

June
First

New Review

Ten
Cents

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. III. 10c a copy Published on the first and fifteenth of the month. \$1.50 a Year No. 7

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
THE GREAT ILLUSIONS.....	49	A WORKER'S INDUSTRIAL OUTLOOK.....	61
William English Walling.		Justus Ebert.	
CURRENT AFFAIRS	51	A WARNING TO THE MIDDLE-AGED.....	62
L. B. Boudin.		Elsie Clews Parsons.	
"WORLD DOMINION OR DOWNFALL".....	53	BOOK REVIEWS	64
Louis C. Fraina.		BIRTH CONTROL; BOURGEOIS PACIFISM.	
THE INSIDE OF A PRISON.....	55	A SOCIALIST DIGEST.....	65
Frank Tannenbaum.		SOCIALIST IMPERIALISM; A DUTCH SOCIALIST LEADER ON SOCIALISM	
THE RULES OF NAVAL WARFARE.....	57	AND THE WAR; FRENCH SOCIALISTS AND THE GERMAN PEACE TERMS;	
Isaac A. Hourwich.		A SOCIALIST DEFEAT; AMERICAN SOCIALIST PRESS AND THE LUSITANIA AFFAIR.	
THE SINKING OF THE LUSITANIA.....	58	CORRESPONDENCE	70
A SYMPOSIUM: EUGENE V. DEBS; ROBERT H. LOWIE; JOSEPH MICHAEL;		From Thomas C. Hall; Henry Hazlitt.	
WM. E. BOHN; GUSTAVUS MYERS; ROSE PASTOR STOKES; WM. J.			
ROBINSON, M. D.; HELEN MAROT.			

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

The Great Illusions

By William English Walling

POSSIBLY we shall learn nothing from the war; at the present moment it looks that way. For all the world, including Socialists, seem to be divided between militarists and pacifists. By pacifism I mean of course the movement Socialists have attacked for fifty years—up to the present war—under the name of "bourgeois pacifism," the idea that disarmament, the Hague Tribunal, and similar devices could put an end to militarism and war.

In one sense of course every internationalist, whether Socialist or Democrat, is a pacifist. Every internationalist is opposed to war. But from the days of Marx and before, up to the present time, all Socialists have been prepared for certain war-producing contingencies which can be abolished neither by calling them "illusions," as Norman Angell has done, nor by any other phrases or exorcisms. Nor can the economic causes of national conflict be avoided by disarmament, Hague tribunals, international police, or abolition of secret diplomacy, as proposed by the Women's Peace Party, the British League of Democratic Control, the Independent Labor Party, etc. In a word, no measure dealing with military affairs or with mere political forms can *in the long run* have any effect whatever—as long as the present conflict of economic interests between the nations remains. The whole effort of the bourgeois pacifist from the Socialist standpoint is to attempt—in spite of the horrible and tremendous lessons of the present war—to close our eyes

resolutely to the great task that lies before us, namely, to find a way either in the near future or ultimately, to bring the conflict of national economic interests to an end.

There are two economic forces in the world which can not be conjured away either by words, by mere political rearrangements, or by any action whatever with regard to arms—whether making for more armament or less armament. There is no power at present which can prevent a great independent nation like Russia or Japan, Germany or Austria, where the political conditions are in whole or in part those of the eighteenth century, from declaring wars of conquest either against helpless, backward or small countries, or against the economically more advanced and more democratic countries like England, France, or the United States. It is true that industrial capitalism now preponderates in Germany, but no German publicist has ever denied the tremendous influence of the landlord nobility, both over the government and over the economic and political structure of German society. It is true also that these great agricultural estates are partially operated under capitalistic conditions, but the position of agricultural labor throughout enormous districts of Prussia is certainly semi-feudal. This is equally true of Austria, and the landlord nobility is perhaps even more predominant in Hungary than in Prussia.

The second fact which can not be conjured away by phrases or mere political rearrangements is

that—under the present system of society—there is a direct conflict of interests between all nations, even the most civilized. This is why Norman Angell, in his new book (*Arms and Industry*), is at such great pains to deny that nations are economic units and “competing business firms.” His denial is futile.

Even under individualistic capitalism all elements of the capitalist class have a greater or less interest in the business of the nation to which they belong; under the State Socialist policy, which is spreading everywhere, this community of interests is still closer. Moreover, under State Socialism even the working classes gain a share (of course, a small one) of whatever profits accrue from the successful competition of one’s own nation with other nations, and especially from such competition in its aggressive form, “imperialism.”

Socialists have sometimes denied that the economic interests of the working people of the various nations conflict.

Otto Bauer, of Austria, the world’s leading Socialist authority on imperialism—who was to report on the subject for the International Socialist Congress to have been held in Vienna last summer—is of the contrary opinion. He believes that one of the worst features of the present system is that, under capitalism, the immediate economic interests of the working people of the various nations *do* conflict.

Only in so far as the working people attach greater importance to attaining Socialism than to anything they can gain under the present society, are their interests in all nations the same. In so far as the working people aim at an improvement of their condition *this side of Socialism* their economic interests are often in conflict.

Moreover, State Socialism, political democracy, and social reform, since they tend to give the working people a slightly greater share in the prosperity of each nation, intensify the workers’ nationalism and aggravate the conflict of immediate economic interests. This is why all the labor union parties of the world are tending in the same direction as that in which the German Party has been so clearly headed since the war—a tendency very clearly formulated by *Vorwaerts* when it recently asked whether the German Party was not becoming a “nationalistic social reform labor party.”

The bourgeois pacifists consider war to be the “great illusion.” In favoring war, under any conditions, they say, the capitalists, the middle classes, and the working classes are all mistaken. The only people that gain are the officers of armies and navies, and armament manufacturers. It is needless for Socialists—believers in the economic interpretation of politics—to point out that such a conclusion can only be reached by an abandonment of the economic point of view.

In the opinion of internationalists, war can be abolished neither by armament or disarmament, nor by any measures leading in either direction. War can be abolished only by abolishing the causes of war, which every practical man admits are economic. By strengthening already existing and natural economic tendencies which are slowly bringing the nations together, the causes of war may be gradually done away with.

The outlook therefore is very hopeful—provided the intelligent (if selfish) ruling classes of the great capitalistic nations (England, France, America) decide once and for all to place no hopes either on militarism or pacifism. These natural economic tendencies indeed would already have made war impossible if they had not been impeded by artificial obstacles, such as tariff walls, immigration restriction, financial concessions to favored nations, etc.

Socialists relied upon natural economic forces to abolish competition, establish the trusts, bring about government ownership, and prepare the way for democratic ownership. They rely upon similar economic forces to bring the nations together; reciprocal lowering of tariffs, the common development of the backward countries by the leading nations, the neutralization of canals—and last but not least, the modernization of Russia, Japan, Prussia, and Austria, that is, the full establishment in these countries of industrial capitalism and the semi-democratic political institutions that accompany it—as we see them in Great Britain, France, and America.

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

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

ALEXANDER FRASER JULIUS HEIMAN LOUIS C. FRAINA
President Treasurer Secretary

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

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

Current Affairs

By L. B. Boudin

The Lusitania and Patriotism

THE sinking of the *Lusitania* has let loose the hell-hounds of war in this country. Our "moral indignation" over the "brutal and wanton destruction of so many innocent lives" has reached a very high pitch. And so has our patriotic fervor. So much so that we are ready and willing to sacrifice many more innocent lives, perhaps a hundred or a thousand-fold, in an effort to avenge this "dastardly crime" against our citizens.

I am not among those who sneer at this well-nigh universal outburst of indignation as a sham, designed to cover the machinations of some clique of high financiers or armament manufacturers who see in war a chance to enrich themselves at the expense of the lives and well-being of their countrymen. Not that there are not any such, either in this country or elsewhere. But the universal outcry of horror which followed the sinking of the *Lusitania* had about it that true ring of spontaneity which cannot be mistaken,—a ring of genuineness of feeling and immediacy of reaction which could not possibly result from artificial stimulants.

Nor am I among those who justify or excuse the action of Germany. Murder is murder,—no matter what the excuse. And while it is true that all war is murder, the edge of "moral turpitude" is taken out of murder committed in "legitimate" warfare by the fact that the combatants are supposed to be on an equal footing, and playing the game according to rules which prevent the taking of mean advantage by one combatant against the other when the basis of equality has disappeared. Hence the rules, universally recognized, against the maltreatment of prisoners and non-combatants. These rules Germany has undoubtedly violated in the *Lusitania* case. This was not an act of war, but cold-blooded murder, wholesale slaughter of non-combatants, with all the moral turpitude that that implies.

And yet this agitation over the *Lusitania* affair only serves to expose in its entire nakedness the shame of our patriotic code of morals. For it is not the brutal murder committed by Germany, in itself, that has stirred us up so much. Nor her breach of international law. She has done both before and on a vaster scale, in her invasion of Belgium. And yet we did not think of going to war about it. And even now it is not the wanton destruction of twelve hundred innocent lives that is to bring us into war, but the killing of the *one hundred American citizens among them*. One does not need to condone Germany's act in order to recoil from the horror of a war fought for such a reason. An ethical code which

makes the moral indignation over murder, and the willingness to make sacrifices in order to prevent it, depend on the citizenship of the victim is utterly abhorrent to any real sense of justice. The working class should have none of it. The working class of this country might be ready to go to war for a just cause. But the cause in which they are now asked to enlist is essentially unjust. It is based on the same foundations which underlie Germany's inhuman act which we are asked to avenge,—*national selfishness, mis-called patriotism*.

War Atrocities

THE Bryce Commission on German atrocities in Belgium has rendered its report. This calls to mind the fact that there are all sorts of reports on atrocities, as was to be expected; for there are other nations at war besides Germany, and other invasions besides that of Belgium. So we have been constantly receiving reports of atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Russians in East Prussia and elsewhere. And the other day Mr. George Macaulay Trevelyan reported on Austrian atrocities in Serbia. In fact, the air is full of atrocity charges, which follow every invading army like a shadow.

There is no doubt that most of these reports are gross exaggerations. Some are pure inventions. But even after allowing for exaggerations, intentional and unintentional, there is still enough left to form a story of cruelty so revolting as to make one ask in amazement: How is it possible that civilized human beings, brought up in peaceful towns and villages, should behave in such utterly inhuman way? Of course, the ordinary atrocities reporter has his simple answer: The particular nation whose atrocities he reports is not composed of civilized human beings, but of "barbarians," beasts, and fiends in human shape and garb. But how can the impartial observer account for these things? How account for the fact that the Germans whom we know to be a highly civilized people, earnest, good-humored, and not over-excitabile, should be guilty of unspeakable cruelty? And yet, the German atrocities in Belgium at least are well authenticated in the main.

This raises the general question: Has so-called "civilization" anything to do with the manner in which war is conducted? It is generally assumed that with "the progress of civilization" the manners of war have been softened, and unnecessary cruelties done away with. And each nation usually claims for itself the honor of having abolished, or attempted to abolish, this or that "survival of barbarism" in the conduct of war. An examination of the history of modern warfare will show, however, that these assumptions and claims are absolutely without foundation.

It is true that changes have occurred from time to time in the modes of warfare, affecting among

other things the degree of cruelty with which war is conducted. But these changes were not along any uniform line, and there was no constant tendency to progressively diminish the cruelties of war. Nor did whatever lessening of cruelties there has occurred have any visible relation to any "humanizing" tendencies of our civilization. And there is no particular credit due to any one nation for any particular effort in behalf of humanitarianism in war. The fact is that methods of warfare, including the "humanity" or "inhumanity" thereof, are closely allied with the economic and social conditions of the warring nations, and the special needs, real or imaginary, of the particular occasion.

There can be no doubt of the fact that the present war has been conducted with a most unexampled cruelty on all sides. This, strangely enough, is due to the democratic nature of modern warfare,—to the fact that a great modern war cannot be conducted by any government without the active and enthusiastic participation of the entire people. But this enthusiastic participation of the great masses of the people can only be secured by inflaming their passions, particularly the passions of hatred, to the highest pitch,—a process in which the picturing of the enemy-people as fiends in human shape, capable of and actually committing all sorts of atrocities, plays a very important part. It is significant that the German people, who are supposed to be most enthusiastic for the war, have been fed from the very beginning with an outrageous assortment of faked-up atrocity-stories,—atrocities supposed to have been committed by Belgians upon German soldiers. Also with such literary production as the "Song of Hate."

The atrocities in Belgium were the natural consequence. Or, rather, this made these atrocities possible. For a careful examination of the Bryce report and other data at hand shows that the German soldiers acted "under orders" when committing most of the outrages which can be laid at their door. These orders were dictated by "military necessity" as understood by the military clique now dominant in Berlin. It seems that this clique became possessed with the insane idea that a nation, nay, the entire world, can be terrorized into submission. Hence the terroristic methods which have characterized the German mode of warfare in the present war. The carrying out of this terroristic policy in the field was made possible partly by the methods of inflaming the public mind already referred to and partly by a correlated policy of terrorism at home.

Atrocities and the Duty of Socialists

TO us Socialists, the subject of war atrocities presents a peculiarly knotty problem for solution. On the one hand it is, of course, utterly impossible for us to condone or overlook them when their commission is established. The excuse of so-called

"military necessity" cannot possibly be entertained by us for a moment. It is therefore clear that we must condemn them and protest against them as vigorously as we possibly can. When we happen to belong to the nation which is committing the atrocities, or about to commit them, the performance of our duty is therefore very simple—although not always easy. It is this duty which our valiant comrades Ledebour and Liebknecht have recently performed when they protested in the German Reichstag against the threat of the German General Staff to burn *three* Russian villages for every village the Russians shall have burnt in East Prussia.

But how are we to proceed if we belong to a nation against whom the outrages have been committed, or to a neutral nation? How protest against the atrocities without fanning the flame of hatred among nations? And how shall we treat the many reports of outrages of the authenticity of which we have no absolute proof?

These are questions which it is not always easy to answer. And it is particularly hard to lay down general rules in such matters. An ounce of good Socialist instinct will in such cases do more good than a pound of precept. And yet in some respect our duty seems to be so clear that it could not be changed by the particular conditions of any case, and may therefore be regarded as general rules of conduct to be observed at all times.

So are we in duty bound to remind the people again and again that many, if not most, atrocity-stories are pure fabrications—due some times to malice and some times to hysteria. This includes the stories of so-called *eye-witnesses*. One could fill a book with instances of fake atrocity-stories told by "eye-witnesses" under circumstances which apparently excluded any possibility of error or any motive for lying. But false they were nevertheless.

Another thing that we must keep constantly before the people is the fact that certain outrages are inseparable from war. Such are, for instance, sexual excesses. The soldiers of all nations are equally guilty of them under similar circumstances. When the army is stationed at home or in a friendly country the phenomenon takes the harmless or even patriotic form of "war babies." With an invading army it assumes the serious aspect of "outrages on womanhood."

And, last but not least, we must never forget, nor permit others to forget, that in most outrages actually committed, the common soldiers, the arms-bearing portion of the masses of the "guilty nation," are as much victims of a cruel system as are the people against whom the outrages are committed. Our indignation, and whatever action is prompted thereby, must therefore be directed not against the nation, but against the system, and the government or class which stands back of it and is responsible for it.

"World Dominion or Downfall"

By Louis C. Fraina

THE issues of the Great War are being defined by the decision of events. The complex causes of the war, its swift precipitation and multiplicity of issues involved, combined to obscure the central issue at stake. As events moved this issue emerged and clarified itself; the initial intentions of either side were not the determinant factor.

Whatever Germany may claim to be fighting for, it is now clear in the light of recent events that Germany's stake in the war is *world dominion or downfall*.

It was within the choice of Germany, as the aggressor nation and the most powerful military group, to decide what the central issue was to be. At the outset of the war, the military superiority of Germany determined the scope of the military operations; and its subsequent actions determined the central issue at stake.

Not that the decision of Germany was necessarily conscious or pre-determined. The defensive France of the Revolution developed into the aggressive France of Napoleon solely through the action of events. The Napoleonic wars started as a defensive offensive, as a colossal effort to defend France by crushing its enemies on their own soil. Events transformed the defensive offensive into an aggressive offensive, and Napoleon and France were soon fighting for the hegemony of Europe.

It may be perfectly true that Germany assumed the offensive as the best means of defending itself; so did revolutionary France. But the situation created thereby has developed forces and a momentum of its own, becoming the controlling factor. Whatever the motives of Germany, the logic of events demonstrates that in determining the general strategy of the war it determined the immediate issue for itself—the *hegemony of Europe*.

In German parlance, "military necessity" has an ultimate as well as an immediate meaning. In a nation in which militarism is the supreme arbiter and war a conscious instrument of imperial policy, "military necessity" is generally identical with "political necessity." There was probably a well-defined though latent purpose to conquer Belgium, a purpose that asserted itself at the psychological moment and combined with immediate "military necessity" to dictate the unprovoked and brutal invasion of Belgium.¹

¹ Paul Vergnet, in *France in Danger*, quotes the following words of Daniel Frymann:

"It is impossible to abandon the mouth of the Rhine to Anglo-French domination or influence, for it is contrary to nature that Germany should not possess the outlet to the sea of her most important way of communication. It is impossible to leave the coast of the North Sea in the hands of these States (France and England). It is impossible to tolerate little States on our north-west frontiers, which give no guarantee against violations of neutrality on the part of England and France, and which, on

Assuming the offensive against France is another fact which proves the aggressive purposes of the German government. Germany defending itself on the Rhine frontier would have been impregnable, inexpugnable, particularly in view of the enormous power of the defensive in modern warfare. Its offensive against France was dictated by other than purely military considerations—by considerations of a general policy to crush France as a prelude to the domination of Europe.

General Bernhardi, in *Germany and the Next War*, shows clearly that the "military necessity" for assuming the offensive against France lay in the German desire to dispose of France as a competing power in Europe:

"In one way or another we must square our account with France if we wish for a free hand in our international policy. This is the first and foremost condition of a sound German policy, and since the hostility of France once for all cannot be removed by peaceful overtures, the matter must be settled by force of arms. France must be so completely crushed that she can never again come across our path."

And Bernhardi emphasizes his conclusion that Germany must "annihilate once for all the French position as a Great Power."

It is perfectly clear that the campaign Germany decided upon at the outset of the war implied the conquest of Belgium and the permanent crushing of France, that is to say, the hegemony of Europe. An early victory would not have meant world-dominion. Bernhardi's famous diagnosis of the stake involved in Germany's next war, "World dominion or downfall," was not true during the early stages of the war. But it has become true since; and whatever Germany's conscious aims may be, *recent events demonstrate that Germany is now fighting for world stakes, and that a German victory would mean German world dominion*.

The significance of the torpedoing of the *Lusitania*

the contrary, would gladly afford supporting points to our enemies. Hence we must insist that as soon as opposition between Germany and France or England leads to warlike complications, Belgium and Holland must be called upon to choose between those States and the German Empire."

This may be the opinion of a minority, but it is a minority that becomes dominant in times of war. (There was no immediate "military necessity" for the invasion of Holland; but it is indisputable that, Belgium conquered and retained, Holland would not long remain an independent nation. It is now openly being stated in Germany that at the end of the war Holland must be compelled to join the *Zollverein*).

The economic need for the conquest of Belgium was recently expressed by the *Kölnische Zeitung*, which counts so confidently on a permanent occupation of Belgium by Germany that it suggests the building of a canal from the Rhine at Düsseldorf to Antwerp and Zeebrugge:

"Only a German opening to the Rhine can rectify the mischances of nature and history which have placed the seacoast so far from our coal mines and frontiers. From the German Rhine through German territory to the German Sea, that is what we have to aim at in building a canal from the Rhine to the sea.

"It is this direct communication with the interior of Germany which would save so much expense, time, and labor in the transport of our coal and goods, and which would free our import trade from being handled in English and other seaports, and thus save us all that intermediate trade and the expense of loading and harbor dues."

is obscured by humanitarian cant, German metaphysical dishonesty and callous sentimentalism, and the emphasis on rules of war and international law. All these are minor considerations. It is perfectly true that the torpedoing of the *Lusitania* was a crime against civilization, a brutal expression of a systematic campaign of terrorism, a violation of international law. But the significance of an event historically cannot be measured legally or ethically. *The torpedoing of the Lusitania was a poignant emphasis, a final proof of what Germany's campaign against neutral ships had already made clear: Germany has declared war upon the world.*

It is true that the German may justly interject: "Not at all; it is the world that has been fighting Germany."

But discussion of priority and justification does not at all impair the fact that Germany *is* fighting the world and that the stake for Germany is now world dominion or downfall.²

Germany stands condemned at the bar of international opinion. It stands condemned because of its invasion of neutral rights, its violations of international law, its cynical philosophy of the omnipotence of the sword. It stands condemned—and this is the greatest count in the indictment against Germany—because the world feels itself menaced by a victory of the German sword.

This is a war of economics. The economic resources of the world are at the service of the Allies. The military superiority of Germany has been demonstrated, its defeat must be consummated by the economic superiority of the Allies, and all the world is contributing to that end. In this sense, the neutral nations are fighting Germany as much as the Allies, and ultimately perhaps just as effectively. It *is* a world war.

The whole world, accordingly, is morally and economically arrayed against Germany; and should victory perch upon its banners Germany may justly claim having beaten the world. Under these circumstances victory would mean world dominion for Germany and make the German sword the arbiter of world events.

The consequences of German victory would have incalculable and calamitous consequences. German world dominion must necessarily be aggressive, and not essentially pacific as that of Great Britain. The Empire of Great Britain has been consummated, and it is now solely a question of conserving the Empire. Germany, on the contrary, would have to carve out its empire, which would obviously imply aggression. The threat to the peace of the world is clear, and menacing.

² There is no claim here that the German nation desired world dominion or would have invited war to secure it. This aspiration, articulate and aggressive as it was, was the aspiration of a small group. It was a latent aspiration that could assert itself and control events only in a favorable situation. The ultimate purposes of belligerents are seldom conscious at the outset; they depend upon events, become conscious and well-defined by the action of events. And there is no denying that the situation Germany is now in favors the elements aspiring after the feudal dream of universal empire.

The impossibility of permanent German world dominion—the fact that in this age economics are ultimately more powerful than the sword—does not alter the fact that the temporary dominion of Germany would threaten the peace and security of the world. German victory would be a prelude to another world war.

An international situation dominated by the threat of war would retard the normal development of international economics. It would emphasize the national phase of Capitalism, modify and soften class divisions, and produce a new series of international military antagonisms. In spite of Capitalism's use of militarism as an instrument, militarism is not an indispensable and normal phase of Capitalism. Germany's victory would impose a new and mightier militarism upon the world, drain its economic and political resources and crush its libertarian aspirations. The economic consequences alone would be enormously disastrous. Germany would levy economic tribute upon other nations, retard their economic growth in order to aggrandize its own national Capitalism.

The cultural dangers are just as acute as the economic. German militarism, unlike the militarism of other nations (Japan possibly excepted) is not alone an instrument of war: it is a philosophy, a method of government, a system of civilization. It means the crushing of the individual, the military regimentation of man, the apotheosis of the material and the mass. Culturally, the Great War may be said to be the contest of two conceptions of civilization—the human and the physical, the spiritual and the material, the individualist and the militarist. The Allies are the unconscious and imperfect representatives of the one, Germany the conscious and perfect representative of the other.

The neutral nations cannot allow, must not allow Germany to win. Germany must be beaten if it takes the whole world to do it. The internal system of Germany became an international problem as soon as "Germanism" crossed its own frontiers and threatened other nations. The war became a concern of the whole world as soon as the situation showed that Germany's stake was world dominion. Accordingly, the neutral nations must "be in" on the terms of peace; they must organize to demand a hearing at the congress that will settle the issues of the war. The Allies, the rancor and hatred of battle still strong within them, may subordinate the larger international issues to aggrandizement and the humiliation of Germany. This would be a calamity, which the neutral nations can avert. The democratic interests of the world must dictate the terms of peace, not the interests of the Allies alone,—terms of peace, that must carry guarantees of future peace and security.

Germany's foreign policy is part and parcel of her home policy—as was the foreign policy of the third

Napoleon. In a letter to Marx during the early part of Franco-Prussian War, Engels gives the reasons for desiring the defeat of France:

"If Germany is defeated by Napoleon, Bonapartism is then established for many years to come, and Germany may be bankrupt for a generation. It will then be useless to talk about an independent German labor movement, for the struggle for national existence will then consume all energy, and at best the German workers will drag on behind the French. On the other hand, if Germany wins, then Bonapartism is, at any rate, finished, and the everlasting talk about the union of Germany will come to an end, as it will be accomplished.

"The German workers can then organize themselves on a much more rational basis than they could before; and no matter what kind of government France gets, the French workers will, at any rate, get more freedom than under Bonapartism. . . . Napoleon could not have made this war except for the chauvinism that rules the great mass of the French people, including the workers, especially those occupied in the building trades in the great cities that have come under the influence of Bonaparte. Until this chauvinism gets a sound ducking,

peace between Germany and France is impossible. We could have expected that a proletarian revolution would have undertaken this work; but now that we have the war, the Germans will have to do it, and that as quickly as possible."³

The Napoleon the Third of contemporary Europe is Wilhelm the Second of Germany. The reasons Engels urged for the defeat of Bonapartism may be urged in greater measure for the defeat of Kaiserism. "Downfall" does not mean the downfall of Germany as a nation or a people. It means the downfall of Kaiserism, militarism and Junkerism—the downfall of German Empire but not of German nationality. "Germany could not have made this war except for the chauvinism that rules the great mass of the German people, including the workers. Until this chauvinism gets a sound ducking peace between Germany and France, and peace in the world, is impossible. We could have expected that a proletarian revolution would have undertaken this work; but now that we have war, the Allies will have to it, and that as quickly as possible."

³ Quoted by Gustav Bang, in "Marx' and Engels' Forty Years' Correspondence," *International Socialist Review*, February, 1915.

The Inside of a Prison

By Frank Tannenbaum

I HAVE just come out of prison. In prison human beings, men like you and I, with our instincts, ideals, hopes, and dreams, are subjected to barbarous treatment devised for the purpose of destroying all that is good and beautiful in man.

Many a time while working in the shop or quarry I would watch my companions assemble in little groups and snatch a song in whispered voice so that the keeper could not hear, their hard and dejected faces mellowing to the tune of the song. Listening to their talk about themselves, their lives and the causes of their being in prison, I would ask myself: Why are these men here? They are not essentially different from the men I know outside. Why are they the accursed of society? Why are they subjected to this inhuman treatment? And I found it hard to give an adequate answer. I could not get the answer from them; for such answer as they might give me would be only half the truth.

These criminals, pickpockets, burglars and forgers are good and bad as occasion demands. In fact, I think they were as a whole better than the men outside: I mean that they were more social in their relations to each other. They were far more generous and self-sacrificing and usually very intelligent. My personal experiences are eloquent of this.

On the first day of my actual confinement on

Blackwell's Island I was approached by one of the boys, a stranger to me, and asked if I wanted to communicate with my friends. Of course I did. He supplied me with paper, stamps and envelopes for two letters and sent them out for me. At that time I took the thing for granted because I knew nothing of the prison discipline and the consequence such an act might hold for my benefactor. But I soon learned through experience that what he had done laid him open to severe and brutal punishment, such as few of my friends on the outside would risk. If he had been caught while rendering me that service he would have been placed in the cooler for at least ten days, where he would have been kept on a small slice of bread and some water, forced to sleep on the hard stone floor. He would have lost six weeks' privileges—for six weeks he would not have been able to write to his friends, receive mail or visitors, or have any of the privileges which the prisoners enjoy, and they are not many. He would have lost from ten to thirty days good time; that is to say, at the end of his term he would have been forced to do ten to thirty days more before being released.

When I was in the cooler I saw an exhibition of social feeling which has gone a long way toward strengthening my faith in the intrinsic goodness of the human being. The men in the cooler at that time were given a slice of bread in the morning

which had to last them twenty-four hours, as the keeper came around only once a day each morning. There was a general practice among the men that he who was being taken out of the cooler that morning would give his slice of bread to one of the boys staying in. This means that a man who had lived for eight, ten or more days on a single slice of bread each day, deprived himself of that the morning he was going out because he would enjoy a meal about half past twelve. If you have ever starved for days and then given away your portion while hungry because you would eat some time later in the day, you will understand why I say the boys in jail are social.

One day while one of the boys was standing against the wall prior to being punished the tier-man (himself a prisoner) smuggled a hot cup of coffee to him. It was the first nourishment the boy had had that day, for it is a rule of the jail that the man against the wall be given nothing, not even the slice of bread he gets in the cooler. The tier-man was caught by one of the keepers.

"What are you giving him?"

"What do you suppose I'm giving him?" countered the tier-man. "Something to drink."

"You know that's against the rules."

"What do I care? You think I'm going to have a man standing in front of me without anything to eat or drink all day?"

"You think you're smart. I'll show you," snarled the keeper.

The next morning the tier-man was left in the cell without being given breakfast. The keeper came by and leered at him. Jack, the tier-man, was a husky lad of about twenty-four, a leader among the prisoners, and of one of the New York gangs. Jack wasn't easily cowed; he shook his clenched fist at the keeper, and said:

"You dirty ————! You think you're big, don't you? Just let me out and if I can't beat your head off as I am and you with your gun and club, I'm willing to die right now. And if I ever run across you outside I'll send you to hell where you belong."

Jack wasn't all hard. A few days after I had arrived and been put to work in the brush-shop, he came over to me and said:

"Frank, I'm your friend. Shake!"

I shook hands and asked just what he meant.

"Well, you know you are in jail and there's no saying what may happen. If any one bothers you, they bother me, see?" And all through my term it was known that Jack was my friend.

No impression of my prison experiences stands out so vividly and so full of horror as the one I went through on the first day when being measured and photographed for the prison records. After the preliminary taking of my name and the cropping of the hair, I was taken down to a small room with the other boys. This is the photographer's room.

I was told to undress to the waist, take off my shoes and stockings, and seat myself in the chair. Then the man in charge came over with an iron instrument and jammed it upon my head. He then proceeded to measure and weigh me in a manner so absolutely impersonal, so brutal in its indifference, that all of my antagonistic and uncompromising spirit which had carried me through till then snapped and broke.

The thing most valuable about the human being is his self-respect, his consciousness of being something and of having personal value: upon this depends the interpretation which he will give to all social acts. And it is just this that the jail destroys in its inmates. The first shock that I received from being treated impersonally took me hours to recover from. This process is continuous and everlasting. The men are deprived of all individual identity, of all personal characteristic. The equality of the slave is the ruling note. There are no good, no bad, no high, no low, no rich and no poor: all the distinctive features of blame or praise which constitute so powerful a factor in one's life outside the jail have no existence in it. This leveling begins with the physical appearance of the inmates. All wear the same suits, dress the same, live the same, eat the same. From the physical it extends itself into the spiritual and moral aspects of prison life.

In the year I was in jail I saw hundreds of different men come into the institution, different from each other in their intellectual training and moral outlook upon life; and I saw these same men gradually succumb to the influence of the jail, lose their individuality, and assume all the aspects of the habitual criminal. The lawyer and the doctor, the business man and the burglar, would become so mixed and alike that an outsider would take the burglar and the "rough neck" for the lawyer and doctor, and sometimes he would be right in doing so.

I know of one instance, a doctor, a man who had seen twenty years medical service in the state department of health, and was sentenced to six months for malfeasance in office. When he arrived he stood upon his dignity and tried to act as if he were something above the men with whom he was doing time. But as the days passed into weeks and the weeks into months, he gradually lost his "superior" bearing and got down to the level of the lowest. I sometimes was inclined to think lower still.

This man used to argue with me a good deal, and his conversation was as lewd and filthy as the rest of the men; and it was even more repulsive, being a new characteristic with him. He continually insisted that his prison companions were the "scum of society."

In exasperation one day I answered:

"We are so mixed here that I find it hard to differentiate and I hate to see you or any one else set yourself up above the rest of the men."

The Rules of Naval Warfare

By Isaac A. Hourwich

IT is within the range of possibility that at the time when this article will reach the reader, the United States may be at war with Germany. The President's note charges Germany with a violation of "the rules of naval warfare" and commands her to desist from the use of the submarine against enemy merchant vessels, on the ground that it jeopardizes the lives of non-combatants. Of course, if the prime object of Germany in waging war upon the Allies were to advance the Christian doctrine of non-resistance to evil, she would have permitted British ships to obtain ammunition with which to kill her soldiers, rather than let her submarines endanger the lives of non-combatants. Inasmuch, however, as our Government justifies its ultimatum to Germany by the principles of International Law, I shall confine myself to the legal issues involved in the Lusitania incident.

Unquestionably, the Lusitania case is without precedent in International Law. Heretofore, whenever an enemy ship was destroyed, its passengers were first taken aboard by the captor. All these precedents, however, belong to the time preceding the invention of the submarine. The question at issue is, whether this newest engine of destruction shall be discarded in obedience to precedents of International Law, or International Law should adapt itself to the working of the submarine.

Every technical improvement under Capitalism has been attended by increased danger to life and limb. To object to improved man-killing machinery on the ground that it endangers human life is Quixotic. Professor Kirchwey, of the Columbia University Law School, suggests, on the other hand, that the United States Government could easily safeguard the lives of non-combatants by the enactment of a simple rule prohibiting passenger ships to carry munitions of war for belligerents, which would be in harmony with the spirit of the existing regulations prohibiting "the carriage on passenger vessels of dangerous articles."¹ Such a rule would interfere neither with the right of American citizens to travel on ships of belligerent nations, nor with the business of carrying contraband of war. In the absence of such an inhibition, however, the law applicable to the Lusitania case must be ascertained by the construction of the accepted rules of warfare.

The general law of war is laid down by Wheaton, an American and English authority on International Law, in the following broad proposition: "The belligerent has, strictly speaking, a right to use every

means necessary to accomplish the end for which he has taken up arms."² There is, however, an important restriction attached to this rule, viz.: that non-combatants are "not to be injured, *except in so far as military necessity makes injury to them unavoidable.*"³ The American official authority for this qualification can be found in Section 22 of the Instruction for the Government of the Armies of the United States in the Field, framed by Professor Francis Lieber and promulgated April 24, 1863: "The unarmed citizen is to be spared in person, property and honor *as much as the exigencies of war will admit.*"⁴ The same rule is expressed by a British authority as follows: "The measure of permissible violence is furnished by the reasonable necessity of war."⁵

What is "the reasonable necessity of war"? The answer given to this question on a further page is not promising from a humanitarian point of view: "The determination of reasonable necessity in practice lies so much in the hands of belligerents that necessity becomes not infrequently indistinguishable from convenience."⁶

In this respect there is a wide difference between war on land and war on the sea. While the rules of warfare on land have been slightly humanized in the nineteenth century, the rules of naval warfare still breathe the spirit of the middle ages. "This difference is accounted for," says the late Professor Martens, a recognized authority on International Law, "by the collateral aim pursued by belligerents. This aim is the destruction of the enemy's peaceful and neutral commerce."⁷

In support of this view may be cited the American instructions to the navy issued during the war between the United States and Great Britain: "The commerce of the enemy is the most vulnerable point we can attack, and its destruction the main object, and to this end all your efforts should be directed."⁸

Pursuant to these instructions, the warships of the United States destroyed 74 British merchant vessels.

How do these principles apply to the case of the Lusitania? If it be true, as claimed by the German Government, that she was carrying soldiers for the British Army, she came within the law that "every

² Wheaton, International Law, p. 472. (London, 1904.)

³ Maxey, International Law, p. 424.

⁴ Moore's Digest, VII, 173.

⁵ Hall, International Law, (ed. 1904), p. 396.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 398.

⁷ Martens: Modern International Law of Civilized Nations, vol. II, p. 564. (St. Petersburg, 1905.—In Russian).

⁸ Hall, l. c., pp. 457-458.

merchant vessel which is used for the purposes of carrying persons in the military service of a belligerent brings itself . . . into a hostile relation to the other belligerent. . . . The basis for this rule is its necessity to prevent collusion between neutral individuals and belligerents."⁹ This is precisely the German contention. Should the demand of the President be conceded by Germany, any British ship carrying volunteers or munitions of war could secure immunity from attack by offering free passage to a few American citizens.

It is said that the German proclamation of a "war zone" is without precedent. It is supported, however, by good British authority. Says the late Professor Hall: "The distance at which the blockading force may be stationed from the closed port is immaterial. . . . During the Russian war in 1854 the blockade of Riga was maintained at a distance of one hundred and twenty miles from the town."¹⁰ "In 1861 the British Government recognized the blockade which was declared by the United States against the whole seacoast of the Confederacy, extending

over 2,500 marine leagues."¹¹ Commenting upon that blockade, Professor Hall says that it was "thought by the British Government amply sufficient to create the degree of risk necessary under the English view of International Law."¹²

The United States Instructions of 1898 define an "effective blockade" as one which makes "ingress or egress dangerous." The sinking of a few score British vessels by Germany within the past three months furnishes the necessary evidence that ingress or egress was dangerous, indeed. "The fact that some ships get in or out without being captured is (according to an American authority) not sufficient proof that the blockade is not effective."¹³

It can be readily seen that if the United States relied solely upon International Law, Germany could oppose the demand of our State Department upon American and British authorities. There was consequently only one argument by which our Government could hope to stop the use of submarines by Germany—a threat of war.

⁹ Maxey, l.c., p. 573.

¹⁰ Hall, l. c., p. 700.

¹¹ Martens, l.c., Vol. II, p. 575.

¹² Hall, l.c., p. 701.

¹³ Maxey, l.c., p. 656.

The Sinking of the Lusitania

A. Symposium

Prussian Militarism Stark Mad

To the NEW REVIEW:

WHOM the Gods would destroy they first make mad. The criminal destruction of the Lusitania and the frenzied celebration of the great event in Berlin prove conclusively that Prussian militarism has gone stark mad. The sole regret from the Kaiser's point of view is that the rescue boats were not also torpedoed and the glorious massacre made complete. Such is the genius of Prussian militarism and such the "Kultur" the Kaiser and his barbarian horde have insanely determined to impose upon the whole civilized world.

Triumphant Prussian militarism would mean absolute reversion to feudal barbarism. It is the deadliest menace that confronts the modern world. The gospel of Bernhardt is the gospel of savage conquest and international assassination. "Deutschland ueber Alles" simply means "Alles unter Deutschland," the United States of America not excepted. And yet I would not have the United States declare war on the Kaiser and his imperial government. Moral self-restraint at this crucial hour requires greater courage and is more potent for righteousness and peace than a declaration of war.

Let the torpedoes of the Kaiser's submarine that destroyed the Lusitania and sent hundreds of inno-

cent women and babes to their watery graves echo from coast to coast and re-echo from pole to pole. Let the monstrous massacre of the innocents carry its own tragic lesson and make its mute appeal to the moral sense of the world. To paraphrase Victor Hugo: "For Kaiser Wilhelm and his Prussian military despotism to conquer in this war is not in the law of the twentieth century. Another series of facts is preparing in which they can have no place. They have been impeached before the infinite and their fall decreed."

The torpedoes that struck the Lusitania sounded the knell of the Hohenzollern-Hapsburg dynasty, the deadliest foe to freedom and progress in all the world.

EUGENE V. DEBS.

War Against War

To the NEW REVIEW:

THE very request for an expression of opinion on the Lusitania episode strikes me as an instance of the environmental *bourgeois* influence on even radical opinion, evidence of which influence has indeed repeatedly appeared in the NEW REVIEW since the beginning of the war. The sinking of the Lusitania is an incident of neither social nor economic nor, I add advisedly, of any *specific* ethical import. A protest against modes of warfare because they are unconventional comes

with bad grace from radicals, who are supposed to have freed themselves from the fetters of convention and who are tolerantly sympathetic with sabotage, syndicalism and other forms of industrial warfare not conspicuous for the observance of Marquis of Queensberry rules. Why an internationalist should draw a distinction between the murdering of neutral and of "hostile" individuals; or why a pacifist should condone the murdering of armed men and wax indignant over the murdering of non-combatants, I fail to understand. Voltaire describes Cromwell as a sincere religious maniac until he entered the ranks of the Puritan army, where "*parmi tant de fous il cessa de l'être.*" The implied remedy for folly is unfortunately not of universal applicability. The hysteria called forth by the Lusitania incident may, however, I am optimistic enough to believe, induce some radicals to concentrate their sentiments and efforts where they are wanted,—solely and wholly upon a war against war.

ROBERT H. LOWIE.

Destroying Itself

To the NEW REVIEW:

THE sinking of the Lusitania is the deliberate act of a ruling class bent on destroying itself. To what extent German Junkerdom will succeed in its suicidal policy only the future can tell. However, the very success of the submarine seems to point to the final overthrow of the ruling German caste and of its royal representatives, the Hohenzollerns.

We may well expect the German bourgeoisie which so cheerfully has made the entire militaristic programme its own, including all its "Schrecklichkeit," to ease its conscience with the consoling thought that the torpedoing of the Lusitania, like the invasion of Belgium, was another act of "military necessity." We wonder, however, what may be the feelings of those Social-Democrats who through love of the Fatherland or loyalty to the Kaiser have made themselves the active allies of the Junkers and the bourgeoisie. When, in August, 1914, the majority of the Social-Democrats joined in the "Wacht am Rhein" while their leaders voted for the Budget, did they ever contemplate that Louvains and Lusitanias and the other achievements of Teutonic "Kultur" might be the fruit of their "patriotic" alliance? But there they are—and nothing now can efface these crimes from the record.

Perhaps the German Socialists who have bartered away their Internationalism, for national glory, offensive, defensive and what not, may in the day of reckoning rue the bargain which they have so lightly made. Be that as it may, for the Socialist movement as a whole, the sinking of the Lusitania is the culminating proof of both the futility and danger of compromise. Through it an international movement based on the broadest needs of society has

been betrayed into support of the most brutal reactionary forces, seeking to destroy the elemental rights of humanity itself.

JOSEPH MICHAEL.

A Comparatively Trivial Matter

To the NEW REVIEW:

THE sinking of the Lusitania must be considered in relation to entire mass of activities carried on by the two great groups of powers at war. The notion that war is a struggle between soldiers carried on according to rule is purely fictional. Every considerable war is struggle between large groups of people only a majority of whom are officially connected with it. It involves the whole population of each social unit involved and every feature of the group civilization. Women and children suffer as much as men. One line of manufacture or transportation is liable to suffer as much as any other. For the total effort of one group of combatants is directed toward making the life of the other group so nearly impossible that a call for peace will become necessary. Hence efforts to starve large populations, the commission of atrocities like those which have taken place in Belgium and eastern Prussia are characteristic of all considerable wars. The horrified French should remember that Napoleon's soldiers did in Germany just what the Germans are said to have done in Belgium.

The sinking of the Lusitania, then, is only one incident in a struggle which normally involves the sinking of hundreds of vessels, the destruction of scores of cities, the brutal massacre of large sections of population. In the total mass of suffering caused it is a slight and unimportant incident.

It is only as the basis of a news-story or the excuse for the intervention of a new power that it gains any importance whatever. If the American government were silly enough to say, You have killed 120 of our citizens; in revenge we will kill thousands of yours—then this incident would gain an apparent importance. But if America really wishes to take part in the killing it can find excuses almost any day. For war is not carried on, never has been carried on, according to the rules. So even from this point of view the sinking of the Lusitania is a comparatively trivial matter.

War itself is the crime.

WILLIAM E. BOHN.

Germany Torpedoing Individuality

To the NEW REVIEW:

THIS war is at basis a conscious or unconscious attempt of Germany to impose upon the world a scheme of society under which humanity will be standardized. The Allies are in reality fighting for the survival of individuality, and to prevent the individuality from being submerged under a system which regards the individual not as

an entity, but merely as an automatic unit in a "regulated" society. Under a system such as the German in which the individual is regarded simply as a figure in the statistical table, it is not at all surprising that the Germans should calmly take the view that a shipload of women and children are simply a mass to be destroyed at will, if "regulation" demands it.

As under the influence of theories and speculation, the Socialist Party, particularly in Germany, has tended to ignore the human interests of the individual, and has considered only statistical masses, so to-day Germany represents the very climax of this attitude. Superficially there are certain economic, racial and other aspects of the war, but fundamentally it is an instinctive fight on the part of the rest of humanity for human liberty—the liberty that saves the individual from being extinguished by bureaucratic "regulation" and cultural materialism. Charles V. waged great wars in an attempt to regulate the religious conscience of mankind; the Germans to-day are seeking to regulate the social, cultural and other activities of mankind. One can clearly connect the Nietzschean deification of might with the obsession in the same direction that has so greatly influenced German thought. Nietzsche's ideas that he who allowed tenderness or other considerations to stand in the way of an object was a sentimental weakling were fully carried out in the torpedoing of the Lusitania. GUSTAVUS MYERS.

Murder is Murder

To the NEW REVIEW:

THE other day when I went down into my cellar to get some potatoes, I came across some damp, oily clothes lying in a dark corner, neglected from the spring house cleaning. Ha! thought I, these must be removed. This is the sort of thing that causes spontaneous combustion.

We've got to remove the damp, oily rags—the damp oily ideals and prejudices that a capitalist code has stuck deep down into the dark corners of our brains; for that is the sort of thing that causes so much social spontaneous combustion and destroys the workers' hopes which take so much time and infinite pains to rebuild.

It should be our task not to add more heat until the situation becomes dangerous, but to give light. Murder is murder, whether Americans are killed or Turks, nor does it cease to be murder when men are killed according to the "rules of International warfare," nor is it greater murder to kill in violation of the "International rules of warfare."

Whether a man shoots down another for some real or fancied grievance or the State in cold blood sends through the offender's veins ten thousand electric messengers of death, the offence against humanity is not different. The fact that one is a legal

affair and the other not does not alter the fact that two men have been violently put to death.

From time to time I catch myself napping—coming under the narcotic influence of the capitalistic press, like so many of our comrades in the present critical situation.

I pull myself together, pinch myself, wake up, pull a few more damp, oily rags from my conscious and subconscious cellars and, musing on the miserable influences that flow in upon us here, I begin to understand more clearly something of the influences that put the German Social-Democracy to sleep, Internationally and Socialistically. Then I reiterate the pledge to myself not to add one jot of heat more, but to try to give more light . . . to dwell on the causes of the war to the end that an intelligent, enlightened democracy might some day remove them and with them the terrors of that Thing that hangs black over all Europe and begins to cast the shadow of its dark wing over the United States.

ROSE PASTOR STOKES.

A Continuous Horror

To the NEW REVIEW:

YOU ask my opinion on the sinking of the Lusitania. My opinion as to the ethics of or the alleged justification of the sinking of the vessel I cannot give you, for the simple reason that it would be unprintable.

As to the horror of it, I have become somewhat inured. The human nervous system can respond to certain stimuli only a certain number of times. Then it becomes exhausted and ceases to respond. Such horrors as that of the sinking of the Lusitania take place, only in a different form, every single day. More than a thousand lives are lost daily, and the deaths are more painful, more lingering, and the preceding agony much longer. That among those who lost their lives were one hundred or so American citizens does not change the situation, does not intensify the horror. WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M.D.

A Ruling Class Issue

To the NEW REVIEW:

IT is the enormity of the sinking of the Lusitania that challenges the thought of revolutionists and confuses their sense of their relation to it. But the event is no more tragic than all the other slaughter, the raping, torturing and burning which has been going on in Europe for nearly a year. The sinking of the Lusitania threatened our own safety, but not more so, indeed far less than the unemployment in this country directly due to the war.

The action of Germany is a challenge to be taken up by our government and the people of the country who have directly or tacitly stood for the order which the government represents.

HELEN MAROT.

A Worker's Industrial Outlook

By Justus Ebert

IN all modern countries the financial situation pre-determines the industrial one. Modern industry is primarily a matter of big capital—of big finance. To know the industrial outlook then it is necessary to peek into the realms of huge finance. Everything looks good there—for the big financiers. The war has especially smiled on them and their trustified industries. By causing many foreign loans to be made here, and creating a trade balance of unprecedented proportions, the war is enabling the liquidation of American securities held abroad and otherwise transferring titles to foreign wealth to American banking coffers. The war has, at the same time, enforced a period of economy and thrift in this country, resulting, together with the causes already specified, in the piling up in banking centers of cheap money awaiting an outlet. Under the circumstances, a great speculative activity ensues, while the most important, basic industries, like steel and transportation, take on new life, showing decided signs of improvement, with prospects of still further upward tendencies for the future. No less remarkable is agricultural activity. Owing to foreign demand, wheat cultivation will be increased 10,000,000 acres over the high acreage record of previous years. No wonder the harvester trust "calls back" labor; this all "means business," "lots of it."

Naturally, Labor also responds to this change in conditions. The terrible, philosophical apathy due to war unemployment is now giving way to lively prospects arising from the employment due to war activities. It is coming to be recognized that an increasing demand for labor is just as favorable to working class action as is the terrible impoverishment due to enforced idleness; in fact, a little more so.

Accordingly, Labor is muttering, organizing and striking once more. On the railroads, demands are being arbitrated, while revolutionary agitation is growing within the brotherhoods. In the ship yards of New England and the Atlantic seaports, the I. W. W. is actively organizing. Chicago has a building trades dispute of some proportions on hand. Brewery workers in Washington, D. C., and traction workers in Syracuse, Auburn, Rochester and Buffalo, N. Y., are out on strike. So also are the traction workers of Springfield, Mass.; while those of New York City are organizing. Last, but not least, the I. W. W. is organizing the migratory workers employed in agriculture; it will also attempt the formation of agricultural unions of permanent agricultural workers. The times are more favorable to Labor's assertion of its own interests, from the

highest skilled to the lowest unskilled. Especially should we look for important "doings" in the metal and machine industries, in which there is a demand for mechanics of all kinds. "This is a machinists' war"—why then should not the machinists turn the demand for their skill to their own advantage?

The present industrial status, together with its "boom" prospects, is held to be abnormal. It is held to be based on conditions that are liable to sudden and disastrous changes. The end of the war and the return of Europe to peace conditions will, it is held, cause a collapse. This is combated on the ground that the abnormal conditions have made permanent some of their outgrowths, so far as this country is concerned. The wealth coming in and due to the big financiers, together with that now here, will infuse the country with new capital and new life. At the same time it is pointed out that the war is wasting capital; that with its end its lack will be felt, thus delaying still further big constructive work, of which there is none going on at present. There is no vast railroad undertaking, no big industrial planning, no large internal improvement, all of which are deemed fundamental to real substantial progress, which must wait on that of a transitory and uncertain character, such as is now about to prevail.

Where big financiers fall out, how can puny workmen dare to agree? One thing is certain, to wit, that the rate of failures among the middle class is still abnormal; that unemployment has far from disappeared; and that every improvement in the present situation redounds mainly to the benefit of big capital and big industry. It is they who reap the bonanza profits of war contracts and are the medium through which improvement is possible. And it is they who prepare to take over German trade with this country and Russia by entering into the manufacture of chemicals and extending their sales of machinery of all kinds. It is they who are building ships, establishing branch banks in South America, and otherwise digging their roots deeper into the soil of American capitalism. In brief, it is they who are building a bigger and more powerful capitalism on the ruins of middle class enterprise occasioned by the war and with this as the basis, are challenging the powerful Federal administration with renewed life and determination. From all of which it is safe to conclude that whether this "new prosperity" is of short or long duration—of little or huge volume—the middle and working classes are going to be provided with bigger problems, necessitating bigger and better organizations of all kinds for labor to solve them with. Labor must grow as capitalism grows—in this lies our one great hope.

A Warning to the Middle-Aged

By Elsie Clews Parsons

WOULD we give prestige to a cherished habit or custom, we are likely to call it a distinctive trait of civilization—quite unaware whether or not it exists in savagery or among the "lower" animals. Among these "signs of civilization" is generally accounted reverence for age, respect for the old, a feeling which is in fact one of our most indubitable inheritances from savagery, not to speak of a more remote simian past.

Domination by the old is a marked characteristic of savage society. In Australia the old men tell the young what to eat, when to marry, whom to marry. They punish murder, incest, and even conjugal harshness. Once during a general quarrel Spencer and Gillen saw one of the younger men, i. e., a man between thirty-five and forty, a medicine-man, too, try to strike one of the older men. At once, at this grave offense, his precious medicine powers left him. Among the Mpongwe of the gaboon the young must never approach the aged or pass their dwellings without baring their heads and crouching. Sitting down in their presence, they must keep their distance. Handing them anything, they must drop on one knee. The word of an aged Fuegian is law and like that of our Supreme Court justices is never appealed from. Among many another savage tribe the sayings of the old are oracular and before the old the young express opinions with the greatest caution and diffidence. Lately during a visit to the Southwest among the Pueblo Indians I was much impressed by this reticence of the young with the old. Sons and sons-in-law, daughters and daughters-in-law had little or nothing to say to us guests before their parents or parents-in-law. They take orders like obedient little children. As among Arabs and Coreans, sons and son-in-law do not smoke in the presence of the patriarchal head of the family.

In patriarchal societies the old keep their hold on the young through the family. In Athens before a man could become a magistrate he had to prove that he had been a good son. Refusal to feed or shelter parents cost a man his right of speaking in the national assembly. A Roman had the *jus vitæ necisque* over his children. If a Jewish maiden was unchaste her father might kill her. (The modern heirs of the Old Testament only drive her away from home.) Hebrew fathers could also pawn or sell their children. In ancient Mexico and Nicaragua a man paid his debts, too, with his children. Chinese fathers still do, and disobedient children may be killed with impunity by their parents or grandparents. The rank of the Chinese ruler who was unfilial was reduced. A Hindu was taught never to do anything without parental leave. Among

the Ossetes of the Caucasus, young men never sit in the presence of the head of the family, nor speak with a loud voice, nor contradict him. In Morocco they sneak away when they hear him coming. Kikúyu prescriptions about diet are a matter of deathbed instructions. A dying father passes them on to his assembled sons, attaching to them the sanction of his dying curse, *ki-rú-me*. In almost every patriarchal family sons and daughters marry at their father's behest. Even today in the mutilated patriarchate of France sons under twenty-five and daughters under twenty-one cannot marry without parental consent.

In England the church succeeded in making parental consent legally unnecessary and throughout Christendom, the Church, antagonistic as it was to family cults, more or less undermined parental authority, setting "a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother." But such combativeness against parents is characteristic only of proselyting faiths. Sure of itself, religion is the most loyal of parents' assistants. The ancestral spirits of the Caroline Islands put an unending curse upon the unfilial. So did the classical gods, and Plato says that "if a man makes a right use of his father and grandfather and other aged relations, he will have images which above all others will win him the favor of the gods." Jahveh promises longevity to respectful children. By honoring his mother, a Hindu gains the world of men; his father, the world of gods. The Chinaman is urged to make his father "the correlate of Heaven." Slav peasants believe that marriage against parental approval calls down the "wrath of Heaven." By the sixteenth century the Christian Church itself set down in its catechism, "If we do not honor and reverence our parent whom we ought to love next to God, and whom we have almost continually before our eyes, how can we honor and reverence God, the supreme and best of parents, whom we cannot see?"

Deities and their representatives endorse not only parents, but all seniors, and stiffen their authority. To the Iroquois reverence for old age was the will of the Great Spirit. "Respect for elders is the working of righteousness," says a Chinese sage. "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man, and fear thy God," is commanded in Leviticus. "The vital airs of a young man mount upwards to leave his body when an elder approaches; but by rising to meet him and saluting he recovers them," declares Manu. Assault of an elder is hateful to the gods, opines Plato, urging that seniors by twenty years be never molested

"out of reverence to the gods who preside over birth." Respect for the old is still inculcated because God wants it, but nowadays the Elders can no longer depend on other relations to the supernatural for prestige.

In more primitive societies ghost cults and definite ancestor worships are the mainstay of gerontocracy. Where ghosts are important members of the community, knowledge of their ways is essential. This knowledge is peculiar to the old. In the Torres Straits only the old men were said to know that Terer, the impersonated death figure who danced at funerals, was not in reality a spirit. And it was only the old men who gathered together the food for visiting ghosts and set it out for them. In Victoria it was customary to pierce the septum of the nose and to wear in it a piece of bone or a reed or stalk. Any display of repugnance to this ornament was checked by the old men declaring that they knew quite well what the recalcitrant would suffer in the next world. As soon as ever the spirit left the body it would be required, they said, to eat *toorta gwanang*, unmentionable filth.

Not only because of their ghostly knowledge, but because they are themselves soon to become ghosts are the old revered. It is well known that ghosts cherish their mundane likes and dislikes and are either benevolent or malevolent to the living. Kindness to those on the brink of the grave is obviously therefore a prudent policy, and the blessing or curse of a dying parent is naturally to be longed for or feared.

For a long while we have been relegating our ghosts to a distant habitat, and parental leave-taking has gone out of fashion.

It is not only his knowledge of and closeness to ghosts that has given the old man in primitive groups his great prestige. He is intimate with other supernatural beings, and he is knowing, too, and influential in connection with the rest of his environment, social and natural. When Elema traders cross the Gulf of Papua they carry with them two old men to influence the gods of the winds and of the sea. The old men of the Embe, an East African tribe, supply the warriors with battle charms. In the Caroline Islands it is the old men who are depended upon for observation of the stars, of weather, of winds and currents. Among the Haida of the Queen Charlotte Islands only the old men knew the rules which ensured success in fishing. When Sahagun was anxious to understand Mexican chronology and to straighten out the conflicting opinions about New Year's Day in Mexico, it was the old men whom he summoned together, "*los mas diestros que yo pude aver*, the most skilful I could get." It is always to the old in fact that ethnographers turn for tribal history and tradition. Not only an increase of knowledge but an increase of fame, strength and length of life is promised by

Manu to the Hindu "who constantly pays reverence to the aged."

Nowadays among us battleships are more effectual than war charms. The weather bureau is more trusted than the weather-wise, and the Marconi operator than the god of the tempest. Maps and charts and bulletins purvey the facts of wood and field and sea. Chronology and history are independent of memory. Health and longevity we hope for through living wholesomely. Knowledge or fame we have little expectation of getting except through our own endeavors. And so as scholars or historians, as ecologists in general we do not depend upon the old.

The keeping of written records was a blow to gerontocracy; but long after writing and even after printing was invented the old held their own. Their *accumulated* experience was still a big asset; for their environment was comparatively unchanging. Early culture is extremely conservative. As soon, however, as a society begins to change, experience is at a discount. It is adaptability which counts. Obviously, in an unstable society like ours the unadaptable are heavily handicapped. One of the most marked characters of old age is its rigidity. The very adjustments of life seem in time to lessen the power to adjust.

Unnecessary to society and lagging behind it, the old have no longer any prestigious status. To be pointed out as the oldest living inhabitant or described in a newspaper paragraph is hardly a substitute for being honored by your emperor or worshipped as a prospective ghost. To reproach a careless youth for irreverence or folly with such unconvincing warnings as "when you are as old as I am, you will understand, or you will be sorry," is hardly as satisfactory as ruining his chances in this life or dismaying him with what is ahead of him in the next. Nor is laying claim to an untellable kind of wisdom, metaphysical enough to be challenge proof though it may be, really as comforting and reassuring as making rain for your friends or sending down a plague upon your enemies.

No, there is no place in our society, no respectable place, for the old *qua* old. Moreover the sooner we ourselves realize it, the better for us. Under the cover of "growing old gracefully," we overeat, grow fat, get slack, sentimentalize, and cease to count. Never indeed was there a time when a search for the fountain of youth was as imperative. It makes little difference whether we look for it in the Islands of Bimini or in a régime of sour milk, sleeping out, and foregoing pomps and vanities, as long as we never give up the search and never succumb to the sentimental self-justification of growing old. With that old man who believed in staying young, with Cato of Rome, let us utterly disagree to what was still in his day, he says, a highly commended counsel, the counsel to become an old man early in order to be an old man long.

Book Reviews

Birth Control

DR. W. J. ROBINSON has just published a book on "The Limitation of Offspring."¹ It does not tell how this limitation is effected—a natural omission in the present state of our laws. But, anticipating a change in those laws, Dr. Robinson has included several blank pages under the chapter-heading, "The Best and Most Harmless Means of Preventing Conception." The matter for these pages is ready, we are told, and will be published as soon as the laws permit.

It is a book intended for the laity; but that is not to say that it will not serve both to educate some members of the medical profession, and to stiffen the backbone of others.

Judged from this point of view, the work of Dr. Robinson has been of the greatest importance, and is deserving of the greatest credit.

The present agitation for the repeal of the laws prohibiting the spread of knowledge concerning the prevention of conception seems to spring simply from the general increase of public intelligence. The present state of affairs is offensive to enlightened minds, and wherever there is enlightenment, there is revolt. But it is easy to forget that enlightenment does not come of itself. Some one must do the pioneering. In every country there have been courageous individuals who have, at great cost to themselves, spoken out alone in a hostile and sneering silence—and continued to speak out for years before there was any answer or sign of interest from the public. Such an individual breaks a taboo that is almost more powerful than law itself; he permeates prejudice and superstition with scientific knowledge; he lays the basis for a change in public opinion. Not even the person who breaks the law, and risks or suffers punishment for the sake of spreading knowledge, is a greater benefactor than the pioneer who slowly and patiently accustoms people to the idea that such knowledge is desirable.

Such a man is Dr. Robinson. At a time when—as can be seen by books published over the signature of "eminent" physicians—hypocrisy or plain ignorance in regard to the sexual nature of men and women was the order of the day in the medical profession; when the truth about sex was denounced at medical congresses as im-

moral and irreligious (yes, indeed!—to hear them you would think the first concern of a true physician was whether a fact was moral, and the question of whether it might be true a matter of no importance)—in such a time of almost incredible professional timidity and bigotry, Dr. Robinson made his journal, *The Critic and Guide*, a center of this revolutionary propaganda.

This present book is especially valuable to the laity because Dr. Robinson is not one of those who know nothing but their own trade, and cannot write of it except in trade-lingo. He knows life, and understands people, and he writes of life and people sympathetically in plainly-to-be-understood English.

Others who have taken part in this work are represented by articles in this book, republished from *The Critic and Guide*, by Dr. J. Rutgers of Holland ("A Country in Which the Prevention of Conception Is Officially Sanctioned"), Clara G. Stillman, James F. Morton, Jr., Edwin C. Walker, A. Jacobi, M.D., and James P. Warbasse, M.D.

The career of Dr. Robinson is a stimulus to new effort. After such a beginning, we should not grudge the tremendous effort needed to achieve this victory for knowledge. F. D.

The New Trend of Bourgeois Pacifism

BOURGEOIS pacifism no longer bases itself on religion and ethics; it pretends to base itself on economics. This pretense, however, is absurdly thin and transparent. Norman Angell and the present generation of pacifists are in the first place clearly partisans; they will condescend to use almost any argument for peace, no matter how absurd, and side by side with Angell's economic arguments are to be found almost all other traditional and time-worn pacifist propositions. The only really new feature is that they are trying to show that social evolution has already reached the point where wars are a loss to practically everybody concerned. In other words, they have not progressed one step beyond Bloch in his theory announced half a generation ago, that war-making had become so bloody and frightful that there would be no more wars! Bloch said war is now impossible because it costs too much blood.

¹ *Arms and Industry*, by Norman Angell. New York: Putnam's. \$1.25 net.

Angell says war is "an illusion" because it costs too much money.

At times Angell stands upon a purely economic foundation. He says, for example, that the interference of the French and German governments with the great banks of those countries has nearly always miscarried, and that political are subordinated to economic considerations. But within a few pages we find that while he does not abandon, he entirely subordinates the economic point of view. The economic influence we find is only one among four influences, the other three non-economic.

"For twenty or thirty years, Germany has been a developing and borrowing nation, and France a saving and lending nation, a difference due to economic, moral, religious, and racial forces, over which the financiers have no more control than they have over the tides of the sea."

But Angell's point of view is less than twenty-five per cent. economic, for he considers democratic government to be not the expression of a certain stage and form of social and economic development but an "idea." And he contends that these ideas develop in a reactionary country as in a democratic one, that they have "entirely disregarded political grouping." For example, if democracy has developed in England, Socialism has developed in Germany.

This view of Angell's totally ignores the fact that Germany is still held back by the landlord nobility, both in its economic and in its political development, whereas the rôle of this landlord nobility was reduced to a secondary one in Great Britain by the reform act of 1832 and was finally brought to nothing by the abolition of the veto power of the House of Lords.

Norman Angell's standpoint is essentially uneconomic, for he definitely places the chief weight upon "preaching and talking and writing," upon "preachers and books and newspapers." The Socialist can accept this position only in so far as these spiritual forces are the direct and accurate expression of economic facts.

When we examine Angell's three leading "economic" propositions, we find them entirely fallacious, just as we should expect. He denies, for example, the following solid economic facts—because they are used as defenses of war:

"1. That conquered territory adds to the wealth of the conquering nation; that it can be 'owned' in the way that a person or a corporation would own an estate;

¹ *The Limitation of Offspring—By the Prevention of Conception*. By William J. Robinson, M. D., with an introduction by A. Jacobi, M. D., President of the American Medical Association. New York: The Critic and Guide Co. \$1.00.

"2. That military power is a means of imposing upon other countries economic conditions favorable to the nation exercising it;

"3. That nations are economic units—'competing business firms,' as one great military authority recently called them."

The first proposition he handles in such a superficial manner that it is hardly worth while to pay attention to his arguments. They all come down to his claim that wealth has become "intangible" and so cannot be captured. Wealth has become intangible just in so far as governments are willing to recognize its intangibility. The moment "necessities of state" require it, governments can seize upon tangible goods or tax them *ad infinitum*.

In denying that governments can confiscate property, as well as in his answer to the third proposition above quoted, Angell shows himself to be an extreme economic individualist. Indeed he goes so far in denying the effective actions of governments that he passes entirely beyond the anarchists. For they say that governments have power for evil; Angell says that governments, like wars, are really illusions, that they can do nothing against free competition and the so-called laws of supply and demand. There can be no doubt that the third pro-war argu-

ment attacked by Angell, that nations may be regarded as competing business firms, is not as yet altogether true, but the whole movement in the direction of State Socialism is a movement in the direction of regarding the whole nation as a business firm, of which all the ruling class are, in varying degrees, shareholders.

Angell says:

"The current conception is based upon the image of a State as the economic executive of its citizens, as a limited liability company—or its board—is the economic executive of its shareholders."

This proposition is not yet a truth, but it is rapidly becoming true. Angell is able to deny it only by denying absolutely the great importance of government ownership and governmental control of industries.

If we are indeed moving in the direction of State Socialism then Angell is more blind to this progress than any publicist whose name we can recall. All Socialists and anti-Socialists, collectivists and anti-collectivists, either welcome or fear the tendency of present society—which all admit is in the direction of State Socialism. Angell's writing would have been up-to-date in 1850.

Other of Angell's propositions have been made ludicrous by the present war. For instance, he says:

"The economic conditions in lesser States (e. g., Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland) are just as good as in the States exercising great military power (e. g., Russia, Germany, Austria)."

And further he asks a rhetorical question which may be converted, without changing his intention, into the following proposition, which is almost identical with that of Bloch, namely, that long wars have become physically impossible, that the modern industrial organization paralyzes the employment of existing *material* machinery for war purposes. He asks:

"Could States like Germany feed industrial population for any considerable period after a general mobilization, the interruption of communications, and the disturbance of the credit system?"

Few persons now doubt that the war is answering this question in the affirmative.

Angell's economics are uneconomic in practically every particular. His view not only of the present but of all history is fundamentally erroneous. For example, he naively regards all the religious wars of the past as having a religious and not an economic foundation: he says they were regarded "the way of protecting religious truth from error or compelling the acceptance of religious truth." W. E. W.

A Socialist Digest

The Basis and Significance of Socialist Imperialism

ONE of the chief Socialist publications since the war is Leo Trotsky's pamphlet, very favorably mentioned in *Vorwaerts*. Trotsky believes that the leading Socialist parties had become thoroughly nationalistic but that this period will be brought to an end by the war. He thinks they now have no hope but in revolution:

"The war of 1914 heralded the disintegration of national states. The Socialist parties of this now finished epoch were national parties. All the ramifications of their organizations, all their activity and psychology had grown up together with the national states; and they rose to the defense of these conservative states, in spite of the solemn promise of their congresses, as soon as that imperialism which had grown great upon national soil began to eat away the roots of the tree of nationalism. In their historic collapse the national states are drag-

ging down the nationalist Socialist parties with them. It is not Socialism that is passing away but its contemporary historic expression.

"Just as the national states became an obstacle to the development of the forces of production, so the Socialist parties became the chief obstacle to the development of the revolutionary movements of the working class."

Trotsky believes that the old International has passed away forever and thinks it a vast advance that it is dead, since it represented a useful force in its day, but has now become thoroughly reactionary.

With most European Socialists, Trotsky believes, that the main cause of the war is "imperialism," the effort of capital to find new markets for its goods and new fields of exploitation. The struggle for national independence is seen only in the case of the smaller countries; in the others the talk of national defense is mere pretense.

"In the economically backward countries of Europe the war brings up a question of much earlier economic origin, a question of democracy and of national welfare. This question is im-

portant for the various peoples of Russia, Austria, and The Balkans. But these historically belated questions, which were left to the present epoch as a heritage by its predecessors, do not alter the fundamental character of events. It is not the national strivings of the Serbians, Roumanians, Poles, or Finns, that have brought twenty-five million soldiers on their feet, but the material interests of the bourgeoisie of the Great Powers.

"The development of Germany upon a capitalistic basis began with the destruction of the continental hegemony of France in the years 1870-71. Now when the development of Germany on a national basis has made it one of the first capitalistic powers of the world its further development is blocked by the hegemony of England. The full and unlimited dominion on the continent of Europe appears to Germany as the indispensable condition for the overthrow of its world enemy. Therefore imperialistic Germany writes first of all in its programme the creation of a league of middle European states: present-day Germany, Austria-Hungary, The Balkan Peninsula with Tur-

key, Holland, Scandinavia, Switzerland, Italy, and if possible a weakened France together with Spain and Portugal, are to become an economic and military whole, a greater Germany under the hegemony of the present German state. This programme, which has been thoroughly worked out by the economists, publicists, jurists, and diplomats of German imperialism, is the most striking proof and convincing expression of the fact that the limitations of the national state have become unbearably narrow for capitalism. In the place of the nationalistic Great Power the imperialistic World Power must step in.

"Under these historic conditions the proletariat cannot act in defense of an outgrown national Fatherland, which has become the chief obstacle to economic evolution, but must stand for the creation of a far more powerful and stronger Fatherland—the Republican United States of Europe, as the foundation of the United States of the World.

"The only practical programme which the proletariat can oppose to the imperialistic perplexities of capitalism is a Socialistic organization of the world economy. To war as a method for the solution of the insoluble productions of capitalism at the climax of its development, the proletariat is forced to oppose its method, the method of social revolution."

We here arrive at Trotsky's main thesis, that the division of the world into nations is breaking down. Without going further into his remedy, a world-wide Socialistic revolution, let us quote his opening paragraph in which he formulates this fundamental principle:

"The whole earth, the land as well as the sea, is already the arena of a world-wide economy, the parts of which are inseparably dependent upon one another. Capitalism did this work. But it also caused the capitalist states to struggle for the overthrow of this world economy because of the interests and profits of each of the national bourgeoisies. The policy of imperialism is proof of the fact that the old national state which was created by the revolutions and wars of 1789-1815, 1848-1859, 1864-1866, and 1870 has outlived its time and now appears to be an unbearable obstacle to a development of the forces of production. The war of 1914 means, above all, the downfall of the national interest as an independent economic territory. Nationality will remain as a cultural ideological and psychological fact; the economic basis has been taken away from under its feet. All statements that the present bloody conflict is a work of national defense are due to hypocrisy or

blindness. On the contrary, the objective meaning of the war lies in the destruction of the present national economic units in the name of a world economy. But the effort of imperialism is not to accomplish this task by means of a reasonably organized co-operation of all producing mankind, but to organize it on the basis of exploitation of world economy by the capitalist class of the victorious country, which through this war is to develop from a Great Power into a World Power."

Trotsky indicates the necessity of the proletariat to organize itself against this new imperialism. Among the German Socialists, however, there is a tendency to defend and accept this imperialism. On February 22nd, the Socialist member of the Reichstag, Wolfgang Heine, made a sensational nationalistic speech before the new Socialist Party formed at Stuttgart in opposition to the radical majority. This speech met with the approval of the *Hamburger Echo*, the Karlsruhe paper, and a number of other organs representing the very considerable group of Socialists of the extreme right wing, and was attacked, upon the other hand, not only by the papers of the left wing, but also by the Socialist organ of Dresden and those of the industrial district of Northwest Germany. Its importance is shown by the immense amount of discussion it created in the German Socialist press. The leading points may be divided into two parts—opposition to peace, including support of the Government, and an imperialistic argument giving permanent reasons for supporting the Government in its foreign policy. The arguments in support of the present war and against an early peace are as follows:—

"The time has not yet come to seek peace. Every untimely step is wrong and attains the opposite of that which we desire to reach. We saw that in the Socialist Conference in London. . . . There are also people with us who have fantastic peace plans. In the Prussian House of Representatives, the platonic peace declaration of the Social-Democrats resulted in all the members of the House, with the exception of the ten Social-Democrats, issuing a declaration against peace. If we desire peace, we must at present trust the German armies, the German generals, the German people, the persons who are undergoing untold suffering in the field. To-day the Army is the people and the people is the Army. . . .

"Let us trust in the love of peace and the desire for peace of the Kaiser. Twice during recent years he maintained peace by his personal intervention. Of importance also is the declaration of the German Government which is now going through all the news-

papers, and warns us that it is too early to discuss conditions of peace. We can accept this declaration absolutely. On the German side it is not a war of conquest. If it is necessary, the Social-Democracy will stand at the side of the Kaiser and the Chancellor if it is a question of obtaining an honorable peace which does not carry with it the danger of the renewal of the war. . . .

"What shall we do in order to transform the country according to our wishes? Shall we encourage the thought of a possible revolution after the war? This question must be answered with an unconditional negative. Even if we shook the foundations of the state by a revolution, the enemies whom we hope to fight down by an army would press into our Fatherland and fall upon the disunited and torn people. That would be the end of the German realm and the German people. . . .

"The German labor movement arose out of class conflicts. Class conflicts will continue to exist as long as there is a capitalistic mode of production. But there is also a common interest which binds the workers to the employers. Our working people live from industry. Especially from export trade. If this is destroyed, the worker will be more damaged than the employer. The capitalist can take his money away and put it into other undertakings, even abroad. The worker, if he has no more work, is ruined. It has been said, 'What difference does it make whether the worker has any longer a living in Germany? He emigrates and expends his labor power elsewhere.' That is no longer such a simple affair, and our German working people are too good to serve as fertilizer for foreign civilization. In spite of all conflicts with the present state, the worker is bound to it.

"If it is said by a German worker that he wishes to see to it that the German export trade does not go to pieces, he is told that that is imperialism, labor imperialism. Do not allow yourself to be driven into the horn of the dilemma by this word. You know what it means to the worker to have paying work. He does not care to have it taken away from him. If that is called imperialism, we advocate this imperialism."

Perhaps the most important of all the German Socialist pamphlets on the war is that of Heinrich Cunow on "The Break Up of the Party" (an ironical title). For Cunow was long an editor of *Vorwaerts* and, like Lensch, was one of the leaders of the younger radicals—before the war. Cunow's pamphlet is imperialistic throughout, and has provoked a reply from Kautsky. Cunow justifies Imperialism:

"The new imperialistic phase of development is just as necessarily a result of the innermost conditions of the financial existence of the capitalist class, is just as necessary a transitional stage to Socialism, as the previous stages of development, for example, the building up of large scale industry.

. . . The demand, 'we must not allow imperialism to rule, we must uproot it,' is just as foolish as if we had said at the beginning of machine industry: 'no machine must be tolerated, let us destroy them, and let us henceforth only allow hand-work.'

Cunow declares that the workingman lives in a nation, a state, as well in as a class. And that this community form is just as much a reality of social history as the class.

Cunow therefore rejects absolutely the "right of nations to an independent government" as a petty bourgeois and pseudo-democratic conception, which he claims was not accepted by Marx, but was called reactionary by him. In support of this he cites two expressions from Marx. One from a letter to Engels, and the other from his article on Democratic Pan-Slavism. In the first, Marx says that in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, "The whole mass of the German people of all classes saw that it was above all a question of national existence that was involved, and therefore rose up at once."

In the article quoted Marx wrote of the process of historical necessity by which the little nations were absorbed by the larger: "No doubt this process could not have been completed without plucking by force many a delicate little national flower. But without force and iron ruthlessness, nothing is accom-

plished in history; and if Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon had possessed the same capacity for sensitiveness to which Pan-Slavism now appeals on behalf of its decaying clients, what would history have been!"

Vorwaerts makes the following reply to Wolfgang Heine, beginning with a brief summary of Heine's view, which indicates clearly enough Vorwaerts' own attitude towards it:

"We are thankful to comrade Heine that he develops his programme of the future in this way without circumlocution. With confidence in Kaiser and Chancellor, he is opposed to independent party action for the present. After the war, according to his view, the Social-Democracy will become a labor party striving for democratic social and political reforms. Talk about revolution is senseless. Our attitude towards the state must change. Militarism, which he believes has changed its character during this war, since Jews and Socialists may become officers, must see its just claims recognized by the Socialists. The rejection of the Budget is senseless. The struggle about cheers for the Kaiser and participation in court functions (that is Republicanism) is a thing of the past. 'We must win influence untroubled by so-called "principles."'

"We think that comrade Heine, in these expressions, has given utterance to what is, in fact, the goal of a great part of our leadership. The attention of the masses of comrades and labor union members cannot be attracted soon enough to these efforts at transforming the Social-Democracy into a Nationalist Social Reform Party. For the masses must eventually decide."

The Views of a Dutch Socialist Leader on Socialism and the War

IN matters of importance the evidence of an intelligent and trustworthy eye-witness and observer should always be welcome. Therefore when H. H. Van Kol, Socialist member of the Senate of Holland, passed through New York recently on his journey to Japan, American Socialists had an excellent chance to obtain first hand information about some aspects of the European war and its effect upon our comrades.

We are reliably informed that Comrade Van Kol was willing to talk freely to representatives of the local Socialist dailies. The *Volkszeitung* made excellent use of the opportunity offered. The Yiddish *Forward* republished in substance the interview of its German contemporary. The *Call* remained si-

lent except for a very brief paragraph of minor consequence.

And yet English speaking Socialists and other Americans will find many of Van Kol's utterances both newsy and enlightening, as they are herewith reproduced from the *Volkszeitung*.

"Tell the American Socialists that the wounds inflicted on Internationalism and the world-wide solidarity of the class-conscious proletariat during the first weeks of this terrible war are healing, and that we in Europe are trying again to approach and understand one another. But once we have this good-will, the rest will follow as a matter of course." (Thus for the *Call*, three days behind.)

Replying to a question, Van Kol went on to tell what he found during a five

weeks' automobile journey back and forth through Belgium: "Belgium is a wilderness. The Germans have done terrible work there. Up and down through the country I travelled and for the rest of my life I shall not forget what I saw there.

"You ask me whether the *franc-tireurs* were the cause of that? At the beginning when the Germans unexpectedly invaded Belgium, undoubtedly Belgian civilians tried resistance, shooting from ambush. But only during the first few days. For meanwhile the most rigid punishments had been inflicted: shooting of innocents, the burning down of whole cities and villages, wholesale arrests. After these first few days—so I was assured everywhere in Belgium—nothing of that kind happened. The Socialists and the authorities did everything possible to keep the population from excesses, and I was assured with universal success. . . . The majority of later cases originated because of sexual outrages by drunken German soldiers, outrages which fathers, brothers or friends of the outraged tried to resist.

"You speak of German discipline. I could tell you of the wonderful discipline with which the German soldiers executed the burning of whole communities. First came a detail of soldiers putting a coat of benzine on the buildings; they were followed by a second detail throwing fire arrows—manufactured for this special purpose—into the structures with such precision that the flames would shoot up exactly when the second detail of from 50 to 100 men had marched away. It is, alas, an undeniable fact that in Belgium more civilians than soldiers have been killed."

Van Kol had said all this in a quiet matter-of-fact way, without showing any bitterness toward the Germans. Some feeling was noticeable only when he spoke of many Socialists who had also lost their lives in this manner. He mentioned how Comrade Huysmans, the secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, had lost in that way many near relatives.

"The indignation among the Belgians is tremendous. During the first few months Huysmans declined to have anything to do with German Socialists. Now, I am glad to say, that has changed for the better. When recently, toward the end of March, Haase, Mueller, Molkenbuhr and Ebers—all four of the Executive Committee of the German party organization—were at The Hague, they conferred with Huysmans for hours in an entirely friendly manner. The worst is now over.

"What did those four want? They came in an unofficial capacity entirely, so much so that they declined to call at the office of the International Bureau

or to speak with anyone except Huysmans and Troelstra. But I doubt not that they learned something, for immediately thereafter Comrade Haase wrote me a long, cordial letter expressing his utmost regret that they had permitted themselves to be fooled by their government.

"You ask me why I blame the Germans and not the French? You should not wonder at that. Aside from the fact that the German party has been our great model and leader—as it has been really for all parts of the International—it had at first taken the highest ground. Only three days before the declaration of war Comrade Hermann Mueller, of their executive, had been in Paris, where the comrades had arranged for a conference looking toward an understanding. There Huysmans pleaded for abstention of the Germans from voting. 'We understand,' he argued, 'that you are in a difficult situation, with the Russians on one side and the French on the other. Don't vote, abstain!' But Mueller replied that they were determined to vote against any war credits. Soon afterward came the unanimous vote for the war credits. The French had stated unequivocally from the first that they would have to vote in the affirmative if France was attacked.

"But it is not the vote for the war credits that made the situation in the International so distressing as rather the tacit consent to the violation of Belgium. At first the German comrades had been badly fooled, to be sure. But later on, when they had learned the truth, they should have protested vigorously. Then everything might have been overlooked. But nothing was done, no declaration was made. 'Military necessity' had overwhelmed even Germany's Social Democrats. In Haase's letter, above mentioned, he expresses strongly his regret about this blunder. Our comrades had believed all the governmental stories about 'secret treaties' with England and France and about the violated neutrality of Belgium. To-day they no longer believe those silly lies about French soldiers in Belgium prior to the declaration of war. To-day they know better and they admit all that openly. . . .

"The International of Labor dead? Not by any means. It is paralyzed by the war and weakened. But it begins already—though still timidly—to raise its head and to put out feelers as to whether the time for its revival has not arrived. There are two danger zones—Belgium and Germany; but they may yet be overcome. The bitterness in Belgium is already ebbing since Anseele, Lafontaine and others are laboring valiantly for an understanding. Huysmans, who has suffered so much, as-

sists them admirably. The point is to create a movement for peace in Belgium, which in turn would also take hold of the French and English comrades. If the Belgians forget and forgive, the others have no ground for being irreconcilable. Among the French it is chiefly old Vaillant who is unforgiving, Sembat is less so, and Guesde still less. Donawet, Thomas and the trade unionists who have now discarded all syndicalistic separatistic efforts, are likewise in favor of a peace movement and are helping along. With the French the sore point is Alsace-Lorraine, which hypnotizes them still, except two or three leaders. I attended a meeting of their parliamentary group when they all stated distinctly that they did not by any means favor a dismemberment of Germany, that besides Alsace-Lorraine no German piece of territory should be taken. That is the general view in Europe.

"There remains then the German Social Democracy. But as you know, the peace movement is growing there also very rapidly, or rather the anti-war movement. Toward the end of March, when the comrades of Holland at The Hague had a talk with members of the German Executive Committee, we all gained the impression that the Scheidemann faction is weaker by far than is usually believed outside of Germany. But that was no news to us Dutch, who hear more about Germany than others. The developments after the war will do the rest. Once wages are going down and the conditions of labor are growing terribly worse and distress becomes general, a change of sentiment must come, and with it—alas—the split. Alas, because I am sorry for the magnificent structure of the German Social Democracy. But the split is inevitable, because the difference in the views of the two groups is too far reaching and cannot be bridged over."

The French Socialists and the German Peace Terms

IN the last issue of the *NEW REVIEW* we gave the peace policy advocated by the German and Austrian Socialists at their recent conference at Vienna. One of the leading French Marxists, Compère-Morel, has defined the attitude of the Socialists of France towards this programme and also towards that offered last month in the name of Liebknecht, Luxemburg, and others. Compère-Morel says:—

"We have only one answer to give. That peace for which we are developing an energetic agitation in France, both inside and outside of Parliaments,

is also desired by us. But under one condition: That it is erected upon the grave of Prussian militarism, either overthrown by you, or conquered by us, as you prefer. As long as you do not display the will to overthrow a regime which means a permanent danger for the whole world, which rules you by force, and whose whole power has arisen through your subordination to its will, so long there will be no peace. As long as Socialists and proletarian Germans—that is to say, you who signed the manifesto—blindly follow the order of generals like Bissing, as long as you follow statesmen like Bethmann-Hollweg, who are without scruples or moral conscience, no peace! As long as you, comrades, obey your superiors without resistance, lay waste Belgium, and a part of France you occupy without reason, so long no peace. And if your proletariat are unable to develop a republican movement for freedom, which alone can turn your monarchial militaristic and war-like Germany into a free, democratic, and peaceful Germany, and continues to allow the revolutionary spirit of the elder Liebknecht and the fighting Bebel to be turned by your oppressors into a stream of blood, fire and tears, so long it will be the task of the weapons of the Allies which are serving the greatest, the most noble, and the most just Cause of modern times, to force you to a complete and lasting peace!"

A Socialist Defeat

THE defeat of Stitt Wilson, one of the five members of the National Executive Committee of the American Socialist Party, for Mayor of Berkeley, California, is not very sympathetically received by the *New York Volkszeitung*. It says:—

"The Socialist Party can congratulate itself. Stitt Wilson, the so-called Socialist candidate for Mayor, was beaten. Scarcely anything worse could have happened for the Party than his election and the increase of his influence inside the Party. This man, as the State Secretary of the Socialist Party in California, inserted the following advertisement in the *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, on the second of April:—

"As Mayor in 1911 and 1912, he was an honest, efficient and progressive man. He was a great success. He is now a candidate, because Progressives, Democrats, Socialists and Prohibitionists have requested him to run."

"And such a man sits in our national Executive Committee! The first demand on the convention of the National Committee at Chicago, on the part of every class-conscious Socialist must be, 'Away with Wilson from the Executive Committee of the Party!'"

The American Socialist Press and the Lusitania Affair

THE position of the Socialist press of America on the sinking of the Lusitania, is well summed up by the leading English daily organ, *The New York Call*, and the daily German organ, the *Volkszeitung*. Both papers recognized the act of the German government as hostile to the American nation and the American people. The *Call* believes that while war will not result from the present case, that the acts will be repeated, and that war will then be highly probable. In answering the question "Will the German Government back down?" it says:—

"There is no reason to think so. The policy of sinking such vessels as the Lusitania is a fixed one. Other transatlantic liners will meet the same fate if the German submarines can get at them. And if several lie in wait for one vessel, there is more than an even chance that it can be done with any ship.

"Yet it is not at all sure that war will be declared on Germany as an answer to this action. Perhaps in the end, after a repetition or several repetitions, it may be found that there is no alternative."

The *Volkszeitung* does not care to contemplate the probability of war in any event. But it goes farther than the *Call* in one respect, for it is willing definitely to *advocate* very strong action on the part of the American government short of war.

The *Call* was at first not inclined to take the sinking of the Lusitania very seriously, and its position, indeed, was identical with that of many German defenders of the outrage in this country. It was unwilling to see in the incident any special significance whatever:—

"If war is to eventuate, its results will be far more important and ominous for the German people who live among us than for the Germans overseas. Already, too, the press is subtly inciting the fury of the populace against those who have been most publicly prominent in defending and justifying the German side of the controversy."

The *Volkszeitung* takes an even more serious view. We read:

"Is it possible that there are human beings who rejoice over such a deed to such a degree that they allow themselves to give voice to jubilation? It must be so. For the first evening edition of the German afternoon papers sounded almost jubilant that the work had succeeded, that the goal had been reached! And in the morning papers we read that although 'the attack on a

passenger ship is regrettable, that is war'—and the conclusion was always and everywhere the same.

"Regrettable! That is the highest feeling to which this sort of patriot is able to force himself. These gentlemen do not understand and feel that it was a contemptible infamy, a merciless murder, a pre-conceived and thought-out mass butchery; that it is their own country people in this country who will have to suffer, that it is especially the American workers who will have to pay for the deed of the torpedo, does not seem to trouble them."

But the main assault of the *Volkszeitung* appears in a second edition in the same issue, attacking the German "patriots" in general terms, under the title "Patriotic Madness":

"It is a peculiar phenomenon that the Germans, however they may be respected individually, are, as a whole, disliked everywhere and in all countries. This phenomenon is all the more strange as the accomplishments of Germany in all realms, but especially in art and science, are recognized; yes, in part, wondered at. Most remarkable is this dislike in a country like the United States where so many Germans work and live, often in prominent positions. The dislike of certain bourgeois circles here and elsewhere may be traced back to the competition of the German bourgeoisie, but that does not explain the dislike of the other elements of the population.

"It was not always so. After the Civil War, in which the Germans took so prominent place in freeing the slaves and establishing the Union, the German element in the United States was not only respected but loved. Whence this reversal of opinion? It is a direct result of Prussian militarism which, since the Prussian-Austrian War, came to dominate Germany through and through, and whose spirit passed into all elements of the population, even among the working classes. The impudent spirit of arrogance and superiority which is a peculiarity of militarism was everywhere to be noticed; after the Franco-Prussian War, it became absolutely unbearable. . . . A most disagreeable example of this has been and still is offered us by the official and unofficial diplomatic representatives of Germany in this country. The present public opinion against Germany in this country has been not a little influenced by their apparently unconscious arrogance and lack of tact, not to mention the ultra patriotic fire-eaters and drivers of the German-American press.

The Milwaukee *Leader* takes a frankly pro-German view; in fact, its editorial (May 18th) might have been written by an employee of the official German Press Bureau:

"There can be no question that an American taking passage on a ship carrying the British flag and going into the war zone assumes the risk attached thereto. An American has no more business to take a British ship going to the war zone off Ireland or Flanders than he has to go into the war zone of Mexico.

"Everybody knew that the Lusitania carried no less than 5,400 cases of ammunition to England which practically made the Lusitania a war supply ship. What business did any American have on a vessel like that?

"On the day the Lusitania left, papers all over the country contained a notice signed "Imperial German Embassy," warning trans-Atlantic travelers that if they entered the war zone on ships of Great Britain, they did so at their own risk. Many prominent passengers on the Lusitania received telegrams signed with the fictitious names, stating that the ship was to be torpedoed and advising them to cancel their passage. Others, on reaching the pier, were accosted by strangers who warned them to remain ashore. They did not do so. They laughed at the warning. They assumed the risk.

"The least that might be said is that if an American felt the desire to go to England or France, he should be careful to take passage on a ship carrying the American flag, or some other neutral flag.

"It is a fact that there were many hundred Americans killed in Mexico during the present "revolution" without the capitalist press of our country showing much nervousness. These poor Americans were called "adventurers." But the rich folks going to taste the "war thrills" in Europe, are they not adventurers?

"And it is also a fact that our capitalists main and kill many thousand American workingmen in factories and mines without the capitalist press getting excited about it. We are told that these workingmen assume a reasonable business risk. Now why should not our business men going on war business on English ships to England and into the war zone assume a reasonable business risk?

"The torpedoing of merchant vessels bearing a hostile flag without making provision for the safety of passengers and crew, is an entirely new departure in modern warfare. But the submarines and the aeroplanes are a new departure and have not been "regulated" as yet by international law. War is hell!"

Correspondence

Answer and Accusation

To the NEW REVIEW:

IN your May 1st issue I must take exception to a great many of your positions, but particularly to the article of Mr. Hubert Langerock, with much of which I agree, but whose main assumption is utterly unhistorical. Germany had most evidently no designs upon Belgium when the war was threatened as is obvious from the fact that Germany made frantic efforts to secure England's neutrality on the condition of leaving Belgium alone, and that even after the fall of Luttich, Germany again offered Belgium peace, autonomy and territorial integrity as well as an indemnity for the damage done, if only Belgium would accept the situation.

German capitalism did not provoke the war. It did not need to, it was getting on very well, and war meant putting everything in the melting-pot. Capitalism is too timid to really provoke a war of such proportions and such chances against it. The war, as I know positively, came as a terrific surprise to some of the leading capitalists of Germany, who, like the Government itself, had been lured into security by the seeming attitude of England. And these men felt exceedingly bitter against the diplomacy that they regard as having been hoodwinked and deceived by the much cleverer work of Russia and Sir Edward Grey.

The "Kraft-ideal" is largely a creation of the London Yellow Press. Would not Socialists do well to view with suspicion the phrases and catch-words put into our mouths by Lord Northcliffe and the unscrupulous gang that arranged and carried through the Boer war on exactly the same set of phrases? *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, and when I as a Socialist hear of England conducting a war to "conserve small nationalities" (Ireland, Persia, Cyprus, Egypt?) to crush "militarism" (two power naval standard?) to maintain the sanctity of treaties (China, Portugal, Transvaal?) and note that Mr. J. P. Morgan & Co. are financing the job, I begin to be suspicious. Of course this is a capitalist war, but only because England made it so. It began as a war on the most primitive lines of barbaric territorial ambition on the part of Russia. Her landed aristocracy wanted more land and more peasants and a seaport for grain export. The feudal ambition

wanted Constantinople and the seaway. Industrial capitalism is still an exotic in Russia, and of German, English, Jewish and American extraction. It would never have at this stage of the game begun a world war. But England is in the individualistic state of industrial exploitation and found her match in a State Capitalism infinitely more efficient and educated, and Russia, France and Belgium are England's pawns in her game. England wanted, i.e. England's Whig plutocracy, that masquerades under the name of democratic Liberalism—wanted to crush the competition of Germany's state socialism or capitalism. France also has been burning under a sense of injury, not because Elsass and Lothringen were taken, but again because State Capitalism was taking her industrial leadership from her, and making her a second rate power. Thus England found willing tools.

We who are Socialists know that Germany is not a democratic socialist state. At the same time it is the most advanced experiment in collectivism ever made, and the way Germany is smashing the individualistic inefficiency of Russia, England and France is one of the most remarkable arguments in favor of the extension of collectivism; and Germany's unity of purpose the most telling argument for democratic control that the world has before it. The war will be worth years of arguments in favor of democratic collectivism. And Germany's impending triumph is the death knell of individualistic competition as "the life of trade." England will after the war have to communally educate, socially organize and increasingly collectively own the land and productive machinery. How any Socialist can wish for the success of feudal Russia and individualistic France, and plutocratic England over against the State Socialism of Germany is a riddle I cannot find any answer to save the one Wall Street gives to so many, "bought and paid for!"

THOMAS C. HALL.

New York City.

A Plan for Representation

To the NEW REVIEW:

MR. WALLING'S article on "Minority Representation" in the April NEW REVIEW, while admirable in many respects, seems to me to suggest needlessly complex methods of dealing with representatives for legislatures. To my mind the best and

simplest method of securing equitable representation in such cases is through the plan known as cumulative voting. So far as I know, this obtains at present only in corporations.

Under this method every share of stock is allowed as many votes as there are directors to be elected. These votes may be distributed, or they may be concentrated on one or two directors.

Suppose there are 5,000 shares of stock in a corporation and five directors to be elected. Suppose also that an organized majority controls 3,000 shares, and an organized minority 2,000 shares. Now, if ordinary voting obtained, the majority could simply give 3,000 votes to each of their candidates; the minority, 2,000; with the result that the majority would elect every director. But with cumulative voting the majority would have 15,000 votes and the minority 10,000 votes. The majority could give 5,000 votes to each of three candidates, and elect them. The minority could likewise give 5,000 votes to each of two candidates, and elect them. If in its greed and cupidity the majority attempted to elect every director, it could give only 3,000 votes to each candidate; in which case the minority could divide its vote among three men, give 3,333 votes to each, and elect a majority of the board.

I have never been able to understand why this plan has not been applied in politics. When public officers "at large" are to be elected, why cannot each voter be given as many votes as there are offices to be filled, with the power of distributing these votes at his pleasure?

As an illustration let us take a city subject to commission government. Let us suppose there are five commissioners to be elected. Let us suppose further that the numerical strength of the Socialists in this city is not much more than one-fifth that of the leading party. Then the Socialists, instead of nominating five men, only to see them go bravely down to certain defeat, could nominate but one. This would concentrate the entire vote of the party on that one candidate. The Socialists would have one office-holder in place of five also-rans.

The plan, of course, is capable of extension. In our States, where two Senators are now elected by popular vote, we could allow every enfranchised citizen to give either one vote to two men or two votes to one man. We might even extend our Congressional districts to, say, three times their present size, and elect by the cumulative method three representatives-at-large from each.

HENRY HAZLITT.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THOUSANDS of GOOD Books

are to be had nowadays at
very low prices.

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

IBSEN—Brand, trans. by F. E. Garret.
A Doll's House, The Wild Duck and The Lady from the Sea.
Ghosts, An Enemy of the People and The Warriors of Heligoland.
Pillars of Society, The Pretenders and Rosmersholm.

DOSTOIEVSKY—Poor Folk and The Gambler.
Crime and Punishment.
The House of the Dead.
Letters from the Underworld.
The Idiot.

TOLSTOY—Anna Karenina. 2 vols.
Childhood, Boyhood and Youth.
Master and Man and others.
War and Peace. 3 vols.

TURGENEFF—Virgin Soil.
Liza.

POUSHKIN—Prose Tales.

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

Special Bargains

GEORGE BRANDES, Lassalle

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

STRINDBERG, Zones of the Spirit

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

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

MAISELS' BOOK STORE

424 GRAND ST., NEW YORK

PEARSON'S

is the only Magazine
of its kind

This is why:—

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

This is what it did:—

ABANDONED FANCY COVERS
CUT OUT COLORED PICTURES
ADOPTED PLAIN PAPER

This was the purpose:—

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

This was the result:—

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

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

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

SPECIAL OFFER:

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

NEW REVIEW

256 Broadway

New York City

MAKE YOUR DOLLAR GO FAR

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

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

COTTON'S WEEKLY

New Review BOOK SERVICE

Many of our readers have been buying books through the NEW REVIEW, and express complete satisfaction.

It has been suggested, and we have decided, to organize a regular NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE.

You can buy any book of any publisher by any author through our BOOK SERVICE.

We are at your disposal in securing books, locating books, giving information and advice about books.

We vouch for the books we sell

Socialists and the War

By WM. ENGLISH WALLING.
An indispensable book on the great war—thoroughly documented and comprehensive. It not alone shows the Socialist action but the Socialist analysis of the war.

Price, \$1.50, Postpaid

We vouch for the books we sell

The Limitation of Offspring by the Prevention of Conception

By WM. J. ROBINSON, M.D.

A book on a tremendous subject by the man most fitted to write it. Of unusual interest and importance. Brilliantly lucid, vivid and direct.

Price, \$1.00, Postpaid

OURSCOPE

We shall within a few weeks publish a list of the best books on particular subjects—fiction, poetry, drama, sociology, political economy, Socialism, etc.

Our book reviews are intended as a summary of current literature and a guide to the new books.

You can buy any book reviewed at the price quoted.

We vouch for the books we sell

NEW REVIEW 256 Broadway
New York City

Artists'
Materials



Picture
Frames

Colors and Boards of all makes

S. HALPERN

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

Patronize NEW REVIEW Advertisers

The New Manifesto

Dr. Anton Pannekoek writes of this new book
by Dr. Herman Gorter of Holland, on

"Imperialism, World War and Social Democracy"

now being published in Germany, and
which will be off our presses July First:

"This book may be considered the Manifesto of the new revolutionary movement that is arising out of the ruins of the old Social Democracy, as it broke down in the great European crisis.

"This work is not the product of one man but rather of a group, a party. It is the European expression of the Left Wing of the great socialist movement, represented in Holland by the Social Democratic Party.

"Twenty years ago Dr. Gorter was already known as one of the chiefs of the young literary movement in Europe. His poetical works are valued as among the best in Holland.

"Dr. Gorter has written several books for socialist propaganda. His 'Socialism and Anarchism' arose from the older fights with Anarchism; his 'Principles of Socialism' belong to the best of our propagandistic literature; his work on the 'Materialistic Conception of History,' has been translated into German and has been sold there in many thousands of copies because it is the best popular explanation of this Marxian theory."

The S. D. P. of Holland, of which Dr. Gorter is a member, was the special organization of the same tendencies that constituted the Left Wing in Germany. The **NEW MANIFESTO** of the rising revolutionary Socialism originated in Holland.

"**IMPERIALISM, WORLD WAR AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY**" is the Manifesto of the tendency for which Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and the Left Wings in the socialist groups all over the world are fighting.

It is the

NEW MANIFESTO OF REAL SOCIALISM!

Price, postpaid, 50 cents; sent with a yearly subscription to the **INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW** for \$1.25. Ask to have your subscription start with the first instalment of Prof. J. Howard Moore's course in popular biology, "Savage Survivals".

Address: **CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY**

341 E. Ohio Street,

CHICAGO, ILL.

Patronize NEW REVIEW Advertisers