

Sept.
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. 14

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION	225	EFFECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION	239
Isaac A. Hourwich		Moses Oppenheimer	
CURRENT AFFAIRS	227	"THE SIX BEST NOVELS"	240
L. B. Boudin		Floyd Dell	
THE NEWEST SOCIALISM	229	BOOK REVIEWS:	
William English Walling		Re-Making of China; Ablest Pro-German Argument.	
PEACE—AND AFTER	233	SOCIALIST DIGEST:.....	
Louis C. Fraina		Berlin Socialists Attack Party Policy; A Socialist Protest in the	
TURKEY AND THE NEAR EAST	234	Duma; African Roots of the War; A Glimpse of the Austrian	
Theodore Rothstein		Socialists; MacDonald Supports the Government; The Balkan	
"WAR IS WAR"	237	Tangle; "Peace" and the Party.	
Lionel Petersen			

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

The Industrial Commission

THE Walsh report has no precedent in the vast literature of government publications. A typical government report states "only facts", without drawing or even suggesting any conclusions, except purely arithmetical ones, e. g.: "It appears from the proceeding figures that whereas in the year 1880 Pennsylvania held the foremost place as a producer of iron ore, toward the year 1910, Minnesota had relegated Pennsylvania to the rear."

The mere piling-up of facts, however, without aim or purpose, renders them practically useless to the general public. This is a matter of policy with the departments at Washington. Our leading universities have bred a type of scientific Gradgrinds specially adapted to the task of digging out "facts, facts, facts."

The Commission on Industrial Relations was created in response to a petition initiated by a group of social workers, who recognize *The Survey* as their organ and Prof. John R. Commons as their social philosopher. Prof. Commons was chosen as one of the representatives of the public on the Commission with the obvious purpose of entrusting to him the guidance of its scientific investigations. It has been insinuated in the Socialist press that his dissent from the Walsh report came as the result of secret confabs with the representatives of capital. These rumors are doing him an injustice. No one who is acquainted with his work since he has become identified with the University of Wisconsin could have expected from

him any other report. He has not posed as a radical, even though the Seidel administration in Milwaukee chose to represent him as one. His sympathies are with the Gompers school of trade-unionism and with the National Civic Federation. It is generally understood that the name of Mr. Frank P. Walsh was suggested by him, but the sudden evolution of the successful lawyer and newspaper publisher into a social insurgent doubtless came as a surprise to his sponsor as much as to all other sane progressives.

The Commission was patterned after the National Civic Federation, and its object was to suggest a method to bring about peace between Capital and Labor. It wound up with a breach between Capital and Labor amidst its own membership, and the other two representatives of "the public" found it impossible to unite with either side in a joint report. Such is the logic of the class struggle.

Undoubtedly, the outcome in this particular case was determined by the personality of Mr. Walsh. Proudhon thought the men of the middle class specially fit for popular leadership. On the one hand, their antagonism to the rich above them directs their sympathies toward the poor. On the other hand, their resources enable them to gain an education which is denied to the poor. Whether or not this theory be true as a general proposition, it furnishes an explanation of the insurgency of Mr. Walsh. Two of the labor members of the Commission are poor men, who are on the lookout

for a job. Neither of them could afford to quarrel with his daily bread and butter by antagonizing the rich and the powerful, who might eventually help him to a position.

Mr. Walsh is free from such cares and can afford to ignore the shrieking denunciation of a sheet like the *New York World*, the Ciceronian thunders of the erudite *New York Evening Post*, and the mild reproof of the *New Republic*. His action as chairman forced the labor members of the Commission to line up behind him.

The name of Mr. Basil M. Manly has been prominently associated with Mr. Walsh's report. In truth Mr. Manly is only a trained writer of government reports. A few years ago, under the direction of former Commissioner of Labor Neil, he assisted in the preparation of a perfectly conventional report on the steel industry. Under the direction of Mr. Walsh he did what Mr. Walsh wanted him to do. His own views or sympathies did not count in either case.

The Walsh report has been acclaimed by the official organ of the Socialist Party as "the full program of Socialism". Says the *American Socialist* in its Labor Day Edition:

"The gist of the whole matter is this," said Mr. Manly; "Labor must organize, and must collectively use our democratic institutions (by which is meant of course the universal ballot) for the introduction of industrial democracy. This is contained in the first paragraph of the summary of our findings."

"Look at these words again! Rub your eyes and consider what you see! Here is an official report of a Governmental body of the highest rank declaring that only through the program of Socialism can the horrible evils which it has revealed be ended. For labor, organized and conscious of its strength, using the ballot to bring about industrial democracy.—This is the full program of Socialism, and nothing else."

The catchwords "Industrial Democracy," and even "Social Democracy," are used nowadays by men like Mr. Roosevelt, or Mr. Brandeis, in a very loose sense, embracing conciliation and mediation in labor disputes and any and all forms of social legislation. Much as one might like to see "the program of Socialism" endorsed in "an official report of a Governmental body of the highest rank," it is necessary, nevertheless, to go beyond the mere phrase "Industrial Democracy," to the recommendations of the Commission, in order to ascertain its program.

The basic idea of the Walsh report is thus stated in the press abstract given out by the Commission.

"As a remedy for the unequal distribution of wealth and income, the report urges the enactment of an inheritance tax so graded that . . . it shall leave no large accumulation of wealth to pass

into hands which had no share in its production. The report suggests that a limit of one million dollars shall pass to the heirs."

This is "the full program of Socialism" enunciated by Mr. Walsh, in which Messrs. O'Connell, Lennon and Garretson concur. If this program could be realized, the multimillionaire would become extinct in the next generation and individual fortunes would all be reduced below the maximum limit of one million dollars. Would this decentralization of ownership, however, affect the concentration of industrial enterprises?

The Commission itself emphasizes the fact that "the control of manufacturing, mining and transportation industries is to an increasing degree passing into the hands of great corporations," and that "in such corporations, in spite of the large number of stockholders, the control rests with a very small number of persons." The report cites the example of the United States Steel Corporation with its 100,000 shareholders, in which "the final control rested with a single banking house." Would the monopoly power of the corporation over the market, its industrial functions, and its power to exploit its employee be in any way affected, if the maximum limit of individual holdings of its stock were reduced below one million dollars?

Decentralization of property was advocated by European social reformers in the first half of the XIX century, when capitalistic enterprises were still conducted by individuals and partnerships. A graded inheritance tax was favored by bourgeois economists as a remedy against concentration of property. Far be it from me to question the authority of the *American Socialist* when it speaks *ex-cathedra* on Socialism. It is important, however, to distinguish "the full program of Socialism," as understood by Mr. Walsh, Mr. Manly, and the *American Socialist*, from the uncanonized version set forth in standard works under the name of Scientific Socialism.

"The second principal cause of industrial unrest," according to the same report, is, unemployment. To relieve the unemployment situation "two prime causes" must be removed—"unjust distribution of wealth and monopolization of land and natural resources." The remedy for the first evil has been stated. As a remedy against the second, the well-known plan of the single-taxers is recommended. Is it necessary at this late day to expound the distinction between Single Tax and Socialism?

ISAAC A. HOURWICH,

Current Affairs

Our Great Victory.

THE German-American submarine warfare farce which at one time threatened to become a tragedy is visibly drawing to its happy conclusion. The wedding-bells may now ring, and the merry-makers dance to the composite tune of the Star-spangled Banner and Die Wacht am Rhein! That our "patriotic" press should talk of "our great diplomatic victory" is only natural, for by all the rules of "patriotism" we must win a diplomatic victory, otherwise our "national honor" would be at stake and we would have to go to war. Such are the rules of the inexorable code of honor—and the poor "patriot" has no choice but either get "satisfaction" or fight, like the duellist of old. So whenever our good "patriot" does not want to fight his only way out is to win a diplomatic victory, get "satisfaction."

Fortunately for our patriots and the world "satisfaction" can be easily had when one is disposed to be easily satisfied, and "victories" are not hard to obtain when one is not particular about it—when its only practical use is to save one's face. So we must not examine our "victory" too closely in order to find out wherein Germany's alleged "concessions" consist. And if we should essay such an examination and find, as we must, that Germany has conceded absolutely nothing of any value either from the standpoint of international law or from the practical standpoint of "the man on the ship," we need not be either surprised or grieved. It is true that International Law has not been vindicated. It is also true that with a judicious use of the "ley fuga" with which we are so well familiar from Mexican political practice, and which Germany has wisely reserved to herself in her "concession," that country can go on torpedoing passenger ships as freely as before. But then we must remember that our diplomacy never had any such ends in view and we must not therefore be disappointed at not obtaining them.

As was already pointed out in these pages, our rattling of the sword in the first Lusitania note was meant for home consumption only—to prepare our people for "Preparedness." That result achieved, we were getting ready to climb off the perch when Mr. Bryan interfered and almost knocked the stool out from under our feet. Happily that "diversion" did not turn out as serious as it might have, and we were almost landed safely with both feet on the ground when the unfortunate Arabic incident occurred. Here was real danger. The "psychological moment" was untoward—the torpedoing of the Arabic was so timely as to look like an answer to our Second Note. By all the rules of the "patriotic" code we had to get "satisfaction" or fight. What if

Germany wouldn't give us "satisfaction"? For by the rules of the same code giving another country "satisfaction" is a loss of "honor" to your own. And the German government, too, must have the "home market" in mind when dealing with other governments. We might easily have had to fight whether we wanted to or not.

We must therefore be eternally thankful to Providence for having disposed Germany to give us "satisfaction," and we must not look the gift horse too closely in the mouth. Nor do we need to be too curious about the causes that made Germany disposed to give us "satisfaction". It may be the failure of the submarine campaign, or the Balkan situation, the rate of exchange, or German Magnanimity. What does it matter? Sufficient unto the day the woes thereof. The contemplation of the danger that we have escaped is too absorbing to permit us, for the moment at least, to distract our attention by historical analysis.

But while there is no time for historical analysis, I must take a few moments to point a moral. And I can do this best by quoting my distinguished fellow-journalist Mr. Herman Ridder of the *Staats-Zeitung*. Said he in that famous journal: "We have escaped war for the moment. We should not forget, however, by how small a margin we have avoided it. Only the peaceful intent and historical friendship of the German Government *permitted us to withdraw our foot from the hole* into which it was forced by our war party".

Leaving out "the peaceful intent and historical friendship" as belonging to the domain of that historical analysis which I have agreed to eschew for the present, and substituting "patriotism" for "war party,"—for what is "war-party" in others is "patriotism" in us,—what Mr. Ridder says is gospel truth. There is no doubt about it: the "patriotic" code has put us in an awful hole, and we have to thank our stars for having been permitted to crawl out from it.

The American Way with Mexico.

ALL signs point to "intervention" in Mexico. Why?—is a subject that has already been discussed in this magazine, and will in the future undoubtedly come in for some further attention. But there is one thing that should be noted here and now: the peculiar way in which we are going about this business,—the truly American way.

The established precedents for such cases are that some citizens of the country desiring to "intervene" are killed by citizens of the country which is to receive the blessing of intervention, thus furnishing a *casus interventioni*. Thus the killing of two of her missionaries led Germany to intervene in China with the result of the cession of Kiau Chau,—a result which is said to have elicited from the German Kaiser the wise observation that if he were fortu-

nate enough to have "his" missionaries killed at the rate of two a month he would soon be lord of the world. But here was the rub: suppose the heathen refuse to kill German missionaries? Suppose the citizens of the country-intervene refuse to murder any citizens of the country-intervenor? The usual way out of the difficulty was to adopt the practice resorted to by governments in their difficulties with revolutionary movements: get the *agent provocateur* on the job to incite the killing. At best a clumsy way, and not wholly free from danger.

That's where our modern, truly American methods excel: When we want to send a strike-leader to the gallows we don't employ *provocateurs* to incite him or his followers to the killing of an employer, policeman, or strike-breaker. Such methods are too round about, time-wasting. Besides, it involves the sacrifice of a life that is dear to us. We have therefore devised a much surer and cheaper way. We get an officer of the law or strike-breaker to kill one or more of his own men, and then try the strike-leader for *murder*, for having made us kill his followers.

And now we are taking a leaf out of the labor movement and applying it to international affairs. When the Mexicans refuse to kill our citizens, so as to furnish a *casus interventioni*, we kill a few Mexicans and call it sufficient. The other day we killed Gen. Orozco and three other Mexicans, whereupon we sent troops to the Mexican border, "to guard Texas." If that should not have the desired effect we shall kill a few more Mexicans, which will of course give us the right to march an army across the border and send the fleet to Vera Cruz.

A Calamity Narrowly Averted.

THE Socialist Party is to be congratulated on having escaped obloquy which would have attached to it if it had participated in Mr. Henry Weismann's "Friends of Peace" Convention. But the narrowness of the escape,—through an eleventh hour reversal by the National Executive Committee of its own action,—shows how constantly we must be on guard against similar occurrences in these troublous times. It is, of course, to the credit of the National Executive Committee that it did not stand on its dignity, and rescinded its decision to send delegates to that Convention when the true character of that gathering was called to its attention. But the fact that it could be ignorant of the true nature of that "Peace Convention" until almost within a day of its meeting, shows the great danger lurking in these so-called peace movements. The word "peace" is one to conjure with in these war-stricken days,—hence the necessity for a double-guard against frauds and imposters.

This is particularly so owing to the unfortunate circumstance that this war has developed right within our own midst a variety of Socialists who might be best described as "Dernburg Socialists", who are

assiduous in their endeavors to bring the party within the folds of the pro-German propaganda. Some of them do it on principle, others "for value received." And since the sources of nationalistic inspiration are not likely to dry up in the near future, nor the coffers of the pro-German propaganda be seriously depleted, it will be well for those who have the real interests of the Socialist movement at heart to keep a watchful eye.

For Freedom and Emancipation.

THOSE were glad tidings, indeed, that the New York *Call* has brought us the other day, in a special message from Washington for the correctness of which it pledges its Socialist word of honor. This message is to the effect that Germany is ready to conclude peace on the following terms: (1) Freedom of the seas; (2) freedom of Poland; and (3) Emancipation of the Jews. Could any news be more cheering? Not only is peace within our grasp,—for should those depraved monsters, the Allies, not be willing to accept such terms of peace the entire neutral world ought to intervene and compel them to do so,—but the war itself has not been fought in vain. The sacrifices may have been great, but the freedom and emancipation which it has brought about no less great.

But even more cheering than the present condition is the promise for the future. It appears from this authentic and authoritative message that Germany always has been, now is, and always will be ready to make an honorable peace, but that a year from now "when Germany's conquests and victories have mounted higher and higher", "the allies can establish peace only by more and greater concessions than those outlined at present". Under ordinary circumstances the reference to a year from now might look ominous. But when we remember what the terms "outlined" consist of, all fear for the future is dissipated and we look confidently into the future. For assuredly the "more and greater concessions" could not but be of the same nature and character as those "outlined at present". In other words, if the war lasts a year longer we shall secure at its termination "more and greater" freedoms and emancipations. No wonder some peace-at-any-price men are so zealously whooping it up for the Kaiser and his glorious army!

L. B. BOUDIN.

If You Buy Books—

You want to concentrate
and get efficient service

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE

256 Broadway, New York City

The Newest Socialism

By William English Walling

IT is probable that the Fabian Society already has more influence over British Socialism than Karl Marx. The war is certain to increase this purely British tendency. And there is another fact that will greatly increase the power of Fabianism. The Fabian Society is undoubtedly having a new birth. Two years ago the very successful *New Statesman* was founded by Sidney Webb and Bernard Shaw. Last year the Fabian Research Department began what amounts to nothing less than an effort to reconstruct Socialism.

This new Socialism is certain to have more or less influence beyond the shores of Great Britain. If the International Socialist Congress had been held last summer the Fabian Society had decided unanimously to put before it a resolution asking for a study of the present organization of industry with a view to the inauguration of a complete Socialist policy as to industrial reorganization. If the resolution had carried, the Fabian Society would certainly have led in this investigation.

The Fabian study of industry, of its present organization and of the practical possibilities of future reorganization, is appearing as supplements to the *New Statesman*, edited by Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Already two highly satisfactory studies of cooperation have appeared and recently we have their summary of the present stage of development of collectivism and of its probably future extension towards Socialism. This is undoubtedly the most scientific and complete as well as the most thoroughly socialistic study of collectivism that has yet appeared. It is to be followed by a discussion of "the state in partnership with the capitalist", by a study of the labor unions, and finally by a concluding study of the probable place in the future society of cooperation, collectivism, and labor organization.

But we can no longer doubt that the recent supplement on collectivism is the keystone to the whole structure. Already the Webbs have admitted that the collectivist tendency is a hundred times as important as the cooperative tendency. It is clear that they attribute greater importance to the labor unions than to cooperation. It is now clear that they intend to give an intermediate importance to the labor union movement, greater than that of cooperation, but less than that of collectivism.

This method of constructing a Socialist policy, if there is ever to be a Socialist policy, will appeal to all scientifically minded persons. It is hard to see how the scope of the investigation could be broader, how any other method could be followed. Kautsky, in

his controversy with Cunow, has argued that Socialism must be built only on a study of general tendencies, such as "the intensification of the class struggle" and "the tendency of capitalism to become morally bankrupt." He repudiates Cunow's effort to make a quantitative study of social conditions and probabilities. In contrast to this, Webb's method is based on an accurate, detailed, and inductive study of existing facts. The Webbs avoid Kautsky's vagueness—for Kautsky is vague and not at all dogmatic if we regard his writings as a whole (his dogmatism occurs only in matters of detail). But we shall see that the Webbs, carrying the responsibility for a totally new construction, tend to lapse into new dogmatism. Has the time arrived when the Marxists have become intellectual opportunists, while the anti-Marxists have become dogmatists? If this is the case possibly it is because it is inevitable that a principle which has already won the day and served its chief purposes should become opportunistic, while a new principle that is still struggling for existence should take too rigid a form. For it is possible to accept a large part of this new Socialism without repudiating the essential feature of Marxism as the Webbs recommend and also without succumbing to their new dogmatism.

The conclusion might hastily be reached that this "new Socialism" is no Socialism at all. I shall show that it does indeed deviate from Socialism in some important respects. But on the whole, the Socialism of the Webbs and the Fabian Society can no more be questioned than the Socialism of the present Social-Democratic Party of Germany or any of the leading Socialist organizations. The worst that can be said against it is that it is nationalistic, like the other Socialisms. It must be remembered that Sidney Webb was chosen by the International Socialist Bureau as one of the four "reporters" for the Vienna International Socialist Congress.

The Socialism of this new Fabianism appears clearly in a number of passages. For example, the Webbs expect communism to prevail in many public services, that is a policy of furnishing service free of charge. Collectivism proper, under which charges are made, they predict, will be extended only far enough to provide for the expenses of the government. These expenses will have to be provided for in this way "when there are no great incomes of rent and interest remaining in private hands to be taxed." This is a Socialism as definite as that of Kautsky's *Social Revolution*. Moreover, the Webbs expect collectivism to be carried so far *within the coming generation* that the larger part of the pop-

ulation will be employed by governments. They estimate that the proportion of the governmentally employed is already ten per cent and that it will be increased to fifty or sixty per cent within a generation. They say:

"Even if no more were accomplished in the next thirty years than the bringing under public administration, in all the countries of the civilized world, those industries and services which are today already being governmentally administered in one or other of the countries, the aggregate volume of State and Municipal capital and employment would be increased probably five or six fold; that such an increase, without adding a single fresh industry or service to those already successfully nationalised or municipalised in one country or another, would probably bring into the direct employment of the national or local government an actual majority of the adult population."

The Webbs point out that this collectivism does not mean centralization since it will be largely carried out by local governments which may even compete with one another. On the contrary, they argue that there may be a decentralization compared with the existing control by large corporations:

"There is every reason to infer that, in comparison with joint-stock capitalism, government management of industry means, ultimately, in this way, a larger number of independent employers and an increase in local control."

The only limitation to the development of collectivism is similar to that suggested by Kautsky in his *Social Revolution*:

"The enlargement of individual freedom for the many, which the greater equalisation of incomes will produce, may be expected to result in the development of all sorts of new individual enterprises supplementary to or competing with those undertaken by the national or local government."

There can be no question then that the Webbs are aiming at Socialism and that they have found a new way of presenting it. The practical question arises as to the means they propose for reaching Socialism, and here of course is the vital defect in their argument. In its broadest possible interpretation Marxism means that society progresses by means of economic class struggles, and Socialists believe that there is no other way by which Socialism can be attained. On the contrary the Webbs calmly assume that governments represent all people or will soon do so, that is, they attach no importance whatever to economic struggles between social classes. In their present work they calmly assume in their first sentence, that governments are associations of all consumers:

"We do not, it is true, usually think of governmental administration of industry, whether municipal or national, as being that of an Association of

Consumers. Yet when a State Government organizes for us such service as communication and transport, it is engaging in industry essentially as an Association of Consumers, producing not for profit, but for use—not with the object of deriving the greatest possible income to the users or consumers of the commodities or services in question."

After assuming that the government represents all consumers they then proceed to the assumption that the government represents all citizens:

"As is done to an increasing extent by German and Belgian Co-operative Societies, governmental industry in all countries habitually devotes any surplus of receipts over expenditure either to other public purposes, including the improvement of the service itself, or to a lowering of the demands made on the citizen or of the price charged to the consumer, which may even be altogether abolished."

And finally they adopt another populist and in no way socialistic view when they say:

"Whatever is owned by or on behalf of the community by some authority of public character and is administered for the *common good*—the test being whether any excess of receipts over cost of working goes, not to the profit of the administrators or of any private owner or shareholders, but to public purposes—is, for our purpose, governmental, as contrasted with capitalist, enterprise."

The well-read Socialist will scarcely need to have his attention called to the extremely impractical character of such statements. If we do not know who our opponents are in politics, how are we to overcome them? Even if one had never heard a discussion of economic struggles as the basis of political struggles, practical common sense would teach that governments represent neither "the citizens," "the consumer," or "the common good," and will never do so until some exceedingly radical change has taken place.

The profits of governmentally owned industry are, according to the Webbs' own evidence, expended very largely, not for the benefit of consumers generally, but for the benefit of certain business interests. For example, in the first sentence above quoted, they refer to the docks as being governmentally owned for the interests of consumers. Yet they point out that in Great Britain the docks are largely under the direct control of the business interests using them, according to a law which specifically places the control in the hands of these interests. Similarly it is clear that governmentally owned railroads may be operated entirely for the benefit of the business interests, or shippers.

In several cases the Webbs seem to confuse the consumers with the tax-payers, speaking of the "rent-paying inhabitants" as if they were all the inhabitants. This is a familiar view among non-Socialist economists, but it is certainly an extra-

ordinary one for Socialists. Indeed, one of the most vital defects of the Webbs' treatment is that they give no discussion whatever of taxation, on the pretext that it is connected with the police, the army, and the other functions of the *laissez-faire* state. They thus ignore the view held by nearly all Socialists that graduated income and inheritance and land taxes are the most rapid road to Socialism. They seem to imply, on the contrary, that governmental income is to be secured chiefly from nationalized industries. Thus they ignore the fact, pointed out not only by Kautsky but even by the Fabian Socialist, Emil Davies, in his recent book on collectivism, that governmental monopolies are used today largely as a means of indirect taxation. In other words, a government supported in this way would be maintained by an increase in the cost of living.

The Webbs postpone the discussion of "the partnership of the state with the capitalist" to a later supplement of the *New Statesman*. But they say that they regard the "partnership of indebtedness" as a transitional form. Undoubtedly there will be much nationalization and a further increase of national indebtedness after the present war, as a means of indirectly taxing the people and paying the war debt. And it is clear that the Webbs regard this as a transitional stage. Socialists generally will not admit this. It may become a transitional stage or it may not. That depends on whether the Socialists capture the control of the state.

The Webbs practically admit that the present state uses the profits of governmental enterprise for the sake of private interests, for example, that a large part of these profits are applied to reducing taxation. Strange to say, at the close of their article, they admit that "the extent to which the citizen-consumers, or any considerable proportion of them, exercise any effective influence and control, and also the degree to which any improvement is effected in the working life of the citizen-producers, depend on the character of the people and the nature of its governmental machinery."

Of course this is a satisfactory statement from a Socialist standpoint, but it is in amazing contradiction to nearly all that had been said before. If this is true then half of the Webbs' previous statements are untrue.

What then are the Webbs' plans and hopes for the development of the machinery of democracy? We find them advocating the election of local bureaucratic autocrats by the people, these autocrats to represent the people in every particular. This is a plan that might be called "local centralization". It reminds us of the centralization of power in the hands of the French members of the Chamber of Deputies, each deputy being a little autocrat in his district. Together, all these little autocrats form

a sort of bureaucratic caste. It is this caste which has been the bane of French politics and the cause of the movement for proportional representation in that country. The Webbs say:

"Thus all England might be divided among constituencies forming units of convenient electoral size. These constituencies would be the areas also for the levy and collection of the local rates, but not necessarily for any other purpose. Each would elect one representative (or even two or three), who, giving their whole time to this work and presumably salaried, would be responsible for the administration, within that area, of every form and function of Government—to be 'shot at' by the citizens for every conceivable grievance!

"Each citizen would have only one election to think about, and only a single demand by one rate collector to meet, whilst he would know that he was entitled to complain to his single elected representative about any maladministration whatsoever."

The only democracy in the Webbs' scheme is this geographical decentralization, and an occasional election of one man. Their scheme is almost identical with that of our bourgeois progressives who a few years ago proposed to concentrate all power in the hands of a mayor—a proposition that has been absolutely and finally rejected, even by our bourgeois democracy.

The Webbs themselves use the expression "democratic autocracy", and we may apply this expression to their own idea of democracy. Whence comes the fact that they give so much attention to labor organization, to collectivism, to every aspect of progress except democracy? The question may be easily and definitely answered. They are under the strange illusion that the development of collectivism necessarily brings with it the development of democracy:

"The more a government engages in industrial functions, as contrasted with functions merely of police and national defence, the more essentially democratic does its administration tend to become."

But let us analyze the Webbs' position more deeply. Whence comes their confidence in collectivism? It is clearly derived from their belief in experts, in the trained intelligence which is coming to direct all the new governmental enterprises. They rightly place tremendous hope in this application of science to government, but they carry this hope so far as to ignore all other aspects of the social problem. They forget that an obligarchy of experts is conceivable and even probable. Such an oligarchy would probably be more intelligent and more humane than the present one. But there is no reason to suppose that it would fail to place its own interests above that of society as a whole.

The Webbs may be regarded as the representatives of this new scientific bureaucracy. In their

ideal they are undoubtedly Socialists, but in every practical matter they advocate the development of society only to the point of control by this bureaucracy of "altruistic" professional people, assuming continued development towards Socialism after that point. For example, they do not seem to realize that, when the state provides higher education far below cost, as they admit it does, it subsidizes the children of the upper classes, who alone are able to take advantage of this opportunity. They speak of competitive examinations and of the diffusion of educational opportunities as if this meant equal opportunity for the children of the masses. What it really means is the opening of opportunity to the middle classes alone or to those very few children of the aristocracy of labor who are able to climb into this class or to secure scholarships.

Yet the Webbs note and discuss at length the division between the upper and the lower classes of governmental employees which follows the lines of the division between the working people and the professional classes I have already been discussing. They say:

"The outstanding feature of the State and Municipal service all the world over, as compared with the Co-operative Movement, is the great distinction drawn between the upper and lower grades—in the main, between the clerical and administrative staff on the one hand, and the manual workers, skilled or unskilled, on the other. This cleavage, which we notice even in America and Australia, greatly transcends in importance the differences between the treatment of the various grades of brain-workers or manual workers themselves; it extends to much more than pay and privileges; it divides the manual worker from the brain-worker also in respect of status and public esteem, and in respect of the amenity and security that are allowed to those who directly serve the community. Everywhere it is the members of the administrative and clerical staff—the brain-workers as distinguished from the manual workers—who are alone looked on as Civil Servants, or whose employment by the community as a whole instead of by particular capitalists is deemed to entitle them to consideration. For this there is, of course, the historical reason that, down to less than half a century ago, all the posts to which any adequate salary was attached, and which did not involve work associated with the menial class, were reserved, in practice, in nearly all countries, for the relatives, the dependants, or the parasites of the aristocratic or governing class."

Yet, after this clear recognition of the situation, they fail absolutely to draw any practical conclusion. This division exists, the question is how is it to be overcome? No doubt the Webbs will take up this question in their coming study discussing the value of labor organizations. And no doubt labor

organizations may accomplish something for the manual workers employed by governments. But there is no reason whatever to suppose that they will be able to equalize conditions, as long as the control of governments remains in the hands of professional and salaried classes. And Webb does not even suggest how this control by the new middle class is to be overcome.

An equally fatal error of this new Socialism is the nationalistic basis which it shares with the leading Socialist parties of the world. The Webbs make the following admission as to the limitation of national industry, or the organization of society on a national scale:

"Even the national boundaries, which define the areas of administration of State monopolies, though economically more advantageous than the more restricted fields of most capitalist undertakings, are found to have their drawbacks. The geographical frontiers have been determined by historical causes of a political character, and they must be ill-adapted for the enterprises of today."

Yet in their whole discussion they give no attention whatever to international industrial organization. Thus they calmly assume that nations will be able to get along peaceably together without any continuation of economic or military conflicts we new see about us. They are disturbed neither by the present war nor by the deeply-rooted conflict of interests between the various advanced countries nor by the exploitation of the more backward peoples by the more advanced. Elsewhere indeed, Sidney Webb has definitely defended the social utility of the present British Empire.

Yet the Webbs admit that it is the evolution of capitalism that has brought humanity to the promising outlook for collectivism which they describe. Great nations and then empires, they point out, have been built up by the development of capitalism. Is it not possible that the international organization of industry and the world trade will also have been brought about by capitalism, before international collectivism is possible? Is it not certain that all the middle and professional classes of the various countries are more or less nationalistic, that is to say, antagonistic to the other nations? And is it not a fact that the collectivists and even the Socialists make no exception to this rule?

On the other hand, the present war is bound greatly to accelerate not only graduated taxation but also government ownership, legislation to make the working people more efficient, and all of the collectivist tendencies of which the Webbs treat. Certainly it is a most auspicious moment to begin a completely fresh and new reconstruction of Socialist policy. For it is highly probable that the international situation may pave the way for Socialism within the present generation.

Peace---And After

By Louis C. Fraina

THE peculiar, the decisive thing about the many rumors of peace is that they emanate from German sources or from sources in sympathy with the German cause.

The German manoeuvres for peace, or a separate peace with one of the opponents, are not new. At the time when Paris was in danger, Germany tried to detach France from the Allied cause by offering a separate peace. The answer of France was the Battle of the Marne, and the answer of the Allies to future overtures of that sort was to sign an agreement not to make a separate peace. The failure of these efforts was capped by a terrific offensive to destroy the military power of Russia and compel her to sue for peace. The offensive failed in its chief purpose; and then came rumors of German overtures to the Tsar for an advantageous separate peace. The answer of Russia was to repudiate the overtures, and re-organize her government and army preparatory to a new effort to crush the enemy.

The latest peace move is obviously Germanic in its origin. The Pope of Rome, by tradition and sympathy, is friendly to Austria and Germany. Their form of government appeals to his medieval conception of society, and his hatred of anti-clerical Italy and France is a necessity of Vatican politics. His conduct during the war has been distinctly pro-German, and any definite peace move he might make would be on behalf of Austria and Germany. The mission of Cardinal Gibbons as Papal envoy to discuss peace with President Wilson, if it was not simply platonic, means that the Central European Empires hope through the Pope and President Wilson to make overtures to the Allies without appearing in the role of suers for peace.

It must be borne in mind, however, that this is not an acknowledgment of defeat on Germany's part. On the contrary. Germany is seeking to capitalize her present victorious position. And this is indicated in the unofficial German peace proposals.

Apparently, the proposals were framed to create sentiment in favor of Germany. The demand for the "freedom of the seas"—nothing about the "freedom of the land"—makes a bid for neutral sympathy; "co-equal rights and liberties for the Jews" has an obvious meaning; while the demand that Bessarabia be ceded to Rumania is a bid for Rumanian co-operation or "benevolent neutrality." The other proposals are the proposals of a victor; they demand the restoration of the German colonies, Austro-Hungarian dominance in the Balkans and an indemnity. It is inconceivable that under the

circumstances Germany would be satisfied with the *status quo ante*, as many fatuously believe.

Germany is at present the victor. The fact cannot be denied, and as the days pass on, while eventuality of Allied victory strengthens itself, the task becomes all the more difficult. Each new victory of Germany strengthens her position.

The only hope of peace now would be a desire for peace expressed by the Allies. Is there any such prospect?

Barring Belgium, France has suffered more than any of the belligerents. In spite of obviously and grossly false rumors to the contrary, France gives no indication of moving for peace. The national determination to destroy the invader is unshaken. While others talk, France fights. The victorious German sweep in Poland, instead of destroying Russia, is shattering the reactionary and bureaucratic control which has been responsible for the defeats. An analysis of the Italian campaign shows conclusively that it has been mapped out with an eye toward two years more of war. And England hasn't put forward any great efforts yet, but is preparing steadily in spite of almost insuperable obstacles.

Under the circumstances, what is the duty of the Socialist?—The task of the American Socialist movement?

It is our task to *prepare* for peace, not to bring peace. No action of ours can affect the immediacy of peace.

It is our task to unite with the Socialists of the neutral nations to bring pressure to bear upon their governments, tending towards the formation of a League of Neutrals to demand as an international right a share in the peace negotiations.

It should be our task to formulate a peace programme which would be acceptable to the belligerent Socialists,—the *revolutionary* Socialists among the belligerents. The peace programme of the American party is apologetic, incompetent and pro-German.

It is our duty not to lie, not to distort facts in a stupid and unnecessary effort to create peace sentiment, as Morris Hillquit did in an interview in the New York *Evening Mail*:

"One of the important signs of peace is the way the labor convention now being held in England is fighting the militarist spirit and putting the government on notice that it will not stand for conscription. That is a very significant and helpful sign. It proves that the 3,000,000 organized workers have not been carried away by the spirit of jingoism."

British labor, as Hillquit perfectly well knows,

has always been opposed to conscription. The convention simply re-affirmed the opposition. *The day after Hillquit gave out this interview the Trade Union Congress overwhelmingly defeated a motion calling for peace.*

It is our task to follow closely and critically Socialist action and thought in the belligerent nations, as they will profoundly affect the future of the organized Socialist movement.

It is *not* our task to refrain from criticizing the actions of the belligerent Socialists, as Hillquit intimates in the interview mentioned:

"We here in America have an important duty to perform. It is to refrain from harsh criticism of our brothers in Europe and from thinking harsh things about them. We can best contribute by guarding ourselves to see that we maintain a strictly sympathetic and neutral attitude toward all of our suffering fellow workers and Socialists in the war zone."

This is truly the language of legal sophistry. Criticism must fit the need. Can any criticism of Eduard David and Wolfgang Heine, and the other German Socialists who agree with their advocacy

of Imperialism,—can any criticism of these perverts of Socialism constitute "harsh criticism"? Hillquit's is a policy of extenuation by "impartiality," of justification by silence. Our task is to criticize these perverts of Socialism—in that we are *one* in the fight waged by the Liebknechts, the Mehrings, the Luxemburgs, and all the real Socialists among the belligerents. And in doing this, we are simultaneously fighting *our own* battle for revolutionary Socialism in *our own* movement.

The intellectual bankruptcy of the American Socialist party is very real and very pitiable. Nowhere does it show an appreciation of the magnitude of the task of the immediate future. Nowhere does it show any indication of the vast problems in process of solution in belligerent Europe. No effort is being made to study the trend of after-the-war conditions. Like the American nation and its president, the American Socialist party is chasing after the will-o'-the-wisp of peace and landing in the swamps of impotence.

Our task is to *prepare* ourselves, by intelligent study and organization for peace—and after.

Turkey and the Near East

By Theodore Rothstein

[Political and military strategy is now converging upon Turkey. The Allies believe that the forcing of the Dardanelles will decide the issue of the war. The interests of Italy, the Balkans, Russia and Germany centre in Turkey and its fate. The article below, which appeared in the *NEW REVIEW*, January 18, 1913, titled "The Eastern Question," throws a much-needed light upon Turkish affairs.—Editorial Note.]

IT is a peculiar disease, this of the Turk. Nothing like it has ever occurred in the history of political pathology before, and certainly nothing like it will ever occur again. A hale and hearty nomad, full of warlike instincts, he came to Europe at a time when the Byzantine Empire was tottering on its rotten foundations under blows of the Slav barbarians who had established themselves on the Danube. It was mere child's play for the Turk, who had already occupied the entire Asiatic hinterland of Constantinople, to administer in due course a *coup de grace* to the capital itself and to erect the Crescent in the place of the Cross on the dome of St. Sophia. From that time till the middle of the Seventeenth Century he kept on conquering and expanding. He had been the first to establish a professional standing army after the modern style—the famous Janissaries—and this served him in good stead when fighting the neighboring States whose military organization was still feudal. That the Turk, of all people in the world, was alone to evolve at an early age a military system which otherwise is the mark of a national bourgeois State,

was due to the circumstance that though he himself turned a feudal as soon as he settled down to ordered political life, he yet was possessed, on account of his predominating position in a world that was strange to him by race and creed, of a vivid sense of racial and religious solidarity, which in better circumstances might have become the basis of a real national life. The circumstances, however, were very unfavorable. His occupation of Constantinople and of all the countries in Southeastern Europe and Northwestern Asia blocked the trade routes from the Mediterranean to the East and led to their deflection further West, over the Atlantic Ocean. The result was that while Europe, especially her Western portion, had a new and illimitable horizon opened to her, Turkey was left stranded by the receding waves of vivifying commerce, and was condemned to stagnation. The treaty of Carlowitz of 1699, which put an end to her last attempt to capture Vienna, marked the limit of her growth. She still remained rotting in her feudal phase while the most of Europe was rapidly marching on the road of capitalist transformation, and the tide of conquest began to turn against her. For forty years till the Treaty of Belgrade (1739), the Ottoman Empire was in a state of equilibrium, and then began the process of disintegration, both within and from without. Within palace revolutions were following one after the other, and the subject races grew restless and revolted. From without began the secular

struggle with Russia, and the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji (1774) marks the commencement of the era of amputations. By that Treaty, Turkey lost her Crimean province and the predominance in the Black Sea. Eighteen years later she lost the territories between the Dniester and the Boug; in 1812 she lost the entire Bessarabia; the Treaty of Adrianople (1829) deprived her of Greece, Servia, Moldavia, Valachia, and a large portion of Transcaucasia; and the war of 1877-78 left her without Bulgaria. In addition to this, she lost Cyprus in 1878, Tunis in 1881, Egypt in 1882, Tripoli in 1912, and at present, so far as one can see, she is going to lose practically all her possessions in Europe and most of the islands in the Aegean Sea. Here, too, as elsewhere, the economic and social forces have taken their revenge; because Turkey had not kept pace with their demands and remained a feudal State, she has had to yield to the superior force of a higher social order.

But we must not run away with the idea that Turkey was never conscious of her weakness and never made any attempt to regenerate herself. In 1826 she made a beginning with her political reorganization by abolishing the Janissary troops, who had degenerated by that time into a Pretorian guard, and by introducing a more modern system of universal military service. In 1838 the great charter of Gulhané was promulgated, establishing the equality of all creeds and nations and initiating a series of administrative, judicial and financial reforms in accordance with European experience. In 1845 a new universal and secular system of schools was introduced, and the slave traffic was abolished. In 1852 the feudal administration of the provinces was broken up, and a new civil, military, and fiscal system was introduced. In 1855 the famous Hatt-i-Humayoun was issued as a further step in the equalization of the various nationalities of the Empire and in the establishment of better justice, better administration, and of representation of the people on local bodies. In 1864 a law on the vilayets was promulgated which marked a further step in the reform of local government and local taxation, including education; and in 1868 a Council of State and a High Court of Justice were established at Constantinople, with Christian representation, to unify the work of legislation and judicial administration. This long series of reforms (known in history under the collective name of the *Tanzimat*) was crowned in 1876 by the grant of a Constitution.

Why, then, if this be so, has not Turkey succeeded in effecting her transformation into a modern State and has remained afflicted with a barbarous social and political organization that has so many times proved her ruin? The reason is not to be sought in the religion or the race of the Turk, but in the presence of powerful neighbors to whom her re-

generation would have spelt the destruction of some of their most cherished dreams. In the midst of the campaign of 1828, in which the Turks, thanks to their new military organization, revealed an unexpected strength, Pozzo di Borgo, the Tsar's right hand man, wrote: "The Emperor has put the Turkish system to the proof, and has found in it a commencement of material and moral organization which hitherto it has never possessed. If the Sultan had been able to oppose to us a more lively and sustained resistance while scarcely able to put together the elements of his new plans of reform and improvement, how much more formidable should we have found it if he had time to give them more consistency and solidity?" This, in a nutshell, was and always continued to be the Russian attitude towards Turkey. Russia, since Peter the Great, had been aspiring to obtain an outlet to the warm waters of the Mediterranean. The road thither lies through the Bosphorous and the Dardanelles, of which Constantinople holds the key. It was, therefore, against the interests of Russia that Constantinople should be in the hands of a strong Turkey. Turkey, in fact, ought to be driven away from the Bosphorus altogether, and Russia, whose first Tsar, Ivan III, married Sophia Paleologos, the sister and heiress of the last Emperor of Byzantium, was to succeed her. From the end of the XVII century, therefore, Russia was at constant war with Turkey, and it was, in the first instance, these wars which prevented Turkey from carrying out the intended work of reformation. They necessitated the concentration of all her effort on military matters; they ruined Turkey's finances and absorbed her best abilities; and they strengthened the hands of the reactionary social elements which blamed the reformers for disorganizing the ancient fabric of the State in face of the enemy.

There was, however, in the hands of Russia a still more potent instrument for paralyzing Turkey's effort at reform. The wars which she waged against Turkey would have soon made an end of the latter's existence, had it not been for the protection which Turkey found in England. The same factors which attracted Russia to Constantinople prompted England to oppose her, since the Mediterranean and Constantinople constitute the route to India. Each time, therefore, that Russia resumed her march towards Constantinople she met with the resistance of British diplomacy and British arms, and her attempt was never entirely successful. Russia then had recourse to other means. Turkey was never able to assimilate her subjected nationalities, which all belonged to a race and religion different from hers. This was not so much due to her tolerance and inborn aversion to proselytism, as some are apt to think, (since even the Albanians and Bulgarian Bomaks whom she had forced into the folds of Islam were never assimilated

by her) as to the fact that only capitalism is capable of creating a national State, whereas Turkey has always remained a feudal and semi-feudal State. Her subject races, then, remained the same organized national Christian entities that they had been before, at the time of their independence, only that they were now turned into a class of dependent peasantry working, under various forms, for the conquerors who had taken away their lands and combined in their persons not only the economic, but also the political authority. It was the circumstances natural that the economic, political, and social antagonism between the two classes should assume the form of a national and religious antagonism, and it was this antagonism that Russia made use of in order to gain her ends. Posing as the protector of the subject Christian Slavs, she had her emissaries all over the Balkans, instigating the Serbs and the Bulgars to rebellion, furnishing them with money and arms, supplying them with leaders, and so forth. Each time she saw Turkey making an attempt to reform herself she would foment a fresh revolt which had the treble advantage of creating a diversion, throwing Turkey back on her Moslem subjects, thereby strengthening the fanatical and feudal elements and perpetuating her weakness, and allowing Russia to gain a fresh footing in the Balkans. In this way Turkey never succeeded in properly carrying out her designs for regeneration, and remained exposed to all aggressions.

To a minor degree what was said here of Russia's policy applies also to that of Austria, with this difference, however, that the latter's ambition, since she discovered her "Balkan destiny" after seeing her career bared in Europe by the events of 1866-1871, was confined to the western portion of the Balkan peninsula, the possession of which was desirable to her on account of its Adriatic coast, its Serbian inhabitants, and its Salonica harbor on the Aegean. Austria was careful not to go to war with Turkey, but she did her share in fomenting disorders within her frontiers by the same means as Russia.

Being weak on account of her economic and social backwardness, and being constantly harassed in her work of reform by troubles from without and within, Turkey was condemned to remain forever on the sick-bed and to be attacked now and again by her enemies. The last attack was, perhaps, the most formidable of all. In 1908 she made one more supreme effort to retrieve her dangerous position by initiating a series of reforms. She once more adopted a constitution and appealed to Europe to assist her. But Europe would not have it at any costs. By this time England and Russia had made their peace, and the former had no longer the same vital interest in preserving the Ottoman Empire from destruction. On the contrary, since Germany had, in return for financial and railway concessions, constituted herself the champion of the Ottoman

Empire, England became the enemy of both. A vigorous agitation and a subtle mechanism of intrigue at once set in, when it became clear that the Young Turks would not betray German friendship, and simultaneously with the organization of the reactionary forces within, first the Albanians and then Italy were let loose upon the reformers from without. The result was, as on former occasions, the abandonment of the reform work and the resuscitation of all the reactionary forces, culminating in the triumph of the old set. It was this moment that was chosen by the Balkan States, guided by Russia, to unite for a grand effort against the Turk. Formed in each case on the basis of the Christian nationalities detached at various times, with Russian help, from the Ottoman Empire, these States had been rapidly progressing on the road of capitalist development and had ultimately arrived at a stage when the extension of the national market by the incorporation of the remainder of their races, still living within the confines of the Ottoman Empire, became a matter as urgent as that, which in similar circumstances, dictated the unification of Italy and Germany and their consolidation into national States. The object, which in itself was progressive, might have been achieved in a different way, namely, by the formation of a Balkan Federation. But just as Cavour and Bismarck had, for dynastic purposes, preferred the way of war, so did also the "statesmen" of the Balkans, the kings and the kinglets with their ministers, choose the war method as more corresponding to the interests of their respective dynasties.

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

Published by the New Review Publishing Association

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALFRED 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.

"War is War"

By Lionel Petersen

CATCH-WORDS and catch-phrases are the bane of our existence. They are particularly the curse of every radical movement. "Wo die Begriffe fehlen"—says Goethe—"stellt ein Wort zur rechten Zeit sich ein." A catch-word or a catch-phrase always denotes a paucity of ideas.

But of all catch-words and catch-phrases the worst are those which sound uncompromisingly radical. They not only denote a paucity of ideas, but usually cover very questionable practices. At the same time they sound so alluring to the average young man or young woman,—young, that is, in spirit,—who has set out to regenerate the world by making a clean sweep of present institutions as to be positively irresistible. We must, therefore, keep a constant watch upon them, and examine closely into their meaning, as they are put forward, for no amount of abstract reasoning or *general* exposure will do. As soon as we have exposed the foibles of one to the extent of making it "impossible," it is sufficient for it to change its garb to offer fresh allurement to the empty mind and warm heart of the average professional revolutionist. Besides, most of us have such short memories that the work may have to be done over and over again.

In the early days of the Socialist movement in this country there was a great fight over the question of "politics." The "moderates,"—as their opponents called them,—believed in political action; while the "radicals,"—as they called themselves,—didn't. The principle argument against political action, the one that appealed mostly to our revolutionary spirit, ran somewhat as follows:

Politics is a capitalist institution, designed to fool and the better exploit the working class. It is, therefore inherently bad, and nothing good can possibly come of it. Furthermore, being an instrument of exploitation, it is necessarily corrupting, its very touch contaminating. The workers must therefore have none of it. The battles of politics can have no possible interest for us. They are either shams designed to divide the workers so that both sides can exploit them the better, or, when real, the fight is over the question who should do the exploiting. *All* politics are therefore bad. There is not, and can not be, any such thing as good politics. "Politics is politics."

This not only sounded alluring, but seemed incontestably true. For didn't we know the capitalist interests behind the political parties? And didn't we know that they were all ready to make up their differences and turn their united forces against the working class whenever it showed signs of dis-

affection? And wasn't it but too true that many, if not most, revolutionists who entered upon the devious ways of politics succumbed to its corrupting influences and were entirely lost to the cause of the working class?

Any argument that could be advanced against this line of reasoning and indubitable proof seemed only the emanations of a spirit of timidity if not actual cowardice. Nothing but attempts at "temporizing," due to faintness of heart or an inability to emancipate oneself from the intellectual bondage in which the bourgeoisie keeps the working class.

We soon learned to know better however. We discovered the emptiness of the formula "politics is politics." We found that there is *politics and politics*. We found that politics was indeed compatible with revolutionarism, that there was such a thing in short, as *revolutionary politics*. But we were destined to learn even more. We learned with mingled chagrin and amazement that the radical-sounding catch-phrase "politics is politics" was made a cloak for the most hideous practices,—that the principle that *all* politics were bad when translated into practice read: "vote as you please." At first we were just amazed and indignant. We called anarchists those who opposed the organization of a working class political party on the ground that all voting was bad, but, nevertheless voted for Tammany Hall traitors. Some of us still do that. Foolishly, of course, for there is absolutely no treason involved in an Anarchist's voting any kind of a capitalist ticket, including that of Tammany Hall, although it would be treason for a Socialist to do so.

The principle of "politics is politics" not only permits but directly encourages, and sometimes even dictates, the practices that seem treasonable to us. To begin with, if *all* voting is bad, and there are no degrees of badness, then when we do vote,—and the flesh is so notoriously weak,—what difference does it make,—except to you personally, for *your own personal* reasons,—*how* you vote? But you can even put it on the higher plane of the interest of the working class.

Here is one way of doing it: The working class cannot emancipate itself by means of political action. Therefore it *must not* organize any political party of its own looking to that end. It must look to other means for that, whatever those may be. But in the meantime it is compelled to live within the capitalist system, and it makes some difference to it what's doing within that system. It has certain temporary non-revolutionary interests to preserve. Why not organize a strictly *reform-party*, without any revolutionary purpose, but just for the daily fight by the working class for an improved existence under capitalism? Or, better still, why not utilize the present existing political parties,—*all* political parties are alike,—for the purpose of

obtaining the necessary concessions from the capitalist class?

And here is another: The only way of putting some sense into the heads of the workers, so as to make them resort to *the* proper means of emancipating themselves, is to help capitalism run itself into the ground,—of emphasizing its worst aspects and tendencies as much as possible. “The worse the better.” It is therefore the duty of all real revolutionists to help capitalism make of its domain such a sink of iniquity and corruption that it should at once become manifest to the working class that the whole system is beyond redemption. Voting for Tammany Hall is probably the best means that could be devised for achieving that purpose.

You can take your choice: Vote for Tammany Hall. “Help our friends and punish our enemies” Or join some *reform*-movement. As long as you do not organize a class-conscious revolutionary socialist party, you are safe within the principle of “politics is politics.”

* * *

The other day I was passing a street corner where Socialists were holding an anti-war meeting. I stopped to listen and observe. The speaker was vociferous, and the audience enthusiastic,—to judge by the applause.

“War,”—said the speaker,—“*is war.*” “No amount of quibbling can change that. It is all equally bad, and we’ll have none of it under any pretext. You can draw no nice distinctions between kinds of war; nor between the degrees of guilt of those who go to war or support it. War is *all* of one kind, and *all* those who participate in it or approve of it are equally guilty. There can be no war with honor, nor any peace with dishonor. Therefore we are for peace at any price.”

I looked at the speaker: His face was familiar. A few months before, I had heard him, on the same corner, defend the action of the German Socialists in going to war. I looked at the applauders in the audience: I recognized a couple of them. One was an old time opponent of all voting, now snugly tucked away in a Tammany Hall job. Another was a declaimer of revolutionary phrases, a severe critic of the spirit of “moderation” prevalent in our party,—now safely landed in the Progressive harbor.

Meanwhile the speaker was proceeding; “The weak-kneed, the temporizers, they who don’t dare tell the whole truth, will tell you that there is war *and* war. That some war is absolutely wrong and indefensible, while other war may be justifiable. I say that these distinctions are only calculated to confuse you. Once you start drawing distinctions you don’t know where you’ll land. You must abhor

all war just because it is war, and not because it is conducted in one way rather than another. Going to war in *defense* of Belgium is no more justifiable than the *invasion* of Belgium. The torpedoing of the *Lusitania* is no worse than the sinking of a troop-transport. General Sherman said: War is Hell. Are you going to draw distinctions between the different kinds of Hell? *War is war*,—and that’s all there is to it.”

Someone in the crowd murmured: “What a beautiful, soul-inspiring doctrine.” I turned around; it came from the lips of a woman whose face was aglow with enthusiasm. For a moment I forgot the speaker and the rest of the audience. But a moment later my thoughts went back to them, and I could not help thinking of the real meaning of the doctrine when translated into practice.

Yes, what a beautiful doctrine that knows no distinction between Suedekum—Schippel and Jules Guesde; between those who want Germany to conquer the world, and those who want to prevent Germany from subjugating Belgium and France. Between those who want Germany to rule the world, and those who want the world to rule itself. And what a convenient doctrine too, for us here. Just think of the advantage of being able, when the time comes, to join in an adventure against Mexico or Japan, and claim that you are following in the footsteps of Jules Guesde and George Plekhanoff. “War,” we shall then say to our possible critics,—“war is war. And how dare you draw distinctions between the war they engaged in and the war we are waging? On your own showing we are as good as they. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What was good doctrine then is good doctrine now. *War is war*, and no distinctions made.”

No wonder our best men have always fought and are now fighting against such a monstrous doctrine,—a doctrine not merely devoid of thought, but vicious in tendency. The proof of the pudding is in the eating: Today this doctrine is upheld by the Suedekums, the Schippels, the Scheidemanns, and the rest of those Socialists who have joined the Kaiser in his great effort on behalf of “German Kultur.” It is opposed by that band of noble spirits who have dared not only the wrath of the Kaiser but also the odium of their own party in opposing this war: the Liebknechts, the Mehrings, the Luxemburgs, the Zetkins.

But what care we for Marx or Engels, Franz Mehring or Rosa Luxemburg, so long as we have a revolutionary-sounding catch-phrase?

Effective Political Action

By Moses Oppenheimer

THE war in Europe and the breakdown of the International proved that the working classes of the various countries are still very far indeed from their goal: the conquest of political power so as to become the dominant factor in organized society.

As firm believers in political action we must now inquire whether the movement has waged the political struggle in the past in such a manner as to impress the proletarian masses thoroughly with their mission and the way to achieve it. That is particularly true of the movement here in America. Has our organized party achieved power and influence promising success in the not distant future? Has it used its means and its energy to bring nearer industrial democracy? Has it become the recognized voice of the working class, or is it rather today more than ever the tail of a mere fraction of that class, the backward elements of the A. F. of L.?

The time for fooling ourselves is past. All too long have we been side-stepping and soft-stepping. All too often have we been marching behind the noisy hosts of bourgeois reformers, forgetting our proletarian character and aiming at looking respectable.

What have we to show as the fruit of our labor in the political field? First of all, a long line of Has-Beens: an ex-Congressman, some ex-members of legislative and municipal bodies, ex-mayors of Haverhill, Mass., of Milwaukee, Wis., of Schenectady, N. Y., of Butte, Mont., and so on ad nauseam. We have our solitary member of Congress elected chiefly by votes of non-socialists. We have here and there a few non-consequential members in representative assemblies, nowhere occupying a position of real power. We have a few writers who are doing well financially by contributing articles in capitalist magazines.

Only dreamers of day dreams can honestly believe that we are marching on triumphantly to the conquest of the state. Were a catastrophe similar to the European war to overtake us our movement would fail even worse than that of Germany did. The proof of it is seen in our impotency in the face of the outrages perpetrated upon our wageworkers, in the brutality of our capitalists, our officials, our courts.

No, we are very far indeed from being a political power for the good of the working class. We are phrase-mongers, make-believers. We fool ourselves thinking that thereby we fool our antagonists. We make faces at the enemy and call it class-war. We play politics in the style of little boys playing war

with tin soldiers. We make a noise and call it campaigning. We teach clap-trap and call it propagandæ.

We persistently shut our eyes to unwelcome facts. We swallow the capitalist assertion that we are living in a democracy. We swallow it and enact the notorious Art. II section 6, against the advocacy of "crime, violence or sabotage" without even an attempt to define these terms otherwise than the capitalists do. We swallow the statement of one of our high party cocolorums that it is "ethically unjustifiable and tactically suicidal" not to obey laws made by capitalist agencies in this our "Democracy." Are we truly living under a Democracy? That is the point. Upon the correct answer to that question depends the political course we should steer.

The feminists in our ranks—and there are quite a few—answer in the negative. That is very good as far as it goes. For in our economic fabric male suffrage is becoming more and more an anachronism.

But we, as socialists, are bound to look farther than mere femimism. We must look at the whole working class, native and foreign born, male and female, white and colored, settled and shifting. If we do we discover that our ruling class, a good deal more foresighted than we, has hamstrung the workers politically, preventing them for many decades from acquiring effective political power. They did not go about it by a frontal attack on universal suffrage. They let that bubble alone as a convenient plaything amusing the "sovereign" wage slaves. They did the trick stealthily, step by step, hypocritically babbling for "Purity of the Ballot"

They made naturalization more difficult and expensive. They enacted residential and educational clauses. They imposed poll taxes. Tricks like these were pulled off right before the eyes of our socialist luminaries who failed to see their real object.

Any political movement expressing the wage workers should forever be on the alert as to the franchise rights of that class.

The census of 1910, at least, should have been an eye-opener. Its official tables show that we have in the United States a foreign born male population of voting age of a magnitude to make it an economic and political first class factor.

Of this vast foreign born army only about forty-five per cent are naturalized, mostly of the so-called "older immigration." The rest are politically as powerless as the cattle in our fields. Of that powerless class the census of 1910 showed well nigh four millions, mostly concentrated in the industrial

centers. By this time, more than five years later, the number probably exceeds five millions.

Those are only the men. How many women belong to the same category? The Census stands mute. It failed to collect the figures. But considering the fact that foreign born women scarcely ever seek naturalization it is safe to assume that the female army of powerless wage slaves is at least as large as the male. And those millions will not be enfranchised by woman suffrage based on citizenship.

It should in fairness be mentioned that in a few states, mostly agricultural, male immigrants enjoy the franchise under certain conditions prior to full naturalization. But the number of such beneficiaries is unimportant, their rights even now of a precarious character. For years a movement is under way to make the franchise everywhere depend on full citizenship. It has already been successful in Wisconsin where our party connived at this emasculation of the workers in the silly hope to gain thereby a temporary political advantage.

Our rulers have duplicated in our time the political scheme of ancient Sparta where enslaved workers, the Helots, had no share in political power. Our own Helots get from time to time a taste of Spartan tactics. Shot down, clubbed, deported or jailed—are they politically less helpless than the Helots of Sparta?

Furthermore, there is the mass of colored people in the South, about ten millions, natives of the soil enriched by their sweat and blood, disfranchised by all kinds of barefaced trick regulations, with Judge Lynch always at his ghastly function. Their interests as an exploited element coincide with the interests of the Northern wage slaves. What have we done, what are we doing in their behalf? We put a nice phrase about equal rights in our platform and once in a while amuse ourselves by passing some resolutions of sympathy for them.

Such is the political condition in which the workers of the United States are enmeshed. It is a condition altogether peculiar to us. Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy have neither such a tremendous mass of immigrants nor such a colored problem. We cannot look to them for precedents to guide us. The problem is ours, growing ever more menacing.

What has our party done in the face of it? Practically nothing that counts. It has not even the excuse of not knowing. As soon as the advance sheets of the Census of 1910 revealed the state of things I introduced resolutions in the Central Committee of local New York calling for action by the Party. They were passed and forwarded to the State Committee. That body, in turn, forwarded them to Chicago where they since slumber peacefully in some pigeonhole. I furnished to Carl D. Thompson,

of the party's Bureau of Information, enough material showing the state of things. But no action resulted.

I published two extensive articles on that subject in *Solidarity*, the monthly organ of the German Sick and Death Benefit societies. That medium is supposed to have a circulation of 50,000. But I failed to wake up the 'Alte Genossen'. Then I published a long essay in "Zukunft," the Yiddish monthly boasting a circulation of 20,000 among the 'intelligent' Yiddish element. That element kept on dreaming of "Yiddish Culture", nor did the readers of the *Call* act when I stated the case elaborately on its editorial page. Neither writing nor lecturing on that subject seems to have produced any tangible impression on the party of Political Action.

And now I feel justified in asking: What does Political Action mean? Mere repetition of hollow phrases, of resultless campaigns? The cultivation of Hero Worship for the glory of "Leaders?" Will the party ever cease to follow blindly into impasse and quagmire? Will it ever pull itself together for effective political action *fighting ceaselessly for a genuine adult franchise* as a weapon in the struggle for emancipation?

"The Six Best Novels"

By Floyd Dell

PHYLLIS had been reading in the Sunday *Times* the lists of "the six best novels" as sent in by Jeffery Farnol, Rupert Hughes, Samuel Merwin, and a dozen or so more of the illustrious well-known among our writers of fiction. Phyllis didn't think much of their selections. She said they were stupid lists.

"*Adam Bede* and *Romola* and all that rot!" she said scornfully.

"Well," I said lightly, "you make up a better list."
"All right," she said, "I will!"

She sat up, reached for the cigarettes and a match, and blew out a slender cloud of smoke in the moonlight.

"Are you listening?"

"Of course I'm listening." She was so serious about it. One always is when one makes up lists of the six best novels. And she was charming in her seriousness. I shifted my pillow so that I could look at her.

"First of all, *The Red and the Black*," she began.

"I begin to think you are a great literary critic," I said. "That book of Stendhal's is the finest novel ever written."

"Of course," she said. "But just wait. My others may not please you so much. Let me think." The breeze was playing with a wisp of her hair. Her eyes were solemn.

"Then," she announced firmly, "*The History of Mr. Polly*. I suppose you'd have me put in one of those great lumps of philosophy, like *The New Machiavelli*, instead. But I won't. *Mr. Polly* is the best thing H. G. Wells ever wrote—"

"It's one of the best things anybody ever wrote," I said. "We won't quarrel about that. But suppose you had to explain why you thought these were the best novels. What would you say about *The Red and the Black*, for instance?"

"I don't know. I'd say that Stendhal was one of the few writers who knew anything about love, perhaps—not that he knew any too much about it. Or perhaps it's the adventurous quality of it, making it seem so much like real life. Or perhaps it's the girl, Mathilde—though Stendhal doesn't do her justice."

"Why do you like Mathilde?" I knew well enough that it was because Mathilde was so much like herself.

"Because she has a soul like an eagle," said Phyllis. "Because—oh, well! Let's get on with our list. And if you insist on asking, perhaps the reason I like *Mr. Polly* so much is because *he* was adventurous, too. Adventurous and funny. That's what life is—a glorious adventure and a perfectly absurd comedy. Isn't it!"

"It is for some people," I said.

"For you, too," she insisted.

"I deny nothing." When Phyllis argues about her philosophy of life, she is irresistible. She is the proof of her own gay, confident, bold idealism. . . Her face changed in the moonlight; she was weighing the merits of some writer, and her thoughts showed plainly.

"What's the matter?"

"I was going to choose Anatole France's *Thaïs*. But I really don't know whether he can get in at all!"

"Poor Anatole France," I said. "What has he done to deserve this unkindness from you?"

"He just hasn't quite written a first-rate novel, that's all," said Phyllis. "And that's perhaps because he wastes so much of his time being cynical about women."

"Leave him out, the dog!" I said. "Serves him right."

"How many have I got—only two? Well, then I suppose I'll put in *Tom Jones*."

"Why do you hesitate?"

"Because everybody pretends to be crazy over it. But I do like the spirit of it. That makes three."

"I'm keeping count."

"Then," she said, "there's Balzac. Yes—*Cousin Pons*. You don't like Balzac, do you?"

"No," I said. "I repudiate your list."

"Who cares?" she said. "That's four. Two more Not Dickens or Thackeray. Oh, yes! Beresford.

Counting the whole trilogy as one novel. Certainly that ought to go in."

We talked for a while about the Jacob Stahl trilogy, by the new English writer, F. D. Beresford. We had been reading the last volume, just published. We said again for the thousandth time how wonderful a book it was.¹

"Did any of those people in the *Times* mention it?" She nodded contemptuously toward the floor, still littered with the Sunday paper. "Of course not. How should they know a great book when they see it!"

Then she returned to the important task of selecting the last book in our list. "Turgeniev? No. Tolsto? Never. —I suppose you'd put in *Jean-Christophe*, but I wouldn't."

"I wouldn't either, now," I confessed. I had just been re-reading that book, which a few years ago had seemed to me so wonderful. The glory had departed from it.

"Oh!" cried Phyllis. "Of course—Gustav Frensen!"

"Of course!" How could we have forgotten him? He should have disputed the first place with Stendhal; or at least come unquestionably second, as the greatest living novelist. Frenssen! The very name thrilled us. We discussed long whether it should be *Holyland* or *Klaus Hinrich Baas*. Then we decided that the marvellous girl, Doris Rotermund, in *Klaus Hinrich Baas*, was not enough to outweigh the thousand lovely things in the other.

"*Holyland*," she decided.

"Six!"

"Have I forgotten anyone?" she asked anxiously. The list must be perfect.

"Dostoevsky!"

"Dostoevsky *must* be in. The only question is, which one? . . . That girl, Nastasya, in *The Idiot*, promises so wonderfully, and doesn't turn out anything at all. I'll put in *Crime and Punishment*. —Do you really think Stendhal is a better novelist than Dostoevsky? Sometimes I think Dostoevsky is the only novelist that ever lived. And then—no, you're right. Stendhal was writing about *well* people. We'll leave Dostoevsky at the bottom of the list, just for that."

Somewhere a clock struck, twice. The moon had clouded over. I could only see her smile in the light of the cigarette, whose gleam came and went as she puffed at it.

"Too many," I said.

A ray of moonlight struck in across the bed. "I'll take out Balzac." She smiled, threw the cigarette into the fireplace, and nestled down beside me. "Now do you like my list?"

¹ *The Early History of Jacob Stahl; A Candidate for Truth; The Invisible Event*, by J. D. Beresford. George H. Doran & Co. \$1.35 each. The set \$2.50.

Book Reviews

The Re-Making of China

THE Great War has already accomplished two things in the Far East: it has undoubtedly allowed Japan to secure the balance of power in that region, and it has given China an opportunity to re-organize its finances and to attempt to shake off the strangle-hold of foreign finance upon the country. The economic and financial problem is the most important one in China today, in its way even more decisive than the political problem of democracy. For the conquest of political democracy will prove an empty thing if foreign finance remains dominant in the industrial world of China.

In his interesting little book,¹ A. S. Waley ignores entirely this most important problem. The book is a concise summary of the events immediately preceding and subsequent to the revolution of 1911. That at once denotes its virtues and its defects. While the book is valuable in re-constituting the march of events, it throws no light upon the *causes* of those events, upon the economic and social development culminating into revolution.

Clearly, vividly we are shown the superficial political events leading up to the revolution—the torpor of China immersed in the methods and psychology of the sixteenth century; the insistence that officials know the classics while paying no attention to a knowledge of modern methods—“the officers of the Chinese army were only required to know the classics, any knowledge of military tactics being considered quite unnecessary”; the apparent decadence which was after all only somnolence; the various foreign onslaughts which gradually deprived China of her choicest territory and simultaneously produced a national awakening; the early efforts of Emperor Kwanghsu at reform, which were crushed by the Dowager Empress, who imprisoned the Emperor, usurped power and reversed his reform policy; the anti-foreign movement which culminated in the Boxer Rebellion and the horrors of which were eclipsed by the brutality of the foreign repression; the sudden change of the Empress from reaction to reform; the era of reform from 1902 to 1908; the death of the Empress Dowager in 1908, the elevation of the reactionary Prince Chun as Regent and the dismissal of Yuan Shih-Kai, followed by a period of reaction

¹ *The Re-Making of China*, by Adolf S. Waley, London: Constable and Co., Ltd. \$1.00.

capped by the revolution of 1911. A concise summary of the events of the Revolution is given—the recall of Yuan in an effort to save the dynasty, his election as first Constitutional Prime Minister of the Chinese Empire, the increasing success of the revolutionists and the swinging of Yuan over to the Revolution; Yuan's election as Provisional President, his usurpation of power and the crushing of the new revolutionary movement led by the disappointed Sun Yat-Sen, ending, as we now know, in the institution of a Yuan dynasty under the forms of Republican government.

Mr. Waley ends his record of facts with a few words about the future of China. After stating that the Chinese are not a military people, such as the Japanese, he says:

“There is, however, another point of view from which the Yellow Peril may become a serious menace to the peace of the world. This danger arises out of the refusal of other nations to admit Chinese immigrants.”

This is indeed the menace of the future. The way out is the rapid industrialization of China and the internationalization of the point of view of other nations.

In speaking of the industrialization of China, Mr. Waley says:

“This industrial development will be dependent upon the national credit and the extent to which financiers will be willing to provide the further necessary capital, a question which will be contingent upon a settled form of government.”

All this, however, would simply produce another Mexico as it was under the Diaz regime. And, indeed, the parallel with Mexico is interesting and instructive. As foreign capital conquered Mexico, so is it conquering China; and this conquest is producing the identical result—the subordination of national independence and national economic autonomy to the interests of foreign capital. This is the first problem of China, as it is that of Mexico. And Yuan Shih-Kai seems following in the foot-steps of Diaz in lavishing favors and concessions upon the foreigner. This foreign financial control seems to have been a prime cause of the revolution. “When the revolution broke out in October, 1911,” says G. L. Harding, “three provinces were in revolt against the nationalization of railways, not because they were opposed to

that policy, but because its influence was a foreign influence and because it meant the buying out of Chinese railways with foreign money.” Miles and miles of new railroads are being built by foreign capital and under the virtual political control of foreign governments; Japan is after the vast iron deposits of China, while Standard Oil has secured control of the richest oil-fields in the world. Again, Harding says that the opposition to Yuan Shih-Kai was not so much because he “was seizing the country for his own purposes, but that he was *seizing it for the foreigners' purpose.*”

The re-making of China, accordingly, and at the present stage of things, seems to consist primarily in the Chinese developing their own financial and industrial resources, and preventing foreign capital from consolidating that financial control which inevitably leads to political domination.

L. C. F.

The Ablest Pro-German Argument

PROF. JOHN W. BURGESS, perhaps America's best known political scientist, has long appeared before the public as one of the most *active* defenders of the German cause. His recent book,¹ indicates that he is probably the most able of the pro-Germans in this country. Though he indulges in some of the ordinary pro-German fallacies, his book is given over very largely to solid and undeniable statements of fact. Let us indicate briefly what Prof. Burgess regards as the most important points in the German cause—necessarily without adducing any of the counter arguments of the other side.

Burgess admits that the British government does not feel that Russia is a danger to herself, since she can deal with Russia after having disposed of Germany. If this statement is true, it disposes of the Russian danger for the rest of the world also, and considerably simplifies the argument, confining it to the relative merits of German or British predominance in the world.

Burgess makes a telling assault on the very nature of British society, describing how it is predominated by an upper layer of ten to twenty thousand families, and while a very large part

¹ *The European War of 1914: Its Causes, Purposes and Probable Results.* Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co. \$1.00.

A Socialist Digest

Berlin Socialists Attack the Party Policy

of the population at the bottom is in a state of degeneration. He contradicts himself, however, in not allowing for any radical change in this system since 1887, when he first made his observations. Undoubtedly this change has not yet proceeded very far. Still it has begun, as Burgess himself admits within three pages where he says that "the House of Lords can now no longer thwart or even modify permanently the will of the House of Commons."

On the whole, however, every Socialist will admit Burgess' assault on Great Britain, but only a small minority of the Socialists—even in Germany—will share in his eulogistic discussion of the German system. Burgess says of the German Empire:

"Its economic system is by far the most efficient, most genuinely democratic which exists at the present moment in the world or has ever existed. There is no great state in the world today in which there is so general and even a distribution of the fruits of civilization, spiritual and material, among all the people as in the United States of Germany."

But he does not even limit himself to this strong statement. Germany, he claims, has "no proletariat and no pauperism; prosperity is universal." (p. 94). The State Socialism of Germany through its workmen's insurance system "has secured to labor its proper share in the wealth produced". (p. 96). Further:

"The institutions of the country are adapted and adjusted to bring each individual person into the place and sphere for which he or she is best capacitated, thus avoiding loss by the abrasions of economic friction."

Professor Burgess is quite unreliable in his statements concerning Germany, as for example when he says that "it is a land of small proprietors where relatively few great estates exist." Probably there is no country in the world where greater estates and their owners play such an important role as in Germany. For the great estates of England have no economic function, and their owners were shorn of their predominant role in British society as long ago as 1832. However in dealing with the international relations of England and Germany, Burgess' book is most valuable. For the anti-German side of the case the reader will have to look elsewhere. But Burgess is able to show most clearly the aggressive character of British Imperialism. Many other books published recently show equally clearly the aggressive character of German Imperialism.

W. E. W.

OUR good comrades of Berlin have always maintained a high record for courage, self-sacrifice and unfaltering devotion to the cause of the international proletariat. During the period of the anti-socialist law they never flinched under the heavy blows aimed at them by the Bismarckian regime. It is, therefore, of great interest to note their virile opposition to the tactics of the official party machine in matters relating to the war. The celebrated protest of last June found its warmest support in the Berlin ranks. They followed up their action by holding *Vorwaerts* in line for internationalism. In July they issued a strong leaflet as a reply to the official peace manifesto of the party executive. This leaflet was signed by ninety of the most active Berlin comrades. The names of the signers were not published for obvious reasons. But they were given to the party executive. Of course, such a document could not appear in the Government press under the military censorship.

The Berlin comrades are bitterly disappointed by the platonic wishes for peace expressed in the party manifesto, modified by the attacks of said document upon the brother parties of the allied countries and by the policy of hushing up the war policy of the Kaiser's government.

"The party leadership asserts that the vote of the war credits on August 4, 1914, meant solely the granting of means for the defense of the attacked fatherland. But on that date nothing reliable was known except that Russian soldiers had entered German territory and German soldiers Russian territory. But at that same time they were faced by the monstrous fact that German troops had violated the neutral states of Luxembourg and Belgium in spite of international agreements.

"The phrase 'defending the fatherland' has been used for centuries by conquest-seeking despots in order to rouse the spirit of the masses. The kings of France and of Sweden as well as former Prussian rulers have used that phrase in their various war manifestoes.

"The socialist position is, on the other hand, clearly expressed in resolutions of the international congresses of Stuttgart, Copenhagen and Basel—thus:

"If still war should break out it is our duty to strive for its speedy ter-

mination and to endeavor with all our strength to use the economic and political crisis caused by the war in rousing the people and thereby hastening the abolition of capitalist class rule."

"This obligation, voluntarily assumed by the German party executive in voting for it, has now been grossly violated by the policy of August 4. The statement of that memorable date by the social-democratic faction of the Reichstag received its final form after an understanding with the government and the bourgeois parties. It did not aim at the abolition of capitalist class rule.

"The party executive acquiesced in the proclamation of 'civil peace' (Burgfrieden) under which the ruling classes occupy position after position gained by the workers during the struggles of half a century. The most elementary, the most indispensable weapons have been wrested from the hands of the workers by the state of siege, more so here than in France and England. Only people without any historic understanding can fondly imagine that the working class, voluntarily giving up its rights during the war, will be rewarded after the war by an extension of rights.

"The class struggle does not weaken the defensive power of a commonwealth against outward enemies. On the contrary, it increases it as history shows in hundred cases.

"We abhor the war atrocities not only as much as the party executive, but much more. We abhor them not only in Eastern Prussia, but also at the foot of the Alps, in Belgium, in France and on the high seas. What a strange way of fighting war atrocities by forever voting new means for war which from its very essence must ever create more atrocities!"

Referring to the attacks on the brother parties of the enemy countries the document points to the only way that can lead to a lasting peace and the re-establishment of the International: to fight imperialism as the guilty cause of the world war and to fight it in the only place where the fight can be made effective, namely in its own house. It is the duty of the German party to take the lead in such a fight because of the position it used to occupy in the International and because its policy is largely responsible for the breakdown of our World League.

The policy of timid side-stepping ruined the bourgeois opposition parties

fifty years ago and earned severe castigation of such men as Lassalle, Marx and Engels who impressed upon the German workers: "You should receive gifts only with the spear, point against point."

A Socialist Protest in the Duma

OUR Russian Comrades in the Duma have stood up manfully for the international proletariat since the beginning of the war. Five of them have been sentenced to Siberia for life in consequence. The little band remaining at their post refused to be terrorized or silenced. At the session reopened after the disastrous blows suffered by the Czar's army, the socialist spokesman, comrade Tscheidze, representing Tiflis, fearlessly attacked Czarism in an address so strong and brilliant that it compensates somewhat for the weakness shown in Berlin and Vienna.

"If there is not a drastic change," Tscheidze opened, "Russia will enter on the path of catastrophe and the people on the road of degeneration."

Apparently, he said, it was only by disaster that statesmen were led to consider the requirements of the nation. Pointing to the Ministers, he flatly stated they were responsible for the crisis through which the nation was passing.

"The very moment war was declared the Russian working class was terrorized by the government," he continued. "The most active working class leaders were flung into prison; their press was suppressed. But this is not all. Those same gentlemen (indicating the Ministers with scorn), who have always had and still have Miassojedovs in their ranks (Colonel Miassojedov a favorite of the Czar's government, delivered Russian military secrets to the German General Staff)—these same gentlemen have been searching for traitors among the workers! At the very moment when these Miassojedovs and their protectors were selling Russia behind the back of the army, perhaps to the agents of the Kaiser, they were sentencing our five Social Democratic Deputies to banishment in Siberia for life! And after all this you dare to talk about your unity with the Russian working class, about the solidarity of the Russian nation!"

Tscheidze denounced in hot terms the attitude of the Russian Government towards the demands of the working class for a living wage. "The workers have been asking for some slight increases in wages. For that they have been shot. In Kostrom ten strikers were shot and many arrested." Similarly the government has treated the

"Thus we take our stand in the conviction that the loyalty we cherish for the principles and traditions of the German Social Democracy can serve only to secure the unity and purity of the party."

Jews. "Six millions of the Jewish population is placed in such a position that they have nothing to lose but their chains—and the scaffold."

"From the workers the government is taking their leaders and flogging them into prison and torturing them," Tscheidze continued in ringing tones. "From the Jews the government is taking their most respected public men and retaining them as hostages. I doubt whether any government has even before taken hostages from its own people. I confidently declare it to be unprecedented in history."

Tscheidze was remorseless in his denunciation of the government's policy in Galicia. "Hardly had our army entered Galicia," he said, "when our administration commenced to apply their real Russian methods. To a deputation of Galician Jews, who inquired what would be their fate, the administration cynically declared that 'if they remain loyal they will be placed in the same position as the Russian Jews!'"

In uncompromising language the Social Democratic leader exposed the tyranny the government has practiced over its subject nationalities, and concluded with these powerful words:

"The government has been chiefly concerned with strengthening its own power. It has looked on all other questions as unimportant and temporary. But the responsibility for these acts does not rest alone with the government.

"It rests with the Duma, which has so willingly given its support to the government. In this unity between the Duma and the government not only have the reactionaries, but also the bourgeois Imperialists, and even a considerable section of the Radical intellectuals been seeking a source of power.

"And the result, gentlemen, we must recognize is here. The country finds itself in a most critical and sordid condition. But no great country can remain in such a position. We shall find a way out—the only way out, the way in which we Social Democrats have so often pointed in this House, the way of liberation from absolutism, the way of complete democracy. All other objects must be subordinated to this great national end. The government must go to the people and take its destiny in its own hands."

The African Roots of the War

THAT the war is a struggle to control undeveloped territories inhabited by colored races is a view held both by Socialists and by the representatives of these races. W. E. B. DuBois expresses this view in the *Atlantic Monthly*:

"The present world war is, then, the result of jealousies engendered by the recent rise of armed national associations of labor and capital whose aim is the exploitation of the wealth of the world mainly outside the European circle of nations. These associations, grown jealous and suspicious at the division of the spoils of trade-empire, are fighting to enlarge their respective shares; they look for expansion, not in Europe but in Asia, and particularly in Africa. 'We want no inch of French territory,' said Germany to England, but Germany was 'unable to give' similar assurances as to France in Africa."

This imperialism is facilitated by the fact that these territories are inhabited by backward races, against whom the whites have united, thus making them especially valuable as material to be exploited. So Du Bois asks:

"Suppose we have to choose between this unspeakable inhuman outrage on decency and intelligence and religion which we call the World War and the attempt to treat black men as human, sentient, responsible beings?"

Du Bois proposes the remedy, but suggests that it will not be acted upon, and that wars will therefore continue to be fought over the right to prey upon that colored peoples. He says:

"What the primitive peoples of Africa and the world need and must have if war is to be abolished is perfectly clear:

"First: land. To-day Africa is being enslaved by the theft of her land and natural resources. A century ago black men owned all but a morsel of South Africa. The Dutch and English came, and to-day 1,250,000 whites own 264,000,000 acres leaving only 21,000,000 acres for 4,100,000 natives. Finally, to make assurance doubly sure, the Union of South Africa has refused natives even the right to buy land. This is a deliberate attempt to force the Negroes to work on farms and in mines and kitchens for low wages. All over Africa has gone this shameless monopolizing of land and natural resources to force poverty on the masses and reduce them to the 'dumb-driven-cattle' stage of labor activity.

"Secondly: we must train native races in modern civilization. This can be done. Modern methods of educating

children, honestly and effectively applied, would make modern, civilized nations out of the vast majority of human beings on earth to-day. This we have seldom tried. For the most part Europe is straining every nerve to make over yellow, brown and black men into docile beasts of burden, and only an irrepressible few are allowed to escape and seek (usually abroad) the education of modern men.

"Lastly, the principle of home rule must extend to groups, nations, and

racés. The ruling of one people for another people's whim or gain must stop. This kind of despotism has been in later days more and more skillfully disguised. But the brute fact remains: the white man is ruling black Africa for the white man's gain, and just as far as possible he is doing the same to colored races elsewhere. Can such a situation bring peace? Will any amount of European concord or disarmament settle this injustice?"

A Glimpse of the Austrian Socialists

SINCE the fatal news that the Austrian Socialists, in the days preceding the declaration of war, had justified their government's attitude toward Serbia, little has been heard of their actions. From recent issues of the Vienna *Arbeiter-Zeitung* it appears that the Austrian Socialists accept the standpoint of the Central Empires that Russia, France and England engineered the war.

Commenting upon an alleged statement of Count Berchtold concerning the origin of the war, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* says that Berchtold probably speaks in all sincerity. But this world-war has not fallen from heaven, and the "Book of Fate" is, after all, written by mortals. The Socialist organ brushes aside the diplomatic negotiations and entanglements which preceded the war. Every one knows about the hate of Russia towards Austria about the antagonism of France and England toward Germany. This hatred, this antagonism, says the paper, was the foundation on which capitalist Europe built, and nothing is clearer than that the political divergences between these nations were utilized by a large class of influential men to poison public opinion and to raise it to that state of white heat which made it easily malleable in the hands of the military parties.

But the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* takes a fling at the German jingoes. The Kaiser having said, it is reported, "It was not my will!" upon looking at the heaps of dead on a battle-field, the organ of the Austrian Socialists says:

"The Kaiser uttered those shuddering words: 'Ich habe es nicht gewollt!' but can his notorious Gen. von Bernhardi say the same—this man whose book is the song of songs for all war enthusiasts? This man preached the 'necessity of war as one of the indispensable things of politics and Kultur.' This man warned his compatriots 'not to neglect the opportunity of the hour,' and that it was inadvisable to wait where war threatened. It was Bernhardi who said that when was advisable 'enough points offered them-

selves where the handle might be turned."

Are all those influential persons free of guilt, asks the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, the men who wrote for years about the liberating effects of war, about the redeeming properties of war, who mocked at the "loose ideas of peace," and who sneered at the wish to preserve peace as cowardly and unmanly! These men dare not repeat the Kaiser's words.

The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* is a thorn in the flesh of the censor. Scarcely a day passes without its columns appearing in a curiously mutilated condition. In a recent issue, six white spaces appear on which matter had been printed offensive to the authorities. Yet every now and then something appears in its columns which seems to have escaped the censor's watchfulness. Thus, it had recently a paragraph dealing with a remark of the semi-official *Reichspost*, in which this journal concedes with the Pope because of the alleged interference with his correspondence. The *Reichspost* declared that this was a slap in the face of 300,000,000 Catholics, an action which would embitter the Christian world, and wound their inner feelings.

The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* throws scorn on this in the following words: "Certainly. The watching over the correspondence of the Papal chancery is the most terrible thing in all this terrible war, and the action which, more than any other, must fill the minds of 300,000,000 with the greatest sorrow!"

The Socialist organ recently discussed the question: "What is at the root of the dislike felt towards Germany by the majority of civilized countries?" The admission is made that even in the majority of neutral countries this dislike is felt. To say, as so many North German writers and newspapers are in the habit of saying, that Germans do not mind being hated, so long as they are feared, is neither politically wise nor logical.

The sowing of the seeds of fear will never enable one to reap a harvest of love. The seeds of fear grow into the

full ear of hate. Despite the writers and newspapers who do not mind being hated, the vast majority of Germans, both in Germany and Austria, desire to be admired and loved and respected, but the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* maintains that so long as they support a policy of sowing fear they will never gain anything else than hatred.

In the opinion of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* it is high time that the German nation thought out this question. This awful war will not last forever, and German men and women will return to normal thoughts and find it wholly undesirable to be regarded as the scourge and terror of the world. Scourging and terrorizing is not Germany's world mission, but the winning of the world's love and respect.

MacDonald Supports the Government

THE leader of the British Laborites and Socialists, J. R. MacDonald, though opposed to the declaration of war, has come out with a strong declaration in support of the government. He says:

"British labor is today working hand in hand with the government to save the nation. That, for the moment, is the status of British labor. But—after it is all over British labor will have something to say to the British Government."

The "something" that British labor will have to say to the government after the war, according to MacDonald, is that "war is unnecessary and the elements that make war possible must be wiped out."

"But in the meantime," continued MacDonald, "British labor has come to the stage of realization that the government must be helped out of its difficulty and inevitably British labor must forget the past and look to the future by helping the government fight for its existence."

British trades union members and leaders are now in khaki by thousands and tens of thousands and putting in hard licks in war munition factories and other government work, declared MacDonald.

"Do you mean that labor henceforth will overlook all its industrial grievances and postpone these grievances and strikes until after the war," was asked.

"For the present labor is forced to give in. It is inevitable at this time," answered MacDonald.

The Balkan Tangle

THE Balkan situation continues to be the Chinese puzzle of politics. Between Europe and Asia in the nature of things runs the world's greatest artery of commerce. The trouble with the Balkans is primarily that they lie across this route.

Thus they are thrown into the whirlpool of the world politics of the Great Powers.

Rumania, Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece are together about four times the size of New York State with somewhat over double the population. The production is almost entirely agricultural so that each of these nations exports foodstuffs and imports manufactured products.

Anton Hofrichter, in the *Neue Zeit* furnishes a valuable presentation of the currents and cross currents in this locality at the present time.

He first explains the underlying principle that minor nations like the Balkan countries cannot practice the independent politics of great powers based on the supremacy of their own requirements but are in a relation of vassalage where the highest that they can aspire is to take advantage of favorable opportunities outside.

Rumania occupies this sort of position even though she is the biggest of the group in area and population. Hofrichter finds that while she is not strong enough to take the aggressive like Italy, she today occupies a commanding position because she blocks the communication between Turkey and the Central powers. Even without attacking she can simply obstruct. Thus both Russia and Austria are bidding for her co-operation, while Rumania herself maintains a cautious reserve because she knows from past experience that she has the most to fear from either a too successful Russia or a too successful Austria.

At the time of the Russo-Turkish War (1877) the treachery of Russia in keeping Bessarabia for herself drove Rumania into the arms of Austria. This affiliation continued uninterruptedly up to as late as 1912.

But then came the first and second Balkan Wars and with them a reversal of sentiment as complete as it was sudden. "From the treaty of Bucharest dates the estrangement of Rumania and Austria-Hungary."

A close observer could have seen even earlier that the preoccupation of Russia in the Orient and her defeat at the hands of Japan left Austria in unchecked control of the situation in the South. This was confirmed by the absorption of Bosnia and Herzegovina

in 1908, while Russia stood helplessly by.

After the first Balkan War when it came to the division of spoils, Austria showed her hand by supporting the Bulgarian aspirations so as to prevent a greater Serbia. In other words, Austrian statesmanship aimed to prevent a Balkan Union by instigating or supporting the aspirations of any part of the group against the other. Thus the Austrian support of Bulgaria led to the second Balkan War.

The defeat of Bulgaria caused the collapse of this policy on all sides. Bulgaria felt that she had been left in the lurch by Austria while Rumania found herself playing second fiddle throughout the entire situation. This was manifested concretely when Rumania took the northern strip of weakened Bulgaria, while on the South Greece and Serbia were enlarged. Austria had started out by opposing Serbia and Greece and ended by losing Bulgaria and Rumania.

At present, Bulgaria like Rumania holds the whip-hand over the communications between Turkey and the North, with the added advantage however that the Bulgarian border is much better sheltered against any attempt of the Teutonic powers to force their way through to the South. But Bulgaria, in spite of the grudge she has been nursing since 1912 against her Balkan neighbors, has not forgotten the value of Austrian "support"; she is accordingly bargaining with both sides without declaring herself towards either.

Moreover, the protective tariff on foodstuffs by Austria-Hungary and Germany closed their markets to the very products that these smaller countries must sell, whereas the Balkan countries import the best proportion of their industrial manufactures from the Teutonic nations. These circumstances tend to aggravate the antagonisms that have resulted from domination by superior strength unmixed with persuasion or compromise.

Thus the situation presents a picture of uncertainty and indecision. This is further complicated, if that were possible, by the recent entry of Italy whose occupation of Avlona and some Adriatic Islands as well as her claim to a sphere of interest in Albania make her a new factor to be reckoned with.

The near future may also show whether the role assigned by Hofrichter to these minor nations is not subject to change, partly as he himself states on account of the present favorable strategic opportunity but even more so by the possible entry of a new

historical factor—a Balkan union which shall be the equivalent of a great power and rule supreme in its own sphere.

"Peace" and the Party

THE National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party recently decided to participate in the "Peace Convention" to be held early in September under the auspices of "The Friends of Peace" and other pro-German organizations using peace as a decoy. Immediately upon the announcement of this action, L. B. Boudin, National Committee member from New York, initiated a motion to disapprove of the action of the N. E. C. Commenting upon his motion, Boudin said:

"The Friends of Peace Convention is not a bona fide peace demonstration, nor part of any bona fide peace movement, but is part of a huge pro-German fraud directed by notorious pro-Germans and financed by German slush funds, masquerading as a peace movement. In addition thereto, the people who engineer this movement, notably Mr. Henry Weismann, are notorious enemies of the Labor Movement, and the participation of the Socialist Party in this congress would be a lasting disgrace to the party not only as a party of real peace, but as a representative of the interests of the working class. In addition it would undoubtedly lead to disruption within the party and discourage the real workers for peace."

The motion secured the necessary seconds, who protested vigorously against participation in a fraudulent peace convention. Before the motion was voted upon, the N. E. C. reversed its decision. Commenting upon this, the New York *Volkszeitung* briefly but pointedly says:

"The reversal by the National Executive Committee of its decision to send delegates to the Weissmann—Rebhan "Peace Convention" was the least that could be done in the premises. The members of the National Executive Committee are probably innocent of any intentional wrongdoing, having simply fallen victims to a fraud and honestly believed the cleverly prepared articles and other 'publicity matter' sent out by the organizers of the convention. But the National Executive of a political party has also the duty of using more care than our Executive did in this instance."

From Across the Pacific

"Increase our order to seventy-five copies per issue, also send two copies of Wm. English Walling's "Socialists and the War" and two copies of Dr. Wm. J. Robinson's "Limitation of Offsprings".

W. ANDRADE.

Australia.

Sample Copies

A friend of the NEW REVIEW, who feels that the magazine deserves a greater circulation, has given us \$50.00 on condition that we use the money to send sample copies to possible subscribers. If you can distribute a bundle of sample copies, from time to time, where they are likely to do some good, drop us a postal to that effect. *We need* your cooperation

Ask For Them

If you like

PEARSON'S MAGAZINE

at all, you will like it BETTER than any other magazine

Send your name and address on a postcard to PEARSON'S MAGAZINE, 425 East 24th Street, New York City, for a **FREE SAMPLE COPY**

AND SEE; then subscribe through us—

HERE'S A BARGAIN

New Review	1 yr. \$1.50
Pearson's	1 yr. 1.50

3.00

OUR PRICE - \$2.00

A FEW FACTS--- AND AN APPEAL

"I always feel that so long as you are at the business end we shall pull through, somehow or other. When I was Secretary of the S. L. P. we performed miracles of high financing. . . . In all seriousness, you are doing wonders and deserve to be left alive for some time yet.

"Frank Bohn."

* * *

But even "high financing" has its limits, and when a creditor comes along and insists upon payment, *cold cash* alone will satisfy him.

That is the situation the NEW REVIEW is now up against. *We need cold cash*; and when we get it, it won't become warm because of too much repose in *our* coffers. It will go straight to the creditors.

* * *

It hasn't been "high financing" alone that pulled the NEW REVIEW through. Cutting down expenses to the bone and our readers' hearty support performed the miracle.

Consider these facts:

The NEW REVIEW doesn't pay a cent for editorial work, or for any of the articles it publishes.

The total salary budget each month for the business office amounts to \$130.

A Socialist, who happens to be a printer, does our printing at a surprisingly low figure.

* * *

In answer to our last appeal, the total has been raised to \$190. *This is not enough.*

We have managed to get our creditors to extend us two weeks' grace.

We must secure \$160 more by the end of September. The situation is critical. Won't you respond?

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
General Manager.

Address: *New Review*, 256 Broadway, New York City

AN OPPORTUNITY---

Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich, an experienced writer and lecturer, is making a lecture tour to the Pacific Coast and back. The NEW REVIEW has secured his services, and our plan allows organizations to secure him for lecture engagements on an extremely profitable basis.

ITINERARY

Sunday, Sept. 26, Pittsburg, Pa.;
Monday, Sept. 27, Cincinnati, Ohio;
Thurs., Sept. 30, Terre Haute, Ind.;
Friday, Oct. 1, Chicago; Sat. Oct. 2,
Milwaukee; Sunday, Oct. 3, Chicago;
Monday, Oct. 4, Chicago; Tuesday,
October 5, Chicago; Wednesday, Oct.
6, Deoria, Ill.; Friday, Oct. 8, Madi-
son, Wis.; Sat. Oct. 9, Minneapolis;
Sunday, Oct. 10, St. Paul; Tuesday,
Oct. 12, Winnipeg; Wednesday, Oct.
13, Winnipeg; Thursday, Oct. 14,
Winnipeg; Sunday, Oct. 17, Calgary;
Tuesday, Oct. 19, Portland, Ore.;
Sunday, Oct. 24, San Francisco; Sun-
day, Oct. 31, San Francisco; Sunday,
Nov. 7, Los Angeles.

LECTURE SUBJECTS

Socialism and the War.
The Trust and Socialism.
**Conciliation and Arbitration in Labor
Disputes.**
Immigration and Trade Unionism.
Economic Effects of Immigration.
Russian Revolutionary Movement.
**Recent Political and Economic De-
velopment in Russia.**
The American Labor Movement.

Write now for dates—immediately. Our terms are of the best.
*Here is a chance for Labor, Socialist and radical organizations to secure this
able lecturer and make money for your propaganda.*

New Review Lecture Bureau, 256 Broadway, New York City

DR. HOURWICH AND HIS CAREER

Dr. Hourwich is a brilliant writer and lecturer—lucid, brilliant, stimulating, always stimulating. His experience has been wide and deep, and contributes to the force of his ideas.

His revolutionary activity dates from his youth. When only nineteen years of age, he was arrested by the Russian Government, and served 8 months in solitary confinement. After his release, he was again arrested for revolutionary conspiracy and deported without trial to Siberia. After 3½ years he returned to European Russia, and was denied admission to various universities. He studied law, became a practicing lawyer; but in 1890 the government sought his arrest again, and Dr. Hourwich fled to Sweden, from whence he came to America.

In New York, Dr. Hourwich became active in the labor and radical movement. In 1891 he was appointed Fellow at Columbia University, and in 1893 was elected Docent (Instructor) in Statistics at the University of Chicago. He has a reputation as Statistician, and for many years worked for the Census bureau. In 1906 he went to Russia, during the revolution, as a correspondent. Soon after his return he became clerk for the Cloakmakers' Union, and engaged in a fight with the Manufacturers' Association because of his uncompromising class-consciousness.

Dr. Hourwich is the author of "Peasant Migration to Siberia," "The Economics of the Russian Village," and "Immigration and Labor." He is the greatest authority on immigration in this country.

Dr. Hourwich has been active in all radical and progressive movements in this country.