

May
15th

New Review

Ten
Cents

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. III.

10c a Copy.

Published on the first and fifteenth of the month.

\$1.50 a Year.

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
THE SOCIALISM OF THE SWORD.....	25	THE NOVELS OF DOSTOEVSKY.....	38
Louis C. Fraina.		Floyd Dell.	
CURRENT AFFAIRS	27	BOOK REVIEWS	39
L. B. Boudin.		TREITSCHKE; GERMAN SOCIALIST WAR LITERATURE; REVOLUTIONARY	
THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST.....	29	FUTURE OF RUSSIA.	
Nicholas Russel.		A SOCIALIST DIGEST.....	41
"THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NORTH".....	32	THE TREND TOWARD STATE SOCIALISM IN THE BELLIGERENT NATIONS;	
Covington Hall.		THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS' PEACE TERMS; THE BRITISH SOCIALISTS	
SOLIDARITY AND SCABBING.....	34	AND PEACE; INTERPRETING JAPAN'S DEMANDS UPON CHINA; BERN-	
Austin Lewis.		STEIN AND THE FRENCH SOCIALISTS.	
BILLY SUNDAY AS A SOCIAL SYMPTOM.....	36	CORRESPONDENCE	45
Phillips Russell.		From Felix Grendon; Floyd Dell.	

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

The Socialism of the Sword

By Louis C. Fraina

THE military State Socialism imposed upon the belligerent nations by implacable necessity is not a new phenomenon in the scope of its purpose; it is a new phenomenon in its application and social consequences.

The theory of the older Socialism of the Sword was lucidly stated by Benjamin Franklin.

"Property is the creature of society and society is entitled to the last farthing whenever society needs it."

This is a recognition of the right of the state to protect itself and the power of the state to seize its citizens and their property as means of protection. The language of Franklin, "Society is entitled to the last farthing," indicates the method,—taxation and expropriation. Property was taxed, destroyed, stolen by the state, but economic activity was not fundamentally altered by the decrees of the state. Socially, that was not State Socialism; it was an action of the state economically and socially destructive, and not constructive.

The ancient prerogative of a state to protect itself assumes the form of State Socialism only when the state denies the right of private property in industry; only when the state regulates economic activity thoroughly and arbitrarily and absorbs within itself the means of production of the nation. *Formerly the state simply taxed property; now it RE-ORGANIZES industry.* The change is tremendous and fundamental. Previous wars while being waged were purely destructive; constructive economic and social changes usually followed *after* and not during the

war. Now, however, these constructive changes occur in the midst of war itself. While the armies of the nations slaughter each other, the state organizes and transforms the internal social system. The Napoleonic wars destroyed the old order of things in Europe, but except in France the new order was developed many years later. *The Great War, however, is constructing the basis of the new order of things at the same time that it destroys the old.* The work of destruction and construction proceeds simultaneously. In this new phenomenon lies one of the great hopes of progress as a consequence of the war.

The belligerent nations are instituting State Socialism by the absorption of economic activity within the control of the state. This was impossible in a society of isolated individual production; it is possible and practicable only in a society in which industry is highly developed. This pre-supposes economic unity within the state, the reality or illusion of common economic interests, national enthusiasm and solidarity; all of which pre-supposes or produces the *war of peoples* in place of simply the war of nations. States are no longer organized as competing military powers, but as basically competing economic groups. Out of this proceeds the implacable necessity of State Socialism during the war. In all the belligerent nations—in Germany most, in Russia least—the economic forces are mobilized for war, offensively and defensively.

In the fact that it is a *war of peoples* and a *war of economics* lies the dynamic social significance of the Great War. It is a war of peoples not alone be-

cause of universal military service and its huge armies, but because the people at home are fighting in a very real sense as much as those at the front and because they believe they have a stake in the country worth protecting—are a part of the nation. It is a war of economics not alone because industry is mobilized, but because *all* the forces of the nation, close-knit by economic unity, are brought within the scope of the war—utilized, affected, transformed. A war possessing these social characteristics must necessarily produce fundamental and permanent changes, economically, politically, culturally.

Considering its economic basis, the State Socialism of the belligerent nations, while an expedient of war, is not necessarily a temporary expedient. All the more does it possess the quality of permanency because the emergency acts of the governments strengthen a previously-existing and powerful State Socialist tendency. Internationally the war is bound to modify national individualism in favor of federation of nations; nationally the war strikes a powerful blow, perhaps the final blow, at the decrepit system of economic individualism.

The war does not produce new forces and a new line of progress, but caps the climax of the evolutionary developments proceeding in the bosom of pacific society. It destroys that which was on the verge of destruction and strengthens that which was ascending into power.

Those who still cling to the system of economic individualism imagine the compulsory collectivism of the war to be temporary because "this whole government regimentation has meant great sacrifices for many classes." But these sacrifices are the sacrifices of war; part and parcel of the Socialism of the Sword, they are incidental and temporary in State Socialism itself.

The old argument of inefficiency is being revived. It is pointed out that graft and corruption and vicious speculation are actively at work. These triple evils, however, are nothing new; present in all wars, they were actively at work in the American Civil War and in the wars of the French Revolution. They were incidental to the social changes proceeding during those epochs, just as they are incidental to the social changes implied in military State Socialism. Besides, graft and corruption are a more or less normal phase of Capitalism.

Prejudices are more pertinacious than economics. While titanic events marking the birth of a new era are revolutionizing the economics of the world, immediately and potentially, the arguments and ideological conceptions of a moribund system of things still persist and will continue to persist. Ideological superstructures do not change as easily as their economic and social foundations.

The devotees of economic individualism desperately hope that labor will prevent permanent State

Socialism. The *New York Evening Post* expresses this attitude beautifully:

"The man with the tools is to be regulated as minutely as the man with money. And there can be no doubt at all that Kitchener methods enforced upon British workmen after the war would lead to loud protests and a political revolt. . . . It would be, to them, only one more oppressive display of the power of the capitalistic state."

Exactly; but it has never been assumed by revolutionary Socialists that State Socialism meant anything else than the governmental regulation alike of labor and capital. American progressivism has made this clear.

The potential revolt of the workers and the capitalist fear of the proletariat would strengthen instead of weakening State Socialism.

The despotic control of industry exercised by a State Socialist regime would impress upon the workers the idea and necessity of industrial self-government. The class struggle, while transformed and simplified, would become more acute and pervasive. The unity of the heterogenous elements of the capitalist class implied in State Socialism would strengthen that class, and greater resistance provoked among the workers.

State Socialism strengthens the potentiality of proletarian revolt—in that lies the promise and social mission of State Socialism. But the proletariat would not revolt to re-introduce the economic individualism of the bourgeois; it would revolt to introduce industrial self-government, that is to say, Socialism.

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

Published by the New Review Publishing Association
256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALEXANDER FRASER JULIUS HEIMAN LOUIS C. FRAINA
President Treasurer Secretary

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

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

Current Affairs

By L. B. Boudin

Trial by Jury and the Working Class

JOHN R. LAWSON, Executive member of the United Mine Workers of America and leader of the striking miners in Colorado during the recent strike, has been convicted of murder in the first degree. Concededly Lawson did not actually kill anybody, and the prosecution rested on a legal fiction, which, if permitted to become the law of the land, will place every strike leader within the shadow of the gallows. It is therefore up to the working class of this country not only to see to it that this particular conviction is annulled,—one of the most infamous in the long list of outrages perpetrated by our Capitalist Class against the workers within the last few years under the forms of law; but that the principle upon which it rests be not permitted to become part of our jurisprudence.

There is another phase of the subject which the working class ought to consider very seriously. No amount of legal fiction could have convicted Lawson if the jury which tried him had not been as eager to send him to the gallows or life imprisonment as was the prosecutor himself. Remember the readiness with which other juries have within the last few years been convicting all those who participated in the class-struggle on labor's side, no matter how absurd the charges or insufficient the proof. Now, trial by jury has justly been considered one of the bulwarks of our liberties and one of the principal securities provided in free countries against injustice and oppression. Why, then, has trial by jury failed to protect the working-class of this country against palpable injustice?

The answer is: *the working class never really gets trial by jury.* What it gets is a sham and a fraud, palmed off under the forms of trial by jury. Trial by jury does not mean a trial by twelve men instead of by one or three; nor does it mean trial by laymen instead of trial by men learned in the law. What it really means is a trial by *one's peers*, that is a trial by men of the same condition of life, *members of one's own class.* Magna Charta therefore declares that: "No freeman shall be arrested, or detained in prison . . . unless by the lawful judgment of his peers." And the judgment of *one's peers* is just as necessary for the protection of liberty in a struggle between one class and another as it is in a contest between a subject and his king.

But a workingman is never tried by a jury of his peers. There were no workingmen on the Lawson Jury. And when a workingman is tried for an offense growing out of the class-struggle he is not only not tried by a jury of his peers, but the

jury is usually composed of members of the class against which he has committed the offense for which he is being tried. How can he expect justice at the hands of such a jury?

The Political Mood

THE wave of reaction which has come over this country since the last presidential election shows no signs of receding. On the contrary, the indications are that it is still on the upward sweep, and will continue to rise for some time to come, probably until the next presidential election is over. In the language of the *New York Times* and its confrères—"the country is tired of political agitation" and wants a rest.

The manifestations of the "chastened mood" of our electorate are many and diverse, but they all point one way—*the way backwards.* Those of our radicals and progressives who have not themselves been "chastened" by the backward sweep of the political trend look with dismay upon their shattered hopes, whether those were pinned upon the official Progressive Party or upon "progressivism" generally. Wisconsin, the great "Experiment in Democracy," the State of Hope of all the academic and journalistic "me too" Socialists, has turned out a false light, a *fata morgana.* And the Progressive Party, in which the more practical among them placed their faith, lies shattered in pieces.

This has put our radicals and some of our Socialists in a quandary: *What of the morrow?* Until now the task before them seemed to be clear enough: Put the People in control. The People in control of their political machinery, free from the incubus of corrupt political bosses and the shackles put upon them by the "special interests," will right everything and we shall enter upon a glorious era of "progress" and *social reform.* But now that *The People* untrammelled and unbossed have turned their face backwards, as they have done in Wisconsin and the West generally, who shall turn the tide? And our poor radicals stand bewildered, not knowing how to account for the strange and, to them, inexplicable behavior of "The People"; nor what to do next. Some of them have themselves become chastened under the influence of the prevailing political mood, and intend henceforth to move slow, very, very slow. And the rest are just wondering, troubled in spirit, and without light or leading.

Social Reform and Taxes

IT is of course impossible to discuss adequately in the space of a brief note all the reasons for the collapse of the progressive movement in this country. And we shall not attempt to do so here. But the main reason may at least be pointed out. It is this:

"The People" as such are neither progressive nor

radical; no more than they can be said to be conservative. Whether or not "*the people*" will be progressive depends entirely on who are "the people" we look to and what kind of "progressivism" we expect from them. It so happens that "the people" whom our quondam progressive movement looked to were the farmers and the lower strata of the bourgeoisie, the so-called "small man." Now you can get your "small man" interested in and even enthusiastic over "progressivism" as long as that means more political power to himself, particularly where it is intimately connected with his economic needs, such as lower freight rates, cheaper public utilities, and similar things. But you cannot get him interested in, much less enthusiastic over, "progressivism" when that comes to mean *labor legislation*, or social legislation on such a scale and of such a kind that he doesn't get most of the benefit accruing from it.

You may, by adroit manœuvring, get him to put such "planks" into his "progressive" platform, as part of a political plan to get the working man to vote for his "progressive" ticket. But you can do this only so long as you can make him believe that the workingman's *progressivism*, if meant at all seriously, is to be brought about at the expense of the "special interests." The moment he discovers that it may be done at his own expense, or at the expense of the community at large, that is at the expense of the *taxpayers*, he is done with progressivism. Your "small man" is the most implacable enemy of high taxes that the world has ever produced. He may hate bosses and political corruption, but he hates high taxes more. In fact his chief objection to bosses and political corruption is that they have the hateful tendency of increasing the tax rate.

The progressives of Wisconsin and the West generally have discovered that the kind of progressivism which their leaders have been preaching of late, owing to the political exigencies of the situation, is not their own progressivism pure and undefiled, but the kind that raises the tax-rate. They discovered, for instance, that their beloved LaFollette, the hero of so many campaigns against the "special interests," suddenly developed a propensity towards workmen's compensation and similar extravagances which reflected painfully on the tax lists. So down went the noble hero to smash, and perhaps to political oblivion—a warning example to "progressive leaders" to make sure what kind of "progressivism" their following will stand for. And it would be well if some of our Socialists, too, would examine the progressive movement of this country a little more closely so that they may know the kind of progressivism they are dealing with before they make it the basis of their actions or prognostications.

The Constitutional Convention

IT is very unfortunate that the Convention to revise the fundamental law of the State of New York should meet at a time of general reaction. That the reactionary wave should be particularly strong in the Empire State, is, of course, only natural. New York has always prided itself upon its "conservative temper," and this pride has on the whole been justified. In the election of 1914 this "conservative temper" took the form of a Republican landslide, which brought about, among other things, the election of Mr. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., as the first popularly elected United States Senator from the Empire State. This proved clearly that the people can do for themselves what many imagined only Murphy and Barnes could do for them.

Just where the reactionaries intend to drive their principal wedge is hard to tell just now. But the indications are that whatever else they do, the Judiciary Article is going to receive their most serious consideration. Our elective judiciary has long been a thorn in the side of our "best citizens." Their ideal is an "independent judiciary"—that is a judiciary independent of any political machine and therefore thoroughly devoted to the interests of the capitalist class as a whole. Such a judiciary is to be had only under an appointive system. So long as "progressivism" and "radicalism" were in the ascendant and the people were clamoring for the recall of judges, an appointive judiciary could only be an ideal to be cherished secretly. But now that reaction is rampant many feel that the time is ripe for the realization of this fond dream. Nice little plans have, therefore, been submitted to the Convention for an appointive judiciary, under the plea of taking the judiciary "out of politics."

The Convention and the Socialist Party

THE New York State Executive Committee has appointed a committee to prepare a plan of action in connection with the Constitutional Convention.

A Conference on May 22 is to decide what demands are to be made by it upon the Constitutional Convention, but the Socialist Party will submit to the Conference a list of demands for consideration.

This action is to be heartily welcomed. Of course, such conferences are likely to open the doors wide for all sorts of questionable political adventures. But a Socialist Party must not abdicate its functions of leading and directing the working class, in order to preserve its own innocence. Action is the law of all life, including the life of parties. We must therefore take some risks rather than do nothing. Particularly since the history of our own party has conclusively proven that we may soil our hands even while doing nothing or next to nothing.

The War in the Far East

By Nicholas Russel (Japan)

HUMAN history is the history of man's relations and corresponding attitude towards his environment—elemental and social. The roots of these relations are deeply buried in the animal struggle for existence; their branches vanish in the still foggy heights of the "brotherhood of man" based on principles of solidarity and harmonious, co-ordinated, spontaneous co-operation.

We started as slaves of our elemental environment, which we symbolized first as the bloodthirsty, cruel tyrant of the Old Testament, a tyrant who delighted in contortions of the burning body and the smell of burning flesh. It was the state of absolute, unconditional submission. *Primos deos fecit timor.*

With the growth of knowledge grew our ascendancy over the environment. Our symbols softened. In the New Testament man regards the god-environment as a merciful and loving father. In our own days, when Jove with his thunderbolts has been brought down from Olympus and put to the task of messenger boy and motor driver, our ideas of, and our attitude to, the elemental environment assume the monistic aspect: we pride ourselves in being a *living part of one great living whole*, of the great universal entity.

Recent research in Mesopotamia has shown civilization possessed of a common root. It started among the Akkadians or Simmerians (of Turanian stock) some 7,000 years ago. To them we owe our calendar, our numeral system and a number of important inventions and discoveries. Civilized life spread in two opposite directions: *east* and *west*, from Mesopotamia. After a long journey around the globe civilization recently met on the shores of Japan.

The difference in the attitude of man towards his elemental and social environment is the key to the understanding of the fundamental difference between the two civilizations; between the East and the West, the Eastern and the Western man, the Eastern and the Western mind.

The fortunes of the two waves were quite different in this respect. With the Western wave, after many vicissitudes and tribulations, ups and downs, man ultimately emerged triumphant over the elemental environment; he gradually emancipated himself from the bondage; first, in the domain of *intellect* (ancient civilizations and later European Renaissance); then in the domain of *conscience* (Reformation); still later, *politically* from the tutelage of the state, to whom the power of the elemental environment in the course of evolution was delegated, (French Revolution and English Magna Charta).

Finally in Socialism we see the dawn of the approaching *economical* emancipation. Such are the principal mile-posts marking the epochs of Western history.

A different fate awaited the Eastern wave. The awe-inspiring majesty of the physiographical environment: high mountain chains, large rivers, stormy seas, extensive deserts, extreme continental temperature variations, proved so many unsurmountable obstacles on its way, on the way of human progress, obstacles that kept man what he was—an abject slave of this environment; the slave who had no choice but to regulate his conduct in accordance with its dictations; never to lose sight of the past, lest he lose the Ariadne's thread of tradition, sever the umbilical cord attaching him to mother nature. The only guide was the experience of the past,—“the wisdom of ancestors.” Every departure from it was a sacrilege. Wherever and whenever through collective effort and some fortunate combination of circumstances he succeeded in partly emancipating himself from his surroundings, the same elemental forces (as manifested in social organization) stepped in and asserted their sway. Such was oriental despotism. At the best, it was but a change of masters: elemental forces of social character replacing the direct categorical imperatives of the ambient surroundings.

After 7,000 years' journey in opposite directions the two waves have effected their connection in the Far East, as if animated with antagonistic principles: on one side man was found in control of the elemental environment (and to some extent of social); on the other, environment in control of the body and soul of man. Two confluent rivers, say blue and white, like the Rhone and Arve in the neighborhood of Geneva, for quite a distance run in the same bed as the two parallel ribbons until gradually their waters mix and assume a uniform color.

Here is the source of all the sharp contrasts characteristic of life in the Far East, contrasts making the sum total of the Far-Eastern situation. The gradual neutralization of these contrasts by arming the East with the knowledge of the West, Western principles and Western methods, producing man's control of his surroundings, will constitute the warp and woof of the future history of this part of the globe, the history into whose future we propose to cast a glance.

Qualitatively and quantitatively war is the ultimate manifestation, the culminating point of the competitive system. Qualitatively—because it is a result to the *ultima ratio* of all competition—physical

force. Quantitatively, because it represents the final and supreme effort, the maximum of stress of accumulated energy.

The antidote for war lies in the substitution of the principle of co-operation for that of competition. The pendulum, after having reached its extreme, must swing back.

The Great War is the last phase, the last act of social-economical strife and elemental national-political division. It is their last word: *reductio ad absurdum*. The system of armed peace, a silly invention of Prussian Junkers, is at bottom nothing but a race between the taxpayer and the inventor, the race inevitably resulting in the triumph of the second and the bankruptcy of the first. From this *impasse* there is but one way out—the *abolition of competition in international relations and of the strife between capital and labor*, or rather the transfer, the raising of both forms of competition to a higher plane, that of intellectual and moral achievements, of further victories over the elemental nature, both in its outer and especially *social* manifestations.

The unprecedented strides in scientific and technical knowledge during the last half century, especially through the conquest of space, caused the terrestrial globe, as the habitat of our race, to contract to one-tenth of its former dimensions. Through such contraction continental Europe practically found itself as *one household*, felt itself as *one family* living under the same roof and clamoring for the removal of vexatious traditional elemental, class and national divisions; for the readjustment of all "superstructures" resting on an economic foundation in accordance with the new conditions. Such is the meaning of the present war.

We know that intellectual age does not coincide with the physical one, neither with individuals, nor with social classes. With both mental evolution is liable to be arrested and become stationary. The result is that we meet bearded and whiskered men enjoying boyish games, and entire classes mentally lingering in former centuries. With individuals this phenomenon is called "*oslerization*" in honor of Professor Osler, who gave much attention to that subject. The same phenomenon observable with classes ought to be designated as "*Shaefflerization*," since it was Prof. Shaeffler that called our attention to the fact that the mentality of different strata of society corresponds to different centuries.

It happened that the German nation saw fit to retain in its midst the pugnacious Junker class of big landholders, who as a class are part and parcel of mediæval feudalism, whose psychology and ideals of valor are those of the XVII century. It was like a dead tooth remaining in a healthy jaw. Parallel with the preservation of this social relic Germany preserved in its mass psychology another mental relic of mediævalism, the counterpart of the junkers' arrogant pugnacity—a negative to a positive—obse-

quious pusillanimity of the mediæval villein. It prevented Germany from pulling the dead tooth herself before it became a public nuisance. The old Michel bore patiently the agony of the dead tooth and all its abominations, until a painful boil developed. Then he made such a racket that all the neighbors had to run to his assistance and pull the tooth.

Feudalism has to be destroyed, lock, stock and barrel. *Delenda est Carthago*. The bulwark of reaction, the Bastille, barring the highway to human advance, the mediæval feudalistic survival, the Prussian Junker class, must be annihilated. Thrones and the rest of the mediæval furniture to be moved to the garret or disposed of to antiquarians and curio collectors to find final resting place on museum shelves.

You seldom meet men who realize the magnitude and import of the present international conflict. Reasoning in terms of the past, they expect that in a few months peace will be concluded: France will get Alsace-Lorraine, Russia the Straits, Italy Triest, and so forth. *Such is not the case*. This war represents a social upheaval similar to the great French Revolution. Generations will live on it. Its consequences are countless and incalculable. It removes one of the cards from the very foundation of the elaborately complex card-structure of modern society. And with it the whole structure collapses.

The war deals a mortal blow to the *principle of nationality* as the foundation of political division. The new Europe, that will arise from the ashes, will be built exclusively on the principle of *territorial solidarity*, regardless of all traditional and elemental distinctions. The new Europe will discard the *principle of centralization* by dividing itself into a few hundred sovereign states more or less corresponding to the present and old provincial divisions, form one solid federation with the Federal centre somewhere in The Hague or rather Brussels; constitute itself into *The United States of Europe* cemented by territorial solidarity.

The new Europe will *destroy the system of armed peace*, will disband armies and navies replacing them with *but one* at the disposal of the Federal Government.

The new democratic Europe will carry the *democratic principle* deep into *economics*, wresting the means of production from the hands of the capitalist class and returning them to whom they belong in equity—to the associations of workers, to municipal, county, state and federal authorities.

How fast all this constructive work will be realized is hard to tell, but *it must be fast since life among roofless ruins is not pleasant*.

The great international cataclysm constitutes a prelude to a series of great events. It is the last gasp of the expiring capitalist system and the first breath of the social revolution. All prominent Socialist thinkers, including Marx and Engels, have

predicted that social revolution will be initiated with a great international conflict.

Parallel with the European continental federation England with her colonies may form another similar constellation. Central and South America will follow suit and North and South Africa will not remain long behind.

Assuming that the above prognostications are probable, we may revert to our subject—the influence that European events will exert upon the future of the Far East.

Let us remember first that the keynote of this future will remain the *amalgamation of Eastern and Western civilizations, the lifting of the Eastern man to the Western level through arming him with Western knowledge, thus asserting his mastery over the elemental environment.*

Hitherto the United States has and still plays the part of the principal school teacher, and one may expect that it will continue in that rôle for a long time. For a long time its moral and intellectual influence will predominate. The United States is not a conqueror. The territorial acquisition of the Philippines, Hawaii, etc., was incidental and irrelevant to the all important mission that it has fulfilled thus far in this part of the world. The concatenation of facts such as the opening of Japan to the world's intercourse; the essential contribution to the building of the Japanese educational system; the enlightenment of China by a host of American teachers and missionaries, enlightenment that resulted in the overthrow of the monarchy; finally, the education and democratization of the Philippines cannot be explained away by chance combination of circumstances or the gravitation towards oriental markets. There must lie at the bottom of all this reasons by no means occult or mystical, but belonging to a higher category of sociological knowledge not unlike the contrapunt or thorough bass in music. Every great nation had her world's mission. As examples I may point to the Reformation in Germany, the Great French Revolution, the English Magna Charta and constitutionalism, her championship of individual liberty.

Why should the United States be an exception?

Why should the United States have come to the Far East (as one of the "republican" Philippine Commissioners—for Public Instruction, too—Elliot by name, expressed himself in a public address in Manila), *"to trade on the principles of the open door and equal opportunity"*?

Japan had started her part on the Far Eastern stage first, as a promising pupil; after graduation she was promoted to the important post of the assistant school teacher. If this simile is correct, any fisticuff conflict in the school room between the two, with pupils around as spectators, would constitute the most amusing chapter of "The Comedy of Uni-

versal History." Whatever comes, let us hope, *we will not lose our temper and debase ourselves to such ridicule.*

I do not believe that Japan, at least as long as the Philippines in some shape or other are attached to the United States, cherishes any serious designs in that direction. In case of abandonment there may be some temptation, and that is reason enough for American retention of the Philippines.

The mass of the Philippine people is doing well under the present regime, and, being a-politic is entirely indifferent to "independence." This question of independence is agitated exclusively by the ambitious and office-hungry class of politicians. The middle and upper classes find themselves too comfortable to tempt providence, to take the risk of falling into the pit of Mexican pronunciamientos. At the best, the question of Philippine independence is but a huge misunderstanding. Real independence is in local self-government, of which the Philippines have full measure. As for certain sovereign rights: foreign relations, war and peace, tariff, etc., every State of the Union has it delegated to the Federal authorities, and in this respect the Philippines are not worse off than New York or California. I do not intend to convey the idea that the present American regime is perfect. Far from it; it is too bureaucratic, paternalistic and unprincipled, too much flavored with the corner grocery spirit, but it is the best that the Philippines can have under the circumstances. A true Philippine patriot, such as Jose Rizal, in these circumstances would ignore politics and use his best efforts to emancipate the Philippine people from their worst and most dangerous enemies: *hookworm, padres and professional politicians.* The outside danger to the Philippines (if danger it is) lies in the fact that, at a most conservative estimate, they are capable of sustaining one hundred and fifty millions of population in lieu of the present eight millions; and with hookworm in the intestines, padre on the neck and a politician in every pocket, the Philippines seem unable to populate the land with their own resources. The ethnical pressure is too uneven on both sides of the Chinese sea. Notwithstanding all restrictions and enforcement of the United States emigration law, the infiltration of Chinese goes merrily on. They constitute the majority of the commercial class and of skilled labor, especially in the country. They intermarry with Philipinos and procreate mestizos of a higher intellect, character and efficiency than any of the numerous pure Philippino nationalities. Peaceful Chinese absorption of these islands racially, as well as of the rest of the Malay group, seems inevitable.

The immediate effect of the titanic struggle in Europe upon the Far East will be the relaxation, if not the total collapse, of the deleterious military, diplomatic and capitalistic pressure of foreign na-

tions. The attention of the European powers will for a long time be riveted on home affairs and cannot admit of any active policy in this part of the world. For a long time the Far East will be left to its own resources, so that with the moral, intellectual and probably economic influence of the United States, there remain in the Far Eastern stage but two actors: Japan and China. Their mutual attitude and relations will constitute the fundamental aspect of future events. What will those relations be?

Before attempting even a problematic answer to that question, we must remember that the European social-economical and national-political upheaval resulting in social revolution, economic and political internationalization, decentralization and democratization, will not fail to profoundly influence the Far East. One may expect that both the Chinese and Japanese will take a lesson and spontaneously follow suit in the great transformation. How far and how fast will they go? They cannot keep abreast with the West, being economically and psychologically not fully prepared, but their advance will be faster than was ours. They will not have to repeat the evolutionary phases through which we passed, no more than they need repeat experiments of Fulton and Watts. They will accept and imitate our latest productions. Their task in social, economic and political relations, as in industrial technique, will be so much easier; and one must expect they will not lag behind too much. They will rapidly summarize untold centuries of Western evolution, as the human embryo summarizes the life-history of the race.

In order to unravel with some degree of probability the main features of the future relations of Japan and China one must consider the profound psychological and social difference between these two great oriental nations, the difference in locality and of the elemental and social environment.

The Chinese are slower but steadier both in thought and action as compared with the more quick and more inflammable Japanese. They feel an organic distrust of authority, being collectivistic in their nature. Whereas Japan beats Germany as a classical country for all kind of state socialistic experiments emanating from above, China's initiative and plans of action invariably come from the people, from all kind of secret and open organizations and associations. Compared with the peace-loving, soldier-despising Chinaman, the Japanese in the mass is pugnacious and aggressive when led by a constituted authority. Like Germany, with all the decorative constitutionalism (about 2 per cent. of population vote in the elections), Japan is still in the hands of two military clans, Satsuma and Choshu, of whom one controls the navy and the other the army. To what extent European disarmament will be followed by Japan it is impossible to say. Taxation is al-

ready crushing the masses. The small farmer, the backbone of the country, finds his vocation already unprofitable because of the heavy taxation. Accordingly he sells his small holdings, which fall into the hands of large holders and land speculators. In spite of such ominous facts, the peacefully inclined premier, Okuma—President of the local Pacifist Branch—favors the formation of two army divisions and the building of new superdreadnoughts. It is hard to believe that Japanese disarmament will proceed as fast and be as radical as one is justified to expect in Europe. In any event hardly any steps will be taken in this direction before Japanese relations to China and the United States will fully clear up. The demands from China as formulated by the present Japanese Government justify the belief that Japan intends to assume military and economic dominance in China with a view to a prospective federation, in which Japan will reserve first fiddle to herself. So far all the advantages are on the Japanese side; China is helpless. She is bound to follow the policy of non-resistance to evil and sullenly admit the intruder, and later on . . . deal with the new intruder as she dealt with the numerous intruders in her hoary past: swallow and digest him in a calm, systematic fashion, as a phagocyt does with a microbe.

“The Conscience of the North”

By Covington Hall

IT is well sometimes to “see ourselves as others see us,” wherefore, I propose to try to show the North how its much boasted “conscience” looks to us of the “Repressed South.”

The spirit to write this exposure of “the conscience of the North” came over me on reading Mr. Joseph C. Manning's article in the NEW REVIEW for March on “The Repressed South,” which is, in the main, absolutely correct, and far worse true.

But who aided and abetted the “Democratic” party in its infamous suppression and betrayal of the South? It is certain that the old slave owning Aristocracy is no longer a power in Dixie, for its property rights were long ago expropriated and its sons and daughters are now scattered to the four winds of the earth, the vast majority of them, even in the South, being either wage workers or working farmers or professionals. Their property rights being destroyed, their political power is, according to Marx, and in truth and fact, non-existent. Therefore, who aided and abetted the “Democratic” party in the peonizing of the “New South”? What and who are the economic powers behind this party, the most shameless political machine that ever engineered the looting and enslavement of any land?

Not only does Mr. Manning tell the entire truth when he shows how the "Democratic" oligarchy disfranchised the Negro and Colored voters, but also when he points out that they used the "race question" (which, as he well says, is no question at all) to disfranchise the majority of the white voters along with them. But it is also true that there must have been some strong economic power behind and urging on the "Democratic" party to commit this crime against their own people; nor was disfranchisement by any means the worst and foulest crime committed against the people of the South—the looting of vast natural resources was their crime of crimes and the "race question" was and is only raised to divide the wage workers and working farmers and thus render more easy the taking of the loot.

Who got this loot? For it is on this loot that the present industrial and political system of the South rests. It is from it that peonage and tenantry and all their degrading evils have come. On this loot rests the economic power that controls the modern South. Around and for its protection is organized all the political and other repressive forces by which the people of the South are held in a subjection like unto that of Mexico under the reign of Diaz The Damned.

Therefore, who got this loot?—*Northern Capitalists* got it, Capitalists who own practically the entire state of Louisiana. They are our Lumber, Cotton, Sugar, Fruit, Railroad, Shipping, Banking, Oil and Sulphur Kings. They are the dominant economic power in Louisiana and all other Southern states today and the "Democratic" party is nothing but their political chattel slave, self-sold and for a price that Benedict Arnold would have scorned and spurned.

They are the fathers of peonage, the most grueling and pitiless form of slavery ever devised, since, unlike chattel slavery, the master has no monetary interest in the body and welfare of his servant and need not, therefore, care what comes to him or of him, as the old time slave holders were forced to do, since, just prior to the breaking out of the war, common laborers cost, in Louisiana, as much as \$1,500 apiece. This forced his master to watch over at least the slave's physical welfare and that of his children, just as he was forced to watch over that of his horses and their colts—because it *paid*, and I would have liked to have seen any detective, gunman or deputy sheriff, even though he were "duly and lawfully commissioned" by the "Democratic" party, attempt to murder or manhandle such a slave, or to commit against the slaves the thousand and one crimes the hellions of the Lumber Trust daily and hourly inflict upon its peons, white as well as black. The old planter aristocracy would have had the hellion attempting any such deeds landed in jail or on the gallows "before sundown." They would have

been outraged at his deeds, because he was injuring *their property*. Not so is it with the peon masters—they have nothing to lose by an injury to or the death of the peon; he cost them nothing. Therefore they owe him no duty, yet they demand of him all service. Peonage is, as it were, a marriage of wage and chattel slavery, in which the slave has none of the benefits and all of the evils of chattel slavery. And peonage is the form of slavery inflicted on the Southern wage workers and working farmers by the economic might of Northern Capitalists.

Therefore, to what "conscience of the North" does Mr. Manning, and the rest who are always mouthing this phrase, wish to appeal? That part of "the conscience of the North" which is profiting by this infamous system of slavery is not going to be touched by any such appeal. As a matter of fact it is trying to extend this system over the entire Continent. If the wage workers and working farmers of the South lie down and wait until *any* conscience in the North, or elsewhere, wakes up and comes and saves them, they are going to wait a mighty long time. Besides, a people who can't save themselves are not worth saving. If that's the best we can hope for, to be saved from "on high," the sooner we are sent to hell in a hand-basket the better.

Economic power disfranchised the Southern workers and looted us of our native land. It was economic power, that here and in West Virginia, Michigan, Colorado, Montana and elsewhere, abrogated and abolished the "rights" "guaranteed" in and by the Constitution of the United States, all of which has led me to the conclusion that the Syndicalists are about correct when they assert that "constitutional rights" without the economic power to enforce them are not worth the paper they are written on, and that whether that piece of paper be the holy constitution of the United States or the beautiful constitution of Mexico.

The first thing the Southern workers should attempt is not the waking of "the conscience of the North," but their own class conscience, and, not to seek first and mainly political re-enfranchisement, but to begin at once the organization of powerful industrial unions, class organization that will have the *might* to make good every *right* they think worth *taking*.

It is in this connection that I charge the Socialist party as being the most cowardly political organization in America today and I hold "the conscience of the North" mainly and principally responsible for the present *debacle* in the American Socialist and Labor Movement. It is from *you* that have come the "leaders" who have led nowhere but into the quagmires of compromise and middle class politics and unionism. It was *you* who gave us "Centralism" and bureaucracy, those twin curses of the Labor Movement. It is *you* who practically control our entire press. It is *you* who advise us to wait and

vote, we, the vote-less, in the midst of terrific struggles like that of the Louisiana Lumberjacks. It is *you* who waste reams and reams of ink and paper on philosophical dissertations on the European war while the "Democratic" "leaders" of Texas are sending Rangel, Cline and their comrades, men who *acted* in the cause of liberty, to the filthy prisons of that looted state and, while they were doing the will of their Northern masters, you had hardly a word to say—you let the Scalawags of the South wreak their will on these defenseless comrades with barely a line in their behalf—you, "the conscience of the North"!

If there is one thing on earth we Southerners have good reason to look on with super-suspicion, it is "the conscience of the North." Capitalistically it has

looted and enslaved us; revolutionarily (?) it has passed anti-sabotage laws against us; it has tenanted and peonized us; added insult to injury; so, from what and all we have seen of it, it is no wonder that it looks like the most conscienceless thing we ever butted into. Therefore, we say let "the conscience of the North" and the constitution of the United States go to hell. Let's wake up the *fighting conscience of the workers*. Come alive! You're dead and don't know it and we are dead and do. That's the only real difference between your hamstrung "conscience" and ours. Lastly, the least "conscience" we are burdened with in the waging of the class war the sooner will victory perch on the banners of the working class, the sooner will the State be crushed by the Commonwealth.

Solidarity and Scabbing

By Austin Lewis

WE are all familiar with the punishment of the scab and the approval which such punishment meets among working people. This approval, even of actual violence, is an abhorrent surprise to the middle classes. That one cannot work when he likes where he likes and for what he likes, strikes at the very foundations of that individual liberty which underlies the middle class state and which the ordinary middle class citizen regards as essential to his welfare. But such liberty has been found to be incompatible with the prosperity and even with the life of working people, and hence, the workers obedient to the ordinary ethical code as they are, are obliged by the circumstances of their life to make another ethical code, which transcends the value of the former since it is obligatory upon them, or to use the current term, "makes for life."

With the advent of the solidarity notion however the question of scabbing becomes even more important than before, for it is vital to organized labor that it should be able to maintain itself intact and present a firm front to its enemies.

It could only do this in the future as it has frequently done in the past by virtue of a sort of terrorism combined with sentimental appeals if it were not for the growth in the idea of labor solidarity. But the development of industry, with the gradual substitution of unskilled for skilled labor, has worked a recent and rapid change in the conditions with which skilled labor is confronted in times of strikes or lock outs.

Under the system in which the skilled had a sort of monopoly by virtue of his skill, the justification of the use even of violence against scabs is very apparent. The strikers, or the men locked out, were

engaged in a fight which tended to improve or maintain conditions in the particular craft. All who practised that craft share, of necessity, in the gains made for it by organized labor, even though they were not members of the union. The treachery of those who, for a transitory and monetary advantage took the place of their fellow craftsmen and thus reduced the standing of the entire labor body is very apparent. None but the very meanest and most contemptible of men would act as scabs under such conditions, and there is no question of the moral inferiority of the scabs of that period.

But it may happen and indeed increasingly happens that the skilled craft is artificially and unsocially maintaining conditions which are uneconomic and have no industrial justification. This is shown by the fact that unskilled can be substituted for skilled in the event of a strike or lock out. This has been done repeatedly in recent times. In fact unskilled Italians have been known to break a strike in the metal trades and to become so-called skilled workers in the course of a few months.

It is hard for the skilled trades to find any real ground of complaint against these scabs. They do not belong to their organization, they do not even belong to their craft. Benefits which might arise to the craft from the strike do not appeal to them for they will never be members of the craft. They are working in iron today, they may be working in wood tomorrow. There is no appeal to be made to them on any common ground from the trade union point of view.

Indeed they are in such a position that they have a grievance against the skilled crafts which have not only not done anything for them but have actually put obstacles in their way and have made the

tiresome work of earning a living even more difficult than necessary.

So bitterly is this grievance felt in fact that at times the so-called unskilled so far as organized they have frequently resolved to carry on a campaign against the skilled trades from whom they have had so little sympathy and so much antagonism. But they have always refrained from putting their threats into deeds because of that tendency towards solidarity which is so much more effective in the weak than in the strong. Moreover, the feeling, at least among the leaders, that war between the various sections of labor could have nothing but a detrimental effect upon the movement as a whole, has been so powerful that the malcontents have had no chance to put their threats into effect.

Only the most earnest feeling of solidarity could compel men in such a condition as are the unskilled to refrain from scabbing. For the work to which they could gain access by scabbing on the skilled offers so many opportunities for better pay that very marked self denial is required for its refusal.

The extent of the growth of the solidarity notion may be gauged by comparing the conduct of the unskilled in this respect with that of the organized skilled crafts who frequently scab upon one another. In most of such cases jurisdictional disputes are fundamental causes and, as a result of the ill-will and actual hatred engendered by these disputes, we find members of the same craft destroying each other and using actual physical violence in the prosecution of their hatreds.

The strike of electrical workers on the Pacific Coast in 1913 was one of the most notable among many of such occurrences. In this case one organization of electrical workers sided with the employers and when the other union went on strike promptly supplied scabs and worked with the result that hundreds of men were ruined and the efforts made towards improvement in conditions were thrown away.

This case in fact is merely typical of a large number of such which have all tended to make the craft union form more and more popular.

Yet such actions are quite justifiable on an hypothesis which does not set up a standard of solidarity. In fact the case of the electrical workers was regarded in trade union upper circles as disciplinary and as tending to assert the authority of the Federation officers who had declared against one union on the ground of lack of submission to authority.

Still the action of the union which scabbed upon the striking union was popularly regarded as utterly reprehensible and the great majority of the unionists on the Pacific Coast had sympathy for the striking union. Nothing but its defeat really reconciled the mass of the workingmen to the situation which was, of course, hopeless after that. An occur-

rence like this tends to show that the solidarity notion is making headway even among the trade unionists and that another standard than mere craft welfare is being set up.

In this connection we may note the criticism of Jim Larkin in his article "The Underman" in the March, 1915, number of the *International Socialist Review*.

Larkin is a labor leader of tremendous vigor and ability who has managed to get results from material hitherto considered as impossible by the average labor manager. His success has lain in the efficient organization of unskilled labor. Concerning American Federation manifestations in this country he says:

"The Railway Workers are organized in thirteen different unions, each of them charged with having scabbed on the other, and one is humiliated as a worker by being compelled to listen to a gentleman named Brandies boasting that a union spent a million dollars in assisting a shoe manufacturer to break a strike."

In all these instances we find the old ethic, which is not the solidarity but the craft ethic, influencing the actions of the members of the skilled unions. The contrast between this and the new solidarity ethic as exemplified in the actions of the skilled unions as far as they have been organized is sufficiently obvious.

But whereas the trades unions do not scruple to scab upon one another they have naturally still less hesitation in scabbing upon the unskilled.

When a strike has continued for a few weeks and the pinch begins to be felt, numbers of the skilled men on strike are obliged to turn to unskilled labor in order to live. They invade the construction camps and farms and orchards and as they do not look forward to any prolonged period of employment at such occupations they are not particularly interested in maintaining any standards. They work under conditions and for rates of pay which the unskilled who are obliged to make their livelihood permanently at such occupations are struggling to improve, and they thus reduce the general standard for the unskilled and render their attempts at betterment all the more difficult.

This has occurred many times in the West in the history of the attempts of unskilled labor to improve itself. Even where strikes of the unskilled have been made we find the same willingness on the part of the organized craftsmen to actively operate against the strikers. This was true in the very important Big Creek strike in California which was conducted under the auspices of the Industrial Workers and was really vital to the interests of men engaged in the basic Western occupation of construction work.

The case of McKees Rocks, in which an actually victorious strike of unskilled workers was ruined

by the scabbing of skilled men is one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of recent trades unionism.

But in all these cases the actions of the trades unionists did not spring from any wanton desire to injure. They were caused by the fact that the men so scabbing did not understand that they were scabbing. Their ethic reached only to the effects of their actions upon organized trades and not upon workers as workers.

In this respect their point of view is not unlike that of the ancient Greeks whose civism extended only to those who had a panoply and who consequently had no moral responsibilities towards their inferiors who were not so fortunately situated.

Regarding the philosophical concepts behind these manifestations, we are all aware that they are but the persistent natural rights notions which as Robert Rives La Monte (NEW REVIEW—March) has again reminded us are the product of petty handicraft. His remarks in that connection are worth repeating. He says:

“Petty handicraft was moribund in England in the seventeenth century, it was all but dead and buried at the dawn of the nineteenth, and here we are in the second decade of the twentieth still defending or attacking capitalism with weapons forged on the intellectual anvil of petty handicraft.”

These words are still more applicable to the actions of organized labor as far as it has so far manifested itself not only in this country but elsewhere.

The ethical teachings of the machine process have not as yet begun to make themselves felt, unless somewhat feebly among the unskilled workers who are its more immediate victims. These consequently respond more readily to the solidarity idea for in that notion is their sole hope of relief.

If it were possible for a class to change the view point which the circumstances of its origin forced upon it, that class could save itself. But history has shown that such a transformation is impossible. Hence it is extremely improbable, to say the least, that the trades unions can transform themselves into an organization having an ethical basis resting on solidarity rather than on natural rights.

Still, the machine industry is at work and the ethical effects of that industry must of necessity make their impress upon the brains and conduct of the members of the trades who are brought into contact with it. The process is going on as we can see by the sympathy which has risen spontaneously in the ranks of organized labor for the unskilled, as in the Wheatland case. But it has so far not proceeded far enough to affect conduct and it cannot do so without transcending the limits of craft unionism and importing an ethical concept which trades unionism is not capable of supporting.

The higher industrial form should, as a matter of necessity, imply the higher industrial ethical and

really does so. La Monte says that he sees no sign of the action of the machine industry upon the ethical consciousness of the workers, and he claims that Veblen is unable to discover such signs, except in the phenomenon of syndicalism. But conscious Syndicalism is in reality the least of these signs. The new life appears everywhere inside the organization even in its present form. Where they appear however they also threaten the organization, as it now exists. Proof of this is to be found in manifestations which can only be apparent to the close observer of actual phenomena in the world of labor itself. To see them one must be in close contact with the workers themselves. They are necessarily hidden from the student and the critic. If given an opportunity I should be glad to deal with some of these manifestations in later articles.

Billy Sunday as a Social Symptom

By Phillips Russell

THE state of Pennsylvania is at present suffering from a pestilence of religious revivalists.

Like locusts they have settled down upon a population already sorely beset by the thousand evils that accompany a highly developed industrial system. A Philadelphia newspaper recently contained accounts of no less than six “big” revivals in progress in six of the important manufacturing centers in the eastern part of the State. The very heavens resound with cries of “Repent ye!” and the midnight silences echo with the clink of the after-service counting of collections.

It is not without significance that almost coincident with the arrival in Pennsylvania of the Rev. William Ashley Sunday, there was launched by certain mysterious powers a tremendous agitation for laws restricting the sale of liquor and a sudden wave of protest against the passage by the State Legislature of a workmen’s compensation law. It may seem peculiar to connect Mr. Sunday’s religious campaign with the latter two, and yet that such a connection exists is fairly evident.

The manufacturers of the State, than whom there is no more reactionary or purblind group of capitalists in the world, conducted their agitation against the compensation law for some weeks, but made little headway. The new Governor favored the passage of the measure for political reasons; and public sentiment, which generally means middle class sentiment, was behind it for no particular reason except that it was felt that Pennsylvania ought not to lag behind other “great” states in social legislation.

So the manufacturers decided to make the best of the situation, saying, in effect: “Oh, very well; take your old compensation law. But, mind you, if we

have got to pay for accidents that happen in our establishments, there aren't going to be any more accidents. Or if we do continue to have accidents and we do have to pay for them, our profits have got to be increased enough to make up for the difference. We aren't going to have a workingman go out for lunch, take a drink, and then come back into the shop with vision obscured or brain fuddled enough to cause him to lose a hand that will cost us \$500. Nor are we going to permit a man to come in 15 minutes late on a Monday morning because there has been a Sunday night beer party at his house. Booze must be put beyond our workmen's reach. We have got to have more regularity in working hours, more productiveness and more efficiency."

There are two methods, favored throughout history, of separating a man from the thing that he desires. One is to work on his superstitions and make him believe that it is sinful for him to have it; and the other is to work on his fears and threaten him with punishment if he does have it.

The capitalists of Pennsylvania are using both methods in their determination to make the worker efficient, that is, profit-producing.

I have heard Mr. Sunday preach and I have read his sermons. He is not a new thing under the sun, not a freak, not necessarily a crook or a dishonest man. He is simply the Apostle Paul in a 1915 model, well tailored business suit, with St. Paul's outlook on life, but with none of that saint's prosiness or pessimism. Paul was a reformed *roué* and there is nothing so tiresome as a one-time Don Juan's preachments against the sins that he is too old longer to commit.

The Rev. Billy was "one of the boys," too, as he often remarks, with a scarcely suppressed smacking of the lips. So vivid is his description of the wine-bibber's sinful pleasures that he imparts to one an almost overpowering thirst. I don't know when I have absorbed a long, tall, cool glass of beer with more lustfulness, with more Bacchic abandon, than the minute after I had issued from the Sunday tabernacle where I heard the evangelist for the first and only time.

But it is when the Rev. Billy excoriates the sins that are associated with women that he is at his best. Behind each adjective peeps the satyr, behind each jest lurks the saloon loafer with his beery stories. So inflaming to the imagination is his description of the illicit indulgences of the dance, of the exposure of the feminine person seen in the musical comedy chorus, that it is not to be wondered at that a former Marine Corps surgeon who heard him in one of his early sermons in Philadelphia, went to his room and so mutilated himself that he died.

St. Paul's virtues were all negative. Refrain from sin, he said; live clean, be faithful to your masters. So preaches Billy—abstain from liquor and from women, be "on the level" with your boss. In short:

don't drink, because it impairs your efficiency as a profit producer; don't sport with Amaryllis in the shade or play with the tangles of Naera's hair, because you will stay up late and won't feel like working the next day; do your damndest for your employer, because he supplies you with a chance to work for him.

So much for the Rev. Billy as regards Pennsylvania. Why he was brought to Paterson, every one knows. In the most open fashion it was stated that he was needed there to allay the discontent, to divert the minds, of the silk mill workers whose revolt upset the state two years ago.

In addition, there may be another and larger reason for Billy's popularity with the capitalist class and the capitalist press. From remarks heard and signs noted here and there, I have reason to believe that certain large employers of labor were severely frightened by the activities of Frank Tannenbaum and the unemployed in New York last winter a year ago. New York is not, in the strict sense of the word, an industrial center; it is not dependent upon one, two, or a dozen establishments which employ great armies of men. New York's capitalists can afford to be careless and to take chances. But Philadelphia's and Paterson's cannot. Hence the importation of the sooth-saying Billy.

Does Billy earn his pay? He must have done so in Philadelphia. Listen to the words of a Pennsylvania Railroad official at the farewell banquet given to Mr. Sunday:

"Our employees are more courteous, more faithful to their duties, *more efficient*, since Billy came to town."

The italics are mine.

Russia and Germany

THE apologists of Germany and of the action of German Socialist deputies in the Reichstag in voting the war credits love to dwell on the great differences between Russia and Germany. One way of doing it is to dwell continually on "Russian horrors." One of these apologists introduces an article which he recently contributed to the *New York Call* with the following words: "Russia is more than ever like a prison from which only the shrieks of the tortured prisoners reach the outside world"—the implication being, of course, that Germany is ever so much better. We cannot admit that one is better than the other; although we are quite willing to concede that one is worse than the other. The most important difference just now is this:

In Russia a Socialist parliamentary representative is disciplined by his comrades when he votes *for* the government, while in Germany a Socialist parliamentary representative is disciplined by his comrades when he votes *against* the government.

The Novels of Dostoevsky

By Floyd Dell

IT is an experience of the first magnitude to read the novels of Dostoevsky. There has been nothing like them in the world's literature—nothing so volcanically powerful, so searchingly true, so terribly and wonderfully revelatory. Their definite importation into the common stock of literature accessible in English, through the translations of Constance Garnett now being published at the rate of two a year by the Macmillan Company,¹ is likely to be an event of significance in English and American literature.

Fiction can hardly remain the same after it has been touched by Dostoevskian influence. It is an influence which changes our sense of fiction values; it makes us demand as readers, and should make us desire to achieve as writers, those larger boundaries, those abysmal depths and terrific heights of experience which Dostoevsky's art includes. It gives us a new sense of truth which makes the revelations of our standard English novelists seem paltry and insignificant. It must give a tremendous impetus to the fictional expression of the terror and beauty of life.

—Somewhere in the early nineteenth century, people began to believe in civilization. They observed that the earth, the sea, and even in prospect the sky, were being brought under the control of man; they observed that there was a steady improvement in the machinery of production, brought about by invention, and in manners and morals, by law. They idealized this process, with the result that a great value was set upon seeming a little better this year than we were last year. Attention was centered upon a gradually improving mediocrity. The result in science was the popularization of the doctrine of "evolution." The result in literature was the disappearance of the old-fashioned hero and the old-fashioned villain, and the centering of attention on the ordinary citizen, who was neither very good nor very bad, but just a little better than people were a short time ago. Extreme wickedness and extreme goodness went out of fashion in good literature. And this change of literary fashion reflected the current dogma that the human soul was really a respectable affair, something far, far beyond the savage, and aspiring only in a quiet evolutionary way to the sanctities of a utopian future. Such, indeed, is the view that most of us hold of ourselves today.

But a change is coming over us. We are beginning to wonder if after all it isn't easier to be a savage or a saint, or both at once, than it is to be a respectable citizen. We are beginning to suspect that we are not really the respectable citizens that we seem, slowly evolving mediocrities, but a medley of violent extremes of good and evil. A science has already come forward, in the shape of Psychoanalysis, to teach us this. And so perhaps we are ready to learn the same thing from the novels of Dostoevsky.

Five of these novels have already been published in this series: *The Brothers Karamazov*, *The Idiot*, *The Possessed*, *Crime and Punishment*, and *The House of the Dead*. Of these, *Crime and Punishment* has indeed long been known to English and American readers as a profound study of the light and darkness of the human soul.

But one book alone cannot convey the Dostoevskian view of life. One book may leave the reader with the idea that he has been looking into a peculiar and "morbid" soul. It is only several of these books that can impress upon the reader that this peculiar and morbid soul is the soul of mankind. That fact—for under the conviction of Dostoevsky's art one accepts it as a fact—is at first terrifying, then profoundly illuminating. One sees the soul of man as ever containing infinite possibilities of cruelty and infinite possibilities of love—one understands how, maugre our nineteenth century ideas of a gradually evolving mediocrity, life can still shape forth appalling wickedness and miraculous good.

Among these books, the latest one to be published, Dostoevsky's *House of the Dead*, is not the most powerful, but it is interesting as showing how Dostoevsky got his insight into life. He got it in prison, where life both in its good and its evil stands most nakedly revealed. From these personalities, people who were under no constraint of pretending to be respectable mediocrities, who were perhaps in prison because they could not successfully make that pretense, he found out the truth—that the human soul is devilish and sublime. For in prison, as in the dreams to which the psycho-analysts go to learn the truth about human nature, all that is too wildly bad or good to fit in with our conception of what we ought to be, is found.

Dostoevsky's novels have been called nightmares. But reflect that nightmares may be the clue to our self-deceitful lives. Under the pretty painted exterior of the ordinary soul may be the lightning-riven gulfs of Dostoevsky.

¹ *The House of the Dead*, by Fyodor Dostoevsky. From the Russian by Constance Garnett. \$1.50 net. The Macmillan Co.
The Brothers Karamazov. \$1.50 net.
Crime and Punishment. \$1.50 net.
The Idiot. \$1.50 net.
The Possessed. \$1.50 net.

Book Reviews

Treitschke

IT is a peculiarity of human nature, particularly in times of stress and turmoil, to personify, individualize events and hatreds. This peculiarity expresses itself in the immemorial custom of choosing a scape-goat, a custom of great social significance. The Great War has produced scape-goats innumerable. Among these is Treitschke; and if we are to believe certain hysterical detractors of Germany, Treitschke is responsible for the war, if not directly responsible surely chief accessory before the fact—a mighty achievement for a man dead these twenty years!

The reactionary interpretation of history is a pivotal point in the repressive culture of to-day. In Germany history is more than that—it is a method of government, the justification and the faith of imperial policy, the answer of reaction to progress. "We invoke the men of the past against the present," says Treitschke. We should not be led astray by partisan denunciation ascribing great events to individuals, and the importance of Treitschke has been disproportionately emphasized. But Treitschke articulated the spirit of his age, and his philosophy is usually the philosophy of Germany's contemporary representatives. Bearing this in mind, the significance of Treitschke while not decisive bulks large, socially and historically.

It is unfortunate that Treitschke should have been introduced to the British and American public with a partisan bias and for partisan purposes. Nor is the available translated material¹ sufficient for a comprehensive and complete judgment. It is sufficient, however, for the purpose of a broad, outline sketch.

The Germany of Treitschke was a Germany awakening to material power and gradually becoming drunk with the power of material things. Treitschke says: "Germans to-day no longer, as in

Schiller's day, escape from the stress of life into the still and holy places of the heart." This was a necessary and inevitable development, and it is absurd to regret "the Germany of Schiller and Goethe" and use the regret as a club to smite the Germany of to-day. It was a time of shattered republican ideals. The revolution of 1848 had ended in disaster and the exile of the bulk of the revolutionary class. Then came the victory of power—military power—and the unity of Germany. The German bourgeois became rapt in visions of power and profit, cast aside the remnants of its liberal ideals and adopted the policy of "blood and iron." Bourgeois, Junker and autocrat became the Holy Trinity of the new Germany, political Reaction and Power the Father and the Son.

Treitschke's intellectual development parallels this development. Particular material facts produced a particular national psychology, and Treitschke was its expression.

Starting as a liberal and constitutionalist, Treitschke ended a complete reactionary and fervent devotee of the absolute monarchy. Hausrath gives a sympathetic and critical account of this change. Bismarck and Prussia were the chief transforming factors. Having grasped the purpose of Bismarck, Treitschke "frankly declared the strengthening of Prussia to be the supreme national duty." He became filled "with deep disgust" by the "meaningless mendacity of our average liberalism," and decided that "our fate will clearly be decided by conquest." His hatred of France seems to have been largely a hatred of French liberalism and its traditions. Hausrath has this to say about Treitschke's hatred of the French:

"In regard to our sympathy for France, which he reviled as the Rhine Confederation sentimentality, it would be difficult for him to place himself in our position. During the last century we had received nothing but kindness from France, namely, deliverance from the Palatine Bavarian regime, from Jesuits and Lazarists, from episcopal and Junker rule, from guild restrictions and compulsory service: all this and the very existence of the country we owed directly or indirectly to Napoleon and the Code Napoleon, from which the hatred of the French arose. This, it is true, I found quite natural, considering Napoleon weakened Prussia and abused Saxony."

Prussia, with its lust of power and conquest and its conscious use of war

as a method of imperial policy, became Treitschke's ideal; and his history was, in Prof. J. H. Morgan's phrase, "a kind of hagiography of the Hohenzollerns." He created a philosophical and historical justification for Prussian policy, opposed universal suffrage, ridiculed parliamentary government, and expressed a metaphysical faith in the monarchy. "Roughly," says H. W. C. Davis, "Treitschke accepts the rule of Aristotle, that the people should be allowed to criticize, but not to originate measures."

The cult of power—the will to power—was dominant in Germany. Treitschke was the reactionary expression of this social tendency, as Nietzsche was its revolutionary.

The central tenet of Treitschke's teachings is the concept of the state as power. He concludes that "all the states known to history have arisen through wars." He seems to have had no conception of the evolutionary social and economic basis of the state. Germany in the seventeenth century degenerated, according to Treitschke, "through theological controversies and the coarse sensuality of a sluggish peace," and "left it to the Dutch to break the naval power of the Spaniards, and afterwards to the English to subdue the Dutch conquerors." In other words, had Germany at the time been possessed of the "will to war" and waged war instead of clinging to a "sluggish peace," she could have wrested world-supremacy from the Spanish. That Germany lacked the economic, social and political organization necessary to the task is unworthy of consideration in Treitschke's military interpretation of history.

His conception of history is defective in another sense—it is rigid and seeks to control the present and the future through the actions of the past. This and that happened in the past, so it must happen again. Civilizations developed along rivers and there have been struggles for these rivers, so Germany must seek full control of the Rhine—which would mean the conquest of Holland. War has been an instrument of policy and progress, and war is therefore necessary, inevitable, immutable. This is a denial of a fundamental law of history, that each evolutionary epoch produces new forms of progress and new forces, and either transforms or entirely supersedes the forces and forms of the epoch preceding.

The available material indicates that Treitschke was not a fundamental and

¹ Treitschke: *His Doctrine of German Destiny and of International Relations*. Together with *A Study of His Life and Work*, by Adolf Hausrath. New York, Putnam's. \$1.50.

Germany, France, Russia, and Islam. By Heinrich von Treitschke. With a Foreword by George Haven Putnam. New York, Putnam's \$1.25 net.

The Confessions of Frederick the Great with Life by Treitschke. Edited, with an Introduction, by Douglas Sladen. New York. Putnam's. \$1.25 net.

The Political Thought of Heinrich von Treitschke. By H. W. C. Davis. New York, Scribner's, \$1.50.

Selections from Treitschke's Lectures on Politics. Translated by Adam L. Gowans. New York, Stokes, 75c.

original historical thinker. The man was intensely, fanatically sincere, but he seems to have lacked vision and insight. He was a propagandist, the propagandist of a particular necessity, as was Macchiavelli; but where Macchiavelli considered transitory the necessity as well as the means—he favored autocracy as a means of unifying Italy, but simultaneously hoped that, Italy being united, autocracy would give way to the Republic—Treitschke considered means and necessity permanent. Marx was a propagandist, but while Marx based his propaganda upon history, Treitschke based history upon his propaganda.

LOUIS C. FRAINA.

German Socialist War Literature

WITHIN the last two months German Socialists have published a number of pamphlets and several books on the war. Among the new pamphlets those which deserve the most attention have been reviewed in *Die Neue Zeit*, which gives the following summary of a pamphlet by Wolfgang Heine, ironical throughout:

"The war, on the German side, is held to be no imperialistic enterprise. Only the French, and the Russians and English, desired conquests. That it is a question of the economic existence of Germany in this war cannot be doubted for a moment. The interest which the German capitalist has to develop exports, as against other nations, the German workman has to a still higher degree. By imperialism we must understand 'all efforts of one state to extend itself at the cost of another.' Even if Germany were a social republic to-day, it would have to sell goods abroad and for this purpose 'to develop an export trade if not to carry on a direct policy of expansion; so that this republic also would have to be imperialistic.

"All those who are against the Fatherland and against its support by the Social Democrats in the present struggle which Germany is waging for its existence' continues Heine, 'cloak themselves now very cleverly as friends of peace.' But peace does not depend upon Germany since victory has not yet been won. All agitation for peace and all discussion of peace are therefore only harmful.

"All the difficulties which our Social Democracy has met in the last twenty years rested upon the belief that it was indifferent to the Fatherland. Now this accusation has been contradicted by facts, and so altogether new possibilities and prospects are opening out for the Party and especially for the labor unions. But everything would be ruined

if the anti-war group succeeded in spoiling the magnificent impression which the conduct of the Party and the labor movement in Germany has hitherto created."

Heine has always represented the reformist wing of the Party. Lensch, formerly editor of the Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, and Haenisch, a member of the Prussian Landtag, were leaders of the radicals. Both are now ardent supporters of the war. *Die Neue Zeit* reviews the pamphlet of Lensch in the same critical tone as it does that of Heine. It attributes to Lensch the following sentiments:

"The interests of freedom and democracy are incompatible with the victory of France. A victory of the Allies would mean the destruction of Social-Democracy and the 'perpetuation' of capitalism, the tearing to pieces of Germany, renewed hostility between France and Germany, and the hegemony of the Czarism in Europe, endless armament, and the danger of more war. But a defeat of the Allies would mean the opposite of all this: the rapid development of Social-Democracy even in Anglo-Saxon countries, the general advance of the working class, the solution of the German question, the economic advance of Hungary, reconciliation between France and Germany, army reforms in the direction of a citizen army, the development of central Europe towards freedom, the overthrow of the Czarism."

Vorwaerts also quotes the two following passages from the book of Lensch:—

"The driving forces that caused the war were the tendencies of capital to expand. But as soon as war existed it was no longer a question of these tendencies alone. . . . Everything which originally brought on the war has now passed into the background. Now the questions at issue are the following: Shall the German people continue to exist as a great independent nation, or shall a great part of its population be torn away from it in the East and West and forced under foreign dominion? For Germany—by which we mean the German Empire and Austro-Hungary—the question of the expansion of capitalism has become transformed into a question of national existence."

Die Neue Zeit does not recommend very highly any of the current publications, except those of Bernstein and Kautsky. It does, however, give high praise to the work of Rohrbach, recently translated into English. Rohrbach is an anti-Socialist imperialist but his political economy is considered by *Die Neue Zeit* to be very largely sound, and therefore he discloses the true nature of imperialism.

W. E. W.

The Revolutionary Future of Russia

ONE of the most interesting things about Russia are the prospects of revolutionary movement there. Has it been crushed?

Prof. Wiener, himself a Russian by birth and education, thinks not. The spirit of the revolution has not been dissipated, and the unanimous support of the government in the war is not at all an acceptance of autocracy:

"If Russia is victorious it will return to the chaotic state which preceded the war, and the nation must ultimately win those individualistic liberties which have constantly cropped out even under the most crushing oppression. It is doubtful whether a revolution will ever accomplish this, but it is evident that the constitutional ideas, which in the beginning of the nineteenth century found a lodging only among a small band of officers and intellectuals, now are understood and propagated among the workingmen and students at large."

Prof. Wiener believes that "the possibility of a successful revolution from below is still very remote," and that the impending intellectual emancipation of the peasants "presages a far more powerful revolution than the one aiming at mere political liberty." The peasants will be the decisive factor:

"When reformers will once come to see that their only hope of saving the country lies in giving the masses that education which they themselves need and want, and not that which the theoreticians want to foist upon them for their own advantages, they will lay the foundation for that greatness which is certainly in store for Russia."

Prof. Wiener gives this sympathetic and suggestive interpretation of the Russian people:

"Here paganism and barbarism have survived until our own day, strangely mingling with the highest achievements of the human mind. Meekness and brutality, communism and the most advanced individualism, the strongest State and the weakest political consciousness, absence of race hatred and the most cruel 'pogroms,' the deepest religious nature and the most abject superstition, an all-pervading democracy and the most absolute monarchy, all these and more contradictions are the result of this unique jostling of mythical antiquity and stark reality—an eternal and inextricable enigma to the Western observer. Hence the totally contradictory valuations which are found in books on Russia, on the basis of the same data." J. D.

¹ *An Interpretation of the Russian People.* By Leo Wiener, Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University, New York: McBride, Nast & Co. \$1.25.

A Socialist Digest

The Trend Toward State Socialism in the Belligerent Nations

THE governments of the belligerent nations have been forced to undertake innumerable gigantic enterprises in direct connection with their armies. They have been obliged to take over, or to operate, or to reorganize and control, industry after industry. In order to supply their armies they have been compelled to organize a considerable part of the total production of the countries at war. In order to feed the people at home they have been forced, in scarcely smaller measure, to organize the distribution and sale of food. If the process is carried as far in the next eight months as it was in the first eight months of the war, it will hardly be an exaggeration to say that all these nations will be well on the road—for the time being—to governmentally operated industry, or collectivism, or State Socialism.

It is true that the Socialists have not been and will not be chiefly responsible, or even largely responsible, for any of these policies. But their Socialistic tendency is shown by the fact that the Socialists were everywhere the first to demand them. They have followed the lines laid down by the Socialists, and if we wish to see where they may lead in the immediate future we cannot do better than to look at the criticisms and the further demands the Socialists are now making.

Let us turn, for example, to the German Socialists' programme elaborated a few weeks after the outbreak of the war, let us compare it with what the government has carried out, and note what is still demanded. The German programme was put forth as a demand for the governmental organization of consumption—especially of the food supply. This leads at once to the organization of agricultural production and as it will be noted to other radical steps related to this:

(1) Measures for the regulation of production.

(a) To organize the harvest and its utilization.

(b) To make it the duty of farmers to raise specified crops. Immediate planting of waste land with rapidly-growing edible greenstuffs and vegetables. Organization of cattle and dairy production.

(2) Measures for the provision of the means of production.

(a) To supply fertilizers and seeds through public institutions and to regulate their use.

(b) To provide machinery by means of community organizations to encourage intensive agriculture.

(c) To open up woods and moorlands to the public for the production of litter.

(3) Measures for securing labor power.

(a) Public regulation of employment.

(b) Fixing of a minimum wage.

(c) Abolition of servant laws and exceptional laws against farm hands.

(4) Measures for the use of food-stuffs.

The prohibition of the use of potatoes and grain for the production of spirituous liquors, regulation of the production of beer, sugar and starch.

(5) To make it the duty of farmers to sell their products to public institutions (imperial, national, and communal).

(6) To fix prices for means of production and products for producers and middlemen.

(7) To encourage production of food-stuffs and the regulation of their distribution by communities.

(8) The suitable application of these regulations to the fishery, forestry, coal-mining, and chemical industries.

The above programme was passed on the 13th of August and was supported by the Federation of Labor Unions as well as the Party.

In the middle of November, both organizations once more put their programme before the government in the shape of the following demands:

(1) The obligation of producers and traders in the means of life, to sell their products to public bodies (imperial, state, and local).

(2) Lowering of the maximum prices contained in the order of the Imperial Council of October 28th.

(3) Fixing the minimum prices upon all kinds of grain, potatoes, sugar, flour, bread, alcohol, and petroleum for producers and middlemen.

(4) Lowering of the supplies for the production of spirits. Limitation of breweries.

(5) Abolition of the sugar taxes.

(6) The addition of potato meal to flour on the basis of 10 parts by weight to 90 parts of rye flour.

(7) Measures against speculation in industrial raw materials.

The only one of these policies that Vorwaerts admits was carried out on radical lines was that aiming to prevent speculation in raw materials.

The internal war programme of the British Socialists, worked out under the direction of the Webbs and the Fabians, is no less scientific and radical than that of the Germans.

The programme includes the following demands:

"Labor representation (both men and women in proportion to the workers in the area concerned) on all national and local committees of a public character established in connection with the war.

"The inauguration of a comprehensive policy of municipal housing.

"The establishment of co-operative canteens in connection with the army, to insure that food is supplied at reasonable prices to the soldiers in camp or barracks.

"(a) Provision of productive work, at standard rates of wages for the unemployed.

"(b) Where the provision of work is impracticable, maintenance to be granted on a standard sufficiently high to insure the preservation of the home and the supply of what is necessary for a healthy life, and the immediate abandonment of all the inquisitorial methods now too often used in order to restrict the amount of relief.

"(c) Trade unions to be subsidized out of national funds to such an extent as will permit them (where provision of work is impossible) to pay members unemployed benefit without bankrupting other resources.

"The encouragement and development of home-grown food supplies by the national organization of agriculture, accompanied by drastic reductions of freight charges for all produce, in the interests of the whole people.

"Protection of the people against exorbitant prices, especially in regard to food, by the enactment of maxim and the commandeering of supplies by the nation wherever advisable.

"National care of motherhood by the establishment of maternity and infant centers, the provision of nourishment for expectant and nursing mothers, of doctor or midwife at confinement, and of help in the house while the mother is laid aside.

"The compulsory provision of meals and clothing for school children, three meals a day, seven days a week.

"The continuance of national control over railways, docks, and similar enterprises at the close of the war, with a view to the better organization of production and distribution."

Like the Germans, the British Socialists demand the inauguration of a

legal minimum wage. If this is established—no matter how incompletely nor how low the wage—it is needless to state it will in itself mean a revolution in the organization of labor and of industry.

Direct war needs, however, compelled a far more rapid evolution, as witnessed by the law giving the government power to take over any establishment for war purposes. Such establishments will not remain in the government's hands after the war. But many new methods will be introduced, especially in the handling of labor, and a large part of these will doubtless be permanent. Moreover, wherever the government will have proved equally efficient with, or more efficient than, the private owners, an unanswerable argument will have been given for later nationalization or municipalization. As Lloyd George pointed out, the success of this policy will be the strongest possible argument for collectivism, "since the British people are essentially a people who act on example, and experiment rather than on argument."

The German Socialists' Peace Terms

EARLY in the war Socialist leaders of Munich adopted a peace programme in which the following were the principal items:

"Indemnifications determined by just claims and financial responsibilities.

"Plebiscites conducted by international committee in disputed territories: Alsace-Lorraine, Schleswig, Russian Baltic provinces, Finland, Poland, Trentino, Balkans.

"International possession of European states: Bosphorus, Dardanelles, Suez Canal, Gibraltar, Kiel Canal."

This was before the taking of Antwerp and Lodz. We have already shown that Kautsky and Bernstein oppose all indemnities. The latter now also opposes a plebiscite in Alsace-Lorraine—as a condition of peace.

Eduard Bernstein takes a liberal view of the Alsace-Lorraine question. At the same time it will be recalled that he defended the invasion of Belgium as a military necessity, and is against an indemnity. He is in favor of peace and does not want the war to be prolonged for the purpose of crushing England, but he does not accept the peace conditions favored even by the most pacific of the Socialists of the Allies and leading neutral countries.

While he is not opposed to a plebiscite to settle the Alsace-Lorraine question, he wishes this matter to be left entirely to the decision of the Germans. His argument is as follows:

"Our French comrades do not at all take the point of view that the fate of

Alsace-Lorraine should be decided by the fortune of arms. In a number of declarations they have limited themselves to the demand that the population of these provinces should be given the opportunity to decide as to their own fate.

"We Social-Democrats would be giving a very poor testimony of our feeling for democratic justice if we made any criticism of this French demand for the right of self-government for Alsace-Lorraine. The objection we have to make to the French is quite another one. We should and must try to make clear to them that this demand, under present conditions, means an indefinite prolongation of this murderous and wasteful war, since neither the rulers of Germany nor the majority of the German people can be won over to the view that the question, to which country Alsace and Lorraine should belong, can be decided now during the war; since any solution which is forced in war leaves with the conquered the desire to win back by force what has been taken away. But a peace which would only be a truce is as little in the interest of the French as of the German people. We can not ask that the French should abandon this demand for justice. But we can advise them, because of our mutual interest, not to insist upon it as a condition *sine qua non*."

The peace program of the German radicals was first definitely formulated in the manifesto of Liebknecht, Ledebour, Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin and Otto Ruehle (who voted with Liebknecht against the third war loan). The manifesto first printed in *The Labour Leader* of April 1st was accompanied by a significant letter dated March 12th, from which we take the following sentences:

"Dear Comrade, do help us to make an end to this murderous war (before still other countries join) and to make our Comrades in France, as well as in Britain and Belgium, take the road of International Socialism."

This should be read in connection with the following passage of the manifesto itself:

"It is said that propaganda for peace would be interpreted as a sign of weakness. Against that we say: Wrong interpretations are thwarted by hard facts. And the incontestable fact is the favorable military position of Germany. The frontiers are secure, and the war is being carried on on the enemy's ground. It is for this very reason that we can be the first to proclaim the word, 'Peace.'"

It is precisely the incontestable fact of the superior past achievements and present position of the German armies that is given by the French Socialists

as their reason for opposing immediate peace, on the ground that nothing could be done with the German government under present conditions. And one of their chief grounds for supposing that this condition can be changed is their hope that Italy and certain of the Balkan nations will join in the war.

But it is in the peace terms of this pro-peace group that the greatest difficulties are found. For they do not even mention the vital issues. Here are the terms:

"No annexation;

"Political and economic independence of every nation;

"Disarmament;

"Compulsory arbitration."

Not a word about a plebiscite in Alsace-Lorraine, nor about an indemnity for Belgium.

However, one, at least, of the signers of this manifesto is disposed to do justice to Belgium. The Berne International Conference of Women Socialists, held about the middle of April, was convened by Clara Zetkin. And she signed a resolution—passed unanimously—which contained the following clause:

"A general resolution was adopted after discussion calling for 'a speedy ending of the war by a peace which shall expiate the wrong done to Belgium, impose no humiliating conditions on any nation, and recognize the right of all nationalities, large and small, to independence and self-government.'"

The adoption of this clause by the Liebknecht group would indicate that a handful at least of German Socialist leaders share the views of the British pro-peace faction. From this beginning the peace movement might conceivably grow—before many months—until it included a considerable minority of the German Party. But even this small beginning has not yet been made.

About the middle of April the German and Austrian Socialists held a Conference in Vienna to discuss peace terms. The following resolutions were passed and are widely approved by the capitalist and pacifist press of America:

International arbitration courts must be developed into obligatory tribunals for settling all differences between nations.

All treaties and agreements of states must be subjected to the democratic parliamentary control of a representative assemblage.

International treaties for limitation of armaments must be agreed upon, with a view to disarmament.

The rights of every nation to determine its own destiny must be recognized.

German Socialists in America are

not so enthusiastic. The New York *Volkszeitung* refuses to believe that the conference did nothing more Socialistic than to pass these high-sounding "pious wishes." The organ of the American German Socialists is still more severe on another of the resolutions passed. This Vienna Conference resolved:

"The fact that Socialists of belligerent States are defending their country in war must not be made a barrier to maintaining the international relationships of all Socialist parties or to activity in their international arrangements."

To which the *Volkszeitung* retorts: "If this last resolution means that the support of the war by the parliamentary representatives of a Socialist Party shall form no obstacle against that Party's membership in the 'International of Labor,' then the prospects for a reconstruction of this international are poor."

Are the British Socialists for Peace?

A REPORT has been widely published in the newspapers that the two British Socialist parties at their recent congresses took up a position against the war. What is the truth of this report? We shall see that it is far from accurate.

Shortly after the London Conference of the Socialists of the Allies counter-tendency appeared where least expected. The British Socialist Party declared:

Five peace resolutions and two amendments were adopted at the Annual Conference of 1915, most of them with large majorities, and one amendment—of pronounced jingo tendencies—was handsomely defeated.

The peace resolution, which was adopted by 78 branches against 57, reads:

"This Conference of the British Socialist Party condemns the cry raised by the capitalist parties in every belligerent country for a fight to a finish.

"This Conference therefore fully indorses the efforts of Socialists in neutral countries to terminate the war, and declares unhesitatingly that it is the supreme duty of the Socialist Parties throughout the world to work for an immediate peace *on such terms as will prevent the repetition of a similar war.*"

A resolution which declared for the preliminary destruction of the "Central European autocracies," after which the workers should begin to work for peace, was defeated, 46 branches voting for and 81 against it.

In its annual congress, held at Norwich on April 5th, the Independent Labor Party accepted a report from the National Administrative Council of the Party setting forth that the Party declared that it was the duty of the labor movement to secure peace at the earliest possible moment. The resolution was in part as follows:

"The labor movement reiterates the fact that it had opposed the policies which produced this war, and that its duty now is to secure peace at the *earliest possible moment* on such conditions as provide the best opportunities for the re-establishment of amicable relations between the workers of Europe."

J. R. MacDonald and at least three out of the four members of the National Administrative Council of this Party had been delegates a few weeks before at the Conference of the Socialists of the Allied countries at London, at which it was voted *unanimously* that the war must be continued until victory was won. Had Hardie, Glasier, Anderson, and MacDonald changed their opinion? Or could their position at the April Conference in favor of immediate peace be reconciled with their previous stand? This question was brought up at Norwich. We take the following account from the *Labor Leader* of April 8th:

"Mr. Burgess (Bradford) directed attention to a phrase in the declaration issued by the Conference of Socialists from the Allied countries which said that 'the invasion of Belgium and France by the German armies threatens the very existence of independent nationalities,' and that 'a victory for German Imperialism would be the defeat and the destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe.' He asked whether Mr. MacDonald was as alleged the author of these sentences. He also quoted from the declaration the phrase 'whilst inflexibly resolved to fight until victory is achieved,' etc., and asked if it represented the view of the I. L. P.

"Mr. Bruce Glasier said the National Administrative Council had issued its own manifesto, and by that it must be judged. The Conference of Socialists from Allied countries was a private Conference, and no account of what occurred was to be published. The declaration adopted was a compromise. It did not represent his (the speaker's) view, but each side had to yield something. The declaration was a great advance on previous statements issued by the Belgian and French Socialists at the beginning of the war, and except for the efforts of the I. L. P. it would have been very different and, in his view, harmful to the international Socialist cause. They had exercised a very moderating influence. (Applause.)

"Mr. Burgess: Does the N. A. C. consider this declaration to be authoritative?"

"Mr. Bruce Glasier: It was not indorsed generally by the N. A. C."

Mr. MacDonald offered the following explanation:

"The phrase 'fighting the war to a finish' must be interpreted in a Socialist sense and not in the popular sense. The war had got to finish, and at the present moment it was no use to talk about 'stop the war.' He challenged anyone to point to clearer declarations than his that the war ought not to be carried further than the political point when the forces of democracy in Germany were liberated and prepared themselves to crush their own militarism, and thus place European peace on a firm foundation. The end of the war must date from the time when the democratic forces of Europe were ready to take things into their own hands."

The Congress apparently accepted these explanations, as the National Administrative Council was re-elected by overwhelming majorities and its report was accepted by a vote of 188 to 3.

MacDonald thus adds a third clause to the conditions under which he and his followers will favor peace. Practically all British Socialists and Laborites had demanded a Belgian indemnity and a plebiscite in Alsace-Lorraine. He now demands, further, that the war must not end until the democratic forces of Germany are "liberated and prepared to crush their own militarism." Clearly this is not exactly the view of the majority of the I. L. P. But its resolution, like that of the British Socialist Party, is somewhat ambiguous. To get the real sentiment of the I. L. P., we must refer to another resolution, about which the discussion chiefly raged. The Conference divided almost evenly on the problem as to whether the present war was to be opposed, along with all wars, whether so-called offensive or defensive, deciding by one vote (121 to 120) to pass over this question. The majority of the Congress, then, was *not* for immediate peace at any price. A considerable faction, as the applause showed, shared MacDonald's views, while the Congress as a whole refused to rebuke its representatives for voting for the resolutions of the London Conference.

The following resolution was passed by a vote of 243 to 9:

"This Conference expresses its strong disapproval of the action of the Labor Party in taking part in a recruiting campaign, and of I. L. P. members of Parliament speaking from platforms on which attempts were made to justify the war, and the foreign policy of the Liberal Government which led to the war."

Finally, by the very close vote of 120 to 121, the following resolution of opposition to the present war and all other wars was defeated:

"This Conference is of opinion that the Socialists of all nations should agree that henceforth the Socialist Parties should refuse support to every war entered into by Capitalistic Governments, whatever the ostensible object of the war, and even if such war is nominally of a defensive character."

Japan's Demands Upon China

THE rapid march of events in the Far East is arousing fears among the organs of international High Finance. Japan is said to threaten the spoliation of China, her subjugation and permanent suppression. American militarists are using this event as an argument for more powerful armaments. Japan is being reviled by the American press; and an expression of the *New York Times* is typical:

"For two good reasons Japan ought to make a treaty of firm and lasting peace with Germany before she proceeds to enforce her ultimatum upon China. The first is that, according to the general understanding of the Western world, she is attempting to assume control of the Government, the fortunes, the destiny of the Chinese Republic in a distinctly German manner, in the manner which the great teachers of political theory in Germany have declared to be the true method of increasing the territorial domain, the commerce, and the power of a State. For a second reason, if she now proceeds by armed force to enforce the demands China has rejected, she will tear up, as unconsidered scraps of paper, two solemn treaties, one with Great Britain and one with the United States."

The whole thing is complicated by the fact that Japan and China are each using the situation for purposes alien to the situation itself. And the information concerning recent events is meagre and conflicting. The *New York Evening Post* gives a significant analysis of Japan's demands:

"How incomplete and confused is the information upon which the sinister interpretation of Japan's motives is based, appears from an examination of such versions of the Japanese demands as are actually available. On February 18 the *Chicago Herald* published a list, 'obtained through Chinese sources,' of Japan's specific demands, including those which she is supposed to have withheld from the knowledge of the other Powers. On February 17 the Peking correspondent of the As-

sociated Press cabled his own version. In one version or the other there are overstatements and omissions of vital importance. Take, for example, the following clauses in the Associated Press account:

"'Before granting railroad concessions to any third Power, China must agree to consult Japan.

"'Before endeavoring to obtain capital for loans from any third Power, China must consult Japan in advance.'

"Here is apparently an attempt to establish a Japanese control of the financial and railway policy of the entire Republic. But when we turn to the *Chicago Herald* version, we find that China must obtain Japan's consent to negotiations with third Powers over railroads, or loans, or the hypothecation of revenues, in *South Manchuria and eastern Mongolia*. Since Japan has consented to defer consideration of eastern Mongolia, we are left with the simple fact that Japan is claiming preference over other Powers in the sphere of influence everywhere recognized as her own, the terrain she won by her victory over Russia ten years ago.

"Turn, on the other hand, to the *Herald* summary of the famous Article 5, over which the break between Tokio and Peking is threatened. The first and third clauses look formidable:

"'The central Government of China shall employ influential Japanese subjects as advisers for conducting administrative, financial, and military affairs.

"'China and Japan shall jointly police the important places in China or employ a majority of Japanese in the police department of China.

"'Certainly, if China 'shall' employ Japanese advisers and Japanese policemen in the 'important places in China,' the charge of vassalage would almost be justified. But what does the Associated Press summary say?

"'Before choosing any foreign political, military, or financial advisers, China must consult Japan.

"'If China employs foreigners as controlling advisers in police, military, or financial departments of the entire country, Japanese shall be preferred.'

"Other clauses stipulate the right to propagate religious doctrines in China, various railway concessions, China's obligation to purchase half of her military supplies from Japan, and the obligation to consult Japan before granting railway, harbor, or mining concessions in the province of Fukien, which faces on Japanese Formosa.

"Thus, if one studies the list of Japanese demands as reconstructed from the different versions and in the light of authoritative comment at Tokio, the impression is hardly avoidable that, while Japan is plainly resolved upon bettering herself in China, she plans to do so, not by imposing her authority

upon China, but by improving her position as against the other Powers. The right to advise, guide, and administer, in the affairs of the Republic is made conditional upon China's inclination to avail herself of foreign assistance in general. From the Japanese point of view this may be fairly described as an assertion of mere equality with the other Powers, or a preference over other Powers where Japan believes she is entitled to the preference, as in the matter of policing China if it should come to a foreign police. For the 'spoliation of China we find no evidence. Japan has promised to give back Kiaochau, and in the stipulation that China 'shall not alienate or lease to other countries any port, harbor, or island on the coast of China' the Tokio Government has declared that 'other countries' includes Japan.

"In the facts, as we have them, no vital assault on China's independence or integrity is apparent, though an extension of Japanese influence is plainly forecast."

Bernstein on the Socialists of France

Bernstein has published a collection of Socialist documents bearing on the War under the title "Die Internationale der Arbeiterklasse und der europäische Krieg." *Vorwaerts* notices the following important points brought out in this pamphlet:—

At the outbreak of the war, *Vorwaerts* was in complete agreement with the Party executive. [The radical anti-governmental character of the declaration in *Vorwaerts* was shown in the *NEW REVIEW* for October and November.]

Bernstein says further:—"The opposition against the war on the part of the French Socialists was so strong that in spite of their unfavorable judgment of the behavior of the Austrian and German governments, one group wished to vote against the war and the war credits, another group was for abstention from the vote, and only a minority was of the opinion that under the changed situation there was no way of avoiding voting in favor of the war credits. The declaration of Germany against France, which then followed, and Germany's declaration of its intention to march into France through Belgium, had the result that on the 4th of August the Socialist group in the Chamber of Deputies voted unanimously for the war credits."

Thus Bernstein gives us data which, as he clearly believes, largely exonerate the French Socialists for supporting their government.

Correspondence

Shaw on Education

To the NEW REVIEW:

MR. WALLING'S adventures in criticism are as startling as Vachel Lindsay's adventures in the Congo. In his letter about my review of "Shaw on Education" he says he has discovered the existence (hitherto unsuspected) of an American Shavian. Not content with this discovery, he announces that Bernard Shaw has no philosophy, is neither Socialist, democrat, nor radical, holds manifestly bourgeois ideals, dodges the economic basis of educational reform, drifts irresponsibly on a sea of contradictions, and—to complete the gay perverseness of his conduct—stoops (once a month or so) to reactionary positions, for conclusive and final evidence of which the unbiased reader is referred to the index of any one of Walling's books.

It is clear from the "errors" of which Walling convicts Shavians that he does not yet understand the species, and so I had better explain it to him without delay. When a Shavian bows three times to the East at the mention of the name of Bernard Shaw, this is not, as Walling rashly infers, an act of idolatrous worship. It is a public expression of gratitude at the existence, on an earth teeming with medicrities and dullards, of a man who can quicken the soul with aspiration and the world with wonder. In short, a Shavian is one who unaffectedly acknowledges his debt to the inspired utterances that cross his path, whether these come from Da Vinci, Voltaire, Shelley, Rodin, William James, or Strauss. As soon as Walling grasps this point and observes that a disciple of Shaw is frequently a Butlerian and a Wagnerite to boot, he will understand why the true blue Shavian is little likely to be nonplussed if it ever be proved (as Walling charges) that Shaw is "reactionary" in his economics "desultory" in his theories of education, "superficial" in his philosophy.

But Walling has not made these charges good. A cat may look at a king, and any fool may echo Walling's bland declaration that Shaw's philosophy has no foundation. I assume that Walling, whose reputation for sincere and dispassionate investigation I have always respected, has examined the well co-ordinated system of thought that Shaw has spent a life time in riveting together. But if he has done so, how can it have escaped him that Shaw's philosophy—like every sound philosophy, like every philosophy that

does not lead to a wild and inhuman absurdity—is based upon faith? Or does Walling reject faith as an insecure foundation? If so, I invite his attention to the fact that even Euclid, having no demonstrable first premise, built his work upon faith. And lest he misconceive what I mean by faith, I assure him in advance that I mean what Shaw means and what Samuel Butler says, namely, that "faith consists in holding that the instincts of the best men and women are in themselves an evidence which may not lightly be set aside."

It is, however, not so much at the Shavian foundations as at the Shavian contradictions that Walling rebels. This is because his reverence for sincerity and consistency rises so high that he not only prefers to see Truth robed in pomp and circumstance, but finds it a blasphemy and a scandal that Shaw should occasionally robe her in the maddest levity. Curiously enough, Walling shares this feeling with the compact middle-class idealist whose sense of correctness and consistency Shaw has so often outraged. But can it be that, in any important respect, Walling is in the same boat with the unspeakable bourgeois, the same bourgeois whose breath is as a stench in his nostrils? "What an ignominious and irresponsible contradiction," some anti-Wallingist might cry. Yet, if this happened, we should comfort Walling. We should tell him that life is full of contradictions and that our poor philosophers of life must cut their cloth to fit their pattern. I have myself read all of Walling's books and noted his well-meant endeavor to classify the universe and its anti-nomies under half-a-dozen ironclad and rigidly consistent heads. But I swear I can prove that the undertaking was a failure, Walling being far too clever a man to be guilty of no contradictions whatever. Perhaps he will repudiate this statement as in itself an intolerable contradiction. It makes no difference.

Having given Shavians a piece of his mind, Walling eventually falls afoul of Shaw's views on education. He declares with much feeling that Shaw has wilfully evaded the economic basis of educational reform, inasmuch as he fails to clamor for a reduction in the size of school classes and for a consequent increase in the school budget to the tune of four or five hundred per cent. Walling evidently regards this omission as dishonest. Perhaps it is, but it is no more dishonest than a recruiting poster which invites men of sound health and of specified height

and weight to enlist, while it omits to mention that a one-legged man who meets these requirements need not apply. If we Socialists may never open our mouths without twaddling about "the economic basis of the subject," we shall soon be as pathetic a lot of half-wits as Betsy Trotwood's Mr. Dick who, it will be recalled, never got beyond two sentences without twaddling about the head of Charles I. Everybody in America, save apparently Walling, knows that when a Socialist urges educational reform, it is self-evident that he is striving for a condition of affairs in which the child of a ditch digger shall be in as small a class in school and shall have as big an income at home, as the child of a railroad president. This is the mark that Shaw deliberately aims at, when he champions the rights of children and advocates an equal income for every child, woman, and man in the community.

Naturally, he doesn't waste his time begging the ruling classes to open their purses in order to bestow an expensive educational training upon the inexpensive children of the poor. He leaves that sort of poppycock to others. Walling, however, whose heart bleeds for the working people, cries out upon so much brutal common sense and angrily calls Shaw a reactionary for not endorsing a plan that limits classes to eight pupils, a plan proposed by Bebel some thirty years ago. I might, with as much reason, call Walling a reactionary for not endorsing a plan limiting classes to seven pupils, a plan proposed by Milton (in his famous Tractate) three hundred years ago. The fact is, most of us realize, what Walling seemingly overlooks, namely, that society pays a railroad president so handsomely that he is able to send his valuable children to fashionable private schools where Milton's small-sized classes have been the rule since long before Walling was born. When the railroad president and the ditch digger get the same income, society will esteem the ditch digger's child no less highly than the railroad president's, and will take care to offer each of its valuable children, regardless of parentage, an equally sound and expensive education. There really is no disputing the fact that as long as we have big incomes and little incomes, we shall also have education, food, and clothing, of a finer and more expensive quality, accessible to those whose purses are better filled. Those of us who do not like this condition, can

either lump it, or work, (like Shaw and Walling in their several ways) to induce society to make the obvious change. Meanwhile, we must leave to political amateurs the game of joshing the public with the easy assumption that rich men's school taxes can ever be increased five hundred per cent. for the benefit of poor men's children.

"Shaw adopts the employer's educational ideal of *cutting down* school taxes by making the pupil pay his own way." This is Walling's extraordinary comment on an innocent proposal made by Shaw (and by Butler, James, Wells, and many other thinkers) that minors, *from an early age on*, be expected to render such periodical services to the community as their years, their leisure, and their capacity may allow. Now, I have known boys, who, in the summer intervals of their school and college careers, have "paid their way" as ship boys on coastwise steamers, as boys-of-all-work on the farms of Dakota or Maine, or as artisans' helpers in various trades, and have pronounced these experiences to be ten times more valuable than all their formal school instruction put together. But we are told that Dewey and the new educators regard any sort of youthful knocking about in vocations as wicked and unpedagogic, and since Shaw desires the State to turn this wickedness to its profit, Walling holds him up to public execration as a Machiavellian imposter. Walling goes further. He tears the mask of hypocrisy off Shaw, and pictures him running to the side of the big employers, wringing their hands very hard, and assuring them, while sobs choke his voice, that their school taxes shall never, never be increased—save over his dead body! Now all this is highly diverting. But how in the world did Walling's eyes construct this picture of Shaw? Titania, we know, fell in love with the face of an ass under the impression that it was the handsomest face she had ever seen. But there was some excuse for Titania's delusion inasmuch as her sight was bewitched by Oberon's monkeyshines. But what excuse is there for Walling? To this able Socialist and author, Shaw's works are as open as they are to me. I take it that he knows as well as I do that Shaw stands for the taxation of unearned incomes at the rate of one hundred cents on the dollar, and for the gradual redistribution of the national income (by the simultaneous pressure of Collectivism from above and Trade Unionism from below) until all children, women and men shall enjoy the only kind of equality possible among human beings, and that is an equality of income measured in dollars and cents. Does any one believe that the

employers get much comfort from Shaw's pursuit of this goal, say as much comfort as the Forty Thieves got from Ali Baba? And can anyone be mad enough to infer that, after the community has begun to pay our children a dignified income from the moment of their birth, a crime will be committed if adolescent citizens are asked to give the community a small return in useful work during a part of their leisure? We must always bear in mind that it is strictly on this basis of the pecuniary equality of children and adults that Shaw's educational proposals are advanced; on any other basis, the thorough, scientific and *democratic* training of the young must remain a madman's dream. It seems to me that as soon as Walling realizes where his criticism of Shaw's economics has led him to, there will be nothing left for him but to call high heaven to witness that he never meant to say anything half so outrageous.

Having spent nine years as a pupil in English schools and some years as a teacher in American schools, I am unable to share Walling's cocksure assumption that education in the United States is far ahead of that in England. We all know that the English authorities have not abolished religious instruction. But is that such incontrovertible evidence of inferiority as Walling alleges? Take my own case. I had the usual Bible course in the Old and New Testament books as prescribed in British schools. What was the result? When I read the story of Eve's daring adventure in behalf of knowledge with its sequel in Adam's ignoble cringing to the Lord, I became a Feminist; when I got to the tale of the cruel punishment God visited on Cain after first goading him to fury by mercilessly partisan discriminations, I became a Socialist; and when I reached the place where John the Baptist enjoins the Pharisees to look for truth in deeds not words, I became a Pragmatist. Probably thousands of other boys passed through the same avenues to the same awakening, and stepped as lightly as I did from the old religion to the new religion, I mean the religion of modern men and women who put their God at the End of the world instead of at the Beginning.

Now the Bible may hold many barbarous errors and delusions. But it is, nevertheless, the ancient literature of a very remarkable people, and it contains, in the words of Christ and of the great Prophets, an inspiration that redeems its crudest superstitions. What do American educators put in the place of this literature? What but the typical sawdust schoolreader with piffing insipidities and aimless puerilities by Henry W. Longfellow and

Phoebe Cary? Worse than no literature at all, in short. As between this substitute and the Bible, give me the Bible, say I. And so says Shaw.

But this cruel alternative should not be imposed upon children, as Shaw emphatically points out. A child should be taught, as a matter of practical information, the objective facts of existing religious beliefs. He should know that a Hindu is as well satisfied with Mohammedanism, as a New Englander is with Christianity, and that the one feels as superior to all outsiders as the other. What the schoolboy actually learns, however, (and learns by *innuendo!*), is not fact but prejudice. He learns, for example, that the Hindus set up Allah in place of Jehovah, a piece of depravity for which we shut the gates of Christian mercy on them forever; or that the Shintoists, dispensing with priest, temple, and ethical doctrine, thereby give an exhibition of bad taste for which they stand beneath contempt and deservedly rank as the social inferiors of American gentlemen.

Shaw's chief point about religion is, however, that "the real Bible of the modern world is the whole body of great literature, art, and music in which the revelation of Hebrew Scripture has been continued to the present day." Until we begin to put this modern Bible at the disposal of the school children in the United States, our social philosophers had better talk warily about the superiorities of American schools, and exercise discretion in entering these superiorities on the index of any of their books.

FELIX GRENDON.

New York City.

A Correction

To the NEW REVIEW:

EMMA V. Sanders of Stockholm, in a letter printed in this journal last month, quotes some words of mine about "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." She is under the impression that I said that Feminists want such concessions abolished in the interests of "equality before the law," and takes pains to inform me that they do not. This is interesting, but unnecessary information so far as I am concerned; for if Miss Sanders will look at my article again she will see that I was saying then just what she is saying now. If Miss Sanders wishes to disagree with me, she will have to change her opinions.

FLOYD DELL.

New York City.

PEARSON'S

is the only Magazine
of its kind

This is why:—

Three years ago Pearson's decided to be a **free magazine.**

This is what it did:—

ABANDONED FANCY COVERS
CUT OUT COLORED PICTURES
ADOPTED PLAIN PAPER

This was the purpose:—

A plain form would enable the magazine to live on its income from subscriptions and monthly sales. It would not have to consider the effect on advertisers when it wanted to print the truth about any public question.

This was the result:—

Pearson's **now** prints the truth about some question which affects your welfare in every issue. **It prints facts which no magazine that depends on advertising could "afford" to print.**

And, with all this, Pearsons still prints as much fiction and entertainment articles as other magazines. If you want plain facts instead of pretty pictures buy a copy on the news stand for 15 cents, or subscribe by the year for \$1.50.

By special arrangement with Pearson's we are able to make you the following clubbing offer.

SPECIAL OFFER:

NEW REVIEW, 1 Yr. \$1.50
PEARSON'S, 1 Yr. \$1.50 } Our Price
\$3.00 } **\$2.00**

NEW REVIEW

256 Broadway New York City

MAKE YOUR DOLLAR GO FAR

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

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

COTTON'S WEEKLY

THOUSANDS of GOOD Books

are to be had nowadays at
very low prices.

The following were formerly to be had in editions of \$1.25 and \$1.50 only, and cost now **35 cents**, by mail, 45c.:

IBSEN—Brand, trans. by F. E. Garret.

A Doll's House, The Wild Duck and The Lady from the Sea. Ghosts, An Enemy of the People and The Warriors of Heligoland. Pillars of Society, The Pretenders and Rosmersholm.

DOSTOIEVSKY—Poor Folk and The Gambler.

Crime and Punishment. The House of the Dead. Letters from the Underworld. The Idiot.

TOLSTOY—Anna Karenina. 2 vols.

Childhood, Boyhood and Youth. Master and Man and others. War and Peace. 3 vols.

TURGENEFF—Virgin Soil.

" Liza.

POUSHKIN—Prose Tales.

All above volumes contain from 300 to 500 pages, are well printed and cloth bound.

Special Bargains

GEORGE BRANDES, Lassalle

Published by Macmillan, \$2.00 net. Our Price 60, by mail 70c.

STRINDBERG, Zones of the Spirit

Published by Putnam at \$1.25 net. Our Price 50, by mail 60c.

Hundreds of other bargains in all branches of Literature and Social Science gathered for the last twenty years—with some understanding of the intrinsic values of books.

MAISELS' BOOK STORE

424 GRAND ST., NEW YORK

Statement of the Ownership, Management, etc.

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

Editors, Frank Bohn, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.; William E. Bohn, East Orange, N. J.; Louis B. Boudin, 302 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Floyd Dell, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.; W. E. DuBois, 70 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.; Max Eastman, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.; Louis C. Fraina, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.; Felix Grendon, 141 E. 26th St., New York, N. Y.; Isaac A. Hourwich, 27 Cedar St., New York, N. Y.; Paul Kennaday, 780 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.; Robert R. La Monte, New Canaan, Conn.; Arthur Livingston, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Robert H. Lowie, Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.; Helen Marot, 206 W. 13th St., New York, N. Y.; Joseph Michael, 115 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Herman Simpson, 121 W. 120th St., New York, N. Y.; William English Walling, Greenwich, Conn.

Managing Editor, None.
Business Manager, Louis C. Fraina, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York.

Publisher, New Review Publishing Association, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.

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

New Review Publishing Ass'n, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.

Richard P. Appleton, 76 4th St., Newark, N. J.; Jessie Ashley, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.; Louis B. Boudin, 302 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Anna P. Boudin, 477 E. 16th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Maurice Blumlein, 103 Water St., New York, N. Y.; Morris Beriman, 1212 Beverly Rd., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Alexander Fraser, 413 First St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis C. Fraina, 87 Greenwich Ave., New York, N. Y.; Felix Grendon, 141 E. 26th St., New York, N. Y.; Bertha W. Howe, Great Kills, S. I., N. Y.; Leo Hermann, 1208 49th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louise W. Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Eleanor Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hildergarde Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Philip L. Liebman, 302 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Robert M. Lackey, Box 272, Kingston, Jamaica, B. W. I.; Arthur A. Livingston, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; M. Michaelovsky, 235 W. 71st St., New York, N. Y.; Joseph Michael, 115 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Moses Oppenheimer, 301 E. 68th St., New York, N. Y.; Mary S. Oppenheimer, 301 E. 68th St., New York, N. Y.; George Oberdorfer, 2393 Eighth Ave., New York, N. Y.; Isaac Ortman, 106 Rivington St., New York, N. Y.; Charles Edward Russell, 1025 15th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.; Herman Simpson, 121 W. 120th St., New York, N. Y.; J. G. Phelps Stokes, Stamford, Conn.; J. B. Segall, Orono, Maine; Ray Simpson, 203 W. 113th St., New York, N. Y.; Sarah S. Simpson, 203 W. 113th St., New York, N. Y.; William English Walling, Greenwich, Conn.

Known Bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: NONE.

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of April, 1915.

(SEAL) A. B. ROBERTIELLO,
Notary Public, N. Y. C.

My commission expires March 31, 1917.
Certificate filed in New York County.

Artists'
Materials



Picture
Frames

Colors and Boards of all makes

S. HALPERN

3 East 30th St., near Fifth Ave.
NEW YORK CITY

**WILLIAM
ENGLISH
WALLING**

*Author of
"Socialism as It
Is," "The Larger
Aspects of
Socialism," etc.*

Ready May 15

*12mo.
500 pages
\$1.50 net.*

THE SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR

"The Red Book" would have served as a title for this book had not Austria pre-empted it.

Three-fourths of this book consists of a very carefully selected documentary statement of the position toward the war of the Socialists of all countries where they are an organized body, with special reference to their Peace policy.

No material has been omitted or included merely because it seemed creditable or discreditable to Socialists in general or to the Socialists of any particular country.

The running editorial comment sets forth the conditions under which the statements of these leading Socialists or Socialistic organizations were made, and indicates why they are important.

In addition to this editorial matter, Mr. Walling furnishes a final chapter summarizing the revolutionary Governmental Socialist measures adopted by the governments at war and the attitude of the Socialists toward them.

This book shows the attitude not only of the Socialists, but of the European masses. For the first time, we have adequate answers to such questions as these: Is there a strong anti-war sentiment among the people of France? Of Russia? If so, just how strong? Is there a powerful pro-war sentiment among the common people of Italy? If so, how powerful? And similar questions are answered about the many nationalities of Austro-Hungary and the Balkans.

The main interest, naturally, lies in England and Germany. This is the first book to give a satisfactory statement of the relative strength of the pro-war and anti-war factions among British workingmen, their respective arguments and their real motives as well as a complete summary of the position of Shaw, Wells, Keir Hardie, J. R. MacDonald and H. M. Hyndman.

Similarly with Germany. It tells the strength of the anti-war faction represented by Liebknecht and the Vorwaerts; of the middle group represented by Haase, Bernstein and Kautsky which supports a war of defense against Russia, but not a war of aggression against France, Belgium and England; of the pro-war faction, led by Scheidemann, Suedekum, David, Heine, and Legien and other labor union leaders.

And finally the book shows the peace programs of those Germanic and Allied Socialists who favor peace and answers the all important question: How far do these, the only people's peace movements, have *common* demands, and how far are their differences so irreconcilable that they will have to be decided by a prolongation of the war?



HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

**34 West 33d Street
NEW YORK**

Patronize NEW REVIEW Advertisers