



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. II

MAY—JUNE, 1918

No. 3

The Divine Right of *The* Hohenzollern

By KARL MARX

Karl Marx and *The* International

By HERMANN SCHLUETER

The Rape of Finland's Labor Republic

By SANTERI NUORTEVA

The "Disarmament" Cry

By N. LENIN



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. II

MAY—JUNE, 1918

No. 3

The Divine Right of *The* Hohenzollern

By KARL MARX

Karl Marx and *The* International

By HERMANN SCHLUETER

The Rape of Finland's Labor Republic

By SANTERI NUORTEVA

The "Disarmament" Cry

By N. LENIN

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. II

MAY—JUNE, 1918

No. 3

CONTENTS

	Page
The Divine Right of the Hohenzollern. By Karl Marx	249—259
Karl Marx. By Ludwig Lore.....	260—270
Karl Marx and the International. By Hermann Schlueter.....	271—288
The new "Americanism." By James Oneal.....	289—295
Pontius Pilate Scheidemann. By Dr. Hans Block.....	296—297
The Rape of Finland's Labor Republic. By Santeri Nuorteva.....	298—304
The "Disarmament" Cry. By N. Lenin.....	305—316
Appeal by the People's Commissary of Education. By A. V. Lunacharsky.....	317—322
The Biology of Peace and War. By Dr. John J. Kallen.....	323—333
Current Affairs.	334—357
A War Anniversary.—St. Louis.—One Year After. Freedom of Thought and Speech.—Foch and Siberia: a Contrast.—War Maps and "Liberalism." —Toward the Revolution.	
Documents for Future Socialist History.....	358—375
Documents of Russian Constitutional Assembly.— Austria's Pacifism. By H. N. Brailsford. Mr. Compers and the British Labor Party.—"Knights of Liberty" in Oklahoma.	

The Co-Operative Press  15 Spruce St., New York

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Published by The Socialist Publication Society, 119 Lafayette St., N. Y. City

Issued Every Two Months—25¢ a Copy; \$1.50 a Year

Editors: LOUIS B. BOUDIN, LOUIS C. FRAINA, LUDWIG LORE

VOL. II

MAY-JUNE, 1918

No. 3

The Divine Right of the Hohenzollern

By KARL MARX

Introduction by FRANZ MEHRING

The following article was originally published in "The People's Paper," a Chartist organ, on December 13, 1856, where it was discovered by Comrade Rjazanoff. It deals with the "Neuenburg Question," one of the serio-comic incidents by which the Prussia of Frederick William IV. and his romantic reactionaries used to amuse all Europe. To-day the matter has been forgotten, therefore a few words of explanation are necessary to understand the article of Marx:

The manner in which Neuenburg came under the sway of the Hohenzollern is pictured by Marx perfectly. As far back as the time of the Burgundian Kingdom, the little country had its own ruler, and was recognized by Switzerland, but had neither voice nor vote in the Swiss assembly. When, after many changes, its feudal dynasty died out in the year 1707, there appeared fourteen claimants, among them the King of France and the King of Prussia. The latter was supported by England and Holland in view of their intense opposition to the hegemony of Louis XIV., and he was equally supported by the Swiss Cantons as a neighbor who was not dangerous; the result was decided by the feudal ruling class of Neuenburg for

the reasons described by Marx, or as the loyal Prussian historian, Stenzel, puts it, "after many promised favors had been secured by them." Indeed, a divine reason for the Divine Right of the Hohenzollern to Neuenburg.

It is not quite correct for Marx to say in his article that the French Revolution destroyed the domination of the Hohenzollern in Neuenburg. On the contrary, as late as February 15, 1806, Frederick William III. ceded the little country to Napoleon, who turned it over with all sovereign rights to his Marshall Berthier. After the first Treaty of Paris by agreement dated June 3, 1814, Berthier turned Neuenburg over to the King of Prussia in consideration of a life income of 34,000 Prussian dollars. This was confirmed by the Treaty of Vienna, but Neuenburg was incorporated in the Swiss Union as the 21st Canton.

The salvation of the little country proved to be the fact that it finally emerged from the swamp of feudal domination.

The constitution of 1848 gave everyone in Switzerland the full rights of citizenship after a residence of two years, so that by 1856 nearly half of the population consisted of those who had immigrated, who by means of the universal suffrage could easily assume power.

In country and city the Patricians saw their power steadily vanishing. They, therefore, hit upon the desperate idea of restoring feudal conditions by a royalistic "coup." Some of the leaders went to Berlin, but Frederick William IV., while too cowardly to sanction the undertaking openly, was dishonest enough to accord it silent consent. Thus a handful of Junkers tried their luck "in the name of the King," and on the third of September 1856 took the castle of Neuenburg by surprise, arrested the authorities, and proclaimed the restoration of the Hohenzollern. The farce lasted just two days; Swiss militia from Bern put an end to the matter quickly, without the loss of a drop of blood. Sixty-six prisoners fell into their hands, and were turned over to the Swiss Court on the charge of

treason. The latter made no secret of the fact that the guilty parties would be given their freedom, provided once and for all, the King of Prussia gave up his claims of "Divine Right" to Neuenburg.

The latter addressed a communication to the Swiss in which he extended to them the "urgent recommendation" to free the prisoners, and subject to this proviso, tendered "his good offices to finally solve the whole question."

But the Swiss hadn't the remotest intention of giving up sure guarantees for vague promises. Thus it looked as though war were unavoidable; in Prussia preparations were made to mobilize 160,000 men and insure their transit through South Germany; the Swiss sent several divisions of the militia to the border.

But the whole stupid affair was becoming too ridiculous for the European powers. Bonaparte gave Switzerland positive guarantees, and in January 1857 the prisoners were freed. Frederick William IV. had to hand to Bonaparte a renunciation of his claim of "Divine Right," and on March 5, 1857, the four neutral great powers met in Paris as a tribunal, before which Prussia and Switzerland were to come to an understanding in regard to details. Frederick felt deeply insulted by being obliged to treat directly with the Swiss rebels, but he tried to combine the profitable with the disagreeable, by demanding a feudal restoration, an allotment of an income of \$2,000,000, etc., etc. When, after much juggling and haggling, he was awarded \$1,000,000, he ended the fiasco by the ridiculous statement that he did not care to bargain for money with Switzerland, and that he would rather take nothing, so that he did not get a sou for his "Divine Right."

Marx wrote his article about the time when the Neuenburg incident threatened to embroil Europe in war.

The Divine Right of the Hohenzollern

By KARL MARX

Europe, just now, is interested in only one great question—that of Neuenburg. That is to say, if we are to credit the Prussian newspapers. The principality of Neuenburg, even if we include the county of Valangin, covers the modest area of about 220 square miles, but the royal philosophers of Berlin maintain that not quantity but quality is the determining factor in the greatness and smallness of things, which stamps them as sublime or ridiculous.

The Neuenburg question, to them, embodies the eternal dispute between Revolution and Divine Right, and this antagonism is influenced by geographical dimensions as little as the law of gravitation by the difference between the sun and a tennis-ball.

Let us see of what the Divine Right consists to which the Hohenzollern dynasty lays claim. It is based, in the case before us, on a London protocol under date of May 24, 1852, in which the plenipotentiaries of France, Great Britain and Russia "recognize the rights over the principality of Neuenburg and the county of Valangin belonging to the King of Prussia according to the stipulations of Articles 22 and 76 of the Vienna agreement, and which from 1815 to 1848 existed simultaneously with those rights which are allowed to Switzerland by Article 73 of the same agreement.

By this "diplomatic intervention" the divine right of the kings of Prussia is determined within the limits of the Vienna treaty. This treaty, however, refers back to the claims which Prussia acquired in 1707. What was the situation in 1707? The principality of Neuenburg and the county of Valangin, which in the middle ages belonged to the Kingdom of Burgundy, became members of the Swiss Confederation after the defeat of Charles the Bold, and continued in that capacity under the direct protectorate of Berne, even in the course of

subsequent changes that occurred in its feudal "sovereignty" up to the time of the Vienna agreement which made it sovereign member of the Confederacy. The sovereignty over Neuenburg was conveyed first to the house of Chalons-Orange, then through the mediation of Switzerland to the house of Longueville, and finally, at the extinction of this line, to the widowed sister of the Prince, the Countess of Nemours. When she tried to assume power, William III., King of England and Duke of Nassau-Orange, entered a protest and conveyed his right and title to Neuenburg and Valangin to his cousin Frederick I. of Prussia; this agreement was hardly given any notice during the lifetime of William III. But upon the death of the Duchess Marie of Nemours, Frederick set up his claim. As fourteen other candidates came forward, however, to assert their claims, he, with wise moderation, submitted his claim to the local nobility, not, however, without first having assured himself of the support of the judges by bribery. Thus by bribery the King of Prussia became Prince of Neuenburg and Count of Valangin.

The French Revolution annulled these titles, the treaty of Vienna restored them, and the Revolution of 1848 removed them again. Over against the revolutionary right of the people the King of Prussia set up his Divine Right of the Hohenzollern, amounting to nothing more than the divine right of bribery.

All feudal conflicts are characterized by pettiness. In spite of this there are distinctions among them. History is always willing to occupy itself with the innumerable petty intrigues, quarrels and betrayals by means of which the Kings of France managed to overcome their feudal vassals, for they enable us to study the origin and development of a great nation. This is not the case in Germany. On the contrary, it is most tiresome and monotonous to trace how one vassal after another managed to gobble up greater or smaller portions of the German Empire for private gain. Unless some particular set of circumstances happen to enliven the scene, as is the case for

instance in the history of Austria. In the case of the latter we see one and the same prince as chosen head of the empire, and as feudal lord of a province of the same empire, by descent, intriguing against the empire in the interest of the province. His intrigues are successful, for his successes towards the south seem to revive the inherited conflict between Germany and Italy, whereas his expansion to the east leads to a continuation of the bitter fight between the German and Slavic race, and the resistance of Christian Europe against the Mohammedan Orient. Finally, by shrewd family alliances his personal power attains such an eminence that for a time it not only threatens to engulf the whole empire, which he managed to surround with an artificial glamor, but to bury the whole world under the domination of a universal monarchy.

In the annals of the Margraviate of Brandenburg (now a province of Prussia and originally the home and possession of the Hohenzollern family) we do not meet with such gigantic characteristics. Whereas the history of her rival appeals to us as a mephistophelian epic, that of Brandenburg creates the impression of a dirty family squabble in comparison. Even where, in view of the identity of interests, we would be led to expect similar tendencies, there is a tremendous difference. The original importance of the two border states—Brandenburg and Austria (Eastern Margraviate)—is traceable to the fact that they were the advance guard of Germany against the neighboring Slavs, whether for defensive or offensive purposes. But even from this point of view the history of Brandenburg lacks color, life and dramatic action, for it comprises only actions on a small scale with unknown Slavic races scattered over a comparatively small strip of territory between the Elbe and the Oder, none of which ever attained historical importance. The Margraviate of Brandenburg never subdued or Germanized a single Slavic race of historical importance, and in fact succeeded only once in reaching out as far as the confines of Brandenburg. Even Pomerania, whose feudal lords were the margraves of Brandenburg from the time of the 12th century,

had not been entirely incorporated in the kingdom of Prussia in the year 1815, and by the time the electors of Brandenburg tried to appropriate it piecemeal, it had long since ceased to be a slavish state. Even the credit for having transformed the southern and southeastern seaboard of the Baltic sea was due partly to the mercantile enterprise of the German trader, and partly to the sword of the German knight, and belongs to the history of Germany and Poland, not to that of Brandenburg, which came only to reap where it had not sown.

We may be so bold as to claim that among the numerous readers who are interested in the importance of the classic names Achilles, Cicero, Nestor, and Hector, very few will have come across the fact that the sandy soil of the Margraviate of Brandenburg, which today produces only sheep and potatoes, gave birth to four electors who enjoyed the proud titles Albrecht Achilles, John Cicero, Joachim I. Nestor, and Joachim II. Hector. The same glorious mediocrity which is responsible for the fact that the Electorate of Brandenburg matured so slowly to what we will politely call a European power, shielded its internal history from any indiscreet curiosity on the part of the outside world. Based on this, Prussian statesmen and historians have tried their utmost to get the world to accept and understand that Prussia is the military state par excellence, from which it follows that the Divine Right of the Hohenzollern is the right of the sword, the right of conquest. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is possible to assert, on the contrary, with perfect accuracy, that of all the provinces which the Hohenzollern possess today, only one was conquered—Silesia. This fact is so isolated in the annals of the history of the house that it earned for Frederick II. the surname of "Peerless." The Prussian monarchy comprises 107,578 square miles; the Province of Brandenburg at present contains 15,514, and Silesia 15,748 square miles. How, then, did she manage to acquire Prussia with 25,035, Posen with 11,391, Pomerania with 12,050, Saxony with 9,776, Westphalia with 7,778, Rhenish Prussia with 10,180 square miles? By the

divine right of bribery, of open purchase, of petty thievery, of legacy hunting, and traitorous partition agreements.

In the beginning of the 15th century the Margraviate of Brandenburg belonged to the house of Luxemburg, at the head of which was Sigismund, who at the same time wielded the scepter of Imperial Germany. Sigismund was always in financial difficulties, and was hard pressed by his creditors. He found in Count Frederick of Nuremberg, of Hohenzollern descent, a friend who was both agreeable and helpful. At the same time, as security for the sums loaned to the Emperor at various times, the administration of Brandenburg was conveyed to Frederick by the Emperor in 1411. After the shrewd creditor had managed to secure temporary possession of the property of the spendthrift, he continued always to involve Sigismund in new debts; in the year 1415 upon final accounting between creditor and debtor, Frederick was invested with the hereditary title of Elector of Brandenburg. In order that there should be no doubt as to the nature of the agreement, two clauses were inserted: the one contained the condition that the house of Luxemburg had the right to buy back the Electorate for 400,000 florins, and in the other, Frederick and his heirs bound themselves in the case of all subsequent elections in Germany to cast their vote for the house of Luxemburg. The first clause shows that the agreement was a bit of bargaining, the second that it was pure bribery. In order now to acquire complete possession of the Electorate, it was merely necessary for the avaricious friend of Sigismund to get rid of the option to repurchase, and it did not take long before a favorable opportunity for undertaking this operation presented itself.

At the Council of Constance, when Sigismund was once again unable to raise the necessary funds to defray the expense of Imperial attendance, Frederick hurried to the Swiss border and bought with his purse the cancellation of the fatal clause. Such is the nature of the methods employed by the Divine Right, by virtue of which the ruling dynasty of Hohenzollern

acquired possession of the Margraviate of Brandenburg. That is the origin of the Prussian monarchy.

Frederick's successor, a weakling, who was given the surname "Iron" because he had a preference for going about in armor, bought an additional section from the Order of Teutonic Knights, just as his father had done before him. Just as the Roman senate had once been accustomed to serve as arbitrator in the internal disputes of neighboring countries, so a policy of acquiring by purchase the lands of principalities overloaded by indebtedness, became the customary method of the Hohenzollern princes.

We shall not dwell further on these dirty details, but shall proceed to the time of the Reformation. It would be absolutely wrong to suppose that, because the Reformation proved to be the mainstay of the Hohenzollern, the Hohenzollern were the mainstay of the Reformation. Quite the contrary. Frederick I., the founder of the dynasty, at the very outset of his reign, led the armies of Sigismund against the Hussites, who rewarded him for his trouble by giving him a sound thrashing. Joachim I. Nestor (1493-1535) was an adherent of the Reformation until he died. Joachim II. Hector, while he was an adherent of Lutheran protestantism, refused to draw the sword in defense of the new creed, and this at a time when it was in danger of being overcome by the overwhelming power of Emperor Charles V. Not alone did he refuse to participate in the armed resistance of the Smalcaldic League, but he offered his services to the Emperor surreptitiously. The German Reformation therefore met with open animosity on the part of the Hohenzollern at the time of its origin, false neutrality during the period of its initial struggles, and at its terrible conclusion through the Thirty-Years War, weak vacillation, cowardly inactivity, and base perfidy. It is a known fact that the Elector Georg Wilhelm tried to block the way of the liberating army of Gustavus Adolphus so that the latter had to drive him by force into the Protestant camp from which he afterwards tried to steal away

by means of a separate peace with Austria. But even if the Hohenzollern were not the saviors of the Reformation, they certainly were its beneficiaries. Even though they hadn't the least ambition to fight for the cause of the Reformation, they were only too willing, and in fact eager, to commit plunder in its name. The Reformation, to them, was merely a religious pretext for secularizing church property, and the greatest part of their conquests in the 16th and 17th centuries can be traced back to a single great source: the blunder of the church, a further curious emanation of Divine Right.

In the genesis of the Hohenzollern monarchy, three events stand out prominently: the acquisition of the Electorate of Brandenburg, the addition of the Dukedom of Prussia, and finally the elevation from a Duchy to a Monarchy. We have seen how the acquisition of the electorate was accomplished. The Dukedom of Prussia was acquired by the following three measures: first, through secularisation; secondly, by marriage, and moreover, in an equivocal manner: the Elector Joachim Frederick married the younger daughter, and his son, John Sigismund, married the older daughter of the insane Duke Albrecht of Prussia, who had no male heirs. The third measure was bribery. And, moreover, he bribed the court of the Polish king on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the parliament of the Polish republic. The corruption was full of complications and lasted a number of years. A similar method was used to convert the Prussian Dukedom into a monarchy. In order to obtain the royal title, the Elector Frederick II., who subsequently became King Frederick I., had to secure the consent of the Emperor, whose Catholic conscience, however, was an obstruction. Frederick thereupon bribed the Jesuit father Wolf, the confessor of Leopold I., and added in trade 30,000 sons of Brandenburg who were slaughtered in the Austro-Spanish war of the Succession. The Hohenzollern Elector went back to the old Germanic institution of employing living beings as money, save for the difference that the Germans of old paid with cattle, and he with

human beings. Thus it was that the Kingdom of the Hohenzollern was founded by the grace of God.

From the beginning of the 18th century, as the power of the Hohenzollern grew, they improved their methods of expansion; in addition to bribing and bargaining, they also used the system of division of spoils by partnership with confederates, against countries which they themselves had not defeated, but which they plundered after defeat. Thus we see them, together with Peter the Great, partitioning the Swedish provinces, and with Catharine II. taking part in the partition of Poland, and with Alexander I. in that of Germany.

Whoever, therefore, opposes the claims of Prussia to Neuenburg by contending that the Hohenzollern acquired them by bribery, commits a grievous error. He quite forgets that Brandenburg as well, and Prussia, and the royal title were obtained purely by bribery. No doubt they possess Neuenburg by the same Divine Right as their other territory, and they cannot waive the former without risking the latter.

KARL MARX

By LUDWIG LORE

In the midst of the bloodiest slaughter the world has ever seen we have celebrated the centenary of the birth of the man who hurled the words "Workers of all countries, unite," into the world.

And yet we know that the teachings of Karl Marx are not forgotten. Marxian ideas influence the whole civilized world, their truths are becoming apparent even to those who formerly looked upon them with doubt and unbelief.

How times have changed since that 14th of March 1883, when Karl Marx closed his eyes forever. A small group of intimate friends and supporters stood about his bier. Small was the number of those who recognized his theoretical teachings. The world knew, it is true, that the spiritual leader of the General Council of the International Workmen's Association was a prominent scientist and a remarkable thinker. But it had little or no understanding of the ideas he had created. Even of those who fought under his banner, few had more than a very incomplete and superficial conception of their import.

How could it have been otherwise? This lack of clearness was, after all, simply the reflex of the movement that he served. The downfall of the Paris Commune, the dissolution of the International Workmen's Association, the socialist exception laws in Germany and the severe industrial crisis in the seventies had vitally impaired the working class movement. There were Socialists in every civilized country, but the movement everywhere bore the marks of inner chaos. Only here and there the movement had succeeded in concentrating into a real social-democratic party. The struggle for the political enfranchisement of labor had only just begun; independent political working class action in the sense of the Social-Democracy was still in embryo. Referring to the Reichstag elections of October 27, 1881, Friedrich Engels wrote to Edward Bernstein on Nov. 30,

of the same year, "If ever an outward event has been capable of restoring Marx to his former vigor, it has been done by these elections." True, the number of socialist votes had fallen from 493,000 in 1877 and 437,000 in 1878, to 312,000. But the result filled Marx and his intimate followers with rejoicing. That it was possible to emerge from the elections with this comparatively small loss of votes, at a time when the heaviest political and economic pressure rested upon the people was, to them, encouraging proof of the power of resistance of the German working class. "Never has a proletariat responded so splendidly," continued Engels in his letter. And truly, the German working class showed more firmness and more unity, particularly in the large cities and industrial centers, than any other working class in the world. Little Denmark excepted, the movement everywhere stood on the verge of dissolution, where it had not, indeed, already fallen to pieces.

Out of these weak beginnings a socialist movement has developed that is today a power in the world.

Disheartening as the outlook today may be, there is not a country in the civilized world in which the socialist movement, in one form or another, has not become a decisive factor in political and economic life.

* * *

In every age of human progress in the history of every great idea, one may observe the same phenomena. The new idea, the outgrowth of existing historic and social conditions, slumbers in the unconscious masses of humanity until it becomes embodied as it were in a few particularly sensitive, great and active minds. But seldom has the embodiment of a new idea found such complete expression in a *single* person, as when modern Socialism received its first concrete expression in the life, thought and work of Karl Marx.

In 1842 Marx first stepped into the arena of public life, as fighter in the radical wing of the bourgeoisie. Two years later, he turned toward Socialism. In 1845 and 1846, together with Engels, he was working out his socialist teachings, and came

into direct contact with the socialist labor movement. At that time it was still a secret organization. In his writings he relentlessly attacked all radicalism and socialism that failed to take account of the political struggles of the times or deemed itself superior to them. He opposed that abstract philosophical speculation that plays with concepts and ideas, and the kind of socialist speculation that fixes its aim according to ideas and ideals, instead of by the concrete needs of the working class. But his own theories, in so far as they had not already appeared in his critical works, were published by Marx and Engels on the eve of the revolution of 1848, in the memorable, epochmaking manifesto of the Communist Party.

It is generally known that Marx and Engels each prepared a separate draft for this manifesto, that Engels, after the two had been compared, immediately declared that of Marx to be superior to his own, that the two worked together on this manifesto until it appeared in its final form.

To us it would seem as if the original draft prepared by Marx, which has been published in the "Letters of Marx and Engels," defines the most permanent scientific work of Marx and Engels, the *materialistic conception of history*, more clearly than the final manifesto. There we read:

"The Communists propagate no new theory of private ownership. They merely express the historical fact that capitalist production and, therefore, bourgeois property relations are no longer in harmony with the social forces of production nor with the development of industry itself."

"Do not wrangle with us by judging the intended abolition of bourgeois property by your bourgeois standards of freedom and culture. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economic conditions of existence of your class.

"You share with all past ruling classes the prejudiced conception that regards existing production and property relations as

the eternal laws of nature and reason, instead of looking upon them in their true light, as the historic conditions that are the outcome of a temporary stage of development of the forces of production."

"What you are well able to comprehend in the history of feudal ownership, you refuse to understand about capitalist ownership."

"Communists propagate no new theory of ownership. They merely express a fact. You deny their most forcible arguments. You must deny them. You are about-face Utopians."

This gives us, briefly, the materialistic conception of history. According to this theory, all human conceptions of right and morality as well as their philosophical expressions, are the outgrowth of human conditions, or, in other words, the methods of production of the human race, i. e., the character of the productive forces used by man—the forces of nature and the tools—are the ultimately decisive factors.

The conditions under which the human race produces exert a definite influence upon its conceptions of right, morality and world philosophy; and these latter are therefore subject to constant change in the course of human evolution.

The materialistic conception of history was by no means the immediate discovery of Marx and Engels. It had been well developed in its fundamental elements, before their time. The scientific greatness of the authors of the Communist Manifesto lies in the fact that they developed it systematically and with a definite aim in view, that they created out of a mass of undigested ideas and ideals a compact and pregnant formula.

Greatest of all contributions made by Marx to posterity is the determination of the specific role played by political economy in the history of the world. Upon this is based the theory of the class struggle. True, the existence of classes and the inevitable struggle between them had already been proclaimed. It was left to Marx and Engels to give to this struggle a scientific founda-

tion, to turn it, by the recognition of its historic significance, into more clearly defined and more consistent channels.

Earlier French and English writers had conceived of history as a series of class struggles taking place under everchanging forms and conditions. But Marx first investigated the economic causes that are responsible for the rise and decline of the classes themselves, and the economic motives that determined their inner struggles. He drew them out into the light of scientific research, stripped of the ancient wrappings and trappings of religion, righteousness, ethics and morals in which they had been presented to the human race often more or less consciously by the combatants themselves.

In his works the various classes that have held the scepter in the history of human kind, were for the first time justly tried and justly adjudged. They were recognized as the necessary products of social evolution, of a process of development moreover that made their overthrow a necessary condition of the progress of human kind. He showed the inexorable law of social developments that creates within each new class that comes into power the class that will one day hurl it from its throne.

This brings us to the second historical contribution of Marx, the perception that the great human struggle of the classes is ultimately of an economic nature, that its object is the surplus product of human labor that the producing classes must pay to their masters. The form of this surplus product changes under varying forms of production. In a capitalist state of society, the obvious form of surplus production disappears, i. e., the form in which it presents itself in a system of serfdom or chattel slavery. It became necessary, therefore, to disclose this hidden surplus product paid by the proletariat to the dominant class in capitalist production. The specifically economic works of Marx, which find their concentrated expression in his gigantic, uncompleted "Capital," are devoted to the investigation of this problem.

According to Marx, this surplus product is the surplus value of capitalist production that is produced by the wage worker for the employer over and above the price of his own labor power.

In other words, the wage paid by the capitalist to his worker, whatever form it may take, whether as time or piece wage, is not a return for accomplished labor, but rather the price for which the capitalist buys the labor power that the worker temporarily places at his disposal. The employer utilizes this labor power for the production of a surplus value over and above the price paid therefore. Without this surplus value a capitalist system of production is inconceivable; the accumulation of surplus value is the law of life of capitalist society. The fight for surplus value, as it is expressed on the one side by the competitive struggle between capitalists against one another, on the other as a struggle for wages and hours of labor between capital and labor, is the driving force that leads first to higher methods of production, and thereby, ultimately, to increasing concentration of capitalist undertakings, to the accumulation of capital in the hands of individuals until this concentration has reached a point when it becomes incompatible with the further development of human production. At this stage the working class will be forced to enforce the expropriation of capitalistic monopolists—or fall into a state of extreme degradation and servitude.

But the disappearance of the last class dependent upon the exploitation of surplus value will put an end to production for surplus value, and in its place will come communistic production upon a socialized basis.

This phase of the Marxian theory, particularly the conclusions he has drawn from his theory of surplus value, has met with active skepticism, not only from the so-called "Katheder Socialisten" (College Professors) the school of Schmoller, Wagner and Sombart, but particularly on the part of the school of "Revisionists" that first received a systematic program of sorts under the leadership of Edward Bernstein. But even Marx's socialist critics—who by the way have become more and more silent, cannot deny, what even Werner Sombart must concede: that capitalist production is production for surplus value, that surplus value is the dominant force in capitalist society.

* * *

If the great revolutions in Finland and Russia, and the pro-

gress of events in the British labor movement possess any significance, it is that we have emerged from the period of petty social and political reforms into an era of revolutionary social upheavals.

The revolutionary upheaval of society by the abolition of the capitalist state has ceased to be an academic question. It has come into a stage of living actuality and will henceforth demand the most intense attention of the socialist movement and of the International. Under these circumstances it is particularly interesting to recall the words that Marx has written of the coming revolution. His "Capital" contains the most concise description of the revolution and the characteristics Marx believed it must ultimately assume:

"What now remains to be expropriated is no longer the independent workingman, but the capitalist exploiter of many workingmen. This expropriation will be enforced by the laws of capitalist production itself, by the concentration of capitalist industries. One capitalist kills many others . . . The number of capitalist magnates who usurp and monopolize all benefits that result from this upheaval constantly decreases. And in the same measure suffering, oppression, enslavement, degradation and exploitation, increase, and with it there grows the revolt of the united and organized working class, trained by the mechanism of capitalist productive processes. Capitalist production becomes a fetter to the productive process that has grown up with and under its protection. The concentration of the means of production and the socialization of labor reach a point where the capitalist shell becomes unbearable. It will be rent asunder. The hour of capitalist private property will strike. The expropriator will be expropriated."

According to Marx, then, it depends only upon the one consideration, whether or not the point has been reached when production by private capitalists will release production, i. e., when the Revolution will come of its own accord. For of course it cannot be hastened, it must break its own way, as a historic necessity. Marx did not mean an ordinary industrial crisis.

Undoubtedly he had in mind a crisis of extraordinary dimensions, a crisis that would spread out over all of *the most important industrial nations*, because this social revolution can come only from economic, not from purely, or even mainly political sources. He means, in other words, the "world catastrophe," that checks all industrial production by wiping out all markets, that depreciates capital and so staggers the economic foundation of present day society that its proud capitalist superstructure will fall into tottering ruins. Even terrified capitalist economists are beginning to see that a few more years of war will inevitably result in the overthrow of the existing social state.

In this paragraph Marx mentions another outward characteristic that will mark the great social revolution: the expropriation of the smaller capitalist by the larger, and the development of a working class "united and organized, schooled by the process of production itself," a class to which he referred at another time as the "only revolutionary class." The revolution itself will be the expropriation of the expropriator, at the command of the revolutionary working class through a new social order.

In other words, Marx never believed in the possibility of a gradual revolution that would lead to the great expropriation, for he was never so childish as to believe that the monopolists would submit peacefully to gradual expropriation. He knew that this expropriation can come only in one great upheaval, and that it must come when the processes of production in all countries where modern industry exists, have been so completely dominated by its masters that the pressure of their power becomes unbearable.

According to Marx, "the education, organization and unification of the working class" to revolutionary action will be, in the main, the work of the capitalist class. This has been interpreted to mean that Marx attached no importance to the propaganda work of the socialists and their parties. In a man who was himself the organizer of international socialist propaganda, this would be a peculiar contradiction. What Marx actually wished to express was this: that even when socialist propaganda seems

to make only slow, hardly noticeable progress, as was the case at the time when his "Capital" was being written, this is no cause for despair. He recognized that the conditions for the realization of the socialist goal are created, as a historical necessity, by the capitalist class, and that these will determine the moment when the eyes of the workers and the expropriated will be opened, when they will be turned into a revolutionary proletariat. The Bourgeoisie, says Marx, produces, above all, its own gravedigger.

In the "Communist Manifesto" Marx further describes the character of the revolution, and the tools with which these "grave diggers" will bury the titanic corpse of capitalism forever: "If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled by the force of circumstances to organize itself as a class, if by means of a revolution it makes itself the ruling class and, as such, sweeps away the force of the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonism, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class."

And at the end of this epochmaking document, which is the more impressive because it was written at a time when capitalism was still in its infancy, it is expressed still more clearly:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

He who has carefully read and understood Karl Marx will never class him with those well-behaved children of polite society who look forward to *the* revolution as a friendly neighborly afternoon-tea, and shudder with holy terror before the actual realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

* * *

In every age of human progress in the history of every great idea, there occurs the same phenomena. The new idea, the outgrowth of historic and social conditions, slumbers in the unconscious masses of humanity, until it becomes embodied, as it

were, in a few particularly sensitive, great and active minds. But seldom has the embodiment of a new idea found such complete expression in a *single* person, as when modern Socialism received its first concrete expression in the life, thoughts and work of Marx.

The scientific greatness of Marx and the greatness of scientific Socialism can find no better formulation, than that which they received in that pregnant sentence of the Manifesto in its early wording:

"We do not come to the world with a new doctrine: Here is the truth; fall on your knees before it! We have but evolved new principles from the principles of the world. We do not say 'Cease your struggles, they are vain; from us you will hear the true message for your struggles!' We only show you *why* you are struggling, and this realization the world *must* make its own, even against its will."

Therein lies the all-conquering power of the ideas that Marx and Engels brought forth into the world. They did not preach Socialism as a doctrine. They held up before humanity a mirror in which it could see itself, its struggles and the causes that brought them forth, Marx did not say: "Follow my teachings and you will be happy." He said: "Nature and industrial conditions in their inevitable course will force you, willingly or unwillingly, whether you close your eyes to the truth or not, along the path that history has marked out for you."

What Marx was as a thinker, he was as a propagandist, as the fighter for an ideal, for whose clarification and concrete realization he rendered such inestimable service. His practical work as leader of the "International Workingmen's Association," which is described elsewhere in this magazine by one intimately acquainted with the circumstances, can hardly be separated from his scientific activity. The former was the natural and necessary consequence of the latter. The spirit that conceived and explained the fundamental idea of the "Capital" was ordained to cry out the thunderous "Workers of all countries, unite!" into the world.

And this slogan became mighty, became glorious because it so

fully expressed the needs of the times, because an international union of labor had to arise to take up arms against the internationalism of capital. Therefore it re-echoed, from North to South, from East to West, like a trumpet blast waking the exploited and the miserable from their drugged sleep of slavery.

Marx is still young. With the freshness and determination of youth his thoughts and his spiritual weapons are fighting the battles of the proletariat. He has found the alchemy that will heal human misery. He has taught us how to destroy the slavery that lies at the root of all slavery. Before his achievements in the field of socialist science, the works of all his predecessors vanish. Before his bold, almost adventurous undertaking, to achieve the fraternity of the most neglected, most derided of all classes, to destroy classes themselves, the boldest plans of history pale into insignificance. Never was there a character of greater purity. In him words, deeds, thoughts and actions were one harmonious whole. Ideal in his family relations, as a man and as a citizen, Marx may well be for us an eternal monument of spiritual greatness and human power.

His name will live forever in the Pantheon of humanity—in the noblest temple of fame whose gates are closed to the “great men” of the earth, in the hearts of the poor and the miserable, in the hearts of the working class.

Marx and the International

By HERMANN SCHLUETER

I.

The International Workingmen's Association that was called into being in September 1864 in London, was not the creation of a single man. And yet a single man, Karl Marx, gave this organization its form and its content, defined its aim: the union of the workers of the world for the emancipation of the proletariat.

The thought that became the keystone of the International Workingmen's Association was not new, even in 1864. The idea of international unity of mankind, in fact, did not originate in the labor movement, even if it did find its most decided expression there. During the great French Revolution the ideal of universal brotherhood was born; of a world republic that would tear down all national boundaries, that would give peace to the world.

At that time the radical bourgeoisie of England, too, declared itself in sympathy with these international ideas. In November 1792 they sent a message to the French revolutionary parliament which said, in part: “A Triple Alliance not of crowns, but of the people of America, France and Britain will bring Liberty to Europe and peace to the world.”

In another message these British reformers protested against the thought of a heritage of hate between England and France, while looking forward to the movement when an indissoluble bond may unite both nations, the forerunner of peace and unity all over the earth.

French as well as English philosophical political literature of that time contains numerous references to the international unity of mankind, which naturally found its most intense expression in the democratically inclined portions of the population. The July Revolution in Paris was greeted with undivided rejoicing by the working class of England, so far as it had entered public

life at that time. At great mass demonstrations they gave voice, in speeches and resolutions, to their solidarity with the revolutionists of Paris, they supported its fighters and its victims, held memorial demonstrations, and were permeated with a feeling of solidarity with the revolutionists.

As they saw more and more clearly the differences that existed between the various classes of society, the workers realized that they, as workingmen, had interests that were in opposition to those of their exploiters and oppressors, that human solidarity must include, first of all, the members of the same class of society. The idea spread that the workers of all nations belong together, that they must unite their forces for the more effective pursuit of their interests against the ruling classes of all nations. And it is astonishing, how clearly this thought of international working class solidarity in all countries was expressed, at that time, at the beginning of the thirties of the last century, at a time when the labor movement was just coming into existence.

Thus, for instance, the Socialist cooperative movement of England, in 1832, sent delegates to France, to the St. Simons and to the United States of America in order to emphasize there, the unity of interests of the workers of all nations. French workmen at Nantes sent an address to English labor declaring: The workers of all countries are brothers. Let us form a union that neither seas and rivers nor state boundaries can divide. Let us all come together, all the cities and the industrial centers of the world." In a message to the workers of America an English Cooperative Congress emphasized that the working class must transform, entirely, existing social and political conditions. English Trade Unionists called to French workmen: We agree with you most heartily that the workers of all nations are brothers.

In The London Workingmen's Association, where the Charter that later became the program of the Chartist movement, was first drawn up, this internationalist tendency was particularly apparent.

In an appeal to the workers of the countries issued by this organization we read: "If you feel with us, then you will tell of it in your shops, you will preach it in your organizations, you will

publish it in hamlet, in town, from country to country, from nation to nation: that there is no hope for the sons of labor until those whose interests are identical with theirs, have an equal right to decide what laws shall be passed, what plans shall be made to rule this country justly."

And another appeal to the working class of America, issued by the same organization in the fall of 1837, begins with the words: "We turn to you in a spirit of fraternity, as is fitting among workers in all countries of the world."

The same thought is expressed in an appeal to the European working class, when it says: "Producers of all wealth: we see that our oppressors are united. Why should not we, too, have our bands of brotherhood, our Holy Alliance?"

When, in November 1836, The London Workingmen's Association sent an address to the laboring class of Belgium in which national differences were condemned as foolish, the Belgians answered in a similar tone. In an address to the working class of America we read: "The tyrants of the world are strong because we, the toiling millions, are divided." And in an appeal to the workers of France: "We turn to you, because we believe that the interests of our class, the world over, are identical."

Thus the international solidarity of the proletariat played an important role at the earliest awakening of the labor movement, and everywhere, in the labor organizations, found suitable expression on all occasions. But there were also organizations that made the propagation of this thought their foremost duty, that tried to bring together workers of various nationalities for the sake of uniting them for the furtherance of the mutual interests of the working class in all countries.

In the middle of the 40's London had become the haven for countless refugees from the different countries of the European continent. Among these men, at the end of 1844, the idea of forming an international organization, which was to be the meeting place of the Democrats of all nations first took root.

This organization came into existence in the beginning of 1845, and called itself the "Democratic Friends of all Nations." It was not particularly successful.

In the summer and the fall of the same year a number of international celebrations were held in London, that were visited by Democrats from all nations. The best known of these celebrations is that of September 22, at which Julian G. Harney was the chief speaker. This celebration was the first meeting of more than a thousand representatives of international democracy. In their decisions they demanded not only Internationalism, but Communism as the aim of the proletarian movement.

This idea of an international association for democracy was taken up by Harney who proceeded, at the beginning of 1846, to organize the "Fraternal Democrats," an organization that shortly afterward united the radical wing of the English Chartists with the revolutionary refugees from the continent. This organization kept up relations with the democrats and reformers, not only of Europe, but of America as well.

In Paris in 1843, German refugees had organized a democratic secret organization, "Bund der Geächteten." Out of this the famous "Bund der Gerechten" evolved, after a split in 1836. Members of this "Bund der Gerechten" organized the public "Deutscher Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein," which later, as "Kommunistischer Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein" was destined to play a momentous role in the labor movement. Here, on English soil, the "Bund der Gerechten" that had hitherto remained entirely German, rapidly developed into an international secret society. Here speakers from all nations were heard. In February 1846, Harney delivered a speech in which he said: "The cause of the people is alike in all nations—the cause of labor, of exploited, enslaved labor. In every country those who produce wheat, live on potatoes; those who raise cattle, never taste meat; those who raise grapes taste only the dregs of their noble juice; those who make clothes go in rags; they who build houses, live in wretched hovels; they who produce the necessities, the comforts, the luxuries of life, are drowned in misery. Are not the sorrows

and the destitution of the workers alike in all countries? Is not their cause identical?"

The leading spirits in the "Bund der Gerechten," and in the "Kommunistischer Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein" tried earnestly to induce Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to join their ranks. How the influence of these two theoreticians gave a new foundation to the Socialists of the "Bund der Gerechten," how they turned it into the "Communist League" is too well known to require repetition. It is generally known that this metamorphosis was partly accomplished, partly furthered, by the Communist Manifesto whose publication gave to the modern labor movement its first theoretical foundation. The "Communist League" thus was the first concrete expression of an international labor movement. Many of those who were active in this secret organization, later assumed a leading role in the International Workingmen's Association. The theoretical principles that were written upon the standards of the "Communist League" are the same principles that are today the connecting link between the units of the entire world proletarian movement. Here, in the Manifesto of this "Communist League," the great word of Marx and Engels, "Proletarians of the World, Unite!" began its victorious journey over the face of the earth.

II.

The overthrow of the revolutionary movement of 1848 killed the labor movement on the European continent. The 10th of April, 1848, gave the death blow to the Chartist movement in England. The Communist trial in Cologne and the general reaction all over Germany choked the first germ of independence in the working class; in France the coup d'état of Napoleon crushed down the last vestiges of a labor movement that might have escaped the overthrow of the June insurrection.

But the overthrow of the 1848 revolution brought in its wake unheard-of industrial prosperity. Capitalism, which had reached a modern state of development only in England, took root upon the continent. In Germany, in France, new forces were awak-

ened. In reactionary Central Europe the remaining walls of mediaeval craft domination were rent asunder. Freedom of movement, freedom of labor were victorious over ancient craft rules.

The "free play of economic forces" began. Capital started on its triumphal march over the European continent.

But at the same time it bore, in the words of Marx, its own gravedigger.

The rapid development of capitalism in the countries of the European continent, awakened the labor movement as well. In France labor and Socialist organizations of the most widely diversified character came into being. In Germany Lassalle's agitation culminated in the organization of the "Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiter-Verein," and in England the trade union movement grew as it had not grown in 30 years.

In London, in 1862, the World's Fair was held, a triumph of a growing capitalist world. At this rendezvous of the bourgeois world, labor, too, played its part. From Germany and France labor delegations were sent to London. Here they met the English workers, and became familiar with a form of economic labor organizations that was practically unknown on the continent. The relations thus established were continued in written communications and discussions. At that time the labor movement in London stood under the influence of persons who used the economic power of the trade unions for political purposes. The ties that were formed between workingmen of London and Paris during this Exhibition, led to the decision to arrange mutual demonstrations on all international questions that moved the world. The overthrow of the Polish revolt of 1863 led to a protest demonstration that again brought French workers to London. This protest meeting was held on April 1864 in St. James. Here a committee of English workingmen was elected, which sent a sharp protest to the workers of France, whereupon the latter answered with a second delegation for whose reception a public meeting was arranged on September 28, 1864, in St.

Martin's Hall in London. This meeting became the birthplace of the International Workingmen's Association.

The meeting was attended by Germans, Poles and Italians as well as by French and English. The chairman was Professor Beesley, who had already made a name for himself by his support of the working class. In his opening speech he expressed the hope that this meeting would lead to the formation of more intimate relations between the workers of the various nations. He further dwelt upon the autocratic acts of the government, calling upon his hearers to rid themselves of that egoistic sensitiveness that hides under the name of patriotism.

The shoemaker *Odger* spoke in the name of the English workers.

The English trade unionist, Wheeler, brought in the following resolution:

"The meeting has received the answer of our French brothers to our appeal. Once more we bid them welcome, and since their program will further the harmony of labor, we accept it as the basis for international unity. At the same time we appoint a committee with the privilege of increasing its membership at will, to draw up the by-laws and regulations for such an organization."

This resolution was debated and accepted. The election of the committee was taken up, and among those elected was Karl Marx.

Thus the International Workingmen's Association was founded.

With the years a legend has gained credence that Marx was the founder of this famous association, that he was its creator and patron. Nothing could be further from the truth. As a matter of fact he came into this organization rather unwillingly and was exceedingly critical of its aims and ideas. In a letter to Engels written at that time Marx draws a vivid picture of the unclear semi-bourgeois opinions of the prominent members of the association, and shows how, only after he was convinced of

the impossibility of accepting their proposed programs, he brought in his "Inaugural Address to the Working Classes" as a substitute for the proposals of the others. To this Engels answered: "I am eager to see your "Address to the Working Classes." It must, in truth, be a work of art, after all that you told me in your letter about these people. But I am glad that we are coming into contact with people who at least represent their class, and after all, that is the most important consideration. . . . But on the whole, I suspect that the new association will soon split up into its theoretical bourgeois and its theoretical proletarian elements, as soon as the work of 'precision' shall have begun."

Here, too, there is nothing that suggests that Marx's activity in the Workingmen's Association was part of a preconceived plan for the unification of the proletariat of all countries. Marx became active there only when everything had already been arranged. In no way did he force himself into an official capacity into the organization. On the contrary, he was with difficulty persuaded to do so, against his own preferences. But once in the General Council, he used his whole power to direct the new Workingmen's Association into the channel that, in his opinion, alone could fulfil the requirements that would have to be met. His experience, his keen mind soon assured him that influence upon the central body, that made it possible for him to direct and form the declarations and decisions of the International, to become its "head."

The International Workingmen's Association was not the creation of one man. It came into existence as the necessary product of economic development, which forced the working class in all countries to unite more closely, in order to strengthen its position in the struggle.

III.

We would have to write a history of the International Workingmen's Association in order to describe in detail the work of Karl Marx in this first organization of the labor movement of all countries.

The Inaugural Address, this first official declaration of the new organization, still lacks, as Marx himself remarked, "the old daring language."

But its principles, on the whole, were thoroughly in accord with the contents of the "Kommunist Manifesto," and the closing sentence of this manifest "Proletarians of all countries, unite," was also the closing sentence of the Inaugural Address. The International Workingmen's Association had found its theoretic basis before it was founded. Of course it was not possible to force the full recognition of these principles in the International at once. In France Proudhon's ideas dominated the Socialist leaders. In England the masses had almost forgotten the revolutionary ideals of the Chartists. The narrow trade union conception that had become dominant in the labor movement of that country determined the attitude of the working class. It was necessary, therefore, first of all, to emphasize the points of likeness between these various groups and theories, to push the differences of opinion slightly into the background, lest the International at the outset become the arena for inner quarrels and differences.

Karl Marx, who by his wisdom and his farsightedness had quickly become the acknowledged head of the General Council, was particularly capable in this respect. He kept the unifying forces of the labor movement consistently in the foreground, and thus succeeded in bringing Socialists, Proudhonists, Communists and Trade Unionists together for the achievement of a common goal. Only a Marx, with his clear conception of the contents of the Labor movement, with his remarkable understanding of the subject, could accomplish this herculean task. Without him the international unification of the working class would have had to wait many years for its realization.

It was for this reason Marx pushed the idea of the class struggle into the foreground in his inaugural address, to create a foundation upon which all workers might stand, to determine the lines of cleavage between the capitalist world and the world

of labor. He described the purpose of capitalist development in the years after 1845. He described the terrible misery that existed on the one hand, the mad thirst for wealth of the ruling class on the other. "It is a great fact, that the misery of the working class has not decreased from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period has been unequalled in the development of industry and the growth of trade." The increase of riches and power in these years was truly enormous, but it was limited to the ruling classes. And while these ruling classes climbed up on the social ladder, the mass of the working people sank down into ever increasing want at least in the same ratio that marked the rise of the upper classes. Hunger lifted its head in the capital of Great Britain and became a social institution, and the inmates of the prisons of England received better food than the "free" workers of the country. He showed that, with a slightly different local color and a somewhat smaller degree, English conditions were being reproduced in every country on the continent that was in the process of industrial development. The fate of the workers of England will be the fate of the workers of the world!

Against all these factors labor possesses only one element of success—its numbers. But numbers are a determining factor only if they are united by an organization and led by knowledge. For this reason the workers of all countries must be united. For this reason they must overcome their prejudices. For this reason they, the proletarians of all nations, must unite in one band of brotherhood.

Like the Inaugural Address, all of the other numerous important declarations of the General Council of the International were written by Marx. He determined the direction along which the movement was to go, within the leading authority of the International, and backed up this decision in the published manifesto. And the effect, particularly upon English politics, was far greater than is generally recognized.

Thus, for instance, the International played a prominent role in the agitation for extended suffrage in England, which in 1867 created another million of new voters. For the purpose of

carrying on this agitation the English workers had founded a "Reform League." Concerning this Karl Marx wrote to Friedrich Engels on May 1, 1865: "The great success of the International Association is this: The Reform League is our work. In the inner committee of 12 (six middle class men and six workingmen) the workingmen are all members of our Council. All middle class bourgeois efforts to mislead the working class we have baffled. . . . If this regalanization of the political movement of the English working class succeeds, our Association, without making any fuss, will have done more for the European working class than would have been possible in any other way. And there is every promise of success."

A few days later, on the 13th of May, Marx added a postscript to this letter to Engels. "Without us, this Reform League would never have been founded, or it would have fallen into the hands of the middle class."

After the reform movement during the following year had assumed an absolutely revolutionary character, after the labor speakers, who at the same time were members of the Council of the International, had recalled, in mass demonstrations, that once before the people of England had beheaded its King, Marx again wrote to Engels on July 7, 1866: "The London Labor demonstrations are miraculous, compared to what we have been accustomed to seeing in England since 1849. And yet they are purely the work of the International. Mr. Lucraft, for instance, the chief on Trafalgar Square, is one of our council. That is the difference between *working* behind the scenes, hidden from the public eye, and showing off in public, according to the favored manner of the Democrats, while one does *nothing*."

It was Karl Marx also, who led the General Council to take a stand in the Irish question, to demand the solution of this problem from the point of view of the working class.

He showed that the working class in England would never be capable of decisive action until its Irish policy was distinctly separate from that of its ruling classes; that it must not only

make common cause with the Irish, but must even take the initiative in dissolving the union between Ireland and England, to put in its place a freer, more liberal relationship. He insisted that this solution alone is commensurate with the interests of the English proletariat. So long as the English land oligarchy can hold itself entrenched in Ireland, it will be impossible to overthrow it in England, and yet its overthrow is the foremost condition in the liberation of the English working class. In Ireland, however, the destruction of the landed aristocracy will be much more easily accomplished, once the solution of this problem has been placed into the hands of the Irish people themselves. For in Ireland the fight against landlordism is an economic and a *national* question as well.

In pursuance of this policy in the Irish question as outlined by Marx, the General Council of the International took its stand on the side of the revolutionary Irish movement. It protested, for instance, against the inhuman treatment accorded to Irish political prisoners in British prisons, and against the death sentence passed upon a number of Fenian conspirators.

It was upon a suggestion from Karl Marx that the General Council took its stand on the question of Negro slavery and the American Civil War. Again he was chiefly instrumental when the London workingmen, under the direct influence of the General Council, arranged protest meetings against the anti-Union attitude of their manufacturers and their government.

On the 22nd of November, 1864, the Council decided to send an address to the American people, congratulating them upon the recent re-election of President Lincoln. The address, written by Marx, was presented to Lincoln through the American ambassador in London, and said, in part:

"Everywhere they (the European workmen) patiently bore the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crisis, opposed enthusiastically the pro-slavery intervention—opportunities of their betters—and from most parts of Europe contributed their quota of blood to the good of the cause."

"While the workingmen, the true political power of the North, allowed slavery to defile their own Republic, while before the Negro, mastered and sold without his concurrence, they boasted it the highest prerogative of the white-skinned laborer to sell himself and to choose his own master, they were unable to attain true freedom of labor, or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation; but this barrier to progress has been swept off by the red sea of civil war."

"The workingmen of Europe felt sure that as the American War of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American Anti-Slavery War will do for the working class. . . ."

This address to Lincoln was answered by Charles Francis Adams, then United States Minister in London. It seems that Lincoln also sent a personal answer to the General Council, for Marx wrote to Engels: "The fact that Lincoln answered us so politely, and was so blunt and formal in his communications to the Bourgeois Emancipation Society, has made the 'Daily News' so indignant that it did *not* print our answer."

It is generally known that, beside this address to Lincoln, the International sent two other addresses to America, one to President Johnson on the assassination of Lincoln, and a second to the people of the United States. The latter rejoices in the end of the war, and congratulates the people of America for having preserved the Union. Both addresses were written by Marx.

But Marx was the spokesman of the International not only in foreign and general political questions. He was active, as well, in the inner work and clarification of the movement, and undertook the work that this entailed. Thus most of the preparatory work for the annual Congress of the Association was the work of his pen. His also were the wonderful memoranda that were presented by the General Council at these congresses. He was the author of the most important resolutions that were adopted by these congresses upon recommendation by the General Council.

The illuminating resolutions on labor unions that were adopted at Genf at the Congress of 1866, were his. Today it is

difficult to understand their importance in view of the then existing state of affairs. On the European continent there were no unions after the pattern of the English trade unions. The Marxian resolution demanding the furtherance of the trade union movement on the continent, met with active opposition from the French and the Swiss delegates. They insisted that such unions would never develop on the European continent. But two years later, at the International Congress in Brussels, there were forty delegates representing continental labor union organizations.

In the General Council itself Marx more than once found active opposition on this question. As in the International, there were represented in the General Council the most widely diversified views. It became necessary to bring about an understanding and wherever possible, agreement between these various groups. All who knew him tell with what almost superhuman patience Marx strove to accomplish this. Marx did not allow the most tiresome debates in the General Council to keep him from pursuing his work of education in these meetings. And though his time was scant—he was finishing the first volume of his "Capital," at that time—he was always ready to give it for the sake of bringing clearness and understanding to the members of the Council.

The following is an example: One of the members of the General Council, John Weston, a disciple of Robert Owen, believed it to be useless to work for a general increase in wages, because the capitalist would cover the difference by increasing the price of his product, thus keeping the worker in his old condition. Therefore, he argued, labor unions are dangerous.

Marx opposed this stand in the General Council and in order to make himself clear, delivered a long theoretical lecture in one of its sessions which was later published under the title "Value, Price and Profit." In this lecture he showed, using the history of the labor union movement as an illustration, that the argument used by Weston, was not, in reality, based upon the actual facts, and he investigated, thoroughly, the laws that control wages in capitalist society. Through his splendid dissertation he won

the General Council over to his side. Later the Council supported, almost unanimously, the proposals and resolutions on labor unions that were presented by Marx at the International Congresses.

Not only in the regular questions of politics and organization did the opinion of Marx prevail. His views also determined the position adopted by the General Council in questions of war, and particularly regarding the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 and its after-effects.

During this war the General Council published two addresses, both written by Karl Marx. The second of these was particularly important.

In the first, which was written a few days after war was declared, Marx was of the opinion that Germany was fighting a war of defense. The falsification of the Ems dispatch was then not yet known. In this address he says verbatim: "Whatever may be the outcome of the war of Louis Bonaparte with Germany, in Paris—the death-knell of the second Empire has already rung. It will end, as it began, with a parody. But let us not forget, that the governments and the ruling classes of Europe have made it possible for Louis Bonaparte for 18 years, to play the cruel joke of a restoration of the second Empire."

"On the part of Germany the war is a war of defense. But who has put Germany into a position that makes this defense necessary? Who made it possible for Louis Bonaparte to make war upon Germany? Prussia! It was Bismarck who conspired with that same Louis Bonaparte, in order to crush down popular opposition at home and to annex Germany to the Hohenzollern dynasty."

In the second message, that was published right after the capture of Napoleon at Sedan, Marx and the General Council protested against the continuation of the war by Germany. The war of defense had become a war of conquest, as was proven by the demand for the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.

"Certainly, the territory of these provinces at one time be-

longed to the long dead German Empire. And, therefore, it is maintained that this piece of earth, and the human beings that have grown up upon it, must be confiscated as an eternal possession of the German nation. But if the map of Europe is to be changed that it may correspond with old historic rights, then let us under no circumstances forget, that the Kurfürst of Brandenburg was at one time, for his Prussian possessions, the vassal of the Polish Republic."

In this address Marx made his famous prophecy, that the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine would drive France into the arms of Russia and would bring a new and a greater war. He declared: "Do the German jingoes really believe that German peace and freedom are assured, if they force France into the arms of Russia? If the fortune of arms, if rejoicing over success and dynastic intrigues lead Germany to rob French territory, only two paths are open before it. Either it will become, whatever may happen, the obvious serf of Russian aggrandizement, or it must arm, after a short period of rest, for a new 'defensive war,' not for one of those half baked 'localized wars,' but for a gigantic war against the united Slav and the Roman races."

Our times have shown how clearly Marx foresaw the political course of events.

It is well known how wonderfully Karl Marx pictured the Paris Commune in his address of the General Council on "Civil War in France." According to him, the Commune was, in the main, a government of the working class, the newly discovered political form under which alone the economic liberation of the working class can be achieved. On the 28th of May the last Commune revolutionists gave up their lives. Only two days later, on the 30th of May, Marx read his papers in the General Council, describing the historic significance of the Commune in short, pregnant lines, but more clearly and truthfully than this has ever been done anywhere in the mass of literature that has been written on this subject.

It would lead us too far afield, should we further discuss the contents of Marx's address on the Commune, especially since it

is probably well known everywhere in working class circles. Nor can we more than mention in passing the part played by Marx in the differences that arose within the International after the Fall of the Commune, as a result of the secret machinations of Bakunin and his followers.

The work that fell to the lot of Marx as a result of these unpleasant quarrels was enormous. It is possible that it would have exceeded even the limits of his endurance, had he not gained in Friedrich Engels, who had moved from Manchester to London, an industrious helpmate in the work of the International.

In September 1872, the last Congress of the International Workingmen's Association on European territory was held. It was the first International Congress which Marx was able to attend. It was decided to transfer the General Council of the Association from London to New York. This put an end to the direct participation of Karl Marx in its business affairs.

After the Congress of the Hague was over, Marx spoke in a mass meeting in Amsterdam, where among other things he said:

"The Congress at the Hague has proclaimed the necessity for the working class to fight against the old social state, which is on the point of collapse, on the political as well as on the social field. . . . A group had arisen in our midst which proclaimed working class abstinence from political work.

"We deemed it our duty to declare, how dangerous and how threatening such opinions may become for our cause.

"The worker must, sometime, get the political power into his own hands, in order to lay the foundation for a new organization of labor. He must overthrow the old political system that upholds the old institutions, unless he is ready like the old Christians—to sacrifice the 'Kingdom of this World.'"

"And," he continues, "Citizens, let us remember that fundamental principle of the International: Solidarity. Only so long as we keep alive this rejuvenating principle among the workers of all nations will we achieve the great aim that is our goal: The overthrow of capitalist society must be based upon solidarity.

That is the lesson of the Paris Commune that fell only because this solidarity was lacking in the workers of the other countries."

And in closing, Marx said in this speech, which, in a way, marked the end of his official activity as member of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association:

"As for me, I will remain true to the task I have undertaken, and will work unceasingly to lay the foundation for the solidarity among the working class. No, I am not withdrawing from the International, and the remainder of my life, like all my energies in the past, will be dedicated to the triumph of our social ideal, which,—be sure that that time will come—will bring about the world rule of the proletariat."

What Marx promised there, he has kept. After the Hague Congress, as before, it was Marx who enriched the proletarian movement of the world with his powerful mentality.

Karl Marx cannot be called the "founder" of the International Workingmen's Association. This first great union of the workers of all countries had no founder in the generally accepted sense of that term; it was the product of necessity at a given stage of economic development. But he first gave the organization its content. He determined its course, it was his untiring work that gave to the International its significance.

Therefore the name of Karl Marx is forever bound to the International Workingmen's Association.

The new "Americanism"

By JAMES ONEAL

The intense propaganda now being waged by reactionary elements to "Americanize" the United States brings to mind some curious facts which these crusaders will hardly consider, facts which include a similar crusade in the '50s of the last century. Though this native American agitation is mainly directed against Germans who display some sympathy with the imperial assassins of Prussia, there is an unmistakable leaning against anything "foreign" in our opinions on various matters. The Americanization program is directed with as much regard to reclaiming the internationalist Jew and Russian as it is to winning or suppressing the nationalist German. The schools, the press, and politicians work with fever heat to accelerate the normal process of assimilating the foreigner. To do this our super-patriots indulge in a glorification of American history and American institutions, themselves possessed with an exaggerated idea of the place of the United States in the history of nations.

Once before we had this native American craze which was also used in the interests of reaction. The immigration to the United States following the Napoleonic Wars reached 20,000 a year and, small though this number is in comparison with later immigration, it caused considerable apprehension for the safety of American institutions. This, with the rise of the Holy Alliance and its hostility to republics and the revival of the order of Jesuits, caused fear of foreign control of politics and education. Mobs occasionally burned Catholic churches and clashed with foreigners in general. The excitement subsided temporarily until immigration increased from 30,000 in 1830 to over 60,000 in 1836, when the agitation revived. It was intensified when the Irish famine drove Irish proletarians and peasants in droves to our shores and the revolutions of 1848 sent more than a million from 1840 to 1850.

Out of this ferment came one of those political freaks that have so often testified to the shallow character of bourgeois

political parties in the United States. This freak was known as the "American Party" or the "Know-Nothings." It proclaimed itself distinctly American and opposed to the influence of foreigners in politics and education. Its text book, "The Sons of the Sires," published in 1855, is a prediction of what fearful things were in store for us from the menace of immigration and contact with foreigners. It opposed all foreigners and foreign influences and especially singled out "German skepticism, French infidelity, Socialism, and Jesuitism," as the chief dangers. The reader of this will be impressed with the mental calibre of the politicians who could lump all the foregoing together and see in them a common enemy. Many of the statements in this text book of "Know-Nothingism" read curiously like the hysterical cries of our Native Americans today. Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Wise Wood, James M. Beck, Samuel Gompers and company have not improved on the propaganda that raged before the overthrow of slavery in the middle of the last century.

This party of "pure Americanism" carried a number of states and elected a number of Congressmen in 1854. In Massachusetts, where it won practical control one year, its representatives inaugurated such a reign of graft that it was turned out of office the following year. During this period the anti-slavery agitation had acquired such proportions that the Whig and Democratic parties were seething with dissensions over this question. In many sections they split into rival factions. To distract attention from this fundamental issue that was later to culminate in a bloody contest between North and South, the Whigs of the South flocked to the American Party. The southern Whigs had represented the most exclusive of the more wealthy slave owners of the black belt and looked down upon the lesser breed of slave drivers.

Besides the motive of obscuring the emancipation issue these Whigs had other reasons for their alliance with the new party. Slave labor in the South prevented that region from getting a good share of immigration. What it received was in the main the lowest type of white labor from Europe, which was diverted from northern ports to southern ports by skillful management in the

North. These defectives were thrown on southern charity and were a source of expense to the taxpayers. A few German revolutionists settled in southern cities but also proved "undesirable" as they quietly agitated against slavery.

It will thus be seen that the slave owners had a number of good economic reasons for embracing the "patriotic" American Party. In the closing years before the Civil War this party in the South became the representative of the higher aristocracy of slave owners, the shrewdest and best educated of the black exploiters who were the first to see the value of the "Americanization" issue for reaction. It is significant, therefore, that the native American issue in politics—until its recent revival—made its final stand as the instrument of a ruling class that lived on slave labor long after slavery had been abolished by other nations. The issue was synonymous with reaction and used to aid a dying system of human servitude.

What are the facts regarding the new "Know-Nothingism" of today? They establish an interesting relation with this same reactionary South. It should be remembered that the South still remains the one section least affected by immigration. The purity of its blood is undefiled by the foreigner. As slave labor discouraged immigration to the South, its peonage, low wages for whites, and brutal exploitation of blacks have constituted a barrier against the coming of the foreigner.

If one will take a map of the United States and the figures on immigration as applied to the states, and will paint those states white that have little foreign blood, he will find all of the South a white shade except Texas and Maryland. The Old South has the lightest shade of all, while all of the North and West—precisely those sections that have made great progress in all fields of human activity—stand out in marked contrast with the South. North Carolina has less than 1 per cent of foreigners, and by this term is meant the foreign born and children of a foreign born father or mother. Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina have from 1 to 5 per cent. Louisiana, Florida and Kentucky come next to

these in purity of their American stock, having from 5 to 10 per cent. From these figures it will be seen that the southern tier of states still retains an overwhelming majority of people whose blood is untainted by contact with foreigners.

Contrast this with the most progressive states of the North. New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Montana and Utah have 50 per cent. or more who are foreign born. Next in the order of progressive states, those having from 35 to 50 per cent., are Arizona, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Vermont and New Hampshire, while the remaining states of the North follow close behind. Anyone acquainted with the United States knows that the states with a large mixture of the foreign born in their populations are the progressive states. They do not stand still. In invention, agriculture, education, industry, transportation, and in the number of Socialist votes polled, they lead the South. The pure American states of the South are known as the most backward in all these fields and there are those who claim that the old American stock is so degenerating that the Negro becomes more vigorous and the prospect of his probable future control of southern capitalism enrages the ruling whites and fosters the lynching spirit.

This degeneracy of the "true Americans" is more pronounced than many surmise. If one will follow the line of the Appalachian Mountains from West Virginia to Northern Alabama he will trace a region inhabited by a people who have been almost entirely isolated from contact with the foreigner, and yet it is the most backward of the backward sections of the South. East of this line live the poor whites of the lowland and who are also practically immune from "foreign contagion." The latter live in rags and squalor, are mostly illiterate, and are so thoroughly "American" that many of them cling to the belief that the North is a "foreign country" and that the "Yankee" is a foreigner.

The inhabitants of the mountain region have been so shielded from foreign contagion that the overwhelming masses in all their lives never saw a Jew, an Italian, a Russian or a German

and never heard a foreign language spoken. What mixture of other blood is found in their veins is due to contact with the Indian and the Negro. Here the primitive colonial society of 200 years ago finds its only survival in America. Here the old clan ethic of savage times, that an injury done to one member of the tribe is an injury to all its members, still survives in the family feuds of the mountains. The spinning wheel and household manufacture still prevail. "Homespun" is still worn by the natives and "city clothes" are rarely seen. Hunting and fishing by the males would identify these communities with the nomadic tribes of a few thousand years ago were it not for the household industry of the women. The old Elizabethan ballads that were sung by our forefathers 200 years ago are still sung by these Americans and are handed down from grandmother to child. Many of these natives never saw a railroad or an electric car, while a Pittsburgh steel plant would strike one of them speechless. The movie is a foreign mystery, Charlie Chaplin is unknown, and it is no exaggeration to assert that many of these Americans do not know that a world war has been raging for nearly four years.

This is your "pure American," oh super-patriot! No foreign influences have contaminated him or led him astray. The Socialist movement has not touched him or been able to make any great impress on his brothers in the lowlands or in the thickly settled communities. He is a special, finished product of unadulterated "Americanism" and as such should be a source of pride to the National Security League. He wants little, knows little, and gets little. Behold him, the pure American type, the one distinctive contribution based on the proposition that things foreign corrupt the mind, the thought and life of Americanism.

Many other illuminating facts might be cited regarding this distinctly Americanized region. We have space for only a few. The ruling classes of the South, descendants of the old regime of Americans, have not shown the intelligence or enterprise of the bourgeoisie of the North and of other countries. The South has all the resources that would make a paradise of capitalist exploitation, yet its ruling exploiters have been so backward in

industrial progress that not until the capitalists of the "foreign" North invested their capital in the South has the latter made progress since reconstruction days. Just in proportion as northern capitalists have fertilized southern establishments has this backward region begun to awaken and take on new life.

The Americanized South is the leader in every phase of modern reaction and a consistent opponent of progress. It leads in illiteracy and is the last in education. The percentage of illiteracy in the South is as follows: South Atlantic States, 16 per cent; East South Central, 17.4; West South Central, 13.2. In the North: New England, 5.3; Middle Atlantic, 5.7; East North Atlantic, 3.4; West North Central, 2.9; Mountain, 6.9; Pacific, 3. In the South the per capita of expenditure for schools is \$2.79; in the North, \$7.37. The cost per capita of average attendance in the South is \$18.98; in the North, \$52.09.

The political backwardness of this Americanized section is also apparent. The Negro is almost completely eliminated as a voter as well as many thousands of poor whites. The land of boasted "chivalry," it is the one section of the country where no concessions have been made to woman suffrage, with the exception of Arkansas, which merely permits women to vote in presidential primaries and grants a restricted municipal suffrage.

The case is complete against the "New Know-Nothingism." The genuine American stock, that is the descendants of our colonial ancestors, who have relied on their own initiative and have maintained a prejudice against other peoples and had little contact with them, give us the one example of arrested development in the United States. Just as the higher aristocracy of slave owners embraced "Know-Nothingism" in the declining days of their rule, so the reactionary elements who today seek to reduce political and economic views to a standardized pattern seek refuge in a revival of this barren crusade of ante-bellum days.

If the educational program of the average school board today is carried out for the next ten years the next generation of

Americanized citizens will be a shallow-brained collection of vain boasters of everything American, oblivious of the capitalist oligarchy that is fast acquiring complete control over the things they venerate. The program is one patterned after the Prussian model which our super-Americans affect to despise. It implies unquestioned obedience and submission to economic wrongs and political tyranny, a discouragement of independent enquiry, and a blind worship of the status quo.

A strutting ego-maniac Kaiser with his Junker assassins have profited by this standardized education and have even dragged the once great Socialist movement of Germany by the heels in their war of conquest and annexations. The only counter force to pan-Germanism and exaggerated "Americanism" is the pan-humanism of Socialist internationalism, a conception that recognizes our own defects as well as the merits of others. A proletarian internationalism that opposes the chauvinism of each nation, that opposes the cultivated hatreds of the ruling classes, that seeks to cultivate an era of good feeling and solidarity among the unhappy workers of the world, is more needed than ever at this period. Socialists owe much to the future of this ideal by doing all they can in counteracting the hatred and chauvinism that are now being impressed upon our youth. Otherwise the type of "pure Americanism" now having its habitat in the South will find a home in the North and reaction will secure a firm place in the struggles of the future.

Pontius Pilate Scheidemann

By DR. HANS BLOCK (Leipzig)

"Within a few days the curtain will fall upon the fifth act of that great tragedy, the Russian Revolution. What has happened in Russia was not the intention of the Social-Democracy. Before the whole world we declare that the policies that were used against Russia were not our policies." From the Reichstag speech of Deputy Philipp Scheidemann, Feb. 26, 1918.

Truly, a bloody tragedy has been enacted before our eyes, a tragedy as terrible as any that the world has seen.

But Herr Philipp Scheidemann is not the man to speak about it. Not Herr Philipp Scheidemann, the party friend of Herr Otto Braun and Parvus, not Herr Philipp Scheidemann, the erstwhile friend and admirer of the Bolsheviki.

Nineteen centuries have passed since St. Peter answered, trembling with cowardly fear, "Nay, I know him not."

Only a few days ago Herr Otto Braun and Herr Philipp Scheidemann drew a sharp line between themselves and the Bolsheviki. Only a few days ago they, too, denied their former friends and comrades, the one in the "Vorwärts," the other on the floor of the Reichstag. As St. Peter trembled before the Roman soldiers, so did they tremble before the Annexationists of the majority bloc, so they too, murmured fearfully: "We know them not. We know them not."

When Peter realized his own weakness, he went out, and wept bitterly. Those gentlemen, Otto Braun and Philip Scheidemann stand with heads proudly erect. For why should they weep? Are they not great politicians?

And another episode from that great tragedy that happened nineteen centuries ago comes to our mind. When Judas Iscariot led the Roman soldiers he said to them, "Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; hold him fast."

How long is it since Messrs. Parvus and Philipp Scheidemann went to Stockholm to exchange fraternal embraces with the Bolsheviki?

"Judas repented himself. He cast down the pieces of silver in the temple and hanged himself."

But that Herr Parvus should cast away pieces of silver—how very unlikely! And the death-knell of the Socialist scientific annexationist publishing society is ringing for the funeral train of the Bolsheviki. Impatiently they are waiting for the curtain to fall.

There is something in the bitter tears of the Apostle Peter, in the repentance and suicide of the traitor Judas, that appeals to us.

But in this great human tragedy of the past, neither the cowardly St. Peter, nor even the faithless Judas Iscariot are as contemptible as that great Pontius Pilate, the original cold "politician," who "washed his hands in innocence."

Human repentance and human grief awaken sympathy, even for the faithless. But cold, self-satisfied self-justification can arouse only hatred and disgust.

"Before the whole world we declare that the policies that were used against Russia were not our policies." Thus the "dependent socialists." They have voted for war loans, and will continue to vote for them; they have supported the government, and will continue to support it; they have sworn allegiance to the annexationist majority bloc,—but they wash their hands in innocence and declare, "What has happened in Russia was not the intention of the German Social democracy."

Truly, a bloody tragedy has been enacted before our eyes.

But Herr Philipp Scheidemann should not have spoken about it. Not Herr Philipp Scheidemann, the friend of Herr Parvus and Herr Otto Braun. Not Herr Philipp Scheidemann, a member of the majority bloc and erstwhile friend and comrade of the Bolsheviki. Not Herr Philipp Scheidemann, the carefully calculating Herr Scheidemann, who gives brotherly kisses today, and draws black lines of demarcation to-morrow. In a word, not the self-satisfied politician, not Herr Pontius Pilate Philipp Scheidemann!

The Rape of Finland's Labor Republic

By SANTERI NUORTEVA

Representative in the United States of the Provisional Government of the People's Republic of Finland

A few years ago Jack London's book, "The Iron Heel," created quite a sensation. At a time when the workers' power grew so strong as to threaten the very existence of capitalism, London portrayed the oligarchy resorting to hired armies to put down labor, creating for a long time a reign of oligarchical terror, destroying labor organizations and all democratic achievements of the people. This idea, at the time, seemed to many Socialists a child of unbridled fancy, a nightmare, an impossibility in a civilized world.

But the reality is stranger than fiction. Comrade London was good enough to imagine that the only element of society which the oligarchy could induce to perform tasks of that character, would be thugs, gunmen and ignorant and reactionary workmen. If at that time he would have said that the enlightened working class of Germany would have lent itself to perform a "mission" of the same kind in the interests of a threatened oligarchy of another country, he would have been ostracized by every orthodox member of the International.

The irony of fate—a nemesis to the German Socialist majority decision of August 4, 1914—would so have it that the hundredth anniversary of Marx' birth witnesses that stupefying nightmare, the tragedy of the German workers, clad in Prussian uniform, blindly following their leaders to Finland to strangle one of the first labor republics, to murder thousands of Finnish workmen and women, so that capitalist privileges and feudal rights may be re-established in Finland.

* * *

It is impossible to understand events in Finland without taking into consideration the social and political background. Up to 1905 there was no popular representation in the Government or in the Diet. The great mass of the people were wholly without

political rights. Under the old feudal constitution most of the producing population was in a condition of virtual serfdom. Tenant farmers were compelled to yield payment in labor to the wealthy overlords. The hereditary Swedish-speaking aristocracy, with feudal class privileges, was able to continue, under the old constitution, mediaeval forms of oppression. The class struggle of the Finnish people started as a struggle for education in the native language. In this struggle good results were obtained. The Finnish people are probably the most illiterate in the world. Ninety-eight per cent. of the population could neither read nor write. A popular culture, however, had grown up as part of the labor movement, together with a strong cooperative organization which was vital in the life of the people. In Finland, as in most of the Russian border provinces, the labor movement had come to the fore as the only organized force opposed to the crushing feudal system of privilege.

The revolution of 1905 established a single Chamber Diet in Finland, based on universal male and female suffrage, with proportional representation. In the first Diet chosen under this democratic franchise, the Socialists secured forty per cent of the members—by far the largest *bloc* among the various parties. This strength was increased in successive elections, and in 1916,—the last legal election,—the labor party secured a clear majority in the Diet. Most of the laws designed to diminish the feudal oppressions under which the great mass of the people suffered, were vetoed by the Czar, through the influence of the aristocracy, which was in close contact with the Russian bureaucracy. The Czar in the meantime was attempting the Russification of Finland as a Grand Duchy of Russia, through a system of military terrorism, which was opposed by the strong Socialist organization, and also by the bourgeoisie, but by the latter only in so far as it was detrimental to certain privileges of the wealthy classes.

There was a clause in the Finnish Constitution which provided for the independence of the country when the Government of the Czar ceased to rule over it. In accordance with this clause, after the downfall of Czarism, the Diet declared Finland independent. The aristocracy, seeing in this the end of their

privileges, managed to persuade the Provisional Russian Government (Kerensky's) to dissolve the Diet. This wholly illegal action was carried out by sending Cossack troops to Helsingfors in order to crush the representatives of the Finnish people. New illegal elections were held, in which for one reason or another large numbers of electors did not take part, and a so-called "Government" was formed, precursor of the "White Guard Government" of today. Recent dispatches from Finland show that immense election frauds were perpetrated in that election to the detriment of the labor party. It has been maintained by the supporters of the "White Guards" that they only recently became pro-German, and then merely because they were faced by the necessity of "saving their little farms and factories" from "anarchy" at home. The fact is that the junker elements in Finland, forming the "White Guard" leadership, were covertly plotting for German intervention in Finland from the early days of the war and actually sent thousands of Finnish young men to Germany to be trained in the German army. Today the "White Guard" leaders are openly boasting of this. In the issue of "Kalova," the official "White Guard" newspaper, of March 2 last, now on my table, appears a copy of a laudatory telegram sent to the German Chancellor by the "White Guard" Prime Minister. It begins:

"On this day, when the Finnish 'Chasseurs,' who have been drilled in Germany, are returning to their Fatherland to fight on Finland's soil for the freedom and independence of their country, the Government of Finland is sincerely impelled to express to His Majesty the German Emperor and to the Imperial Government not only its admiration of the glorious deeds of the German people and their illustrious leader, but also the gratitude, welling from the bottom of the heart of the Finnish people because of all that Germany has done for our country and for the Finnish 'Chasseurs' who this day three years ago voluntarily entered the military service in Germany."

The *coup* whereby the Democratic Diet was dissolved roused the Finnish people. As time went on they saw that the Finnish reactionaries were bent upon getting into the saddle. Revolution was in the air, and late in January of this year a great

uprising of the people took place, beginning in a general strike. The "White Guard Government" fled to the sparsely-settled northern part of Finland, leaving the capital and all the agencies of government, and all the popular manufacturing districts in the hands of the forces of the people. A People's Republic was declared, and a Provisional Government formed, which has appointed me its representative in the United States. This Government was immediately recognized by the Soviet Government of Russia.

At the time of this revolution the "White Guard" was formed, composed mostly of hired thugs and strike-breakers, armed with German weapons and officered by the "Finnish chasseurs" above referred to, trained in the army of the Kaiser. This "Butcher Guard," as the Finns call them, would have had no chance to impose its will against the wishes of the great mass of the Finnish people. Fighting alone, it was doomed. But the German Government, spurred by the desire of making Finland an outpost of German imperialism and securing a road to the Russian arctic ports of Kola and Archangel, which would give Germany control over Scandinavian shipping,—heeded the call of the Finnish junkers and sent 40,000 men. The forces of the Provisional Government, a hastily raised voluntary army of upwards of 100,000 men, poorly armed and more poorly fed, were no match for the German war machine. Finland has fallen. Today the "White Guard" is giving the German officers lists of their political opponents, and the Germans are slaughtering the proscribed men and women by the thousands. In this primitive fashion, the system of Sulla, the "Whites" hope to create a majority for themselves.

For many weeks there have been stories in the papers about "Red Guard" atrocities. Many of these have been exaggerations and many downright lies. They have come mostly from German sources, reactionary Swedish sources and from the pro-German "White Guard" leaders, who up to a few weeks ago seemed to be able successfully to camouflage many of their real purposes from American representatives with whom they were in contact.

That there were "Red Guard" killings that should have been

avoided, I do not deny. In any country in revolution a certain rough element, devoid of principles, inevitably bobs up, to take advantage of the situation for purposes of plunder. The Provisional Government leaders had taken stringent measures to put down such persons. From the start the forces of the Workers' government were under strict orders to give "White Guard" captives all the rights of organized warfare, though the "White Guard" forces had no standing in international law. On the other hand, "White Guard" leaders have openly boasted that "Red Guard" captives were to be slaughtered as "Bandits."

The producing working classes of Finland, strongly organized, trained in over ten years of parliamentary achievement, desire to establish Finland as a cooperative commonwealth, without special privileges or political or economic exploitation of any kind. They are opposed by the aristocracy and the capitalists who lead the junker forces of Finland, and who are willing to accept German vassalage to perpetuate their feudal control and keep the mass of the people in chains.

* * *

The Finnish Socialists have always demanded for the working people of Finland education in the language of the people, and the right for Finland to determine her own fate in accordance with the specific economic conditions of that country. They have always fought for Finland's autonomy. But never have they been nationalists in the usual meaning of that word. The national question was to them a class question.

Until the Russian Revolution, the Russian Czar was the main support of the Finnish bourgeoisie in their opposition to the interests of the working classes. Especially after 1906, when the workers in Finland achieved parliamentary rights, the unlimited power of veto of the Russian Czar was used by the Finnish bourgeoisie as a weapon against the radical legislation of the Diet in which the Socialists were in the majority.

The power of the Socialists was so great, that although they were in the minority until 1916, the bourgeoisie did not always dare to oppose the passage of some of the important laws de-

manded by the masses. Instead of that they utilized their connections with the Russian court and almost always succeeded in thwarting radical legislation by the veto of the Russian Czar. Finland's dependence on Russia was thus one of the principal obstacles to the workers' control of Finland and this class interest of the Finnish Parliament led to the fight for Finland's autonomy.

That the independence desired by the Finnish Parliament—as well as by the Finnish bourgeoisie—was a class issue and nothing more, will be seen from the following facts: In July 1917 the majority in the Finnish Diet, representing the Socialist party, voted for Finland's independence from Russia, and was ardently opposed by the Finnish bourgeoisie. In November of the same year, the illegally elected bourgeois majority in the new Diet,—(recent dispatches from Finland prove the election was tainted with huge frauds, tens of thousands of Socialist votes having been stolen) voted for complete independence of Finland *against the opposition of the Socialists*, who demanded that such an independence should be proclaimed only with the sanction of the Russian Government and that close military and economic connections with Russia be continued. The reason for this is quite clear. In July 1917, Russia was governed by Kerensky, who, in spite of all his socialist paraphernalia remained militaristic and bourgeois. At that time there was no apparent possibility of having in Russia a real workers' government and the Finnish bourgeoisie was successfully using Kerensky's government against radical legislation of the Socialist party in the Diet as they used the Czar against the Finnish radicals. The Finnish Socialists having obtained the majority in the Diet, not accidentally but because of strong labor organizations throughout the country, very naturally wanted to have an unhampered opportunity to utilize their power for the advance of the cause of labor. It was just because the bourgeoisie well knew that its safety was threatened by the radical bills of the Socialist Diet, that they opposed Finnish independence at that time.

In November 1917, the roles were changed. The workers were in power in Russia,—the bourgeoisie was in power in Fin-

land. The Russian Government no longer appealed to the Finnish bourgeoisie as an insurance company against radical legislation,—on the contrary it was the most formidable supporter of absolute proletarian rule in Finland. So the Finnish bourgeoisie took up the cudgels for the independence of Finland, even to the point of war with Russia. The Finnish Socialists, on the contrary, demanded a close union with Russia. In this connection it should also be noted that the policy of the Socialists in regard to Finland's relations with Russia, from the very outset of the revolution up to the present time, has been fully approved of by the Russian Bolsheviks with whom the Finnish Socialists have always been in close connection and in complete sympathy.

I considered it of importance to bring out these facts, as in a recent issue of the "Class Struggle" there was an article by Comrade Louis Boudin which gave a somewhat incorrect view of the nature of the struggle for independence on the part of the Finnish Socialists.

The "Disarmament" Cry

By N. LENIN

In a large number of countries, particularly such as are small and not directly participating in the present war, for example, in Sweden, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, voices are being raised in favor of altering an old item in the social-democratic minimum program, namely, substituting for "militia" or "an arming of the populace" a new demand: "disarmament." In the organ of the International Young People's Organization, the *Jugend-Internationale* ("The International of Youth"), No. 3, there is an editorial article on disarmament. In the "Theses" of R. Grimm on the war question, prepared for the congress of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, we find concessions to the "disarmament" idea. In the Swiss periodical *Neues Leben* ("New Life"), Roland-Holst comes out apparently for a "conciliation" of the two demands, in reality, however, for a similar concession. In the international organ of the Left Wing, *Vorbote* ("Harbinger"), No. 2, there is an article by the Dutch Marxist, Wijnkopp, in favor of the old demand of an armed populace. The Scandinavian Left, as will be seen in the articles printed below, accepts "disarmament," but recognizes in it certain elements of pacifism.*

Let us turn our attention to the position of the defenders of disarmament.

I.

One of the chief arguments in favor of disarmament, which is not always put in so many words, is the following consideration: we are against war, against any war, altogether, and the most distinct, unambiguous expression we can give of this view is the demand of disarmament.

The incorrectness of this view we have already pointed out in our article on the Junius pamphlet,** to which we refer the

* This article originally appeared in the "Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata," No. 2, December, 1916, in Switzerland. It is followed by articles by Karl Chilbum and Arvid Hansen.

** In No. 1 of the above periodical, October, 1916.

reader. Socialists cannot be opposed to all wars, and yet remain Socialists. Nor must we permit ourselves to be blinded by the imperialistic character of the present war. Typical for the imperialistic epoch are just such wars between the "great" powers, but it is by no means impossible to have democratic wars and uprisings, for instance, such as are waged by oppressed peoples, against those oppressing them, to attain freedom from oppression. Inevitable are the civil wars of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, for Socialism. Wars are possible between a successful Socialism in one country, against other, bourgeois, or reactionary countries.

Disarmament is a socialistic ideal. In socialist society there will be no wars, which means, that disarmament will have been realized. But he is not a Socialist, who expects the realization of Socialism *without* the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship is a government power, depending directly on force, and, in the twentieth century, force means, not fists and clubs, but armies. To insert "disarmament" into our program is equivalent to saying: we are opposed to the use of arms. But such a statement would contain not a grain of Marxism, any more than would the equivalent statement: we are opposed to the use of force!

It should be noted, that the international discussion on the present question has been conducted, chiefly, if not exclusively, in German. In German there are two words, the difference between which it is very difficult to render in Russian.* One means simply "disarmament," and is employed, for instance, by Kautsky and his followers, to indicate a reduction of armaments. The other properly means "lack of armament" and is used chiefly by the Left Wingers in the sense of an abolition of militarism, of any militaristic (warlike) system whatever. We shall speak in this article of the *second* meaning, which is a demand frequently made in certain *revolutionary* social-democratic circles.

The Kautskian preaching of "disarmament," which is ad-

* Lenine has in mind, probably, the German words "Abrüstung" (disarmament) and "Entwaffnung" (lack of armament), respectively.

dressed chiefly to the present governments of the imperialistic great powers, is a vulgar piece of opportunism, of bourgeois pacifism, actually calculated—in spite of the good intentions of the gentle Kautskians—to divert the workers from the class struggle. For such a propaganda is calculated to inspire the workers with the thought that the present bourgeois governments of the imperialistic powers are *not* bound by thousands of threads of financial capital and tens or hundreds of corresponding (i. e., predatory, greedy, preparatory to imperialistic aggression) *secret treaties* between themselves.

II.

A suppressed class which has no desire to learn the use of arms, and to bear arms, deserves nothing else than to be treated as slaves. We cannot, unless we wish to transform ourselves into mere bourgeois pacifists, forget that we are living in a society based on classes, and that there is no escape from such a society except by the class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class.

In every class society, whether it be based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at the present moment, on wage labor—the class of the oppressors is an armed class. Not only the standing army of the present day, but also the present-day popular militia—even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, as in Switzerland—means an armament of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. This is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell on it. It is sufficient to point out the use of troops (including that of the republican-democratic militia) against strikers, a phenomenon common to all capitalist countries without exception. In fact, the arming of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat is one of the most striking, fundamental, significant facts of present-day capitalist society.

How can you, in the face of this fact, ask the revolutionary social-democracy to set up the "demand" of "disarmament?" To ask this is to renounce completely the standpoint of the class struggle, to give up the very thought of revolution. Our watch-

word must be: arm the proletariat so that it may defeat, expropriate, and disarm the bourgeoisie. This is the only possible policy of the revolutionary class, a policy arising directly from the *actual evolution* of capitalistic militarism, in fact, dictated by this evolution. Only *after* having disarmed the bourgeoisie, can the proletariat, without betraying its historic mission, cast all weapons to the scrap-heap; and there is no doubt that the proletariat will do this, but only then, and not, by any possibility, before then.

While it is true that the present war calls forth, among reactionary Christian socialists and the whining *petit bourgeois*, only terror and intimidation, only an aversion to all use of arms, to blood, to death, etc., we, on the other hand, must declare that capitalist society always was and always will be *a terror without end*. And if now the present most reactionary of all wars is preparing to put *an end to the terror*, there is no reason for our falling victims to despair. But the "demand" of disarmament, at bottom, cannot be considered as anything but a counsel of despair—let us say "dreams of disarmament" rather than "demands of disarmament,"—at a time when it is clear to all eyes that see, that the forces of the bourgeoisie itself are preparing the way for the only war that is at once in accordance with the laws of evolution and revolution: the civil war against the imperialistic bourgeoisie.

To him who says that this is theory, out of contact with life, we answer by recalling two facts of importance in the world's history, namely, the part played by the trusts in bringing about the factory labor of women, and, second, the Commune of 1871 and the December uprising of 1905 in Russia.

It has been the function of the bourgeoisie to develop trusts, to drive children and women into factories, and there to torment them, ruin them morally, and condemn them to merciless exploitation. We do not "demand" this process, we do not "support" it, we struggle against it. But *how* do we struggle? We know that the trusts and the factory labor of women are steps in progress. We do not wish to retrace our steps to trade craftsman-

ship, to pre-monopolistic capitalism, to domestic labor of women. Onward through trusts, etc., and beyond them to Socialism!

This view, which takes into account the *actual course* of evolution, is applicable also, with corresponding modifications, to the present militarization of populations. The bourgeoisie is today militarizing not only all the men, but also all the boys. Why should it not proceed tomorrow to militarize all the women? In this connection we can only say: So much the better! Go right on! The faster you go, the nearer we are to an armed uprising against capitalism. How can social-democrats be alarmed at the militarization of boys, etc., unless they forget the example of the Commune? This is not "theory, out of contact with life," not a dream, but a fact. And there would be no cause for congratulation, should we find that social-democrats, contrary to all economic and political facts, should begin to doubt that the imperialist epoch and the imperialist wars will bring about the repetition of many such incidents.

In May 1871, a bourgeois observer of the Commune wrote, in an English paper, "If the French nation consisted only of women, what a frightful nation it would be!" Women, and children of thirteen, fought in the Commune by the side of men. And in the approaching combats for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, it will not be otherwise. Proletarian women cannot look on passively, while a well-armed bourgeoisie shoots down the poorly-armed or unarmed workers. They will take to arms, as in 1871, and out of the present intimidated nations, or rather, out of the present workers' movement, disorganized more by the opportunists than by the governments, there is not the slightest doubt that there will arise, sooner or later, an international league of the "frightful nations" of the revolutionary proletariat.

At present militarism is permeating all of social life. Imperialism is an infuriated struggle of the great powers for the division and redivision of the world. It must therefore inevitably lead to a further militarization of all countries, including the neutral countries and the small countries. What will proletarian women do about this? Will they simply abjure all warfare and

everything warlike—simply demand disarmament? Never will the women of an oppressed class that is really revolutionary be content with such a base inaction. They will say to their sons:

“Soon you will be a man. They will give you arms. Bear them and learn well the business of war. This knowledge is necessary for the proletarians, not in order that they may shoot at their brothers, the workers of other countries, as they are doing in the present war, and as they are being advised to do by renegades from Socialism,—but in order that they may struggle against the bourgeoisie of their own country, in order that they may put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, not by the path of good-natured wishes, but by the path of victory over the bourgeoisie and of disarmament of the bourgeoisie.”

If we should renounce the carrying on of this propaganda, and particularly, if we should renounce it in connection with the present war, we had better at once give up all our big words about the international revolutionary social-democracy, about the socialistic revolution, about the war against war.

III.

The advocates of disarmament oppose the passage in our program on “arming the people,” among other things, because this demand might easily be made the basis of concessions to opportunism. We have above considered the most important point, the relation of disarmament to the class struggle and to the social revolution. Let us now consider the question of the relation between disarmament and opportunism. One of the principal reasons why this demand is unwise is, precisely, that it, together with the illusions it calls forth, will inevitably weaken and emasculate our struggle with opportunism.

There is no doubt that this struggle is the chief one now confronting the International. To fight imperialism without at the same time ceaselessly fighting opportunism, would be an empty phrase or delusion. One of the chief difficulties connected with the Zimmerwald and Kienthal movements, one of the principal causes for the possible failure of these embryos of the Third

International, is in the fact that this question was not frankly put, and of course the question was therefore not answered by deciding to break irreparably with opportunism. For the moment opportunism has won the upper hand within the European workers' movement. In all the great nations there have developed two main currents of opportunism: one is the frank and cynical and therefore less dangerous social-imperialism of Messrs. Plekhanov, Scheidemann, Legien, Albert Thomas, Sembat, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Henderson, etc., and the other is the more veiled Kautskian variety: Kautsky and Haase and the “Social-Democratic Workers' Group” in Germany; Longuet, Pressman, Mayeras, etc., in France; Ramsay MacDonald and other leaders of the “Independent Labor Party” in England; Martov, Cheidze, etc., in Russia; Treves and the other so-called reformists of the Left, in Italy.

Outright opportunists are openly and directly opposed to revolution and to incipient revolutionary movements and outbursts, in frank alliance with their governments, although the forms of this alliance may differ, beginning with participation in the ministry and winding up with participation in the War-Industry Committees. The veiled opportunists, or Kautskians, are much more harmful and dangerous to the workers' movement, for, from the very outset they conceal their advocacy of such an alliance by resorting to certain high-sounding near-“Marxian” catchwords and slogans. The struggle against these at present predominant forms of opportunism must be carried on in every field of proletarian policy: parliamentarism, trades unions, strikes, war activity, etc.

What is the distinguishing mark of both these forms of the prevalent opportunism?

In this: that both keep silent, or cover up, or limit themselves to what the police regulations will permit, when they deal with *the concrete problem of the relations between the present war and revolution, and the other concrete problems of the revolution.* And this in spite of the fact that before the war a countless number of times the relation was pointed out between *this very* war, which was then impending, and the proletarian revolution,

and this was done both unofficially and (in the Basel manifesto) officially.

The chief trouble about the disarmament demand is precisely in the fact that it ignores all the concrete questions of the revolution. Or have the advocates of disarmament chosen to espouse some new form of revolution without arms?

IV.

Furthermore. We are by no means opposed to the struggle for reforms. We do not wish to ignore the sad possibility that—as a supplement to its misery—humanity may, at the end of this war, be obliged to pass through another imperialistic war, if the revolution is not born in this war, in spite of the innumerable explosions of the mass ferment, of the mass discontent, and of our own exertions. We advocate such a reform program as shall be directed *also* against the opportunists. The opportunists could not help being delighted if we should leave to them alone the combat for reforms, while we withdraw to the vague and shadowy eminence of some sort of “disarmament,” saving ourselves from the wretchedness of reality by flight. For “disarmament” means running away from squalid reality, not fighting it.

By the way, one of the chief defects in the putting of the question as to the defense of the fatherland, in the hands of some of the Left Wingers, is its insufficient concreteness. It would be both greatly more correct, from the theoretical standpoint, and immeasurably more significant, from the practical standpoint, to say, that in the *present* imperialistic war the defense of the fatherland is a bourgeois-reactionary illusion, than to define a “general” attitude of opposition to “any” defense of the fatherland. The latter is both untrue and does not “hit” the immediate enemies of the workers within the workers’ parties: the opportunists.

On the question of a militia it is our duty to say, putting the answer concretely and in accordance with practical necessity: we are not in favor of a bourgeois militia, but only of a proletarian militia. Therefore: “not one penny and not one man” either for

standing armies or for a bourgeois militia, such as is maintained in such countries as the United States, or Switzerland, Norway, etc. All the more, since we see, even in the freest of the republican countries (for instance, in Switzerland), an increasing Prussianization of the militia, a prostitution of the militia to mobilize troops against strikers. We must demand: an election of officers by the people, the abolition of all military tribunals, equality in the rights of foreign and domestic workers (a particularly important point in those imperialistic countries which, like Switzerland, to a greater and greater degree, are shamelessly exploiting the foreign laborers, reducing them to a position of legal helplessness), and furthermore: the right of every hundred, let us say, of the population of a given country, to form voluntary organizations for the learning of warlike accomplishments, with instructors of their own election, who are paid out of government funds, etc. Only under these circumstances can the proletariat learn the art of war for *themselves*, and not for their slaveholders, and this form of instruction is demanded by the interests of the proletariat. The Russian Revolution has shown that every success, even every partial success of a revolutionary movement, such as the conquests of certain cities, of certain factory settlements, certain parts of the army, necessarily requires the action of a successful proletariat for the realization of this very program.

And finally, it is not sufficient to fight opportunism by means of programs alone: we must consider what effects these programs actually produce. The most colossal, most fatal error of the insolvent Second International was in the fact that their words did not correspond to their actions, that they had formed the habit of a conscienceless and irresponsible use of revolutionary phrases (for instance, consider the present relation of Kautsky and Co. to the Basel manifesto). Approaching the disarmament demand from this angle, we must first of all ask the question: what is its *actual* implication? Disarmament, as a social idea, i. e., as an idea produced by a certain social *milieu* and capable of influencing certain social conditions, as opposed to the whim of an individual or of a clique,—in this sense it originates, manifestly, in the special, exceptionally “peaceful” conditions of life of the various

small states which have for some time held aloof from the bloody world-highway of war, and hope to continue to enjoy this privilege of non-participation. Anyone who wishes to convince himself on this point, needs only to consider, for example, the reasoning of the Norwegian disarmament advocates: "We are a small nation, our army is very small, we cannot undertake any acts against the great powers" (and, therefore, we are also powerless to prevent being dragged into an imperialistic *alliance* with one group of great powers or the other!). "We want to remain at peace in our little corner and to continue our own provincial policy; we demand disarmament, compulsory arbitration, permanent neutrality, etc." ("Permanent neutrality": do they forget that this means Belgian neutrality?)

The pathetic desire of the small nations to keep aloof, the *petite bourgeois* desire to continue to keep out of the great combats of universal history, to enjoy their position of comparative monopoly and to remain in timid passivity—this is the *actual* social condition which may assure to the idea of disarmament a certain degree of success and a certain popularity in some of the small nations. It is clear, however, that this tendency is reactionary and illusory, for imperialism will, in some way or other, drag all the small states into the whirlpool of universal production and of universal politics.

Let us illustrate with the case of Switzerland. The imperialistic position of this country actually dictates *two* lines of action to the workers' movement. The opportunists, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, aspire to make of Switzerland a republican-democratic monopolistic federation, for the deriving of profits from the tourists of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and to exploit this "peaceful" monopolist position under the most favorable and the most peaceful circumstances possible. As a matter of fact, this policy is a policy of agreement between a rather small privileged section of the workers of a small nation, which nation is in a privileged position, with the bourgeoisie of their own country, and *against* the masses of the proletariat. But the real social-democrats of Switzerland wish to utilize the comparative freedom of

Switzerland, her "international" situation (surrounded by the great cultured nations, and speaking, thank God!, not "her own language," but three universal languages), for the purpose of extending, making permanent, strengthening the *revolutionary* alliance of the revolutionary elements of the proletariat of all Europe. Let us enable our bourgeoisie to maintain itself in the position of monopoly in trading with the charms of the Alps, and a few coppers will fall to our share—that is the *actual* content of the policy of the Swiss opportunists. Let us support the alliance of the revolutionary proletariat of France, Germany, and Italy, so that they may overthrow the bourgeoisie—that is the actual content of the policy of the Swiss revolutionary social-democracy. Unfortunately, this policy is not being pushed with sufficient energy by the "Left" in Switzerland, and the fine declaration of the Party Congress at Aarau in 1915 (recognizing the revolutionary mass struggle) remains on paper only. But that is not the subject of our present discussion.

The question now before us is this: Is the disarmament demand consistent with the revolutionary tendency among the Swiss social-democrats? Manifestly it is not. As a matter of fact, the disarmament "demand" expresses the opportunistic, narrowly national, circumscribed horizon of the small nation type of workers' movement. As a matter of fact, "disarmament" is the most nationalistic, outright nationalistic, program of the small states, and not by any means an international policy of the international revolutionary social-democracy.

P. S.—In the last number of the English periodical, *The Socialist Review* (September, 1916), the organ of the opportunistic "Independent Labor Party," we find, on page 287, a resolution of the Newcastle Conference of this party: a refusal to support *any* war *at all*, waged by *any* government *at all*, even though it might "nominally" be a "defensive" war. But on page 205 we find the following declaration in an editorial article: "We do not approve the Sinn-Fein rebellion" (the Irish uprising of 1916). "We do not approve any armed rebellion, any more than we approve any other form of militarism or of war."

Need we point out that *these* "anti-militarists," who are the advocates of **disarmament**, not in the small countries, but in the large ones, are really the worst kind of opportunists? And yet, they are theoretically entirely in the right in considering armed uprisings as "one of the forms" of militarism and war.

From "Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata," No. 2. Printed in Switzerland, December, 1916.

APPEAL BY THE People's Commissary of Education of Russia

A. V. Lunacharsky, To All Who Teach

Comrades:

For many decades past the best of the Intelligentsia was serving the people, and was proud of its service.

It looked upon education—the awakening of knowledge among the masses—as one of its most important problems.

The best representatives of the Intelligentsia, moreover, did not consider themselves chosen wizards, bearers of a higher culture, called upon to preach to the "barbarians" some ready-made gospel.

On the contrary, from the awakened masses they looked for creative impulse, deep-rooted self-dependence, creation of a new, social, moral and artistic world.

Not small, indeed, was the influence of the educated on the awakening of the people—on the process through which the instinctive longing of the exploited for justice, was transformed into a revolutionary consciousness and an ardent social activity.

In February of 1917, the people, as if half-awake and urged on by necessity, overthrew the decayed throne and then stopped—like a semi-blind giant—not knowing what to do next.

It entrusted its fate—its triumph—to worthy fighters of the Revolution—to a large group of the best known names in the revolutionary world.

But among these representatives of the really intelligent masses, there prevailed two ideas:—first the necessity of continuing the war and, second, the necessity of a social peace with its own bourgeoisie.

Both these ideas were not of the people. But the masses were won over—in spite of as yet feeble warnings of the only party which had grasped the meaning of events—their future force—the hidden hopes of the soul of the people.

The Intelligentsia, grouped into defensive parties, hand in hand with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, led the country along a road which brought Russia to the brink of ruin. The masses made a convulsive effort to save themselves—to save Russia and the Revolution. Yet it was not only the knowledge of the ruinous situation thus created that impelled the masses toward the third Revolution, the uprising of the 25th of October, which led to the fall of the coalition government, but also the intense desire for social justice as expressed in the wish for basic social reforms—the immediate introduction of certain beginnings of the graduated Socialist program. In Russia for the first time the masses came out independently with their own program, and the desire to take the government into their own hands.

And how did the Intelligentsia meet the heroic attempt of the proletariat to create on the brink of destruction, a strong government of the people—the attempt to organize the country, to put an end to the war?

It met this attempt with hatred. It not only refused all help to the proletariat, but it rejoiced in every conspiracy against it. It was embittered each time the young hero crushed with his triumphant heel the serpent's head. With venomous malevolence it proclaimed the weakness of the military staff of the downtrodden class and its want of officers in so many spheres.

With impatience it awaits misery. Together with Milukoff it is ready to prefer defeat to the continuance of the Revolution, and with Ryaboushinski it impatiently yearns for the gaunt hand of hunger which already grasps the throat of the people. At one time loving mankind, revolutionary, socialist, it now calls for autocracy. "Look," it exclaims, "the Great Revolution—half of Russia has been delivered by the wicked

Bolsheviki into the hands of the Soviets. The Bolsheviki are traitors, provocateurs, demagogues."

And the Bolsheviki are alone with the proletariat. The heavy burden of being the intellectual representatives of the new people's regime lies alone upon their shoulders. And of course they make mistakes—and why, if they make mistakes, do you not come forward to correct them and help the country? You do not agree with the policies of the proletariat. Then—criticise them. It is not true that you have been deprived of the freedom of propaganda. The social-patriotic newspapers openly called for armed struggle against the enlightenment of the people—and yet they still continue to appear. There never was a newspaper of the Black Hundred which was so full of venom as those of the Socialists of the Right. Only men who lack all sincerity proclaim that moderate and helpful criticism is, under present conditions, impossible.

But let it pass, if in the sphere of politics the Intelligentsia can only obstruct and censure harshly and give nothing more to the proletariat and its government. What is the meaning, however, of the boycott of the country's food supply and financial mechanism?

Only to overthrow the Bolsheviks?! Let the whole world perish if in its ruins will be buried the hated "demagogues."

But we have well learnt to translate into the language of classes such antipathies. The Intelligentsia, which in neutral spheres worked together with the hangmen—Romanoffs—which led the country to ruin hand in hand with the capitalists through a protracted war, and bourgeois speculations, proved powerless to work together with the proletariat.

Is it possible that you could give your labor, thought and life for the people only so long as you acted as its guardians and could find nothing but rancorous sophisms for the proletariat when in a fateful and dangerous hour it was forced to the first revolt in Russia and the approach to power?

Is there a gulf which cannot be bridged between the petite bourgeoisie and the masses? Is the means ineffective which makes the Intelligentsia socialist only in words and in reality more sympathetic to the exploiters than to the exploited? Yes, it is so—in essence. In essence, the Intelligentsia is, as a whole, petit bourgeois. But at the same time, it is the bearer of special functions in society—it is the organ and servitor of social knowledge and consciousness. For, in the words of Lassalle, the union of science and the fourth estate is a most natural phenomenon. A real artist must be sensitive to truth, to the beauty of heroism and of the will to freedom. The teacher, the true teacher, must first of all be with the masses in all their experiences and through all their wanderings.

Is there really no hope? Will the attacks not cease? Is it possible that at the brink of the abyss when the proletariat at last with its uttermost strength, has overthrown the old regime, and the bourgeois octopus—that it will be seized by the throat by the intelligent social-revolutionist, social-democrat-menshevik, so that both they and the proletariat be thrown into their graves and the graves of their common aspirations?

You teachers—men and women—show them the example. Down with the boycott! Let us build a new school of the people. I, the people's commissary of education, do not want to force anything on you or on the schools. I say to you—away with the power of the bureaucracy! Conquer the bureaucracy! From now on the ministry (of education) is an executive organ. Let us build together a parliament of enlightenment, a vast government committee for the education of the people. With friendly efforts let us build together a commission instead of a minister—a commission which will not hinder and command but which will make the work easier and aid all healthy initiative. Let us finish the process of decentralization of schools and the transfer of their management to self-governing bodies. Can we even take count of the many problems which confront us? But they must all be decided by

conferences of teachers directly with the representatives of the organized working people. I published a series of statements dealing with the basic problems of education in Russia, and lately I issued a decree of the Central Executive Committee creating a Commission of Public Education. It is possible, and very probable, that these do not meet with everybody's approval. But the statements contain my own personal views, which I intend to apply not as a leader but as a collaborator. The decree has merely a preliminary character, for some sort of an apparatus had to be created to commence the work.

I picture to myself a perspective of the following sort: The Government Committee of Public Education will meet in an extraordinary session to work out the broad democratic basis for the call of an Educational Convention of teachers and direct representatives of the organized working masses. At this convention, in a friendly and open discussion, we will elaborate the underlying principles of a new people's school in Russia and will submit these for confirmation to the constitutional convention.

We will create in the sphere of education an atmosphere of true co-operation. Here class differences do not frighten us. A sincere and true teacher yearns for that perfect school which would transform the greatest number of citizens into completely developed men. The proletariat yearns for the same.

If engineers and workers were to take up the creation of productive machines, apart from any calculations of an entrepreneur character, and guided only by the objective sign of the greatest productivity, they could no doubt co-operate without the least friction. Likewise with the schools. The people has gained its freedom. It wants more light for itself and its children. I have been called by the Congress of Soviets, which represented 15 million of the foremost citizens, to be the People's Commissary of Education. I undertake this task without any pretense or pomp but with a clear sense of re-

sponsibility, and with a readiness at the first signal from the people to give up my post and join the ranks again, and I address myself to you—you men and women teachers of Russia, to put aside the unworthy boycott, and while waiting for the day when the Constitutional Convention will establish a definite order in the matter of public education, to begin our work now.

I appeal to you for the fulfillment of the following program:—The immediate preparation for an educational congress on the most democratic lines; the realization of such congress at the very earliest opportunity; the friendly co-operation of the proletariat and the best part of the "Intelligenza" in the creation of a united and free public school in the broadest sense of these words.

When I am writing this call to you, teachers, a new master of the land is guiding my hand—young, inexperienced, but mighty—the very same worker whom you wanted to serve. Go to his aid. He has conquered but he is alone. He is full of strength but surrounded with trouble. Glory to the one who in the heavy hour of trial by fire, will be on the side of the people—such as it is, and shame on those who forsake it.

And, remember, if the ugly revolt of the Intelligentsia against the worker were to continue, it would sow his path of suffering with only new thorns, but it will not stop the wheels of his chariot. The people are calling on you to work together to build a new school in common. If you decline it will undertake its task alone, together with its true adherents and well-wishers.

There is no return to the past.

The People's Commissary of Education,

A. V. Lunacharsky.

The Biology of Peace and War

By DR. JOHN J. KALLEN

The European War is a rare opportunity for Socialist invasion of a field monopolized by thinkers hostile or at best unsympathetic to the movement. This invasion becomes imperative in the light of present tendencies in this field when events are being interpreted in ways that distort the truth in favor of international Parasitism. I refer to social psychology.

W. Trotter's mid-war attempt at impartial, scientific analysis of the world debacle in his "Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War" is interesting in this light. The carefully presented analysis of the first part can be used to reach conclusions vastly different from those the author draws when he applies those principles to the world war.

There is a grain of truth in the skeptic's sneer that there is no science of society possible. The truth is that under certain conditions it is impossible to conduct an investigation that shall be "with malice towards none and justice towards all," that shall conform to the tenet of science, *nil admirari*. War is one of those conditions. The German intellectuals, Trotter tells us, exhibit "the infinite insecurity of the hold of reason in the most carefully cultivated minds when it is opposed by strong herd feeling." And he himself admits his bias against Germany, and he thinks, "having recognized the existence of that as a necessary obstacle to complete freedom of thought it may be possible to allow for it and to counteract what aberrations of judgment it may be likely to produce." (157.)

This frankness in no way has secured the object it aims at, we shall see. However much he seeks to fight it his judgment and method of inquiry are vitiated to such an extent as to detract from his fundamental premises which should have been the point at which he stopped his inquiry to leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. Or, allowing himself the luxury to apply his principle of psychology derived from

his study of the instincts in the lower animal forms, he should have more carefully sifted his facts in human society.

Trotter starts his analysis from the recognition of a widespread phenomenon among animals, their clustering into herds or groups. It was thought in the days antedating modern biology that man alone lives in societies, and this because his reason tells him that it is better to live gregariously than isolatedly. And society being thought a purely "rational" product we had such interpretations as Rousseau's "social contract." Subsequent examination showed that sociability is not the outgrowth of reason but is of instinctive origin. Lower animals with little or no intellect live in societies. Bees, ants, wolves, buffaloes, elephants, fishes in schools, birds in flocks, etc., display the gregarious habit.

Natural selection made necessary this primitive gregariousness. Trotter points out that the herbivorous animals, needing to feed constantly, could not exist without gregariousness. They could not give enough attention to means of self-defense and at the same time be as absorbed in grazing, as they must be, if they were isolated. Gregariousness makes up for the lack of time in the individual grazing animal to pay attention to dangers. In a large flock one can watch while the others feed and perform other functions, etc.

From the biologic fact of gregariousness Trotter shows the consequence of this in human society. He traces the many effects of gregariousness on our ways of thinking. Altruism he shows to be a "natural instinctive product." The mental types are affected by the instinct of gregariousness. Those that are more readily influenced by the "voice of the herd" are insensible to experiences outside it. They are what Trotter calls the "stable" type which is the most prevalent one. On the other hand are those who find that other experiences not sanctioned by the herd are of vital import. There is then generated a conflict in their minds between the voice of the herd and the voice of experience, using the term to mean everything that comes to the individual not only in events in the outside

world but the experience or his own impulses as well. The "stable-minded" are at the top of society. Trotter thinks, (133)

"Man owes to the social habit his inveterate resistiveness to new ideas, his submission to tradition and precedent, and the very serious fact that governing power in his communities tends to pass into the hands of . . . the stable-minded, a class the members of which are characteristically insensitive to experience, closed to the entry of new ideas and obsessed with the satisfactoriness of things as they are."

While the "stable"-minded deal with an unsatisfactory piece of experience "by rejecting its significance," we are told, (57)

"in certain minds such successful exclusion does not occur, and the unwelcome experience persists as an irritant, so to say, capable neither of assimilation nor rejection."

The important condition to gregariousness is the sensitiveness of the individual to the voice of the herd. He must react to stimuli from the herd. Likewise in society, Trotter insists on the suggestibility of the individual "everywhere, and under any circumstances." (33.)

The author fails to recognize an important fact. The "stable"-minded at the head of society happen to be the Parasites. They do things not because necessarily they have feelings for the herd but because of very material reasons. They are "stable" because it most decidedly "pays" to be such to secure themselves possession of the material wealth in the first place and immaterial power in the second. In other words, the "stable-minded" are such because of material reasons. The instinctive elements in man's make-up are there, no one denies. But the particular application of them is under control of non-instinctive forces. The most important thing that determines the stable-mindedness of the Parasite is his economic condition. He in turn influences through his prestige the masses, on whom he depends. The masses as Trotter

demonstrates are capable of being influenced, and the Parasite merely seizes upon this capability and turns it to advantage.

The author does not dwell except in a few lines, with the reasons outside the instinctive which make for this stable-mindedness in the great mass. Suggestibility can be heightened and the Parasite is instrumental in heightening it. Lack of knowledge, bodily fatigue from overwork, economic insecurity, etc., make the masses unable to assume any other attitude save that of submission to those in control who have carefully secured confidence in themselves that they represent the "herd," the whole of "society," act "in the interest of all," etc.

Trotter fails to see that, whereas in the animal world the stimuli exerted by the herd on the individual and vice versa have some basis in fact, those utilized by the stable-minded need not. To illustrate, a sheep sees danger. It gives the alarm. The herd acts and reacts. In society the Parasite sees the advantage of raising a "false alarm" and making it appear to be a true one. Every belligerent in the war is fighting a war of "self-defense"; the masses believe the alarm, yet the entire non-Teutonic world is confident that so far as the Kaiser at least is concerned, to take an unquestioned example, the alarm is false. This indicates that whereas the instincts operated for the good of the herd they do not necessarily work for the good of society, and if any nation "goes wrong" Trotter should not condemn as he does the entire nation for having a perverse instinctive basis.

One of the chiefest advantages to the animal of gregariousness is one that Trotter cannot too often repeat. Among non-gregarious animals each one carries on a struggle against all other animals. It is a Hobbsian *bellum omnium contra omnes*. This prevents the individual to develop in many directions and forces him to specialize in structure. But the gregarious animal is shielded from the results of natural selection. A division of labor is possible. Says Trotter (103):

"The fundamental biological meaning of gregariousness

is that it allows of an indefinite enlargement of the unit upon which the undifferentiated influence of natural selection is allowed to act, so that the individual merged in the larger unit is shielded from the immediate effects of natural selection and is exposed directly only to the special form of selection which obtains within the new unit."

Some gregarious types succeed more than others. What conditions make for the best success of a species with the gregarious habit? What type should man adopt to secure a larger benefit from his biologic inheritance?

Two things are needed: members must intercommunicate their little experiences, and they must react to the larger whole when it demands this. Communication and reaction are the two conditions to success.

"A proportionately less developed capacity for communication will mean that the species is not deriving the advantages it might from the possession of gregariousness, while the full advantages of the type will be attained only when the two sets of activities are correspondingly strong."

Man has the power remarkably developed—if he would but use it. The animal has only a few ways of communicating and reacting, ways laid down by instinct. Man with his brain development can react and communicate in an infinite number of ways.

"The enormous power of varied reaction possessed by man must render necessary for his attainment of the full advantages of the gregarious habit a power of intercommunication of absolutely unprecedented fineness." (62.)

The reason why the best results of gregariousness in man are not obtained and why social characteristics are "the contempt of the man of science and the disgust of the humanitarian," is because the type of mind society allows to rule, the "stable-minded" spoken of above.

"This type supplies our most trusted politicians and

officials, our bishops and headmasters, our successful lawyers and doctors, and all their trusty deputies, assistants, retainers, and faithful servants." (161.)

On the other hand if the type of mind in control were neither of the two extremes, neither stable or unstable, "such a directing intelligence or group of intelligence" (162) would "abandon the static view of society," would "reach out towards new powers for human activity," would discover the "natural inclinations in man," and would "cultivate intercommunication and altruism," would make "time and space their quarry, destiny and the human soul the lands they would invade; they would sail their ships into the gulfs of the ether and lay tribute upon the sun and stars."

Trotter does not hint how this type could be set up in the seats of the mighty. Plato told us of the philosopher-statesman who would rule the model Republic. But we have a right to ask how the formula is to be compounded. Shall we seek out the ethical man, or shall we first reconstruct society so that the unethical "stable-minded" cannot creep into power? Trotter does not answer.

This brings us to the scientifically saddest part of Trotter's essay. He recognizes three types of gregariousness, the aggressive form, as among the wolves and dogs; the defensive type, as among the sheep or oxen; and the socialized form of gregariousness of the bees and ants. He says: "Socialized gregariousness is the goal of man's development." (167.) Well and good.

Having laid this down in the course of his analysis we are introduced into a vicious reasoning by analogy, the type of reasoning that played such havoc with the "biological school" of sociology as well as almost every philosophic camp. The philosopher, Fechner, built up his animistic theory on the following "logical grounds": Living man is possessed of heat. The earth has warmth in it. Therefore the earth has life. I need not seek some specious reasoning to illustrate the point for the sociologists, Trotter will serve the purpose.

The wolf type of gregariousness, we are told, is vicious, aggressive. The pack is irresistible from attack because of cooperation, the individuals are very sensitive to leadership, they react with confidence often at the risk of their lives for the pack. They have "war cries," barks and yelps of all kinds to spur on action. This is point number one in the reasoning. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!*

Germany is aggressor in this war. The Germans are irresistible in attack, are overconfident, they fight with great sacrifice, they withstand the most brutal discipline in the interest of the nation, they assiduously utilize "hymns of hate" and other war cries to spur on the soldiers. This is point number two.

The reader can see point number three, the crowning achievement, THEREFORE Germany is the wolf type of gregariousness, the lupine type par excellence. "The wolf is the father of the war song, and it is among peoples of the lupine type alone that the war song is used with real seriousness." (186.)

It is true, Germany has cultivated the proverbial "hate" for the enemy. But are we without it? Our calling the Germans Huns in placard and magazine and newspaper, in parodies and in songs, what is it all for? And if we do it, are we "lupine"? The author vaguely admits that war cries are used by his native land, England, but he assures us they have not the same mission as those used by the Germans!

Having established with precision that Germany is the lupine type, having firmly laid down that premise, we are treated to another precise induction. Listen to Trotter trotting at the following pace (200):

"A psychological hint of great value may be obtained from our knowledge of those animals whose gregariousness, like that of the Germans, is of the aggressive type."

And what is that, do tell. Why, when "Nero," or "Topsy," or "Towser" bites baby or does some other canine

foolishness, the only way to correct him is by giving him a thorough thrashing, and,

"his punishment must not be diluted by hesitation, nervousness or compunction on the part of the punisher. The experience then becomes one from which the dog is capable of learning, and if the sense of mastery conveyed to him is unmistakable, he can assimilate the lesson without reservation or the desire for revenge."

And, since it's beyond question laid down that Germany's social system is that of the dog and wolf, THEREFORE she too must be beaten to a frazzle or she will have a desire for revenge, etc., just like Topsy, if the master spares the knout. Of course, Trotter is not guilty of "reasoning by analogy"! Oh, no.

"When I compare German society with the wolf pack, and the feelings, desires, and impulses of the individual German with those of the wolf or dog, I am not intending to use a vague analogy but to call attention to a real and gross identity." (191.)

We insist we may agree that Germany's tactics are like a wolf's. BUT, we most decidedly refuse to accept that as a dictum of science derived a la Trotter by pernicious reasoning.

All along we are given to understand it is the psychology of the Germans that makes them what T. tells us they are. And before urging our own scientific, I think, objections, let me quote the author's opinion about his own country, England. It is:

"The most complete example of a socialized herd (201);

"England has taken as her model the bee" (201);

"the spirit of the people makes the great wars, but it leaves the statesmen to conduct them" (206).

How the author can so flagrantly say the last in the face of conscription of her own subjects and of those of Ireland who protests she does not want conscription, that the "spirit of the people" is against it, is difficult to see.

As to England being the "most complete example" of a socialized herd, we envious Americans might flatly call the author a—well, slightly mistaken. The beehive business is not new. Huxley used it to show Socialism's a dream. It took the Socialists to inform Huxley as we now inform Trotter that the only thing in the beehive the English accept as a model is the category of "Drones." Were we to build our argument on analogy we would say: Drones exist in the hive. Since England has as her "model the bee," drones exist in England. Now the bees sting out the drones, THEREFORE the workers must sting out the drones in England.

But levity aside. No society is strictly aggressive or defensive, today. Even in lupine Germany it is not. Germany did not arouse the masses to fight by telling them to conform to their "psychologic" needs as Mr. Trotter thinks. If the German individual had the gregarious needs of the wolf then it would have been unnecessary for the military clique to arouse them in another way. Mr. T. says nothing on this. Yet it follows with a good deal more logic than he has mustered that if their instincts were aggressive, only this type of stimulus might have been utilized by Kaiser Wilhelm, and with tremendous success.

But the world knows, Wilson and Lloyd George said it, that the Kaiser duped the people, made them feel that they fight a "war of defense" when in reality the Kaiser entered the war for aggression. Why is it, that these people had to be aroused by a "defensive" stimulus if they were a pack of wolves who fight when they are not threatened but do so for aggression in itself?

Will Mr. T. reclassify England and other nations in the light of the secret treaty revelations by the Bolsheviki? France, Italy, Russia, England, had imperialistic aims these treaties show. Therefore they too were "lupine" in type. And further about England, that country modeled on the gregariousness of the bee, does the treatment accorded the Indians fit in with a "socialized gregarious" habit? It seems to

me Trotter has to do either of two things with his book: cut out his falsely derived arguments about England and Germany and others, and leave his more scientific findings, or else give the whole story about each "type" of nation.

Socialists as was said have another way to explain a "lupine" type like Germany. The masses are not this, as the methods of the military clique to make them fight prove. The masses always fought for the abstract ideal painted by the Parasite as a camouflage of their own motives.

Trotter gives to the ruling classes some hints which he got from his patient psychologic studies. He noticed the English worker somehow did not take to the war. And he blames the Parasites for not granting him something to make him feel an interest in the war. Notice the following (146), italics mine:

"A very small amount of conscious, authoritative direction at that (beginning of the war) time, a very little actual sacrifice of privilege at that psychologic moment, a series of small, carefully selected concessions, none of which need have been actually subversive of prescriptive right, a slight relaxation in the vast inhumanity of the social machine would have given the needed readjustment out of which a true national homogeneity would necessarily have grown."

Fools that they were, now as a consequence of this psychologic neglect (148):

"We are already faced with the possibility of having to make profound changes in the social system to convince the workingman effectually that his interests and ours in this war are one."

Quite right, "very small" would be the concessions needed, and right again that now there is a possibility of serious consequences from this lack of foresight! What these small things were Trotter does not fail to tell us. He advises to spread the idea of equality (151), but he hastens to add, not "material equality" between the defunct nobility and other Parasites of

England and the workers. He admits "it is difficult to persuade a man with thirty shillings a week that he has as much to lose by the loss of national independence as a man with thirty thousand a year" (151). But he joyously tells us:

"It seems certain that it would still be possible to attain a very fair approximation to a real moral equality without any necessary disturbance of the extreme degree of material inequality which our elaborate class segregation has imposed upon us."

Trotter admits something that is hopeful. He tells us (197) that the individual is gregarious by instinct. But the specific kind of gregariousness, whether lupine or defensive or socialized, is not inherited. That is a matter of social choice. Exactly. That type is foisted on the inherently social masses. It is against the Parasites who did the foisting, that we must turn the cannon still hot from the slaughter of innocents, not against the "wicked impulses" within the breasts of the masses. And we must do this internationally, Mr. Trotter.

In conclusion, though we have handled the author not very delicately, still he has his very fine points. He shows the fallacy of the "biological necessity of war" idea, he shows the logic and biologic necessity of the "pacifist" type, etc. On the whole he has tried to be fair. He but demonstrates his own thesis that when reason is opposed by hard feeling the latter stands the chance of the proverbial snowball in extraterrestrial regions. The war has warped his judgment, made him indulge in unscientific reasoning by analogy. Had he the international viewpoint things would have fared better. His catering to the Parasites of his own "social gregarious" polity makes imperative, as I said at the outset, that Socialists accept the challenge of the pseudo-social psychologists and fight them on their own ground in the interest of internationalism.

Current Affairs

A War Anniversary

Since the appearance of the last issue of the *Class Struggle* America has completed her first year in the World War, and Russia has completed her first year in Revolution. A year has also passed since the Socialist Party's St. Louis National Convention which resulted in the adoption of the now famous "St. Louis Resolutions." This year has been fraught with great events for the world in general, and for us Socialists in particular. Some of these events are reflected in the changed attitude of the Socialist Party membership towards the St. Louis Resolutions, which is discussed elsewhere in this issue. Here we would like to call attention to a factor which has remained unchanged during this year—a factor that has played an important part in the decision reached a year ago by many of us who did not agree with the premises and reasoning of the St. Louis Resolution but who nevertheless accepted its conclusions, and which must be taken into consideration now in considering the question of a change of attitude towards the war. We refer to the question of the auspices under which the war is being fought, the power that has decided the question whether and when we should enter the war and that will decide the question when and upon what terms we shall conclude peace, and the motives that animate and move it.

In an editorial article on "Ideals and Interests," which appeared in the *New Republic* at the close of the first quarter-year since our entry into the war, that esteemed contemporary of ours said:

"Two sets of hard-headed people have been made uncomfortable by the statement that America is in the war for the sake of ideals. On the one hand the conservative tariff-Republican kind of man objects. He is belligerent, but he wishes to make war for some private and exclusive right, or to avenge some concrete injury. He distrusts the more generous reaches of the mind.

To him the world is in reality a crowd of aggressive individuals, each trying to get as much as possible for himself, and it is dangerous self-deception to act on any other theory. This opinion is shared by pacifist supporters of isolation. If Germany has sinister imperialist designs, so have the Allies. No American really wanted war except those who had something immediate to gain by it, or those who were fooled by the profiteers. The only individuals in the world who combine integrity of purpose with a sufficient measure of cynical wisdom, according to these objectors, are those who refuse to accept the deceitful ideology of a war to organize peace."

The editors of the *New Republic*, refusing to accept either of these two positions, then proceed to explain their own, "realistic," attitude towards the problem, thus:

"To the realist the attitude of both the standpatter and the suspicious pacifist toward the war is supremely irrelevant. He does not distrust the expression of an ideal, if it seems to him likely to translate itself into some kind of desirable reality. He does not become hopeless of that realization because he is aware of selfish motives on the part of people who are taking the action which he for the moment advocates. He has faith in the validity of his purpose, but he is humble as to his means. He does not believe in any necessary opposition between ideals and interests. He knows that unselfish ideals may in the end serve interests, and he knows that interests often serve ideals. . . .

"At the same time the realist has his own dangers to fear. He cannot become a romantic partisan. He cannot cast up accounts once for all and then throw himself blindly into relentless action. *He must check up his partners as well as his enemies.*"

When the war broke out, we, who are neither "tariff-Republicans" nor "pacifist supporters of isolation," and who flatter ourselves with being the real "realists," tried to "size up" the situation "realistically" as to the different forces involved and their relative strength, and other matters of consequence that a true "realist" should consider before he embarks on a perilous

venture in partnership with others. Like the good "realists" that we were, we knew, of course, that we "cannot cast up accounts once for all and then throw ourselves blindly into relentless action." We knew that in order that we may count in the game we must be in a position to "check up our partners as well as our enemies."

And here is where we met our first obstacle to our embarking upon the very desirable but extremely perilous undertaking of swatting the Kaiser and saving democracy. We found that the "tariff-Republicans" (of both old parties) were to be the "managing partners" in this enterprise, and that they "wished to make war for some private and exclusive right, or to avenge some concrete injury." Here was a situation that would make any true realist pause, no matter how "humble" he might be. In fact the humbler he was the more reason for looking before he leaped. His humility of spirit could only accentuate the paucity of his physical resources in the tremendous task he was taking upon himself of "checking up" upon his arrogant and powerful "managing partner."

Now we no more believe in any "necessary opposition between ideals and interests" than do the editors of the *New Republic*. Like the editors of the great "journal of opinion" we know "that unselfish ideals may in the end serve interests, and that interests often serve ideals." But that was so much more reason for us to look carefully into the causes of the sudden awakening of a certain kind of idealism in the breasts of certain of our compatriots. It was not so much a question of the sincerity of the idealism avowed, as a probing of its sources for the purpose of determining how long it may be expected to last and how far it may be expected to go. And such an examination revealed the painful fact that genuine as that idealism may be, its source was to be found in the violation of certain private rights and in our desire to avenge a concrete injury. As the *N. Y. Tribune* put it: "If it had not been for the submarine's interference with our commerce the American people might never have realized how much democracy needed saving."

But water cannot rise above its source. Nor can an ideal born out of a particular interest outlast that interest. There was no telling when our interest in the war would vanish, for one reason or another, and our idealistic enthusiasm for civilization and democracy with it.

It was this trend of thought that the writer sought to express in the following paragraphs of the resolution which he offered at the St. Louis Convention in the name of a minority of the Committee on War and Militarism:

"When the great war opened with one of the most lawless and ruthless acts in history, the invasion of Belgium by Germany—an act not merely abhorrent in itself, but striking at the very roots of those international arrangements for which we have contended so long and which must lie at the foundation of any international order that will put an end to all wars, the president solemnly enjoined upon the people the duty of reining neutral, not merely in deed, but in thought.

"By that declaration President Wilson officially and authoritatively announced to the people of this country, as well as to the world at large, that the existence of international law, the fate of small peoples, and of democratic institutions, were matters that do not concern 'us.'

"And they did not concern 'us' so long as 'our' trade was not interfered with. But, when the enormous export trade which 'we' have enjoyed during the last two and one-half years was seriously threatened, our rulers suddenly realized the solemn duty resting on 'us' to come to the defense of democracy, civilization, and international law."

This was not merely a criticism of President Wilson and his administration. It was a statement of one of our reasons for refusing to approve America's entry into the war—the fear that American enthusiasm for democracy and international order would disappear with the interest that has generated it, and that the peace which will terminate the war will be dictated by the same kind of interest as that which has started it.

Many things have changed since those paragraphs were written at St. Louis. But the facts upon which they were based have not changed. The argument still remains valid, and the fear they express is still real.

This fear may perhaps not be decisive of our attitude towards the war. We may, perhaps, now that our "managing partners" have learned a thing or two during the past year, be in a position to exact from them proper guarantees against an improper peace. As to that we do not express any opinion here. But the point itself is of the utmost importance, and must be carefully weighed and considered whenever the question of a change of our attitude towards the war comes up for discussion. B.

St. Louis—One Year After

There is only one word in the English language which can adequately describe the state of mind of the Socialist Party with respect to the war on the anniversary of the St. Louis Convention. That word is: *Chaos*.

Formally the St. Louis resolution still remains unrepealed. But to a large section of the party membership it has long since ceased to be a rule of action. Just how large that section is it is impossible to say, since the party bureaucracy insists on not permitting the party to express itself either by way of a referendum or a congress of delegates specially accredited by the membership to discuss the subject and reach a decision. All that we can say therefore with assurance is that that section is both large and influential. On the other hand it would not be safe to say that the majority of the party membership has given up its opposition to the war, since some of the leaders who have a genius for discovering where the majority stands are still on the fence.

In the meantime confusion reigns supreme.

In New York the Socialist delegation in the Board of Aldermen of the Metropolis vote for Liberty Bonds, under the leadership of the principal author of the St. Louis Resolution; while in Wisconsin, Victor Berger, one of the principal leaders of the

party and one of its three delegates to the prospective International Socialist Peace Congress, runs for office on a program demanding the withdrawal of our troops from France.

The New York Call publishes a statement of Allan L. Benson, the Socialist Party's presidential candidate in the last presidential election, expressing the hope that Berger would be defeated, while the Milwaukee Leader assures us that Morris Hillquit, the National Chairman and International Secretary of the Socialist Party, telegraphed emphatically denying any criticism of Berger's platform, and expressing the conviction that Berger's election would be "a triumph for international Socialism."

Perhaps the best illustration of the confusion reigning within the party, and the attempts made by the politicians to straddle the issue, is furnished by the New York "Conference on the Party's attitude towards war," which ended in an utter fiasco after trying for six weeks to get somewhere. Early in March the N. Y. State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party called a Conference to consider the question of the Party's attitude towards the war in view of recent developments. The conference,—which consisted of the members of the State Executive Committee, the Executive Committees of the Locals within Greater New York, the Socialist Assemblymen and Aldermen from New York City and other Socialist functionaries—met on March 15th, and after an evening's discussion elected a Committee of Twelve to draft resolutions and report the same to the Conference.

The Committee of Twelve labored hard for a month, and finally reported a set of resolutions drawn up by the authors of the St. Louis Resolution and agreed to by a majority of the Twelve. The Conference discussed these resolutions and a substitute reported by a minority of the Twelve, at an extremely stormy session (held on April 18th) defeated the substitute, but refused to adopt the majority resolutions, sending the whole matter back to the Committee for further consideration. The Committee thereupon refused to consider the matter any further and "referred" it to the State Convention which is to meet on June 29th-30th.

The outstanding features of the work of this Conference, aside from its failure to agree on anything, is the consistent refusal of the swamp, led by the politicians, to take definite position one way or another on clear-cut issues.

In the Committee of Twelve, the present writer attempted to force the issue of the "Withdraw from Europe" agitation made acute by Berger's recent campaign, by offering the following resolution:

"In view of the present international situation, we deem all demands for a withdrawal by the United States of its armed forces from Europe at the present time as not in consonance with the principles of international Socialism or the policies of the internationally minded working class, nor with the spirit and intent of the resolutions adopted by the Socialist Party of this country at its Emergency Convention held at St. Louis in April, 1917, and we, therefore, strongly deprecate the same."

This resolution was voted down. Instead, the Committee adopted the following, under the circumstances utterly meaningless, statement:

"The aim of the Socialist movement is not a partial or temporary peace, nor one maintained through armed power. What we desire is a universal peace, rendered secure by the removal, in the largest possible measure, of the causes which lead to war."

An attempt was also made in the Committee to force an unequivocal expression of attitude on the war generally, by the introduction of a resolution re-affirming the St. Louis resolution. This resolution, too, was defeated; and the following declaration was adopted instead: "The Socialists of the United States, while maintaining their attitude of steadfast opposition to war, must bend all their efforts in war as in peace to secure needed political and economic reforms for the workers"; followed by some more verbiage of the same inoffensive and meaningless sort.

The advocate of the unequivocal re-affirmation of the St. Louis Resolution thereupon attempted to "put teeth" into the

"while" clause by moving to insert the article "the" before the word "war," so as to bring the declaration into some relation to the present "emergency," but his attempt failed, the Committee preferring to talk of war generally, rather than of the present war.

In reporting for the majority of the Committee of Twelve, Mr. Hillquit stated that its resolution was intended to reaffirm the St. Louis Resolution "by implication." But at the same time he offered an amendment which deprived the Committee's resolution of the last vestige of resemblance to the St. Louis Resolution which it was supposed to "impliedly" re-affirm. As amended by him the passage quoted above read:

"The Socialists of the United States, while maintaining their attitude of steadfast opposition to war among nations *as an instrument of social progress*, must bend all their efforts," etc. A statement to which the most rabid pro-war man could hardly take exception.

Needless to say that such a policy of evasion and equivocation can only end disastrously for the party. It must be stopped at once, an unequivocal attitude taken, and a frank and clear statement of our position made. Even a wrong position is better than a policy of equivocation.

We, therefore, heartily endorse the demand made by Eugene V. Debs for a National Convention of delegates duly elected and accredited by the party membership to discuss the situation, with a view of meeting it fairly and squarely, and without dodging any of the momentous issues which these stirring times are pressing upon our attention.

B.

Freedom of Thought and Speech

The bill amending the Espionage Law that was unanimously adopted in the House against the lone vote of the Socialist Meyer London,—while the Senate, once more showing itself less cowardly than the so-called "popular branch of Congress," passed it with 48 against 24 votes,—has not yet at this writing received the signature of the President. This has created the impression that

Mr. Wilson will probably neither veto nor sign the bill. If this should be the case the bill, after 10 days, automatically becomes a law. But since it is an Administration bill we are convinced that the President will finally affix his signature to a measure that is more drastic, more far reaching and more reactionary than any piece of war legislation that has been adopted anywhere by a belligerent or non-belligerent nation.

The new Section 3 not only concerns itself—as would be proper—with purely military movements and affairs, it not only includes Liberty Loans and all other financial government transactions that may be connected with the war; it actually deprives the people of the United States of every form of freedom of speech and opinion regarding the form of government, the constitution, the military or naval uniform, the flag or the fighting forces of the U. S. Compared with this holy sanctity of the American uniform the Gessler hat of the Swiss Burgvogt is the very superlative of republican radicalism. Twenty years in jail, a fine of \$10,000 or both may be the penalty for every infringement of these exceedingly elastic clauses.

But bad as these provisions are, they are by no means the worst. Section 4 is so incredibly reactionary and so far exceeds even the notorious practices and traditions of the Czarist "Black Cabinet," that even now it seems impossible that it should become a law. It reads:

"When the United States is at war the Postmaster-General may upon evidence satisfactory to him that any person or concern is using the mails in violation of any of the provisions of this act, instruct the Postmaster at any postoffice at which mail is received addressed to such person or concern to return to the postmaster at the office at which they were originally mailed all letters or other matter so addressed, with the words "mail to this address undeliverable under Espionage Act," plainly written or stamped upon the outside thereof, and all such letters or other matter so returned to such postmasters shall be by them returned to the senders thereof under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may prescribe."

According to this proposed section the Postmaster-General has the power to cut off any person, group of persons, organizations, corporations (newspaper, etc.) completely from all intercourse from the outside world. From his decision there is no appeal. Mr. Burleson becomes the absolute ruler; he will control the existence of persons and organizations, and no complaint, protest, proof or appeal can change the decision of the almighty censor.

It may be argued, of course, that the Administration desires the addition of these drastic provisions in order to be able more effectively to strike the real spies and tools of the enemy. But even this faint hope has been shattered by the Department of Justice.

When Senator France presented his well-known amendment which provided that Section 3, Title 1, shall not apply to those who utter "what is true, with good motives and for justifiable ends," the Administration Senators immediately declared their active opposition to the amendment, insisting that it would invalidate the whole law. Nevertheless it was adopted in a Senate reading. Two days later Senator Overman who was in charge of the bill presented a memorandum from the U. S. Attorney-General which opposed the France amendment and argued that just these "good motives and justifiable aims" constitute the greatest danger for the morale of the armies and of the population.

The memorandum says: "There is no more dangerous element in this country than that which conscientiously battles for unlimited individual freedom of action and speech at this time. These persons assume the highest ethical and philosophical grounds, but their influence is as paralyzing as that of the fanatics whose motives are so earnest that they will commit arson, murder or suicide to register their beliefs.

"The motives of the Bolsheviki in Russia were good, their ends justifiable in their eyes, and their criticisms of the administrations were true, but they overlooked the military dangers of such discussions, with the result that the soldiers shot nobody but their

own officers and their fellow citizens, and the Germans are still marching unresisted across the prostrate nation in spite of a treaty of peace.

"The only ones who have profited by the Russian excess of liberty are the Germans, who do not believe in personal freedom except in the countries they wish to conquer.

"The passage of this amendment would greatly weaken American efficiency and help none but the enemy. Results, not motives count in war, therefore the law and its executors should be concerned with procuring desirable and preventing dangerous results, leaving motives to the mercy of the judges or to the perspective of historians."

In an earlier memorandum the U. S. Attorney General enumerated the "current types of dangerous and effective propaganda" against which the amendments are particularly directed. The Department of Justice designates among others International Socialism and its propaganda against war as the product of capitalist rivalry between groups of national capitalists, as types of propaganda that the Administration intends to stop with the enactment into law of the new sedition bill. The following excerpt from this memorandum shows this clearly:

"Another class of effective propaganda, by which I mean propaganda that has an effectiveness in reducing the fighting force of the nation and contains the dangers of actually disintegrating the fighting force of the nation, is that which is engaged in promoting the proletarian revolution. Its cardinal principle is that hostility between nations is due to commercial and capitalistic rivalry; that the real hostility is between the proletariat of all nations and the capitalists of all nations. We know that this type of propaganda has had serious results in weakening the fighting effectiveness of Russia. It contains few assertions of facts, at any rate; assertions of facts can easily be avoided without reducing the effectiveness of the propaganda. On its face its motive is not treasonable; that is, on its face its motive is not to assist the enemy. Where a treasonable motive exists, this motive is concealed and seldom discoverable. To

introduce the element of motive is to render the statute practically useless against this type of propaganda.

"Another type analogous to the previous type is that which promotes the theory that international Socialism is opposed in principle to this war. The promotion of international Socialism can not, when representing genuine convictions, be attributed to bad motives. It represents one theory as to the best way of promoting human happiness, and the promotion of human happiness is a good motive. Yet this propaganda sometimes takes a shape which might have great effectiveness in obstructing war preparation and the conduct of the war."

Very little remains to be said. If this bill becomes a law it will mean that freedom of thought and speech have been wiped out of the "Magna Charta" of the American people, and the working-class movement in all its phases will be the first to feel the heavy pressure of these newly created conditions.

The military situation in Europe and the powerful sentimental appeal that lies in the fate of Finland and Russia has in some cases dulled the perceptions of our comrades to actual conditions. To them this piece of legislation—even without the notorious I. W. W. bill, should bring a rude awakening. L.

Foch and Siberia: A Contrast

"Fighting the whole world" seems, at first glance, so impossible a task that he who would undertake it must of necessity be bereft of his senses. Nevertheless, the job has been undertaken, and carried out more or less successfully many times in the history of mankind. And what's more, those who undertook this seemingly impossible task were adjudged "great" by their fellow-men, even when they failed of ultimate success. Of the two last attempts at this kind of job prior to the great world war, those of Frederick the Great and of the great Napoleon—the first was fairly successful and the other was a success for almost twenty years. It is true that the Napoleonic attempt ended in complete, final and decisive failure. But Napoleon is

not on that account considered a fool. His failure was commensurate with his undertaking—the “world” which he fought being much larger than that which Frederick at any time engaged. But he also came much nearer complete success than Frederick ever did. And his stature as a historical figure is greater in proportion.

Evidently “fighting the whole world” is not such a difficult task after all. And the reason for it is simple enough. “In union there is strength.” In disunion there is weakness. And he who fights “the whole world” usually fights a disunited world.

Coalitions are notoriously weak. They suffer from what we call “divided counsels.” Divided counsels are, however, merely an outward symptom of the real malady from which all coalitions suffer and which renders them weak and ineffective as contrasted with the power that undertakes to fight “the world”. The real malady of all coalitions, the malady which causes their “divided counsel,” is *divided interest*. Every coalition is a temporary alliance of independent powers with *different* and often *conflicting* interests. Each member of the coalition fights because of special grievances and for special aims and purposes of its own. As war-aims and war-plans are intimately allied to each other, the different constituent elements of the coalition can seldom if ever have the same plan of campaign against the common enemy. If they agree at all upon a common plan of campaign, it is merely as a compromise between the special plans which each of them would like to follow if its wishes alone were consulted. Such common plans are never elaborated and followed except under great pressure from the common enemy, when general defeat becomes the only alternative to a common plan, and sometimes not even then.

“Where is Blücher?” is, therefore, in one form or another, a common complaint in such coalitions, and a fruitful source of dissension among its members. “Blücher” is very seldom on the spot where he ought to be in the judgment of the other members of the coalition. For “Blücher” always attends to *his* business, and his business is not always the business of every other mem-

ber of the coalition, and the different “Blüchers” are, therefore, very naturally apt to differ as to what is the common business of the coalition, or its most important business at any given moment.

The greatest of all world wars now in progress is no exception to the general rule. The strength of Germany lies in the fact that what is sometimes referred to as the “Central Alliance” is not really an “alliance.” If it ever was such, it has ceased to be long ago. There is only Germany, whose legions, like those of Napoleon during the latter part of his career, are recruited from a number of subordinate or tributary nations. Germany has achieved unity of command because Germany’s vassals have no separate war-aims, or at least can have them only within the framework of Germany’s own plans for world-organization. Germany prescribes their war-aims. She may, therefore, plan the operations of their troops. The situation is quite different on the side of the Allies. Before the United States entered the “Western Alliance” and Russia dropped out from it, there were at least four “principal” members of that Alliance, besides some “minor” ones, each with its own special aims and purposes, and, therefore, with its own strategy and plan of campaign. They were, of course, willing to “render assistance” to each other, like good partners, but they had not a common general plan of campaign, and could have none. They may have tried to “co-ordinate” their different plans, and work out common plans for special joint enterprises, such, for instance, as the Saloniki expedition. But that is something quite different from the single plan of campaign which Germany’s Great General Staff could work out for the entire war and all fields of operation and impose upon its “allies.” On the whole, the members of the Alliance opposed to Germany pursued independent plans of campaign, plans that were dictated primarily by their separate and distinct interests.

The Russian Revolution and the entry of the United States into the war changed the situation to a very large extent. The power with the most “special interests” suddenly abandoned her

special interests, and declared against special interests generally. At the same time a new and powerful Ally joined the coalition whose special interest was the *general* defeat of Germany. Up to that time England occupied that position to a certain extent—her world-position being such as to make her somewhat indifferent as to where Germany was beaten as long as she *was* beaten somewhere. England, too, however, had her special interests in that regard, particularly because of her sensitiveness with respect to “the way to India.” But the position of the United States as a world-power is such that they have no such special interests whatever,—at least not in such proximity to any actual or potential “front” as to make their special interests develop into a special “strategy.”

Nevertheless, these two great events were unable in themselves, to eliminate all the special interests among the Allies that stood in the way of a really unified strategy. The Italian disaster in the fall of 1917 eliminated one of these obstacles, by eliminating Italy's special interests from immediate influence upon the Allies' possible plans of military operations and by demonstrating to the Allies, including Italy, the dangers of pursuing special interests. After the Italian disaster the demands for “unity of command,” at least on the “Western front,” began to make itself heard. But the old cast of ideas, as well as some of the old special interests which gave birth to the old ideas, still persisted. Lloyd George, yielding to necessity, agreed to the creation of the allied Supreme War Council.

The commotion which followed this step, which nearly resulted in the overthrow of the Lloyd-George government, shows how revolutionary a step “unity of command” really is for a coalition. But the setting up of the Supreme War Council was only the first step in effecting “unity of command”—it was not “unity of command” even for the allied armies operating in France.

The last object was accomplished during the present great offensive by the appointment of General Foch as Commander-in-Chief of those armies. And the manner of its accomplishment

testifies eloquently to the great reluctance with which it was done. It should be remembered that General Foch was only appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies operating in France on March 26,—*five days after the beginning of the great German offensive, and not until after the Germans had succeeded in breaking through the allied front before Amiens.* It required all that in order to make the Allies do what would seem the most obvious and the only sensible thing to do.

Much has been said about the “particularism” and “unadjustability” of English “professional soldiers” as the reason for the great opposition which prevailed in England against the “unity of command” which would place the English army under the direction of a non-English commander. That such particularism and unadjustability are prevalent in English army circles is undoubtedly true: they are prevalent wherever the nationalistic cast of ideas prevails. But the prejudices of professional soldiers could not possibly have been a determining factor in England, which has always known how to assign professional soldiers their proper place. The truth is that the opposition to that measure was more wide-spread and its causes were much more deeply rooted. The real cause of the opposition was the still existing divergence in the war-aims of some of the Allies at least. We have had a glimpse of this when Mr. Balfour told the House of Commons the other day that a “greater Alsace-Lorraine” was at least in the not far-distant past one of *France's* war aims *but not of the Allies.*

So long as there is no unity of war aims among the Allies there can be no real unity of command or of strategy, in the larger aspects of the war. Temporary unity may be achieved here or there under the stress of circumstances—usually *unfavorable circumstances.* But complete and lasting unity of strategy in planning the struggle of the Allies against Germany and unity of command in carrying out these plans can only follow upon a complete agreement on the war aims of the Allies.

This applies even to a greater extent to the so-called “political” phases of the struggle, the most important of which is the

question of the future relations of the Allies to Russia. The treatment which that question has received at the hands of allied statesmen is in marked and regrettable contrast to the final solution of the question of unity of military command in France. While England, France, and the United States, are placing their military resources in France under one command, their diplomacy, official and unofficial, is apparently acting at cross-purposes in the treatment of Russia, as exemplified by the threatened invasion of Siberia.

There is no question of greater importance to the Allied cause today than the question of the proper handling of the Russian situation. And yet the Allies do not seem to be able to agree upon a common plan of action. It is true that for the moment President Wilson's intervention seems to have frustrated the designs of the reactionaries in all Allied countries for a Japanese invasion of Siberia. But the reactionaries are again making themselves heard, and there is renewed danger of the design being carried out after all. Needless to say,—the carrying out of that design would be the greatest blow imaginable for the cause of the Allies as well as for the Russian Revolution and the cause of liberalism the world over. The results of such a blow may in the end turn out to be more disastrous than even "the breaking through" of some particular military front. Here is a situation which imperatively requires unity of action, and unity of action of the right kind.

And it seems to be up to the United States, people and government, to force it upon the Allies if need be. It must be remembered that the policy of "unity of command" which resulted in the appointment of General Foch as Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies in France was not accomplished without the forceful intervention of the United States, both through its government and the organs of expression of public opinion.

It is up to us to make the demand for a proper policy towards Russia even more insistent, so that such a policy may be adopted before the Allies shall have suffered on the political field a disaster comparable to the disaster in the military sphere, which

finally brought about the long delayed appointment of General Foch to the post of Generalissimo of the Allied Armies in France.

B.

War-Maps and "Liberalism"

"When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil was well, the devil a monk was he."

In a famous interview given by Dr. Von Bethmann-Hollweg while still German Imperial Chancellor, that celebrated statesman declared that the peace-terms would depend on the condition of the war-map at the conclusion of the war. But peace terms are not the only things depending upon the war-map. The developments of the recent past prove conclusively that the "liberalism" of governments and ruling classes and even of peoples, in war times has an intimate relation to the war-map: It is almost *always in inverse ratio to the favorableness of the war-map.*

Germany during the past year furnishes the best illustration of this rule.

About a year ago, when the war-map looked anything but favorable to Germany, a great wave of "liberalism" swept over that country. The crest of the wave was reached when the Reichstag passed its famous "No-Annexation" resolution, and the Kaiser solemnly promised to introduce equal suffrage in Prussia. The first was intended to guarantee the application of Germany's "new spirit" in her dealings with other nations; while the second was intended to assure the benefits of the "new era" to the German people at home. Both were heralded far and wide as near-revolutions. The American Socialist press of a certain type was jubilant: a democratic peace and a liberal Germany were both here. The leading Socialist paper in this country even went to the extent of announcing that all autocratic power had already been abolished in Germany.

The new "liberal spirit" of Germany in its relation to other nations proved itself at Brest-Litovsk, and is daily proving itself in the Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, and the former

Russian Baltic provinces. Internally, it has been proving itself in the increased activities of courts martial, and similar "liberal" institutions, and it has just now again proved itself in the defeat of the Prussian Equal Franchise Bill.

And let there be no mistake about it: It is not merely a question of the perfidy of the Kaiser or of the Prussian Junkers. It is a case of general reaction, reaching deep down into the masses of the population, including the most advanced sections of the proletariat. The unvarnished truth is that reaction is triumphant all along the line in Germany. One of its most significant as well as most discouraging symptoms is a series of electoral defeats suffered by the Independent, or "minority" Socialist party,—the most important of which is the defeat of its candidate for the Reichstag in a by-election in the Nieder-Barnim district, one of the strongholds of the "Independents."

And the reason for these defeats, the underlying reason of the entire reactionary wave, is to be found in the condition of the war-map: Had the German armies failed on the "Eastern front" in the measure that they have actually succeeded, the New York Call might have turned out a true prophet even though but a poor news-reporter, and autocracy in Germany might have been considerably curbed at least, if not entirely abolished, by this time.

But the German armies *have* succeeded where good Germans, along with other good people, wanted them to fail. So we must be prepared for a strong onward sweep of German reaction for some time to come.

In a recent article Karl Kautsky, the veteran Socialist theoretician and one of the principal leaders of the German Independents, discusses the Nieder-Barnim election in its relation to the general reactionary mood of the German people at the present moment, and shows that this is a mere repetition of what occurred in Germany after the great German victories in the wars of 1866 and 1870.

"No man," says Kautsky, "was more hated by his people than was Bismarck at the beginning of the war of 1866. Nor was

any war ever met with stormier manifestations of protest on the part of the population than was that war. Had the Prussian armies failed of victory, the result would have been, if not actual revolution, at least the overthrow of the Bismarck governmental system, and the introduction of the parliamentary system instead. But the Prussian armies *were* victorious and immediately, after the first victory, the temper of the people changed, and Bismarck was being acclaimed with the greatest enthusiasm."

Kautsky proceeds to show how the liberal opposition, which controlled the "House of Delegates" before the war of 1866 by the enormous majority of 241 votes out of a total of 352, dwindled down within a few years, under the influence of the victorious wars, to a pitiful 50 votes in a house of 433.

And then, turning to the present situation, he says:

"During the summer of last year the great majority of the German people were in a mood to listen favorably to the policies advocated by us (the Independents). So much is proven by the concessions which the weathercocks of the majority block, then just organized, were willing to make to the idea of a peace without annexations and with the right of nations to self-determination. But the last few months have made a great change in the situation; and this again, may also be seen from the attitude of those same weathercocks. The politicians of the momentary mood, in the Reichstag as well as among the people, see nothing but the forward march of the German armies, without bothering much about the causes to which it is due. They see only the peace,—the very profitable peace—and do not stop to think about the consequences that are likely to follow in its wake. They see only the successes, and become enthusiastic over the state policy thus seemingly crowned with success.

"So long as this mood continues, we Independents will have a hard row to hoe. Let us not deceive ourselves: the tide is for the present against us."

Since the above lines were written by Kautsky, about two months ago, the situation has not improved. On the contrary, it is going from bad to worse.

One of the curious manifestations of the present mood in Germany, is the organization of a new political party—the party of “workingmen and salaried employees.” The principal aim of the new organization is to secure a full utilization of Germany’s military victories. Its concrete program includes: a demand for indemnities, securities, and lands for colonization; the annexation of all the “German” Baltic provinces,—as well as the “low-German” Flemish districts of Belgium; the unification of all “Germanic” peoples; opposition to “English-American brutal super-capitalism” (Grosskapitalismus); opposition to the present “super-annuated” Reichstag, and support of a *strong monarchy* and *strong* armaments; opposition to “the democratic prolongers of the war,” who endeavor to prevent every separate peace; and many equally beautiful things besides.

Such is the newest “Labor Party” of Germany. Verily, a sign of the times. B.

Toward the Revolution

For the International Socialist movement the war has been a crucible. The white heat of its passions has melted old conceptions and prejudices, has separated the pure metal from the alloy, has brought clearness out of confusion. From this crucible it will emerge, a new movement, ready to meet the problems and struggles of a new world.

Nowhere has this change been more marked, and nowhere more remarkable, than in the Scandinavian countries. The Socialist movement in these nations, from the fact that their population is devoted overwhelmingly to agricultural pursuits, was always characterized by a strong opportunistic tendency. Up to the outbreak of the war the radical wing, in every one of these nations, was in the hopeless minority. In Sweden the party had split on this issue into two groups, of which the Socialdemocratic Party, the representatives of the right wing, was by far superior in strength and influence. The Young Socialist Party, the political party of the radicals, were hard put to it, to maintain their existence. In Norway, at a congress held in 1913, the

small group of radicals was so completely outvoted as to be practically annihilated.

Recent reports from Scandinavia, therefore, are as amazing as they are gratifying. At a Convention of the Norwegian Socialist Party, held in Christiania at the end of March, the balance of power had so completely reverted to the other side, as to leave the movement practically under the control of the left wing group of the Norwegian Social-Democracy.

The Executive Committee, which had consisted of six radicals and twelve conservatives, brought in the following majority and minority resolutions:

“The socialist state of society is founded upon the will of the majority of the people. The Social-Democracy, therefore, can recognize no dictatorship that draws its authority from the use of force, whether it be a dictatorship of the upper or of the working class. The convention must, therefore, refuse to support general strikes or revolutionary mass action against the high cost of living or military strikes for the abolition of military service. At the present time such action could only harm the cause of the working class. The convention appeals to the proletariat to support their labor union and political organization for the protection of their own economic interests, to prepare for a powerful drive, that the Social-Democracy may win the majority in the Storting in the coming elections.”

The minority brought in the following counter-resolution:

“The Social-Democracy cannot recognize the right of the ruling class to exploit the working class even when this exploitation is supported by the consent of the majority in the national parliament. The Norwegian labor party must, therefore, insist upon its right to use mass action or revolutionary measures in its struggle for the industrial liberation of the working class. As a party whose most vital issue is the class struggle, it cannot be indifferent to this struggle when it is being conducted by other working class organizations. The convention, therefore, greets with joy the creation of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Councils in

Norway and sees in them an expression of the self-reliance and self-activity of the working class population."

Furthermore the following majority and minority resolutions on the military question were presented:

"The party convention hereby earnestly appeals to the workers of Norway to support the Norwegian labor party in its disarmament program, and to abolish the military system by the power of a populace majority. Believing that this can be accomplished in the near future, the Executive Board cannot consent to a program that will pledge our organization to military strikes and strikes in war industries, with consequent general military uprisings."

The minority moved:

"The convention hereby calls upon the workers of Norway to prepare and organize a strike on a natural basis, with the support of labor union action against military and defense service. We demand, furthermore, that a general strike be prepared to prevent war, and the declaration of war."

After a debate that lasted four hours both resolutions of the opposition, i. e., of the so-called "minority" were adopted with 158 against 120 votes. Furthermore, the following resolution on the military question was adopted:

"Whereas the national labor union congress has refused to support a military strike, and

Whereas separate organizations have been formed for those who are liable to military service,

Be it resolved, That there is no possibility of united action between the two main organizations in this matter, and

Be it further resolved, that military strikes are fully compatible with socialist principles,—that the working class, therefore, cannot relinquish the right to use this weapon in the struggle for its own emancipation."

The decided refusal of the old guard, to affiliate the organization with the Zimmerwald Conference was overthrown, dele-

gates from the radical socialist movement in Sweden were invited to participate in the convention, and similar invitations were extended to Comrade Bolabanoff, secretary of the Zimmerwald Commission, and Vorovsky, the Stockholm representative of the Bolsheviki.

In Sweden a similar change has made itself evident. The influence of the radicals there, too, is growing stronger from day to day, as the elections of 1917 plainly showed.

This upheaval in the Scandinavian labor movement is, of course, not accidental, but due to a fundamental change in the attitude of the whole population. Dissatisfaction with the food-rationing system, and the constant imminence of war has brought a new and more decisive tone into the Scandinavian labor movement. Sporadic uprisings and riots are breaking out with a frequency that is alarming the members of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. The refusal of the old party leaders to engage in active anti-militarist propaganda has led to the organization of outside anti-militarist organizations, that have enjoyed the whole-hearted support of the radical element everywhere.

And so, out of the chaos and confusion that fills the world, clearness and health for our movement are arising. Opportunism and chauvinism are disappearing, and soon the brotherhood of man will cease to be an idle dream.

L.

Documents for Future Socialist History

Documents of Russian Constitutional Assembly

At the opening session of the Constitutional Assembly, the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Soviets, Sverdlov, when opening the assembly, read the following declaration:

The Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People

I.

1. Russia is to be declared a republic of the workers,' soldiers,' and peasants' Soviets. All power in the cities and in the country belongs to the Soviets.

2. The Russian Soviet Republic is based on the free federation of free peoples, on the Federation of National Soviet Republics.

II.

Recognizing as its duty the destruction of all exploitation of the workers, the complete abolishment of the class system of society, and the placing of society on a socialistic basis, and the ultimate bringing about of a victory for Socialism in every country, the Constitutional Assembly decides further:

1. The socializing of land will be carried out, private ownership of land will be abolished, all the land is proclaimed to be the common property of the people and will be given to the toiling people without compensation on the principle of equal right to use land.

All the forests, mines and waters, which are of social importance, as also all living and other property, all agricultural enterprises will be declared national property.

2. To confirm the Soviets' law concerning the inspection of working conditions, the highest department of national economy, which is the first step in bringing about the ownership by the Soviets of the factories, mines, railroads and means of production and transportation as property of the Soviet Republic.

3. To confirm the transferring of all banks over into the hands of the Soviet Republic, which is one of the steps in the freeing of the toiling masses from the yoke of capitalism.

4. To enforce general compulsory labor, in order to destroy the class of parasites and to reorganize economic life. In order to

make the power of the toiling masses secure and to hinder the restoration of the rule of exploiters the toiling classes will be armed and a Red Guard, composed of workingmen and peasants, formed, and the exploiting classes will be disarmed.

III.

1. Declaring its firm determination to free society from the claws of capitalism and imperialism, which have drenched the country in blood in this, the most criminal war of all wars, the Constitutional Assembly accepts completely the policy of the Soviets, whose duty it is to publish all secret treaties, to organize the most extensive fraternization among the workers and peasants of the warring armies and to bring about by use of revolutionary methods a democratic peace among the nations without annexations and indemnities, on the basis of free self-determination of the nations—at any price.

2. For this purpose the Constitutional Assembly demands complete separation from the brutal policy of the bourgeoisie, which is furthering the well-being of exploiters among a few selected nations by enslaving hundreds of millions of the toiling people, in colonies generally and in small countries.

The Constitutional Assembly accepts the policy of the Council of People's Commissaries, which has given complete independence to Finland, begun the transferring of soldiers from Persia, and declared for Armenia the right of self-determination.

A first blow to the international bank and finance capital, according to the Constitutional Assembly, is a law which annuls those loans, which have been taken by the governments of the Czar, of land owners and bourgeoisie; and that the Soviet Government is to continue firmly on this road until the final victory from the yoke of capital is won through international workers' revolt.

As the Constitutional Assembly was elected on the basis of the lists of candidates nominated before the November revolution, when the people as a whole could not yet rise against their exploiters, and did not know the extent of the latter's might of opposition in defending their own privileges, and had not yet begun to create a socialistic society, the Constitutional Assembly would consider it, even from a formal point of view, as unjust to put itself against the Soviet power. The Constitutional Assembly is of the opinion that now, in the decisive moment of the struggle of the people against the exploiters, the exploiters cannot have any seat in any of the Government organizations. The power must completely and without exception belong to the people and to its authoritative representatives—to the workers,' soldiers' and peasants' Soviets.

Supporting the Soviet rule and accepting the orders of the Council of the People's Commissaries, the Constitutional Assembly acknowledges that its duty is to outline a form for the reorganization of society on a socialistic basis.

Striving at the same time to organize a free and voluntary, and thereby also a complete and strong union among the toiling classes of all the Russian nations, the Constitutional Assembly is content to outline the basis of the federation of Russian Soviet Republics, leaving to the people, to workingmen and soldiers, to decide for themselves in their own Soviet meetings, whether they are willing, and on what conditions, to join the federated government and other unions of the Soviet enterprises.

These general principles are to be published without delay and the official representatives of the Soviets are required to read them at the opening of the Constitutional Assembly. These principles are the working basis of the Assembly.

The Proclamation of the Bolsheviki

When the majority of the members of the Constitutional Assembly refused to accept the program of the Executive Committee of Soviets, the Russian Social Democratic Workingmen's Party (Bolsheviki) gave out a proclamation, which was read in the session of the Constitutional Assembly on January 18th, 1918.

The proclamation follows:

The great majority of toiling Russia, the workers, peasants and soldiers, have demanded that the Constitutional Assembly recognize the results of the great October revolution, the Soviets' proclamation regarding land, peace and inspection of working conditions, and, above all, that it should recognize the Soviet Government. Fulfilling this demand of the great majority of Russian working classes, the All-Russian Executive Committee has proposed to the Constitutional Assembly that it (the Constitutional Assembly) should recognize this demand as binding. The majority of the Constitutional Assembly has, however, in accordance with the demands of the bourgeoisie, refused to approve this proposition, thereby throwing a challenge of battle to all of toiling Russia. The social revolutionary right wing, the party of Kerensky, Avksentyev and Chernov, has obtained the majority in the Constitutional Assembly. This party, which calls itself a Social Revolutionary Party, is directing the fight of bourgeois elements against the workers' revolution and in reality is a bourgeois counter-revolutionary party. The Constitutional

Assembly in its present state is a result of the proportionate party power in force before the great October revolution. The present counter-revolutionary majority of the Constitutional Assembly, elected on the basis of the obsolete party lists, is trying to resist the movement of workers and peasants. The day's discussions have clearly shown that the Social Revolutionary Party of the right wing, as in the time of Kerensky, makes concessions to the people, promising them everything, but in reality has decided to fight against the Soviet government, against the socialistic measures to give the land and all its appurtenances to the peasants without compensation, to nationalize the banks and to annul the debts of the nation.

Without wishing for a moment to conceal the crimes of the enemies of the people, we announce that we are withdrawing from the Constitutional Assembly in order to let the Soviet power finally decide the question of its relation toward the counter-revolutionary part of the Constitutional Assembly.

The Manifesto Dissolving the Constitutional Assembly

At their session of January 19, 1918, the Executive Committee of the Soviets decided to dissolve the Constitutional Assembly, giving out the following manifesto:

"The Russian revolution has from the beginning put in the foreground the workers' and peasants' Soviets as a mass organization of all workers and exploited classes, which is the only body capable to direct the fight of these classes for their complete political and economic freedom. During the whole first period of the Russian revolution the Soviets increased, grew and were strengthened, on the basis of their own experience, rejecting the idea of the possibility of a compromise with the bourgeoisie and rejecting the treacherous bourgeois democratic parliamentary formalities, and coming, in practice, to the conclusion that the liberation of the oppressed classes is impossible unless all such formalities and compromises are rejected. The relations were finally broken by the October revolution which gave complete power to the Soviets. The Constitutional Assembly, elected on the basis of the lists prepared prior to the October revolution, was a result of the relative party power in force at the time when the government was composed of men favoring a policy of compromise with the Cadets. The people could not at that time, when there were only Social Revolutionary candidates, differentiate between the supporters of the Right Wing, Social Revolutionists, the

supporters of the bourgeoisie, and the Left Wing, supporters of Socialism. Therefore this Constitutional Assembly, which was intended to be the crown of the bourgeois parliamentary republic, because of its very composition, had to oppose the October revolution and the Soviet government. The October revolution, which gave the power to the Soviets and through them to the workers and exploited classes, was strongly opposed by the exploiters. The crushing of this opposition clearly showed the beginning of a socialistic revolution. The working classes became convinced by their experience that the old parliamentarism had outlived its time, that it could not comply with the realization of the tasks of Socialism and that, not the social but only class institutions, such as the Soviets, are capable of crushing the opposition of the propertied classes and to lay down the foundations of a socialistic commonwealth.

The refusal on the part of the Soviets to use their full power and to abandon the Soviet republic, which is supported by the people, on behalf of the bourgeois parliamentarism and on behalf of the Constitutional Assembly, would now be a step backward and it would lead to the destruction of the October revolution.

The majority in the Constitutional Assembly, opened on the eighteenth of this month, is composed of the Social Revolutionary Party's right wing, the party of Kerensky, Avksentyev and Chernov. It is but natural that this party refuses to take under consideration the complete, exact and clear proposition of the highest body of the Soviet Government, which proposition in no way could have been misunderstood, and that it refused to accept the proclamation of the right of toiling and exploited people and to recognize the October revolution and Soviet Government. Thus the Constitutional Assembly broke all its ties with the Russian Soviet Republic. The Bolsheviki and the Left Wing Social Revolutionists, who are supported by the great majority of workers and peasants, were under such conditions compelled to withdraw from such Constitutional Assembly. Outside of the Constitutional Assembly, the members of the right wing and the Mensheviki, the majority of the Constitutional Assembly, are openly fighting against the Soviet Government, agitating in their newspapers that their supporters overthrow this government, and thus they are supporting exploiters who are opposing the transferring of land and factories into the hands of the workers.

It is clear that thus the remaining part of the Constitutional Assembly can give their support only to the bourgeois counter-revolution in its fight to crush the Soviets. Therefore, the Executive Committee of the Soviets has decided to dissolve the Constitutional Assembly."

(*The New Republic*)

Austria's Pacifism

By H. N. BAILSFORD (London)

When M. Clemenceau gave to the world the startling letter in which the Austrian Emperor proposed terms of peace to France, he marked the end of a chapter. The publication of the letter would have been an unpardonable imprudence if the Emperor Karl were still an effective force working for a peace of reconciliation. Without a facsimile of the letter in the original language, it is hard to form a judgment upon it: and even then its terms might admit of two interpretations. At the lowest, it means that Austria was very much more anxious for peace than her ally; and was ready to discuss terms which included large concessions, more especially from her ally. For a year past by every device of private suggestion and public advocacy, she has endeavored to hasten peace, even at the cost of incurring the violent hostility of the German military party. The exposure of her efforts to attain peace must now have drawn down upon her the violent anger and suspicion of the Junkers. Flushed with the double elation of their easy triumphs in the east and their costly successes on the western front, dreaming once more of annexations and indemnities, they will turn upon this monarch as a false ally, and bury under their imprecations not him alone, but the whole Catholic pacifist movement of which he was the spokesman. Their fury may make for the young Emperor one of the most painful humiliations through which the Hapsburg dynasty has passed in our time. M. Clemenceau reasoned that it is to our advantage, even by means which challenge criticism, to create distrust and disunion in the enemy camp. There is one grave drawback to these tactics. After this sharp lesson, will the Emperor again dare to promote the cause of an early peace? If he were to risk another effort, can any vestige of influence among the leaders of opinion of the Central Powers survive this disclosure? Has not M. Clemenceau silenced a voice which was pleading for peace, and made an enemy of a man who wished to be a friend?

The French Ministry must have assumed that for some time to come the Austrian passion for peace has been submerged by events. The Emperor wrote before the collapse of Russia, before the successful offensive against Italy, before the treachery of the Ukrainian Rada, before the painful surrender of Rumania, and before the second battle of the Somme. A good deal has happened to prove that the Austrian peace party, even though the Emperor still heads it, is not its own master. It had to acquiesce in the cruel eastern treaties. A day after

the civilian ministers had declared that no Austrian troops would take part in the last invasion of Russian soil, the military command set them in motion. A few weeks after Count Czernin had vowed that he would not take a yard of Russian territory, the Magyars forced him to assent to what is no less a violation of his professed principles—the “strategic rectifications” at the expense of Rumania. Finally, when Count Czernin in public speeches doubly underlined his solidarity with Germany in the question of Alsace, he declared, in a sort of cipher which the French government would understand, that the Emperor’s recognition of the justice of French claims (if he ever made it) is now a thing of the past. M. Clemenceau had some reason to dismiss Austrian pacifism as a negligible factor. Sincere it may be, with the sincerity of desperation, passionate it may be, with all the resentment of a helpless victim toward an overbearing master, but it is powerless. It cannot act for itself. It cannot influence its ally. The conclusion of this reasoning was evidently that the only use which can be made of Austrian pacifism is to expose its rather pitiful manoeuvres, in order to sap the cohesion of the hostile alliance.

It was after the Russian Revolution that Austrian pacifism openly declared itself from high places. The connection of these two events was not accidental. The Revolution meant the end of pan-Slavism. The dread of that aggressive, disintegrating movement was suddenly lifted from the mind of Austria’s rulers, and they realized their liberation from the fear which had made them Germany’s allies, if not her vassals. They had tolerated Prussian militarism because they found it useful; it was the foil to the ambitions of Tsardom in Galicia and the Balkans. There was, however, another reason why the Russian Revolution caused Austria to sigh more than ever for peace. In the fate of Russia she saw an anticipation of her own destiny. After the first beginnings of the abortive Russian Revolution of 1905, Emperor Francis Joseph conceded manhood suffrage to Austria. After the successful Russian Revolution of 1917, the Emperor Karl talked of “Democracy,” proclaimed the ideal of an Austria composed of “equal privileged nationalities,” furthered franchise reform in Hungary, and tried to conciliate the Czechs.

In the long run, the working out of the parallel between Austria and Russia is a question only of time. The ultimate factor in this war, as in any protracted modern war, is economic endurance. The collapse of Russia had its local and temperamental features which cannot be reproduced elsewhere. Ultimately, it meant that a backward agricultural nation cannot survive a long war of attrition on the present scale. There were picturesque aggravations of Russia’s case—her Rasputin, her Empress, her tendency to theoretical extremes. What

really counted in the balance was the attrition of her means of transport, the wearing-out of her rails, her locomotives, her wagons, the dearth of the simplest agricultural implements, the massacre of her horses, and paralysis of a primitive industry which could no longer supply even the spades and the horse-shoes which she required. She could not import, she could not produce. She collapsed, partly because her organization was primitive, and partly because her bureaucracy was too stupid, too disloyal, too distrustful to improvise an efficient, popular substitute for itself.

In a less degree, Austria presented the same features. She, too, is primarily an agricultural nation. Her organization also is relatively medieval in mind. Her rhythm of work is slow and easy-going. Even her agriculture (to say nothing of her industry) as Herr Naumann puts it, is in Austria twenty, and in Hungary forty years behind that of Germany. Like Russia, she exports food in normal times. Like Russia, she has come near starvation in time of war. If her bureaucracy was much less corrupt and much less stupid than that of Russia, it also has shrunk from the test of fostering a popular substitute for itself. There is a limit to the endurance of every state engaged in this war. The Russian limit was three years. There is some absolute figure which measures Austrian endurance. It may be four years; a little less or a little more; it may be five. It is not indefinitely elastic, because the Austrian mechanism shows in a much less degree the same fatal incapacity as the Russian: it can not replace its own worn-out parts.

Most of us realize today that the period of Russia’s endurance was shortened because the Entente turned a deaf ear to her pleading, and refused to revise its war aims. The same symptoms are evident within the Central Alliance. Since the Emperor Karl first came to the throne and cleared the ministries of the men who made the war, Austria has stood within the central group, as Russia stood within the Entente, for a moderate programme, a status quo settlement of territorial questions, and the reconstruction of European society on the basis of disarmament, and arbitration. Like Russia, she renounced all conquests for herself, and even now the re-drawing of the Rumanian frontier on which Hungary has insisted, though bad in principle, is trivial in extent.

War-weariness always seeks a theoretical disguise, which may, none the less, be sincere. When the Russian Revolution in its early stages renounced the dream of Constantinople, called for the abandonment of all imperialism, and began to evolve the simple, but far-reaching philosophy of self-determination, it saw before it the limit of its active participation in the war. Stripped of academic refine-

ments, its policy was a call for the dropping of all war aims which might prolong the war. Official Austria has adopted a more conservative philosophy, the Catholic pacifism of the Papal Note. It is lukewarm and uncertain about the democratic theory of self-determination. It looks further into the future than the Russians did, and lays stress (as they did not) on disarmament, partly perhaps as a means of lessening its own dependence on the Prussian war machine, but chiefly because it dreads the prospect of bankruptcy. He would be a blind cynic who doubted the sincerity of the Emperor's pacifism; there are phrases in all his public declarations which could have been coined only by a mind which had reached its position by its own mental travail. None the less, the brutal fact is very simple, and it does not differ from the Russian fact. Austria renounces conquests for herself, and calls on her allies as loudly as she dares, to renounce them also, primarily because she knows that she cannot stagger without permanent ruin through an indefinitely prolonged war.

Count Czernin pleaded, as Kerensky pleaded, for moderation, because Austria, like Russia, is very nearly worn out. His fate has been the same. He has not moved his allies. He has had to acquiesce, though with no direct profit to Austria, in the cruel eastern peace. On the eve of his fall he stood helpless before the consequences of his failure—the ascendancy of the German war lords, the inevitable refusal of the western Powers to make peace on the basis of German domination, the renewal of the offensive in the west and the prolongation of the war, which he had desperately tried to shorten. He has fallen, as Kerenski fell, in the hopeless effort at once to secure a moderate peace and to please his own allies.

Up to this point, the parallel between the cases of Austria and Russia is close. Is it destined to be closer yet? There are unluckily sharp differences as well as likenesses. Germany exerts over her ally a power which Great Britain and France did not possess over Russia. There is, moreover, in the Magyar and German governing classes of the Dual Monarchy an element which responds to Berlin far more promptly than any element in Russia responded to London or Paris. The Emperor may seek to explain or repudiate his compromising letter; Count Czernin may rally in public speeches to the defense of Alsace, and resign when complications overwhelm him. None the less, the economic reasons which drive Austria imperatively to an early peace, are still operative. Count Czernin's anxiety was very legible in his last speech. He seems to dread not so much mass movement for peace on the part of the working class, which may repeat the general strike of January, as the refusal of the Slavs to be reconciled, and to take part in any reorganization and consolidation of the monarchy.

The Czechs in particular have played a part which exactly reproduces the tactics of Sinn Fein in Ireland. They want no settlement arranged at Vienna: they cling doggedly to the hope of a settlement dictated by the Peace Conference. In Russia, all the masses wanted an early peace. In Austria the Slav politicians, and still more the Slav exiles, are driven by the logic of their maximum demands to desire a prolongation of the war, since at no less a price can they hope for a settlement dictated by the Entente. There was in Russia no such fundamental division of opinion. The Emperor may have behind him the mass of the German working-class of Austria, but he cannot reckon, for all his liberalism and his desire for reconciliation, on the support of his Slavs. Even if he were to break finally with the German and Magyar parties of ascendancy, he has no assurance that he would gain the Czechs, or even the Poles and the South Slavs. While the war lasts, he is condemned by these internal divisions to impotence. Nothing less than the conviction that a forcible settlement of internal questions is excluded will bring the Slavs to compromise. Austria can take no decided action on her own initiative; yet she knows that the failure to act may be her ruin. The refusal of the Entente to consider the needs of Russia led to her collapse and disintegration. The refusal of Germany to consider the needs of Austria may have consequences even more disastrous to her. Her influence will not count again among the Central Powers until Germany experiences another period of war-weariness, more acute than that of last summer. Passive, hopeless and hunger-driven, in what condition will Austria emerge from the ordeal?

(The Public)

Mr. Gompers and the British Labor Party

(By a Member of the British Labor Party)

The great gulf which is fixed between Mr. Gompers and British labor is still there, in spite of the happy party in New York the other day at which Mr. Gompers flayed Mr. Paul Kellogg, presumably (for there is no contrary evidence) with the assent of the labor delegation sent by the British Government to this country. The press may play the ostrich; but the fact remains that Mr. Kellogg is a more trustworthy exponent of the present spirit and outlook of British labor than Mr. Appleton. This is no reflection on Mr. Appleton, for he is a good man; but he and his colleagues belong to the same school and stage of labor leadership as Mr. Gompers. The British labor move-

ment has left that stage behind it; whether one judge that this is for good or for evil, one's own bias on these questions will decide.

The difference between Mr. Gompers and the British labor movement is partly due to the fact that the latter has behind it the experience of nearly four years of war. Rightly or wrongly it has reached the conclusion that the existing order of private capitalism lies at the root of the policies which are responsible for the war. At the Buffalo meeting of the American Federation of Labor in November, Mr. John Hill, a fraternal delegate from the British Trade Union Congress, said: "That this war generally arises out of the imperialistic efforts of kings and emperors for a larger portion of the earth's surface in the capitalist interests, to control an ever larger proportion of the product of the worker's toil, and that all nations shared in the responsibility for this war, that below all intrigues are the capitalist interests, and that unless we emancipate ourselves from the domination of capitalism, there will be no democracy after the war, is the position of the English workers." What the British labor movement is quite clear about is that there can never be a settled peace on earth as long as competitive capitalism furnishes the motive of national policy; and it has made up its mind to abolish this source of trouble. It recognizes that this task, like charity, begins at home, and in its report on reconstruction, it lays the axe to the British root of the tree. The cynical readiness of the big business interests to turn the country's necessity to their own advantage, especially in the early stages of the war, before the Government interfered with the wild epidemic of profiteering, has served to remove finally any lingering sense that the good of the nation is bound up with the existing industrial order; and British labor is resolved that the existing order must go.

It has naturally less misgivings in contemplating the change in so much as the war has revealed the stupid wastefulness of the system of private capitalist enterprise. The revelation which the close industrial organization required by the war, has provided of hitherto unexplored and even unsuspected possibilities of production in British industry, has demonstrated that "big" business as we have known it is exceedingly "bad" business. The immense increase of output in all industries, through proper coordination, standardization of processes, the systematic use of scientific investigation, and a more adequate oversight of the physical condition of the worker, has made it plain that private capitalism either would not or could not make proper use of the productive resources of the British people. For instance, the ignorant opposition of the average employer to the movement for decreasing the hours of labor has discredited his judgment and his capacity for handling men, in view of such findings as those recorded

by Lord Henry Bentinck in the Contemporary Review for February. Lord Henry shows conclusively from data drawn from the engineering, printing and textile trade that "in every case, in which experiments have been tried, the result in output has been favorable to a shortening of the working day."

That private capitalism has thus been discredited does not however mean that the British Labor Party has adopted a policy of State Socialism. The very circumstances which have revealed the inefficiency of private capitalism have also led to a deep dislike of State control. The working of the Munitions Act has proved that the State may be as harassing and troublesome an employer as the individual or the corporation; and the British Labor Party's problem is to find a way by which private capitalism may be eliminated without introducing the policy of industrial control by the State. Here again they have been helped by the experiences of wartime. The Garton Foundation and the Whitley Committee on Reconstruction, the one a private, the other a parliamentary body, and neither committed to "labor" views—have been led by a study of industrial conditions in wartime, to advocate measures of democratic control in industry; and the experiments in democratic control which have been made, especially in the woolen trades, have plainly demonstrated its practicability and its economic value. Out of these circumstances has emerged the doctrine of national ownership with decentralized and democratic industrial control, which seems to underlie the economic policy of the British Labor Party.

It appears, therefore, that the difference between the British Labor Party and Mr. Gompers is that the former contemplates a radical change in the existing economic framework of industry, whereas the latter is content to work for the improvement of labor conditions within the existing framework. Mr. Gompers adheres to the "nibbling" policy, the policy of raids upon the enemy's trenches here and there as the occasion arises. The British Labor Party stands for a calculated offensive en masse. It was evident that the old guerilla leadership was becoming obsolete in British labor before the war; and the trade unions were beginning to develop the large-scale strategy of the general strike. But it is now clear that the venue of the conflict will be henceforth transferred from the shops to the House of Commons. While Mr. Gompers still preaches his doctrine of political indifferentism, the British Labor Party has resolved upon the attempt to take control of the machinery of government. The general strike is abandoned for the general election.

Historically it is the case that political power has belonged to those who possessed economic power; and Mr. Orage, the leading

advocate of the "National Guild" idea, not long ago disparaged the project of a British Labor Party on the ground that it was useless for the workers to seek political power until first they had the economic power in their hands. But as a matter of fact this antithesis disappears in the British Labor Party's program. Mr. Orage and his "National Guild" collaborators rightly insist that the strength of the capitalist position is organically bound up with the commodity theory of labor,—the view that man's labor is a measureable marketable commodity separate from his personality and subject to the law of supply and demand like any other commodity. Repudiate this theory, and the capitalist synthesis naturally collapses. But something else of even greater consequence happens. Over against the commodity theory it is maintained that the worker has as direct an interest in the product of his labor as his employer, and that the only proper relation between the capitalist and the actual producer is that of partnership. The logic of this view leads at last to the doctrine of national ownership with democratic control; its immediate result is to change entirely the status of the worker. He is no longer a mere economic unit at the mercy of the chances of the market, but a partner whose claim upon profit is of a piece with that of the owner of capital, and whose full maintenance, in health and strength,—whether trade be slack or brisk—is a permanent charge upon the proceeds of industry. It is this view of the worker's status that is practically expressed in the Labor Party's demand for the establishment of a national minimum standard of life. It raises the worker above the insecurities of a fluctuating market and puts the commodity theory of labor out of commission. The worker is no longer a "hand" but a partner in the great game of production. Mr. Gompers, with all his zeal for improving the external conditions of the worker leaves him in his old status; for that reason it is impossible to resist the conclusion that he represents an obsolescent order; and that the British Labor Party points the road of advance.

I have not touched upon the unconcealed difference between Mr. Gompers and British labor on the immediate issues of international labor policy. This is a development out of the radical divergence in economic outlook which I have endeavored to explain. Mr. Gompers still moves within the ante-bellum ideology. He finds the particularist universe which he inhabits large enough for himself and for American labor; the strength of the British Labor Party on the contrary is that it has begun to think in universals. Its program for Great Britain is not a class-ascendancy but a living and working society, and for the world not the particularism of nationality but the generous hope of a free cooperative commonwealth.

"Knights of Liberty" in Oklahoma

(The Liberator)

TULSA, NOVEMBER 9th.

[Editor's Note:—In this story of persecution and outrage at Tulsa, Oklahoma, told in the sworn statement of one of the victims, there is direct and detailed evidence of one of the most menacing by-products of the war. Here in Tulsa, as in Bisbee and Butte and Cincinnati, patriotic fervor was used by employers with the connivance or open co-operation of local officials, as a mask for utterly lawless attacks upon workingmen who attempted to organize for better conditions. This false resort to loyalty on the part of certain war profiteers is emphasized in the recent Report of the President's Mediation Commission. These cowardly masked upper-class mobs, calling themselves "Knights of Liberty" and mumbling hypocritical words about "the women and children of Belgium," will not succeed in terrorizing the labor movement of America, nor will they tend to make it more patriotic.]

On November 9, 1917, seventeen men, taken from the custody of the city police of Tulsa, Oklahoma, were whipped, tarred and feathered, and driven out of the city with a warning never to return.

In a letter dated December 21, a resident* of Tulsa, writes:

"I think it is only fair to say that the bottom cause of this trouble locally was that a few men, presumably belonging to the I. W. W. came into the oil fields something like a year ago and were meeting with considerable success in getting oil-field workers—especially pipeline and tank builders—to fight for better wages and shorter hours.

"Not long after the outrage was committed in Butte, Mont., on the crippled I. W. W. leader (Frank Little), the home of J. Edgar Pew in this city was partly destroyed by some kind of explosion and Mr. and Mrs. Pew narrowly escaped being killed. The news agencies at once published it as a dastardly act of the I. W. W.'s.** Mr. Pew is the vice-president and active manager of the Carter Oil Co., which by the way, is owned and controlled by Standard Oil and is one of its largest producing subsidiary companies. A few weeks after the Pew

* Names of informants are withheld for reasons of safety. The names are in possession of the National Civil Liberties Bureau, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, which has the case in hand.

** Several men are now reported in the press to be under arrest in Oklahoma for dynamiting the home of Mr. Pew and the oil refinery, none of whom have any connection whatever with the I. W. W.

home incident, an explosion followed by a fire partially destroyed an oil refinery that is located at Norfolk, Okla. This property was under the Carter Oil Co. management. Two men lost their lives in this accident. The news agencies without exception (so far as I know) exploited this as another I. W. W. outrage."

From this point we take up the story in a sworn statement made by the secretary of the Tulsa local.

"On the night of November 5, 1917, while sitting in the hall at No. 6 W. Brady Street, Tulsa, Okla. (the room leased and occupied by the Industrial Workers of the World, and used as a union meeting room), at about 8.45 P. M., five men entered the hall, to whom I at first paid no attention, as I was busy putting a monthly stamp in a member's union card book. After I had finished with the member, I walked back to where these five men had congregated at the baggage-room at the back of the hall, and spoke to them, asking if there was anything I could do for them.

One who appeared to be the leader, answered 'No, we're just looking the place over.' Two of them went into the baggage-room flashing an electric flash-light around the room. The other three walked toward the front end of the hall. I stayed at the baggage-room door, and one of the men came out and followed the other three up to the front end of the hall. The one who stayed in the baggage-room asked me if I was 'afraid he would steal something.' I told him we were paying rent for the hall, and I did not think anyone had a right to search this place without a warrant. He replied that he did not give a damn if we were paying rent for our places, they would search them whenever they felt like it. Presently he came out and walked toward the front end of the hall, and I followed a few steps behind him.

"In the meantime the other men, who proved to be officers, appeared to be asking some of our members questions. Shortly after, the patrol-wagon came and all the members in the hall—10 men—were ordered into the wagon. I turned out the light in the back end of the hall, closed the desk, put the key in the door and told the 'officer' to turn out the one light. We stepped out, and I locked the door, and at the request of the 'leader of the officers,' handed him the keys. He told me to get in the wagon, I being the 11th man taken from the hall, and we were taken to the police station.

"November 6th, after staying that night in jail, I put up \$100.00 cash bond so that I could attend to the outside business, and the trial was set for 5 o'clock P. M., November 6th. Our lawyer, Chas. Richardson, asked for a continuance and it was granted. Trial on a charge of vagrancy was set for November 7th, at 5 P. M., by Police

Court Judge Evans. After some argument by both sides the cases were continued until the next night, November 8th, and the case against Gunnard Johnson, one of our men, was called. After four and a half hours' session the case was again adjourned until November 9th, at 5 P. M., when we agreed to let the decision in Johnson's case stand for all of us. . .

"Johnson said he had come into town Saturday, November 3rd, to get his money from the Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., and could not get it until Monday, the 5th, and was shipping out Tuesday, the 6th, and that he had \$7.08 when arrested. He was reprimanded by the judge for not having a Liberty Bond, and as near as anyone could judge from the closing remarks of Judge Evans, he was found guilty and fined \$100 for not having a Liberty Bond.

"Our lawyer made a motion to appeal the case and the bonds were then fixed at \$200 each. I was immediately arrested, as were also five spectators in the open court-room, for being I. W. W.'s. One arrested was not a member of ours, but a property-owner and citizen. I was searched and \$30.87 taken from me, as also was the receipt for the \$100 bond, and we then were all packed in the cells.

"In about forty minutes, as near as we could judge, about 11 P. M., the turnkey came and called 'Get ready to go out you I. W. W. men.' We dressed as rapidly as possible, were taken out of the cells, and the officer gave us back our possessions, Ingersoll watches, pocketknives and money, with the exception of \$3 in silver of mine which they kept, giving me back \$27.87. I handed the receipt for the \$100 bond I had put up to the desk sergeant, and he told me he did not know anything about it, and handed the receipt back to me, which I put in my trousers pocket with the 87 cents. Twenty-seven dollars in bills was in my coat pocket. We were immediately ordered into automobiles waiting in the alley. Then we proceeded one block north to 1st Street, west one-half block to Boulder Street, north across the Frisco tracks and stopped.

"Then the masked mob came up and ordered everybody to throw up their hands. Just here I wish to state I never thought any man could reach so high as those policemen did. We were then bound, some with hands in front, some with hands behind, and others bound with arms hanging down their sides, the rope being wrapped around the body. Then the police were ordered to 'beat it,' which they did, running, and we started for the place of execution.

"When we arrived there, a company of gowned and masked gunmen were there to meet us standing at 'present arms.' We were ordered out of the autos, told to get in line in front of these gunmen

and another bunch of men with automatics and pistols, lined up between us. Our hands were still held up, and those who were bound, in front. Then a masked man walked down the line and slashed the ropes that bound us, and we were ordered to strip to the waist, which we did, threw our clothes in front of us, in individual piles—coats, vests, hats, shirts and undershirts. The boys not having had time to distribute their possessions that were given back to them at the police stations, everything was in the coats, everything we owned in the world.

"Then the whipping began. A double piece of new rope, $\frac{5}{8}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ hemp, being used. A man, 'the chief' of detectives, stopped the whipping of each man when he thought the victim had enough. After each one was whipped another man applied the tar with a large brush, from the head to the seat. Then a brute smeared feathers over and rubbed them in.

"After they had satisfied themselves that our bodies were well abused, our clothing was thrown into a pile, gasoline poured on it and a match applied. By the light of our earthly possessions, we were ordered to leave Tulsa, and leave running and never come back. The night was dark, the road very rough, and as I was one of the last two that was whipped, tarred and feathered, and in the rear when ordered to run, I decided to be shot rather than stumble over the rough road. After going forty or fifty feet I stopped and went into the weeds. I told the man with me to get in the weeds also, as the shots were coming very close over us, and ordered him to lie down flat. We expected to be killed, but after 150 or 200 shots were fired they got in their autos.

"After the last one had left, we went through a barbed-wire fence, across a field, called to the boys, collected them, counted up, and had all the 16 safe, though sore and nasty with tar. After wandering around the hills for some time—ages it seemed to me—we struck the railroad track. One man, Jack Sneed, remembered then that he knew a farmer in that vicinity, and he and J. F. Ryan volunteered to find the house. I built a fire to keep us from freezing.

"We stood around the fire expecting to be shot, as we did not know but what some tool of the commercial club had followed us. After a long time Sneed returned and called to us, and we went with him to a cabin and found an I. W. W. friend in the shack and 5 gallons of coal oil or kerosene, with which we cleaned the filthy stuff off each other, and our troubles were over, as friends sent clothing and money to us that day, it being about 3 or 3.30 A. M. when we reached the cabin.

"The men abused, whipped and tarred were: Tom McCaffery, John

Myers, John Boyle, Charles Walsh, W. H. Walton, L. R. Mitchell, Jos. French, J. R. Hill, Gunnard Johnson, Robt. McDonald, John Fitzsimmons, Thos. Fischer, Gordon Dimikson, J. F. Ryan, E. M. Boyd, Jack Sneed (not an I. W. W.).

"This is a copy of my sworn statement and every word is truth."

In answer to special inquiry the writer added to his statement as follows:

"It was very evident that the police force knew what was going to happen when they took us from jail, as there were extra gowns and masks provided *which were put on by the Chief of Police and one detective named Blaine, and the number of blows we received were regulated by the Chief of Police himself, who was easily recognizable by six of us at least.*"

The above account is substantiated at every point by a former employee of The Federal Industrial Relations Commission, who at the request of the National Civil Liberties Bureau made a special investigation of the whole affair. His report names directly nine leaders of the mob, including five members of the police force.

The part played by the press in this orgy of "Patriotism" is illustrated by the following excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Daily World on the afternoon of the 9th:

"GET OUT THE HEMP

"Any man who attempts to stop the supply for one-hundredth part of a second is a traitor and ought to be shot! . . .

"The oil country can take care of its own troubles. It does not need the I. W. W. . . .

"In the meantime, if the I. W. W. or its twin brother, the Oil Workers' Union, gets busy in your neighborhood, kindly take occasion to increase the supply of hemp. A knowledge of how to tie a knot that will stick might come in handy in a few days. It is no time to dally with the enemies of the country. The unrestricted production of petroleum is as necessary to the winning of the war as the unrestricted production of gunpowder. We are either going to whip Germany or Germany is going to whip us. The first step in the whipping of Germany is to strangle the I. W. W.'s. Kill them, just as you would kill any other kind of a snake. Don't scotch 'em; kill 'em. And kill 'em dead. It is no time to waste money on trials and continuances and things like that. All that is necessary is the evidence and a firing squad. Probably the carpenters' union will contribute the timber for the coffins."