

Dec.
First

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. 18

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
THE PROBLEM OF NATIONALITY	321	THE MECHANICS OF SOLIDARITY	332
Louis C. Fraina		Austin Lewis	
THE MIND OF A CENSOR	325	THE LITERARY REVIVAL IN IRELAND	336
Floyd Dell		Ernest A. Boyd	
INDIA AND THE EMPIRE	326	CURRENT AFFAIRS	338
"Baghi"		L. B. Boudin	
PREMATURE PEACE?	330	A SOCIALIST DIGEST:	
S. J. Rutgers		Russian Socialist Manifesto; Bernstein's Peace Programme; A German-	
CAPTURED	331	Austro-Hungarian Customs Union; Spanish Socialist Congress.	
Anna Strunsky Walling		CORRESPONDENCE:	
		From T. D. O'Boiger; F. J. Gould.	

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

The Problem of Nationality

By Louis C. Fraina

I.

THE problem of Nationality cannot be considered simply in its relation to the right of nations to independence. It is primarily a problem in the history and economics of Capitalism, - the problem involved in the stage of development achieved by the social-economic system contained in a nation, and which determines the form of expression of the nation.

Nationality does not come into being because of mystical or cultural impulses; it is created by a definite process of economic development and its political reflex. Nationality is not desirable in itself; it is desirable only as a tool with which to work at particular stages of our social development. Nor is Nationality in itself democratic and progressive; it is that only when the social forces it expresses trend toward democracy and progress; under different circumstances Nationality may be completely reactionary.

A very important point to be stressed in a discussion of Nationality, accordingly, is the fundamental difference between the democratic nationalism of the era of bourgeois revolution and the reactionary nationalism of Imperialistic capitalism. Eduard Bernstein proposes that Socialists oppose only the "new capitalistic nationalism which culminates in Imperialism," and not the "old ideology" of nationalism "which required the self-government of the nation as a centre of culture among other similar centres." Bernstein's proposal neglects seriously the economic and political aspects of the problem, as

determined by the development of capitalist Imperialism and its reactionary tendencies. It is impossible to revive the old democratic ideology of nationalism, since the social conditions underlying its previous existence are no longer dominant in the economy of industrially highly-developed nations. The emphasis laid upon democratic nationalism leaves unconsidered the fact that capitalism has turned its back upon the era of its democratic aspirations, and that consequently the contemporary expression of Nationality is un-democratic.

Nationalism, as much as Imperialism, possesses general characteristics; but to discuss the problem of Nationality in its general characteristics alone is to miss its real significance. While the essential economic characteristic of Imperialism is the export of capital, each national Imperialism has its own distinctive features determined by economic and political development. The essential characteristic of Nationality is the temporary necessity of the nation as a centre of economic, political and cultural activity; but the form of expression of Nationality varies as the historical requirements vary. Not only is Nationality to-day different in the great capitalist nations from the Nationality of the era of bourgeois revolution, but Nationality differs as between different nations, and nations in process of formation.

These differences are not simply theoretical in their interest. Important practical conclusions are involved. They signify that new social forces have come into being, fundamentally altering the problem and our attitude toward the problem. The change

from Colonialism to Imperialism means not simply a change in the foreign policy of nations, but a change in the economics of Capitalism, a new stage in economic development. The problem of Nationality in its newer aspects has a similar meaning—directly determined by the Imperialistic trend.

The newer Nationalism, in its Imperialistic aspects, demonstrates that the Great War is not a result of Nationality as much as a *revolt* against Nationality. Although there is a peculiar circumstance involved: that this revolt against Nationality proceeds along nationalistic lines, the effort of a particular nation to subjugate other nations in its own national interest. But in spite of its dynamic expression, it is fundamentally conditioned by the economic urge which seeks to shatter the fetters of Nationality. Industry organized along national lines has become an obstacle to the development of the forces of production; industry has become international to a point where it must tear down the barriers of the nation.

II.

Nationality, the trend toward Nationality, makes its appearance simultaneously with Capitalism. Ascending capitalism develops the nation-state, which plays an important part in the overthrow of feudalism and the establishment of the capitalist economy. The effort to break the fetters placed upon industry organized on the basis of the city-state leads directly to the formation of the modern nation. Ascending capitalism requires freedom of trade within as large a territorial unit as possible, national markets exclusively for the national bourgeoisie to develop and exploit; a common system of coinage, weights and measures; and a strong central government to protect and encourage capital, and to carve out larger territorial limits for the nation. The nation-state develops a sense of solidarity in the people of a particular national group, and firmly establishes national institutions, a national literature and culture. The nation has conformed essentially to economic and geographical facts; while race and language have been convenient expressions of Nationality, the nation has itself created "race" and "language", and often suppressed them in the fulfillment of its historic task.

The early struggles of ascending capitalism seek to create the national unit along as large territorial limits as possible, while maintaining order within the national domain. The industrialized unit in the nation seeks wider markets, wider sources of raw material,—regions which it can industrially revolutionize. The process of expansion is accelerated by a series of bloody wars. All this, in conjunction with other favoring circumstances, leads to the institution of absolute monarchy, directly traceable to the requirements of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie at

this period is only slightly revolutionary, its revolutionary expression assuming vitality in the measure that the task of carving out the national frontiers is completed. But, this task accomplished, the social organization expressed in the dominance of absolute monarchy, itself based upon a compromise between the bourgeoisie and the feudal nobility, becomes a very real obstacle to the development of the productive forces. In the efforts to destroy this obstacle, the bourgeoisie initiates its revolutionary era, one result of which is the organization of the nation along democratic and republican lines. It is at this epoch that the nation assumes a definite and concrete form.¹

But the bourgeoisie becomes frightened of its own revolutionary impulses: all bourgeois revolutions end in dictatorship,—which persist or disintegrate as conditions determine.² Having accomplished the task of destroying the economic fetters upon its development, the bourgeoisie becomes indifferent to the *form* of government, as long as scope is allowed its economic development. Fear of the proletariat, competition between nations, struggles between various groups of the ruling class itself, immaturity of governmental experience,—all these circumstances incline the bourgeoisie toward "strong" government, leaving a merely sentimental feeling for general liberal principles. A compromise is struck in constitutional monarchy.

In this process of developing the nation, revolution and liberal ideas are merely an incidence. When the bourgeoisie has completed the industrial revolution, it discards its liberal ideas and retains only that irreducible minimum necessary for social control. This minimum varies as the historical requirements vary.

In nations which completed their national bourgeois revolution sufficiently prior to the era of modern Imperialism to allow their democratic ideas scope for ascendancy, the reaction against liberal ideas was only partly successful; finally working itself out in a republic—as in France—; or an essentially democratic government—as in "monarchical" England. But in nations which completed their national revolution almost simultaneously with the advent of Imperialism, democracy in government never established itself. Germany is the classic type of this new development,—with Japan a remarkably close parallel.

The bourgeois revolution in Germany in 1848 was crushed by the terrific blows of the counter-revolu-

1) It is interesting to note, that the French Revolution, the finest expression of the revolutionary bourgeois era, was compelled by the struggle against practically all of feudal Europe to break through the bounds of Nationality and project an internationalism implicit in the concept of cosmopolite republicanism. But both the internationalism and the revolutionary ideology were discarded as economic organization proceeded along national lines.

2) This statement does not require corroborative details, bearing Cromwell and Napoleon in mind. General Washington was offered a crown, and there was a strong party with decided monarchical tendencies in the early days of our republic. The recent bourgeois revolution in China ended in dictatorship.

tion. National unity was achieved not as a revolt against the feudal class, but with the feudal class of Junkers in control. Bourgeois democracy remained a thing of the future. The industrial revolution in Germany strengthened, instead of weakening, the monarchical power. It is fashionable to attribute this development to "Prussia," or to Treitschke and the peculiarities of the German people. But the reaction, as at previous periods, might have proven temporary (the forces of democracy grew steadily, a whole movement—the Social-Democracy—being devoted to the task of completing the bourgeois revolution) had not a new set of circumstances intervened which, instead of finding its interest in the overthrow of monarchical power, found its interest in its perpetuation,—the advent of Imperialism.

It is not our task at the present moment to discuss the basis of Imperialism, its relation to the economics of capitalism. It is sufficient for our requirements to point out that Imperialism assumes the political form of a struggle for the control of territory rich in natural resources and capable of being industrially revolutionized by the industrialized nation undertaking the work of "development." Capitalism in its Imperialistic phase turns in on itself and reproduces the period of its youth, when it struggled for a similar objective,—with this difference, however: that where the earlier struggle created Nationality, the contemporary struggle for undeveloped territory negates Nationality. This process carries with it a corollary: as the earlier struggles of capitalism produced war and monarchy, so to-day Imperialism not alone produces war but a tendency toward "strong" government,—monarchy disguised under a variety of political forms.³

Germany was united in 1871, and fifteen years later its Imperialistic era began. This let loose all those reactionary tendencies which lead to a revival of monarchical power. The democratic movement gradually turned Imperialistic, and even the Social Democracy became subtly nationalized, until when it expressed its nationalism at the outbreak of war it suddenly discovered that its nationalistic position committed it to Imperialism.

German Imperialism rejects the principle of Nationality. The conquest of nations is its political objective, war the medium through which it works. The feudal military caste and the imperial regime are accepted as means for the prosecution of war and aggression.

The negation of Nationality is not peculiar to German Imperialism; it is an attribute of all Imper-

alism. An Italian Imperialist declaims as follows:

"It remains for us to conquer. It is said that all the other territories are 'occupied.' But there have never been any territories *res nullius*. Strong nations, or nations on the path of progress, conquer nations in decadence."

A peculiarity of Italian Imperialism, which distinguishes it from other Imperialisms, is that, while in Germany Imperialism is distinct from nationalism—Imperialism transforming and identifying itself with nationalism in order to secure a popular sanction for its purpose—in Italy Imperialism and nationalism developed simultaneously and are really a common movement. This is because Italy was not fully created a nation by its bourgeois revolution. While Italy was created a national state half a century ago, it was not until some decades ago that a real national sentiment began to animate the country. Nationalism and Imperialism developed simultaneously, and merged into one.⁴

Imperialism, accordingly, is the negation of Nationality because the barriers of the nation are no longer compatible with the development of the forces of production. Imperialism seeks to break down these barriers by means of one nation dominating other nations. The Socialist solution is not to emphasize Nationality, but *democratic Federalism*.—the submergence of Nationality in a federal union of the nations, based upon economic necessity, and organized along democratic lines.

III.

The spirit of the demand for new national groupings in Europe is just; but the literal fulfillment of the demand would emphasize national divisions, create new barriers to the expansive forces of Capitalism provocative of war, and doom certain nations to a precarious economic existence.

A stimulating study of the practical aspects of Nationality is contained in Arnold J. Toynbee's *Nationality and the War*.⁵ It is a really excellent book in material, scope and treatment,—the only adequate study extant of Nationality in its modern European aspects as a practical problem in national groupings.

Toynbee starts out with a fundamental error, which vitiates much of his theoretical discussion, but does not affect—strangely—his practical conclusions. This error is that Nationality in itself is the cause of the war. It is an error, however, which is only partly an error; for Toynbee has in mind the

³ This tendency toward "strong" government is a general phenomenon. In this country it is quite obvious. Imperialism is not the only factor in the process. The deeper economic cause, which in itself is a great contributing factor toward the rise of Imperialism, is the dominance of great-capital and the decay of the middle class as an independent class. In this country the Bryan movement represented the revolt of the middle class, the Roosevelt progressive movement the attempt of this class to strike a compromise with plutocracy. This means the abandonment by the middle class, the historical carrier of liberal ideas, of its liberalism, directly leading to the "strong" government of State Socialism.

⁴ Russia seems on the verge of a similar development. "It (the bourgeoisie) might get along for many years with the aid of internal reforms, especially in agriculture, without further expansion in Asia; that is, through such reforms the development of the internal market might be greatly increased. But internal reforms demand the overthrow of the Czarism and the abolition of all pre-capitalistic plundering. The Russian bourgeoisie is afraid of the struggle, and so allies itself with Czarism, and strives for new conquests in the East and South."—Paul Axelrod, *New Review*, January, 1915.

⁵ *Nationality and the War*, by Arnold J. Toynbee, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$2.50, net.

eastern field of the war, where the national aspirations of the Balkans led directly to the present war. But this is only a minor phase of the war; the national problems of South-Eastern Europe may be fully solved, but that would not end the struggle between Alliance and Entente, it would simply give it a new expression.

Toynbee's general conclusion is:

"The first step toward internationalism is not to flout the problems of Nationality, but to solve them."

How? By accepting—

"The principle that the recognition of Nationality is the necessary foundation for European peace."

But in the course of his analysis, Toynbee is compelled to recognize the potency of economics, and substantially modifies his conclusion:

"We have to devise a new frontier which shall do more justice than the present national distribution, *without running violently counter to economic facts.*"

Again: "Will the centripetal force of economics finally overcome the centrifugal force of Nationality?"

Toynbee emphasizes that in the process of creating Nationality, of securing access to the sea, raw material and wider markets, Nationality is partly suppressed:

"The Hungarians used the liberty they won in 1867 to subject the Slavonic population between themselves and the sea, and prevent its union with the free principality of Serbia of the same Slavonic Nationality. This drove Serbia in 1912 to follow Hungary's example by seizing the coast of the non-Slavonic Albanians; and when Austria-Hungary prevented this (a righteous act prompted by most unrighteous motives), Serbia fought an unjust war with Bulgaria and subjected a large Bulgarian population, in order to gain access to the only seaboard left her, the friendly Greek port of Salonika."

The way in which economics dominates Nationality is attested by the Austro-Hungarian *Ausgleich*, the compromise by which Austria and Hungary maintain their unity, while each national group is allowed autonomy. The reason for this is economic: "The *Ausgleich* is simply the political expression of the economic situation. The Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy corresponds to the industrial region above Vienna, the Hungarian half to the agrarian region below it. Their economic interdependence is recognized in the common tariff: Hungary abandons the possibility of building up an indigenous industry of her own, by protection against Austrian manufacturers, in order to secure a virtual monopoly of the Austrian market for foodstuffs and raw produce."

Toynbee clinches his analysis with a plea for federated nationality:

"The national atom proved less and less capable of adoption as the political unit. In Central Europe... the Tchechs will be unable to work out their national

salvation as an independent state: the economic factor necessitates their political incorporation in the German Empire. In the Balkans the political disentanglement of one nationality from another is only possible if all alike consent to economic federation in a general zollverein. In the North-East, geographical conditions decree that national individuality shall express itself by devolution within the bond of the Russian Empire.⁶

"In all cases the political unit reveals itself not as a single nation but as a group of nationalities; yet even these groups cannot be entirely sovereign or self-contained. Like the chemist's molecules, they are woven out of relations between atoms, and are bound in their turn to enter into relation with one another.

"The nationalities of the South-East coalesce in a Balkan Zollverein; the Zollverein as a whole is involved by mutual economic interests with its neighbor molecule, the Russian Empire; similar necessity produces similar contact between the Russian Empire and Norway or Persia. The simple unational molecules of the West and the complex multinational molecules of the East and Centre all dispose themselves as parts of a wider organism—the European system."

The practical problem is no longer simply one of Nationality, but of economics *plus* democracy,—the democratic, autonomous federation of nationalities and nations. The process of capitalist development which created the nation at the same time created it as an economic unit. A nation must be an economic unit, otherwise it cannot survive. Virtually none of the subject nationalities in Europe can create a nation economically self-sufficient. The problem solves itself if democratically approached.

The larger practical aspects are clear: Insofar as Europe is concerned, democratic federalism is the only alternative to Imperialism,—the only democratic, peaceful and civilized way of solving the economic problem involved in Imperialism. But the problem alters itself in non-European countries struggling for Nationality. In China and Mexico, for example, the problem must temporarily be solved along strictly national lines,—the development of a national capitalism, national government and institutions. And this suggests the great problem of the near future: granting that Europe federates, may not federated Europe crush these backward nations? The new Socialist international must meet this problem with an uncompromising demand for national self-government of these peoples. The revolutionary proletariat alone can compel the *democratic* federation of the nations of Europe and the ultimate federation of the world.

⁶ Toynbee says about Poland: "The majority of the Polish nation under Russian rule has actually benefitted economically by its subjection, and economics have gone far towards settling the political destinies of the whole reunited Poland, for whose creation we now hope. Even her eighteen millions cannot stand by themselves, with no coast-line and no physical frontiers. She must go into partnership with one of her larger neighbors."

The Mind of A Censor

By Floyd Dell

THE old-fashioned censor had a simple if objectionable way of thinking. He thought that if people were let alone, they would read or hear or see what wasn't good for them. He believed he knew what *was* good for them. And he considered it his duty to sift the good from the bad, and to see that the bad was suppressed. In a word, he believed in censorship.

The modern censor doesn't believe in censorship. He can't, because he is an enlightened person, and enlightened people don't. In regard to the theatres—if he is a theatrical or, say, a moving picture censor—he is particularly opposed to censorship. He feels that the theatre especially must be free. To no censor, he feels, dare we commit the censorship of this institution.

You see that the modern censor really *is* an enlightened person.

The modern censor moreover feels that the underlying presumption of censorship—the presumption that people need protection, most of all — is a mistaken one.

The modern censor points out that there is something wanted even more urgently than the spreading of moral precepts: and that is the *lifting of taboos*. Censorship, in whatever hands, he says, must inevitably find it hard to do other than reaffirm the prevailing popular taboos.

Lest you think this a fanciful description, let me quote Mr. John Collier. Mr. Collier is the founder of the National Board of Censorship of Moving Pictures. He has always disbelieved in censorship—not only, he tells us, on grounds of practicability, but as a matter of principle. He is not now actively associated with the Board of Censorship, but he endorses its position and general results, and holds its work to be still necessary. He does not believe in censorship, however, and feels that the censorship instituted by himself is a temporary expedient. In fact, it was because he did not believe in censorship that he founded the Board. His experiences have been only strengthened by his experience, and he is firm in the conviction that censorship is a bad thing, and that censorship or some form of artificial control is necessary for the time being.

In an article in the *Survey* for October 2, Mr. Collier explains why the National Board was necessary, why it continues as the most approximately satisfactory method of film regulation yet devised, and why he has always been opposed to censorship. But let me quote:

"Censorship is impracticable and dangerous,

because the means involved are too crude for the ends sought; are indeed largely unrelated to the ends sought; and because the indirect damage of censorship infinitely exceeds the direct good which may be accomplished.

"Fundamentally, the theatre, while truly an agent of preventive morality in one of its aspects, is in another aspect just as truly an agent of necessary adventure—an agent of challenge, of conflict, even of revolution . . .

"These are considerations which indicate the danger of theatrical censorship to society; they make of the theatre, from the standpoint of democracy, a tremendously important, even a sacred institution. The theatre is an institution for the development of the new world-views; such development is possibly the supreme contribution of our present age to human history. To no censor — to no conceivable agent of government or extra-governmental power — dare we commit the censorship of this process of spiritual revolution.

"The underlying presumption of censorship—the presumption that protection is the controlling need of the people—is a mistaken one. The people most of all need not protection but life. That they may have life in greater abundance: This is the last moral command. The only moral protection that is ultimately possible, for those who must go their ways in the modern free-moving world, is knowledge and life.

"Is it too much to suggest that the *lifting of taboos*, the bold facing out of realities and of points of view, especially in the sphere of sexual interest, is needed no less urgently than the spreading of moral precepts? It could be argued, if space permitted, that such a lifting of taboos is a necessary preliminary to the work, which must somehow be performed, of draining off our vast racial impurity. Censorship, even in the unconstrained hands of the National Board of Censorship, finds it extremely hard to do other than re-affirm or shift the prevailing popular taboos."

As an example of the popular taboos which even the National Board of Censorship can do no other than affirm, I quote the following Rules, one in force, the other pending adoption:

SECTION 41. "An adequate motive for committing a crime is always necessary to warrant picturing it . . . It is desirable that the criminal be punished in some way, but the board does not always insist on this . . . The results of the crime should be in the long run disastrous to the criminal so that the impression is that crime will inevitably find one out. The result (punishment) should always take a reasonable proportion of the film."

"The National Board of Censorship will condemn the presentation of complex and intricate themes

presenting the details of the life of the so-called wanton heroine and her companion when these are shown as attractive and successful. It will not allow the extended display of personal allurements, the exposure of alleged physical charms and passionate, protracted embraces. It will also disapprove the showing of men turning lightly from woman to woman, or women turning lightly from man to man in intimate sexual relationships. It prohibits the spectacle of the details of actual physical fights engaged in between women and disapproves of all such contests in which a woman is roughly handled. It disapproves also of the condoning by pure women, in motion pictures, of flag-

rant moral lapses in men, presented in detail and at length."

Any self-respecting artist, if confronted by such limitations in his art, would want to curse God and die. If moving pictures are ever to become an art, they must be free, not merely to be good, but to be bad. Suckled at the breast of the National Board of Censorship on the milk of sociological virtue, they will remain infantile. Mr. Collier doubtless agrees to this — he agrees to everything I could possibly say on the subject. He is opposed to Censorship—firmly opposed. There is no use saying anything. Mr. Collier has said it all. Read his article.

India and the Empire

By "Baghi"

[This is the second of a series of two articles on *India in the Present Crisis*. "Baghi" is the pseudonym of a prominent Hindu Radical. Throughout this article "Hindu" means "East Indian" without reference to his religious affiliations.—Ed. NEW REVIEW.]

WHAT is the true significance of the fabulous aid the Hindu Princes have rendered to England in this crisis? Hindu Princes, we read in newspapers, are the "natural leaders" of the Indian peoples; hence their act and word may well be taken as representative of the attitude of the entire Indian peoples. How far this is true we shall now see.

There are in India about seven hundred noblemen who bear the various princely titles of Rajas, Maharajas, Nawabs, Nizam. But the number of those who have real ruling powers is less than three dozen. The more powerful of these potentates indeed bear sway over vast estates. The Nizam of Hyderabad rules over a kingdom as large as that of Italy. One-fifth of the entire population of India, sixty millions, is under the rule of the big and small Indian princes. The remaining four-fifths (two hundred and forty millions) is under direct British administration. All the Princes are under British suzerainty. They stand to the English government in about the same relationship as the German princes do to the Kaiser, and in some respects as the native British potentate did to the Norman Kings, after the Norman conquest. It is a curiously blended system, a superimposition of imperialism over feudalism.

An illustration may help to clarify the situation. In the original treaty drawn up between the Nizam of Hyderabad and the British government, the former is described as the friend and ally of the latter. This treaty has never been abrogated or modified. But, of course, it has been long ago consigned to oblivion. The Nizam is to-day in sooth, not an ally but

a subject chieftain of the British government. British policy towards native Princes is highly elastic. Under the plea that new exigencies call for new interpretations of the precedents guiding the mutual relations of the British and the native Princes, it seeks to encroach more and more on state rights. If, as sometimes happens, the opposition offered by a state government is very strong, it remains stationary, or may for a time, even recede. More frequently, however, it succeeds in making headway and takes advantage of every change or disturbance that occurs in the internal metabolism of the state. Such crises occur, for instance, when the ruler of a state dies, or a change in the ministry becomes necessary. The accession to the rulership of a state is hereditary, devolving on the eldest son. But the Imperial government must set its seal of approval on the new arrangement. Here comes its chance. When the ruling Prince of Patiala, Maharaja Bhupendra Singh reached the age of majority, about 1910, the council of regency, composed of native statesmen working under the direct control of Colonel Sir Dunlop Smith, the British resident, who had governed the state during the Prince's minority, sent word to the Viceroy that the time had arrived for the Prince to assume the rulership of his state. The Viceroy, (it was the late Earl of Minto) demurred. In his opinion the Prince should have waited a few years more. Meanwhile the state was groaning under the tyranny of direct British administration — of British officials, like the wily diplomat, Col. Dunlop Smith, the efficiently rapacious revenue-officer, Popham Young, of the devil incarnate, the Chief of Police, Col. Warburton. The Prince of Patiala was, however, an unusually bold and pugnacious youth and could not easily be put down. So the British Government in effect said: "We give you a year's trial. If you succeed in winning our

confidence, we will approve the assumption by you of full powers." The Prince understood well enough in what way to assure and please the British government. At the first opportunity that offered itself, he made a highly sensational public speech asserting his personal loyalty and that of his people to the benevolent British government. He made larger donations to the numerous British subscription lists, such as that of the King Edward VII memorial fund; he presented to Earl Kitchener an aeroplane for the use of the British army; and last, but not least, permitted the notorious Police Chief, Warburton, to launch prosecutions against the Arya Samajists, a band of social reformers. The Don Quixotic efforts of the young Prince to smash the wind-mill of reform and progress, afforded the Imperial government much glee and eminent satisfaction. After about a year's probation, the Prince received the customary investiture of full powers from the Imperial hands. The hold of the British government on the present ruler of Patiala is much tighter than it was on his grandfather.

The best chance for the Imperial government comes when a ruler dies without leaving a direct heir. Out of the several claimants to the throne, the one who is the greatest sycophant of the British succeeds. Such a situation is going to arise in the state of Jaipur. Affairs of that state well illustrate another point. Some fifteen years ago, the Prime Minister of the state was Kanti Chandra Mukerjee, a man whose forceful personality had defied the Imperial government time and again. Lord Curzon, who was then the Indian Viceroy must have heaved a sigh of relief at the news of the Premier's death. Now began an interesting game of oriental diplomacy. The British government wanted to have one of their own tools appointed to the Premiership. The Maharaja of Jaipur would not have him. He preferred his own man, San Ser Chandra Sen, an old Bengali gentleman. Now Curzon was strenuously opposed to the appointment in native states of any Bengalese on account of their alleged nationalistic tendencies. The wily Maharaja declared that under the circumstances he would do without a Prime Minister; but nevertheless kept Mr. Sen to do all the work. In about 1910 death took this gentleman away and the chance for which the Imperial government had been waiting offered itself. The British demanded the appointment to Premiership of their tool, Nawab Fyaz Ali. The Maharaja hated the arrangement from the bottom of his heart. He wanted, it was rumored, to appoint Sukh Dev Prasad, formerly the Minister of Jodhpur, a really capable man. All his efforts proved unsuccessful, only showing how a Hindu Prince is helpless against the Imperial power. So though the nominal head of the state is the Maharaja, the real head is the tool of the British government. The only way the Prince

avenges himself, it is said, is by delaying to assign his signature to papers sent to him by his Prime Minister. It reminds one of Gladstone's well known saying about the late Kingdom of Naples, that its government was a negation of God.

As every change in the internal economy of the state—a change in officials for instance—may give the British overlord an occasion for interference, the Indian states have developed an exceedingly conservative temperament. Like invalids, they are afraid to try new modes of living, lest any change in their metabolism might bring on another attack of the dreaded malady.

While the British government may at any time requisition from the ruler of a Hindu state an account or explanation of his doings, the people of his own state have over him no check or control. The government of a native state is a purely arbitrary one-man rule. There are no popular representation and control, no constitutional laws or assemblies. The aim of British policy is best served by the maintenance and continuance of this arrangement. A single individual, a timid or grateful Prince or Prime Minister, can easily be turned into a tool or a puppet; but not so a constitutional government, deriving its sanction and support from the people.

At the court of every Prince, resides a British officer, called the political agent or resident, who is as if the lever by means of which the Imperial government exerts its influence. He is generally an accomplished diplomat, who by alternate threats and cajolery, succeeds in winding the puppet Prince around his little finger. His orders, often veiled as advice or suggestions, come to the Prince as to how much tribute and in what form should be rendered the Imperial government from the resources of the State.

The British government exacts from the petty principalities heavy tribute indeed. Permit me to submit an illustration. Jhind is a small but influential Punjab state. It has a population of about three hundred thousand—mostly peasant farmers. Its gross annual revenue is about \$400,000, small enough in all sooth for its requirements. About one-fifth of this goes to the privy purse of the Prince; about as much or more for the support of the Imperial Service Troops (a tribute to the British). What remains, less than \$300,000 is a pitifully small sum for the purposes of administration. Almost every department, police, judiciary, sanitary and educational, suffers from a chronic lack of funds. There is evidently not an extra cent to be sent out. Yet the dues of Caesar must be rendered. Take the one year period, 1910-1911:

KING EDWARD DIES:

State contributes towards the memorial about 8 per cent. of her entire revenues.

KING GEORGE ASCENDS THRONES:

Coronation in London. State sends deputation. Expenses between 25-35 per cent of annual revenue.

LEUT.-GOV. OF PUNJAB (LOUIS DANE) BRIT. OFF. VISITS:

Expenses on his entertainment, 38,000 rupees (about three per cent of annual revenue).

KING GEORGE'S CORONATION IN DELHI:

Must have cost the state easily from two to three hundred thousand rupees, that is about 25 per cent of the entire annual revenue.

To sum up, within a single year, or a little over, the state spent in the interests of the British government a sum of money amounting to two-thirds of its entire gross income for the period.

Such high finance tricks cannot be performed by merely starving out the internal administration. All the petty reserves and savings are emptied out and resort is often had to borrowing. In levying exactions on the native states the British government follows in pitiless and cold-blooded fashion, the maxim, "charge all the traffic will bear."

The British learned that the state of Gwalior had an accumulated reserve of some \$30,000,000 (Encyclopedia Britt. ed. 10th and 11th). The Imperial mouth began to water. But how to get the tempting mouthful? John Bull's wit was not up to his bovine greed. So he adopted the direct method of "stand and deliver". In the cryptic language of the Encyclopedia Britannica (11th Ed.) two million sterling were loaned to the British government of India in 1887, and one million sterling later on. That is, the Imperial government found an excuse to take over from Gwalior nearly one half of its reserves. The Hindu Princes are so situated, indeed, that for all practical purposes they function not as the guardians of their people, but as *gun men* appointed over them not by John D., but by John Bull.

We now see the nature of the relationship existing between the English government and Hindu princes. So when you read in an English paper that some Rajah has made a magnificent donation towards the British war fund, paraphrase this statement as thus: "The British government has exacted from a certain Rajah a magnificent tribute." It is a satisfaction to me to see that I can quote in support of my contention the high authority of the present Indian Viceroy, Lord Harding. At the Gwalior state banquet, given on March 31st last, he is reported to have said that the outburst of loyal devotion shown by the ruling Princes was not unexpected by those who knew the traditions of the states, but it came as a revelation to the outside world. (*India*, London, April 30th, 1915.) In other words, it is a long established tradition for the puppet Princes to keep paying to the British unceasing tribute, and it was only to be expected that at a time like the present,

the amount of tribute should arise to figures fabulously high. The promptness with which Indian Princes responded to the distress call of Britain, is not surprising either. At the time of the last Delhi Durbar, 1911, King George warned the Hindu Princes, in private interviews, against the influence of nationalism, and also told them to be ready for the great European war. So the Princes knew beforehand that they had to lay by for the evil day.

Take the case of Gwalior again. Its gross annual revenue is five million dollars. From this amount must be met all the multifarious needs of administration of a state extending over twenty-nine thousand square miles, and inhabited by more than three million people. The people are extremely poor, and none of their essential needs, sanitation, education, are properly attended to. Death and starvation keep ever hovering like greedy vultures; and not one decent college exists for all those three millions. But how is then the public money spent? About one-third of the entire gross revenue is absorbed annually by the Imperial Service Troops, a little army which the state has to keep for the exclusive benefit of the British government, hence the designation, Imperial Service. The Gwalior force has been requisitioned for service in Europe. It consists of three regiments of cavalry, two battalions of infantry, and a transport corps. The expenditure on it in peace times is about one half a million rupees, annually. The state has also to bear the expenses of the European expedition. Over and above this, the ruler of Gwalior has made the following war donations to the British: (*India*, London, April 30th, 1915).

1. Six aeroplanes, armored and equipped with guns, estimated cost\$250,000
2. British War Relief Fund 250,000
3. Equipping the Loyalty Ship 200,000
4. Motor Cars (Ambulances) 250,000

That is, from a state whose entire annual revenue is \$5,000,000 the British government has taken up to date in war contributions, nearly \$2,000,000. Like a sensible man of the world, the Hindu Prince makes a virtue of necessity. He disguises his helplessness under a smile in an assumed spirit of good fellowship. A man finds himself suddenly surrounded by a band of armed brigands; yet he retains presence of mind and pleasantly says: "Hello comrades! Why, of course, you are in need! Please don't mention it! I am only too glad to help you! Here is my purse! Good luck!"

We understand why we should not be surprised at the contribution in men and money which the Indian Princes are reported to have made to the British cause. But the papers have reported that some of the Indian Princes had themselves gone to the front to fight. I am convinced that they will do no more fighting than King George does when he is reported

to be visiting the front. Not a single Hindu Prince has yet come to harm. And yet we know they do not carry charmed lives. Among the notable Hindu Princes reported last Fall to have gone to the Front was the Maharaja of Kapur-Thala. But His Highness, together with his court ladies, is now attending to his accustomed round of luxuries in this country. Evidently he got tired of leading an inactive and monotonous life in the wake of the Anglo-French armies. The Hindu Prince's pilgrimage to Europe was a purely dramatic move. It helped to raise the prestige of the British government in the eyes of the outside world. The Princes, for their participation in the show, will get a few more empty titles. "The Stars of India" will now become the "Suns of India." Under the circumstances, the strange thing is that only a very few Princes have gone to the front—about twenty out of over seven hundred. And the case of each one of these twenty will be found on close examination to have in it some peculiar twist. What inspired the Kapur-Thala already mentioned, was not a devotion to John Bull, but an ardent feeling for Mlle. Paris.

Now, when Englishmen speak of a Hindu Prince's loyalty, what do they exactly mean? Do they mean that a Hindu Prince is loyal to the British King in the same sense that an English Duke is; or a German Prince is to the Kaiser? In the case of an English or German Prince, loyalty is only another name for national feeling. In the case of the Hindu Prince, obviously it cannot be so. The *State* and the *Nation* in India are not controvertible terms. They are indeed antagonistic conceptions. There can be only one sense in which Hindu Princes can be called loyal. "Loyalty consists", says Dr. Thorstein Veblen, "in subservience to the common war-chief and his dynastic successors." (*Instinct of Workmanship*, p. 161).

Such a sentiment of loyalty would be quite in keeping with the rest of the Hindu Princes' habitual social outlook, which is feudalistic and medieval. However, there are difficulties. Most of the powerful Princes have ancient regal pedigrees, and consequently possess a keen and haughty pride of race. They regard the British an upstarts, with the manners of dealers in hardware. How can noble lords, with mythological pedigrees regard a shop-keeper, however powerful, as their liege lord or war-chief? There are, however, other "Princes" who do not feel quite the same qualms of conscience. For an analogy I refer to Jane Porter's "Scottish Chiefs". Let us see who are our Princes and Wallaces, and who the Red cummins. For the purpose in hand, the chieftains of India may well be classified as thus:

I.

POTENTIAL WALLACE-BRUCES.

(a) *Rajput Princes and their like*: e. g. Udaipur

(origin: far back in Middle Ages. Possess haughty race-pride; hold the foreigner in contempt.)

(b) "*Originally Allies*": e. g. Nizam, Baroda, etc. (Sikhs, Maharattas—Hyderabad group. In Eighteenth Century rivals of the British for Political supremacy. Later on became "allies" on status of equality.)

II.

CAN BE EXPECTED TO BE LOYAL IN VEBLEN'S SENSE.

The Grateful Princes or British Creatures: e. g. Sir Pertap of Idar, Maharaja of Benares; Jam Ranjit Singh; even Mysore. Have arisen to chieftainship by the grace of the British. A duplication of Napoleon's policy under the Empire, when he created Princes like Tallyrand and Marat.

Now it is precisely these Princes falling in group II—"The British Creatures"—who have been exhibiting their "loyalty" with considerable noise and bombast. Their worth, in the eyes of their countrymen, is small. But they are extremely useful to the British government who employs them to inject some of their "loyalty" into the Princes belonging to the first group. The name that will occur in this connection to every one's mind, is that of Maharaja Sir Pertap Singh. This nobleman is a past-master in the art of demonstrating "loyalty" to the Imperial Power. He is Major General of the British Army and has been in numerous British campaigns. He helped Curzon in organising the Imperial Cadet Corps. It was only a few years ago that the British rewarded him for his loyal subservience, by the bestowal on him of the rulership of a very petty state, Idar. He, with his small following, have gone to the front. Pertap is a shrewd old man, and has wielded enormous influence over a group of young Princes, the foremost among whom are Ganga Singh of Bikaner, and through him the present Gwalior, the present Alwar, and the late Jodpur. One may fairly dub them as the Mayo College group.

The Mayo College at Ajmere; the Aitchison College at Lahore and a few others were founded with money obtained from the Native States, of course, for the "exclusive education of the Princes and the ruling aristocracy". The older generation of Princes feel very suspicious of these institutions where their noble youth, in the name of education, learn to despise their time-honored native luxuries, and to take to all the English vices, including English whiskey and English women. The harem of the "educated and enlightened" Hindu ruler of Jhind is presided over by an English woman, who before entering the harem, used to go about as a circus girl under her maiden name, Miss Oliver. The atmosphere of the Court of Jhind is like that of the parlor of a well-to-do Eurasian gentleman.

Various and devious are the means adopted to create among Hindu Princes a sentimental attachment for things English, dead or alive. All classes

of people in India look with disapproval upon both types of "loyal Princes"—viz. those whom I have dubbed "British Creatures" on account of their origin, and those who have been anglicized through prolonged contact with either or all of these:—English Tutors, English whiskey and English women. The fact is that the less subservient a Prince is to the British, the more popular he is. A Prince who defies the Imperial government becomes immediately a popular idol, a national hero:—e. g. the late Tukaji Rao of Indore; and the present Gaekwar of Baroda.

To sum up:

The fact that the British government has received in the present crisis, considerable aid in men and money from the Hindu Princes does not signify that India is loyal or devoted to, or even in real sympathy with, the British Cause.

(1) Indian Princes are not organized in a union. They cannot resist Imperial demands. They are helpless puppets.

(2) If a few of them are "loyal" enough for practical purposes, they are so either through a narrow selfishness; or through corruption by English luxury.

(3) As a class they have to play the part of conservative tyrants. The British governments support them in their tyranny.

Premature Peace?

By S. J. Rutgers

THERE is a general feeling among belligerent Socialists against what is called "premature peace," a feeling that seems also to prevail in neutral countries.

In Germany, this feeling expresses itself in the demand for war until British naval supremacy is destroyed: among the Allies, it assumes the form of "War to the finish" against German militarism. And each group argues that its victory alone will liberate Europe from future wars.

Most workers will admit, that the destruction of British "Navalism" would simply give to some other nation or group of nations the power to rob the world, and that Imperialism and future wars would not cease. But there seems to be a feeling that there is a magic power in crushing *German* militarism. If we ask for the reasons of this feeling, we are most likely to hear great noise about Kaiserism, junkerism, absolutism, barbarism, etc., against which civilization and democracy are supposed to be fighting. By this democracy is meant the corrupt financial plutocracy of France and the hypocritical and aristocratic government of England. And although few socialists will deny that those democracies have only a slight resemblance to real, proletarian democracy,

there will often be expressed a feeling, that this at least might be a beginning of something better. It seems to me, that this "illusion" is a rather dangerous one, and that it has done much to vitiate socialist opinions about the future.

Already before this war broke out, there was a tendency away from democracy. Where the form of a middle class democracy remained, there was a rapid change towards the supremacy of financial capital with its Imperialistic tendencies. Imperialism, the cause of the present war, is the reverse of democracy; and, it is not likely that an Imperialistic war should end in an approach to democracy.

Whatever may be the outcome of this war, financial capital will become more dominant, with more Imperialism and less democracy. That the war will lead to the ruin of many small capitalists and to an enormous concentration of capital under control of the large bankers, needs no proof. This financial capital has the tendency to conquer the world for profits, regardless of civilization and without any scruples as to robbery and murder. Recent events all over the world prove this. And if it should happen, as some believe, that an important part of concentrated capital will be under the direct control of the state, it will but strengthen the Imperialistic and anti-democratic tendencies

How can we expect democracy and permanent peace under such circumstances? A still more illusory form of democracy, is all that can be expected, and that would be worse than direct government by plutocracy, even worse than a capitalistic government using a feudal class in its service. The results will be the same, only it will be still more difficult for the workers to recognize the fraud and to fight it

Peace between the nations under capitalism could be possible only if the robber-capitalists all over the world combine in one organization against labor. But this situation, which would be most disadvantageous to the working class, is by no means to be expected in the near future, because there is too much difference of interests between the capitalistic groups and because there are no other means for dividing the world than power, a power that is changing every day with the changing economic development of the different nations.

In the period of commercial colonialism there could be to a certain degree, some automatic relation between the economic development of a nation and its commerce. Our *modern* colonial problems are in the first place problems of investments and monopolies, and as soon as there are important modifications in the relative economic power of nations or groups of nations, a new orientation is possible only by an appeal to power, which under the circumstances may lead to war.

Only in a future, much farther away than the end of the present war, can there be imagined a development of capitalism all over the world to such a degree of equality, that there would be one nation of capitalists against the workers all over the world. If socialism will prove unfit to get into power before this fatal situation will be reached, labor will most probably have to go through a series of wars of which the present war is the fearful prelude.

There is only one force, that can stop this disastrous fate, if it puts to this gigantic task the whole of its energy: the international proletariat. But then the workers need an insight into the general lines of development. There must be no optimistic idea about this war being the last war, or that only one or another nation should have to be crushed. Let us acknowledge that labor failed all over the world to oppose Imperialism with the existing national organizations, and let us learn from this defeat to resist the next war as *one international organization*.

From this point of view, it is not so much important what the national results of this war will be, but it is most important that the working class should not be weakened to the extent that it will be unable to perform its future task. This does not mean that the issue of the present war is of no concern to labor. But the proletariat must have its own way of fighting and cannot gain by supporting capitalistic wars. It is the same as with politics. Even if it should be a concern of labor whether the democratic, the republican or the progressive party should be victorious, this would not prevent socialists from voting their own party, whatever the direct results might be.

Labor must oppose every form of militarism, because militarism in its present state of development is one of the most important expressions of capitalist interests, the centre of Imperialism. And granting that we have to fight militarism, we surely cannot stop fighting it because it assumes its most aggressive form of actual war.

Labor failed all over the world in its fight against militarism, but this should be no reason for putting our hope on the results of this war, that we vainly tried to prevent. Labor failed and surrendered to capital, but this very fact makes it rather worthless to talk about socialist peace programs, behind which there is no power and which are doomed to have no practical effect.

To regain influence, labor first of all will have to regain its class-consciousness, its fighting power against the capitalist class on the national as well as on the international field. This means to put an end to the "Burgfrieden" (civil peace) and to protest against national war in the press as well as on the street, which no doubt would result in the suspension

of socialist papers and the shooting of the proletarian protestants. But at the same time the fighting spirit in the trenches would stop, so as to make peace the only possible issue.

This is the way labor could have a real influence and such a peace never would be premature. Even if this should result in a defeat of the capitalistic interests in the country where the socialist spirit should prove strongest, such a defeat would mean a big victory for Socialism. Conditions in the leading European countries have developed far enough to make it utterly impossible, that one nation should keep another as a vassal state on account of the latter being too far advanced in socialist feeling. Moreover such a spirit can only develop in mutual support, internationally.

If we expect that labor will not recover during the present war, so as to push forward its own way of forcing peace, all we can hope is, that it will immediately regain its self respect and fighting power after the war. No doubt the chances will be far better then, and the sooner we get this better chance, the earlier our victory. But for this kind of peace we cannot depend upon the battlefield and economic conditions beyond our control; and it is dangerous to cherish the illusion of power while neglecting the power labor could actually have.

Captured

By Anna Strunsky Walling

HOW insidious it is!
The exquisite woman standing in the middle of the room receiving her friends.

Her interest in him, for the moment so unfeigned, her sympathy so quick and unreserved—she draws him irresistibly to cross over to where she stands in the nebulous clouds that always, unaware to him, had shrouded her class.

So subtly and unalterably different from him, yet she draws him irresistibly—and suddenly he traverses the world yawning between them.

Something begins to give way—his belief in the people, in their inviolate strength, in their inalienable right to all of life. Something gives way, something begins to sink—his faith, his hope flicker and almost go out. He is not aware of his sudden emptiness. He feels wonderfully at home in the camp of the enemy, wonderfully at ease in the skin-lined den of the despoilers.

The fire in the hearth leaps and casts beautiful lights over the exquisite face of his hostess, over the unparalleled tapestries on the wall. Meaningless, hopeless, purposeless he stays on.

The waiting world recedes.

Empty and cold he remains by the treacherous warmth of the enemy's hearth.

The Mechanics of Solidarity

By Austin Lewis

SOLIDARITY cannot be regarded as the result of a propaganda. No amount of preaching of solidarity will bring about the fact. No altruistic campaign to persuade the better established working class into lending aid and comfort to the less favorably placed in the struggle with the employer will achieve results.

Altruism has, however, heretofore formed the basis of such appeals as have been made to the better paid portion of the working class on behalf of those others. No wonder it has not succeeded. Altruism is no more appropriate to the labor movement than to any other of the economic and industrial departments of human life. A comparatively well-to-do artisan will not put himself out on behalf of an unskilled workman any more than a well-to-do trader for a small business man, unless by so doing he actually and directly benefits himself.

We have seen that such efforts as have been made by the crafts towards the organization of migratory labor and the unskilled have had the well-being of the crafts in view rather than that of the unskilled who were the hypothetical beneficiaries.

This does not attribute any particular hard-heartedness to the crafts. It merely shows the sufficiently obvious fact that the members of the crafts are human beings, subject to the same laws as other human beings, and that their own economic security and well-being are their prime considerations.

Solidarity, like all economic and political progress, must come from below, not from above. The crafts will not help the unskilled; hence it follows that the unskilled must help themselves.

But why did the unskilled not help themselves long, long ago? What reasons have we for supposing that they are more likely to struggle towards their emancipation to-day than hitherto? The unskilled could not hitherto have made a coherent and justifiable attempt at self-emancipation. On the contrary, the conditions which would render such a struggle at all feasible are only just beginning to appear.

If economics, as Hegel said, belong to the category of history, all the manifestations of proletarian struggle belong also to the same category. No manifestation of any value can take place until the economic and industrial environment is suited to the production and development of that manifestation.

We have seen the rise of premature proletarian movements posited on some fine sounding theory, the said theory in itself containing much truth. We have seen also the disappearance of the same movements

accompanied by an inordinate amount of suffering and disillusionment which might otherwise have been saved. The statement of Marx in his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* unavoidably recurs in this connection. Says Marx:

"Proletarian revolutions . . . criticize themselves constantly; interrupt themselves in their own course, come back to what seems to have been accomplished in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half measures, weaknesses and meannesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature; constantly recoil in fear before the undefined monster magnitude of their own objects—until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible and the conditions themselves cry *Hic Rhodus, hic salta*."

Without committing one's self to the apparent catastrophism of the latter part of the statement this continual tendency on the part of the labor movement to retrace its steps and to double back upon itself is a very well established phenomenon. Now and again the theory pushes ahead of the facts, and the abstraction produced makes a false dawn which the facts themselves in the long run dispel.

The position of the social democratic movement with respect to the present European war is an instance of just this sort of mistaken enthusiasm. The social democrats were so certain that their political and anti-military propaganda was destined to prevent a European War that, when the circumstances arose which called for their active intervention, they were paralyzed and horrified at the discovery that they had no real power. The fact that there was no real solidarity of labor in the political propaganda, and that the craft organization of industry gave them no control over the industry, was taught by one order of mobilization more completely than by all the arguments of all the syndicalists through many energetic years. Only one thing could have stopped that war,—the solidarity of labor. Such solidarity is a fact and not a theory, a fact which must ultimately confront the governments and which, of itself, would be the most complete safeguard against international war.

Such solidarity results from other economic facts and is the product of automatically working factors in industrial life. It is not to be had for the preaching or the wishing. No sleek orator can evolve it from the sinuosities of tortured speech. It is not made; it proceeds.

Let us consider the question of the former inability of the unskilled to help themselves, that is to get such standing ground as would enable them to make a contest on their own behalf against the employer, on the one hand, and to impress themselves upon the rest of the organized trades on the other.

The relation of the unskilled to the trades has not been unlike that of the trades to the small bourgeoisie. The young man who started out too poor to afford apprenticeship and whose position in the social scale was such as did not entitle him to the advantage of a trade, looked forward to learning such trade as an ultimate or taking advantage of the amount of free land and the frontier, went forth to establish himself in the wild. The social gulf between the skilled and the unskilled man has always been greater than can be understood except by those who have had actual experience of it. The small bourgeois had his small property or his small business, the craftsman had his craft, property also, but the unskilled had nothing but physical strength which was useless as a basis of organization under an economic system which constantly dissipated it. Where industry rested on a basis of skill, that is specialized craft training, the possessors of that skill controlled the labor side of the controversy. For they alone had the power of actively interfering with the process of production on the labor side. They were the only people with whom the employers could treat. Indeed, they were the only persons with whom it was possible to make treaties, for they were the only persons who could organize and make organized demands. Since these organizations were possessed of a certain property, namely, skill, they made agreements with the employers in terms of property, that is, they made contracts. By these they agreed to employ their skill property regularly for an agreed length of time in accordance with certain agreed conditions.

This state of things marks the position of the American Federation of Labor; it is in fact the justification of as well as the reason for its existence.

It is very clear that the unskilled had, under these circumstances, no opportunity for organization. They had indeed no mind for organization for there was clearly nothing in terms of which they could organize. It is true, that attempts were made to organize them at times, such as that of Joseph Arch to organize the agricultural laborers of England. But such efforts were spasmodic, transitory, and doomed to be unrelated to the great labor struggle.

It is evident enough, as it is historically true, that organizations of unskilled labor could not be created where the conditions involved the employment of isolated groups of unskilled, or where the skill of the artisan was the principal factor and the work of the unskilled was entirely subsidiary to and dependent upon the skilled.

This was recognized by the Socialist writers who apply the term "labor" exclusively to that skilled labor which they consider capable of organization. The labor movement to the average Socialist is the organized trade union movement, the organization of the skilled. Outside of this the mass of the unskilled are contemptuously regarded as "Lumpenproletariat" and generally classified as riff-raff and unorganizable material.

Up to now the foregoing has been generally true. Such being the case, criticism of the unskilled for failure to organize falls in face of the fact that the unskilled could not organize because there was no real basis on which they could organize.

Attempts to organize on the same basis as that of the skilled have been made repeatedly, only to fail. These failures have been charged against the unskilled, and leaders who have busied themselves with these organizations have retired disgusted from the task. They have covered their defeat by proclaiming that the unskilled are too stupid for organization.

Ignorance and stupidity are the eternal obstacles to organization and form the burden of complaint of all whose business it is to teach and discipline. It may be granted that large numbers of the unskilled owing to their disadvantageous economic conditions are lethargic and impervious to an intellectual appeal. But this obvious ineptitude is merely relative. The skilled are quite as unreceptive to an appeal which is purely intellectual. So also it may be said are stockbrokers, university men, lawyers and the clergy. Outside of their own immediate environment and except when the impact upon their material conditions is very manifest they are all deaf to the intellectual appeal. Pure "reason" plays a very insignificant part in human relations and leaves the vast mass of mankind quite untouched. Perhaps there may be some truth in the statement that the unskilled are as a body more stupid than the mass of men, but there is no proof that such is the case.

Intellect, pure reason, ability to think, none of these have much connection with the basis of organization. Obvious self-interest is the basis.

In the organization of labor the motives are so plain and the results to be attained so material that very little demand is made on the reason. Had it been otherwise we should certainly never have seen the organization of the crafts.

They organized because their interest in organization was plain. The material prospects of such organization, reduction of working hours and increase of pay were easily recognized. The organization promised these results. Hence the crafts organized even under conditions which appeared to render these results remote in many instances and which required immediate sacrifices.

Indeed, their actions have shown so slight a grasp of the situation on the intellectual side that the

results which they have regarded as their objective were as a matter of fact but partial results. For a diminution in the number of hours worked may be offset by a greater intensity of labor during those working hours and an increase in pay may obviously be counterbalanced by an increase in the cost of living. These results have actually occurred and could have been easily foreseen with a slight amount of thought, of which, however, the organizers were entirely and satisfactorily innocent.

Ignorance and stupidity were no bars to the creation of the organization of the crafts, neither has the perpetuation of such stupidity been any bar to their growth. They have not been the factors which up to now have prevented the development of the organization of the unskilled.

The unskilled have not organized because they had no apparent reason in organizing, and to tell the truth they have had no reason to organize until the present. With the crafts in control there was no chance for the unskilled.

The unskilled worker's only hope was to get out of his class in some way or other. He had no lever by which he could move the crafts and the employers simultaneously, and thus pry away the rocks which lay between him and the free air.

The employers pointing to the unorganized and hungry masses threatened him with extinction if he contested. The organized employees, pointing to the same masses, could afford to smile at any attempt to create an organization out of the inferior and shifting material which formed the bulk of unskilled labor and through which the militant unskilled had to force his way. On the one hand, the cheapness and plentifulness of unskilled labor was the greatest enemy to itself; and on the other hand, the employer could afford to ignore the effort of the unskilled because his business was based upon a contract with the skilled. As long as he could hold skilled labor either in the "free" or union form he was secure. Thus we have many times seen the engineers and conductors ruin the chances of the more unskilled railroad employees. Frequently those trades which have had contracts respecting certain technical processes in mining and manufacture have contemptuously stood by and seen the unskilled beaten to their knees and have indeed helped to beat them. The stories of the attempts of unskilled labor to achieve organization and to gain a fighting ground have a wearisome and disgusting sameness. They are a record of blood and tears.

As regards these movements the claims of solidarity have so far been but faintly recognized and as a matter of fact they are largely mythical. No solidarity and for the most part not even the barest vestiges of ordinary humanity have been shown, until very recently, by the skilled crafts for the efforts of the unskilled. Indeed as far as any sympathy

has been shown for the latter by the former, the unskilled might as well have been Kaffirs.

Moreover, the group which was in a position to make contracts with the employers prided itself upon that fact. Its members rejoiced that they occupied an intermediary position between the employer and the mass of ordinary labor and gave themselves, airs in consequences. They considered, and, indeed advertised themselves, as a distinctive class. Some of them were recognized by the employer as especially his adherents, as it were his janissaries, upon whom he could rely as a defence against the attacks of predatory labor on the outside.

Under such conditions the difficulty, nay the impossibility, of the organization of the unskilled becomes at once manifest. No amount of intelligence could have altered these actual conditions, no conceivable sentimental altruism could have caused the aristocrats of labor to turn a friendly eye towards the organization of the helpless unskilled.

Their outlook was dark. The entrenched trades looked down upon them with contemptuous indifference, more callous and coarse because more ignorant than the contempt of the aristocrat for the bourgeois.

But as those who were unable to fit into the narrow groove of the earlier village life wandered off and built new empires, so the play of economic forces was in time to bring a condition in which the unskilled would have the shaping of labor's destinies. Under the old system of industry in which the crafts had the determining voice the very uncertainty of the life of the unskilled endowed him with ne'er do well qualities in the eyes of the respectable, however hard he might actually work. Indeed the very same stigma is today implied in the term "migratory laborer." It is very manifest in the more ordinary expression "hobo." And just as the new nations derived their origin from the efforts of the outcast and the disreputable to a much greater extent than their respectable successors will admit, the future of labor becomes henceforth more closely identified with the progress of the unskilled.

It is true that long ago, even in the eighties, the dock laborers of London won international fame and set Mr. John Burns on the highbroad to the British cabinet by a mass strike of the unskilled. The gas workers also formed an organization and, although coming under the category of unskilled labor, more than held their own in the struggle.

Everywhere in the advanced countries those who were formerly regarded as unskilled riff-raff began to assert themselves and to show their ability to organize. In many cases their attempts failed after a few efforts, in others something like an organization was formed. This as a rule attached itself to the dominant craft-union organization and went through various vicissitudes, some of them none too credit-

able. "Federal unions" so called sprang into existence only to subside, besmirched frequently with corruption of one sort or another. Labor organizations which attempted to deal with labor en masse instead of with several departmental crafts were talked about. In fact, the speculative field of the labor movement was littered with all sorts of schemes, more or less visionary, for the organization of labor as a whole.

For a time these merged themselves in the socialist movement. The socialist's breadth of teaching his all embracing democracy and idealistic visions impressed the imagination of the agitators. The poets and philosophers of the unskilled therefore threw themselves ardently into the socialist movement so that for several years the socialist platform was a curious and discordant discord of the aspirations of the unskilled and the wailings of the unsuccessful small bourgeois. The absence of the skilled workman from the Socialist movement was indeed in those days quite marked and was so bitterly resented by the socialists of that time that they made vehement attacks upon the "pure and simple A. F. of L." and covered its leaders with abuse largely undeserved.

But the entry of the Socialist Party upon an attempt at serious politics changed the whole situation. The unskilled very soon discovered that they were, for the most part, without that essential political asset, a vote, and were consequently not objects of solicitude to the politicians. "Labor" to the Socialist movement began to mean organized labor or at least such "labor" as could be converted into votes. The unskilled were now assailed with the same epithets as had been applied to them in Germany and elsewhere. He was told very plainly that he must consider himself a very inferior fellow and was certainly and swiftly relegated to the rear.

But it will be observed that all this time the unskilled were becoming recognized. The fact that they were abused shows this. They were beginning to play a role in the great movement. It is true that it was by no means a brilliant role, really quite insignificant. Here and there however appeared movements of the foreign, forlorn, and apparently hopeless workers of the unskilled even of the migratory unskilled, whose advent was received with screams of abusive derision from the most orthodox and conventional of the Socialist politicals.

These movements sometimes, as at McKees Rocks, gained a temporary and precarious triumph. Here the unskilled having at great sacrifice made notable gains were driven from their position by American working-men who could not endure the sight of foreign and despised labor achieving any position.

Exposed at every turn to incessant hostility, denied the most elementary constitutional rights, har-

ried by constables and magistrates, ridden down by mounted police and shot by deputy sheriffs, the feeble unskilled gradually and slowly and with much expenditure of blood and suffering was transformed into the militant unskilled. And this militant unskilled differentiated itself from, arose out of and stood above the sluggish torpid mass.

The organized crafts thereupon began to notice the unskilled. They feared but despised the movement, and from the first have approached the question as a problem affecting not the unskilled primarily but the organized skilled crafts. The point over which the organizers of the crafts have boggled is the possibility of so organizing the unskilled as not to hurt but really to bolster up the crafts. Could the unskilled be persuaded to forego their own advancement for the present material support which the crafts must afford them?

But the notion began to spread more and more rapidly among the rank and file of the crafts that, after all, they had something in common with the mass of unskilled. The proof of this is seen in the encouraging support which the A. F. of L. unions have given to the most desperate class of migratory laborers, as the hoppers of Wheatland.

Here we get the dawning of a newer and broader idea of solidarity. It is clear, moreover, that this idea has not come from any growth of altruism among the skilled laborers but is the product of certain changes in the industrial process which tend to break down the position of the skilled workers.

(Concluded in our next issue)

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

Published by the New Review Publishing Association

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALEXANDER FRASER	JULIUS HEIMAN	LOUIS C. FRAINA
President	Treasurer	Secretary

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

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

The Literary Revival in Ireland

By Ernest A. Boyd

AT a time when the excesses of nationalism are everywhere the subject of discussion it is interesting to turn to a manifestation of nationality which, so far from suggesting warfare, has actually softened such elements of dissention as existed prior to its appearance. The "Celtic Renaissance" as it is popularly, if rather inaccurately, called, is one of the most remarkable phenomena in recent literary history, yet very little is known of its origins. Certain personalities such as W. B. Yeats and J. M. Synge, certain phases, such as The Irish Theatre, have received more attention than has the movement as a whole. It may, therefore, be not amiss to outline briefly the story of the Literary Revival in Ireland.

Contrary to what is generally supposed, the source of the Revival was not W. B. Yeats, but a writer who has probably received less attention than the humblest poet who followed the impulse given by him to the literary activities of his country. Standish O'Grady, though scarcely known outside the circle of Irish writers, was acknowledged by all his young contemporaries as "the father of the Revival." It was he who first directed his brilliant imagination towards the reconstruction of the great heroic epochs of Irish history and legend. His *History of Ireland*, completed in 1860, is a most extraordinary prose epic, in which all the material previously left to antiquarians and philologists is turned into a vivid and eloquent narrative of Irish nationality. Here, for the first time since Gaelic had ceased to be the speech of the people, the great heroes of our antiquity, Cuculain, Finn, Maeve and Deirdre, lived again.

Standish O'Grady followed up this history with numerous novels and romances of a historical or legendary nature, and though some are of very slight importance in themselves, they helped, with his other work, to create a body of literature which fascinated the young poets of the 'Eighties.' They saw in this illumination of ancient Ireland the true substance and spirit of national literature. Not from the horrors of the Famine, nor from the sufferings of the Rebellion, but from the classic lore of Ireland's antiquity, could the precious ore of Irish literature be extracted. Fired by the glowing enthusiasm of O'Grady, they turned to legend and mythology for their inspiration. Thus they broke completely with the purely political tradition which colored Anglo-Irish literature from the decline of Gaelic in the

Eighteenth, down to the period after the Famine in the middle of the Nineteenth, century.

W. B. Yeats was one of the earliest of the young poets to live up to the new tradition he had caught from O'Grady. He boldly attacked the popular idols of the aggressively patriotic school, and substituted as the model for his generation, the two older poets, Clarence Mangan and Samuel Ferguson, who alone had escaped the dominance of the political spirit. With him were associated Charles Johnston, the translator of the Upanishads, A. E., the mystic visionary, John Eglinton, the essayist, and a host of minor personalities. Yeats fought earnestly on behalf of the artistic standard usually neglected when once the soundness of a writer's patriotism was established. He pointed out that hatred of England did not necessarily mean love of poetry, and that good verse was not to be measured in terms of political sentiment. His theories were confirmed by his practice, for he proceeded to publish his first important volume in 1887, *The Wanderings of Oisín*, which was immediately recognized as a new thing in Irish poetry.

The study of Oriental philosophy engaged the attention of all in the group, but while Yeats saw in mysticism a source of beautiful imagery and symbolism, A. E. felt it to be the expression of a positive belief. He was the true mystic of the movement, and has remained so, ever since he first wrote for the theosophical review founded by himself and his friends towards the beginning of the 'Nineties.' In 1894 he collected a small volume of his verse, *Homeward, Songs by the Way*, which was published in Dublin, and marked the beginning of the tendency to seek publication in Ireland rather than in London, as had previously been the rule. *Homeward* was at once greeted as a little masterpiece, and its depth of vision and beauty of speech have made it a unique book in the history of the Revival. It is not the poetry which appeals to the popular mind, but all who have sensed the intuitions of inspired vision know and love it.

Characteristically A. E. at once struck the universal human note which contains but transcends the voice of nationality. He is the only writer of the Revival who has identified himself with the struggle of humanity as distinct from that of nationality. As time went on he proved that the mystic poet and painter was no mere recluse, but could ardently champion the cause of the individual against oppression. He has preferred to associate his co-operative work with his family name, George W. Russell, but in every circumstance he remains A. E., the ardent seer of twenty-five years ago. He alone represents the element which came into the movement at the beginning with the young Russian Socialist R. I. Lipmann, the first translator of Lermontov. But the

latter disappeared from Dublin after *A Hero of our Time* was published. It is interesting, however, to note this early contact with the Russian spirit, since so widely felt in English literature.

The influence of the Dublin poets was not confined to their immediate circle. In London a number of minor poets were caught on the wave of Celticism. Some were influenced by direct contact with Yeats who lived there for several years, others were simply echoes of his own writings. Norah Hopper, Lionel Johnson, Moira O'Neill and Katharine Tynan are amongst the best known of these disciples, who either in London or Dublin, strove to live up to the new standard of excellence imposed by W. B. Yeats and his colleagues. Lionel Johnson was interesting as an instance of the attraction exercised by the new Irish poetry upon one who was essentially English in his birth and education. He shares with Katharine Tynan the distinction of being the only Catholic poet of any importance in the Movement. These two alone have given expression to Catholicism, Johnson in the austere ritualistic English fashion, Katharine Tynan with the simple piety of a peasant girl. They serve to indicate how small a part Catholicism really is of the Irish spirit. The fundamentally inartistic nature of Irish Catholicism distinguishes it from the religion of all other Catholic countries, where the Church has usually been a factor of some aesthetic value.

The Irish Theatre is not the most familiar manifestation of the Celtic Renaissance, although, curiously enough, it was not Celtic at all in its origins. Originally conceived as the Irish Literary Theatre, it ran for three seasons under the guidance of Edward Martyn, George Moore and W. B. Yeats. The two former writers were interested mainly in creating a theatre for the performance of literary drama along the lines of the Independent Theatre, the *Théâtre Libre* and the *Freie Bühne*. The plays most successfully produced were those of Edward Martyn, whose *Maeve* and *The Heather Field* presented most interesting analogies with the works of the great Scandinavian dramatists. Martyn has remained faithful to his intention of the Literary Theatre, and through him, Dublin has seen the performance of the more important works of Ibsen, Strindberg and Tchekhov. But Yeats was concerned with poetic plays of legend and with the folk-drama, in which he felt the germs of national drama must lie. Consequently he parted company with Martyn and Moore in order to throw in his lot with a group of actors who had been working independently in the direction of such a theatre as he wished to establish.

The Irish National Dramatic Company, under the direction of the brothers W. G. and Frank Fay seemed to provide the nucleus required by Yeats. They were performing peasant plays and had under-

taken a legendary drama, *Deirdoe*, by A. E. Lady Gregory and W. B. Yeats came into this group, and soon they were given control, with the result—now familiar on both sides of the Atlantic—that the Irish Players and the Irish National Theatre came into existence. With the exception of Padraic Colum and J. M. Synge, who both made their *debut* in 1903, the National Theatre has produced few peasant playwrights of literary importance. After the success of Synge a number of more or less imitative dramatists attached themselves to the Theatre, and popularity and commercialism dominated the scene. The plays of Yeats have excited no emulation, he remains the only poetic dramatist in the Movement, while the Theatre he did so much to foster is almost wholly identified with stereotyped, realistic peasant melodrama and light farce, whose sole purpose is to amuse. The real fruits of the Dramatic Movement must be sought in the published works of a few playwrights, not in the repertoire of the Irish Players.

The weak point in the Revival has been the absence of good prose. The delightful essays of John Eglington, our only sceptic, were never published for more than limited circulation. The prose writings of A. E. are only now being collected into a representative volume. Yeats, of course, has given us two beautiful prose works, *The Celtic Twilight* and *The Secret Rose*, but he cannot be considered amongst the prose writers as such. During many years the "pot-boiling" fiction of various authors, better known in other directions, was the only evidence that the novel was still being cultivated in Ireland. It was not until Lord Dunsany published his strange and original mythology, *The Gods of Pegana* in 1905, that a standard of prose fiction was set upon the same level as our poetry and drama.

Finally, in 1912, an intensely national genius was manifested in fiction by James Stephens, whose *Crock of Gold* appeared in that year. The fantastic imagination of Dunsany was not colored by the Celtic tradition to the same extent as was that of Stephens, with whom he may legitimately be compared. Stephens having announced himself as a revolutionist in literature by his little volume of poems, *Insurrections*, substantiated his claim by writing one of the most delightful works of grotesque fantasy and tender imagination, in Anglo-Irish literature. His prodigious success announced definitely a new and final phase in the evolution of the Irish Literary Revival. He showed that the Celtic spirit could express itself no less beautifully in narrative prose than in drama or verse, and to confute the pessimists, who doubted if he could repeat the success of the *Crock of Gold*, he last year published *The Demi-Gods* a work of a riper if less exuberant mood, which enables us to forget the failure of the intervening volume, *Here are Ladies*.

Current Affairs

Preparedness and Democracy

WITH the convening of Congress on the sixth of this month, the question of "Preparedness" will pass from the "preparatory" stage of preliminary public discussion to that of "definite results" in the form of laws for the increase of our naval and military forces and equipment. To most people the entire question is merely a matter of dollars and cents,—we are going to spend so many hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and the question is whether or not the expenditure is "justified." Is there any real necessity for placing this additional burden on the poor tax-payers, and couldn't we use our money to better advantage in some other, "more profitable" manner? To some, the question of Preparedness also involves the problem of our international relations: Wouldn't our military preparations in themselves act as an incentive to war, both by developing the military spirit in ourselves and breeding suspicion of our aims and purposes in our neighbors?

Both of these aspects of the problem are undoubtedly important, and the objections to preparedness on these grounds are fully justified. There is no doubt but that the hundreds of millions of dollars now contemplated to be expended annually on preparedness, could be used, nay, are sorely needed for use, in works of social amelioration, the necessity of which is conceded on all sides. And there can be little doubt of the fact that carrying a gun in one's hip-pocket is the most expeditious way of getting into a gun-fight. Police records show that it is not the *unarmed* man that is most often the victim of the gunman. And our history as a nation shows that what is true of individuals is true of nations. We have now existed as a nation for more than a century and a quarter and we never had a fight on hand but what it was of our own choosing.

It is of course true that the temper of the times has changed considerably, and that we are now living in an Imperialistic era in which each "great nation" is out to grab as much of the "unappropriated" portions of the globe as possible, and is ready to use armed force in so doing whenever it becomes necessary. We are therefore much more likely to be attacked in the future than we were in the past. But it is similarly true that the chance of our being attacked will only arise if we attempt to thwart the Imperialistic schemes of any of the "great powers," by ourselves grabbing some of the things which they covet for themselves. In other words, the danger of our being attacked only becomes real if we attempt to play the game of Imperialism.

The policy of "Preparedness" therefore necessarily

means our entry upon an era of "world-politics:" an era in which the menace of war will be constantly hanging over us, when even our "peace" will be nothing but an armed truce liable to be broken at any moment.

But there is an aspect of the "Preparedness" problem which is more important than either of those just mentioned.—or even than both of them put together—the effect which the "Preparedness" policy must ultimately have on our governmental system and the spirit of our political institutions. Those who talk so glibly of the necessity of preparing to protect our country and our *democratic institutions*, forget—or deliberately overlook—the fact that in order to adequately "prepare" for this alleged defense we must first give up the very institutions which we want to defend. For it becomes more and more manifest that the game of Modern Imperialism is incompatible with democratic institutions. And this not merely in the sense that autocratic institutions in "colonial possessions" are in the long run incompatible with democratic institutions "at home." But in a more immediate and military sense: democratic institutions at home make it impossible to so adequately "prepare" from a military point of view as to be able to play the Imperialistic game efficiently abroad. "Adequate Preparedness" therefore implies such a change in our political institutions as will permit us to acquire the high level of military efficiency of that model of "preparedness,"—Germany. If we are ever to have an equal chance with that model of efficiency, we must adopt not only her military system but also her political institutions. That our more thoughtful apostles of "Preparedness" are fully alive to the necessary change, and are ready to make it, can be seen from an article recently published by Prof. Roland G. Usher in the *N. Y. Tribune* under the significant title: "Is Adequate Preparedness Possible for the U. S.?"

The sum and substance of this article is that those are making a mistake who think that we can prepare *adequately* by building navies and raising armies. "Preparedness is more than enlisting men and making munitions." *The spirit is the thing.* And our government as it now stands does not possess the proper spirit. And not only *our* government does not possess it, *no* democratic government can possess it. Look at England:

"Last August they made up their minds to arm; they voted unlimited money; they secured millions of volunteers; they spent money like water to buy equipment and everything else imaginable in the United States; they had at their disposal an administration and governmental system rated by the experts as one of the most efficient in the world; they had in Kitchener supposedly one of the world's greatest military organizers. Yet somehow the army does not seem to have materialized as they had ex-

pected. Money, men, equipment, the will to prepare, all these certainly existed to a degree they do not exist here; and yet something more was needed."

What that "more" is, Prof. Usher does not say. He leaves it to us to infer. And the inference is easy enough: If it is not general efficiency, nor a genius for military organization, what else could it but the spirit which pervades Germany's social and political institutions? It is these that we must evidently copy if we want *Adequate Preparedness*.

The Socialist Party and Preparedness

SOME time ago Morris Hillquit, the National Chairman of the Socialist Party, declared in a public debate with Congressman Gardner that if we admit the likelihood of the United States being involved in a serious war, we must go in for Preparedness.

"If," he said, "we grant the premise that the United States is in danger of *becoming involved in war* with a first class foreign power, we must accept the conclusion that the country is woefully unprepared for such an emergency, and that it is the part of wisdom to strengthen our naval and military defenses."

The question as to whether or not we ought to go in for Preparedness is, therefore, purely one of correct diagnosis of the concrete situation as to whether or not we are likely to become involved in war with a strong adversary. If the diagnosis gives a positive result, it is the evident duty of Socialists to line up with those who want "to strengthen our naval and military defenses."

Now comes the *N. Y. Call*, the leading press organ of the Socialist Party of this country, and supplies the diagnosis. Discussing some statements made by Congressman Crago of Pennsylvania at a meeting held under the auspices of the National Defense League, the *Call* says editorially:

"The pacifist idea seems to be that if we never seek trouble with other nations we shall have none; that they will not attack us unless we provoke them to do so.

"On the other hand, Crago and the militarists generally assume that the social world is not at all constructed upon that principle; that it postulates a fight for feeding grounds, plunder and conquest; that if a nation weak in armaments happens to be wealthy it is a fair mark for more powerfully armed neighbors; that despite their universal professions of peace they will fasten a quarrel upon us so that they may plunder us through force.

"Without doubt our Cragos are right: They recognize in this respect the world as it really is, and not as sentimental pacifists regard it, the idealists who assume that what they think 'ought' to be really is. *The Crago view is the Socialist view.*"

We need not stop here to inquire as to whether or not the *Call* is correct in its assertion that the Crago view is *the Socialist view*. It is sufficient that it is the view of the dominant faction of the Socialist Party of this country. And on that subject the opinion of the *Call* may be taken as authoritative.

And when we put together these two authoritative expressions of opinion as to the position of the Socialist Party of America on the subject of war and Preparedness, we get the following result:

Capitalism, the present dominant economic system, generates war, and in the very nature of things the two are inseparable. As the capitalist system is sure to last for some time yet, this country is not only likely, but almost certain to become involved in war sooner or later; particularly if it remains "weak in armaments", for it will then be "a fair mark for more powerfully armed neighbors." And once we have granted the premise that the United States may become involved in war with a powerful adversary, "we must accept the conclusion that the country is woefully unprepared for such an emergency, and that it is the part of wisdom to strengthen our naval and military defenses."

Curiously enough the Socialist party but a few months ago adopted on a referendum the following amendment to its national constitution, by the overwhelming vote of 11041 to 782:

"Any member of the Socialist party elected to an office, who shall in any way vote to appropriate moneys for military or naval purposes, or war, shall be expelled from the party".

It will be noticed that this prohibition against voting funds for war or preparedness is absolute and unconditional. It does not permit the taking into account of the likelihood of our being involved in war. Nor does it even recognize the distinction between aggression and defense.

Under these circumstances it is only fair to ask: Where does the Socialist Party of America stand on this momentous question?

If You Buy Books—

You want to concentrate
and get efficient service

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE

256 Broadway, New York City

A Socialist Digest

A Russian Socialist Manifesto

THE following appeal is the outcome of a joint meeting of the members of the Social-Democratic and Socialist Revolutionary Parties of Russia, which took place in a neutral country on Sept. 5-10, 1915. After thorough discussion of the problems of the war, resolutions were unanimously adopted defining the position of Russian Socialists towards the war in general and its Russian phase, in particular. For lack of space the resolutions can not appear in this issue. The appeal itself though popular in form is extremely interesting not only because it sheds a light on the position of a great mass of Russian Socialists, but also because of its critical analysis of the issues of the Great War.

TO THE CLASS CONSCIOUS WORKERS OF RUSSIA: We appeal to the class-conscious workers,—peasants, clerks, artisans,—in short to all who eat their bread in the sweat of their brow,—who suffer through lack of material means and misgovernment.

We send to them our warm greetings, and urgently appeal to them to listen to us in this fated period when the enemy has occupied a large portion of Russian territory and threatens Kiev, St. Petersburg and Moscow, the most important centres of Russian life.

In the past too our fatherland had to live through the bloody horrors of an invasion. But never before was it obliged to withstand an enemy so well armed, so skillfully organized—an enemy whose plundering enterprise has been so carefully planned,—as at present.

Our fatherland is in an extreme danger. That is the reason why a heavy responsibility rests on the shoulders of the class-conscious working population of Russia.

If you say to yourself that it is immaterial to you and your less class-conscious workers as to who conquers in the present international conflict and act accordingly, then Russia will be crushed by Germany, and if Russia is crushed it is needless to argue that it will go ill with her allies as well. If, on the other hand you become convinced that the defeat of Russia will react detrimentally on the interests of its working population and will co-operate with all your strength in the defence of our country, then Russia and her allies will escape the great danger that threatens them.

You will make a great mistake if

you imagine that it is not necessary for the workers to defend their country. In fact the interests of no other part of the population suffer so severely from an invasion of the enemy as those of the workers. The so-called higher classes, i.e. the more or less well to do can much more easily escape the baneful consequences of the defeat of their country. The Franco-Prussian war serves as an example. When the Germans besieged Paris and when prices of necessities soared, the poor suffered much more than the rich. And when Germany exacted a five milliard "contribution" from conquered France, in the final analysis it was the poverty stricken population that paid the amount. For in order to pay "the contribution" indirect taxes were levied, the weight of which as is well known, falls mainly on the lowest class. But this is not all. The most pernicious effect of the defeat of France in 1870-71, was the retardation of her economic development, which served to check the growth of the liberating movement of the working class. You may well comprehend, the slower the growth of capitalism in a country the later is postponed the liberation of the working-class from the exploitation of the upper classes. In other words the defeat of France had an imperious effect not only on the immediate interests of her people, but even more, on its subsequent progress.

The devastation of Russia by Germany will inspire our people even more than did the victory of Germany over France. From the economic standpoint ours is a backward country when compared with the countries of Western Europe. Only after the abolition of serfdom in 1861 was the slow development of Russia's productive powers accelerated. The quickened development of productive powers helped to arouse class-consciousness among the workers. The revolutionary storm of 1905-1906 which seriously rocked the foundations of the old regime was the inevitable political result of the economic revolution of Russia in the latter half of the 19th Century. It may be stated with assurance that the faster the productive powers of Russia develop the sooner will its workers become class-conscious and the sooner will strike the hour of the final fall of Czarism. But the war thrust upon us by Germany threatens to check this favorable development and in this lies the greatest danger for the Russian people, at the present moment.

Wars now call for enormous expenditures of money.

It is much more difficult for Russia to meet these expenditures than it is for the rich countries of Europe. For Russia is a country economically behind the rest. On the backs of the Russian people even prior to this war, was the heavy governmental indebtedness. Now this indebtedness grows every moment and besides large portions of Russia are subjected to complete devastation. If Germany wins a complete victory she will demand from us an enormous war indemnity in comparison with which the gold that flowed in 1871 from conquered France into victorious Germany will seem as a mere bagatelle. But our victors will not be content with an indemnity. The more consistent of the public criers of German Imperialism already contend that a demand must be made on Russia for cession of important territory, which besides, for the convenience of German colonists, should be altogether cleared of its present inhabitants.

Moreover enormous war indemnity and cession of Western provinces will not suffice war conquerors. Even in 1904, Russia, because of her criminal adventure in the East, was compelled to conclude a commercial treaty with Germany on very disadvantageous terms. That treaty impeded the development of rural economics as well as of manufacture. It was equally disadvantageous to the interests of the agricultural and the industrial worker. You may easily imagine the treaty which will be forced on us by the victorious German Imperialism. Economically Russia will become a German colony. Her future economic development will be greatly delayed if not altogether stopped. Agricultural workers forced out of their villages through necessity will not have the opportunity to find work in the industrial centres, and instead of becoming class-conscious proletarians capable of fighting energetically for their own freedom they will be gradually transformed into ragged tramps, ready to serve as the unconscious tools in the hands of all sorts of program makers and adventurers.

Degeneration and debasement of a considerable portion of the working class threatens Russia in the event of German victory. But bad as this all is—it would not be all. After conquering Russia, Germany will no doubt dissolve the treaty between Russia, France, England, and the other countries of Western Europe. Then will be recalled

the sad memory of the union of the Three Emperors. But it is not that which grieves us. The great and inevitable calamity will be that under the pretext of a treaty with Russia, Berlin will take upon itself the role of preserving "order" in St. Petersburg. We all know how the reactionaries put their hopes in "the mailed fist" of the German Emperor in the struggle with the revolutionary movement of 1905-1906. And they were right. For in addition to international solidarity of reactionism tried and tested for centuries, German imperialists are materially interested in the support of our old regime, which immeasurably weakens the ability of Russia to oppose an external enemy. If prior to this day the movement for the emancipation of the proletariat and peasantry has been blocked by the Russian reaction, in the future to these reactionary forces will be added the mightier force of German reaction. And then you may bid farewell for a long time indeed to your plans of emancipation.

And what will be the result of German victory on Western Europe? After what has been said about Russia we need hardly expand on the economic misery which will be thrust on the working masses of the countries allied with Russia. We wish to call your attention but to the following: England, France and even Belgium and Italy have advanced much further politically than the German Empire which as yet has not reached even the parliamentary stage. The victory of Germany over the former countries would mean the triumph of the monarchical over the democratic principle, the triumph of the old over the new. If the democratic ideal is dear to you, if in your own country you seek to substitute for the autocracy of the Czar the rule of the people you have no choice but to wish for the success of our western allies.

Lately one of the members of the Duma, of the extreme left, after justly pointing out in his address the complete break-down of the Czar's government in the defence of Russia, added that soon the people themselves will decide the question of war and peace. That of course presupposes a revolution, and the first problem of the revolutionary government would be a life and death struggle with German Imperialism. Such conduct would become incumbent on the Revolutionary Government both in the interest of the democratic countries allied with us as well to insure the final triumph of Russian revolution over the dark forces of international reaction.

Indifference on your part, as to the outcome of the present war would be equivalent to political suicide i. e. the

refusal to lead the working class in its movement toward a better future. The most important, the most vital economic interests of the proletariat and the peasantry demand from you active participation in the defence of the country. Don't be confused with the arguments of those who contend that to defend your country is to shirk your part in the class-struggle. For firstly, for the successful outcome of the class-struggle are necessary certain social and political conditions which we will not have, if Germany triumphs. Secondly, if the working population of Russia must defend itself when it is exploited by Russian land holders and capitalists it is incomprehensible why it should be passive when an attempt is made to place on its neck the yoke of exploitation of German landholders (Junkers) and capitalists, who to our great sorrow are now being supported by a considerable portion of the German proletariat—traitors to solidarity and the proletariat of other countries. The Russian proletariat at the same time that it makes an effort to escape the noose of exploitation by German Imperialism, will conduct the class struggle in the most effective manner suitable to the present times. It is also argued that in defending our country from the German invasion you are supporting the old political order. The defeat of Russia is desired by these short-sighted people because of their hatred of the Russian government. Such reasoning like that of one of the heroes of our great satirist Tshedrin confuses the political administration of the country with the country itself. Russia does not belong to the Czar but to the Russian people. The Russian people in defending Russia, defend themselves, defend their own cause—their own emancipation. For we have already pointed out how the old regime would only be strengthened through a German victory.

The Russian reactionaries understand this well. With a heavy heart they defend Russia from Germany. It is said that as late as last November the recently retired ministers Maklakoff and Tscheglovitoff submitted to the Czar a report demonstrating the benefit to Russia of peace with Germany. Even if this is not a fact it is undisputed that the defeat of Germany would be the defeat of the monarchical principle so dear to the reactionaries.

Our people will never forgive Czarism its incapacity in the role of the defenders of Russia against the external enemy. But if the leading class-conscious elements of the population will not participate in the defence of the country, then the reactionaries may well shift the blame for Russian defeat,

to the shoulders of the Russian revolutionaries, who they will claim have been traitors to their country, and this will acquit them before some portion of the population—and will benefit reaction.

Your watchword should be victory over the external enemy. In an active effort toward such victory the vital force of the people will grow stronger, which eventually will weaken the position of the internal enemy i. e. our existing government. All "revolutionary demonstrations" in the rear of the army fighting with the enemy would be equivalent to treason for it would serve the external enemy at the same time that it would make easier the position of the internal enemy for it would create differences and disputes between the armed forces of Russia on the one side and the advanced portion of the population on the other.

Even strikes should not be undertaken in these times without first weighing carefully their moral, political and technico-military effects.

War it is true will not make our Russian Entrepreneurs more unselfish than they were in time of peace. The receipt and execution of a great many orders from the government, indispensable during "mobilization of industry" will cause entrepreneurs as usual to give special attention to the interests of capital and pay no attention at all to those of labor. You will be quite right to be indignant at such conduct. But in every such case when you are tempted to resort to a strike you should first consider carefully whether a strike will not hurt the defence of Russia. The interests of the individual should be subordinated to those of the mass. A worker in a given factory should remember that he would commit a great mistake; if having in view only his own interests he would forget how bitterly the interests of the entire Russian proletariat and peasantry would suffer because of a German victory. It would be folly if blinded by local and temporary conditions you will act so as to imperil the entire future of our movement in the cause of freedom.

Though you should by no means cease the just struggle for the betterment of your economic condition and should at all times combat any attempt to make it worse, you should not for a moment forget that not only your external, but internal enemies will utilize any false step which you might take. It is quite possible that the reactionaries are only waiting for the opportunity to rouse the workers to local strikes and demonstrations, and in combating and destroying these efforts piecemeal, to leave for themselves a free hand to conclude a

dishonorable peace with Germany which would preserve their power over the working class.

In view of the ineffectiveness of Czarism as a tool of national defense, the opinion is expressed in our advanced circles, that so long as the government of the Czar exists it is not possible to do anything for the defence of our country. This point of view though natural under the circumstances is nevertheless wholly erroneous.

If the advanced elements of our population refuse to join in the defence of Russia until the fall of the existing government they will by that very conduct postpone the time of its fall. The tactics which may be characterized by the formula "all or nothing" are anarchistic tactics altogether unworthy of the discerning leadership of the proletariat and the peasantry. The general staff of the German army will gladly welcome the news of this attitude of our advanced population. For its purposes are needed strikes in England, "disorders" in Russia, for these would make easier the execution of its military program of conquest. You should insist that all our representatives should if possible participate actively in all the organizations which are now being created for the battle with the external enemy. The firmer are our representatives established in these the easier will it be for them to combat the enemy at home. Your representatives should not only participate in special technical establishments (military and industrial committees) created to serve the needs of the army, but in all other organizations of social and political character such as village co-operatives, peasant autonomies, labor unions, sick-benefit funds, Zemstvo and city establishments and the Duma. The situation is such now that we can not reach freedom except through the road of natural defence. But we want you to note that we are not counselling the defeat of the external foe first and then the overthrow of the enemy at home. It is quite possible that the overthrow of the latter may be the preliminary condition to attain the deliverance from the German danger. The French revolutionists of the latter part of the 18th Century would never have dealt effectively with the enemy that was attacking France on all sides if they had not adhered to the extreme and boldest revolutionary tactics. And they had recourse to such only in the measure consistent with and parallel to the growth of the movement against the old order. They were the acknowledged and irreconcilable enemies of thoughtless demonstrations as conscious or unconscious tools in the hands of external and internal enemies of the people. Let those revolutionists

serve to us as an example of both incessant revolutionary activity as well as of sober and careful political insight and circumspection.

We the signers of the appeal belong to different currents of Russian Socialist thought. Among us are Social-revolutionists as well as Social-democrats, we differ in great many particulars. But we all are definitely agreed that the defeat of Russia by Germany will be at the same time Russia's defeat in the struggle for freedom. And we believe that guided by this con-

viction all who agree with us should co-operate with each other in the friendly service to their own people in this its hour of grave danger.

Members of Social-Democratic Labor Party and Party of Social-Revolutionists: G. Plechanoff, A. Bach, L. Deutsch, E. Zinovieva Deutsch, E. Axelrod, E. Bunakoff, N. Avksientieff, A. Lubinoff, B. Voronoff, H. Argunoff. Argunoff.

Members of second Duma: G. Belousoff, G. Alexinsky.

Sept. 10th, 1915.

Bernsteins' Peace Programme

AT the time the German Party adopted the "peace manifesto", recently commented upon in our columns, Edward Bernstein presented a peace programme in the name of the minority in the party.

Bernstein opens by saying that peace can only renew friendly relations between the peoples if it be in conformity with the resolutions adopted by International Socialist Congresses: The supreme principle insisted upon in these resolutions is "the right of peoples to decide their own fate": "the Social Democratic Party does not admit the right of conquest of any nation over any other." In the case of countries of European civilization which have lived under foreign rule, no territorial changes should take place without the wishes of the people being consulted, and such consultation should be supervised by neutral nations so as to ensure perfect freedom in voting. All adults who had lived in the country for at least a year before the outbreak of the war should have the right to vote, and self-government should be given to all subject peoples, whether transferred from one Power to another or not, with the right to decide by vote as to which State they should belong. Outside Europe international modification should only take place under such conditions as guarantee the status of the inhabitants against injury. In order to prevent a renewal of war, Bernstein urges that international law must be perfected by the following means:

1. Reconstruction of The Hague Conference and the establishment of permanent councils for legislation and arbitration.
2. Compulsory arbitration.
3. The suspension of military operations until the quarrel has been submitted to arbitration, and all means of reaching a pacific solution have been exhausted. Any state which declares or

prepares for war contrary to these rules to be treated as an enemy.

4. Questions of war and peace to be decided by elected representatives. Secret treaties to be abolished.

5. Strengthening of laws relating to the conduct of war and the protection of civil populations.

6. The abolition of the right of capture at sea.

7. Internationalisation of waterways and transcontinental railways.

8. Adoption of the principle of the "open door" for colonies, protectorates, etc.

9. Abolition of the right to levy war contributions, to take hostages, and to inflict measures of reprisal on the inhabitants of an invaded country for acts committed in self-defense by other inhabitants. The institution of permanent commissions to watch over treatment of invaded countries and of civil and military prisoners.

Bernstein considers the question of Belgium in detail, and reaches this conclusion:

All forcible annexation of Belgian territory or any interference with Belgian autonomy by any state whatever must be energetically resisted, but further, it must be added that Germany without any provocation whatsoever, as the Chancellor has himself admitted, violated the neutrality of Belgium in defiance of the law of nations, and having thus made her way into Belgium to satisfy her own designs, beat down the resistance of the army and occupied the country by force. Germany is therefore bound in honor to evacuate Belgium, in accordance with the solemn declaration made August 4, 1914, by the German Ambassador, Prince Lichnowsky, to the English Secretary of State, Sir Edward Grey, and to pay a full and ample indemnity to the people of Belgium for the material and moral injury which they have suffered.

A German Austro-Hungarian Customs Union

IN the *Neue Zeit*, E. Varga, of Budapest, discusses the chances of a German-Austro-Hungarian Customs Union from the point of view of the Austro-Hungarian interest. He reaches the conclusion that they are not very promising.

As far as Hungary is concerned both the agrarian and industrial interests are decidedly opposed to such a union, while the workers have thus far not taken any position one way or the other.

Until a short time ago the Hungarian agrarians were eager for such a union. Their change is so recent that no notice of it has thus far been taken in Germany. But to-day the agrarian interests in Austria as well as in Hungary frown upon the scheme of a customs union. The organ of the Hungarian Independence Party, "Magyarország," which is in close touch with the agrarians, said last September:

"We don't know whether the idea of a customs union sprang spontaneously from the war sentiment or whether it is merely the beginning of an agitation in that direction. But we protest in advance against such a mischievous scheme. Our protest is so emphatic that we deem even the discussion of the plan nefarious."

The government thereupon hinted confidentially to drop public discussion in order not to strain the relations with Germany.

The reason for the agrarian change of front is found in the great economic changes that have taken place in the export trade of the dual monarchy. Until 1908 the export of agrarian products into Germany was considerable as the statistics show. It has since greatly fallen off, particularly as to the products of the large estates. Rye and wheat, the important staple articles of such estates, are no higher in price in Berlin than in Vienna. Hence their export to Germany has ceased which naturally had a chilling effect upon the Hungarian agrarians.

But there are also political reasons for the opposition. It is a question whether the growing political importance of the industrial elements in Germany will not force a reduction of the duties on grain in order to cheapen the cost of living. *But in Austria-Hungary the political power of the agrarians is so impregnable that they need not fear any change in the agrarian policy of a high protective tariff.* In Hungary the agrarians are on top. They fear that their grip might be broken by a customs union with the industrially highly developed Germany. Hence they pro-

test against the idea of a customs union.

The Austrian industrialists, on the other hand, have good reasons to fear German competition in their home market as well as in export. German industry has great geographical as well as economic advantages as compared with that of Austria. It has better outlets on the ocean, richer mineral, coal and alkali deposits; owing to the greater efficiency of its workers also a greater output per capita of its industrial products. At present, in spite of the high import duties, Germany steadily increases her export into Austria in consequence. A customs union would place the Austrian industry at still greater disadvantage. *It is therefore self-evident that the Austrian industrialists don't want any customs union with Germany.*

The Hungarian industrialists are practically in the same boat with their Austrian brethren. They are now suffering from the Austrian competition that is not hampered by custom duties. Free imports from Germany would make matters still worse.

From the viewpoint of the Hungarian workers a customs union with Germany would paralyze many branches of the Hungarian industry such as iron, machines, chemicals and so forth. The demand for labor would diminish. The Hungarian industry is not even now absorbing the labor power set free in modern agriculture; hence the steadily growing emigration. *A customs union with Germany would make matters much worse. It would tremendously increase the industrial reserve army, make wage struggles much more difficult and depress wages and conditions of labor.* Hungary, poor in resources of capital, would be a ready field for German exploitation. Both the Austrian and the Hungarian workers have therefore good economic reasons to oppose the scheme of a German customs union.

Looked upon merely from the economic position of the workers, from the consequences of a union upon the labor market, the question would have to be settled in the negative.

On the other hand, such a union between two or three states is impossible without resulting in a far reaching equalization of industrial institutions. A customs union would require a unified money standard and a unified regulation of banking. It would call for a common disposition of the revenues and in consequence tend to produce a common financial policy. In Austria-Hungary exists a tobacco monopoly; there are also internal duties upon some articles of mass consumption, like

petroleum. The new system would have to take account of that fact.

It is also self-evident that the whole external policy which is really influenced by economic forces must be unified in states having a common customs territory. It is impossible to unite states in one custom territory without in the end unifying them also as to taxes and financial matters and external policy.

From the strictly economic point of view such a union would have a bad effect upon the Austro-Hungarian labor market, as has been pointed out. *But for the general condition of the working classes a closer political affiliation would produce good results in the long run.*

The author is no admirer of the Prussian Junkers and the German bureaucracy. But contrasted with the political outlawry of the workers under the brutal, ignorant Magyar clique as represented by Tisza an approachment to the German system of social welfare would be of great advantage to Hungarian labor. Perhaps after a few decades such political advantages might more than outweigh the present economic drawbacks.

Spanish Socialist Party Congress

AT the opening session of the Tenth National Congress of the Spanish Socialist Party, Julian Besteiro, of the Madrid Socialist Group, said that at no time were the problems which the Spanish Socialists have to face so complex. But circumstances were exceptional for Socialists throughout the world. The Socialist Party had not been able to prevent the war, for the same reason that it had not been able to alter the capitalist system, which was the cause of the war. Socialists had done their duty in doing all they could to prevent the war, but no Socialist could tolerate that the liberty and integrity of his country should be put in danger. Vicente Barrio, in the name of the General Union of Workers, condemned the war in Morocco, which, he said, is ruining Spain at a time when it has need of all its resources.

Pablo Iglesias declared that the number of Socialists did not greatly vary from one Congress to another, but one found that while the bourgeois Press a few years ago treated them with silence, to-day their resolutions were often considered in connection with the national policy. This was an undeniable victory. With regard to the Moroccan campaign it was their duty to demonstrate against it on every possible occasion.

Correspondence

Macy's Defense Plans

To the NEW REVIEW:

I THINK that Mr. Macy's plan for national defense (as outlined in your issue of November 15) is much too innocent in spirit to be safe. It seems to me totally to ignore the chicanery and double-dealing as we have seen them practiced in this country over and over again. I do not recall at the moment the date of the shooting of the marching strikers at McKeesport, but it is not so long ago that Mr. Macy cannot recall it. At the time the men were shot down at McKeesport, Mr. Carnegie (against whose exactions and bad citizenship the strikers were protesting in a peaceable way) was at the Hague nursing the dove of peace; and it is safe to affirm that he saw no more contradiction between his fanciful devotion to peace and the killing of these men by policemen he was able to command than the Kaiser saw in overruling the "scrap of paper" that, had he respected it, would have closed Belgium to him as a road to Paris (as he thought). What would be the effect of an army and navy of defense on the Monroe doctrine?

Likewise, if an army and navy of defense were created, and lay like a white elephant on our hands for some decades, evidently not earning their salt, does Mr. Macy think there would be no question of a journalistic or senatorial nature as to why the nation was being burdened with them? And if such a question were asked, however timidly, is not the late instance of Admiral Mayo to the fore to show us that national defense is a matter of reducing the citizens of other countries to submission?

No, the simplest psychology of the situation is that if you give a man a gun and he is of a gunning disposition, as he would be if he accepted the present, it is a silk hat to a thimble that the recipient will prove too much of a gentleman to let the present lie idle in his hands. It would not be good manners, good faith or good politics to let it rust.

Besides, Mr. Macy has not made clear what we are to prepare to defend ourselves against. Who is going to attack us, and by what route and methods, and how will a successful line of communication with a home base of supplies be maintained by an army invading the United States? It is not fair to ask the nation to undertake the cost of maintaining nearly a million and a

quarter soldiers (as I understand is contemplated ultimately) and an extensive navy just to calm the excited nerves of men who are unable to explain the cause of their anxiety.

Lastly, soldiers, time out of mind, have been bad citizens. Civilians cannot get along with them. There is constant enmity between them, whether in the militia camps of Mount Gretna or the familiar life of our cities. They produce nothing. They grow choleric and pretentious in idleness (as John L. Sullivan said, not so politely, of General Nelson Miles, when the military man refused to speak on the same temperance platform with the ring-man at Atlantic City last summer). It does not follow for a moment that defense and non-aggression are synonymous. There is not a nation in the European war at the moment that is not defending home interests: "Deutschland über alles." Germany at the moment is suffering the throes of self-defense.

For these reasons I do not think that Mr. Macy took the full implications of his proposal into account when he practically says that if our politicians cross their hearts as they draw up a national defense bill they and their successors will be governed by a school-room sense of the meaning of defense and aggression ever after. We are now neutrals, but it would not require many odd twists of the capitalistic-political pendulum to see our boats in European waters shooting down allies or Germans in defense of our right to trade. . . . On the whole I am afraid Mr. Macy sets too much store by the value of phrases.

P. S. The above I wrote last evening. This morning (Nov. 16) my newspaper contains news of Churchill's refusal to be made the scapegoat of the war mess in England. He affirms that the blunders of the war are not the result of a civilian forcing his amateurishness on tried and reluctant officers, but plain blunders committed by the first heads of the war situation. Is it worth the while of the U. S. to begin a policy of having that kind of a defense at a cost like England's at the moment? No nation has ever been so *defended* as England.

Philadelphia, Pa. T. D. O'Bolger.

From A British Socialist

To the NEW REVIEW:

NOT many Socialists in Great Britain have belonged for years, as I have, to the Independent Labor Party (which is mainly influenced by J. R. Macdonald) and the British Socialist Party (associated in the public mind chiefly with H. M. Hyndman); and my independence of view, due to this and other circumstances, may perhaps interest American comrades, if only by way of a change. For a considerable period before the war broke out, the Independent Labor Party and British Socialist Party were, to some extent, rivals and eventually hostile, the I. L. P. inclining towards Asquith and Liberalism, and the B. S. P. strenuously criticising Macdonald's leadership. The war has introduced confusion. It was only a few days old (August, 1914), when Macdonald, rather hastily making up his mind, condemned Grey's deceitfulness, condemned the British government, condemned the alliance with Russia, and drew most of the I. L. P. after him. At the same time, a section of the B. S. P. split off from the veteran Hyndman, denounced the war, denounced recruiting for the Army, and denounced Hyndman's anti-German policy. To call these opposing groups, the one "pro-German" and the other "Militarist Socialists", would offend each in turn, but to me and others who hold a midway position, those terms would, with sufficient accuracy, describe the rival platforms.

Macdonald's followers now include a miscellaneous troop of Socialists, Pacifists, Quakers and Tolstoyans, and a number of these people have no sympathy with the central object of Socialism, namely, to abolish profit-making. Many Pacifists sternly and religiously condemn the making of profit out of gun-manufacture, but quite cordially support the making of profit out of the manufacture of clothes, boots, bread, and the rest.

Macdonald is member of Parliament for Leicester (a city in which I resided eleven years), and if a General Election now took place. I doubt whether he would again be returned to the House of Commons, for many Liberals (Democrats) who formerly voted for him, would probably turn against him on account of his attitude on the war. His constant accusations against the policy of his own country evince a spirit that is more negativist than constructive.

The whole nation is discussing the advisability of introducing Conscription, a Universal Military Service for able-bodied men. Our opinions are very

mixed. A great number of trades-unionists suspect that the bourgeois classes want conscription now in order to exploit labor all the more easily after the war. Some people, with theological inclinations, talk in a seventeenth century style about their conscientious objections to slaying their fellow-men. For my part, having renounced theology, I regard this position as obsolete, and, in effect, as anti-social. It is certain we shall never realize the Socialist Commonwealth if we allow groups of Quakers, Anarchists, or perhaps Capitalists, to raise conscientious objections to the industrial, educational, or military policy decided on by the general Public (that is, the Republic). Minority views should always be respectfully listened to, but they must express themselves in secular language, and be finally subject to the will of the majority.

As to military service, I believe the logical Socialist program to be that of the Citizen Army, on a system resembling that of the Swiss Confederation. Of course, along with the duty of men to serve in the Citizen Army, should be coupled a socialization of industries, employment for all, and a veto on idleness; and this program should apply to all women as well as men. Meanwhile, it may be regarded as certain that, if Kitchener and the Cabinet declared compulsory service necessary in order to attain success in the war, the nation, including the Trades-Unionists, would consent.

Had the Germans refrained from entering Belgium, this country might still have gone to war, but opinions would have been divided, as in the days of the Boer War; and the whole character of the fighting would have been different. The violation of Belgium by Germany, following so close on Austria's attack upon the small nation of the Servians, practically ensured a solid sentiment for the war. During the last thirteen months, this sentiment has deepened universally, and the few politicians who stand aside criticising while millions of our young men go to the risks of war in France and the Dardanelles are not likely to receive gratitude or honor in the days after peace is concluded.

American readers who imagine that I am in favor of the policy that led to the war are mistaken. To express the belief that England and her Allies must go forward with the war does not imply approval of Grey's diplomacy. Most Socialists before the war mistrusted Grey, just as they mistrusted Lloyd George; that is, both these politicians were considered to be mere representatives of bourgeois interests and ideals; and, for myself, I still think that. All Europe has for years past been in-

fectured by militarism. But the Germans, who are naturally inclined to organizing and methodising their ideas, and lifting up their ideas as objects of a kind of religious enthusiasm, have been more painstaking and thorough-going and logical in their militarism than their fellow-Europeans. This power of concentration and devotion, which may be applied to very noble uses, becomes anti-social when applied to military ideals. Europe is therefore driven, by a kind of fatality, to expiate its own militarist errors, and millions of European democrats are compelled to hope for the defeat of the Germanic Powers in order to avoid a check to popular liberties and to Socialism.

But I have no sympathy with the fire-eating people who wish to see the Entente Allies enter Berlin, supposing that event were possible. It appears to me that, in an effective degree, the worst elements of German military policy are already checked, and that adequate benefits will accrue to Europe generally if the Entente Allies can ensure the liberation of Belgium, France, and Servia. If these typical problems are decided, the other questions arising out of the campaigns of 1914-15 can be satisfactorily solved. So far as I have been able to judge, this moderate demand would be approved by a large mass of opinion in the United States. But it cannot be claimed that the Allies are at present in a position to enforce even this modest program. Hence, I must say with the deepest regret, discussion of Peace Terms is inopportune, and I fear no service is being done to the cause of reconciliation by making peace proposals just now.

A colossal debt casts its shadow before. Europe will only discover one way to pay it, and I think England will be the first to see the true solution, namely, the socialisation of industries. Only by this means can unemployment be obviated on the return of the armies, and only by this means can the vast economies be effected which will be necessary to raise the money. The control, or partial control, of various industries now exercised by the British Government supply a lesson, which can be read and understood by all men, in the value of collectivist methods. This control still permits private profits, and is therefore not truly Socialist; but it is a significant first step. Of course, aristocrats and capitalists will fight against this change, and raise a thousand objections to this real Universal Service. This struggle to clear off the War Debt will carry Europe into events which will eclipse the tragedy of 1914-15. But the new forces of democracy will be dedicated to this struggle; I mean the masses of the younger So-

cialists, and the dynamic of the Woman Movement. I trust that H. M. Hyndman, who is, after all, our chief Socialist, will live to see the opening of this wonderful drama in human history.

FREDERICK J. GOULD.

London, England.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY New Review

to be celebrated by a
Sociable and Dinner
SUBJECT FOR DISCUSSION:
"Rebirth of the International"

Some extracts from letters to the Dinner Committee will show the lively interest aroused.

Arturo Giovannitti: "I shall be very glad to attend and speak at the Anniversary Dinner of the NEW REVIEW. The subject for discussion is a particularly fine and alluring one and you are to be congratulated for having selected it."

I. M. Rubinow: "I need not say how much I shall appreciate being with the many illustrious ladies and gentlemen whom you mention in your letter."

Jacques Loeb: "I gladly accept and I hope nothing will interfere with my being present. . . . The only thing on which I might speak would be the scientific internationalism which is also in need of re-birth."

Mary W. Ovington: "I shall be very happy to be present at the NEW REVIEW Dinner and to speak. The subject ought to bring us inspiration."

SPEAKERS:

Prof. Jacques Loeb
Arturo Giovannitti
W. E. B. DuBois
Meyer London
L. B. Boudin
Louis C. Fraina
I. M. Rubinow
Mary W. Ovington
Rose Pastor Stokes
M. Oppenheimer, Chairman

Time: Saturday Evening,
December 18th, 7 p. m.

Place: West End Restaurant,
226 West 125th St.

Price: \$1.00 per cover (including tips).

Tickets can be secured from:

By Mail:
Moses Oppenheimer, 1871
Marmion Ave., New York.

In Person:
New Review, 256 Broadway,
New York.

WE DO NOT
ADVERTISE A
BOOK
WE CANNOT
RECOMMEND

New Review Book Service

VITAL BOOKS
ON ALL
VITAL
PROBLEMS
OF THE DAY

To Our Readers: The following list of books was compiled after a thorough survey of the literature of each subject. It is not yet complete; more books and subjects are to be added.

Remember This: We can get you any book of any publisher. Information gladly supplied.

Send all orders to

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE, 256 BROADWAY
New York City

The Great War

The Anglo-German Problem, by Charles Sarolea. Written before the outbreak of the war, this book is an analysis of the conflict of rival Imperialisms. While slightly partial toward France and England, it is nevertheless an important contribution toward the discussion of the causes of the war. (P) \$1.35. Postage 10 c. extra.

Pan-Germanism, by Roland G. Usher. Stresses the diplomatic and political duel between the Great Powers, as an expression of their economic interests and antagonisms. Portrays the inevitable onward sweep of these antagonisms into war. The economic basis and aims of Pan-Germanism explained. (HM.) \$1.75. Postage 10c. extra.

Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution, by Thorstein Veblen. A scientific analysis of the historical, economic and social factors resulting in Germany's phenomenal industrial progress. Treats the subject from the standpoint of material factors and universal history. "Especially welcome as a help to clear thinking," says Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich, (M.) \$1.50 postage 12c. extra.

Russia and the Great War, by C. Alexinsky. Written by a Russian Socialist, who deals with the subject adequately and brilliantly. An exceptionally valuable book. (S) \$3.00 postpaid.

Toward International Government, by J. A. Hobson, the author of Imperialism. A few of the chapters are "A League of Peace"; "International Arbitration; its Scope and Method"; "International Force"; "The International Executive"; "The Social Contract of Nations"; "Democracy"; and "Internationalism."

Origins and Destiny of Imperial Britain, by Prof. J. A. Cramb. The Imperialism of Great Britain eulogized and explained by a Briton. Indispensable to an understanding of the general characteristics of modern Imperialism. (DU) \$1.50

Nationality and the War, by Arnold J. Toynbee. The only book extant dealing with this most important subject. Chock full of material, on the whole ably interpreted. (DU) \$2.50, postpaid.

German-World Policies, by Paul Rohrbach. The aims and ideals of Pan Germanism explained by a "liberal" Pan-German. (M) \$1.25, postage 8c. extra.

Italy's Foreign and Colonial Policy, by Tommaso Titoni, Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, 1903-1909. Being a selection of his speeches to Parliament. Provides abundant material for a study of Italian Imperialism and for the subtle change in Italian foreign and colonial policy subsequent to the Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. (DU) \$2.50, postpaid 10c extra.

The Export of Capital, by C. K. Hobson. Not a war book, but deals with the economic basis of modern Imperialism—the export of capital. A scholarly study of foreign investment—its causes; growth, method, effects, etc. The material for a study of the economics of Imperialism. (M.) \$2.00, postage 10c. extra.

Socialists and the War, by Wm. English Walling. A documentary study of Socialist participation in, and attitude to, the Great War. Indispensable for a full and adequate understanding of the subject. No more important book on the war has been published. (H) \$1.50, postpaid.

France in Danger, by Paul Vergnet. Genuinely defensive in character, moderate in tone and thoroughly documented. Proves that the nation as a whole did not fully realize the Pan-German menace. (DU) \$1.00, postage 5c. extra.

German Philosophy and Politics, by John Dewey. A pragmatic appraisal, incisive and conclusive. No man is better fitted than Dewey to write such a book. Concludes with an inspiring Internationalism. (H.) \$1.00, postage 5c. extra.

Labor Problems

Sabotage, by Emile Pouget, with an Introduction by Arturo Giovannitti. A sober presentation of the value of Sabotage in the class war. (K.) 50c. postpaid.

American Labor Unions, by Helen Marot. Covers the whole labor union movement. Sincerely critical and concretely revolutionary. Full of facts, and thoroughly interesting. Written by a trades unionist with a revolutionary vision of the immediate future. (H.) \$1.25, postage 10c extra.

Immigration and Labor, by Isaac A. Hourwich. A study of a vital problem by a specialist. Traces the economic effects of immigration upon American development, and shows the beneficent results. Statistically it is unassailable, theoretically unanswerable. Even opponents of the author's idea of unrestricted immigration concede the value of the book, the only one of its kind dealing with this subject. The Call calls it "an epoch-making book." Indispensable to Socialists, radicals and all interested in the future of labor. The N. Y. Times says, "Fullness of knowledge evidenced on every page of this studious book." (P) \$2.50, postage 15c extra.

The Militant Proletariat, by Austin Lewis. The unskilled workers as a new and revolutionary factor in the American Labor Movement. A necessary book. (K) 50 c. postpaid.

Syndicalism, by Louis Levine. The new forces in the Labor movement vividly expounded. Sympathetic and critical. "Most comprehensive and illuminating study of revolutionary Syndicalism in the English language."—*American Economic Review*. Paper, (L. G.) \$1.50; cloth, \$2.00. Postage 10c. extra.

Reflections on Violence, by Georges Sorel. The classic on the philosophy of Syndicalism. In this book Sorel expounds his famous theory of "social myths." (HU.) \$2.25, postage 10c. extra.

Social Insurance, by I. M. Rubinow. The only comprehensive book on the subject. Includes Employers' Liability, Sick Insurance, Old Age Pensions, Insurance Against Unemployment, ect. Written by a Socialist and a specialist. (H.) \$3.00, postage 12c. extra.

New Review Book Service

Wages in the United States, by Scott Nearing. Proves that a large portion of American workers are unable to maintain a proper standard of living. Marshals the facts concerning wage theories, the cost of living, and the problems arising out of the standard of living investigations. (M.) \$1.25, postpaid.

Labor and Law of Today, by Prof. Luzo Brentano. (P.) \$1.50, postage 8c. extra.

Fiction

The Star Rover, by Jack London. Daring in theme and vivid in execution, one of the most original novels Jack London has written. A California professor, condemned to death, spends his last hours writing a Mss. which is at once a protest against capital punishment and a speculation on the adventures of the soul in various personalities and times throughout the ages. (M) \$1.50, postpaid.

The Research Magnificent, by H. G. Wells. The story of a man who feels that he is born to be a leader, one of those enlightened supermen who are to lead humanity out of the mire of present conditions, struggles magnificently against those conditions. It is at once a wild life-story and profound study of the contemporary world struggle. "Might almost be called an epitome of human existence." (M.) \$1.50, postpaid.

The "Genius", by Theodore Dreiser. A powerful, gripping story of modern life in New York. Frank and realistic. Mr. Dreiser is one of the great writers of the world, a man who is quietly revolutionizing American fiction. (L.) \$1.50, postpaid.

Violette of Pére Lachaise, by Anna Strunsky Walling. The life and spiritual development of a rare and beautiful character—a girl of the masses who gives herself to the cause of social revolution. (ST.) \$1.00, postpaid.

The Harbor, by Ernest Poole. Presents the American Revolt in fiction. Depicts the great changes taking place in American life, business, ideals and labor. The central character passes from a blind worship of enterprise and efficiency to a deeper knowledge of humanity and the labor movement. (M) \$1.40, postpaid.

Children of the Dead End, by Patrick MacGill. The autobiography of an Irish Navvy. MacGill himself comes from the depths, and his rise marks the rise of a new social class in literature. (DU) \$1.35, postpaid.

The Rat-Pit, by Patrick MacGill. A novel which voices the life and struggle of inarticulate unskilled labor. Realism fused with imagination and sympathy. A new genre in contemporary fiction. (D.) \$1.25, postpaid.

Tales of Two Countries, by Maxim Gorky. The Russian tales are typical of the old propagandistic Gorky. The Tales of Italy express a new Gorky, mellowed by experience, critical without being a propagandist, artistic as life itself in all its simplicity. They sing their story into your imagination, and stir with a strange beauty (HU) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Story of Jacob Stahl, by J. D. Beresford. In three volumes: **The Early History of Jacob Stahl; A Candidate for Truth; The Invisible Event**. Floyd Dell places this trilogy among the six best novels. Perhaps the finest work of contemporary English fiction. (D) Each \$1.35. The set, \$2.75, postpaid.

Jean-Christophe, by Romain Rolland. The novel of an age, the epic of an epoch. It is the history of the struggle of the individual for self-expression, for a new morality, for the sanctity of the individual; a frank portrayal of the life of a man from the day of his birth to the day of his death; a criticism of contemporary culture, destructive and constructive. The characters are drawn by the hand of a master, the style is strong in its simplicity and symphonic in its sweep. Critics agree that it is the greatest novel of the XXth century, one of the greatest novels of all time. (H) In three volumes, each \$1.50, postpaid.

Pelle the Conqueror, by Martin Andersen Nexø. A Danish epic of the proletariat. Overwhelming in its truth, sympathy and realism. A proletarian Jean-Christophe. The first volume deals with peasant life, the second volume with life in the industrial city. (H.) Each volume \$1.50, postpaid.

The Novels of Dostoevsky, by Feodor Dostoevsky. A new and superb translation. The greatest of Russian novelists. The Brothers Karomazov. "The greatest work of fiction ever written, a work so extraordinary that everything else seems insignificant," says George Moore. **Crime and Punishment**: "It is impossible to read this novel without reverently saluting the author's power," says William Lyons Phelps. Other volumes: **The Idiot**; **The Possessed**; **The House of the Dead**; **The Insulted and the Injured**. The novels of Dostoevsky are all of such consistent greatness, and of such strong appeal that to impute supremacy of one over another is unjust. They should all be read, these novels of a man who disputes with Balzac the claim of being the world's greatest novelist. Uniform binding. Each volume, \$1.50, postpaid.

Saïme, by Michael Artsibashev. A powerful novel which created a sensation in Russia. The story of an individualist who scorns all social ties and moral law. (H) \$1.35, postpaid.

The Works of Turgenev, complete, in seven volumes (two volumes in one). An excellent edition in every respect, good paper and typography, bound in neat cloth. Formerly sold at \$15.00. Price for the set (no volume sold separately), \$7.50, postpaid.

The Bomb, by Frank Harris. A vivid novel centering around the Haymarket tragedy in Chicago, in 1887. (X) Regular price, \$1.50; our price 90 cents, postage 10 cents extra.

Together, by Robert Herrick. A striking and faithful picture of American middle-class life, particularly the effect upon the wife of a business man's absorption in his business. Portrays the social and industrial conditions of to-day. (M) \$1.50, postpaid.

The Octopus, by Frank Norris. Written about fifteen years ago, this novel symbolizes one of the most important social movements in American history—the rise to power of the railroad interests, and the class struggle between this power and the agrarian interests of California. Zolaesque in its sweep, magnificent from both a social and a literary standpoint. Perhaps the American novel (DP) \$1.50, postpaid.

The Iron Heel, by Jack London. A brilliantly imaginative picture of the great revolution of the future. Throbs with the spirit of revolt. (M) \$1.50, postpaid.

A Man's World, by Albert Edwards. A significantly modern book, portraying, among other splendid characters, a keen-minded, courageous, modern woman. (M) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Spy, by Maxim Gorky. A novel of the revolutionary movement in Russia. (X) Formerly sold at \$1.50, our price 80 cents, postage 10 cents extra.

Twenty-Six and One, by Maxim Gorky. Three of the best of Gorky's short stories. (X) Formerly sold at \$1.25, our price 70 cents, postage 10 cents extra.

Sons and Lovers, by H. D. Lawrence. One of the finest novels of the newer school of English novelists. (K) \$1.50, postpaid.

Sonnica, by Blasco Ibanez, "the Spanish Zola." A realistic historical novel, describing the life of the ancients at the period of the Punic Wars. The picture of Hannibal is unsurpassed; while the novel as a whole, perhaps possesses more life and power even than Flaubert's *Salammbô*. (DD) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Red and the Black, by Stendhal. We refuse to describe this superb novel. If you never read a work of fiction again, read this. (DD) \$1.35, postpaid.

The Crock of Gold, by James Stephens. A masterpiece of contemporary Irish fiction. A story of the open air, deep forests, rock-strewn pastures and mountain tops, and of the fairy folk of old Ireland with the God Pan and the great Angus Og. "Not another book like this *Crock of Gold* in English literature. . . The humor and the style are Mr. Stephens' own peculiar gift."—*London Standard*. (M) \$1.50, postpaid.

The Way of all Flesh, by Samuel Butler. One of the finest novels, perhaps the finest, in the English language. (DU) \$1.50, postpaid.

New Review Book Service

American History

The Rise of the American People, by Roland G. Usher. Presents "a lucid account of results and not processes." Does not chronicle the mere sequence of events, but explains the meaning of those events. A philosophical interpretation of American History. (C.) \$2.00, postpaid.

Social Forces in American History, by A. M. Simons. An economic interpretation of American history, describing the various classes which have ruled and functioned from time to time. (M) \$1.50, postpaid.

An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution, by Prof. Charles A. Beard. A valuable and stimulating book by a thorough student of the subject. (M.) \$2.25, postpaid.

Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy, by Prof. Charles A. Beard. Deals with the period following the adoption of the constitution. The conflict between rising Capitalism and Agrarianism. (M.) \$2.50, postpaid.

Contemporary History

Present-Day China, by G. L. Harding. An excellent study of China and the Chinese Revolution. Particularly valuable for its analysis of the schemes of Foreign Capital for the financial and political subjugation of China. The author speaks from first-hand knowledge. (C) \$1.00, postage 5 cents extra.

Carranza and Mexico, by Carlo de Fornaro. The causes of the Revolution, Carranza's program, and the reconstructive work of the future. Stresses the feudal and capitalist aspects of the situation. (K) \$1.25, postpaid.

Latin America: Its Rise and Progress. By F. Garcia Calderon. (S) \$3.00, postpaid.

Education

Schools of To-Morrow, by John Dewey, (professor of philosophy, Columbia University) and Evelyn Dewey. Not a dry-as-dust handbook, but a vital, inspiring study. A Survey of all the best work that is being carried on today in America in the way of educational experiment. The authors point to these typical advance posts of progress, search out the truth that underlies them, and from these truths construct the schools of to-morrow. (DU) \$1.50, postage 8c extra.

Origin and Ideals of the Modern School, by Francisco Ferrer, the great Spanish educator, assassinated by the Government of Spain for his radical ideas. (P) \$1.00, postage 10c extra.

Feminism

Women as World-Builders, by Floyd Dell. A study of the Feminist movement by means of ten most representative feminists. Clever, original, these studies relate the Feminist movement to our changing life as a whole. 50c, postage 6c extra.

Fear and Conventionality, by Elsie Clews Parsons. The theme is the outgrowth of conventionality from every human being's fear of every other human being. The ceremonialism of our intercourse with other people is to protect ourselves. The final chapter is a delightful description of the society of the future, where we won't be afraid of each other, and fear and conventionality will vanish. (P) \$1.50, postage 10c extra.

The Old-Fashioned Woman, by Elsie Clews Parsons. A stimulating scientific discussion. Unusual in treatment and conclusions. (P) \$1.50, postage 10c extra.

Woman and Labor, By Olive Schreiner, the author of "The Story of an African Farm," in a powerful and inspiring volume, discusses broadly the position of women to-day in the light of the past, shows the necessity that they should partake in the work of the world. (ST) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Subjection of Women, By John Stuart Mill. The classic on the subject of woman and her problem. With foreword by Carrie Chapman Catt. (ST) 60c., postpaid.

Woman under Socialism. By August Bebel. Translated from the original German of the 83rd edition, by Daniel De Leon. This is one of the greatest Socialist books ever written. It is a powerful exposure of the shams of capitalist morality. This is the book from which garbled extracts are taken to show that Socialists advocate "free love." (LN) \$1.00, postpaid.

Religion

The Study of Religion, by Morris Jastrow, Jr. Discusses the methodics of the subject, and shows that religious origins and developments cannot be understood unless studied in relation to the general historical conditions. (S) \$1.50, postage 10c extra.

History of the Conflict Between Science and Religion, by Wm. J. Draper. A classic on the subject. (A) \$1.75, postpaid.

The Rise of Religious Liberty in America, by Sanford H. Cobb. A historical work of prime importance. (X) \$2.00, postpaid.

The Religious Revolution of To-Day, by Prof. James Shotwell. (HM) \$1.10, postpaid.

Socialism

The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, by Karl Marx. The underlying class-economic interests which created the second Empire. But, more than that, it is a magnificent study in the philosophy of history. 50c, postpaid.

Wage Labor and Capital, by Karl Marx. A popular study of the subject. 50c, postpaid.

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism, Anti-Duehring, by Frederick Engels. A survey of the Socialist position, elaborated in controversy with Prof. Duehring. \$1.00 postpaid.

Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Translated, with Critical Introduction, by Austin Lewis. 50c, postpaid.

Anarchism and Socialism, by G. Plechanoff. A masterly study of the subject, by one of the foremost Marxian Scholars of the world. 50c, postpaid.

Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History, by Antonio Fabriola, Professor in the University of Rome. An elaboration and synthesis of the Socialist theory of Historical Materialism. \$1.00, postpaid.

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx, by Louis B. Boudin, author of "Socialism and War". This is an answer to critics of Marx, and to some Socialists who caricature the Marxian doctrines. It is an excellent synthesis of the Socialist ideas of the world, history, society, etc. \$1.00, postpaid.

Socialism as it is, by Wm. English Walling. A masterly study of the currents of thought and action in the Socialist movement before the war. A really world-wide survey of the international movement of the working class. (M.) 50c, postage 5c extra.

The Larger Aspects of Socialism, by Wm. English Walling. An incisive, inspiring book showing the Socialist trend in modern science and culture, and modern thought generally. (M.) \$1.50, postpaid.

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History, by Karl Kautsky. In five parts: Ancient and Christian Ethics; the Ethical System of the Period of the Enlightenment; the Ethics of Kant; the Ethics of Darwinism; the Ethics of Marxism. 50c, postpaid.

The High Cost of Living, by Karl Kautsky. A study of the economic causes for increasing prices; full of facts and figures. 50c, postpaid.

Social and Philosophical Studies, by Paul Lafargue. A series of keenly critical studies of the causes of religion and abstract ideas. 50c, postpaid.

New Review Book Service

Socialism in Theory and Practice, by Morris Hillquit. The statement or moderate American Socialism. (M.) \$1.50, postpaid.

Capital, by Karl Marx. The great classic of Socialism. Unrefuted and irrefutable. A study of the tendencies and forces in Capitalist Society.

Volume I, "The Process of Capitalist Production," is practically complete in itself. It explains the thing which, up to the time that Marx came on the scene, had confused all the economists, namely, Surplus Value, 869 pages, \$2.00.

Volume II, "The Process of Circulation of Capital," explains the part the merchant and the banker play in the present system, and the laws that govern social capital. 618 pages, \$2.00.

Volume III, treats of "The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole." Predicts the rise of Trusts and makes clear the cause of panics and industrial crises. Shows how the small capitalist is swallowed. Explains the subjects of Land, Rent and Farming. 1,048 pages, \$2.00.

The set, three volumes, \$5.00, postpaid.

Russian Literature

Samine. A powerful novel which created a sensation in Russia. The story of an individualist who rejects all Social ties and moral law. (H) \$1.35, postpaid.

The Millionaire, and other stories. Artzibasheff's genius is perhaps at its finest in this book. (H.) \$1.35, postpaid.

Breaking Point. Another marvellous picture of Russian life, universal in its appeal. (H.) \$1.35, postpaid.

Dead Souls. The great Russian humorous classic. The travels and adventures of a likeable rascal with a magnificent scheme for making a fortune. Introduction by Stephen Graham. (ST) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Black Monk. Stories of Russian life written with consummate art and subtle humor. (ST) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Kiss. Stories of modern Russia by a writer whom Tolstoy called the Russian de Maupassant. (ST) \$1.25, postpaid.

The Steppe and other Stories. A panorama of peasant life on the great plains of Southern Russia. (ST) \$1.25, postpaid.

Miscellaneous

The Cry for Justice. An Anthology of revolt. Edited by Upton Sinclair, with a preface by Jack London. Illustrated with reproductions of social protest in art. The "Cry for Justice" has been culled from the recorded literature of all ages and compacted into this one epoch-making volume. This is the first effort that has made to cover the whole field of the literature of social protest, both in prose and poetry, and from all languages and times. Since a number of prominent authorities assisted the editor this volume is the product of a number of minds; and the collection represents not its editor, but a whole movement, made and sustained by the master-spirits of all ages. 955 pages, vellum cloth, stamped in gold on side and back, \$2.00, postpaid.

Statesman's Year Book. This is the standard year book, the greatest collection of political and economic information concerning the nations of the world. The wealth, resources, industry, trade, government, etc.—all the necessary statistical information is here compiled from the latest reports of all nations. (CM.) \$3.50, postpaid.

The Mind of Primitive Man, by Prof. Frans Boas. A satisfactory idea of the scope of this great work is given by the interesting headings in the table of contents: 1. Racial Prejudices; 2. Influence of Environment upon Human Types; 3. Influence of Heredity upon Human Types; 4. The Mental Traits of Primitive Man and of Civilized Man; 5. Race and Language; 6. The Universality of Cultural Traits; 7. The Evolutionary Viewpoint; 8. Some Traits of Primitive Culture; 9. Summary; 10. Race Problems in the United States. (M) \$1.50, postpaid.

Cambridge Modern History, 12 vols. (M.), each \$4.00, set \$48.00, postpaid. This comprehensive history of modern times consists of twelve royal octavo volumes of about 900 pages each, bound in buckram, gilt, and covers the period from the close of the Middle Ages to the present day. The scope of the work includes 12 volumes, as follows: 1. The Renaissance; 2. The Reformation; 3. The Wars of Religion; 4. The Thirty Years' War; 5. The Age of Louis XIV; 6. The Eighteenth Century; 7. The United States; 8. French Revolution; 9. Napoleon; 10. The Restoration; 11. The Growth of Nationalities; 12. The Latest Age. "The most full, comprehensive and scientific history of modern times in the English language, or in any language." "The Evening Post", New York.

SPECIAL CUT RATES

	Regular Rate	Club Rate (1 year)
New Review	\$1.50	} 2 ⁰⁰
The Masses	1.00	
	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	} 1 ⁹⁰
The Inter. Socialist Review	1.00	
	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	} 1 ⁹⁰
Critic and Guide	1.00	
(Wm. J. Robinson, M. D., Editor)	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	} 1 ⁷⁰
"Songs of Labor"75	
(by Morris Rosenfeld)	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	} 2 ⁰⁰
"Theoretical System of Karl Marx	1.00	
(by L. B. Boudin)	2.50	
New Review ..	1.50	} 2 ⁴⁰
"Socialists and the War"	1.50	
(by Wm. English Walling)	3.00	

Ask us for Combinations on any Magazine

Send all Subscription to

NEW REVIEW
256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

Current Issue of

The

Intercollegiate Socialist

Quarterly Journal of International
Socialism

Symposium on "Peace and Socialism" by Senator Henri La Fontaine of Belgium, Winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Charles Zueblin, Bouck White.

Proceedings I. S. S. Labor Day Conference.

Other Contributors to this Issue:—
John Spargo, Helen L. Sumner, Prof. Herbert A. Miller, Harry W. Laidler, Caro Lloyd and others.

10 cts. Copy

25cts. Year

Intercollegiate Socialist
Society

Educational Building

70 Fifth Ave.

New York City

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

New Review

Lecture Bureau

SPEAKERS:

Frank Bohn

L. B. Boudin

Isaac A. Hourwich

Felix Grendon

and others.

Engagements only for cities not more than 100 miles from New York City.

Terms: Reasonable, on a subscription card basis.

Write Now.

New Review
Lecture Bureau

256 BROADWAY

New York City.

A Message From Belgium

Brand Whitlock, United States Minister to Belgium, referring to a certain Chicago publication, wrote last month:

“ . . . You don't know what a comfort it is to get *The Public*. In the midst of all the horrors of the world it is the one thing I know of—aside from one's own conscience—and the democratic principle down deep in our heart—by which to correct one's reckoning. It is a compass—never sensational, always calm and pointing in the same direction.”

He was writing of *The Public*, which William Marion Reedy has described as “The Greatest journal of pure democracy in the world.”

All this, however, is a little indefinite.

What IS *The Public*?

The Public is a weekly newspaper that aims to be right rather than sensational; that aims to give, in concise and plain terms, all the news that will live. It is also an editorial paper that puts all public questions to the supreme test of obvious moral principles and stands by the results. While its editorial policy is as broad as fundamental democracy itself, its editorials and special articles frequently deal with taxation, because taxation is the taproot of democratic government.

Altho I am a socialist of the deepest dye, if I could not have access to more than one paper or periodical I should choose *The Public*.—W. R. Eastman, Schenectady, N. Y.

Send in a trial subscription and judge for yourself.

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago, Ill.

Please send me *The Public*. I enclose one dollar to cover a year's subscription, on the understanding that it will be refunded if I do not like the paper.

Name

Address

SOCIALISM AND WAR

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Author of "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx."

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

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

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

CHAPTERS.

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

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

Price, \$1.00 Postpaid

Forthcoming Books

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

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

SOCIALISM AFTER THE WAR. By Louis C. Fraina.

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

STUDIES IN SOCIALISM. By Isaac A. Hourwich.

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

New Review Publishing Ass'n,

256 Broadway, New York City

All good Roads lead to "Rhodes"

"New York's Model Preparatory School"

Preparatory Rhodes School

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

Do not waste your spare time.

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

Don't be a Nonentity.

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

All good Roads lead to "Rhodes"