

Sept.
1st

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. 13

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
AMERICAN IMPERIALISM	201	WHY STOP THE WAR?	212
L. C. F.		Phillips Russell	
CURRENT AFFAIRS	203	THE MESSAGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY	213
L. B. Boudin		A. A. Goldenweiser	
ORGANIZED LABOR A BUSINESS?	205	A STUDY IN REACTION	215
M. Rhea		Harry W. Laidler	
FUTILITY OF BOURGEOIS PACIFISM	208	BOOK REVIEWS:	
William English Walling		The German Emperor; A Prognosis.	
"REAL" DEMOCRACY OF THE PARTY MACHINE	209	A SOCIALIST DIGEST:	
Isaac A. Hourwich		Split in the German Party; Reichstag Socialists Again Vote War Credit;	
REVISIONISM AND NATIONALISM	211	The Socialists of Italy; Fabians and the Empire; Arguments Repudiated;	
Eduard Bernstein		War Strikes; Russian Reactionaries Favor Peace.	
		CORRESPONDENCE:	
		From Hubert Langerock; Glenn H. Hoover.	

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

American Imperialism

THE agitation for a larger army and navy—strangely called "preparedness *against* war"—is an opera-bouffe converted into tragedy by the logic of events. In its way this agitation is preparing the sentiment necessary to forge an instrument for American Imperialism. While Imperialism is only one factor in the "preparedness" movement, Imperialism alone will reap the profit. And while our heroic-tongued patriots blabber about the "helplessness of China" and "insurance against war" in their campaign for larger armaments, the United States government, in establishing a protectorate in Haiti, emphasizes the real purpose for which fatedly the armaments will be used.

Not that a protectorate in Haiti *per se* requires a large army or navy. American Imperialism is shy of intervention requiring great efforts and sacrifices. It prefers the role of bully to that of fighter. Perhaps the chief reason why Taft did not intervene in Mexico, why President Wilson has not been forced to intervene, is that if the United States went into Mexico it would be compelled to fight, not simply bully, and that the *money* cost of the adventure would be staggering. But events such as the Haiti protectorate possess a preceding and a subsequent logic. Given *one* imperialistic act, and many more follow. They carry with them certain consequences, one being the necessity to "consolidate" control by acquiring *new* control; and isolated events soon disclose an Imperialism which has gone too far to turn

back, and which requires new imperialistic adventures to protect its stolen holdings.

The early Imperialism of this country was largely a reflex of the Monroe Doctrine, without a definite economic basis. But when American Capitalism out-grew its swaddling clothes and became a world-factor, things changed. American capital looked for investments in other lands; American finance became an integral part of world-finance. The first consequence was the ending of America's "splendid isolation": politically, that isolation may still have been desirable; economically and financially it was not.

Our investments in Latin America assumed very large proportions, and great mercantile organizations, like the American Fruit Company, developed a power stronger even than that of the native governments. It was the backward character of these regions, the lack of civilization and its, at the best, small protection for the worker, that lured American capital to invest, and was responsible for the fabulous profits secured. But this circumstance had its disadvantages. While it produced a docile, easily-satisfied labor, it simultaneously produced disturbed conditions of social and economic life, inefficient governments incapable of maintaining law and order and protecting the profits on investments, and perpetual revolutions that interfered with the peaceably systematic development and exploitation of the vast natural resources. Accordingly, the American government was called upon repeatedly

to protect "American interests," and active political interference in the affairs of our neighbors became the order of the day. The result of all this has been the creation of a *de facto* empire in Central America and the Caribbean, based upon the financial control which ultimately leads to political domination.

Simultaneously with this development, and stimulated by the acquisition of the Philippines, American capital became interested in the Far East. Encouraged by the McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft administrations, American finance made a bid for a share in the spoliation of China. The administration of President Wilson reversed this policy. His Republican predecessors, being primarily concerned with the interests of high finance, encouraged American participation and intervention in the Far East. President Wilson, however, being primarily interested in the lesser capitalists and wishing to unlock for them the "double-bolted door of opportunity," concentrated his efforts upon an Imperialism nearer home and in the profits of which the capitalist class as a whole could participate. Consequently, our government withdrew from the "Six-Power Group," which was negotiating a loan with China. But this action did not mean the end of American Imperialism; it meant the end of imperialism in China, but not in Latin America. The Wilson administration has since then been encouraging the much more dangerous Imperialism which benefits larger groups of capitalists than could participate in financial adventures in the Orient, and which operates in a region much less developed and much less capable of defending its economic and political sovereignty than the nations of the Far East. Since that time, the lines of this newer policy have been clearly visible. In the first place, its object is to make firmer American control in Central America and the Caribbean; in the second place, to divert Latin American trade to the United States by using against Europe the threat of the Monroe Doctrine and by lavishing blandishments upon the Republics of the South. In his Mobile speech in 1913, President Wilson opposed granting oil concessions to foreign promoters by the weaker American states, as the granting of these concessions was a menace to the Monroe Doctrine. Here we had formulated a completely new phase of the Monroe Doctrine, not intended to protect the political independence of the American continents against foreign aggression, but to aggrandize, financially and economically, the United States as against all the other nations of the world.

In line with this policy are the efforts of the Wilson administration to consolidate and intrench American financial and political control in Central America and the Caribbean. There are now pending treaties with Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, which, if approved by Congress, mean the com-

plete subjection of these states to American finance and the American government. In 1914 the last remnants of Dominican administrative independence were destroyed.

The establishment of a protectorate in Haiti is the newest event in this development. The proposed "agreement" with the Republic of Haiti has been framed in the light of the experience in Santo Domingo with the purpose of making American control complete. It is a "perfected" agreement and destroys completely the administrative independence of Haiti.

The Haitian protectorate seems to be a precursor of more general intervention. It is the government's intention, according to report, "to adjust affairs in certain Latin-American countries involving European interests, which interests might lead to trouble between the United States and European nations after the conclusion of the European war." Peru may next be "adjusted." Its government proposing a war-tax on the exportation of minerals and mineral products, the *N. Y. Times* says it "will be damaging or fatal to American interests". English interests also are heavily involved. Could American Imperialism seek a better pretext?

An interesting aspect of this evil business is the way the United States government ignored Pan-American participation. Where is the famous Pan-American "solidarity" which was to function so admirably in Mexico and in all problems of the great American family? The United States has no intention of relinquishing the role of the "brother of the big stick."

L. C. F.

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 President	JULIUS HEIMAN Treasurer	LOUIS C. FRAINA Secretary
-------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

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

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

Current Affairs

The Frank Case.

THE Frank case is closed. Closed in a truly national, American way. Final judgment was passed, not by the Georgia state authorities nor by the Federal Supreme Court, but by the one indisputably national court,—Judge Lynch's Court. We may like it or not, but we must face the fact that Lynch Law is as much an American institution as anything that we can boast of,—as the Presidency, Congress, political corruption, pension frauds. The pharisees and the sycophants will cry "Georgia's Shame!" But Georgia has nothing to be ashamed of before her sister states. Not only is lynching part of the routine life of most southern states, but many states not usually embraced in the designation "The South" have adopted the system of jurisprudence over which Judge Lynch presides. Illinois and Pennsylvania have had their lynchings. Oklahoma had one arranged the other day, and was sorely disappointed when it didn't come off. And what was the tarring and feathering of Dr. Ben Reitman in California, the assault upon Moyer in Calumet, Michigan, and the other numerous cases of "running out of town" of "undesirables," but modified forms of lynching? One and all, they were cases of "taking the law into one's own hands" when it was not convenient to use the regularly functioning public courts.

This is not the place to enter upon an examination of the causes that led to the establishment—or is it the retention?—of this remarkable tribunal. But one thing must be stated here in view of the danger which lurks in the cry of "race prejudice!"—a cry which has the unfortunate tendency of becoming true wherever raised because of the mere fact of being raised. Race prejudice has very little to do with lynching as an institution. Given the institution race prejudice very often designates the victims, but it is not the cause of the institution. Nor does this institution seek or find its victims exclusively among the objects of race prejudice. The man who was to have been lynched in Norman, Oklahoma, did not differ from his neighbors, who were preparing to lynch him, either in color, race, religion, or "previous condition of servitude". Neither did Moyer, nor many of the other victims of "tarring and feathering", "running out of town", etc. Lawlessness is as superior to race prejudice as is the law itself. The victim of race prejudice is at a great disadvantage when he finds himself in the clutches of either, but this disadvantage is merely incidental, and is by no means greater in the case of lawlessness than in the case of the law.

But it makes a big difference when it comes to

the shouting and indignation whether the victim belonged to a weak or a powerful race or class. There are Negroes lynched every day in the year in these blessed United States of ours against whom there is no breath of suspicion that they have committed any serious crime. And there are men assaulted and beaten every day, and occasionally killed, by all sorts of means, except lawful means, for no other reason than being strikers, strike-leaders, "agitators", or other "undesirables". And there are no great newspapers nor any public-spirited philanthropists to take up the matter, raise investigation funds, or do anything to punish the guilty or prevent a repetition of the offense.

The Frank case is not "Georgia's Shame",—it is a disgrace to the United States. But it is only one of a long—and constantly lengthening—list of similar disgraces. And this list will not be closed through the efforts of Negro-baiting and labor-hating newspapers like the *New York Times*. Nor through the efforts of those prominent Jews who think that race prejudice is a damnable thing when it is directed against Jews but a matter of complete indifference when it is directed against Negroes only or against the "lower orders". Lynch law in all its forms and manifestations will only be put a stop to by the only social power in this country that is genuinely interested in doing away with race prejudice and the whole regime of lawlessness,—by the working class when it finally awakens to a realization of its true interest, its historic mission, and its duty to itself and to civilization.

Headed for Destruction.

THE Social Democratic Party of Germany is heading straight for destruction, and is gathering momentum as it rushes onward in its mad course. The granting of the last war-credits and the speech made in the Reichstag by Dr. Eduard David as the official spokesman of the Socialist delegation in that body, mark a new level on the inclined plane down which the once proud "vanguard of the proletariat" has been sliding since the beginning of the war.

The granting of the war credits at a time when even Bethmann-Hollweg could not help avowing the aggressive character of the war,—after Germany had "conquered on every battlefield", and German as well as Austrian territory had been cleared of the enemy; when Germany is in practically undisputed possession of Belgium and Northern France, has bagged the whole of Poland, and is headed for Petrograd,—is as much below the level of the granting of the war-credits on August 4, 1914, as that was below the level of what we were accustomed to think were Socialist ethics.

But the speech which accompanied the granting of the last credits was even worse than the act it-

self. It was an insult and a challenge to every right-thinking Socialist in and out of Germany. Particularly in Germany. The very fact that Dr. David was selected as the official spokesman of the party on this occasion has a sinister significance. Dr. David has for many years past been the head and front of the revisionist-opportunist wing of the party, and since the outbreak of the war is the most conspicuous intellectual leader of the avowed imperialists within the party. His selection to make the official party declaration on this occasion was in the nature of a formal notice that the majority of the Reichstag-delegation has forever broken with the old traditions of the party and has burned its ships behind it. And the speech delivered was in keeping with the character of the spokesman: a challenge to and a defiance of the Socialist minority within the Social Democratic Party.

Away with that Hypocritical Cant!

ON the day after the sinking of the Arabic the New York *Call* printed a cartoon with explanatory reading-matter designed to show that the working class of Germany bore no responsibility for the "murder committed by German officials". In the reading matter the *Call* states that the workers of Germany knew nothing about this atrocious deed and "had nothing to do with it".

We assume that this was done with good intention of helping avert a war between this country and Germany. With the intentions of the *Call* I fully sympathize,—as my comments on the sinking of the Lusitania made clear. But the *Call* adopts the wrong means for achieving that end.

Lying and hypocritical cant have never done good to any cause. In the present case the lie was particularly stupid, and therefore particularly dangerous, as the participation of the organized working class of Germany in the crimes of its rulers is too notorious to permit of any denial. And we only expose ourselves to ridicule,—in addition to undermining confidence in our trustworthiness,—by attempting such denials. To utterly confound us, our opponents, who are neither fools nor asleep, need only point to the fact that on the day the *Call* published its disclaimer the Socialist Party of Germany granted to the German government the means with which it could continue to commit the "murders" in question, and gave "the German officials" who were committing these "murders" a vote of confidence.

No, good comrades, if we don't want the workers of this country to follow in the footsteps of the workers of Germany into the horrors of war, we shall have to adopt better and cleaner means than the attempt to whitewash the unwashable.

The Party Be Warned.

THE inglorious collapse of "Labor's National Peace Council" through exposures and resignations, ought to bury in its *debris* the so-called "Friends of Peace Congress" engineered by the L. N. P. C. But you never can tell! There is a remarkable attractiveness about a free railroad fare to a distant city and a good *per diem*, coupled with the chance of officiating at a "Congress",—and a "Peace Congress", at that,—with the opportunities that that affords of hearing yourself talk in a big hall and perhaps get your talk and even your picture into the newspapers. So the congress may take place after all.

If it does, the Socialist Party should, by all means, keep out of it. Local New York has made the mistake of participating in one of Messrs. Weissmann and Co.'s "Peace demonstrations", and it has already found out to its sorrow what an egregious blunder it had made. The blunder should not now be repeated on a national scale. We understand that Local New York claims that it had not been warned before the act, and did not, therefore, know what it was doing. *The party be warned!*

The Old and the New.

THE revelations about the German slush fund and its uses are highly interesting and instructive. Just one detail, showing the superiority of modern American methods. In arranging for the payments to be made to Mr. Viereck, the German financial agent, following the time-honored custom of European diplomacy, insisted that the payments should be made through a woman, as a means of guarding against detention. Poor, old, lumbering diplomat! But Viereck is wiser in his generation,—and his country. He evidently knows a thing or two about Congressional investigations. And so he directed the payment to be made through his personal counsel, who, if necessary, could plead his privilege.

"Welcomed by the People".

THE German troops were welcomed to Warsaw as liberators. The inhabitants of the Polish capital filled the streets and welcomed the in-marching troops with every sign of real enthusiasm and rejoicing.—*News-item sent out from Berlin.*

"Inhabitants of Warsaw: Your city is in German hands. I expect the citizens of Warsaw to undertake no hostile action, to trust German sense and justice, and obey the instructions of German commanders. I am compelled to take as hostage leaders and most prominent citizens of the town who will be pledged for the security of our troops. With you it rests to protect the lives of these fellow citizens of yours".—*From Prince Leopold's proclamation to the inhabitants after the Germans established themselves in Warsaw.*

L. B. BOUDIN.

Organized Labor A Business?

By M. Rhea

OSCAR PARTELOW, Secretary of the Montana Federation of Labor, said, on March 20th, 1912, when speaking to a man he considered a political enemy of Mayor Duncan, of Butte, "Mart, (M. M. Donohue, Pres. of The Montana Federation of Labor) Mart and I are playing the game—playing the game. We have a job and you can't blame us."

In order to be considered a perfect gentleman I should not enquire too closely into a subject effecting the personal interest of so many estimable men engaged in the same strenuous labor. I should pass it up, and would if it were not that my beery curiosity demands to know what this "playing the game" is.

Was Mr. Moyer "playing the game" when he asked Gov. Stewart to send the militia into Butte to shoot down rebelling workmen? Was the Butte local of the Western Federation of Miners "playing the game" when they hired an attorney to oust Mayor Duncan from office? Was the Montana Federation of Labor "playing the game" when they silently worked to get the troops and to prevent any effective protest being made after they arrived?

In a way, this is "playing the game" too. In every game there is always a last card. This was it. But "playing the game" in its true sense is a far more subtle art. After the Socialist victory in Butte in 1911 whenever a labor leader was met the following was the rule:

"Well what do you think of it?" the labor leader would ask.

"Fine—fine—"

"Yes, wasn't it though—a great victory for labor," the labor leader would respond.

Then in about a minute one would hear about some grave fault of Duncan's. If one gave a half attentive ear for another minute they would hear a tale of Duncan's sins ranging from bigamy, polygamy, burglary and horse stealing, to swiping milk bottles off back porches. Generally, though, the self-appointed critic would have a hard, grimy, calloused proletarian digit shoved under his massaged, manicured, immaculate nose and hear himself called by his first name of four ugly letters that are never associated together in that exact combination except on occasions when one is sailing under a full head of steam.

"Of course—of course" the leader would hasten to say, "Duncan is fine—great—just look how I supported him! He is great—I'm a Socialist—have another drink—" Slap! on the proletarian back while a proletarian stomach was being refreshed

with a proletarian drink,—"Playing the game."

The greatest good that could come to the people of Butte as well as the working class in 1912 was to win a Socialist victory and pass the pending Workman's Compensation Bill that the workers had favored to a vote. These two things were of supreme importance. The value of a Socialist victory cannot be overestimated and the passage of the Compensation Bill, which the interests spent a cold million to defeat, would have established a new landmark in labor legislation. But the Socialist and Compensation had no enemy so hostile and none so effective as the labor leaders.—"Playing the game."

The American Federation of Labor sent a man to Lawrence to break the great textile strike.—"Playing the game."

The American Federation of Labor faction went in as strikebreakers when the Electricians struck in California.—"Playing the game."

A great benefit to labor came out of the dynamiting of the Los Angeles *Times* building. It was that incident in the great labor struggle that caused Congress to create the Commission on Industrial Relations, before which labor had the right to tell its great absorbing story. Before that body, if there is such a thing as reason, it established its right to conduct its war, in its own way, against capital. The Commission was composed of nine people. Three for capital, and a like number for labor and the middle class. Samuel Gompers was given the privilege to suggest two of the three labor men, the railway Brotherhoods the other. Mr. Gompers suggested James O'Connell and John B. Lennon. This was the most important appointment ever made in this country; to ascertain the causes of industrial unrest and suggest a remedy. The ablest men in the labor movement should have been appointed, but instead the old hack O'Connell was put at the head with Lennon at his back. Lennon was suggested because he is not even ordinarily bright and would do what O'Connell told him to do. Shortly after the appointments were made the labor trio met and decided to adopt the unit rule. This always gave O'Connell control of three votes. Owing to the sickness of her husband, Mrs. Harriman was unable to attend to her duties on the Commission. Mr. Delano resigned to accept an appointment on the Reserve Bank Board. This left an active Commission of seven. If one could be won to the O'Connell side he had a majority. If one was absent he had an even break. This made a very powerful member for good or ill.

Mr. Walsh was appointed to represent not labor

but the small business men, professional men, etc., but he quickly saw that the men appointed to represent labor were incompetent. He took up their burden. This ought to have made the incompetent ones feel very grateful—but did it? The Commission history is full of the opposite. There never was a time during the last months of the Commission's life that the representatives of labor did not try to tear down Mr. Walsh's little house of cards. If Walsh was less than Walsh is, they would have succeeded.

Therefore, as one of the powerful members of the Commission, a closer look at this man O'Connell would be interesting. James O'Connell used to be President of the Machinist's Union. When, after a fight of six years, his machine was routed, O'Connell, in the last hours of the Davenport convention, reminded the delegates that they were forgetting something: "You have not yet thanked me for the eighteen years of service and sacrifice I have given your organization." Thus reminded, someone should have arisen and made the customary motion—but by unanimous consent the delegates refused to pass the buck. Immediately after this Samuel Gompers appointed O'Connell President of the Metal Trades Department of The American Federation of Labor and retained him as third vice-president of the A. F. of L. This in spite of the nation-wide agitation at the time against "lame ducks." Then to cap the climax Gompers appoints this man to represent labor on the Industrial Commission!

James O'Connell is a man of middle age, slightly gray, average size, always faultlessly dressed, and carries the cutest little silver headed cane I ever saw. The expression of his face gives me the impression that he has seen everything in the world and is excruciatingly bored by it all. Whenever I look at him I always get the idea of great mental strain. God never looked more bored than James O'Connell. His attitude is that of a man who has the combined troubles of the Universe weighing on his shoulders and is doing the best he can with what tools he has.

James O'Connell believes in the Trinity of the God-Head, business, the American Federation of Labor, the Militia of Christ, the Ten Commandments, the National Civic Federation, the Pope of Rome; and a pot of other junk.

He has the business mind.

During the investigation of the textile industrial troubles, Walsh unmercifully grilled one of the owners. After Walsh had finished, the Captain in the Militia of Christ, who was "representing" labor, leaned forward in his chair. A hush fell on the crowded room. The representative of great, virile labor was about to ask a question. As this was one of the first hearings the spectators and reporters naturally expected something deep and searching;

they thought that what Walsh had handed out to this plute was merely baby talk to what he was going to get from the representative of labor. They expected something that would just crinkle and sizzle this fat plute as though he was being boiled in lard, and then after that they were going to witness the by-products extracted one by one. For an instant James toyed with the situation. Who can blame him? This was to be the dramatic climax of a great battle, a genuine *coup de grace*.

Then out of the mouth of labor's representative issued this classic question: "Which is the cheapest way to make a button-hole, lengthways or crossways of the cloth?" Then his tired, drooping eye-lids fluttered, closed and he fell wearily back on the cushion of his chair, quite exhausted by this unusual mental strain.—"Playing the ass."

The Industrial Commission sent a man to Butte to ascertain the cause of the upheaval in the Miner's organization. The entire field was covered in the usual careful way; the influence Socialism, Industrial Unionism, anarchy, union politics, union corruption, political corruption, company domination of union affairs, lack of proper sanitation in the mines, last and most important, miners' consumption, had played in bringing about the unanimous desertion from the Western Federation of Miners. It was found that all these had had a significant bearing on the whole, but most important was union corruption, union politics, and union inefficiency. When the investigator's preliminary report reached the Commission's office it was disbelieved. Two other trained men were dispatched to the field at once. It was inconceivable that the Butte local of the Western Federation of Miners had been for years the cat's paw of the Amalgamated Copper Company when it was tooted so highly in the East as the acme of union perfection.

"We have always been taught that the Amalgamated had to go over to the Miners' Hall on the first of each month and beg for a stay of execution for another thirty days," one of the investigators remarked when he arrived. These two men covered the field separately and in their own way. When they were through they wired the Commission's office that the first investigator was on the right track. This was new ground. *Labor's revolt against Organized Labor's corruption!* It was startling. Great care had to be exercised. In order to avoid the possibility of a mistake Mr. Basil M. Manley, in charge of the field investigators and himself perhaps the most thorough investigator in America, hurried to Butte in person. He, too, conducted an investigation of his own and drew exactly the same conclusion. Under his personal direction the outline of the hearing was made out. The big question involved was "had organized labor become a business?" Had the great humane work originally in-

tended by the organizations of labor simmered down to a petty business of collecting and properly distributing the per capita tax?

As soon as it became known that the Commission was coming to Butte and what direction the hearing would take every cockroach secretary and business agent cried to high Heaven that it was a shame. Then in the press there began to appear news items to the effect that Mr. S-and-So, a prominent leader, had said in a speech that it was a lie and who ever said it a liar; Mr. Moyer did not ask for troops, and that the Butte local was not corrupt. How these gentlemen knew was never revealed, but presently it became a subject for labor leaders to refer to in all their speeches. Every man who dared to believe that Mr. Moyer had asked for troops or believed that corruption had existed in the Butte Local was an enemy of organized labor, regardless of the fact that troops had been asked for, and were still being asked for in an indirect way by the labor leaders of Butte.

When the Commission arrived, owing to the sudden outbreak of the war, Messrs. Delano, Weinstock and Ballard were not with them. Mrs. Harriman could not leave her husband. Walsh was detained by the task of moving headquarters from Washington to Chicago. This left a Commission composed of Prof. Commons and the three labor representatives.

When O'Connell and Lennon met the investigator in the lobby of the hotel they refused to speak to him. The four members of the Commission present then went into executive session. In about ten minutes they sent for the investigator. Mr. O'Connell demanded to know why such a report had been turned in. The investigator stated that because he had been sent to investigate the situation and that was the situation. O'Connell left the room in a huff and Lennon followed in a few seconds. The investigator was, in the absence of Walsh, to conduct the hearing. When he arrived at the court house Prof. Commons informed him that the laboring men had arbitrarily changed the whole program. Nothing was to be touched on that would tend to cast a reflection on any organized labor leader. The hearing was a frost and the laughing stock of the intelligent people of Butte and Montana.

While the hearings were in progress O'Connell read a newspaper or sat with his feet on top of his desk. There was not a time he did not take the Company's side. When the investigator was making his report on miners' consumption, which is worse in Butte than in any other copper mining district in the world, seven out of every ten miners die from that cause, O'Connell, 3rd Vice-President of The American Federation of Labor, sought to prove that drink combined with unsanitary home conditions were the chief causes and therefore the Company

could not be held responsible for keeping mines in an unsanitary condition.

A big miner asked one of the attachés of the Commission one day: "Who is the bloke?" with a jerk of his thumb towards Jim.

"That is James O'Connell, 3rd. Vice-President of the American Federation of Labor," the attaché answered.

"Ye Gods," the miner said as he fell back, staggered. "I thought 'e was the personal representative of old John D."

When Gov. Stewart arrived he immediately looked up the investigator in order to get a line on his testimony. He was plainly worried. He did not want to tell of the Moyer incident. I believe he was afraid to do so. But he said he would, if he was asked. A meeting was arranged for the morning in the lobby of the hotel. When the investigator arrived O'Connell passed him but would not speak. When the Governor came down a moment later he and the investigator, and Prof. Commons, who had joined the group, took chairs. Jim hurried forward and to the amazement of everyone shook hands with the investigator (regardless of the fact that he had publicly refused to eat with him the night before) wished him a good morning and hoped he had slept well. Then he proceeded to horn into the conversation. There followed then the most disgusting incident of boot-licking I ever saw. James O'Connell, the representative of labor, did everything a man could do except get down on his knees and literally lick this Governor's boots. Jim's antics plainly embarrassed him. He acted as though he wanted to say "please don't." The Governor is too much of a gentleman to have reached out and pushed him away—or poked him on the nose although he acted as though he wanted to. Finally the Governor asked when the hearing for the day would begin.

"At nine," the investigator said.

"Nine?" said the Governor, "I thought your letter stated ten."

"Yes, but in order to arrive in Seattle in time it was found necessary to change the hour."

"Yes, and I object to it," Jim said. "We never have had to start at that hour before and I do not see why we should have to start now."

"Yes," the Governor said, "it must be rather hard on you walking delegates."

Even after that shot Jim asked the Governor to come and have breakfast! He was refused.

After he had made his attempt to prove that miners' consumption was caused by unsanitary home conditions a big Cornish miner looked him over in contempt, and said, "Maybe I'd feel sorry for that bloomer if 'e fell out of a ten story window."

"Wasted sympathy," another miner said.

"Why?"

"e' is too light it wouldn't 'urt 'im."

There was hell about the Butte report all during the Western trip. At the Colorado hearing the investigator who made the Butte investigation had charge of the work in the field—such as finding witnesses and digging up facts, etc. But he did not dare come to Denver in the daytime. He did not dare go to the state house where the hearings were being conducted. Because as soon as he would show himself O'Connell and Lennon would begin raising hell. No employer of labor ever went further to

crush an employee than these representatives of organized labor did in this case. Time and again they demanded this man's discharge and refused to give a reason. When this was not done they took to heckling Walsh. O'Connell even went so far as to state through the press that he did not believe the miner's witnesses this investigator sent up to Denver to testify.

Button-hole Jim, and this man Lennon, might be able to represent the W. C. T. U., the Militia of Christ, or the Pope of Rome, but labor—never!

Futility of Bourgeois Pacifism

By William English Walling

IN the light of the economic evolution of the nations, what becomes of the leading panaceas against war? The most weighty and plausible of the peace propositions may be divided into four groups:

1. The establishment of political democracy in the leading nations and the democratic organization of foreign and military affairs; the abolition of secret diplomacy.

2. Pacifism; which chiefly takes the form today of the proposition that wars do not pay.

3. Changes as to armament—more armament, less armament, or disarmament.

4. Political internationalism—the organization of a league "to enforce peace" or a "league of neutrals," international legislature, courts, or police.

5. Economic internationalism—the elimination of the economic causes of war, that is the elimination of national economic conflicts.

Let us take up these panaceas in order.

First—Would democracy put an end to war? The enthusiastic support given their governments by all the peoples at war, show that this panacea is groundless—at the present stage of democratic and industrial development. It is true that the Socialists everywhere opposed the declaration of war—but a large group of Socialists in every country took a position on the questions at issue that would inevitably lead to war. In every country the territory of which has been expanding something like half of the Socialists and the overwhelming majority of the rest of the population have been expansionists. This is true of the Socialists of France and Germany and of the corresponding Labor Party of Great Britain. In Germany before the war only the revisionists led by Suedekum, Heine, Legien and labor union leaders took a nationalistic position. Now they have been joined by the majority of the newer leaders such as Lensch, Cunow, and Haenisch—all of whom declare imperialism to be a necessity of economic evolution.

It is true that the majority of Socialists are convinced that the *ultimate* interests of the *peoples* of the various nations do not conflict. But this argument begs the question, since it pre-supposes either Socialism or at least a world federation. On this point there is no higher Socialist authority than the Austrian leader, Otto Bauer, who declares that one of the worst features of the present capitalistic system is that the *immediate* economic interests of the people of the various nations *do* conflict.

Second—What shall we say of modern pacifism? "Does war pay?"—is the question asked by Norman Angell. Certainly we cannot give a categorical answer. Obviously defeat in war does not pay. Obviously drawn war does not pay, nor a slight advantage obtained at tremendous cost. But how many Germans doubt that the war of 1870 paid—at least if the balance were struck in the first half of 1914? When the final balance is struck, say in 1916 or 1917, doubtless the war of 1870 will be found not to have paid.

It is easy to be wise after the event. Germany calculated that this war would pay on at least two mistaken assumptions. She did not expect Italy to enter the war, and she thought the war would be over because of her superior production of military supplies before the importations from the United States began to count. It looks now as if the second like the first of these calculations was a fatal error. *Wars can pay but wars usually don't.* That about sums up the situation if we look at it from the standpoint of a single nation and if we fail to look far enough ahead, say a generation, to gauge the ultimate result. But the masses of mankind still take a national point of view and still put their own interests above those of their posterity. *Moreover, in view of the fearful pressure of daily need upon the masses of men we cannot blame them for doing this, nor expect them to act or think otherwise until this pressure is removed.*

In case of a victory of international finance will

not the present war have paid Great Britain, France and America? The answer depends on the question whether we expect to have a trust of nations, a pooling to a greater or less degree of the majority of the world's capitalistic interests, a *real* or *economic* league of peace. If we do, and if Germany could not have been persuaded without war to accept the place allotted to it by this combination—then certainly the war will have paid, first, from the point of view of this capitalistic combination, but ultimately from the point of view of permanent international peace and industrial democracy.

Third—Let us consider the question of armament and disarmament. Primarily weapons are a means and not a cause of war. As far as they are a cause this might supposedly be removed by the internationalization of armament manufacture—*provided the export of arms were not forbidden, for this is the chief if not the sole hope for the establishment of permanent peace out of the present war.*

But we cannot cure war by treating its symptoms—armies and armament. The causes are economic. Of course when the economic forces making for peace become preponderant, the first steps taken will be steps toward disarmament. But they will be due not to a disarmament agitation but to the industrial and military victory of the *economic* forces that make for peace over the *economic* forces that make for war.

Fourth—We have the international political remedies, international tribunals, legislatures, police, leagues of peace, etc., up to a concert of Europe and a federation of the world. Undoubtedly this is the line of future progress. But all these are empty forms except when we decide what these courts, police and legislatures are to *do*. How are the conflicting economic interests to be settled? Anybody who discusses peace without discussing the economic *concessions* each country would be compelled to make wants peace without paying anything for peace. Of course, the sum total of economic concessions and gains would mean a net gain all round. But certain interests lose. Certainly such a great gain as peace cannot be secured without paying for it and at a high price.

Fifth—This brings us to the elimination of the causes of war, which are almost exclusively economic in their nature. What is demanded is the neutralization of canals, the open door in backward countries and colonies and the gradual and reciprocal reduction of tariffs. Babson's league to abolish "the economic causes of war" favors all these measures. But it does not see that they will never be brought about except by an international community of financial interests, a "trust of nations." For just as the evils to be removed are economic and not political in their nature so the international power that is to remove them must be economic also.

"Real" Democracy of the Party Machine

By Isaac A. Hourwich

THE revolutionary and so-called revolutionary parties in every land, as a rule, mimic the form of organization of the government they are fighting. Subconsciously the idea of strength becomes associated in their minds with their particular form of government: "there is no beast stronger than the Cat," quoth the Mouse. The fetish of discipline worshipped by the German Social Democracy is but an imitation of the discipline of the German army. It is quite natural for the Socialist Party in this country to stand for the political machine.

Says Mr. William Ammonsford, in the *New York Call*, of July 31, 1915: "Upon many questions, the Socialists are nearer Tammany than they are to the other political groups. . . . On questions of practical policy, of tactics, of methods, we come together."

Both the Socialists and Tammany "need a strong, closely knit, well-disciplined party." Both the Socialists and Tammany are opposed to the "movement that has been sweeping over the country whose aim is avowedly to make politics more democratic."

Now, that the constitutional convention at Albany, "hidebound, rock-ribbed, conservative that it is, taking its ideal from the paleolithic age, seeks to restore the convention," the Socialists rejoice with Tammany, because it will put the control of the election machinery "where it belongs."

The author believes that the proposition of the convention, "reactionary as it is in intent," will nevertheless "restore the real democracy that was lost by the fake, by the fraudulent, by the pseudo-democracy of the primaries."

The author claims that he and those who think as he does "are the only real democrats in political life." Now what does he conceive to be the organization plan of "real democracy"?

In a "real democracy" all inhabitants are divided into two classes:

I. The first class comprises the bulk of the "voters who need have not the slightest interest in the success of the party, in the triumph of its principles, in anything except, possibly, the success of a personal friend who is running on the ticket."

This description is intended to include "the primary-law cranks who want to forget the principles of the party, and its tactics and its traditions, and to remember nothing but the candidates, the job hunters, to allow anybody, no matter what he believes in, to dictate the party's conduct."

II. The second class are "the paid-up party members." To be eligible for admission to this class, the

applicant must first undergo a test of his or her "fitness to vote and act upon Socialist principles and policy. If the person meets the test, if the man or woman gives evidence that he or she is devoted to the success of Socialist principles, then the greatest possible freedom is given him, a thousand times more than the miserly primary law grants. Voter or non-voter, man or woman, citizen or non-citizen, registered or not, the paid-up party member has the completest and the most democratic rights. . . The party members vote on candidates, upon platforms and upon party policy and tactics."

Inferentially, those persons who have failed to meet the required test are denied the privilege to vote on candidates. The law of the state accords them the right to vote in the election for the candidate picked out for them by the persons "devoted to the success of the Socialist principles," or by the Tammany convention, as the case may be.

It is evident, therefore, that in a "pseudo-democracy" all voters are qualified alike, first, to pick out by their own votes the candidates whose names are to be placed on the official ballot, and next to vote in the election for one of the candidates who have won the nomination, whereas in a "real democracy" the nomination of candidates is the prerogative of the few who are chosen—the many who are called being permitted only to vote for one of the candidates picked out for them by their betters. In other words, the essence of "pseudo-democracy" is unlimited universal suffrage, whereas the essence of "real democracy," as advocated by Tammany and the contributor to the *Call*, is a restricted suffrage.

It must be said, in fairness to Boss Barnes who is among the controlling powers of the Constitutional Convention, that, though aiming to restore to the organization the control of the internal affairs of the party, he would abolish, along with the official primaries, the privilege of the party organization to designate the persons whose names are to appear on the official ballot as party candidates. Unlike the political philosopher of the *Call*, he would not go to the length of vesting the control of the election machinery in a self-appointed oligarchy of politicians which is not responsible to the voters.

"The only real democrats," presumably, have no objection to being eventually elected to public office by the votes of those who "have not the slightest interest . . . in the triumph of its [the party's] principles," who "want to forget the principles of the party . . . and its traditions, and to remember nothing but the candidates, the job hunters." If, however, this be a true appraisal of the general run of Socialist voters, are they not likely to lure the party candidates from the straight and narrow path of the paid-up party membership onto the by-ways of the job-hunters? Would not the Socialist candidate be open to the temptation to please his

constituents, who "have not the slightest interest in the triumph of the party principles"? And would not his desire to win the election indirectly "allow anybody, no matter what he believes in, to dictate the party's conduct"? One who has not passed the test in "Socialist principles and policy" might answer that the Socialist party statesmen have given such evidence of devotion to the success of Socialist principles, that they may be considered immune against the temptations to which the old party politicians would easily succumb. But "Socialism, serving the working class, will not be diluted" by the belief in "good men." It would therefore seem that "real democracy" of the Tammany or Socialist party type is open to the same criticism as the "pseudo-democracy" of the direct-primary cranks.

Is it not thinkable, on the other hand, that "strict party control" of the political machinery has been the instrumentality which enabled Tammany to gain "control of the swag"? What assurance is there that the party "organized for social revolution" might not by the same instrumentality be turned into an "organization of loot," like Tammany?

Mr. Gustavus Myers, in his "History of Tammany Hall," has shown that Tammany was also originally "organized for revolution,"—its founders were ardent believers in the principles of the French Revolution. It was Tammany that won manhood suffrage for the disfranchised propertyless population of New York State. But as soon as this "party organized for revolution" had gained control of the political machinery, it degenerated into an "organization of loot." The convention system of party nominations and "strict party control" were evolved as a means to secure "jobs for members of the gang."

We may grant for the sake of the argument, that in this pioneer stage of the Socialist party, all its members are men and women of high ideals, unselfishly devoted to the principles of Socialism. But when the Socialist party will have become a political power, it will be overrun by new converts from the old political parties. If the system of party organization which has been fashioned to serve the ends of corrupt politics is to remain intact, like causes are bound to produce like effects, albeit the party in power be labeled "Socialist Party."

If You Buy Books—

You want to concentrate
and get efficient service

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE

256 Broadway, New York City

Revisionism and Nationalism

By Eduard Bernstein

[Both in Germany and in England the division which the war has made between Socialists has been confusing. In both countries revisionists and opportunists have, in some cases, been true to the principles of the International, while some who have counted as revolutionary Marxists have been carried away by the war spirit. Paul Axelrod, as shown in our last issue, maintained that the present division goes much deeper than the old one between revisionists and revolutionists. Bernstein's article is partly in answer to Axelrod.—Editorial Note.]

SO far as the German Social Democracy is concerned, the great majority of revisionists are found among those who support the granting of war credits; standing with them, however, are a number who were hitherto vigorous opponents of revisionism. And both groups defend their attitude by referring back to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. On the contrary, I, who sought fifteen years ago to give revisionism a theoretical basis and have been championing it since that time in speech and writing, have taken the opposite position, and I may add that other revisionists have done the same. This is the best proof of the fact that the old labels of revisionist and Marxist will give us little help in answering the question which we now face.

Now revisionism is the theoretical background of a practical policy for which the name of reformism constantly gained wider acceptance. This policy often approximated what is known as opportunism and has often been taken for the same thing. Against this confusion I have protested countless times. Opportunism is marked by the disregard of theoretical thinking, and not a few party members who were counted as revisionists made no secret of the fact that they cared little or nothing for revisionist theory. The opportunistic Socialists in Germany have almost without exception followed the nationalist tendency, and just on this account the notion has gained ground that nationalism and revisionism are twin brothers.

As a matter of fact the state of the case is quite different. Axelrod is right in regard to the difference between the present groups of Socialists as marked by varying degrees of internationalism. But, in my opinion, he does not formulate the distinction accurately when he takes as its point of departure "the irreconcilability of the ideology and psychology of patriotism and nationalism with the principles and interests of the proletarian movement as a whole." The old ideology and psychology of patriotism could be very well reconciled with these principles and interests. But what cannot be reconciled with them is this new ideology and psychology

of nationalism which has lately become fashionable in Germany. The old ideology required the self-government of the nation, its independence as a center of culture among other similar centers. It was essentially democratic. The notion of patriotism itself was once synonymous with democracy. This new German, or, better, neo-German ideology on the contrary, is the expression of conflicts of interests between a definite group of capitalists in one land and other groups in other lands. It imposes these conflicts upon the nation as a whole and makes it appear in any given case that the solidarity of the workers with those of other lands is less important than their attachment to the group of capitalists which dominates their nation. This sort of patriotism or nationalism is, therefore, in the last analysis not democratic, for it leads to the suppression of popular rights and popular policies. It brings about a state of affairs in which state-craft is a matter of governmental intrigue. Right here is found the distinction which we seek.

Let us put it this way. We are dealing with the contrast between the sociological and the imperialist conceptions of the relations among peoples. The sociological conception is based on the social forces which are constantly bringing the peoples into closer contact and so creating increased community of interest. The imperialist idea is that the peoples are the followers of great capitalistic combinations, and stamp the struggles and conflicts of these combinations as those of their respective peoples. While the sociological conception has for its purpose the steady strengthening of international law the imperialistic conception places this international law in a subordinate position. In the field of trade the sociological conception leads necessarily to the policy of free exchange among nations; the imperialistic idea leads to the introduction of high tariff. It is most significant that in imperialistic literature of all shades nothing has been more sedulously botched than plans for dividing the world among tariff leagues. The fulfillment of these plans would be a suitable result of the present war; this would mean the tearing apart of the peoples for an indefinite period.

This new capitalistic nationalism which culminates in imperialism is what we must oppose, not the old democratic sort. To fight the latter would be to serve the purposes of the former. The International of the people is possible only as a union of nations joined together in freedom. This must remain the controlling thought in the International of the workers. And it can remain the controlling thought.

For what we call a crisis of the International is, in truth, a crisis of only a part of it. The International failed because this part failed. If elements that make up this part come to themselves, the rehabilitation of the International will be rapid. For the majority of groups have not failed, but on the contrary have conducted themselves splendidly.

To sum it all up; so far as crass opportunism has not been the cause of sins against the International, they are the results of theories which have as little to do with revisionism as with Marxism.

The Socialist International will come out of this war laying greater stress on international affairs. One of its first duties will be the development of the bases of international politics for the working class. It will give greater attention than heretofore to international law, treaties between nations and trade relations, and will take a positive position with regard to these matters. It may be that at first it will lose considerably. But it will gain in thought, in principles, and in practical programs. This is what I gather from Axelrod's discussion, and in this I agree with him absolutely. (Translated by WILLIAM E. BOHN.)

Why Stop the War?

By Phillips Russell

I SN'T it about time that self-respecting Socialists ceased to roll their eyes heavenward and exclaim: "Ain't this war tur'ble?"

Are Socialists simply nice old ladies clothed in black bombazine, with white lace tatting around their shoulders, that party officials and locals should be joining the W. C. T. U., the Monday Morning Conference of Ministers, the Sisters of Mercy and the Puny Princelets of Peace in moaning around about the "horrors of war" and in framing up futile programs for bringing about an end to "this needless slaughter and horrible sacrifice of human life"?

Revolutionary Socialists had no desire for this war; they opposed it until the last; but now that it is here and gives promise of continuing indefinitely, they can afford to sit back and say: *Let it go on!*

Why, in heaven's name, should anyone wish to stop the war?

"Because human life is sacred," comes the reply. There never was a statement founded more solidly on error. Life is the cheapest thing there is, and there is no variety held in such contempt as the human one. Momentarily, hourly, daily, yearly, life is thrown upon the universe in tens of billions of forms, and in tens of billions of forms it is daily and hourly wiped out.

The assertion that human life is sacred was made by man and was born of man's abounding egotism, his irrefragible belief that somehow Nature regards him as above her other manifestations; that with him, to the exclusion of other creatures, she intends

to fulfill a mission that shall at last satisfy his enormous vanity, his urgent love of power.

Secure in his self-love, man joins with his fellows in founding huge colonies, in erecting vast cities, in navigating tremendous oceans, in constructing civilizations that he imagines shall endure, and then with a single breath, a crook of the elbow, a lift of her diaphragm, as it were, Nature smears him flat into a leveled mass of mingled stone and blood.

In London, shortly after the war began, a physician told me that the years following the various Balkan wars of the past, in which there has always been frightful slaughter, have invariably been distinguished by remarkable human fertility and that the preponderance of boy babies has been especially noteworthy, as if Nature, realizing the shortage of men, was bent upon making up for the difference. I do not know what authority there is for this statement, but it does seem to be true that war has very little appreciable effect on the population of a country after a generation or two has elapsed, except, of course, in cases where actual or approximate extermination has been accomplished. And it is a fact that within a few years after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 France had so far recovered from her "crushing" that she was able to hold a world's exposition that is yet memorable for its splendor and lavish display.

Even now ten million mothers of Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Austria, Turkey, Servia and Montenegro are heavy with the children that will be born within the year. Most of these mothers will bear again and again, and in twenty years after the close of the present conflict—a period measuring but an instant in the world's age—the peoples now involved scarcely will know they ever had a war.

Let's have another answer, then, to the question: Why stop the war?

"Because it is so horrible!" comes the reply.

But are the horrors of war any worse than those of peace as we know it at present? Which would any reasonable man prefer—to be utterly exhausted in a sweat shop or to be utterly exhausted in the ranks of a marching army? To be soaking wet and miserable on the decks of a trading schooner or in a hundred miles of trenches? To see a man ripped to pieces by a shell or by a mine explosion? To spit his life away in a tubercular tenement in three years or to bleed to death on the battlefield in three minutes? Does a mother mourn her son any less when as an ironworker he plunges twenty stories to his death than when as a sailor he is hurled to destruction in a battleship's bowels?

A man who had been a soldier told me that he once saw the remains of a comrade whose entrails had been forced upward out of his mouth by the explosion of a shell. He thought it was horrible, and so it was, but I once saw exactly the same kind of accident happen to a workingman employed in a

plant that manufactured soda water gas. This man was bending over a heavily charged carboy when it suddenly exploded and the memory of the grisly horror that lay in the place of what an instant before had been a healthy man's body lingered for days and days in the memory of all who witnessed it.

Why waste time, then, in drawing up memorials and peace petitions and pacific resolutions that will merely go into some one's waste basket? Let those who believe in "der Vaterland," "la Patrie," and "my country, right or wrong," go out and fight for it. Let those who so passionately love the factory, the bench, the nine-dollar-a-week job and the two-dollar-a-week bedroom go out and die for it. Maybe then, when they have all cut each others' throats, whether they call themselves Socialists, Syndicalists, Anarchists, Democrats or Republicans, we shall

grow a new generation of men whose minds will be rid of superstition and whose tongues will be free of hypocrisy.

Socialism is not to be confused with pacifism. Neither is it merely 900-900 humanitarianism. Its phraseology should not be that of bourgeois peace congresses or Quaker meetings. We do not oppose war because it is war, because it is horrible, or because it slays life. We object to war because we object to being used as pawns in the games of the world's ruling classes, because we object to dying simply that our masters may benefit, because we object to killing inoffensive men whose aims are or should be similar to our own.

Let's have an end to this present orgy of red-nosed sentimentality. The war is on. Let it run to a finish.

The Message of Anthropology

By A. A. Goldenweiser

(*Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University.*)

TO the large mass of the book and newspaper reading public the word "anthropology" conveys no meaning whatsoever; at best strange associations arise before the reader: he thinks of anti-religious tendencies, of attacks on the Bible, of man's simian origin, of curious specimens in the museum, of magic, of cannibalism. Yet the numbers of those to whom the meaning of anthropology is congenial, are growing daily. The science of man is reaching maturity and its right to a "place in the sun" is becoming recognized by the sister sciences.

To-day a host of trained anthropologists is engaged in the highly technical work of anthropological research and theory. Yesterday the anthropological specialist was unknown and the science drew its adherents from other sciences. Max Muller, philologist; Haeckel, Huxley, Haddon, biologists; Durkheim, Hubert, Maess, sociologists; McDougall, Rivers, Wandt, psychologists; Boas, geographer; Virchow, Von Luschan, physicians—all have been drawn into the anthropological melting pot. The new science has profited greatly from thus becoming the focus of many methods, of varied points of view. It has elaborated its own method and is beginning to pay back in kind to the sciences which have so generously contributed to its beginnings. Thus biology is freely drawing upon statistics which, in the able hands of Pearson, has first been applied to varied problems of human heredity; philology is lending a willing ear to the quaint articulations of primitive languages and amidst the unsuspected riches of vocabularies and complexity of grammars finds ample opportunity for revision of some of its rusty conclusions; psychology, at first step-motherly,

then patronising towards its offshoot, folk-psychology, is beginning to find this investment of labor and thought profitable for its own purposes; economics, still very grudgingly, very hesitatingly, is coming to suspect that it may have something to learn from human society that knew not the law of demand and supply and transacted its business without the aid of a medium of exchange.

Perhaps, in the near future, we shall realize that anthropology is the natural introduction to the social sciences. I do not now mean the biological side of anthropology, nor its philological side, but that aspect of anthropology which deals with the pre-history of culture. At the time of Herbert Spencer and for years after, the biological sciences were regarded as the true foundation of social science; some used them in the form of more or less brilliant analogies, others took the analogies seriously. In due time the biological interpretations were discarded for psychological ones. To a great extent these still hold the field. Society, it is said, is a complex of psychically inter-related minds, hence theories of society must be based on psychology. Among thinkers in different fields, on the other hand, the conviction is growing that the explanatory units in each science should belong to that science. Whatever the relations of sociology to psychology, of psychology to biology, of biology to physics and chemistry, there seems to be ample room for interpretative work within the domain of each one of these sciences and without leaving the conceptual level created by the particular science. If there be truth in these considerations, anthropology must needs be recognized as the one science whose data and concepts are most closely akin to those of the

social sciences. The true approach to the *Geisteswissenschaften* is through anthropology. Sociology, law, ethics, education, theory of art, economics, theology, criminology, will be the richer for an insight into their own pre-history. To these must be added history. While the ideal of the science of history was the chronological recording of fact, the historian could harbor little but contempt for the anthropologist, pre-history was the antithesis of history, the contrast was that of ignorance and knowledge. But history is rapidly shedding the scales of chronology, genealogy, politics, and is developing into a science of culture. *The New History*, moreover, is becoming self-conscious, it is becoming conscious of its short-comings; the new historian is beginning to realize, somewhat to his dismay, that documentary evidence can be met by documentary evidence, that the historian like his brother, the astronomer, must cope with a personal equation. Confession of sin begets humility. The historian feels a new kinship with a long neglected friend. History and pre-history join hands in co-operation.

Now, whereas anthropology is thus rapidly coming into its own, there is much of that abuse of its data and theories which is unavoidable whenever a new, rich and complex field is first being drawn upon by students who are, wholly or in part, foreign to that field. Most modern text-books of sociology, and some of economics, contain introductory chapters, or at least paragraphs, dealing with anthropological material. A perusal of such chapters or paragraphs, however, soon reveals the fact that anthropological prejudices of the past generation are thus called to life again, that conclusions long discarded by anthropologists or modified to meet the demands of riper knowledge and deeper insight, are paraded as firmly established truths, being also drawn upon in support of that or another pet theory advocated by the author of the sociological or economic treatise. Thus we still hear of the three stages of human evolution, hunting, pastoral and agricultural; of the matriarchal age; of the phases of economic and sociological development propounded by Morgan and Engels. The treasure-trove of pre-history proves but an anthropological rubbish-heap.

The technique of anthropological research has grown to be complex and unwieldy; its acquisition requires years of persistent labor. It is a task for the specialist. Anthropological literature, moreover, still presents and will always present works of all degrees of excellence and worthlessness. The technical monograph of a trained student shares the shelves with travellers' accounts and biased tales inspired by the zeal of the missionary. This is inevitable; much of anthropological material can only be found in sources which require the closest critical scrutiny before they can be used with safety. This again is a task for the specialist. It thus becomes

clear that the only means to ensure a more careful and discriminating use of anthropological data by workers in other fields is conservative popularization of the results of his science on the part of the anthropologist. This can be achieved through the publication of appropriate books—a task yet hardly begun—as well as through the introduction of anthropology into the curriculum of our secondary schools. This latter enterprise could be achieved with less friction than would at first seem likely; the natural relationship of anthropology to geography and history would pave the way for the introduction of the subject as a separate branch of study.

The wider popularization of the data of anthropology, desirable as a means of enhancing knowledge, is even more desirable on account of what might be called the liberalizing effect of anthropological studies. The snobbishness of culture, of race, of religion, of sex, collapses like a house of cards at the mere touch of pre-history. The widely diverging codes of ethics; the differing standards of beauty, of propriety; the excellence of achievement by peoples deemed primitive, emphasize the relativity of cultural values, as well as the stupidity of the dogma of race superiority. The differences as well as the similarities of religious conceptions at all times and among all peoples, discourage narrow sectarianism. The notable achievements of woman, in primitive times, and in directions which now are often claimed as the birthright of the stronger sex, suggest the reflection that what woman once did she may do again, as well as man, or better.

With reference to its own material anthropology is in a curious and somewhat unique position: the data of anthropology are rapidly passing from the domain of life into that of memory. Says an Iroquois chief and sage, with whom the present writer spent many a memorable day over the arduous task of reviving the past: "Another generation, and there will be no custom; still another generation, and there will be no memory". The old chief, himself since called to join his glorious ancestors, was right. The condition among practically all Indians of North America today is as he described it. The same is true of many primitive races in South America, Africa, Asia. On the other hand, a large part of South America, Australia, the South Sea Islands, still harbor a rich anthropological harvest.

In a little while, perhaps two or three generations, anthropology will become a purely academic pursuit, a science of re-construction and interpretation, with its data all gathered in—and more to come—systematized, and classified. One feels the breath of eternity at the thought that primitive man, master of the earth for untold ages, shall be no more. But while his last offshoots are still with us, no effort should be spared to learn from living lips the story of the past.

A Study In Reaction

By Harry W. Laidler

THE New York *Times*, in its endeavor to arouse the indifferent voter in opposition to the woman suffrage amendment, delivered recently a two column editorial broadside against woman's iniquitous attempt to extend the limits of political democracy in the Empire State. Every one of the arguments advanced by the editorial writer in New York's most distinguished apologist of conservatism exhibited such profundity and brilliancy of intellect that many strongly suspected that the editorial writer must have been inspired by some classic epistle of days gone by.

The other day, while delving into one of the musty archives of a New York library, I chanced upon a volume which, one would almost imagine, had served as a prototype for the *Times'* editorial. It was a small book written in 1818 by Robert Fellowes, a Master of Arts of Oxford University, entitled *The Rights of Property Vindicated*, etc. It bristled with invectives against Manhood Suffrage.

I have placed below in parallel columns the arguments against woman suffrage and the arguments against manhood suffrage:

FROM EDITORIAL AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN THE NEW YORK "TIMES". (FEB. 7, 1915.)

SUFFRAGE INJURIOUS TO SOCIETY.

Woman Suffrage would result either in a needless political muddle or in a social and political turmoil, which would tend to weaken the state, to stir up discord in Society and in the home, and would put obstacles in the way of progress which the wisest statesmanship might fail to overcome.—[Italics mine.]

SUFFRAGE DIVERTS VOTERS FROM THEIR PROPER SPHERE.

If women are to forsake the home for the counting room, the law office, the wheat fields and the smithy, then they may in time be able to cast a ballot which they can explain and justify by reasons which men can understand. . . Is it worth while to divert the whole order of human Society by

FROM "THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY VINDICATED," ETC., BY ROBERT FELLOWES, M. A., (1818) AGAINST MANHOOD SUFFRAGE.

The principle of Universal (Manhood) Suffrage which militates against the principle of property, is in direct opposition to all the possibilities of social improvement; and can only tend to plunge Society into its pristine barbarism. *The catastrophe of the drama would be general penury and desolation.....* The whole political edifice would ere long be crumbled into dust.—[Italics mine.]

That policy must be pernicious which tends to divert a poor man's mind to objects foreign to the improvement of his condition, or which deludes him with vain representations of interest which are totally adverse to that improvement. A poor man should have no politics beyond that of turning his

putting women to do men's work?—[Italics mine.]

time and his industry to the best account. — [Italics mine.]

SUFFRAGE CONTRARY TO NATURE OF THINGS.

The grant of Suffrage to women is repugnant to instincts that strike their roots deep in the *order of nature*. It runs counter to human reason, it flouts the teachings of experience and the admonitions of common sense.—[Italics mine.]

SUFFRAGE WOULD PROVE AN INJURY TO THE VOTER.

At present there is a strong and wholesome barrier which tends to keep women apart from men in the hurly-burly of life, to insure them courtesies from the opposite sex, to give them many precious privileges. . . We are firmly convinced that the *breaking down of the barrier would bring upon them a burden of new evils, that it would tend to coarsen women, to deprive them of natural rights and privileges without due compensation.*—[Italics mine.]

NON-VOTER IS PROPERLY SAFEGUARDED.

If women suffer wrongs, it is the duty of men to right them. If bad laws hamper and afflict them, men should bestir themselves to have those laws repealed. . . It is the privilege of men to care for the women.—[Italics mine.]

However any government may be constituted, it must in reality be administered by a few. Does not this political arrangement, though it may seem artificial, really arise out of the *natural constitution of things?*—[Italics mine.]

Universal Suffrage would be no benefit to the poor to whom it is vaunted as the source of all bliss and the cure of all woe. . . The State refuses the Suffrage to persons without property, not because it favors the rich more than the poor, but because *the Suffrage, if given to the poor, would tend to aggrandize the rich, without benefiting the poor. If the poor had the power, they would probably employ it both to their own and the public detriment.*—[Italics mine.]

The rights of the poor are more safe with those who are within the line of independence, but yet not removed to the farthest distance from the confines of poverty.—[Italics mine.]

AN UNDEVELOPED FACULTY.

Although women have other capacities without number held in equal distinction, and some in higher honor, *they have never possessed or developed the political faculty.*—[Italics mine.]

Both political and philosophical pursuits require a degree of leisure which no day laborer can possess, but which is one of the accompaniments of property.—[Italics mine.]

It will be noted that both writers opposed the granting of the suffrage not because they wished to deny rights to any human being, nor even because they feared that the newly enfranchised might attempt to cut the Gordian knot of special privilege. No! thrice no! They were against suffrage because of their solicitude for the welfare of the disfranchised and of Society as a whole, and their fear that the new voter might exercise the ballot to his or her own detriment!

The one line of reasoning which differs somewhat in the two polemics is that relating to the *capacity* of the non-voter to vote intelligently should his or her efforts succeed. Mr. Fellowes contended that the

poor man was not capable of balloting aright because he was engaged too energetically in the mere struggle for existence and did not possess the leisure to think about public questions which was one of the accompaniments of property. The New York Times,

on the other hand, reverses the reasoning, and declares that woman does not possess the capacity of voting intelligently because she is *not* engaged so universally in the struggle for existence, because, presumably, she has too much leisure.

Book Reviews

The German Emperor

AN intensely medieval personality set in a twentieth century environment. Such is the mental picture of the man now occupying the position he covets with every fibre of his being: the center of the world's stage. He loves the spotlight, the first page as fervently as our own Teddy, and like the latter always has an eye to the galleries in his various performances. It is said that the Berlin publisher of "*Die Woche*" has an understanding with the Kaiser to have William's figure in his weekly's every issue, in return for valuable official patronage. Like our Teddy the Kaiser understands the art of self-advertising, and many of his numerous speeches were delivered for that purpose. Some of them have been too much even for his own officials who felt the need of editing and expurgating them subsequently.¹ Still, what remains after that process reveals the man as he is: a firm believer in his rulership by Divine Right, guided and inspired by the Almighty, ruthlessly going his own way, making for his goal regardless of the means and methods used, utterly impatient of opposition, a mixture of Philip II. of Spain, Louis XIV. of France, and Charles XII. of Sweden.

The Kaiser is a true Hohenzollern in his policies, taking the "Great Elector" for his model. Like that ancestor of his he will not be stopped by any "scraps of paper," any obligation no matter how solemnly assumed. He believes he is Germany's guardian angel and infallible guide, chosen by Destiny. As such he cannot make mistakes. "Wem Gott ein Amt gibt, dem gibt er auch Verstand," is a well known Prussian saying.

No Russian Czar represents the challenge to modern Democracy more sharply than the Kaiser's exclamation: "Whosoever opposes me I shall crush!"

Passionately believing in himself he wants to be far more than the wearer of an inherited crown: he wishes to be

accepted as an authority in military and moral matters, in theology, architecture, sculpture, painting, music and literature. He expects everybody to follow where he leads.

We cannot yet measure the extent to which he is responsible for the wave of Anglophobia now engulfing the "nation of poets and thinkers." It is known that he hated his own English born mother because he came into the world with a crippled arm. He used to speak of her derisively as "Die Engländerin" in the circle of his cronies whence the sentiment tribbled down far and wide, finding an eager response among the more hungry bourgeoisie competing with Great Britain in the markets of the world.

It is this Bourgeoisie in league with the great landowners that backs the Kaiser in his policy of expansion and his struggle for the mastery of the sea. Without the support of the Kraut und Schlotjmukers, the Lords of Estate and of High Chimneys, that policy would be impossible. It is in their behalf that he undertakes to tame and master the "internal enemy," the Social Democracy.

"You may leave the Social Democrats to me!" he promptly instructed one of his chancellors. Then he offered the German workers in one hand his scheme of Labor legislation, in the other hand displaying the master's relentless whip. The workers are to be tolerably fed, clothed and housed as efficient creators of profit for the master class, and immediately as an inexhaustible source of material for the great war machine of the War Lord. They were left in no doubt as to the eventualism of that machine. "At my command you must shoot your own fathers and brothers." The warning was unmistakable. They must not indulge in vain dreams of ever being masters of their own destiny, ever becoming anything but a servile and serviceable mass.

That is why he set his face like flint against any attempt to give them fair representation either in the Prussian diet or the Imperial parliament. That is why their right of association and meeting remains precarious, subject to the whim of the police authorities, why the military code remains a monstrous instrument for crushing every spark of individuality.

It will be the task of future historians and psychologists to imagine and explain why the majority of socialist representatives in the Reichstag found it necessary to accept such a man as their unquestionable leader, in a world crisis. Were they carried off their feet in an atmosphere surcharged with nationalism with skilfully concocted official falsehoods?

When the Kaiser's personal labor succeeded in creating the famous upturned mustachios, he adopted the triumphant motto: "Es ist erreicht" (It is accomplished!) Can the Kaiser now exclaim, pointing to the wing of royal and imperial socialists: "Es ist erreicht?"

M. E.

A Genuine Prognosis

MILITARISTS like Bernhardt dealt with the coming of the present war not to avoid the clash but to be on the winning side. Sarolea¹ tried from humanitarian motives to prevent a calamity which he saw coming.

His prophecy is all the more extraordinary when we consider that it was accomplished by one who believed neither in the materialistic interpretation of social phenomena nor in the class analysis of Society. Moreover this timely warning was in no sense a lucky stroke for it represents a carefully drawn conclusion based on thorough study.

It can hardly be disputed that the outbreak of the war caught the Socialists unawares. How then are we to account for the fact that an antiquated mode of interpretation has been applied so as to give better results than the superior scientific means and methods claimed by us?

¹) *The Anglo-German Problem*. By Charles Sarolea. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.35.

¹) *The German Emperor, As Shown in his Public Utterances*. By Christian Gauss, Professor in Princeton University. Chas. Scribner's Sons, \$1.25.

Builder and Blunderer. By George Saunders. B. A., L. L. D., New York. E. P. Dutton & Co., \$1.00.

Sarolea regards history as the reflex of the human mind, therefore his interest and attention centers on a study of the psychological factor in national and international relations.

The result was that he saw phenomena without seeing their causes but he did see their consequences. Besides his powers of observation are unusually keen and the range of his reading phenomenal, so that what he lacks in the analytical understanding of causes is somewhat compensated by his panoramic vision.

Starting with the axiom that "political aggressiveness abroad is explained by political reaction at home", Sarolea finds that as the Government of Germany is the most undemocratic and reactionary of the big industrial nations, this must lead to an aggressive foreign policy causing Germany to be or become "the storm centre in international politics".

In dealing with external manifestations the foreign democratic policy of England and of France are contrasted with the German mode of expansion by concentration of power in the hands of those in authority through obedience of the mass.

The concrete material for these conclusions comprises an abundant collection of valuable facts. The Chapter on the Bagdad railway deserves special mention as much for the timeliness of its publication (1906) as for the excellence of its contents.

Sarolea's weakness are no less striking than his merits. He understands and believes in political freedom but seems totally devoid of the conception of any such thing as economic slavery. While he could thus grasp the evils of German capitalism because they manifested themselves in the shape of "benevolent feudalism", he is blind to the defects of English or French capitalism on account of the fact that they appear in the form of political democracy. In one instance he even so far forgets himself as to condemn the theory of race superiority when he argues against the German view but justifies the very same distinction in defence of the English and French colonial policy.

We read on p. 135. "No absolute superiority of one civilized people over another can be proved."

On p. 136. "There may be extreme cases where outside interference is justified as in the case of the colonization of a degraded race by a demonstrably superior race."

In spite of all defects in historical interpretation Sarolea must be credited with the accomplishment of that rarest of feats—a genuine prognosis.

MAURICE BLUMLEIN.

A Socialist Digest

The Split in the German Party

EACH faction of the German Socialists is accusing the other of working to bring about a separate organization. But the evidence is rapidly accumulating that the anti-war Socialists are still willing to stay in, while it is the pro-war faction that wishes to throw its opponents out. Reichstag Member Fischer, of Berlin, for example, has caused a resolution to be passed by a Hannoverian Socialist branch demanding that Haase, Kautsky and Bernstein should get out of the Party and that "peace should be concluded only on a basis corresponding to the sacrifices in blood and property" made by Germany.

Vorwärts quotes expressions of three of the best known leaders of the pro-war majority (David, Heine and Kolb) demanding a split. Heine demands that all Socialists who are opposed "to all conquest of a truly powerful position" by Germany should leave the Party and "form a club of their own". Kolb, the leader of the Baden Socialists, writes that it would be better to abandon "the formal unity of the Party," rather than to change its present pro-governmental policy of voting military supplies in the Reichstag: "Those who support this policy can no longer work together with those who wish to betray it. The split between the two opposing views is too great to be bridged over."

The Socialists of Berlin—who oppose the war and the voting of military supplies—declare that they refuse to be thrown out and intend to stay in and force the Party to resume its Socialist character. They are supported by the Party organizations of several other large cities and industrial centers. But the majority is still against them and it is difficult to see how they can prevent the split.

That the majority in control of the German Socialist Party machinery takes the same position now as it did one year ago when it pledged its support to the war is shown by an official declaration of the Party Executive and the Reichstag Group issued at the end of June. This declaration is in answer to the attack on these bodies signed by 700 Party officials, elected representatives, editors and other leading Party members already mentioned in the *NEW REVIEW*. Its leading assertions are a repetition of the position taken in the Reichstag on the 4th

of August last, showing that *there has been no change whatever in the Party's position since that time*. The recent peace manifesto is no exception as it expressly declares that it merely continues the position of last August, the Socialists continuing their support of the war until the "enemy" was ready for peace.

The Party statement of June 28th contains the following propositions.

(1). The party must continue its support of the war because of the entrance of Italy into the war with "a policy of conquest"—thus implying that Germany is not fighting, even now, for conquests. The Italian Party, which does *not* support the war, has officially declared that the German Party which *does* support it, has no right to complain of the plans of conquest of another government.

(2). The Party refuses to take a positive stand on the violations of the rules of war, retaliation, etc., by its declaration that all governments should be criticized alike, thus taking the ground that all *must* be equally guilty *without reference to what they do*. As to sea-atrocities it balances against all the German *deeds*, the mere *phrase* of an admiral formerly in charge of the British fleet that "moderation during war is nonsense". Neither the United States nor any other neutral nation has even accused Great Britain of atrocities at sea, but only of violation of property rights. Bernstein admits that Germany has led in the cultivation of the retaliation idea.

This Party statement even uses stronger language than that of last August. It claims that "the political and economic independence of the country is at stake", that is, that the Allies are engaged in an effort at the conquest and subjection of Germany!

And finally, this statement suggests that the present friendly relations between the Socialist Party leaders and the Government is very useful to the working-people during the war and that if the Party remains strong and united along these lines it will be still more useful after the war! In other words the Party is getting something for the German workers in return for their support of the Kaiser, militarism, and war against all the other workers of Europe.

Reichstag Socialists Vote War Credit

AS was to have been expected, the Reichstag Socialists have again voted the war-credit for the Kaiser. Reports as to Karl Liebknecht's action are not clear, but it seems he abstained from voting.

The blackest thing is the choice of Dr. Eduard David, the worst of the "Socialist" Imperialists, as spokesman of the Socialist delegation. His hypocritical plea for peace was a direct incitement to war and conquest:

"There lives in the hearts of the German people, as in all other peoples, longing for the day of restoration of peace. It were ill for humanity if it were otherwise. The European peoples are bleeding from thousands and thousands of wounds. Every day of the war means further frightful destruction of lives.

"Therefore, I point today to the declaration which our party made in the Reichstag. We adhere to the principle declared on August 4, 1914, *that an end must be made to the war as soon as our enemies are inclined to make peace.*

"Lust for conquest must not prolong this war unnecessarily. Emperor William has said that we were waging no war of conquest, and the Chancellor's speech yesterday supplied further proof.

"Unfortunately, Germany's enemies are not yet inclined to peace, notwithstanding their severe defeats. Their leading statesmen only recently asserted the determination to continue the war until Germany is crushed and their plans for conquest are realized. They are still looking for allies among the neutrals. They say time is their ally, and hope to wear out Germany's economic and military power by protracting the war.

"If we desire peace, therefore, the only thing left is to compel them to see their hope is futile."

Referring to the Chancellor's words to the effect that Germany owes her successes to moral power exerted in the direction of freedom, Dr. David said:

"And I hold it to be my duty to add that we expect a greater measure of liberty for the German people. With this hope, we shall vote for the new credit. We must reach the goal of equal civil rights attending equal civil duties.

"Whoever did not know it before must have learned through this war that the great masses of the German people stand so high in efficiency, in

the spirit of organization, in the sense of social duty, that the demand for full political equality can no longer be refused.

"Creation of freer and higher conditions of law and culture among the

The Socialists of Italy

THE censorship in Italy seems to be even more vigorous than in the other belligerent countries. Not only is practically all military news withheld from the people, but protests against and criticism of the government are suppressed with an iron hand.

In spite of all this, it is quite certain that the Italian Socialists are maintaining their intrepid opposition to the war. Their position is particularly difficult, in that not alone must they contend with the hostility of the government, but in that their stand isolates them among the Socialists of the belligerent nations, except the Socialists of Russia and Servia.

The immediate results of the war in Italy have been manifested in the usual manner by a practical suppression of the freedom of the press. It is improbable that this conflict was deliberately planned by the ruling class in any country in order to divert the proletariat from the class struggle; but nowhere have the rulers been slow to seize the advantage given them by war conditions, and everywhere the exceptional powers of the military dictatorship are utilized to control the expression of opinions adverse to war. Not only has the nationalist current interfered with the spread and maintenance of internationalist sentiment, but everywhere the organs of Socialist opinion are directly and indirectly hampered. In Italy the immediate effect of the war has been a great reduction in size of *Avanti*, while even in its reduced form the paper appears with the characteristic blanks due to the attentions of the censor. Yet more significant is it that the first number of the *Critica Sociale* to be issued after the Italian declaration of war appeared with several empty columns *which should have contained Turati's speech against the war-credits!* Neither in Italy nor elsewhere are people to know the Italian Socialists' final reasons for opposing Italy's participation in the war.

In a recent issue *Avanti* gives interesting details about an attempt to subsidize the peace propaganda of the Italian Socialist party. This attempt was made through the intermediary of Hermann Greulich, a Swiss Socialist.

Greulich came to Bologna on May 16—just a week before Italy declared war

people themselves and in respect of other peoples must be the unalterable aim of a policy which strives for the best for our own people and all humanity. In struggling for that goal we vote for the present war credit."

on Austria—whilst the Congress of the Italian Socialist Party was being held. It was decided that he should be seen the following day, and comrades Bacci, Barberis, Marabini, Morgari, Prampolini, Ratti, Serrati, Sinorti, Vella and Lazzari were appointed to interview him. Greulich was accompanied by Dr. A. Nathan, and Professor Valar acted as interpreter. The report in *Avanti* states that what Greulich proposed was listened to with amazement by the Italian comrades, who fully expected that Greulich had come to talk about the proposed Congress of Socialists from neutral countries. They at once demanded explanations from Dr. Nathan, who stated that an alleged Socialist of Chicago, in agreement with a well-known American pacifist, had empowered him to offer a sum of 200,000 lire (\$40,000) or more to assist the pacifist propaganda of the Italian Socialists. At this statement there were interruptions and protests.

Comrade Bacci, who was presiding at the sitting, asked Nathan if he understood the seriousness of the proposal he was making. They could not discuss such a proposition, and Nathan was asked to leave the hall. Greulich was then questioned as to how all this had come about. He replied that he had come on his own initiative, and had no mission from the Swiss Social-Democratic Party. He had known Nathan, who was a chemist at Zürich, for fifteen years, and believed what he said to be above suspicion. Being pressed for further information about those willing to give these sums, Greulich then mentioned the names of Mr. and Mrs. Warren Spring, of Chicago, the latter being the alleged Socialist referred to, and that the money would come from Andrew Carnegie.

The meeting, without discussion, immediately and unanimously refused to consider the proposal, and deplored that Greulich should have lent himself to such proceedings.

Fabianism and the Empire

SINCE the present war there has been no systematic and lengthy statement of the Fabian policy as to war and Imperialism. The position of Bernard Shaw is very similar to that of the Fabian Society as a whole. But it differs at some points, and Shaw, of course, has a vast number of ideas of his own. From Shaw's statements the public has not been able to get any very clear picture of the Fabian standpoint. It is, therefore, necessary to go back to their Manifesto, *Fabians and the Empire*, written by Shaw and issued shortly after the Boer war. The position assumed in this Manifesto has since been changed at no essential point.

The Fabians, according to this Manifesto, are frank Imperialists:

"The partition of the greater part of the globe among such [Great] Powers is, as a matter of fact that must be faced approvingly or deploringly, now only a question of time."

"We must proceed on the principle, directly opposed to that of Non-Interference, that we have international rights of traveling, trading, efficient police protection, and communication by road, rail and telegraph in every part of the globe."

"But the right to trade is a very comprehensive one: it involves a right to insist upon a settled government which can keep the peace and enforce agreements. When a native government of this order is impossible, the foreign trading power must set one up. This is a common historical origin of colonies and annexations; and it may, for practical purposes, be regarded as an irresistible natural force, which will lead sooner or later to the imposition on all countries which are still refractory to it."

"We are confronted there with colonies demanding democratic institutions in the midst of native races who must be protected despotically by the Empire or abandoned to slavery and extermination."

The restriction of Asiatic immigration, as seen at the time the Manifesto was written, in Australia and since that time in Canada and South Africa, the Society opposes, but it does not oppose these restrictions very bravely. It prefers that immigration should be allowed but that a minimum standard of sanitation, rules and remuneration, for white and yellow men alike should prevent the lowering of the standard of living by the competition of Asiatic immigrants.

However, the Fabians are prepared to see the restriction policy established.

In that case they predict that capital will immigrate to the countries of cheap labor and that the result will be higher and higher tariffs in white countries to protect them from the competition of goods made by this cheap labor.

But even with such protection some industries will necessarily immigrate to China. Provided minimum standards of living are established in China, India, etc., perhaps this immigration of capital and industry will not be intolerable. That is, the Fabians are prepared that the minimum standards may not be set for Asiatics in the British colonies, but, as an alternative, that these standards be set up in Asia.

The real evils of benevolent Imperialism are even more serious, and are practically admitted by the Fabians themselves. First, they do not believe that parliamentary institutions are adapted "for native races" and to prove this point they say: "That dream has been disposed of by American experiments after the Civil War"! Especially they oppose the establishment of parliamentary institutions in India.

Next, Shaw and the Fabians propose to introduce a modified form of conscription, as follows: "This can be done without conscription or barrack life, by so amending the Factory Acts as to extend the age for 'half time' employment to twenty-one, and devoting the thirty hours a week thus gained from the factory and the mine to a combination of physical exercises, technical education, education in civil citizenship, and field training in the use of modern weapons."

We now come to evils of benevolent Imperialism admitted as such by the Fabians. Shaw acknowledges that there is a tendency for all Great Britain to become a parasite through foreign investments and that "the day is coming when it will be as possible for all England to live barrenly on unpaid-for imports representing rents, dividends and tribute from without, as it was for Rome, or as it is for Eastbourne at present."

The Fabians' conclusion is that this situation will lead either to a policy of "bread and circuses" for the people or to a revolution—unless state Socialism is established. But the Fabians do not indicate how state Socialism on a national scale merely would affect the result since they admit that there is no difference between "British individuals living unproductively on British labor" and "British island living unproductively on foreign labor."

Naturally this benevolent Imperialism does not allot any important place

to British democracy or the British working classes. As Great Britain is becoming parasitical these working classes are becoming contented parasites upon the parasite. The role of the British working classes in the political history of 1890 and 190, says Shaw, "has been a steady policy of maintaining a rich class for the sake of getting employment from it either directly or through the huge class of shopkeepers who regard rich customers as their natural prey. Our concern in this Manifesto is not specially for the wage-earning class, which is taking its own course and reaping only what it has sown."

Arguments Repudiated

THE German press in Germany and America attacks the United States on two grounds, that it does not endeavor to prevent Great Britain's blockade of Germany and that it permits the exports of arms and ammunition to the allies. *Vorwärts* now expressly repudiates both of these arguments. It quotes from a leading article which appeared in one of the most influential of the German newspapers, the Berlin *Lokal-Anzeiger*. *Vorwärts* then proceeds to add its own approval to these sentiments, as we shall show. The most important passages in the *Lokal-Anzeiger* article are as follows:

"The attack against America because it delivers war material to our opponents is unjustified. Germany herself defeated a proposition placed before The Hague Conference, forbidding the delivery of war materials by neutral states to belligerents. Therefore, there exists only a rule forbidding the delivery of war material by neutral governments to belligerent governments, while a free road remains open for private industry. [This export of arms was of course one of the methods by which Germany financed and built up her enormous production of war material.]

"Negatively we may refer to the fact that no doubt England now knows that there is no possibility of starving out Germany. I cannot share in the sentimental policy which presents the effort of England to starve out as a great piece of baseness. I cannot share the view because it would be a great pleasure to me to carry out such a war policy successfully against England. It does not amount to a real starvation of dozens of millions of men but only to a pressure tending towards the laying down of arms. We know that in the war of 1870 Bismarck favored the bombardment of Paris, that is, the destruction of dead walls, while a more tender party in Prussia found a siege

by starvation more humane, and that is really what happened."

Vorwärts takes the same position as the *Lokal-Anzeiger*. It says in this article which we cannot sufficiently recommend to all those whom it concerns, there is declared once more earnestly and plainly a thing has long been on the minds of many thinking Germans but which has dried out when the pen was in hand—for well-known reasons (the censorship).

"What the writer says about the American export of ammunitions and about England's fortunately unsuccessful intention to starve out does not need to have a word added to it."

Vorwärts also prints a leading article summarizing and partly justifying American opinion. It says:

"The majority of the population of the United States did not sympathize with the Germanic powers from the beginning, and the agitation that has been carried on on that side by certain representatives of Germanism was only

partially suited to arouse a more friendly feeling towards Germany. But at least the government remained neutral and the great ammunition factories were just as ready to deliver arms and ammunition to the German and Austrian army as they were to the allies, if the English fleet had not made this business impossible."

The New York *Volkszeitung* takes the American side in the quarrel between the two governments. It does not believe war is necessary, and points out that Germany can yield to America's points without serious disadvantage to itself. But the daily organ of the German-American Socialists adds that the responsibility now rests entirely with Germany:

"It depends entirely upon the position of the ruling circles in Germany. If Germany recognizes the demands of Wilson as justifiable and acts accordingly then there is a possibility of peace, if not then the next incident will bring war."

War Strikes

BEYOND the recent colliery strike in Wales, and the Krupp strike in Germany, the general public is unaware that France has been disturbed by labor troubles at all, or that Germany and Great Britain have suffered any others.

It is stated by the *Monthly Review*, a new publication of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, that in France between January and April of this year no less than fifteen strikes and three lockouts were brought to the attention of the Ministère du Travail, and of these four succeeded, five were compromised, and nine failed. The chief cause was a demand for increase in wages. One strike, the most serious, lasted nearly two months. All the strikes occurred in industries producing war supplies.

In Germany, between August, 1914, and last March, fifty-two labor disputes arose, involving altogether 10,218 workmen. Again, the question of wages was the chief cause. But these strikes were not largely supported by the unions. Twenty-six of them were settled by conciliation, presumably through the Government.

Great Britain has been the most prolific in labor troubles since the war. Between January and May no less than 286 labor disputes have disturbed the country. Workingmen affected numbered 109,693. Over two-thirds of these strikes were caused by the demand for increase in wages. Engineering and textile trades suffered most severely from strikes.

Most remarkable of all the facts connected with war strikes in England is the aggregate number of days' work lost in the several trades affected—762,900 days.

One of the great factors provoking these strikes is the high cost of living. The *Monthly Review* gives some interesting facts about war prices. It is stated that throughout Europe the first effect of the war was a sharp rise in prices, due to panic and uncertainty, which was followed within a fortnight by a drop, though not to the pre-bellum level. Thereafter, fluctuations in prices have occurred in most food products with a steady upward tendency. But, strange to say, potatoes and meat have shown a uniform low level. Flour, on the other hand, has undergone decided changes. In Russia, where the war shut off exportation to foreign markets, the price actually fell and has remained low ever since. But in Germany and Great Britain, the price of wheat-flour has increased steadily 34 per cent. in the former country and 33 per cent. in the latter. It must be borne in mind that all-important bread prices almost always follow those of wheat-flour. In Vienna the price increased 82 per cent., which caused starvation among the poor of the city and led to the troubles reported last winter.

England felt the rise in sugar prices most sharply. London imports the entire supply, and the price, resulting from the supply being cut off, rose 70 per cent. Candy is an expensive luxury in England today.

The latter country is handicapped considerably in its treatment of food prices during the war by the Government's strict policy hands-off. This policy is not pursued in the case of a dependence, however. In Egypt, a commission was appointed by the home government with power to fix maximum food prices.

Of course, Germany and Austria both prescribe maximum prices in the case of most foods, particularly of those for which these countries are dependent on others. All the countries of Europe have resorted to this arbitrary fixing of certain food prices, says the *Review*, except Great Britain and Sweden.

Russian Reactionaries in Favor of Peace

THE central organ of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, the *Social Democrat*, prints a most interesting account of conditions in Russia from a correspondent at Petrograd.

Not everyone in high Russian circles wants a "war to a finish." It is realized that the policy of "crushing Germany" may be dangerous to the vested interests, even if it is glorious. A memorandum is being circulated in the bureaucratic and financial circles of Petrograd pointing out that the "crushing" of Germany may lead to the downfall of the German monarchy, and with such an outcome of the war Russian autocracy would have no sympathy!

A speedy termination of the war is also urged on the ground that heavy casualties are occurring among the regular officers of the Russian army, and their places are being taken by men outside of the professional military circle who could not be relied upon to take any part in suppressing a revolution were it to occur! The Social Democrat states that the authorship of this remarkable manifesto is attributed to Maklakov (Minister of Home Affairs), Shtcheglovitov, (Minister of Justice) and the well-known reactionary Etishinsky, who is a member of the State Council. It is significant that similar ideas are being propagated by the organ of the "True Russians," the *Russkoe Znamie*. This is the organ of the "Black Hundreds," the anti-Semitic organization which has organized the massacres of Jews both before and after the present war.

Shortly before the meeting of the Duma on August 5th, however, the three reactionary ministers above mentioned were removed by the Czar, and the liberals were given a voice in the government.

Correspondence

The Use and Value of A Criterion

To the NEW REVIEW:

WHEN the organized Socialist movement of the world, the defunct second "International", formulated its position on war, it embodied an exception or qualification in the statement of its fundamental position. War in general was condemned and ascribed to the antagonisms of expanding national capitalistic units and as such implied no obligations for Socialists; but wars of invasion, armed attacks upon nations could be resisted by Socialists. It was permissible for them to join in the defense of a country of which they happened to be political citizens, if such a country was wantonly attacked by a foreign foe.

The war-socialists of every European country, whenever they have tried to justify their attitude, have invariably done so by a special and appropriate reference to the criterion embodied in the international resolution just referred to.

First came the Belgian party and its stand seems at first sight unassailable, although Germany—after admitting the moral wrong of the invasion in von Bethman Hollweg's speech in the Reichstag—later attempted a posteriori justification by publishing facsimiles of unimportant notes found in the archives of the General Staff in Brussels and which the Belgians themselves considered of so unimportant a routine character, that they never deemed it necessary to destroy these notes before leaving their capital. In the files of the war departments of every nation could probably be found reports of conversations between their staff-officers and the accredited military attachés of foreign nations on the the form of joint military action to dignify such routine business to the extent of expanding it into a formal alliance is altogether too far-fetched even for the proverbial cleverness of a German diplomat.

In my article on the "Future of Belgium" I have pointed out the real reasons which made the patriotic attitude of the Belgian party a tactical blunder from a proletarian point of view, invasion or no invasion.

France also claims to have been invaded and I am bound to state that in my opinion there is less ground for such a contention in her case than in that of Belgium.

When Austria was still handling the Serbian dispute with that reckless in-

tolerance which proves only too well that the murder at Serayevo was only being used as a pretext to start a conflagration whose real causes were more deep-seated and whose approximate date had been set regardless of the personal performances of archdukes and crownprinces, Hervé very judiciously remarked in *La Guerre Sociale* that the Franco-Russian alliance did not mean that France must back up Russia to the extent of willingly and knowingly facing the risks involved in the latter's propaganda of pan-slavism.

In the tragic hours which followed the declaration of war these very statesmanlike utterances were overlooked on account of the threatened invasion and in Jaurès' speech at the public demonstration which followed the meeting of the International Bureau in Brussels, a few hours before his death, there was to be found the first index of a revulsion of feeling among the Socialist parliamentarians of France, which was to swerve them from their various critical attitudes into a patriotic assumption of their country's defense against teutonic invasion.

Likewise in Germany: long before the war—Socialists joined in the "Gott strafe England" chorus, the leitmotiv, which caused the social-democrats to stultify themselves in defense of the capitalistic state, was the necessity of defending the national "Kultur" against the threatened onrush of the Slavic hordes.

Just as "Kraft-ideal" and "Kraft-politik", though fostered through different thought-channels, had become through the mere use of an identical designation, just so through a similar instance of the tyranny of words—anti-slavism became a common ground whereupon all classes and castes of the German population could meet with apparent agreement.

The "Junkers" hated in the Russian landowners their closest competitors upon their highly protected home-market. The industrial capitalists were panic-stricken at the idea of a slavdom assimilating the machine-process, ceasing to buy from them and even trying to undersell them with the complicity of millions upon millions of farm-laborers, unorganized and used to a low standard of living. And the Social-Democrats soon got the habit of making Russia as a whole instead of the autocracy their favorite "bete noire".

They claimed to hate the autocracy of capitalism everywhere, but sported a special dislike for it in Russia, partly on account of the connection of many of their leader with the Jewish race and then also a good deal more because—on account of the confusion between Russia and her rulers—labor-parliamentarians in the Reichstag would denounce the autocracy of the Slav empire without being called to order by the chair and even earn thereby the applause of other benches than the extreme left.

These are samples of the general and all around abuse of the criterion of invasion. In trying to justify their attitude political socialists have worked the criterion to death. They must now look for a substitute. Kautsky has undertaken to supply this new want in an article in the *Neue Zeit* and after discarding several criteria of his own making, he finally proposes the following dogma: Socialists must refuse their assistance to all wars, except when they are justified by the interests of the working class.

As a formula the new criterion sounds fairly attractive in its concision. But let us distrust this first impression. There may be a real danger lurking under the initial appearance.

If this formula had been in use before the present war, would it have changed the course of events? The same men who shouted invasion to justify their patriotic conduct would have emphatically asserted that the best interests of the working classes demanded the victory of their respective nations and—from a cold matter of fact point of view—there would have been a reasonable amount of truth in their contention.

To exist at all, capitalism must expand at any price. Therefore, certain representatives of international capitalism, speculators in staples for instance, will gladly advance the necessary funds to extend the machine-process to new territory, retaining the newly established industries as regular customers in the purchase of their raw material. With the first profits realized, the new capitalist becomes aware of the advantages of local financial autonomy, he wishes a complete economic independence, he feels that he ought to buy at the point of production and to discard the onerous obligations of the entrepot-theory. Supplying the same principle to his output he seeks to get all the advantages of his location as a point of distribution and figures on invading markets contiguous to his own home market.

At this stage and up to the moment where he enters with the competing

producers of other nations in a modus vivendi as to zones of influence and division of territory, his capitalistic production can be said in truth to be national. It harmonizes with that style of patriotism best defined as national individualism.

The newly proposed criterion seems then as a loophole for tactical mistakes to be hardly inferior to the now obsolete invasion theory whose place it was destined to take.

There is no doubt that any kind of an exception to the general rule that proletarians have in common, regardless of their nationality, material interests of a higher order, which should lead them to refusal to participate in any war; could not stand the test of criticism as to its value in facts or logics.

Every criterion would in due time become a loophole. Moreover there exists a strong probability that the real value of a criterion precisely resides in the chance it affords to political opportunists to sidestep their revolutionary duty in the presence of an overwrought capitalism.

A criterion seems then worse than valueless, because on a par with our famous constitutional liberties and natural rights, it was never intended to be used in any other than a negative way, viz, to galvanize every possible spark of indecision and cowardice and to destroy every constructive revolutionary effort along positive lines.

The proletariat wants no criterion whatsoever. If the International is to be restored it should be on the basis of an individual and unconditional refusal to participate in war.

The American Socialist Party, as the most important national group of a neutral country must enter the next International Congress to make a deliberate stand against nationalism and for the practical applications which a living internationalism and not an academic formula embodies.

Up till the present time it has been a constant practice in the American party to be guided by individual sympathies in the election of delegates to international congresses and to take a chance on those elected. The results of such a practice have proved disastrous. I have seen American delegates on the floor of the convention stampeded from one attitude into a diametrically opposed one under the influence of the crowd-psychology of the meeting. I have met delegates on their way home and confessing that they still had no opinion on policies of the highest importance which they had contributed to shape through the power of their votes. Such a procedure is,

to say the least, astonishing in a party where so much of efficiency has always been sacrificed to the maintenance of a clumsy and formal democracy. No other socialist party in the world would tolerate it for a moment.

The agenda of all international congress is published a long time in advance of the meeting with the very purpose to allow national groups to instruct their delegates and to vote on principles rather than for men.

The existing party-machinery, as it stands today, provides several means by which the opinion of the rank and file can be ascertained. Why not use them with such a purpose in view, in order that an instructed American delegation may take the initiative of rebuilding the third International upon a foundation of proletarian solidarity, unqualified by the subtle interpretation of catchy criteria and able to outlive the storms of capitalistic antagonisms.

Hubert Langerock

Astoria, Ore.

"Class Struggle" and "Class Consciousness"

To the NEW REVIEW:

MAY an obscure reader from the uttermost West second the motion, made in your issue of July 1st., by Mrs. Charles Edward Russell? I understand her motion to be that the Socialist Party discard those frazzled phrases, "Class Struggle" and "Class Consciousness".

I could add little to the arguments advanced by the maker of this motion. The demonstrations to the unprejudiced that all attempts to classify the whole of mankind into antagonistic classes is impossible of performance, and unwise, even if possible.

Certainly wage-earners often become property owners and many receive income from both property and their own labor simultaneously. What manner of Struggle, then, is this, where one may be on one side one week and on the other side the next week, or partly on both sides at the same time? What can be the effect on one's mind to be Conscious that he is at once a Capitalist and a Proletarian? Surely this might result in some diabolical, self-destroying internal struggle, more horrible even than the Class Struggle, in which all of us are supposedly engaged.

As one of the thousands who, we trust, second this motion at least in their hearts, let me explain that we readily admit that the interests of the employer are often in conflict with the employee. So too, they are often identical, as when the Railway Brotherhoods co-operate with their employers

and petition the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the raising of freight rates. How often are the barbers, boot-blacks, plumbers, etc., in league with their bosses as against the consumer, in the effort to uphold prices? On two or more occasions the Timberworkers Union has joined the wail of the shingle manufacturers for a duty on shingles. How can such conduct be squared with the incessant Class Struggle theory?

To use the expressions Class Struggle and Class Consciousness to designate the true conditions in society, is certainly to do violence to language. The continuous and unthinking use of these words by our membership is only another indication that most of our critical thought is directed pleasantly outward rather than distressingly inward. How Marx would grieve could he see what numbers of his confessed followers have become what he despitefully calls, 'phrase-mongers', bandying about the nrserly phrases so current in the infancy of socialist thought.

Yes, Mrs. Russell, we are glad to second your motion. Not because we have any hope of its presently passing, but because we wish to pay tribute to the intellectual honesty and fearlessness that prompted you to make it. We hope it is an indication that Socialist thought is to become less narrowly orthodox, more critical and therefore more liberal. Glenn H. Hoover.

Seattle, Wash.

Intercollegiate Socialist Society

THE Intercollegiate Socialist Society is planning a Labor Day Conference, to be held on *Saturday, Sunday and Monday, September 4th, 5th and 6th*, at Hampton Falls, New Hampshire (55 miles from Boston on the Boston and Maine Railroad or by trolley).

This Conference will consider the relation of Socialism to Peace, and will also deal, among other things, with the fundamentals of Socialism, the ethical phases of Socialism and the Socialist remedy for unemployment. Among those who will take part in the Conference are: John Spargo, Prof. Vida D. Scudder, William English Walling, Prof. Ellen Hayes, Charles Zueblin, Mrs. Agnes Warbasse, Mrs. Charlotte Gilman, James Mackaye, Senator La Fontaine of Belgium, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Rose Pastor Stokes, Jessie W. Hughan and Juliet S. Poyntz.

Those planning to attend the Conference should notify *Miss Louise Adams Grout, 154 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.*, as soon as possible.

From Across the Pacific

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

W. ANDRADE.

Australia.

Sample Copies

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

Ask For Them

If you like PEARSON'S MAGAZINE

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

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

AND SEE; then subscribe through us—

HERE'S A BARGAIN

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

3.00

OUR PRICE - \$2.00

Secured, \$176 for the \$350 Fund

In answer to our appeal, the friends of the NEW REVIEW have contributed \$176 to the \$350 we must raise by September 15 th.

The money has been sent in either as donations, ranging from \$1.00 to \$25 or by buying pre-paid subscription cards.

The great asset of the NEW REVIEW, in times of crisis is the personal interest of its readers.

One more call we must make, and if the response is general it should be the last.

The new form has helped us tremendously, but not enough to avoid the usual summer depression—although the depression this year is fully 50% less than last year.

This fund can be raised easily by outright donations or purchasing pre-paid subscription cards.

Will you do your share?

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
General Manager.

Address: New Review, 256 Broadway, New York City

AN OPPORTUNITY---

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

PROPOSED ITINERARY

Stamford, Conn.; Boston, Mass.; Lawrence, Mass.; Salem, Mass.; Trenton, N. J.; Altoona, Pa.; Erie, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Toledo, O.; Cincinnati, O.; Chicago, Ill.; Peoria, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Des Moines, Ia.; Sioux City, Ia.; Omaha, Neb.; Minneapolis, Minn.; St. Paul, Minn.; Winnipeg, Man.; Denver, Colo.; Portland, Ore.; San Francisco, Cal.; Los Angeles, Cal.

LECTURE SUBJECTS

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

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

New Review Lecture Bureau, 256 Broadway, New York City

DR. HOURWICH AND HIS CAREER

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

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

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

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

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