

1,000 Copies Sold on Pre-Publication Orders!

SOCIALIST WAR MANUAL

A Revolutionary Interpretation of the European Armageddon and the Temporary Collapse of Internationalism

Contains:

IMMEDIATE CAUSES

By Louis C. Fraina

GENERAL CAUSES

By Frank Bohn

MILITARISM

By Floyd Dell

THE ATTITUDE OF ITALY

By Arthur Livingston

ANTI-WAR MANIFESTOES

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

By Isaac A. Hourwich

HOW GERMAN SOCIALISTS DIVIDED

By William English Walling

**BRITISH AND AMERICAN SOCIALISTS
ON THE WAR**

Summary and Criticism of articles
by Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, H. M.
Hyndman, Ramsay MacDonald, Rob-
ert Blatchford, Victor Berger, Eugene
Debs and Charles Edward Russell.

This Socialist War Manual Will Probably Become Historic. It MUST Have a Wide Circulation Among Socialists and Non-Socialists Alike.

Price, 15 Cents a Copy

Special Low Rate, bundles of five or more.

NEW REVIEW
80 5th AVENUE, NEW YORK

Help the NEW REVIEW by Patronizing Its Advertisers

The New Review

Vol. II.

NOVEMBER, 1914

No. 11

THE DOWNFALL OF THE INTERNATIONAL

BY ANTON PANNEKOEK (Bremen)

I.

Exactly half a century has passed since the International Workingmen's Association was founded in London under the leadership of Karl Marx. It went to pieces after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 and the Paris Commune. Exactly a quarter of a century ago, at the Congress of 1889 in Paris, the new International was founded. This year the Congress at Vienna was to celebrate the double anniversary. But just a month before it was to take place the firebrand of international war was tossed into Europe from Vienna. With the outbreak of the European War, the new International, too, is disrupted.

When the old International was founded (1864), capitalism in Europe, with the exception of England, was still in its first stages. Its political form, the bourgeois State, was as yet only partly developed. In England alone the bourgeoisie was already in absolute control of the government. There modern industrial methods and large scale production had produced a proletariat which had, to be sure, lost all revolutionary spirit in the remarkably prosperous period following 1850, but which had nevertheless built up strong organizations by means of which it had fought bitter struggles in the sixties in order to realize some of its immediate demands.

In France, on the other hand, the old system of small scale production was still in vogue, though here, too, it was already being hard pressed by the hot-house like growth of capitalist industry. In Germany the factory system began to grow strongly only in the sixties. It did away with the old system of handicraft, impoverished the craftsmen and drove them into the factories.

In these countries the working class was still wholly under

the influence of the ideals and thoughts of the age of individual enterprise. Their feeling of enmity toward capital was not the hatred of the exploited worker against his exploiting master. It was rather the resentment that the unfortunate, miserable master must feel for his stronger competitor, as is proven by the fact that the productive co-operative associations, rather than the labor unions, occupied the center of popular interest.

By means of these societies their supporters hoped to place machine production into the hands of the worker and so render him able to compete with the manufacturer. Lassalle's proposal of productive associations supported by State loans and the prevalence of Proudhon's ideas in France bear witness to the popularity of this idea.

The bourgeoisie, not having as yet acquired political mastery in these countries, formed a strong radical opposition party, which strove, above all, to unite the various provinces into a national whole. Its middle class wing, true to the ideals of 1848, aspired to political democracy, meddled with the labor movement and confused the minds of many workers with its empty phrases.

The workers of Western Europe were unanimous in their determination to defend their democratic institutions against European reaction under the leadership of Russian Czarism. The Polish Revolution in 1863, therefore, gave the impetus that led to the organization of the International.

The history of the old International is a constant struggle between the middle class ideals of the handicraftsmen and the spirit of the modern working class movement that the development of capital had produced. Coming from England, defended at the congresses by English delegates, provided with a general theory by Karl Marx, the new spirit gradually pushed the petty-bourgeois ideals of the past into the background. Thus the International became a school for the propaganda of the fundamental Marxian theories. The more progressive groups of the working class became class-conscious, and gained the insight into social problems that was to determine their tactics in the period that followed. Recognition of the necessity of industrial organization in the struggle against capitalist masters and of independent political warfare to secure control of the government, with communism as the ultimate goal—that was the abiding result of the internal struggles of the old International. But the organization itself was doomed to destruction. The European wars coming to a close in 1870, had fulfilled the national ideals of the bourgeoisie. In Central Europe larger nations, Germany and Italy, such as were necessary for the further development of capitalist industry, had

come into existence. These nations, together with the older France and England, were the battleground upon which the coming struggles of the proletariat were to be fought. The internationalism of a general organization governed by an executive in London had become impossible. The workers of each nation had to shape their struggles according to the local political conditions. The downfall of the International, therefore, was inevitable after the Paris Commune had proven "that the working class could not simply lay hold of the State machinery and wield it for its own purposes" (Marx), in other words, the proletariat was still in its first infancy from the point of view both of intellectual development and organizing power.

II.

Twenty-five years after the foundation of the old International, representatives from the working class organizations of twenty nations met in Paris. The fact that the congress was recruited from representatives of Socialist Parties as well as Labor Organizations, linked the New International to the Old, and proclaimed the theoretical postulates of the latter as a great practical force. The seed had sprouted. Everywhere the workers had embraced the Socialist idea, and were carrying on the political struggle with steadily increasing success. With new industrial conditions there had awakened a new generation with new ideals. Capitalism had gained full control of industrial life; it had spread to the ends of Europe in the East, to America in the West. Everywhere it had done away with small scale production and handicraft and had cast the great mass of the people into the class of wage-proletarians. But even in the hour of its full development it produced the germs of its own destruction. The long years of business depression after 1875 had aroused doubts as to the stability of the capitalist order even in bourgeois circles, while in America the newly arisen monsters, the Trusts, had proclaimed the end of the era of free competition. Middle class opposition disappeared; the proletariat was arrayed face to face against the ruling class. The old middle class illusion, that matters might be mended with the simple expedient of co-operative organizations, had died out. Clearly and distinctly the new problem stood out: the proletariat must obtain control of society so that it may master the whole mechanism of production. Conquest of political power was recognized as the immediate aim; parliamentarism as the means, prepared and supplemented by the conquest of universal suffrage, which latter was at that time the most important factor in the political struggles of a number of nations. Hand in hand with the political struggle went the efforts to found and build up labor unions to secure

better conditions. The congresses of the new International were deliberative conferences of independent autonomous parties of various countries. After the last remnants of the earlier Anarchism were thrown out, these congresses were chiefly occupied with the discussion of parliamentary tactics.

Another twenty-five years passed. Capitalism grew and spread even more rapidly than in the preceding period. Favored by the period of unparalleled prosperity that began in 1894 in Germany and spread out over the other nations, interrupted only by short crises, capitalism had taken possession of the earth. It revolutionized every continent, it broke down the rigid immobility of immense empires that had resisted change for thousands of years, it seized the treasures of the world, it exploited men of every race and color. And everywhere the Socialist spirit, hatred against capital, took root in the minds of the exploited workers, often combined with the aspiration for national freedom.

Socialist organizations arose in China and in New Zealand, in Johannesburg and Honolulu, in Alaska and Arabia. Capitalism and Socialism were flooding the whole earth.

More important still were the internal upheavals. Capital had won complete mastery over the industrial and political life of the nations. All classes, even those which were apparently independent—farmers and the small business men—became its servants; but in the same measure ever greater masses of men became its foes. Gigantic factories filled with the latest machinery put millions of workers into the power of a few magnates. Organization growing steadily more perfect took the place of anarchistic competition. The first Trusts twenty-five years ago were but the weak beginnings of that concentration of capitalistic power which now placed the whole industrial life and the treasures of the earth into the hands of a few hundred kings of production. In Germany and America this development went on with the utmost vigor and rapidity. But while in America the great expanse of territory made possible the broadest development, in Germany, where all activity is crowded into a small space, the antagonism between classes and conditions became exceedingly acute.

These conditions have changed the attitude of the working class. They no longer believe that social supremacy can be won offhand by parliamentary legislation. Parliament has become a mere machine for granting appropriations to defray the cost of the new governmental functions, and at best a stage upon which the protests of labor may find utterance.

The proletariat is pitted against the colossal power of the State, which must be attacked and vanquished. But the strength of the

proletariat, too, has grown. The Socialist idea has taken possession of large minorities of the people in all capitalist nations. Greater still is the growth of labor unions; insignificant in 1889, they have taken rapid strides forward in the years of prosperity. Everywhere in the labor unions there are great armies firmly organized, bound to each other by strong ties of solidarity, confronting the mighty power of the magnates of capital.

But within this struggling mass of workers, progressive and conservative elements are fighting for supremacy.

III.

The policies and theories that comprise the spirit and nature of modern capitalism may be summed up under the name of Imperialism. Capital is eager to spread out over distant continents, to start railroads, factories, plantations and mines, in order to realize high profits. To this end it is necessary that these foreign regions be controlled politically by the home country. Each government strives to conquer or control the largest possible part of the earth for its bourgeoisie, that it may be in a position to protect the interests of its capital there. Each government, therefore, strives to secure the greatest possible amount of world-power and arms itself against the others in order to impart the greatest possible weight to its demands and to force the others to recognize its claims. So we see each European nation striving to become the center of a world-empire consisting of colonies and spheres of influence. This policy of "imperialism" controls nowadays to a greater or lesser extent, the political life of all nations and the mental attitude of the bourgeoisie. It has given to the possessing classes, who hitherto had nothing to oppose to the Socialist ideals of the working class, a new ideal: to make the fatherland great and mighty among the peoples of the earth. The intellectuals, who had formerly flirted with Socialism, now became the enthusiastic supporters of the bourgeoisie; the old ideals of world-peace, progress and democracy were supplanted by the ideals of world-power, patriotism, race prejudice, the admiration of force and brutality. All doubt as to the ability of capitalism to persist indefinitely, and in full vigor, has disappeared, while Socialism is now regarded by them as feeble humanitarian sentimentalism, which unfortunately puts the working class in opposition to national aims. An insane competition in the increase of naval and military armaments eats up billions of dollars, piles heavy taxes upon the masses of the people, and makes drastic social reforms impossible. In all lands it became apparent that a small but powerful clique of capitalists and bureaucrats controlled the political life, not only

in the semi-absolute monarchies of Germany and Austria, but also in democratic France and in parliamentary England. The centralized power of the State was tremendously increased, in order to enable it to cope with the problems of the great world struggle.

On the other hand, the forces of resistance in the proletariat were also growing. The ever increasing taxes and military burdens aroused the bitterest opposition in ever widening circles, as was plainly evidenced by the electoral victories of the Social Democracy. Spontaneous outbreaks from among the masses revealed possibilities of new methods of working class warfare, other than parliamentarism and labor unionism. They showed the weapons at the disposal of the proletariat in the struggle against imperialism: *mass-actions*, in which the working masses demonstrate their opposition on the streets or seek to impose their will upon governments by means of political general strikes. Thus the political and industrial struggles of the workers flow together into one united struggle against the government and organized capital. To be sure, such actions demand a strength of the proletariat, a firmness of organization, a willingness to make sacrifices, a solidarity, a clear Socialist understanding, a revolutionary energy, such as are now to be found only inadequately and can grow only in course of the struggles themselves. But these first struggles already open before us a vista of the coming period of revolutionary assaults upon the State by the proletariat, a period that is destined to supersede the preparatory period of peaceful parliamentarism and labor unionism.

But at the same time the elements of weakness also become more apparent. The rapid growth of the party and labor union organizations has produced an army of parliamentarians, functionaries and officials, who, as a sort of specialists, became the representatives of the traditional methods of warfare and obstructed the adoption of new methods. As the Social Democracy grew in parliamentary strength, the tendency to join hands with portions of the capitalist class for the purpose of winning reforms became more marked. The middle class idea of making capitalism more tolerable by means of small reforms was adopted in place of the revolutionary struggle for power. This reformism, which refused to have anything to do with the class struggle of the proletariat gained the upper hand in the Social Democracy of most of the West-European nations—in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, while in England the Labor Party showed the same tendency without using Socialist phrases. In Germany, as a direct result of reactionary pressure from above, the tactics of the class struggle maintained their ascendancy; but here, too, similar reformistic

tendencies made their appearance with the growth of the organization. It is true that organization is a condition, a necessary instrument for the victory of the proletariat; but as it becomes stronger there is the dangerous tendency to regard it as the end, instead of as the means to an end, its maintenance becomes the highest aim, and in order to safeguard the organization serious struggles are carefully avoided. This tendency is furthered by the numberless officials and executive heads of the party and the labor unions. In recent years the struggle between these two opposing tendencies in the German Social Democracy came to a head upon several occasions. But each time those who called for revolutionary tactics against the increasing strength of imperialism and pointed to the necessity of mass-actions, were in the minority. This was due in the main to the fact that among the workers themselves there was little revolutionary energy. This again is a direct result of the prosperity which furthered capitalist expansion as well as the growth of labor organizations. For in good times there is little unemployment, wages increase, the laboring masses are comparatively satisfied, are not driven to rebellion by hunger and unbearable misery. This is the underlying cause for the growth of reformism in Europe, for the indifference of the masses, for their unwillingness to adopt revolutionary measures, for the stagnation of the whole labor movement.

In such circumstances the International itself was bound to degenerate. The congresses, which were at one time the scene of passionate discussion on tactical questions, degenerated into bureaucratically organized theatrical performances staged by reformistic politicians and bureaucrats. There was but one force that could make of this international union of Social Democratic Parties a living, necessary thing. That was the international policy of imperialism with its ever growing menace of world-war.

In opposition to the Old International, whose center of gravity lay in the international policy of the proletariat, the New International lacked a clearly defined international policy. It was concerned with questions of internal politics, questions and struggles that were caused by the development of capitalism in each individual country. This had to change when imperialism, with its militaristic armaments, its endless conflicts among the various States, its ever-present menace of war, raised its head. The new international policy must needs be entirely different from that of Marx and Engels. At that time the defense of European democracy against Czarism was the aim of the International. To-day, after the Russian Revolution, it could only be to defend the proletariat against world-war, to preserve world-peace. The Inter-

national should, therefore, have become a firm union of the working class parties of all countries against war. The party has always striven toward this end, has always emphasized this phase of its activity. The highest expression of this effort was reached in the International Congress at Basel, where Social Democratic representatives from all countries protested against war and declared that they would do everything in their power to prevent it. But behind this declaration there lay much more fear of war than firm determination to take up the fight against it. Its outward form, the session in the church, the ringing of bells, the avoidance of all discussion as to *how* and with what means war was to be prevented—all these things betrayed the effort to mesmerize the governments with words and outward appearances, instead of trying to organize the real strength of the proletariat and preparing it for a struggle so difficult and requiring so many sacrifices. And when finally the governments really wanted war, there was neither the strength nor the courage to take up the fight. Internationalism went up in smoke and the International lay in ruins.

IV.

The Austrian Social Democracy has always ranted vigorously over the stupidity of the ruling politicians in Vienna, because they could not win the confidence of the Balkan peoples by adopting a sensible policy towards the various nationalities; but in theory and in practice it itself supported nationalism and instead of fighting nationalistic passions in reality supported them. Thus, when the conflict between Austria and Servia broke out, the Vienna *Arbeiterzeitung*, instead of vigorously attacking its own government, took up the cudgels against the Servian government and thus played into the hands of the warlike Viennese government. Naturally anti-war demonstrations in Vienna were entirely out of the question. The despised Servians, on the other hand, were the only ones who loyally did their duty as Social Democrats, although, if anywhere, a nationalistic attitude on the part of the Balkan workers in their desire to uphold the independence of their awakening nations would be perfectly intelligible. Comrade Lapshevitz declared that, while the attack of Austria was an outrage, yet he was of the opinion that the Servian government was in part to blame because of its policy. The Social Democracy, therefore, as an unalterable opponent of this policy, must protest against it by voting against all war credits. This is an example of courage that may well be compared with the memorable stand taken by Bebel and Liebknecht in 1870.

The German working class has been, through its organization and Socialist education, the strongest cohort of the International; if anywhere, it should have been possible here to arouse an energetic opposition to the war plans of the government. Beyond a doubt the government as well as the bourgeoisie was at first somewhat uneasy as to the attitude of the German workers. But this uneasiness was soon dispelled. The party was not willing to fight the government, and immediately used the argument employed by the government itself to create a war sentiment among the people: "We have been unwillingly forced into a war of defense against Russia, which has insolently attacked us and threatens our culture." And the Social Democratic press showed that the war against Russia was a sacred bequest from Marx. In its ignorance of the imperialistic character of modern war, together with the fear of taking up the fight against the terrible power of the militaristic State, the German proletariat has allowed itself to be harnessed to the car of German imperialism. The Social Democratic parliamentarians voted war credits to the government; long years of Socialist opposition against militarism were thus wiped out.

This determined the course of the Socialists all over Europe. True, the Russian Socialists refused to vote war credits, and in England the Labor Party—according to ancient pacifist-Liberal tradition—attacked the government bitterly for its interference. But in Belgium, Emil Vandervelde, former Chairman of the International Bureau, was made a member of the Cabinet, and in France that old uncompromising fighter of the class struggle, Jules Guesde, who always championed the German radical tendency, accepted a place in the Cabinet. In a manifesto published by the French Party, the workers are called upon to defend the democracy and Socialism of France against "German imperialism"—as if the French armies were not fighting for French and English imperialism! Not a whit better are the Syndicalists and Anarchists, whose hatred of the German Social Democracy has now become a fruitful ground for jingoism; thus at the burial of Jean Jaurés, Jouhaux expressed himself in a purely nationalistic sense. German Social Democrats are now going to the neutral countries as commissioners, so to say, of the German government, to soften the hostility of the Socialists against the German government; thus Südekum in Sweden, Scheidemann in Holland, a whole deputation in Italy. And everywhere they are repulsed, not because they have violated their Socialist duty to the International, but because they speak in the interests of that Germany which is held in fear by the middle class of all other nations. In Sweden Branting spoke, as if he were the representative of the Swedish middle class: "We

can never forgive you the violation of the neutrality of Belgium." While the proletarian masses, obedient to the rulers, dissolved into national armies, are slaughtering one another in the service of Capital, the International Social Democracy has broken up into groups of jingo politicians who bitterly attack one another.

The second International is dead. But this ignoble death is no accident; like the downfall of the first International, the collapse of the second is an indication of the fact that its usefulness is at an end. It represents, in fact, the downfall of the old fighting methods of the epoch. Not in the sense that they will disappear or become useless, but in the sense that the whole world now understands that these methods cannot bring the Revolution. They retain their value as preparation, as auxiliary means. But the conquest of power demands new revolutionary forms of struggle. To have pointed these out, to have put before us the new problems which it itself was incapable of solving—this is the bequest to us of the second International. These will be fully developed by the new capitalist world that will grow out of this world-war—a world of mightier capitalist development, increased oppression of the proletariat, more pronounced antagonism of the three great world-powers, Germany, England and America. And out of these new conditions a new International of Labor will grow, more firmly founded, more strongly organized, more powerful and more Socialistic than the one that now perished. Looking beyond the terrible world-fire, we revolutionary Socialists boldly erect upon the ruins the standard of the new, the coming Internationalism:

*C'est la lutte finale, groupons nous, et demain
L'Internationale sera le genre humain.*

FREEDOM OF WILL AND WAR

BY JACQUES LOEB

I

It is a platitude to state to the readers of the NEW REVIEW that the only persons directly interested in war are mediæval elements; groups of traders who wish to exploit the industrially less developed colonies or countries; groups of armament mongers, and prospective army contractors; the military caste and their friends to whom war means economic and social advance; "rulers," adventurous statesmen, and diplomats to whom war means "glory," "power," and a place in "history" or who by a war can extricate themselves from an unpleasant situation.

But all these constitute a very small minority of humanity. The question is: What induces the masses, even the Socialists, to become the dupes of these destructive elements? For there can be no doubt that in the present war the masses in Germany, Austria-Hungary, France and possibly even in Russia went to war with amazing unanimity. This is generally explained psychologically. The writer will try to substitute a kindred but somewhat more physiological explanation.

Organisms differ in their conduct from a steam engine or any other machine by possessing a greater number of degrees of freedom. Under ordinary circumstances a swarm of certain small water crustaceans in a jar shows an apparently absolute freedom (strictly speaking, a limited number of degrees of freedom) in their movements; *i. e.*, nobody would be able to predict the direction in which any of the individuals will move in the next moment. They are as "free" and incalculable in their movements as human beings. If we put into such a jar, containing a swarm of these crustaceans, a trace of a weak acid, *e. g.*, carbonated water, the picture changes in a few seconds. The whole mass of animals is filled with *one* will, all rush madly to the side of the dish from where the light comes. If the position of the dish in regard to the window is changed, the masses will rush again to the window-side of the dish. We can now predict precisely how each individual will act, the machine-character of their conduct is obvious. What has the carbonated water done to these animals? Has it destroyed their "freedom of will"? Not exactly, since they never possessed it, but it has diminished the number of their degrees of freedom, by making their sensitive-

ness to light so preponderant, that all the other agencies which are able to influence their motions are annihilated. All the animals can do now is to rush "to the front"—from where the light comes.

This theory of animal reaction and animal will, which the writer has developed under the name of theory of animal tropisms*, applies generally to the understanding of animal and human conduct. The reactions of the animals towards light in the example mentioned above are determined by the presence of a definite chemical substance; but so are also the other desires and actions of animals and of human beings. Steinach has found that if young male rats are deprived of their testicles and if ovaries are transplanted into these males, they exhibit when they become mature the sexual behavior of females towards the male; and the reverse takes place when females are deprived of their ovaries and when testicles are transplanted into them. The testicles implanted into these females are free from sperm, but they produce certain chemical substances which set into operation the mechanism of male behavior towards the female.

These examples serve merely as an illustration to show that definite chemicals allow animals to act only in one definite way, that they may reduce them to one degree of freedom. It is perfectly mad for the moth or the crustaceans to rush to the light; it is perfectly improper or mad for the female rat with testicles to become interested in other females, but with the chemicals of the testicles circulating in her body she has no choice of other action in the presence of a female, and with carbonated water the fresh water crustacean in question has no other choice but to rush to the light.

It is worthy of notice that these cases cannot be interpreted in the terms of the psychologist. We cannot say that it is "passion" which dominates these testicled females, or the feminized males, because the word "passion" does not explain why they do not act in the opposite way. We do not know the specific nature of the active chemicals in this case, but we know the nature of the chemical when we make the little crustaceans light-mad by carbonated water. It is surely not "passion" which makes the crustaceans go to the light.

We are still accustomed to speak of "the blinding effect of passion in humans." What happens in the case of the "passion" or supreme "emotion" of a human seems to be the setting free of definite chemical substances by some agency—*e. g.*, those which cause

* The reader who may be interested in this theory will find it expressed in various books of the writer, *e.g.*, "The Mechanistic Conception of Life," Chicago, 1912, and "Comparative Physiology of the Brain and Comparative Psychology," New York, 1900.

the complex of reactions called fear. Such substances often annihilate all degrees of freedom of action in the individual except in one direction or way. Humans with such a reduced number of degrees of freedom are "mad" in the same sense of the word as the crustaceans in the above mentioned experiment, or the males with ovaries who exhibit female instincts. The blinding effect of "passion" is only a special case among the many in which the degrees of freedom of individuals are reduced.

It is well known that we can arouse human beings by certain phrases and it is possible that in some cases they influence human beings indirectly, inasmuch as the phrases lead to the secretion of certain substances in the body and that these substances arouse those physical alterations which are the symptoms of "passion." (But it is not necessary that the influence of phrases should in all cases be explained in this way.) Humans with such a reduced number of degrees of freedom of will can easily be led in that single direction which corresponds to the single degree of freedom left open to them.

II

Those who wish to "lead" masses or who wish to utilize them for their purposes, or who desire to make them sacrifice everything for a cause must do so by first reducing in these beings all degrees of freedom but one, namely, that in which they expect them to act. It is possible to restrict the degrees of freedom from without, by the police. This is a clumsy method and it is inefficient, since as long as the internal degrees of freedom are not restricted it is bound to lead to opposition or even rebellion. The effective method of leadership consists in the reduction of the degrees of freedom of the masses from within.

All great movements in history have been produced by the discovery of means by which all degrees of freedom but one were suppressed in human beings. The Crusaders furnish an example. They were rendered unfree by having their minds filled with the phrase of the liberation of the tomb of Christ. Church and Court historians have at all times glorified this condition of artificially produced insanity. The unanimity with which the Germans, French, and possibly Russians, rushed to the front has a similar basis.

The writer still remembers when, presumably in 1879, Treitschke, the "court historian" of the King of Prussia, broke loose with the idea of the superlative value of the Germanic, especially Prussian, "race" and civilization. Through the support Treitschke received from Bismarck (who was possibly responsible for the outbreak) the idea that the German was the Super-Teuton was system-

atically inculcated into the minds of the young. To-day Germany is filled with writers of a similar spirit. The present generation of Germans has been raised in the creed of the superior character of their "race" and civilization and it is a fact that even the most enlightened Germans are not free from such ideas. Is it a wonder that when the government made it plausible to them that this superior race, this superior civilization, nay their homes, were threatened by the barbarian Russian hordes, all degrees of freedom of will were wiped out in the inhabitants of Germany except the one, namely, to blindly obey the command of the military leaders who were to save the threatened civilization and homes?

Conditions in Germany are probably not essentially different from those in France or Russia. We do not know whether these countries have had their Treitschkes, but the "patriots" in these countries have probably seen to it that the minds of the young were belabored in schools, barracks, and through the press, in such a way that when the rulers declared that "Slavic" or "French culture" or "honor" was in danger, the Russians and the French rushed as madly and unanimously to the front as the Germans.

The English apparently do not lend themselves as yet so easily to a complete annihilation of all degrees of freedom of will, and we actually notice the astonishing spectacle that they do not all rush to the front. But the Kiplings will persevere.

The attitude of the French and German Socialists has been a surprise to many. Closer analysis will show that we must judge them mildly in spite of the irreparable harm they have done to the belief that through Socialism humanity will be freed from war. We have pointed out that the phrase used by the German (and in all probability also by the Russian) press is that this is a "race war"—Teutonism *versus* Slavism. The Socialists had learned enough not to be deceived by the clamoring for expansion of trade; they were also probably prepared to resist a desire of the Nationalists for territorial expansion, but they had not yet recognized the danger of the phrase: "racial superiority"—it is indeed a mere phrase, unsupported by any scientific fact and contradicted by the laws of heredity. Talent and, in all appearance, moral qualities, run in families and strains, independently of race. The hereditary characters are transmitted as a rule independently of each other, and with a black skin the highest talent and the highest moral powers may be combined, while a complete absence of both may accompany a white skin. As long as the Socialists worship at the shrine of "racial antipathy" and "racial superiority," as many of them actually do, they will continue to be an unreliable factor in the progress of civilization. It is a great pity that the Socialists get

their information on heredity—the laws of which have only become clear in the last decade—either from the older scientific literature or from purely literary writers who are also responsible for the ideas of racial superiority which dominate Germany to-day.

The danger lying in the fetish of racial antipathy and racial superiority is assuming threatening dimensions in this country. It is a matter of no small concern that the labor unions refuse to work side by side with "Asiatics" or Negroes, giving as an excuse racial antipathy; whereas the principle of brotherhood would demand that they should work with them, influence them, educate them if necessary and in this process learn to appreciate and respect them. Racial antipathy only thrives on aloofness and non-acquaintance. The Southerner, who knows the Negro, has, in the writer's opinion, no racial antipathy, but only social superciliousness towards the Negro, though this superciliousness is probably based on the claim of "racial superiority" of the whites. The mischief lies in the fact that the inhabitants of each country now seem to be convinced of their "racial superiority" over the inhabitants of all other countries. It is hardly necessary to state that by fostering or even tolerating this fetish of racial antipathy we are making it easy for a future militaristic government to induce Americans to go to the front to fight the Japanese.

III

Rulers, adventurous politicians, the military caste, armament mongers, prospective army contractors, international traders and other mediæval forces will continue to work and clamor for war whenever they consider it to their economic and social interest, or when they feel that their prospective "place in history" demands it. They will always be supported by mediæval historians and literateurs, and by part of the press. They will continue to invent and develop phrases by which they can reduce the natural degrees of freedom of will of their fellow-beings to the one mad desire of rushing to the front. The phrases change with the progress of civilization. "Glory" and "territorial aggrandizement" will still be efficient with certain classes of the population, and could possibly be rendered more so if the saluting of the flag in our public schools could be repeated daily instead of only once a week; and if the "right" type of text books of history could be introduced. The labor unions and Socialists, however, begin to understand that "glory" and "territorial aggrandizement" may benefit those in whose interest the war is waged, but that they will not permit the provision of better and more decent conditions of life for the children of the workingman.

"Imperialism" amounts to the same thing, but it is a little less

direct and therefore possibly a little more efficient than the older phrase, "glory." "Imperialism" is found very valuable by the aristocratic and commercial rulers of England.

The latest addition to the store of phrases by which all degrees of freedom of will in the masses can be suppressed except the one of rushing to the front is that of "Racial Superiority" and "Racial Antipathy." The present war was manipulated through this phrase. It is this phrase in which at present the greatest danger for this country lies. It behooves the workingmen, who in a war are the main dupes, to free themselves from the grip of this phrase as they have freed themselves from the grip of imperialistic phrases. People must not forget that as soon as a militaristic government feels sure that it is in possession of the phrase which will destroy the freedom of will, in all directions but one, in the majority of their people, the government will not fail to blunder into war. Only so long as the people are conscious of this fact and only so long as they openly refuse to be muzzled by these phrases—which are often very subtle, *e. g.*, "peace without honor"—can they prevent their governments from creating a situation in which there seems to be no choice left but to "defend their country."

THE WAR: PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS

BY ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

As subjective impressions and the personal equation always count for much it is only fair to preface this brief statement by telling you that the war found me in Tours, France, when the mobilization order practically imprisoned me for nearly three weeks, and that I have not yet recovered from the pervasive sense of sadness which permeated and saturated the intellectual and moral atmosphere of Tours as soon as the inevitability of war was recognized. Frankly, I admit my emotional sympathies are very strongly with France.

The best things on the war I have read are the articles by Bohn and Walling (not forgetting the excerpts from Allan Benson) in the September and October NEW REVIEWS. Next to these and very, very close after them comes an article in the October *Atlantic Monthly* by Prof. Usher, of St. Louis, which I heartily commend to NEW REVIEW readers.

The economic causes of the war—Germany's need for expansion, her rapid industrial development and consequent remarkable overproduction, the door to South America slammed in her face

by the U. S. A. with her bewhiskered Monroe Doctrine, the door to Africa slammed in her face by England and France, and the door to Asia Minor ominously creaking on its hinges from the pushes of the Balkan Slavs more or less openly supported by Russia—all this has been made plain and clear by many Socialist writers and it makes Germany's attitude explicable and comprehensible. But comprehensible and justifiable are not synonyms in the Socialist vocabulary.

Germany with all her boasted and very real culture was driven by the real economic causes suggested above to develop militarism to such an extent that this militarism itself became twenty years ago the dominant factor in the European situation. All France and England trembled (and were right in trembling) whenever there were whispers of German mobilization. The might and efficiency of the German army hung like an awful menace over such civilization as Capitalism had achieved.

And this awful power was wielded, not by a people with free institutions politically, but by the Prussian Junker aristocracy. The Reichstag of the German Empire has never had any real control over the Kaiser. He draws his revenues not from the Imperial Reichstag, but from the legislature of Prussia, which is elected by the notorious three-class system, and is hence owned body, boots and breeches by the Feudal Prussian Junkers, who are thus able to dictate the policy of the German Empire. The Kaiser has never hesitated to defy the Reichstag when he was sure of the support of the Junkers—witness the affair of Zabern in Alsace. The military offenders against the rights of the civilians of Alsace were never degraded or punished in spite of the votes of the Reichstag.

Under these circumstances the triumph of Germany in the present war would mean the subjugation of Europe by Prussian and Austrian Feudal autocracy, which would in time menace both North and South America as well. It would put an end to bourgeois political liberty and free institutions, at once in Europe, and ultimately in America.

It is possible for a Socialist to sneer and say he has no preference between Feudalism and Capitalism, but this is flippant bigotry gone mad. The sane Socialist is ready, revolutionist though he may be, or rather because he is a true revolutionist, to fight for every step of development in social progress, and Capitalism with its parliamentary system is a decided step forward from the tyranny of Feudalism. Hence, in the present war every Socialist, German or non-German, must be against Germany and Feudalism. It may be said that Czarism is as bad as Kaiserism. Well,

let us cross that bridge when we reach it. Czarism is not to-day threatening to annihilate civilization and freedom as Kaiserism surely is. Moreover, in the event of victory for the Allies, Russia will have to consider and regard the wishes of France and England and Belgium, while in the event of German victory, the Kaisers of Germany and Austria will be uncontrolled and irresponsible despots drunken with world-power.

The world has not erred in holding the Kaiser responsible for this war. He surely could have postponed it. He did not. Who shares in this dread responsibility? Alas, those whom we were once proud to call our "comrades" of Germany. There they were 110 strong in the Reichstag, with the world for an audience. They knew that Belgium and France were threatened with German invasion and the atrocities conceivable only to *Deutsche Kultur*.

The world was listening with eager faith for a brave word or gesture of protest from them. Such a word or gesture might have cost them dear, but would have been pregnant with blessings for generations yet unborn.

Never before in history have a handful of men been confronted with such a glorious opportunity.

Never before in history has there been such a dastardly betrayal of principle as the unanimous vote of the Socialists for the Kaiser's War Budget.

Like ostriches sticking their heads in the sand so as not to see, they were blind to the invasion of Luxemburg, Belgium and France; and as though hypnotized by the Kaiser and his pitiful, shameless Chancellor they had eyes only for that ogre the Czar, whose worst sins against Russian freedom could never have been committed without the support of the Kaiser—a support encouraged again and again by the pusillanimity of the German Socialists.

I can only pardon them by believing they knew not what they did. They had no realization of their responsibility. To this day I have met no apologist of the Kaiser who has not said triumphantly: "He *must* be right, because the German Socialists are supporting him!"

This is too sad and tragic to dwell on.

What of the future?

The shortage of labor after the war will be comparable to (though less than) that in England after the Black Death in the fourteenth century, and Labor Unions and Syndicats will exercise an almost inconceivable and undreamt of power in France and England. We may confidently look forward to a tremendous improvement in the conditions of labor throughout Europe.

In this improvement it is improbable that the workers of

America will share notably, simply because we have no or few labor organizations worthy of the name.

But the two best results of the war will be:

(1). International Socialism will be freed from the tyranny of the Prussian doctrinaire disciplinarians.

(At Copenhagen in 1910 the average American delegate was unable to discover his own thoughts on any subject until he had first found out "what the Germans wanted." Then he said, "Amen.")

(2). The rank and file of the German Social Democracy will recover (very gradually) freedom of thought. Socialist "discipline" in Germany has ever been the reflex of Prussian militarism.

Down with the Kaiser!

All hail the emancipation of the brains of Jimmie Higgins, not only in Germany, but in America, too. He needs it here, you bet. Speed the day when the average American Socialist shall begin to respect his own brains!

THE WAR AND SOCIALISM

BY WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M.D.

In a brief article of a thousand words or so it is impossible to present arguments and offer proofs. One can only make statements and give dogmatic opinions. Of course, they are to be taken for what they are worth. I may, however, be permitted to make the prefatory remark that I have never been more partial to the French or English than to the Germans. Quite the contrary is the case. Having been brought up on German literature and having imbibed German culture, I have always felt more kinship with the Germans than with any other foreign nation, and my praise of German science, German industry, German thoroughness, honesty and reliability has never been stinted.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

But it is my deep conviction that Germany is to be held responsible for this awful cataclysm; of course, not Germany—the nation, but its ruler and representative—the Kaiser. It is possible that the Kaiser personally was not anxious for war, that the real guilty parties are the Crown Prince and his military clique, but *facit per alium facit per se*, and if the Kaiser had not affixed his signature no war would have taken place. In every human event there are ultimate and proximate causes. We cannot go here into

a discussion of the former, but as to the latter I do not entertain the slightest doubt as to where the guilt lies. Austria's brutal ultimatum was not presented to Servia without Wilhelm's full approval. It probably was even couched so offensively at his instigation, though he knew that Russia could not permit Austria to crush Servia any more than Germany could permit Russia to crush Austria. If anybody has any doubt on this point he can read Germany's own White Paper, which was published in the *New York Times* on August 24, and reprinted in pamphlet form. The important paragraph in question, which is a clear admission of guilt, can also be read in *Current Opinion* for October, p. 223.

GERMANY AND RUSSIA

As to Germany's fighting the battle of civilization against Russian autocracy, this is all bosh. German militarism has right along been the strongest support of Russian autocracy. It was Germany's moral support, and the knowledge of its physical support in the hour of need, that permitted Russian bureaucracy to keep on crushing the aspirations of its people with a relentless and ruthless hand. Every Russian revolutionist that succeeded in escaping into Germany was, when caught, immediately thrown back by the German government into the jaws of the bloody Moloch. And suddenly the German government has become a champion of liberty and liberalism and an opponent of the knout, the Siberian mines and the gallows? Let the simple-minded believe it.

THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS

The German Socialists have behaved like craven cowards and the most contemptible of chauvinists. A party is not to be judged by the number of votes it controls, the number of papers it publishes and the number of lectures it delivers. It is to be judged by its behavior at an important crisis, and at this crisis the German Socialists failed miserably. What they should have done? They should not have consented to the budget, they should have protested against the war, they should have permitted themselves to be shot. It is certainly better to be shot in the streets of Berlin in an anti-war demonstration than to be shot at the front while killing their fellow human beings. I am quite sure that not more than a thousand would have been shot, and what a tremendous moral effect that would have had! It might have changed the entire course of events, and we might not now have to be daily witnesses of the horrible butchery that is going on.

As to the French and Belgian Socialists, their conduct has been entirely correct. Their countries were suddenly invaded, unspeakable atrocities were being committed, their national existence

was at stake, and in such hour of danger it was but right that they should forget all party differences and form a solid unit. And Vandervelde, Guesde and Sembat are to be applauded and not criticized for having agreed, during the time of the crisis, to participate in the government of their countries. When a ship is sinking and the people are jumping into life-boats it would be insanity on the part of a Socialist to refuse to take the hand of a fellow passenger even if that fellow passenger should happen to belong to the bourgeois or capitalistic class.

FUTURE OF SOCIALIST PARTIES

Anybody capable in the smallest degree of independent thinking has been struck by the utter bankruptcy of Christianity as an ethical agency. In view of the horrible butcheries and atrocities going on, only the very stupidest will still continue to mumble of the love and brotherhood that the Christian religion inculcates in individuals and in nations. President Eliot has admitted that much in a recent letter to the *New York Times*. And I fear that the brave and unbiased will have to admit the same thing about Socialism. In what way have the German, Austrian, and other Socialists for that matter, behaved, immediately before and during this crisis, differently from the bourgeois, from the capitalists, even from the militarists and royalists? If there has been a difference it has been too small to be discerned by a microscope of the highest magnifying power.

It is my humble opinion that when this war is over we will need a new party and a new party will spring into existence. Not necessarily a more revolutionary party. "Revolutionism" that expresses itself in loud words and shallow thoughts, as it unfortunately only too frequently does, is worse than conservatism. What we need is a thinking party, a party whose members will study, reason and think. We have only too many members of Socialist parties whose only difference from Republicans and Democrats is the label, the name. Otherwise they are just as incapable of independent thinking and just as much influenced by prejudices, superstitions and traditions. Such people, even if they call themselves Socialists and vote the Socialist ticket, will not save humanity and will not bring about the millennium. We need a broader party, a deeper party, a party of thinking humanitarians. And above all we do not want a party whose sole asset is Hate.

A PRO-GERMAN VIEW

BY ROBERT H. LOWIE

My sympathies in the present war are pro-German. The catchwords "militarism" and "democracy," which Radicals have taken up as seriously as the professional apologists of reaction seem to me inapplicable: I agree with Hourwich that we have simply a conflict of Russian militarism against German militarism, and that of the two German militarism is infinitely preferable. On the other hand, the catchword "culture," while lending itself to as much twaddle on the German side, can at least acquire an intelligible meaning.

It is asserted that German culture existed long before 1870. To this I reply that there is a great difference between the *existence* of a national culture and its effect on surrounding cultures. At the period when Samuel Johnson's circle gathered at the Club, how many members knew that Lessing was the greatest of contemporaneous critics, or that the Great Philosopher of the age was not the tea-swilling lexicographer who terrorized their meetings, but a meek, weazened professor at Königsberg? Their ignorance was not due to lacking facilities of communication: Kant knew all about Johnson; Lessing knew all about English literature. Nor was it due to aversion from progressive ideas: the brahmins of English thought knew Voltaire and Rousseau, no matter how much they might loathe them. Is it not then in some measure the international prominence of a country that contributes to the international effectiveness of its culture? And can any one seriously deny that this effectiveness of German culture would be impaired by reducing her to the rank of a second-rate power? To this point I shall revert presently.

But according to some of our Radical friends German culture has become militaristic and that is sufficient to nullify all other features. I answer that to characterize modern Germany as militaristic is as accurate as to characterize the Athens of Pericles as pederastic. It is not true that nothing of value has been added to German culture since 1870. On the contrary, while the culture of old Germany had an equivalent counterpart in the cultures of other Western European countries, the distinctive glory of Germany lies in what it accomplished in modern times in that phase of culture that is perhaps best represented by agriculture. The resources of the earth are not infinite. Before we can realize our ideals of

democracy we must live, and in order that all mankind shall live in fair comfort the most rationalistic husbanding of the available material is a prerequisite. I do not believe that the Paiute Indians of Nevada are biologically inferior to the Whites. But I rejoice that in a desert waste over which their ancestors roamed a hundred years ago, eking out a miserable sustenance on wild seeds and small game, there is now on behalf of all mankind an intelligent improvement of nature through irrigation systems and alkali soil experiment stations, of which the Paiute, as well as others, may reap the benefit. I do not believe that the Southern Slavs are radically inferior to the Northern Europeans. But I rejoice that in Bosnia, where agriculture has remained backward in spite of the richness of the soil, Austrian—that is, German—culture has instituted model farms and agricultural schools, effected the use of machinery by native farmers and established gratuitous distribution of seed. If Servia has made some progress in the same direction, whence has the impetus come? Surely not from her great Slavic protector, Russia, where even in the blackearth zone continuous cropping without compensation has exhausted the productiveness of the soil and led to the actual or imminent famines of 1890, 1898, and 1907 (see Kropotkin and Bealby on "Russia," *Encyclopedia Britannica*).

The consistent application of the trained intelligence to practical problems—in glaring contrast to the muddling-along methods followed elsewhere—has been the great cultural achievement of modern Germany. It has not proceeded from eleemosynary motives, but has doubtless done more for mankind, at least potentially, than seems to be recognized. If German militarism has restricted this development, it is nevertheless true that militaristic Germany has far outstripped her less competent competitors.

It will be objected that Germany is not alone in intelligently grappling with the problems of existence. True. Denmark has at least equaled Germany in this respect. But what has been and is likely to be the influence of Denmark's model experiment on a small scale? Evidently the physical prominence of a culture-possessor does have something to do with the influence exerted by that culture elsewhere. Germany is the only large country where problems are not only recognized but solved at once, and solved with the greatest economy of effort and material. In this crowning glory of German achievement there is nothing tawdrily successful, as H. G. Wells would have it; and to say with Floyd Dell that military expenditure prevents appropriation for purposes of education or social amelioration is somewhat amusing since militaristic Germany preceded "anti-militaristic" England by a generation in the elementary devices of social amelioration and has incomparably

the best educational system on the face of the globe. The efficiency of Germany is a cultural asset the world cannot afford to have impaired by ill-advised efforts to "crush" the German people. Of course, we want the German efficiency plant to be differently managed—uniformly and on principle for humanitarian ends rather than partly and incidentally so. We cannot tolerate the notion of a militaristic autocracy, however efficient or benevolent. But there are worse things in this far from best of conceivable worlds. One is a malevolent, inefficient militaristic autocracy—Russia. The other is a bungling, muddling-along quasi-democracy. Let us then beware of driving out Lucifer to enthrone Beelzebub. Let us also cease to be hysterical about the results of German victory. Germany cannot "conquer" Russia or the British Empire; she can at best hold her own or gain minor advantages. The nationalistic spirit fostered by "victory" cannot therefore become fatal to the rest of the world, while a certain degree of liberalization will doubtless be granted to the German people from motives of intelligent self-interest. On the other hand, the victory of that wonderful triumvirate of Defenders of the Democratic Faith that includes the Autocrat of all the Russias may well become a crushing one to Germany and will, of course, strengthen the nationalistic or imperialistic, *i. e.*, always potentially militaristic, spirit of Russia, England, and France. Let us recollect that it is not the republican, progressive France of Jean Jaurès, but the revenge-obsessed France of his militaristic assassin that made possible the alliance of France and Russia, and France's antagonism to Germany; that it is not primarily democratic England, but the England of Kipling and Carson, that is arrayed against Germany. Whenever internationalism and anti-militarism shall fight to overthrow German nationalism and militarism, I shall be on the side of internationalism. For the reasons indicated I see no such issue. I see only the issue of stupidity against intelligence, and I am on the side of intelligence.

FRENCH AND BELGIAN MANIFESTOES

GUESDE AND SEMBAT IN THE MINISTRY

Comrades:—It is after due deliberation and mature thought that the Socialist Party has authorized two of its members, our friends Jules Guesde and Marcel Sembat, to enter the new Government, and that it has constituted them its delegates for the national defence. All the representatives of the Socialist Parliamentary Group, the Permanent Administrative Commission and the Administrative Council of "L'Humanité" have agreed to assume with them the grave responsibilities that they have consented to undertake.

If it were but a Ministerial re-arrangement, if it were only a question of adding certain new forces to the old Government—some of those fresh forces in which our Party is so rich—much more, if it were merely one of ordinary participation in the bourgeois Government, neither the consent of our friends nor of ourselves would have been obtained.

It is the future of the nation, it is the life of France, that are in the balance to-day. The Party, therefore, has not hesitated.

The truth, foreshadowed, announced by us has burst forth. Without being broken through or in any way affected, our armies find themselves, momentarily, falling back before superior numbers. One of the richest and most industrious districts of our country is menaced.

The national unity which at the beginning of the war once more revealed itself and comforted our hearts must display all its power.

The entire nation must rise for the defence of its soil and its liberty in one of those outbursts of heroism which always repeat themselves in similar hours of our history.

The Chief of the Government felt that in order to win over the nation, to organize it, to support it in a struggle which will be and which must be relentless, he had need of the help of all, and most particularly, perhaps, of those who feared for the emancipation of the proletariat and humanity in the formidable oppression of despotism. He knew that in all grave hours, in 1793 as in 1870, it was in these men, these Socialists, these revolutionists, that the nation placed its confidence.

Spontaneously, without waiting any other demonstration of the popular will, he has appealed to our Party. Our Party has replied, "Here!"

This is the spirit in which our friends enter the Government. They will enter it also with a clear outlook on the immense task they have to accomplish.

And, first of all, they will see to it that the truth is told to the country.

They will maintain and develop the courage of the people and its will to conquer by giving its entire confidence in the sincerity of the Government.

They will urge vigorously the "levée en masse." They will act so that no force, no willingness, remains unutilized.

They will inspect the resources of equipment, provisions and armaments which exist in our forts. They will strive to increase them.

They will render each day more intense by the working together of all available forces, the production of munitions and arms.

In order to bring the service of all the national energies to the maximum standard there must be willingness free from prejudice, guided only by the desire for the safety of the country and the greatest organized effort.

Lastly, and above all, comrades, the presence of our friends in the Government will furnish for all the guarantee that Republican democracy is ready to struggle to the end.

How many times has our great Jaurès, foreseeing even a preliminary French reversal under an attack of superior numbers, insisted upon the necessity of this struggle? He would have wished for France to be prepared in every detail. But no matter what this stubborn resistance costs, it is our duty to organize it, and, further, upon it depends the common success of our allies. Our friends will urge forward the nation to this resistance.

To-day as yesterday, after the first tests, as in the enthusiasm of mobilization, we know we are struggling not only for the existence of the country, not only for the greatness of France, but for liberty, for the Republic, for civilization.

We are struggling that the world, freed from the stifling oppression of Imperialism and from the atrocities of war, may finally enjoy peace in respecting the rights of all.

The Socialist Ministers will communicate this conviction to the whole Government. With it they will animate its work. They will share it with the heroic army where the flower of the nation fights to-day. And, by persevering effort and forceful enthusiasm, they will at the same time assure the safety of the country and the progress of humanity.

THE SOCIALIST PARLIAMENTARY GROUP.

THE PERMANENT ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL OF "L'HUMANITÉ."

Paris, August 28, 1914.

FRENCH AND BELGIAN SOCIALISTS TO THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT

However obvious to ourselves may seem the justice of the cause of the French and Belgian nations in this struggle for their existence against the brutal aggression of German imperialism;

However certain we, the French and Belgian sections, may be that we have done our full duty as internationalists against war and for peace:

We owe to the other sections of the International a demonstration of the soundness of our position by a rapid and impartial exposition of the facts.

As regards the French section we need not dwell upon the period before the war, when the madness of great armaments and of a colonial policy was growing, when we stood against the policy in Morocco and against the Three Year Law, which was the immediate consequence of the German law calling for increase in military contingents.

We need speak only of the crisis which produced the present war, and of that only. That crisis was provoked deliberately by the ultimatum of Austria to Servia. And both at the outset and especially when Austria had rejected the conciliatory answer of Servia, there was no doubt that imperialistic Germany was inspiring a war, was bent on having war.

In those critical moments we strove to execute the mandate of the International. We kept in constant and close contact with the French government. We urged it to uphold with all its might English mediation, to grasp at the best chance for peace, to bring pressure to bear upon Russia in the direction of supporting mediation.

We became aware that the French government sincerely was striving for peace, and was using, exactly as we had demanded, every energy to preserve it.

The very afternoon of the outbreak the committee of the Socialist group in the Chamber interviewed the Premier, M. Viviani.

M. Viviani admitted that despite all his efforts the aggressiveness of German imperialism was rapidly making the maintenance of peace more and more improbable. But he assured us that the French government would up to the very last moment do everything in its power to snatch at the slightest opportunities for peace; that in spite of German raids upon French territory the French troops were keeping eight kilometers inside their own frontiers; that the French would do nothing to endanger the continuance of negotiations for peace, which was still hoped for and even believed pos-

sible so long as M. de Schoen, the German ambassador, remained in Paris.

We demanded persistently and energetically that a new and emphatic expression of the determination of France to maintain peace be made at once;

That an express request for mediation be addressed to England with a formal declaration of the whole-hearted and determined support of France.

M. Viviani seemed to us convinced, and he promised to submit the proposal to the Ministry that very evening. We had not been gone an hour when M. de Schoen presented himself at the Ministry and demanded his passports.

The German Socialists of the Leseclub, in Paris, were daily witnesses to our efforts. They approved our measures, they shared our hopes.

However, we have good reason to fear that the German proletariat, deceived by official notices, is not in possession of the real facts.

We submit to its reflection the great fact which determines the source of the will for aggression: the violation of Belgian neutrality.

The German Imperial Government first falsely declared that French aviators had dropped bombs on Nuremberg. It then falsely declared that French troops had invaded or were about to invade Belgium. This at the very moment when the French government had given England a formal assurance, previously renewed to Belgium, that Belgian neutrality would be respected.

With these pretexts, Germany demanded of Belgium a free passage for her armies. Refusal brought the declaration of war against Belgium. Siege was laid to Liege. Belgium was invaded.

Luxembourg was likewise overrun by German troops.

These facts which we submit to the judgment of the international proletariat suffice to establish whence came the aggression, which side willed the war. If, in this hour of crisis, we were united both in the Chamber and in the public with all the other parties of the nation, it was because we felt we were struggling for the principles which we had so often proclaimed in unison with them.

The French government went to war, not with the thought of aggression, not even because it was aware of hostile and malevolent sentiments around it.

We are all convinced that we are defending the independence and autonomy of our nation against German imperialism.

We are not fighting against the German people, whose autonomy and independence we respect equally.

The French and Belgian Socialists are submitting to the grievous necessity of war firmly conscious that they are fighting for the principle of liberty, for the right of peoples to shape their own destinies.

We are certain that once the truth is established their course will be approved and their cause supported by the Socialists of Germany.

For the French Workers' Party:

JULES GUESDE,
JEAN LONGUET,
MARCEL SEMBAT,
EDMOND VAILLANT.

For the Belgian Workers' Party:

EDOUARD ANSEELE,
LOUIS BERTRAND,
CAMILLE HUYSMANS,
EMILE VANDERVELDE.

TWO BOOK REVIEWS

BY MAX EASTMAN

THE STATE. By Franz Oppenheimer, M.D., Ph.D., of the University of Berlin. Translated by John M. Gitterman, Ph.D., LL.B., of the New York County Bar. 290 pp. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. \$1.50.

One thing you have always longed for,—a universal outline history of the class struggle. And that you have in this little book. It is a brilliant Marxian generalization of the process of political history in all times and places.

There are two means, according to the language of Dr. Oppenheimer, by which men satisfy their needs. (1) The economic means—*one's own labor and the equivalent exchange of one's own labor for the labor of others.* (2) The political means—*the unrequited appropriation of the labor of others.* At remote epochs, or in moments of strong feeling, you may call the first *work*, and the second *robbery*—but not if these terms make you blind to the fact that throughout history, wherever possible, all men have preferred the “political means.”

Ever since before the beginnings of states, there have been groups who lived by the economic means and groups who lived by the political means. And the state is simply an organized instru-

ment of domination of the one group over the other. It is completely that, in its origin, and essentially that throughout its development up to and including our own times. That is the substance of the book.

It is long since I've read a more fresh and illuminating study—so fresh, perhaps, because the precincts of history proper are forsaken, and the data of ethnology are given their due preponderance. The tribes of the earth teach us even more than its nations. And they teach us the same lessons. "Universal history is monotonous," as the author often repeats, but its monoties are so significant that variety would be less exciting to the mind.

In the chapter on the "Primitive Feudal State" (to be found in Polynesia, in the Fiji Islands, in Southern Arabia, India, Uganda, etc.), occur some comments on the function of a state-religion which are not to be forgotten, and also a little analysis of the psychology of the ruling group.

After the Primitive Feudal State there are two general lines of development: (1) the Maritime, or City State; (2) the Territorial Feudal State. All history is summarized in these two.

The Maritime State, called into existence by piracy and trade, tends to concentrate itself in a small area instead of spreading out in the conquest of land. And it also tends to develop commercial capital and the extensive use of money. The first feature (concentration in a small area) results in a breakdown of minor class-distinctions within the ruling class, and we have "democracy" with slaves. The second feature (commercial capital) results in the exploitation of slaves, not for the sake of their product, but to supply a market paying money. The result is a few very rich men, used-up slaves, and a "rabble." The rabble finally rules, and the state goes to pieces. Thus the maritime branch of the development of the state is barren; it contributes nothing to further evolution except as its institutions have their influence upon the territorial feudal state.

In the Territorial Feudal State (of which Japan and Western Europe are the best known examples) the central authority tends at first to lose its power to a territorial nobility. This is shown to be an inevitable result of the extension of the state over wide lands *when levies have to be made in kind*, the sovereign being compelled to turn over the levies to the overlords, and therewith the business of protecting the lower class. Finally as these great feudal estates grow larger and larger, the land concentrating in fewer hands, it becomes impossible even for the nobles to exploit the lower class as serfs. It becomes possible only to collect tribute from them, assuming that what they produce is primarily their own. Slavery thus comes to an end.

Thereafter the peasant produces more than is used, acquires capital, and the final result of capital is the industrial city. And the industrial city aids the central power in reducing the territorial nobles to subjection in three ways. It develops money, and money enables the central power to collect levies direct from the people all over the land. It develops "city life"—with its "honorableness of free labor"—and that entices the peasantry away from the estates of the nobles. And finally it develops a class of rich capitalists who demand equality with the nobles, the owners of land, and ultimately win it by marshalling the lower classes in a revolution—the Bourgeois revolution. Then we have the Constitutional State.

This is a state in which a ruling class still dominates a ruled—but a new element, "officialdom," has been introduced. And officialdom purports to, and in some measure does, represent the common interests of both classes. We may say that officialdom mitigates the severity of the class struggle, which still continues to be the essence of political history:

"There is no difference in principle between the distribution of the total products of the economic means among the separate classes of a constitutional state, the so-called 'capitalistic distribution,' from that prevailing in the feudal state."

At this point the trenchant spirit in which Dr. Oppenheimer's book is written seems suddenly to disappear, his blade grows soft, and the whole great story of the struggle of the past trails off into a weakly optimistic endorsement of Utah, and New Zealand, and parts of Australia, as having ceased to be "states" and risen to the glory of "free citizenships," in which men live only by the economic means!

This would be incredible if we did not know that Dr. Oppenheimer has been inoculated with the Single Tax Panacea, and is therefore sick. The Single Tax Panacea gives you a mild case of the disease it is supposed to cure—tolerance of class rule. And usually the mild case becomes chronic. It is only so we can understand how this keen mind, with all its vision of the rôle of cities and movable capital and the industrial proletariat *in the past*, can still see in the revolutionary movements of to-day only a changing ownership of land. An unconscious class-feeling of his own, I suspect, corrupts his science where it approaches a practical application.

But we must not let this weakness destroy the value of a brilliant study of history. We must be thankful that even to the inauguration of the Single Tax, Dr. Oppenheimer applies an economic interpretation.

"Owing to the lack of surplus labor," he says, the great landed estates of New Zealand are "almost incapable of producing rentals," and that is why Henry George is coming into his own!

I think Dr. Oppenheimer can hardly object, then, if we apply an economic interpretation to his own views of current history, and thus save a good revolutionary document.

THE INSTINCT OF WORKMANSHIP. By Thorstein Veblen.

355 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

This is an optimistic book. It argues in detail what Veblen has always insisted at large, that underlying the so-called economic motives of acquisition and emulation there is in human nature a profound primary impulse toward efficient and serviceable use of the means at hand for the furtherance of human life. This instinct was essential to life under the conditions of savagery, and so it was developed by selection. It is a trait of the savage character, and we are all savages by hereditary temperament, hybrid savages of a moderately advanced type. And we have underlying these civilized greeds and rivalries superinduced by the competitive and Christian age—we have deep down in us somewhere that virtue of the savage. It is a biological inheritance, a trait left over, as it were, from "early times, when the common good of the group was still perforce the chief economic interest in the habitual view of all its members."

Of course, Veblen has a laborious time proving, in face of the present exactitude of "Behaviorists" in psychology, that he has a right to the word "instinct." Perhaps he has not, but there is nothing to prevent his generalizing a number of instinctive reactions, and discussing, for purposes of social science, the resultant tendency. Let us name it a *tendency to workmanship*, and still repeat that the book is optimistic—understanding, of course, that an optimistic expression is the last thing in the world to be found in the book. "The Instinct of Workmanship" issues from that same inscrutable source of ponderous Olympian satire as "The Theory of the Leisure Class."

The body of the book, moreover, is not occupied with the thesis I have mentioned, but with a survey of the history of the technical arts, and the controlling effect of these arts upon habits of thought and culture throughout human existence. This book, too, therefore, is in a way an economic interpretation of history—of cultural rather than political history. And it is a tribute to the fertility of the giant hypothesis of Marx that two so different and so valuable books should be appearing this spring, both of them well within the shadow of its meaning.

Veblen makes no mention of the class character, or class use of ideas, but shows (rather more as Marx originally stated his theory) how ideas are moulded by the current "method of production." A little of the material upon this theme was already familiar to Veblen's students in an essay published five or six years ago on "The Evolution of the Scientific Point of View," in the *Chronicle* of the University of California. But that deserves a wider and more permanent circulation, and it belongs inevitably in this book on the instinct of workmanship. For the theme of that essay, as I remember it, was that the dominant categories of all our thinking, even to the idea of cause, arose and developed as portions of the cerebro-nervous mechanism of instinctive economic activities.

In the days of handicraft, for instance, science was pre-occupied with single isolable causes of single phenomena. Every event was conceived as an individual act of workmanlike creation, and all these acts were deemed to lead back in a logical regression to the initial act of a Divine Artificer. But with the development of the machine-technology, science is turning more and more into a purely impersonal study of reality as a *continual process*, never begun and never done, from which single causes may be isolated out by the mind for purposes of correction or control.

That instance may serve as an example of the historic subject matter of the present volume. Unhappily it is not quite a typical example because it is more clear and graspable than much of what Veblen has here to say. We must confess that his work is not strong in structural clarity, whether of idea, sentence, paragraph, chapter, or the volume as a whole. It seems a little lacking in that instinct of workmanship which it so gratefully celebrates. One wishes that Veblen were a little more of a savage.

CORRESPONDENCE

SOCIALISM AND FEMINISM

To THE NEW REVIEW:

The article in the June number of THE NEW REVIEW by Floyd Dell, purporting to be a reply to my article in the previous number, I must submit fails altogether to "make good" against my criticism of Feminism as exemplified in Mary White Ovington's article "Socialism and the Feminist Movement" and in the writings of others of the anti-man sisterhood. As is so commonly the case with the defenders of Feminism, Miss Dell seems to me to evade the issue by devices which are familiar to the craft. Let me endeavor to justify my assertion. Miss Dell admits that the retention of old privileges with the requirement of new rights, so-called, would result in "a pretty state of affairs." She is kind enough to credit me with having taught modern Feminists this lesson. She assumes, however, that the lesson has been learnt. If this is the case how does she explain the fact that two or three years ago it was the suffrage societies who were most active in procuring the pardon of the brutal husband murderer Napolitano in Canada? How does she interpret this plea for the immunity of the woman from punishment in all cases of infanticide, etc.? As illustrating the claim Feminist women make for immunity for all crimes committed by their sex, we have only to review the course of the criminal suffragettes of England. Here the claim is directly made that they are hardly done by. As an illustration of this sort of thing I may quote what was told me by an eye witness. During a recent street scrimmage a Suffragette who had just run a hat pin through a policeman, on being seized by the latter, whined to the bystanders: "Oh, he is hurting me!" Whining like whipped puppies when they themselves are touched after committing felonies which would earn for a man penal servitude for life, is a well known characteristic of these champions of sex equality. On the other hand, do we ever hear of a protest by any Feminist against the existing inequalities of the law in favor of women? On the contrary, the one concern of Feminists in this connection seems to be to bluff the issue by endeavoring to throw dust in the eyes of the public in propagating the deliberate falsehood that the favoritism of the law is for the man, not the woman. The relative amount of success they achieve in this is noteworthy and illustrates the truth that public opinion is not determined in any respect by facts but entirely by its own sentimental inclinations. Facts that contradict these latter, though they may stare it in the face, will be ignored by public opinion, while falsehoods that pander to its sentiment will be swallowed without question. No! I submit that whatever may be the case with Floyd Dell herself and one or two others, especially when hard pressed by anti-feminist argument, the bulk of Feminists, while contending

for any amount of new so-called rights, are only concerned for the Suffrage with a view of confirming and extending thereby already existing privileges.

What special bearing Miss Dell's remarks on the tyranny of unwelcome pregnancy and the desirability of encouraging the spread of information as to the prevention of conception have upon with the question of Feminism in general, or even of Female Suffrage in particular, is not quite clear to me. I agree in the main with what I understand to be the drift of her views on this point, but decline absolutely to admit that "masculine despotism" has anything to do with the state of affairs she deplores, which, as she herself admits, is wholly attributable to "such impersonal forces as religion, bourgeois morality, and the superstition of state worship." I fail to see any excuse whatever for the phrase "masculine despotism." On the contrary, it is public opinion generally, and not least public opinion of women themselves, that supports the above foolish and narrow-minded prejudices so indignantly condemned by my opponent. Female suffrage, judging by matters as they stand, and by past experience of women's prejudices in this connection, is likely to retard rather than hasten broader and more rational views on these and other points of sexual ethics. Miss Dell's dictum that my article is "rather absurd" leaves my withers utterly unstrung. It is a purely personal opinion, "interesting at most," to employ her own phraseology, "to her biographer." On the other hand, I think I shall have the verdict of most intelligent persons with me in denying that such is the case with so important a question—a question lying at the whole basis of the Feminist controversy—as that of the average intellectual and moral inferiority of women to men. (If Miss Dell, as suggested by an interjected clause of hers, fails to grasp the foregoing plain English words I am afraid I cannot help her.) Whatever view may be the correct one in this matter, to say that the question has merely a personal interest in a discussion on Feminism (I think most persons will agree with me) is rather more than "absurd." It might be paralleled by the assertion that in a discussion on the current economic situation the question as to the relative value of gold to the universe of commodities was an indifferent one, any view expressed thereon being a "mere private opinion" of interest only to the particular economist's biographer. What grounds Miss Dell has for her statement that no one knows anything about sex capacity I am unable to fathom. I should have thought it was a subject as amenable to investigation as any other in natural history or sociology.

In certain perfectly plain and obvious expressions of mine Miss Dell detects "feeble violence of phrase." If this is so then there is "feeble violence" in plain truth and, as a lover of truth, I must regretfully resign myself to the impeachment. In doing so, however, I may venture the suspicion that Miss Dell's discovery of "feeble violence" in my phrases is due to the fact that the phrases in question have struck home. Where one cannot refute a proposition it is an ancient controversial practice to call it names.

London, England.

E. BELFORT BAX.

P. S. Since writing the above an account of a case has been published in the English newspapers of a certain unfortunate

Italian in Chicago, who has been charged with the murder of his sweetheart or mistress. The evidence was so thin, *prima facie*, that the authorities did not consider it necessary at first to proceed against the man, but the women of the Suffrage Societies, we are told, forced their hand into undertaking a prosecution. Not content with this, a gang of these obscene harpies, it is said, determined to beset the court during the trial with a view to influencing the jury to convict the man by means of—"telepathy"!! What the result was has not as yet transpired in this country to my knowledge. As to the chances of success of the "telepathic" experiment I say nothing, but the incident of which it forms part surely speaks for itself. If Miss Floyd Dell will, after this, deny that at least the "advanced" feminist members of the female sex are arraying themselves in "a hostile army" against man as man, she is capable, I am afraid, of denying anything. But then, as I understand, she already, in the face of the plain English of Miss Ovington's article, denies that in the latter a sex-war is preached! So it looks as if she were "past praying for" in this respect.

E. B. B.

To THE NEW REVIEW:

Mr. Bax insists upon identifying every stupid or reactionary or sentimental action of middle class clubwomen with Feminism, and using it to prove a "sex-war." When a man has an *a priori* conviction like that about Feminism and sex-war, the newspapers will afford him plenty of opportunity to "rationalize" it. I am credibly informed that the Chicago story he relates is nine-tenths yellow journalism and only one-tenth woman. And, as my informant remarks, "there are plenty of hussies in and out of the woman movement." Mr. Bax also adduces a London suffragette who behaved with some lack of dignity, of humor, and of consistency. Well, how many times has he heard Socialists make fools of themselves in public? It would be possible, by backing up an *a priori* conviction with such evidence, to prove that Socialists believed in—well, I hesitate to say in print what follies they could be convicted of, on the testimony of newspapers and, for that matter, of eyewitnesses. It is as easy for men to act like fools as women, and it becomes people like Mr. Bax and myself (who inhabit, of course, a sphere superior to such weaknesses) to extend an equal tolerance to them both when they fall into error.

Let me point out that the question of sexual discrimination in law is not a matter to be settled by a mathematical computation as to which sex is most discriminated against. The discrimination is certainly *not* all in favor of women. And the sentimentality of male juries in acquitting "lady murderers" does not wipe out such facts as the widespread legal disabilities of women in matters of property, inheritance, and business. Mr. Bax has protested enough, heaven knows, about the discriminations in favor of women. Why should not women protest about the discriminations against them?

Further, let me state the real Feminist position in regard to feminine privileges in law. It is this:

That except as those privileges are concessions wrung from

capitalism for the female part of the working class, concessions which may be achieved later for the whole of the working class—such as the normal work day or the prohibition of night work—*they must be given up*. One privilege against which I have heard many Feminists speak, in public and in private, is Alimony. The others are of a like kind.

It is unfortunate for the position of Mr. Bax, but the fact is that all intelligent Feminists agree with him in his belief that men and women should be equal before the law. And they decline to take a reactionary position just because Mr. Bax in his wilful prejudice against them feels that it would be more appropriate for them to do so.

There still remains this matter of "inferiority of women." Readers of the NEW REVIEW realize that (a) there is no scientific test of moral or intellectual capacity—whence it follows that all generalizations on the subject are matters of private faith; and (b) that the failure of women in general and in particular to accomplish as much as men in the field of intellectual effort *under certain social conditions* does not prove that they cannot or will not accomplish as much *under different social conditions*.

But in my article I suggested briefly that even if it were possible—as it is not possible—to prove the mental and moral inferiority of women, that would be no reason for not giving them the vote. Let me state why. I know a man who appears to be utterly incapable of writing a sensible article on Feminism, though, strange to say, he is a noted philosopher, critic and historian; a man, moreover, who has the naive habit of believing the crude lies about the suffragists that are printed in the daily papers: such a man is, in one regard at least, my intellectual inferior. He is probably my moral inferior, too (though I hesitate to enter this doubtful field); for he has less sympathy for women than I have, and less of a sense of justice toward them. But this man has views about our economic system which he wishes to register by voting. If I allow him that right, can I deny a similar right to (postulated) inferiors who happen to be women? This man has grievances, and so have women. It is a mere truism of democracy that he and they should be allowed to express those grievances at the polling-booth. It may be dangerous to put in his hands and in theirs any share in the decisions which govern the conduct of nations; there is, indeed, something to be said for an oligarchy of people who can write sensible articles on Feminism; but I would be lonely there—my instincts are democratic. . . . Certainly, my intellectual and moral inferiors know what they want better than I do. I am in favor of letting them try to get it. I, being a superior person, should be adequate to the task of finding ways and means of seeing that my will, not theirs, be done. And meanwhile, as a matter of common courtesy, I shall treat them as equals. That is the psychology of democracy.

To return to Mr. Bax, I take great pleasure in noting that he says: "Where one cannot refute a proposition, it is ancient controversial practice to call it names." It would sweeten still further the amenities of controversy with Mr. Bax if he would be careful

to put into practice the excellent precept which can be deduced from his remarks.

FLOYD DELL.

P. S. I observe that Mr. Bax refers to me in his letter as Miss Dell. As it happens, however, I am a man—a fact of no importance to anybody except me and my girl.

F. D.

WHY A SOCIALIST PARTY?

To THE NEW REVIEW:

Walling has understood. One of the chief arguments which a reading of his book "Progressivism and After" raises is whether the Socialist Party has a real political function to perform. Mind you, *the* Socialist Party, not *a* Socialist Party theoretically conceivable to Walling. I said in my review that his position contradicts every important assumption of the existing Socialist movement. It denies the solidarity of labor, it transforms the two-class struggle into a four-class struggle, it asserts that the progressives have a revolutionary mission, it expects vast reforms carried out by the privileged classes, and it attacks by insinuation or implication practically all the existing Socialist Parties of the world. Of course, I wonder what is the function of a Socialist Party, and if Walling isn't wondering, too, it's hard for me to understand the working of his mind. If a cardinal of the Roman Church denied the divinity of Christ and the Apostolic succession, he would leave people wondering why he believed in the Church.

I say flatly that if Walling's diagnosis is true then the Socialist Party, as we know it, is an absurdity. I say he has cut away the ground from under its feet, and if he takes himself seriously he has got to produce a totally new theory of political Socialism in order to justify the existence of a Socialist Party. He has not done that as yet. He pretends that Miss Hughan and I in drawing this obvious conclusion from his analysis are raising something like a preposterous question. That is not an altogether candid reply on Walling's part.

We note how he answers our question: "Why a Socialist Party? *For the same reason that we have needed a Socialist Party in the past.*" And yet he has just written a book to show that all the reasons that we had in the past were false. First, he tells us that the solidarity of labor does not exist; then he calmly asserts that we have the same reason for a party that we had *before*. He tells us that the evolution of capitalism itself will produce "a new life and a new world for the worker"; then he tells us that we have the same reason for a Socialist Party that we ever had.

Now it may be true that some new kind of Socialist Party is needed, granting the truth of Walling's analysis. But it will have to be a party altogether different in tactics and philosophy from the party we know. In other words, a totally different party. Walling shirks that conclusion, and that is why his book contains no programme on which any Socialist Party can act. The great political advances are to be carried out, he tells us, by the progressives; the laboring masses have no chance to influence affairs until

two other classes have risen to power. They can't even "demand"; they can't "intimidate." Well, what can they do?

Does Walling seriously propose to go to the oppressed masses and say: "You are a minority of the voters; you have no chance to gain political power until two revolutions have passed into history; you must not make 'demands'; you cannot intimidate; you must not vote for the progressives who are going to change the world for you; you must spend time, money, energy on a party that can gain nothing for you for many years to come; you must do this not as self-sacrificing idealists, but as hard-headed selfish believers in the economic interpretation of politics." Is that Walling's notion of politics? Is that his notion of a practical programme for the labor movement?

I am not caricaturing him. I am stating as accurately as I can the political philosophy on which he imagines a Socialist Party might be based. It is impossibilist to the last degree, and like most impossibilism it's a hobby that requires a fixed income before you can indulge in it. For labor to act upon it would be the most disastrous waste of opportunity and power that it is possible to imagine. To vote for a party that cannot even make "demands," that can't for a long time affect the balance of power, may be a fine, passionate, quixotic thing to do, but it's a form of sacrifice that labor cannot afford. Labor has got to coin its political power into better conditions of life, and a party which doesn't show some prospect of that is a fraud. It would never command any real following. Talk about "ideologies" and fantastic politics, talk about ignoring the economic interpretation, was there ever a worse example of it than the proposal of this uncompromising materialist that the working classes should support a party which can gain nothing for them until two epochs have passed?

So I say again, Walling has cut the ground away from under the Socialist Party. He has, however, prepared the ground for two forms of social action. He has justified political progressivism and industrial action. His book makes a fine case for progressivism in politics and "syndicalism" in industry. It leaves practically the whole field of political reform to the privileged classes; and by making politics impossible for the laboring masses, it justifies their trust in direct action. Those are not Walling's conclusions—Walling never draws conclusions upon which people can act. He has become that distressing person—the observer with a key to destiny. But other people may draw the conclusions for him. I draw these: that political reform will come from the privileged classes; that revolutionary politics is impossible; that the laboring masses must rely upon industrial action. If I am wrong, what, specifically, are the practical policies that his analysis suggests?

Now, I don't accept those logical conclusions, because I think that Walling's sense of politics is literary and unreal. I think it's nonsense to say that the laboring masses must wait for two revolutions to pass before they can even make a "demand." I think it's nonsense to suppose that the privileged classes will carry out all these great reforms out of enlightened self-interest. I think it's nonsense to say that "as soon as we can intimidate capitalism we

can overthrow capitalism." I have seen capitalism intimidated. Walling simply isn't describing human life as it exists.

Take, for example, a measure like Workmen's Compensation. By Walling's theory it should be adopted with a whoop by capitalism. Well, I am writing this article in the smoking room of an ocean steamer, and opposite me sit two intelligent business men cursing with obscene trimmings the New York statute. They hate it. They'd like to get rid of it. They fought it at Albany. And if Walling ever took part in the actual effort to get a reform passed and genuinely administered, he'd know that his theory of enlightened capitalism is a ridiculous half-truth. Every reform is achieved by pushing and pulling, threats and bargains, fear and wisdom, clashes of self-interest, good will, obstruction and ignorance, and subtle lobbying. When the measure is passed it may help capitalism as much as it hurts, but the passing of it is not accomplished by Walling's notion of enlightened selfishness.

I am writing this article with no desire to start a fencing match. I am not attacking Walling; I am discussing the extremely important practical results of his ideas. And so I want above all things to avoid the usual debate which consists of "you said that"—"I didn't"—"You did"—"I didn't"—, to the utter weariness of the reader.

But I must confess to being annoyed at Walling's utter misrepresentation of my point in regard to poverty. That can be dealt with by two quotations. Says Walling "He believes Socialists as well as Progressives should concentrate their attention on increasing the total product (of wealth)—provided this results in a considerable advance for all classes, including the wage-earners." What I said was that "any movement that promises the worker the immediate advance of *his* absolute income is of infinitely more importance to him than any other movement." I said nothing about a total product. The increase of the workers' absolute income is obviously not the same as the increase of the absolute income of the whole of society. They may get well above the poverty line, in part, by an increase of the whole national wealth, in part, by a change in distribution. But they will give their allegiance to the movement which helps them to rise above the poverty line, no matter what the means, no matter what the name.

WALTER LIPPmann.

To THE NEW REVIEW:

My "Progressivism and After" explains at great length just what is the function of the political party from the radical Socialist standpoint. That I do this successfully is shown by the fact that I have received grateful appreciation from the press and periodicals generally, including a number of Socialist ones. Reformers within the Party, however, naturally do not wish to understand. They are typified by Walter Lippmann, who still professes to find unanswered a number of questions I have dealt with so explicitly that none but reformers within the Party have pretended that there was the slightest difficulty in getting the point.

I say there neither is nor will be any real solidarity between the aristocracy of labor and the democracy of labor until after the

great social revolution. I admit that Socialist parties have gradually come to take the other view. And, finally, I show how Marx was on both sides. He attacked the aristocracy of labor violently, but expected it to be swallowed up in a genuine revolutionary Socialist movement. It is being swallowed by the movement. But, in proportion to the swallowing, the movement is becoming anti-revolutionary and the tool of the aristocracy of labor. Fortunately, however, the swallowing is not complete, the movement is everywhere divided, and I give a very definite and concrete description of the process by which the movement may again become revolutionary, after it will have been deserted by the aristocracy of labor—which, as in Australia, tends to become the ruling and privileged class. Is there anything a ten-year-old boy cannot understand about this?

Next, Lippmann points out that I disagree with most Socialists in assigning a revolutionary mission to the progressives and says this throws me in absolute opposition to the Socialist parties. Not at all. For I assign a far greater revolutionary mission to the Socialists than to the progressives. I believe in the Socialist revolution. Does that prevent me believing in another revolution also?

Lippmann reports me as saying in my book that the Socialist Party can gain nothing for the workers until "two epochs have passed." This is one of his gross misstatements, of which there were at least a dozen in the previous article. If made by anyone but Lippmann I should call them deliberate misstatements. In his previous article, for example, he accused me of advocating "equality," that is, practically, communism, whereas every book I have published contains one or more chapters where I take exactly the opposite view. It was for fear of being misunderstood that I used illustrative figures to show that the two social-reform and democratic "periods" which, I believe, lie between us and Socialism, were not "epochs." I said they would probably last about a decade each, and probably not more than a quarter century when taken together. In his last article Lippmann attacked me for using these very figures. And now he speaks of my 10 to 12 year periods as "epochs." Is this square?

Four decades have passed since the Socialist movement really began. In positing only two more decades before we begin to get positive Socialistic results, I have rightly been called an extreme optimist. Lippmann complains because I say to the workers: "You must spend time, money, energy on a party that can gain nothing for you for many years to come." The majority of European Socialists had this waiting attitude for four decades. I urge them to maintain it for two decades more. I admit that at present they are on the social-reform tack, but I show—as already noted in this letter—just why and how they may be expected, within a few years, to resume their old attitude.

It is true I urge the workers not to make "demands." But a half-truth, Lippmann knows, often gives the same impression as a falsehood. I urge the Party to maintain its programme of reforms. But as the Party has no power to "demand" anything effectively, and can only get such reforms as are favored by the progressive capitalists, I don't want the word "demands" used in this connection.

Lippmann says my advice is, "You must not vote for the progressives who are going to change the world for you"—another false impression conveyed by a half-truth. Lippmann fails to remind the reader that I say that Socialists must continue, as they have always done, to support progressive measures, both inside and outside of Parliaments.

Lippmann reports me as saying that the Socialist Party "can't for a long time affect the balance of power." A pure misstatement, though clearly unintended. I show just how the Socialists even now affect the balance of power, but do not hold it (the progressives do that). And I show how, later, the Socialists will hold the balance of power.

I do not say, as Lippmann states, that any reforms will be adopted "with a whoop" by capitalism. I show, as Lippmann himself repeatedly says, that capitalism is divided. I show, moreover, that the progressives must and do rely on labor support—and, of course, are not disappointed.

Finally, Lippmann (expressing the reformer's view) says that the workers "will give their allegiance to the movement which helps them to rise above the poverty line, no matter what the means, no matter what the name," the two chief means being, as he says, "by an increase of the whole national wealth," or "by a change in distribution," or by a mixture of both.

Now, in so far as the workers look to an advance through "an increase in the whole national wealth" they are progressives. In so far as they look to a better distribution of this national wealth proceeding as far as to decrease profits or the proportion going to profits, they are Socialists.

This distinction appears to be of minor importance to Lippmann and the reformers. It appears as all-important to radical Socialists. (It will be noted that I drop the adjective "revolutionary," as Lippmann suggests, and adopt the word used by the left wing of the German Social Democracy.) The reformer and the Labor Party man want to improve conditions absolutely, even if exploitation is growing greater and the gulf between the classes is growing wider. The radical Socialist welcomes and promotes this form of progress, but he insists in addition on a more and more equal distribution, and—until he can get something in that direction—the radical Socialist spends his chief energy in preparing to get it.

And the greater the thing to be attained the longer the preparatory period—before even the first fruits of our struggle can be enjoyed. If we waited five years before the first ship went through the Panama Canal, can't we wait twenty-five for the first Socialist fruits of the Socialist movement—and admit that all present attainments are of a progressive character and that the credit for them is due largely to the progressive movement?

WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

A SOCIALIST DIGEST

IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

From an important article by Comrade Anton Pannekoek (who, though a Hollander by birth, has for years been recognized as one of the foremost representatives of the radical wing of the German Social Democracy) in the October issue of the *International Socialist Review* we reproduce the following excerpts, to supplement his article in this number of the NEW REVIEW:

The pure type of an imperialistic war is to be recognized by this: It does not break out on account of a particular object, but arises from the general antagonisms of states. These antagonisms are rooted in the competition to win world power or to defend it; and this struggle for world power is nothing else but the struggle of every country to win for its capital colonies, contracts, spheres of influence and favorable opportunities for investment in Asia and Africa. Every country has for a long time felt itself threatened by others because all of them make hostile preparations against one another. Hence every one of them believes itself attacked by the others.

It is true that the forceful struggle for world power brings direct advantage to large capital only; but the whole possessing class feels itself in harmony therewith. All contractors, business men, merchants and educated or professional people (engineers, technicians) have the feeling that better business, better positions await them in proportion as their country increases its reputation in the world and as large industry prospers. . . .

Twenty years ago in Germany the liberals and the Catholic Center party were opponents of militarism and the colonial policy; but since the elections of 1907 all opposition of these petty bourgeois circles against policies of violence and force has disappeared.

And what was the reaction in labor union and Socialist circles against this all-pervading imperialist sentiment?

In the labor unions, whose struggle always looks only to direct material advantages and neglects great ideals and intellectual development, an opinion is current that raw materials are needed for industry and hence that forcible subjection of tropical countries is in the interest of the working class.

The reformist policy in the most diverse countries aims at an approach toward the progressive and reform-favoring part of the bourgeoisie and in exchange therefor is ready to take part in the

administration, to vote budgets, and approve of colonial projects. A backward movement, governed by old bourgeois catchwords, it, too, speaks of patriotism and the duty of working men to defend their fatherland and its "culture."

In Germany the dominance of this reformism was prevented by the traditions of radicalism and by oppression from above. . . . But whoever followed the events attentively could not but notice that here radicalism by no means meant a revolutionary spirit. Behind the large and mechanically repeated revolutionary phrases there was frequently nothing but petty bourgeois philistinism, which dreaded every fresh initiative, and especially was there a lack of understanding of modern politics.

In *Vorwaerts* and other newspapers the policies of the government and militarism were criticised according to the old schedule. They scolded the stupidity and ridiculed the incompetence of official personages and tried to convince the bourgeoisie that their politics were unreasonable, that they were making a mistake in building warships, that their colonies were worthless—in short, that they really would do better to resign and put efficient Social Democrats at the helm.

This whole method was at bottom an attack on the politics of modern grand capitalism from the petty bourgeois standpoint of "small business" and shows that all understanding of modern political development was lacking. And fitted in with this was the theory which undertook to show in the scientific organ of the party, the *Neue Zeit*, that the doctrine of Marx, that fiery, revolutionary champion, meant a *passive waiting* and that all revolutionary activity was nothing but unscientific anarchism. . . .

The revolutionary Left emphasized the fact that the proletariat cannot prevent war by standing pat but only by energetic, active aggression. For this purpose as soon as danger of war appears and nationalistic demonstrations in favor of war begin to be made the working men should fill the streets in masses and chase away the howlers. If the danger becomes more threatening, the demonstrations must become more energetic; under a general strike the masses must be sent into the streets instead of going to the factory, and for these few days they can live wholly for the great political struggle.

If the government tries to forbid the demonstrations and to prevent them by force, then all the more must they be kept up. Even if thousands thereby perish, what is that compared with the hundreds of thousands who fall in war? And in war they fall for capital, in the street fight they fall for the proletarian cause.

Since the government is always able to maintain peace by some concession in the negotiations, it is quite possible that such devoted sacrifices of the working masses in all large cities would make the government cautious and thus preserve the peace.

All this applies to the German proletariat at the outbreak of the present war. Had the Social Democratic Party firmly resolved to oppose the war with all its might and had it aroused the masses to opposition and shunned no sacrifice, then perhaps this fearful war would have been avoided. A successful action like this would have been at the same time an important victory, a step forward for Socialism.

But whoever has followed the tactics of the German party of late years must entertain strong doubts whether it was capable of such action. Six years ago an attempt at mass activity was begun in the struggle for the Prussian franchise, but it was soon dropped, because the leaders of the party were afraid of a clash with the powerful military.

Had this beginning of revolutionary aggression continued, then the German government would have had too much to do with its internal troubles to think about war. The fact that this tactic came to an end after the brilliant conflicts of 1910 means an acknowledgment of its own weakness by the party. Since then a lukewarm spirit, adverse to sharp conflict, got the upper hand in the movement. The bureaucracy at the top became ever stronger and was disinclined to risk itself in revolutionary struggles.

It is true, there was an external growth of the organization, which is the necessary prerequisite for a fight, but at the same time they shunned that fight more and more in order, as they claimed, not to endanger this precious organization. Every independent initiative of the masses which occasionally broke out in the struggles of the labor unions against the counsel of the leaders was branded as a "lack of discipline" and "anarchism." Thus there were lacking in the German labor movement all the prerequisites for coming out boldly against the threatening war.

To expect from narrow parliamentarians and bureaucrats like Scheidemann and Ebert any revolutionary initiative would have been ridiculous, and just as little could one expect that the masses, accustomed to do only what the party ordered, would now come forward independently without the leaders of the party.

On Tuesday evening, the 28th of July, well attended meetings were held to protest against the war. That was all. And in these meetings there was a total lack of enthusiasm. With a feeling of depression, they realized that Fate was approaching without being able to stop it.

The question *how* the war could be resisted was never even raised, because the question *whether* the war ought to be resisted was not even answered with a decisive Yes. . . . In wide circles, even among party members, they were *for* the war. In the *Vorwaerts* and many other party papers the war was set forth as a "war against the blood-czar," a war against Russian barbarism. They cited Karl Marx, who in 1848 had urged Germany to a war against Russia; they overlooked the fact that that applied only so long as Russia dominated and threatened Europe as its most powerful military state.

Thus the war was made popular among the working masses. In vain did a few newspapers of the Left lift their voice against it. Here is shown how heavily the non-comprehension of imperialism revenged itself. Had there been everywhere a clear insight into the fact that to-day Russia, equally with Germany, is a capitalist country, pursuing a policy of commercial imperialism, and that the war was to be waged merely about the expansion of Germany in Asia, and had this truth been hammered into the masses by our press day in and day out, then the workers would not so easily have become the victims of bourgeois patriotic phrases.

Now, however, it appeared to the workers, who had always learned to hate most of all the grawsome Russian czarism, that the German government, which formerly cultivated an intimate friendship with the czar's regime, had really been converted to the views of the proletariat in order to wipe out that disgrace of Europe, the bloody rule of the Cossack lash. . . .

This explains why the Social Democratic members of the Reichstag (only a small minority opposed it) voted the emergency war credit for the government under the plea that Germany was conducting a defensive war for civilization against Russian barbarism.

This position of the German Social Democracy marks a turning point in its history and a breach with its previous tactics. (In 1870 in a similar case Bebel and Liebknecht abstained from voting, and Bebel declared later that he would have voted against the war appropriation if he had dreamed of Bismarck's deception as to Napoleon's alleged attack.) . . .

There was also the fear that if the party voted against the war appropriation, it would call down the wrath of public opinion, and suffer violence through the arrest of its leaders and the suppression of its party papers by the government. They avoided a clash for fear of injuring the organization.

These representatives of the party now think that by their prudence they saved the party organization. Superficially considered, they appear to be in the right, for the party is now treated from above more favorably than ever before; but the *Socialist soul has thereby been sacrificed*.

The bourgeois press praises the Social Democracy for its patriotic stand. The whole position of the party in the country has changed; it is now recognized by the government as on an equal footing with other parties; the numerous exceptional laws against it are repealed; all is friendship and unity between Social Democracy and bourgeoisie. The class struggle against the bourgeoisie is heard no more; the Socialist backbone of the party is broken.

Many a one will ask himself, how could there be such a collapse of the once so proud and class-conscious party, the strongest and most radical in the world? We have already said that within the party the symptoms of a change were long present, but did not come to the surface owing to the force of tradition and old habituated phrases. But in stormy social crises, when the passions of men are stirred to the depths, the venerable catchwords fall suddenly away like a torn cloak and *what one really is*, what lies in one's deepest nature, is unexpectedly revealed.

The leaders of the party, parliamentarians and officeholders, were averse to keen strife and, though retaining the Marxian expressions, had repeatedly sought in elections to let the party co-operate with the liberal progressives. And the masses, thanks to a twenty-year economic prosperity, had gradually become demoralized.

True, large numbers became members of the Socialist party, because they looked upon this as the class party of the workers, and they were also for the most part opposed to political compromises, because they were socially and politically heavily oppressed.

But there were few indications of deep revolutionary feeling, of a really rebellious spirit. The history of the labor movement shows how in times of crisis the revolutionary spirit grows, in times of prosperity contentment. Hence, people wondered why the long and great prosperity showed so little effect on the political attitude of the German workers. The answer is found in the present collapse, the sudden submission to imperialism and the fraternization with the bourgeoisie.

THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS

1. THE PARTY EXECUTIVES STAND PAT

The German Party is now officially supporting the Kaiser and the majority of the Party Executive shows no signs of changing its position. For example, it recently sent an official communication to the Party organ in Italy, the *Avanti*, in which the following passage occurs:

In wars of defense there are no parties in Germany, but only the single thought of protecting Germany. Liebknecht, who was supposed to have been shot, is awaiting his call to the army. [He could not do otherwise unless prepared for instant death.—ED.] The Social Democratic group in the Reichstag, representing the working class, is taking part in the defense policy of the Empire, and for that reason granted the war budget.

This statement is clearly intended to convey the impression that the Socialists are unanimous for the war. Yet a report to the New York *Call* states that *thirty-seven Socialist members of the Reichstag were against voting for the budget*, and several reports say that a considerable number (either 13 or 17), including Liebknecht, *actually refused to vote for the war credits in the Reichstag*.

The official position of the Party since the war is also shown by the protest issued in reply to the joint declaration of the French and Belgian Parties. The German Party claims that this declaration presents the case entirely from the French standpoint, and does not present any of the evidence of the other side. The German Party maintains that there is not yet sufficient evidence to justify any discussion as to the behavior of the various powers before the outbreak of the war. If this were the case, however, it would seem that the Germans are equally wrong in their positive statements (like that just quoted) that their government is on the defensive.

The Austrian Socialists also joined in the protest against this French and Belgian declaration, and the Vienna *Arbeiterzeitung* declared that all Austrian Socialists were unanimous in condemning

the Czarism and had "no criticism to make of Germany's conduct in this war."

The organ of the Austrian Party also has a special article in its number of August 23, celebrating the day that was to have marked the opening of the International Socialist Congress. As it clearly shows the attitude of the Austrian Party, we reproduce some of its chief statements:

In all countries, we Socialists, German, French, English, Belgian, Austrian, Servian, have done our duty as Internationalists, as long as it was possible; we warned against the war, and with every drop of our blood (!!) have sought to hinder it; and we tried to make use of every possible chance of maintaining peace up to the very last minute.

But since fate has overtaken us and overcome us, the proletariat in all countries which formerly did its International duty, now does its duty as sons of the people, who risk everything in order that the people shall not be conquered, in order that its soil shall not be delivered to the horrors of conquest. We all suffer wrong; we all do right to protect ourselves against it.

But even in this tragic moment, we do not forget that we are International Social Democrats. Our heart bleeds because of the frightful necessity of this conflict, but we give to our people and to the State what belongs to the people and the State.

Nationalism and internationalism, according to this, are at no point contradictory. Not only are some nationalisms good, but all nationalisms are good. It seems like an idealization of war itself, for it practically states that in this war all peoples are on the defensive—and would this not apply equally well to any other war?

2. GENUINE SOCIALISTS IN GERMANY YET

We borrow the above title from a remark in the New York *Volkszeitung* in speaking of some of the bold oppositional declarations of the Socialist minority. For example, let one only read between the lines of the following quotation from the Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, taken from an article in defense of the conduct of the Belgians during the war. At great length the Leipzig *Volkszeitung* shows that any atrocities which may have been committed by the Belgians had nothing to do with Clericalism or the Catholic Church, as had been alleged in Germany. The behavior is accounted for by other motives:

That in such struggles as have occurred, especially in Belgium, all passions and cruelties have been especially frequent is all the more understandable because the whole country, from house to house, and from man to man, has been agitated and torn. The Belgian people believes from its standpoint, that it is acting as patriotically as any other country which supposedly or in reality is struggling for its existence. [Our italics.]

The *Volkszeitung* proceeds to state that the actions of the Belgians which are complained of by the German government are not cases of individual resistance of the civil population, but a universal phenomenon and "a kind of people's war." It says: "The actual events prove that in the countries already conquered by Germany, the whole people believe it must struggle for its existence because the irresponsible chauvinists and bar-room strategists, here as there, argue that Germany will annex their country." The words, "here as there," constitute another bold attack on German militarism, which is almost universally in favor of the annexation referred to. The *Volkszeitung* finally says that the arguments discussing the struggle as being one between cultures, which are being published by so many leading Germans, have the same effect as this bar-room talk; they make it a people's war. And as practically every article in defense of the war, whether by leading writers, historians, scientists, or Socialists, takes this cultural standpoint, the *Volkszeitung* takes a position against them all.

The German attacks against Russian civilization and Russian conduct during the war are even more violent than their attacks against the western nations. But the Social Democratic press even manages to get in a good word for the Russians. For example, the official war correspondent of the Social Democratic Party, Comrade Düwell, writes as follows in a dispatch to all the German Socialist papers:

In spite of all stories of murder and fables of robbery, it must be conceded that many Russians are very polite, even distinguished in their manners. On August 27th, the commanding General Von Mackensen telegraphed to the Governor of East Prussia that in several places in Ermland which were not deserted by the inhabitants upon the arrival of the Russians, the behavior of the Russians is highly praised. Even food was often paid for. Beg the population to be calm, stop further flight from the country as far as possible.

This is surely as valuable a comment as could be made on "the Russian peril." Düwell continues:

The town in which we are temporarily stopping has been visited by a large number of Russians. Some of them are insolent. Most of them, however, behaved politely, demanded nothing, but asked for things, and never forgot to say "thanks." They treated the women and children respectfully and paid for what they took.

Düwell concedes that there are barbarians among the Russians, and points out that the same Russians who had been so polite in their advance, destroyed the villages in their retreat, but, as he says, "War is war," and this destruction may have been a purely military measure.

But most significant of the position of Germany's real Socialists was the continued radicalism of *Vorwaerts* all through the month of August and September, which led to two suspensions of that paper, the second an indefinite prohibition, which almost became permanent. The termination of the first suspension was accompanied by the following official warning of the Minister of War:

The Ministry of War rescinds the former prohibition, in the expectation that no articles shall be published that may tend to affect the harmonious spirit of the army. Should this not be the case, any commanding general is authorized to prohibit the issuing of the paper once more.

Vorwaerts did not live up to the official expectation, and the second suspension occurred but on October 1, as noted in the following dispatch, publication was again permitted:

The decree ordering the suspension of the Socialist newspaper *Vorwärts*, has been rescinded, conditional upon the avoidance by the paper of reference to class hatred and class struggle. These are described as wholly inapplicable to the present situation, in view of the unanimity of the German people in the present war.

This doubtless marks the termination of the control of *Vorwaerts* by Germany's real Socialists, for only Socialists of the nationalistic variety could subscribe to such a promise under any circumstances. In the meanwhile the splendid record of two months remains and there remains also the tremendous effect of this courageous campaign.

We have quoted from some of the *Vorwaerts* editorials in our October number. Some of those that have reached us since that time are even more radical—if we pay due regard to the limitations forced upon it by this rigid military censorship.

When the Socialist leaders Guesde and Sembat—with the unanimous approval of their party—became members of the French cabinet, *Vorwaerts* pointed out that this proved that the French proletariat regarded it as a people's war and that Germany would only be able to conquer against the proletariat of France itself.

The principal points of this editorial, which appeared on the 28th of August, are as follows: Guesde and Sembat not only did rightly to enter the cabinet, but are the finest types of Socialists. Guesde is described as "the old fighting companion of Marx and Engels, the founder and organizer of the Marxian tendency in France, the most uncompromising partisan of the idea of class struggle, the sworn enemy of every kind of opportunism." As to Sembat, *Vorwaerts* cites his speech of the 2nd of August in which he defined the present war waged by France as one which aimed

neither at conquests nor at the destruction of German culture. This led the *Vorwaerts* to remark:

The French nation is defending its existence, its unity, and its independence.

Our comrades did not refuse the grave responsibility of this momentous hour. They felt that the independence and security of the nation are the first conditions of its political and social emancipation, and they did not think it was possible for them to refuse their aid to that country in its struggle for life.

The war commenced with the motto, "For liberty and national independence." If we ever have the happiness to make peace with France the liberty and independence of Poland and Finland will not be forgotten.

But most important of all was the editorial of August 25 in which *Vorwaerts*, ably avoiding every possible deadlock with the military authorities, yet succeeded in suggesting that the supposed justification of the war, that it was a defense against Russia, had fallen away, and that it had become a war of aggression. If, after a series of defeats, this becomes the attitude of the Socialists generally and of a large part of the German nation, the importance of this declaration cannot be over-stated. As an example of the ability and force of the great Socialist organ I must quote several paragraphs:

When the war broke out, the word went round: "War against Tsarism!" That was the cry that made the war seem inevitable even to those who were against it. . . . To military experts it appeared an unavoidable necessity that France must be first overcome, in order to advance with Austria against Russia. And to this necessity even those who mourn the frightful fate which drives two civilized peoples into this murderous struggle must resign themselves. . . . From the military point of view the first necessity is to overcome France. On the other hand, politically, the most urgent necessity is the overthrow and destruction of "Tsarism." . . . The victory over the allies of Russia is necessary because they are the allies of "Tsarism." But it is necessary only so far as to prevent their delaying the overthrow of "Tsarism." . . . We must therefore not adopt a policy which will perpetuate the fatal enmity with the western Powers by annexations and interference with the unity and independence of other nations, thus making Russia, even after her defeat, the arbiter of Europe.

If we should not succeed in overcoming "Tsarism," if the strategic necessity should push the political necessity into the background, then, whatever the intentions of the rulers, the final result might lead to a return of the "Holy Alliance" in which "Tsarism" would once more hold the dominating influence, instead of to a union of the civilized nations. . . . Then this war would lose its justification. . . . [The Holy Alliance, it will be recalled, consisted of Russia, Germany, and Austria.]

No, this war must not be directed to the conquest and building up of a new world-power in place of the English and Russian powers, but towards the liberation of the nations. Liberation from Muscovitism, freedom and independence for Poland and Finland, free development for the great Russian people itself, the severance of the unnatural alliance of two civilized nations with Tsarist barbarism—that was the goal which raised the enthusiasm of the German people and made them ready for sacrifices.

For many years it has been an open secret among German Socialists, spoken of almost publicly at every Party Congress, that the one hope of democratizing Germany lay in the military defeat of the government after it had undertaken an unjust and aggressive war. *Vorwaerts* now holds to this hope more than ever, and a large part of the non-German world, as we know, is coming to the same opinion. Not only is *Vorwaerts* eagerly looking forward to German defeats, but it is preparing the Socialists by insisting that unfavorable news should not be kept from the people.*

The article that led to the second suspension of the paper dealt with Germany's efforts "to make the truth known abroad," and to the alleged fact that these efforts may not have succeeded fully. "The extent of these efforts," it is declared, "shows how difficult it is to create confidence in the German reports."

The fact that foreign countries were for so long deprived of German news, says the article, was in part due to necessary military measures. It continues:

But this alone cannot explain the existing difficulties. It is necessary to go back to times of peace to find the explanation. For a long time a great measure of mistrust, suspicion and antagonism to Germany has been heaping up abroad—even in the neutral countries—and we now see the effects of this.

In part, says *Vorwaerts*, this was due to Germany's sudden rise in the economic world and to fear and suspicion on the part of the great capitalists. "But the jingoes abroad would hardly have had such success with their propaganda if another factor had not been present.

That land, which developed so mightily, was at the same time that land which made its workmen a present of an anti-Socialist law, and which also, after the repeal of this law, instituted a police

* The above article may seem to concede that the Kaiser is engaged in a real war against the Czar. But note first the expression "whatever the intentions of the rulers," which admits the sincerity of the Kaiser's fear of Russia only for the sake of argument. This is followed by the cynical prediction that an alliance between Kaiser and Czar may soon follow. Surely a due regard for the censor, and even for the neck of the writer, would scarcely allow him to go further. It will be recalled that the *Vorwaerts* office was reported as attacked and wrecked, and that the paper was first suspended a few days after the publication of the above quoted articles.

government of chicanery and allowed the equality of all citizens to exist only on the paper of the Prussian Constitution.

Thus Germany appeared to the rest of the world, and even to the working classes, in the light of a Power whose rule meant militarism and political oppression. It was this that made it possible for that distrust and bitterness to arise which so greatly aided our bellicose opponents in the ruling classes and which makes it possible for us to gain the sympathy of neutral countries only with the greatest effort.

This explains why regrettable pronouncements have come even from the laboring classes in these lands. These are regrettable above all because *they try to fasten upon the German folk as a whole the responsibility for the acts of a single class.* . . .

The comrades abroad can be assured that the German working class disapproves to-day every piratical policy of state, just as it has always disapproved it, and that *it is disposed to resist the predatory subjugation of foreign peoples as strongly as the circumstances permit.*

The comrades in foreign lands can be assured that, though the German workmen also are protecting their fatherland, they will nevertheless not forget that their interests are the same as those of the proletariat in other countries, who, *like themselves, have been compelled to go to war against their will, indeed, even against often repeated pronouncements in favor of peace.* [Our Italics.]

It was the Socialist daily of Bremen, the *Bürgerzeitung*, however, that published the most revolutionary article that has reached us from the German Socialist press since the beginning of the war. It declared:

Everything that we have said right up to the present will be considered as mere chatter if we do not maintain our ideas *during and after the war.*

If the German Socialists are fighting side by side with the Junkers, their enemies, it is only their blood that is mixing, but not their hearts. All the phrases of German patriotism are shattered against the granite of our Socialist convictions.

They talk about the struggle against Tsarism! But this struggle is being carried on by the Russian revolutionaries, and not by those who, like the German government, have always protected Tsarism against the heroes of the Russian revolution, and are ready to do it again.

The German Socialists have no confidence in the promise of the German ruling classes. Our teachers, such as Karl Marx, have proved to us that it is not good intentions which decide the fate of peoples, but real forces. If the German Empire is victorious, the ruling class of Germany will become stronger and the working class of Germany just that much weaker.

The conclusion seems unavoidable that defeat is preferable to victory, which has been the prevailing Socialist opinion in Germany during many years. The *Bürgerzeitung* even indicates, though

vaguely, of course, its hope that the German Socialists will play a revolutionary role before the war is over: "The world war is German Socialism's baptism of fire."

POSITION OF THE ITALIAN SOCIALISTS

There have been a great many conflicting reports about the position of the Italian Socialists towards the war. It is agreed that no Italian Socialists have favored fighting on the side of Germany. The reformist Socialists, like the English Independent Labor Party, are more or less for fighting on the side of the Allies. The Socialist Party proper is divided, though its sympathies are very strongly and decidedly on the side of the Allies.

One Socialist deputy, Raimondi, who, it is true has been recently expelled from the Party, but only on the doubtful ground that he was a Freemason, says:

It is the duty of the Socialists to do everything possible to push the Government into armed intervention. Official Socialism will disapprove of this but international Socialism is dead. The Berlin Socialists killed it when they took up the cause of the military aristocracy and failed to raise the slightest protest against the defiance which the Kaiser's hordes threw in the face of civilization.

Turati, the leader of the moderate wing of the Party, while opposed to the war, just as clearly blames it on Germany. The following is from an interview in the *Messaggero* of Rome: "I believe that the group will be unanimous on the proposition of neutrality for the present as well as for the future, not only because of its fundamental opposition to war, but also in consideration of the principle of nationality, basely reviled and menaced by the aggressiveness of what is in appearance only Austria-Hungary, but in reality is Austria and Germany, and more Germany than Austria."

When Südekum and another German Socialist deputy, and also several well-known Austrian Socialists, visited Italy to try to defend the position of the German and Italian Parties, the bourgeois press reported that they were trying to get the Italian Socialists to favor the war. This, apparently, was untrue, but they were using the arguments of the German government, which led the Italian Party at Rome to issue the following anti-German statement:

We Socialists regard the despatch of the German mission to Italy as an offence against the dignity and independence of Italian Socialism; the more so as the German Social-Democratic Party, by supporting the German and Austrian policy of aggression, has forfeited the right to the title of International Socialists. We have kept silent up to the present so as not to disturb that neutrality

which the people declared in front of the Government, thus deciding that they would not dishonor themselves by helping Austria and Germany, and being anxious for peace after two years of warfare in Libya.

But we cannot pass over in silence this action of the German Socialists in encouraging the obscure diplomatic intrigues of the Governments of the ex-Triple Alliance, which tend to direct Italian neutrality into the tortuous and perilous paths of indirect co-operation.

We declare that our prayers are for the termination of the war without victors or vanquished, but if this hope is vain, we pray that this war may end in the overwhelming of those who have provoked it—the Empires of Germany and Austria. We do so because these Empires constitute the bulwark of European reaction, even more so than Russia, which is overrun by democratic and Socialist currents capable, as they have shown, of liberating efforts; and also because, if the Empires of Germany and Austria are victorious, it will mean the triumph of the most brutal expression of militarist absolutism. It will mean the victory of the hordes of devastation and destruction, of crimes and conquests which tear up treaties and ignore the law of nations.

After declaring that the defeat of Germany will enable German Social Democracy to emerge from its voluntary impotence, and that the victory of France and England will signify a limitation of armaments and the substitution of a system of military defence for the professional hordes organized for aggression, the statement asserts that there is only one way of showing their internationalism, "to range ourselves with those who are fighting against Imperialism and reaction, and to do as the Italian Socialists resident in Paris, when they say that the only method of expressing their anti-militarism is to fight against the militarist Empires."

This mission of the German Socialists in Italy was chiefly remarkable for a Socialist meeting at which a discussion between Italians and Germans occurred. The speech of Della Setta was especially noteworthy. Della Setta found it exceedingly strange that the German Social Democrats should turn to their Italian comrades in such a moment. Especially since a very undesirable interpretation might be given to their visit. He said:

The defense of the conduct of the German Socialists does not convince us. You speak of that France which is allied with Russia, and of the English enemies of Germany, but we speak of our France, of Revolutionary France, of the France of Jaurés, and of no other. The French Socialists continued to conduct an anti-military propaganda in a country clamoring for revenge. The French Socialists fought against the French preparation for war, which the Germans did not do in their country, or only did up to the point when the imperialistic feelings of the Kaiser and the bourgeoisie might be offended.

German domination is a worse danger for us than that of Czarism, because Czarism keeps the German army from marching

on Paris. Because the French banner protects everything that is most revolutionary in spite of all failures and errors. The German cry to-day is "Deutschland über Alles," and German Socialists are not working against this.

In the present case they ought to have acted according to Republican principles. But the German Socialists published in *Vorwaerts* that the Kaiser had worked for two years against war. You speak of German civilization being in danger, but we can see no civilization in the power that attacks neutral Belgium and accomplishes the destruction of Louvain. On the whole, you Socialists use the same arguments as the German bourgeois government.

To us the Kaiser is no better than the Czar. . . . And if there is a secret wish in your present words and steps, there is also a secret wish in our neutrality, but this wish shall be no secret for you, just as your thoughts are no secret for us. We say openly that we weep over destroyed Belgium, and follow the fate of France with trembling. And as to the relation of Party to Party we will, when peace draws near, call together an International conference as soon as possible.

The last paragraph clearly suggests that Della Setta shares the opinion of Troelstra, the opportunist leader of the Dutch, that the conduct of the German Socialists requires that the International shall be re-organized.

In his reply, Südekum confessed that he had been sent by the German party, which shows that the denials printed in the American and German Socialist press were false. He suggested also that Fischer had been sent to Switzerland and Scheidemann to Holland for the same purpose; and we know all three missions failed. On his return Südekum confessed in *Vorwaerts* that most of the Italian Socialists are outspokenly partisans of France, and even feel a strong disgust for the Germans,—which of course means German Socialists of the Südekum type.

SWISS AGAINST GERMAN SOCIALISTS

The leading Swiss Socialist paper, the Zurich *Volksrecht*, which had defended the German Party for some weeks, finally came out against it, accusing the Germans of not having done what they should have done in the course of the war to distinguish their position from that of the military junker caste. It continues:

Or was it the will of the German Social Democrats that Belgium should be attacked, that the chief attack of German military power should be directed against France? As International Socialists did they also wish to declare themselves in favor of this plan—so long

ago openly prepared for and adopted by the German general staff—in spite of the fact that they claim to be fighting against Russia and Czarism?

The Swiss Party organ continues with a sledge-hammer rebuff to the Socialist Party's official emissaries:

We have already seen from the way in which Comrade Fischer, in the *Volksrecht*, has tried to explain and excuse the violation of the neutrality of Belgium, that the eyes of the leading comrades of Germany are remarkably blinded. How greatly they have increased the difficulty of the struggle against militarism in neutral states cannot yet even be stated.

MANEUVERS OF A PEACE ADVOCATE

J. Ramsay MacDonald, become leader of the Socialist Peace Party, has made an international name for himself among bourgeois pacifists for his attack on Sir Edward Grey.

When the great conflict broke out MacDonald said that all the talk of advancing democracy and peace by this war was "mere moonshine":

Far more likely is it that this war is the beginning of a new military despotism in Europe, of new alarms, new hatreds and oppositions, new menaces and alliances; the beginning of a dark epoch dangerous, not merely to democracy, but to civilization itself.

But now MacDonald has become a war-partisan and has come out with a stirring appeal for recruits. This leads the Social Democrats, in *Justice*, to institute the following deadly parallel:

In the article which, early in August, Mr. MacDonald wrote to the *Labor Leader*, and which has been reprinted and is even now being distributed, he said:

"Our Government supplied the idealism for this war by telling us that the independence of Belgium had to be vindicated by us. . . . It was a pretty little game of hypocrisy, which the magnificent valor of the Belgians will enable the Government to hide up for the time being."

On September 24 in the Leicester *Pioneer*, Mr. MacDonald wrote:

"We could not afford, either from the point of view of honor or of interest, to see Germany occupy Belgium. The war that comes nearest having a Divine justification is the war in which a great and mighty State engages to protect a small nation. From that position I have never receded. In the controversies that have been raised I have doubted whether, when our diplomacy is judged with the whole of the facts before the judges, it will come well out of its trial on that point; but that, when the popular sentiment of the

country is judged, it will come out clean and fine so far as Belgium is concerned, I am quite convinced."

In the House of Commons on August 3 Mr. MacDonald said:—

"So far as we are concerned, whatever attacks may be made upon us, we will take the action that we will take by saying that the country ought to have remained neutral."

In a letter to the Mayor of Leicester, read at a recruiting meeting on September 17, Mr. MacDonald said, "Victory must be ours.

History will in due time apportion the praise and blame, but the young men of the country must for the moment settle the immediate issue of victory. . . . I want the serious men of the trade unions, the brotherhood (and the I. L. P.?) and similar movements to face their duty."

"It is a pretty little game of hypocrisy," indeed. What are we to think of Ramsay MacDonald after all this?

FUTILE PEACE TALK

The national executive committee of the American Socialist Party has issued a call for an "extraordinary peace session of the International Socialist and Labor Congress," thus indicating that in the opinion of the committee the International is still in existence. After stating that "our brother parties in Europe . . . did the best they could under the circumstances" (!), the committee appeals "to them to help us stop this mass murder" by meeting in congress at Washington, D. C.:

The agenda of this congress shall be the discussion of ways and means to most speedily and most effectively stop this war, and such other matters as may pertain to the subject of world's peace.

How a peaceful meeting in Washington, D. C., would stop the war is not indicated. If the Socialists of Germany "did the best they could" when they voted the Kaiser's war credits, what better thing still remains to be done? As against this hollow peace talk we place the words of Max Eastman in the *Masses*:

Quite the contrary, however, we who take sides from the stand-point of *results*, will be found more firmly and ardently advocating the arms of the Allies, than those who take sides from the stand-point of moral causes, however plausible. Not only is our heart with invaded France, but our reason also dictates that the Kaiser and his military machine must be whipped back into Prussia and smashed. Let the war go on until that is accomplished. Let us have no premature peace-makers edging in, as Roosevelt did at the moment the people of Russia were on the point of winning their freedom from a crushed and defeated Czardom. Let the Kaiser's

armies and all his steel engines and feudal military idealism be crumpled back with wounds and misery upon the people of Germany, and then you will see that people in its true character. It is for Germany, more than for the Allies, that we want the Kaiser's defeat.

The German people are now held under the heel of militarism—if the truth were known—more solidly and consentingy held there, than any other people of Europe. That feudal and absolute military oppression, linked fast with cultural and scientific and social-reform progress of the highest type, is the most abominable monster of Europe. And it is the only monster that will surely be slain by a victory of its enemies. That is why we advocate the arms of the Allies, though we have no patriotism but our love of liberty, and no faith that Russia is fighting in the battle of democracy, and no delusion that England and France are the sole repositories of culture and altruism. We say, for the sake of the people of Germany and of all nations, let the war go on.

The French Socialists also, through *L'Humanité*, reject the call of the American Party for a Peace Congress at this stage of the war, on the ground that it would mean a surrender to Kaiserdom and militarism. We take the following extracts from the *Humanité* article from *The New York World*:

Imperial and militarist Germany, more than any other, willed this war. Though others may share the responsibility, Germany, it should be remembered, unloosed her formidable war machine upon innocent Belgium and pacific France, and the industrial districts where Socialism flourishes most have been ravaged most terribly.

Germany has not yet experienced the horrors of the invasion. The abominable class pride of the Junkers, the owners of the great estates, the pan-Germanist manufacturers and the Bismarckian professors, though disturbed by the untamable resistance they have met, are not yet humbled.

Peace negotiation, therefore, is as yet impossible. To crush the enemy of the peace of Europe—since, alas, the German people have thus far not been willing or able to do so—we must continue the struggle until a definite result is obtained.

We must continue without savage hatred, abject Chauvinism or barbarous revenge, but with force and dignity, to safeguard our beloved republic of France, to create a new Europe. When that is done the Socialists of all countries can establish international peace on a definite basis.

THE SURVEY

NATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Industrial Conditions—Civic Progress—Municipal Problems

The Survey is a weekly magazine for all those who believe that legislation, city government, the care of the unfortunate, the education of children, the work of men and the homes of women must pass muster in their relation to the common welfare.

In the Industrial Department the work of the Federal Industrial Relation Commission is fully covered. Notable developments in the adjustment of relations between employer and employee, to secure for the workers safety, health and good wages, are reported.

The Department of Common Welfare is a weekly review of the latest achievements in the fields of civics, education, sanitation, housing, health, child labor, probation and other court work, and all movements of social progress.

The Survey is first and always an open forum for free discussions. In its pages, particularly in the Communication Department, radical and conservative, idealist and cynic, meet on an equal footing and thrash out their differences.

The price of The Survey is \$3.00 per year or we will send to any reader of the New Review a three months' trial subscription for 50c.

THE SURVEY ASSOCIATES, Inc.
105 East 22nd St.,
New York City

The Public

is a *Newspaper* that aims to be right rather than sensational; that gives, in concise and plain terms, all the news that will live.

The Public is an *Editorial* paper that puts all public questions to the supreme test of obvious moral principles and stands by the results.

While The Public's editorial policy is as broad as fundamental democracy itself, its editorials and special articles frequently deal with the land question, because the right settlement of it is the first step toward freedom.

John Kent, Waukeee, Ia., says:
The Public gets better every issue. As I have told you, I am a Socialist, but I want The Public to go on. The Land question appeals to some people to whom Socialism doesn't.

W. R. Eastman, Schenectady, N. Y., writes:
Altho I am a socialist of the deepest dye, I know a good thing when I see it, and, consequently have said for a long time that if I could not have access to more than one paper or periodical I should choose The Public by all means. It always gives me the cream of all that is worth printing, and it seems to me few if any events of real importance escape it. To the best of my knowledge it is always on the right side. W. R. EASTMAN, Schenectady, N. Y.

Read The Public for a time and judge for yourself. Published weekly, \$1.00 a year. Subscribe now and we will send you FREE a copy of "Social Problems," by Henry George. Send \$1.00 today. We will refund, if later you feel dissatisfied.

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago

Help the NEW REVIEW by Patronizing Its Advertisers

DECEMBER, 1914

New Review

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIA

DID CAPITALISM WANT THE WAR?

By John Moody

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN COLORAD

By Helen Marot

THE ELECTIONS

By Frank Bohn

RUSSIA THE REAL MENACE

By Charles P. Steinmetz

THE NEW MAP OF EUROPE

By William English Walling

THE WAR AND DOGMA

By Mary White Ovington

Shall the International Be Reorganized?