplies of raw materials and broaden the footing under our industries," concludes: "We have great confidence that the business men of the country will appreciate the services which this organization will be able to render at this critical juncture in our history. It has been formed in pursuance of a constructive plan to provide permanent business to take the place of the uncertain and ephemeral business which is now giving employment to many of our people, to put a firm basis under our newly developed prosperity, and to enable this country to play a larger part in world trade and development."

Commenting upon the organization of this corporation, the Milwaukee *Leader* says:

"The backers believe that at this time there is an opportunity to seize control of the international trade and finance of the world. The trust proposes to become a great purchasing agent through which it is expected to obtain, at bargain prices because of the war, the vast quantities of indus-

trial securities now held by the capitalists of the warring nations. For years the capitalists of Europe have been investing in traction and power companies, railroads, municipal lighting and gas works, mines, and the whole multitude of industries through which such investors secure the economic power to exploit labor in less developed nations. The pressure of war finance, and the closing of communications have made the owners of these securities ready to sell at bargain prices.

"This mammoth trust proposes to grab up these properties from their fellow-exploiters. To these will be added a vast network of new industries, banks and a great, world-wide scheme of international financiering.

"All this is but the highest development of trustified capitalism. Its sinister aspect is seen in the fact that this trust will henceforth become the power behind the foreign policy of the American government. That government will be called upon to act as its collection agency, to open new markets, to acquire territory for exploitation and, in general, to become the advance agent and private policeman of this imperialistic trust."

The Nation in the New International

THE N. Y. *Volkzeitung* reports an interesting contribution on the question of the International by Paul Axelrod, who is one of the ablest minds in the Russian Movement. According to Axelrod it can not justly be claimed that the old principles of the International have in any way been renounced by the majorities of the parties. He admits that this does not include those who have actually declared war on Socialism and Internationalism, but there is no question here of treason *en masse*. Therefore, the psychological foundation for establishing former relations remains and this can be done right after the ending of the war and to some extent even before. He, however, considers a certain amount of theoretical reconstruction based upon a thorough understanding of the present international crisis to be essential.

An indispensable problem to be solved in this connection is the answer to the following question: Is the division of the human race into territorial and economic societies, constituting the present states and nations

inherent in the laws of nature, or are other forms of social organization possible and in fact necessary, so that the result can lead to a harmonious whole, which shall overcome or undermine the present national and race sentiments?

Axelrod claims that a thorough historical study of nations and Internationalism is needed in order to get a clear understanding of the causes and tendencies and their direction, just as Marx used the materialistic method for a similar purpose in connection with the capitalist system. The particular point that Axelrod has in mind is that, in many instances, we are fighting nationalist abuses instead of fighting pure nationalism as such. Therefore, Axelrod concludes that the salvation of the Socialist movement must involve—international organization of and by the working class, and international social and political activity, in contradistinction to the former attitude which concedes national divisions to be spheres of activity within which to work. This point of view is a compromise with nationalism which must be discarded in the future.

"Japan's Plans to Invade America"

AN article by K. K. Kawakami on the above subject appeared in the *San Francisco Organized Labor*. The article ridicules the perennial Japanese war-scares. It has another significance, however: the editor of *Organized Labor* was formerly the most conspicuous figure in the Oriental Exclusion League. This shows how little the anti-Japanese question counts now in California. Extracts from the article follow:

"Year after year the stock of American-Japanese stories, highly amusing, though somewhat mischievous, is increasing. In 1909, when Mr. Roosevelt sent a squadron of warships around the world, an anonymous German writer published in London an English pamphlet entitled "the War of 1908 for the Supremacy of the Pacific." Shortly afterward a more elaborate Japanese-American war story appeared from the pen of Homer Lea, the self-styled "General" of the American Army. Then came "Banzai," the English version of the German book of much the same nature as "The Valor of Ignorance." The latest contribution to the stock is "The United States and the Next War," written by George Lauffert.

"What more natural than that some enterprising Japanese writers should emulate their American brothers (for the Japanese is highly imitative), and essay to produce entertaining stories of an American-Japanese war? In fact, one anonymous Japanese scribe "put one over" on the Homer Leas of America by publishing his war story with the imprint of a fictitious association whose high-sounding name was the "National Association of Military Affairs." He chose the psychological moment and published the story when the anti-alien land law had just been enacted in California. For all these well-laid plans the book never attracted much attention and has sold only to the extent of some two thousand copies. It has already been relegated to the limbo of oblivion which is its due.

"Now come certain enterprising newspapers in the leading cities of America publishing a condensed translation of this Japanese story under the blazing headline of "Japan's Plans to Invade America." These papers have outdone the Japanese author by stating editorially that the military society, which published the book, is presided over by Premier Count Okuma, and is composed of Cabinet members and army and navy officers. Such a statement, if made knowingly, is a criminal fabrication. That military society exists only in the mind of the Japanese scribe, and

no one except him knows anything about it. We can respect even a jingo, when he pens a story of international war from patriotic motives, endeavoring to convince his countrymen of the necessity of powerful armament as a means of safeguard for his country. But a man who writes such stories from mercenary motives deserves the severest condemnation.

"There is in Japan a governmental board named the National Defense Board (Kokubo-kaigi). It consists of seven members, the Prime Minister being ex-officio its president. No one familiar with Japanese affairs can confound this board with the fictitious National Association of Military Affairs (Kokumingunji-Kiokai) which is the sponsor for the fatuous story, trans-

German Labor Unions and the Party

THE New York *Volkszeitung* fears that the German labor unions are converting the Socialist Party into a mere political tool for obtaining more wages and political reforms. It gives the strongest evidence to show this is the case, especially that of the organ of the Building Trades.

The *Volkszeitung* says:

"It will be seen that the danger to which we have pointed for years has now become a reality. A part of the unions—those in control of the executive Committee of the Federation—threatens to replace the Social-Democratic organization by a 'Headquarters for Action,' to be formed by the unions in case the Party does not pursue the path pointed out to it by the gentlemen at the head of the labor unions.

"The danger that the political labor movement of Germany and its demands will be pushed aside by a pure and simple labor union movement and pure and simple labor union demands is all the greater in view of the fact that the 'civil peace' prevents all discussion of the subject."

The labor union organizations are overwhelmingly on the side of the Party majority in supporting the government. This cannot be questioned. Not only the *International Korrespondenz* and the official organ of the Federation but also other leading labor union papers are pro-war, while nearly all the well-known leaders with very few exceptions are on the same side. It is noteworthy that the anti-war declaration was signed by only eighteen labor union officials out of the many thousands in the country—the overwhelming majority being above mil-

lated by the American papers. It may be well to explain here that the National Defense Board was organized only a year ago, while the book was published three years ago. There is, therefore, no excuse whatever for linking the book with the defense board.

"Is the publication in New York of "The Valor of Ignorance," of "Banzai," of "The United States and the Next War," and similar other books, an indication that America is determined to wage war against Japan? If it is, then the appearance in Tokio of "The Dream Story of the Japanese-American War" must be an indication that Japan is preparing to fight the United States. As a matter of fact, the vagaries of the Homer Leas are about as representative of the sentiment of the American people as the day dreams of their Japanese brothers."

itary age and so accessible at the present time.

That the attitude of the labor unions is nationalistic is borne out by a scientific discussion of their position in the "Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik". After pointing out the ultra-nationalistic attitude of the official organ of the Labor Union Federation, the *Korrespondenz-Blatt*, the writer continues:

"The contrary tendency appears only in very exceptional cases and the labor union trades. It is as if the conception of the state as a class state had been completely obliterated from the labor union ideology. . . .

"Everything which was formerly said by the labor unions about war as a prelude to social revolution appears to have been forgotten. It is now supposed that capitalism will become reasonable and it is forgotten that the victory of imperialism, of the imperialism of one's nation, does not mean progress for the working class but exploitation upon a broader basis, etc. The teaching that the state is the executive committee of the ruling class has been pushed completely into the background. It is hypnotized into something independent of the classes, and so the carrying out of the class interests of the workers against the employers is expected to take place by the help of the state."

The present attitudes of the German labor unions then, according to this testimony, is a thoroughly anti-socialistic as those of America or England. Nevertheless, these unions remain in complete control of the Socialist Party.

Correspondence

Anent "A Russian Socialist Manifesto"

To the NEW REVIEW:

IN its issue of December 1st the NEW REVIEW printed a Russian Socialist Manifesto, bearing the signatures of such well known Russian Socialists as G. Plechanoff, Leo Deutsch, and members of the second Duma Alexinsky and Belousoff. The NEW REVIEW did not comment upon this Manifesto, simply prefacing it with a general statement that it was "an interesting appeal" to the Russian people, that it sheds a light on the position of a great mass of Russian Socialists, and gives a critical analysis of the issues of the great war."

These statements, particularly the one stating that the Manifesto gives an idea of the position of a "great mass" of the Russian Socialists on the war and on the tactics of the party, may bring forth misunderstandings and false apprehensions. This is why I hold it my duty to point out to the readers of the NEW REVIEW that this Manifesto is not a document issued by any official organization of the Social Democratic Party of Russia. The official stand on the war taken by the Russian Social Democratic Party is in strong opposition to the statements contained in this private Manifesto. The Central Committee of the Russian S. D. P., as well as the Socialist representatives in the Duma—the Parliamentary group—condemned the policy of voting for the war credits, of in any way indorsing this Imperialistic war, of entering into any alliances with the Russian or any other class government for the purpose of helping to secure victory for the armies of Imperialism. The working class of Russia does not support the Manifesto of the Russian social-patriots ["Sozial-Patrioten"—anti-Socialists.] The "good advice of the writers of the Manifesto not to engage in strikes "without weighing carefully their moral, political and techno-military effects," the Russian proletariat answers with the continuation of the revolutionary class struggle that has for its chief purpose not the victory of any of the belligerent states, but the victory of the working class over its cosmopolitan enemies—the capitalists, the class governments.

In answer to the Manifesto of the Russian social-patriots, (whose arguments remind one greatly of the arguments used by the German Social-patriots such as Scheidemann, David, Heine, etc., the Foreign Bureau of the Organization Committee of the Russian

S. D. P., has issued an open letter in opposition to the stand of Plechanoff and his followers. This letter is signed by well-known leaders such as Axelrod, Martoff, Trotsky, etc. And to clinch the matter firmly, on November 1st, 1914, the central committee of the S. D. P. issued a Manifesto that contains a clear and definite stand on the war and the tactics of the party, which is strongly opposed to the stand of Plechanoff and his friends, and is based on the spirit of revolutionary internationalism.

I hope in a special article on the attitude of the Russian Socialists to the war to give more details and facts about this matter. It is sufficient at this place to point out to the American Comrades that the Russian party as such has nothing in common with the appeal of the Russian Social-patriots. The Russian S. D. P. repudiates the necessity of helping the government of

the Czar secure military victory, just as the party believes that a decisive victory of the Central European Powers would only strengthen the political reaction in Germany. The only way to fight this war, as any imperialistic war, is to turn the war into a "civil war." This is the only proletarian solution of the problem, a solution based on the example of the Paris Commune and contained in the resolution of the International Socialist Congress at Basel (1912), says the official Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Party.

"Civil war" means nothing else than the revival of the revolutionary class struggle in the belligerent countries; it means to utilize the critical situation in which the war has placed all the belligerent governments, in favor of the workers and their economic and political interests. This is the only way to stop the war. This is the way to open the revolutionary campaign for the conquest of real democracy in Europe and for the emancipation of the working class of the world.

ALEXANDRA KOLLONTAY.

En Route, Lecture Tour.

"The Stakes of Diplomacy"

To the NEW REVIEW:

MR. SIMEON STRUNSKY in reviewing *The Stakes of Diplomacy* accuses me of having started with a psychological analysis of patriotism only to abandon it in favor of a "mechanistic" and orthodox theory. He speaks of the "upflare of elemental hatreds, historic passions and age-old rivalries," which show "the existence of a potential appetite for war to which world markets and colonies are only one of many conceivable stimuli."

Let us pause a moment over these "historic passions and age old rivalries." Let us think back twenty years. What have been the historic passions we have witnessed: England vs. France. England vs. Russia. Russia vs. Japan. Bulgaria vs. Turkey. And now the age long rivals are allies and the historic passions have turned against new enemies. The elemental hatreds are there, but the objects of the hatred have changed with bewildering rapidity.

The point I was trying to make in my book is that the potentialities of war are in all the peoples, but that the stimulus which has set off these potentialities is the game of empires. Mr. Strunsky calls this mechanistic. I am not afraid of the word. The only question is whether the theory is plausible. And I believe it is plausible to say that human nature responds to the stimuli

of the world in which it finds itself. The stimulus may be small and "mechanical," but it may set off immense emotional reactions, similar to those experienced by a philosopher when he sits down on a tack. I don't know whether Mr. Strunsky would call that "mechanistic" or not.

My argument is that at the present stage of the world's development the rich, unorganized, exploitable territory of the world is the determining factor in the rivalry of the Great Powers. Mr. Strunsky seems to think that Germany and France clashed in Morocco because they had some game to play in Europe. I would say that Germany and France clash in Europe because they are playing a game in Morocco. For I believe that if the world consisted of nothing but Germany and France, rivalry would disappear as it has between New York and New Jersey. It is the prizes outside of both Germany and France which set them at each other's throats.

Mr. Strunsky says Germany raised the Moroccan issue to get rid of Decassé, "joint architect of the scheme for encircling Germany." No doubt. But what does "encircling" mean? It means keeping Germany out of Africa, the Balkans, Mesopotamia and the Far East.

And finally, let him consider the case of the United States. We are "preparing," but against what? Against

the fear of European aggression in Latin-America for one thing. But why do we prepare against Germany and not against Canada? Because Canada has no imperial ambitions, and Germany may have. The other object of our "preparedness" is Japan. The rivalry with Japan has two theaters—in China and in California. The clash in China is by far the more serious, for if we renounced all interest in China forever, war with Japan would become improbable for generations. There may come a time when there will be a racial conflict over the Pacific coast. I foreshadowed that in my book. But as Baron Shibusawa informed us the other night, the real question is whether Japan is to have a "free hand" in China. Of course, if we get into war with Japan the Japanese people will fight for their honor in California as we shall fight for the "purity of the white race." And elemental hatreds will be there to feed the flames. So, too, if we fight Germany over Southern Brazil, the Germans will fight for "liberty" and the Americans will fight for "democracy." But the inciting cause will be the tempting weakness of Brazil.

With Mr. Strunsky's doubts as to the effectiveness of the remedy I suggest there is no need to quarrel. I am not sure of it myself. I think it is worth trying and I think merely that it comes nearer to being an international remedy for Imperialism than most other plans now on the market.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

New York City.

SPECIAL CUT RATES

	Regular Rate	Club Rate (1 year)
New Review	\$1.50	2.00
The Masses	1.00	
	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	1.90
The Inter. Socialist Review	1.00	
	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	1.90
Critic and Guide	1.00	
(Wm. J. Robinson, M. D., Editor)	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	1.70
"Songs of Labor"75	
(by Morris Rosenfeld)	2.50	

Ask us for Combinations on any Magazine

Send all Subscription to

NEW REVIEW

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK



THE SURVEY

National Social Service Weekly

Civics--Industry--Health

COMING SOON:

LIFE'S CLINIC

A remarkable series of sketches by Edith Houghton Hooker telling the terrible price men and women must pay for youthful license, has just begun. They are based on medical case histories. She has searched between the lines for the whole toll of human suffering from father, to mother, to children.

THE SERIES

- The Scapgoat.
- Race Suicide.
- The Creche.
- The "Public School."
- Payment in Full.
- The Widower.
- The Sins of his Fathers.
- The Magdalen.

UNCLE SAM-SOCIAL WORKER.

By *Graham Romeyn Taylor.*

What eight federal departments are doing for citizens.

WAR BOOM CITIES.

Bethlehem, Pa.; Flint, Mich.; College Point, Md.; Bridgeport, Conn. Studies by experts of housing, wages, hours, sanitation, and relief problems of resident workers whose expenses boomed with no boom in wages.

PUTTING THE UNFIT ON THE LAND.

By *Winthrop D. Lane.*

Indiana is establishing farm colonies for delinquents, insane, epileptic and feeble-minded. The touch of a nature's healing arts shows them as human beings still.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMON WELFARE.

This is a weekly summary of all important current developments in social and civic work.

The subscription price is \$3.00 a year. We will send to any reader of the NEW REVIEW, a six months' trial subscription for \$1.

SURVEY ASSOCIATES, Inc.

105 East 22nd Street

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Sample Copies

A friend of the NEW REVIEW, who feels that the magazine deserves a greater circulation, has given us \$50.00 on condition that we use the money to send sample copies to possible subscribers. If

you can distribute a bundle of sample copies, from time to time, where they are likely to do some good, drop us a postal to that effect. We need your cooperation.

Ask For Them

Socialism and War

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Author of "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx."

A brilliant and adequate Socialist interpretation of the Great War by the foremost Marxian scholar in America.

This book develops a theory of the economic basis of Imperialism that is at once original and satisfactory.

The general problems involved in the Socialist attitude to ALL wars are brilliantly discussed.

CHAPTERS.

- I. **CLEARING THE GROUND.** Disposes of the superficial "causes" of the war as advanced by many non-Socialists and some Socialists.
- II. **THE ECONOMIC CAUSES OF THE WAR.** A brilliant and inspiring application of the Materialist Conception of History to contemporary events. Analyzes the relation of Capitalism to war, and the economic basis of Imperialism. Shows why Capitalism at one stage of its development is peaceful, at another stage warlike.
- III. **THE IDEOLOGIC CAUSES OF THE WAR.** How material interests develop an ideology. Shows how the economic interests of "iron and steel" Capitalism develop the ideology of the newer nationalism and theories of "race supremacy."
- IV. **THE IMMEDIATE CAUSES OF THE WAR AND THE STAKES INVOLVED.** The production of iron and steel as the basis of Capitalist Imperialism; Germany's lead as a producer of iron and steel the cause of her aggression in the present war. The economic reasons for the invasion of Belgium and Servia. The relation of the Bagdad railway to the present war.
- V. **THE WAR AND THE SOCIALISTS.** Traces the cause for the breakdown of International Socialism, and assigns the responsibility.
- VI. **SOCIALIST VS. BOURGEOIS THEORIES.** What is the Socialist conception of "race" and "nation"? The Socialist conception of Internationalism? The Socialist attitude to war? Can Socialists be neutral? This chapter is a finely constructive piece of work, and applies the class struggle theory to the problems of nationality.

THE ANALYSIS IS STRICTLY SCIENTIFIC, THE STYLE AND PRESENTATION SIMPLE AND DIRECT.

Price, \$1.10 Postpaid

Forthcoming Books

"SOCIALISM" OF NEW ZEALAND. By Robert H. Hutchinson.

MR. HUTCHINSON studied conditions at first hand in New Zealand. His book is a masterly analysis and criticism of State Socialism in New Zealand. Its causes and results are described. A chapter on the influence of the Great War on State Socialism lends an added value to the book.

SOCIALISM AFTER THE WAR. By Louis C. Fraina.

THIS is a study of the future of Socialism in the light of the changes wrought by the Great War. It discusses fully the *revolutionary* Socialist attitude toward the more important social problems arising after the war.

STUDIES IN SOCIALISM. By Isaac A. Hourwich.

THIS is a remarkably suggestive series of studies in social and economic development. Among the chapters are: "The Trust and Socialism," "Social-Economic Classes in the United States," "Industrial Arbitration," etc.

New Review Publishing Ass'n,

256 Broadway, New York City

All good Roads lead to "Rhodes"

"New York's Model Preparatory School"

Preparatory Rhodes School

8-10-12-14 W. 125TH St.

Do not waste your spare time.

- ☐ Are you occupied during the day?
- ☐ Then take up some study in the evening.
- ☐ Prepare for College. It takes less than two years.
- ☐ Study Engineering, Agriculture, Forestry, Medicine, Law, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Etc.

Don't be a Nonentity.

- ☐ You are no better and no worse than hundreds of others.
- ☐ Education counts for more than all the riches in the world.
- ☐ The Rhodes School offers day and evening courses in all college preparatory subjects. Tuition fees are moderate.
- ☐ The Rhodes School has an attendance of more than 2000 students.
- ☐ Write to us for "List of Rhodes Graduates" who entered College in September 1915.
- ☐ Write to us for other interesting information about Rhodes School.

All good Roads lead to "Rhodes"