
At the present rate of progress—which will surely augment itself during the fall and winter months—it is demonstrably certain that the NEW REVIEW will be self-supporting within ten months.

The war will be analyzed from month to month in the pages of the NEW REVIEW. The two brilliant articles by Frank Bohn and William English Walling in this month's issue are a brilliant augury of what is to come.

Since the NEW REVIEW was re-organized it has been making steady progress. Old readers who ceased reading the NEW REVIEW, upon receiving sample copies, have written us, saying: "We are surprised at the progress which has been made." The following figures show the progress made in the purely business income:

March.....	\$142.42
April	156.93
May	163.83
June	176.27
July	221.76

Subscriptions during July were double those of July last year, and considerably higher than any month this year. Bundle orders are increasing; and our friends are enthusiastic concerning the NEW REVIEW.

Geo. N. Falconer, of Denver, recently went on a literature tour of Colorado, selling the NEW REVIEW. He tried to speak in Oak Creek, the seat of one of the coal districts under martial law. Capt. Morgan in command forbade Falconer's speaking on the street; but our comrade held a big meeting in the miners' tent, with rousing success. Comrade Falconer is active in Local Denver, carrying on revolutionary propaganda.

While donations have increased we are still shy \$100 a month, which we ask our friends to supply by becoming Contributing Subscribers pledged to pay \$1 a month for one year.

The great European War is creating havoc throughout the world. Conditions everywhere are in a state of crisis; money is tight. During this crisis the NEW REVIEW will need, more than ever the co-operation and aid of its friends.

Louis C. Fraina,
Business Manager.

The New Review

Vol. II.

SEPTEMBER, 1914

No. 9

THE EUROPEAN EXPLOSION

BY FRANK BOHN

The ease with which the ruling classes of Germany have placed the whole national life of the German people as a pawn in the game of war, cannot but astonish the world. How many times have not the Socialists been called "dangerous to civilization." They would overthrow "culture" and what not. Judging from the most reliable reports, the whole German nation, with the sole exception of the Socialists, is now willing that Germany shall be made a shambles, that its wealth and its art treasures, the homes of its people and the thousand places made sacred by the thoughts and deeds of Germans, shall all be overwhelmed and utterly ruined. Industrial society to-day cannot endure such havoc. The economics of its daily life is a too closely wrought texture to be slashed by the sword. Germany, attacked from every side, will, if the war continues through the winter, lose five from starvation for every one killed by the bullets of the enemy. The conditions of the Thirty Years' War will be repeated. And on what a scale! The schools closed. Industry paralyzed. Cities in ashes. Railroads blown up by dynamite. A thousand roadways clogged with fleeing, starving women and children. All this was brought upon the Fatherland by its arrogant Junkers and greedy capitalists, who were never tired of telling the world that Socialism was "a danger to the civilization of Germany."

There are to-day two unholy alliances in Europe. Each of them has been for a generation an insult to the intelligence of humanity and a danger to the peace of the world. The more wicked and more dangerous of these is the alliance between the German militarist aristocracy, with the Emperor at its head, and the German middle classes, from the capitalists to the intellectuals. Hardly less disgusting is the counter alliance between barbaric Russia on

the one hand and "enlightened" France and Great Britain on the other. The two alliances are fundamentally alike. In each case it is the assignation of those who are essentially political democrats with the brutal passion of soldier imperialists.

Why are these nations at war? In answer we must say that the first fact to be disposed of, the one nearest the surface, is that of militarism. For half a century the governments of Europe have strained every effort to prepare for war. They have burdened their peoples with huge taxes. They have enforced the slavish service of soldiering upon their workers. They have developed a huge army and navy officialdom, whose insolence in Germany has more, in France as much, and in England almost as much, influence upon the destiny of the nation as the greed of the capitalists. Throughout Europe the most respected business is the business of murder. The six great nations which have made up the "Concert of Europe" have, during times of peace, a hundred and seventy-five thousand army officers, proud idlers strutting about from barracks to banquet-hall and ball-room. Fat from much idleness during eleven months of the year, sneering at and spitting upon folk of every class but their own, this professional soldier class makes any lasting peace in Europe impossible.

More fundamental, of course, is that group of national and economic problems which, during the nineteenth century, superseded dynastic quarrels in the history of Europe. The great international feuds are three in number. They are the Balkan problem, the mutual hatred of the ruling classes of France and Germany, and finally the rivalry of the German and British capitalists in the international market.

SERVIA

The vast majority of the population of the Balkans are Slavs. The spokesman of the Slavic interests is naturally the Czar. The Russian Empire has everything to gain by the victories of the small Balkan States over Turkey. Russian policy looks forward to the time when all of these shall be gathered in the fold of the Russian Empire. Servia, backed by Russia, stands with bold front in the path of German policy, which aims at political and economic expansion through the Balkans into Asia Minor. More than that, she covets the million and three-quarters of Slavs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as France covets her re-union with Alsace-Lorraine. The hatred of the Slavs of the Balkans for Austria is popular, profound and enduring. The assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, undoubtedly met with sincere approbation on the part of all the Slavs south of Austria and of many millions of Slavs within the Austrian Empire. This act on June 18th last

was not a very fine or a very modern way of settling a political question. But the Slavs do not claim to be, according to the standard of Western Europe or the United States, a very fine or a very modern people.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

The German "pressure toward the East," its effort to expand commercially through the Balkans and then secure an all-land route to Asia, is accomplished politically by means of Austria. The Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy is a political monstrosity, the like of which the world does not possess elsewhere. Its population is made up of Germans (12,000,000), Hungarians (10,000,000), and Slavs (24,000,000). Besides these there are Italians, Jews, Gypsies and Rumanians to the number of about 5,000,000. In the corrupt and withering structure of the Dual Monarchy, feuds between these various populations smoulder and break out like fires in a dung-hill. The Emperor Franz Josef is the most nearly perfect remaining representative of the Germany of the eighteenth century. He is now eighty-three years of age and has forgotten nothing and learned nothing since he harried every liberal-minded person out of the land after the revolution of 1848.

The twenty-four millions of Austrian Slavs are politically subservient to the twelve million Germans. The Hungarians have a separate government at Budapest, with Franz Josef as their king. The present war will probably mean the rending of this political "crazy-quilt" of Europe. Since the defeat of Austria by Prussia in 1866, her policy has been entirely dominated by the German government. Industrially as well as politically the Dual Monarchy is subsidiary. It furnishes Germany with food products and the raw materials of manufacture and conducts its oversea commerce largely through German ports.

The gross swindle called "Pan-Germanism" is transparent to the most superficial observer. To increase German power by the subjugation of the Southern Slavs, to beat back Russia, Germanize Europe to the Black Sea and the Bosphorus and place German sales-agents in Asia on an equal footing with those of Great Britain—that is the dream of empire which sweetens the sleep of Kaiser and capitalist alike.

RUSSIA

Russia is not an industrial but an agricultural country. The policy of her Imperial Government is directed not to secure markets but to conquer territory, as did the emperors of Rome and the European kings of the Middle Ages. Its hundred millions of peasants are peaceful enough—the man with the hoe never wants the man with the sabre to ride through his turnips. But they are as unde-

veloped and illiterate as the Mexican peons. There has been something almost cosmic, something terrifying to the civilizations of Europe, in the relentless progress of Russian power. Russia advanced to the far away Pacific, and surrendered Alaska to the United States only because she did not have the naval power to protect it from possible seizure by Great Britain. As the great Turkish Empire weakens and collapses, Russia waits like a vulture to devour the parts which fall away. Yet in the case of the South Slavic population in the Balkans we must admit that Russia has at least the argument to advance that she is fighting for the defence of a kindred people. Increase of the territory of Russia and of the prestige and power of the Czar's government within her own borders—those are really the great dangers of the present crisis. Nor did the Czar take up arms with an aching heart. When Austria declared war on Servia, Russian industries were paralyzed by great sympathetic strikes. In Russia any industrial upheaval is bound to have political consequences. War, even if not sought by the Czar, was a most opportune occasion for making an end of the strike.

GERMANY

Germany has over sixty-five millions of people living upon 208,000 square miles of land. These, even under the most highly developed form of capitalism which obtains in Germany, could not live were it not for a constantly increasing exportation of manufactures to foreign markets. Germany is now one of the first manufacturing nations of the world. Her exports amounted in 1913 to \$2,478,150,000, and her imports to \$2,673,750,000. The over-seas portion of this total was more than \$3,000,000,000, and was carried in 4,850 German ships. While Germany cannot be said to be actually driving Great Britain out of the markets of the world, she has been gathering to herself the increase. Even in Great Britain she sold, during the year 1912, over \$290,000,000 worth. Germany and Austria-Hungary comprise together a colossal industrial entity. Next to the United States, this is now by far the greatest factor in the economics of the world. Yet Germany has succeeded less because of her situation and natural resources than because of the character of her industrial population, and the application of science and method to industry and commerce.

The structure of German society to-day furnishes the greatest paradox in the history of the world. The evolution of German political life has not been logical, and hence not safe. The Germans, whom the outer world has known to be so methodical, careful, philosophical and scientific, have been building their government and laws, and hence their industrial and educational life, their whole complex civilization, upon quicksands,

European civilization develops, as every informed Socialist knows, through a series of class struggles. One ruling class succeeds another. The historical period in which one possessing and governing group gives way to another, is known as a revolution. The process in every Western European nation has been as follows: (1) A nomadic stage, with a primitive tribal government and a pastoral economy; (2) Feudalism, with a settled population, an agricultural economy, small economic and hence small political units; (3) A growing handicraftsmanship and commerce, with the result in politics of a monarchical absolutism; (4) The dominance of manufactures and commerce, expressed in political life through constitutionalism, republicanism and internationalism; (5) The growth of the labor and Socialist movement, with an intellectual class as spokesmen, resulting in state capitalism.

Normally the nations of Western Europe pass, with slight divergencies due to varying physiography and national economy, from period to period without much side-stepping, falling down or jumping. The English-speaking peoples furnish, of course, the classic example of logical development. The whole of Western Europe outside of Germany has evolved quite normally. Germany, despite her intellectual leadership of the world, has blundered politically and remained entangled with the past. She should have become a republic in 1848. Her economic development was adequate to that end. The Rhenish provinces and South Germany had been profoundly influenced, during the Napoleonic era, by the social and political results of the French Revolution. But the civilization of Germany had about its neck the mill-stone of Prussia. In Prussia, serfdom, or the actual slavery of the country worker, lasted until 1803. Economically it is still in force, for while the serf was granted his "freedom," the aristocracy kept the lands. On the backs of these toiling peasants there remains to-day an abominable class of parasites—the land-holding gentry of Central and Eastern Prussia.

The historical paradox furnished by this political rulership of the most advanced industrial and intellectual civilization of Europe by a brutal squirearchy headed by the Kaiser, is not as difficult to explain as it might seem. Let us again consider 1848. The revolutionary class at that time, especially in Western Germany, was very large. When the Austrian and Prussian governments beat them down, they emigrated to America—two and a half million strong during ten years. *They left Germany stripped of the revolutionary class which would have given her a political democracy and an orderly evolution of her whole social and cultural life.* The whole force of such German revolutionary thought as has remained

among the middle classes flowed into the channels of the Socialist movement. Before that could gain power as an opposition, the task of uniting Germany had been accomplished, not by the will of the people, but by the military power of the aristocrats. To unite Germany was as great and necessary a social work as to free Germany. The same may be said of America and of Italy in the mid-century. Since the close of the Middle Ages it had been a fond hope of the German mind. By 1860 it had become an absolute necessity to German economic progress. Mere tariff leagues among the German states had been tried and proven inadequate. Vainly did the political democrats and the nascent Socialists unite their voices in favor of a liberal union in the sixties of the last century. The brutal statesmanship of Bismarck and the cavalry of Von Roon broke down all opposition. The ruling aristocrats even won over the business class to their ridiculous notion that a modern industrial state can be successfully reared and permanently established by the old methods of military conquest. Germany was united by means of a great series of political lies, diplomatic swindles, and bloodthirsty raids by Prussia upon her neighbors. After the imperial crowning of the pliant tool of Bismarck in the Tuileries, in 1871, there followed a period of blue reaction in the whole political life of Germany. Middle class liberalism, fearful of the Socialists and impressed by victory, bowed before the Black Eagle. They were rewarded by the development of a forceful and successful commercial policy in foreign affairs. The unholy alliance was perfected and grew in solidity with the growth of the Socialist vote on one hand, and the increase of foreign exports on the other. So it continued—this abortion, this monstrosity, this German night in the midst of universal day. Bismarck, whom the elder Liebknecht described as being totally ignorant of all the truly vital facts and forces of our time, the German bourgeois almost worshipped as the greatest man of the nineteenth century. What indeed must have been the soliloquy of the troubled ghost of this man as it looked upon the heaps of German dead before the forts of Liege, and what will it murmur when it sees French dragoons and Russian Cossacks riding the streets of Berlin?

To that group of Germans who still harbor in the recesses of their minds the traditions of 1848, the leaden clouds of war have a silver lining. Socialism may not immediately result, but political democracy—that at least is assured.

GERMAN *Versus* SLAV

No German in the United States is more capable of speaking for the Germany of eighteenth century absolutism than is Professor

Hugo Muensterberg, of Harvard University. Writing in the *New York Times* of August 9th, Prof. Muensterberg declares:

If this war means such an inevitable conflict of the Slavic and Germanic world, at least it ought to be clear to everyone who can think historically that it belongs to the type of war for which the world as yet knows no substitute, the one type of war which, in spite of the terrible losses, is ultimately moral. Surely no comment on this fight of the nations is more absurd than the frivolous cry that this is "an immoral war."

Speaking generally, this paragraph classifies the mind of Prof. Muensterberg and of all other supporters of the hopes of imperial Germany. Washington, Jefferson and Thomas Paine had cast off this remnant of the mentality of savagery a century and a quarter ago. If Prof. Muensterberg and the German Emperor are correct, then the North and the South of Ireland ought to be at each other's throats forthwith. The United States should make war upon Spanish America, forcibly teach English to its populations and grant fellowships in the department of philosophy at Harvard to the natives who submit first. Prof. Muensterberg perhaps does not realize that his is the theory of the nation-state as developed at the close of the Middle Ages. He shows not the slightest trace of modern internationalism, which is based upon international commerce and which results even now in international culture and fraternity.

As regards this specific case, Prof. Muensterberg's standpoint is most unfortunate. Germany and Austria appear as the aggressors, first annexing territory entirely Slav in population, and then, when the action results in unlawful opposition, crushing out the life of an independent Slavic state. But the imperialistic theory necessarily implies the forcible expansion of one nation or race at the expense of another, with all the bitter tyrannies and conflicts which result.

THE IMMEDIATE OCCASION OF WAR

That the purpose of Austria was to utterly crush Serbia, permits of no dispute. Austria made ten demands upon Serbia and gave her *forty-eight hours in which to reply*. This insultingly short time limit is a Prussian military method, the purpose of which is to attack a weak enemy before he can be ready. The Servian Government was forced to choose between peace or war without even consulting its legislature or taking time to think calmly.* The fifth demand made upon Serbia reads as follows:

* An understanding of the immediate occasion of the war is impossible without reading the Austrian demands and the Servian reply. They are printed in full in the *New York Times* of August 9th.

"To accept the collaboration in Servia of representatives of the Austro-Hungarian government in the suppression of the subversive movement directed against the territorial integrity of the monarchy." The humiliation of Servia in submitting to all but this demand, which would have been tantamount to utter surrender of her sovereignty, was abject to the point of complete moral stultification.

The statement that Germany expected attack by Russia, that "the sword was forced into her hand," is indeed a very stupid lie. The government of Germany is responsible for the Austrian policy of conquest in the Balkans. History will not fail to lay at the door of the German people as well as of the Emperor, whose insolent banalities they have so long tolerated, entire responsibility for starting the war.

The time seemed ripe. The French army was known not to be at its best. Insufficient funds had been voted for its maintenance. The Socialist attacks upon the three year service law had weakened its morale. Great Britain faced a civil war. One week before the German army occupied Luxembourg and entered Belgium, English troops had shed Irish blood in the streets of Dublin. The military unpreparedness of Russia is proverbial. For the Kaiser to wait until after the next election, might force him to reckon with a Socialist majority in the Reichstag. His army had been recently greatly strengthened. The disproportion between his navy and that of Great Britain would be likely to increase against him rather than decrease. His whole life, twenty-five years of which had been spent in preparation for the ultimate test, demanded that he work at his bloody trade, before it was too late to distinguish his reign by feats of arms.

THE GERMAN ARMY

The myth regarding the prowess of German arms is now being exploded. The almost universal acceptance of this belief results from a misinterpretation of a few incidents which should have misled nobody. The last distinguished exploits of the Germans at war (excepting the very great services of the German-Americans in our Civil War) were performed under the command of Frederick the Great a hundred and fifty years ago. In the so-called "War of Liberation" against Napoleon, the Germans were united with the whole of Europe against the Fallen Mighty after the disasters of the Russian campaign. The three wars which resulted from the unconscionable schemes of Bismarck in the movement for German unity, did not give Prussia a single foe worthy of the efforts of first-class troops. In the Schleswig-Holstein affair, the combined armies of Austria and Prussia marched into the duchies, captured a

fort, and the Danes wisely submitted. Austrians arms, of course, have never won a battle which the world remembers. When the Prussians were upon them at Sadowa and Koniggratz, they collapsed in a fortnight. Finally, the victories of 1870 against that blundering charlatan, Napoleon III., were nothing to the credit of either generals or troops. The German army of Von Moltke was ready, perfect in organization. In that lay its strength.

The truth is that the German army, with all its wonderful machinery of war, retains the psychology of the armies of Frederick the Great. Is it possible that there is a sub-lieutenant in the army of China or Abyssinia who does not know that troops must not be exposed in masses, not to speak of hurling them in such form against fortifications? Armies which are really modern emphasize at every point, especially upon the skirmish lines, the imperative need of individual brains and initiative on the part of the rank and file. The bane of imperialism in arms is that it depends, not upon the free intelligence of the whole population, but upon that of a general staff and rigid discipline for all beneath. Fortunately, in holding back the political development of Germany and Russia, kingly rule has stultified their military development as well.

The foreign policy of the Emperor on the eve of the present conflict was everywhere subordinated to the immediate and superficial demands of his military requirements. Strategically he needed Belgium to pierce the French line and take the short and easy route to Paris. So he made bitter, fighting enemies of seven millions of Belgians and thereby drew into the conflict the mighty British navy. These facts prove again that the progress of the world is inevitable. Outworn systems enthrone stupidity. And stupidity, when vested with responsibility, leads to suicide.

PROBABLE RESULTS OF THE WAR

Everybody prophesies. The future is more interesting than the past. So we shall make no excuses. The war will result in territorial alterations, in a readjustment of the Balance of Power, and in profound social transformations.

The territorial readjustments will be made, of course, at the expense of both Germany and Austria. Bosnia and Herzegovina will either go to Servia or be erected into a separate Balkan kingdom. A million or more Rumanians in Transylvania will be united with their national state. If Poland be actually erected into an autonomous state, France and England will permit the inclusion

of Galicia and Prussian Poland. Of course Alsace-Lorraine will go to France.*

The old "Balance of Power" with the Triple Alliance on one side and the Triple Entente on the other, will now require, if indeed the institution continues at all, a readjustment. Its continuance will depend upon the attitude of Russia. If the Czar comes out of this struggle with his autocratic power intact, and firmly entrenched in his leadership of all the Slavic peoples, the dividing line of the new "Balance of Power" is quite evident. It will be Western Europe against the Slav. For so long as autocracy continues, Russia will not disarm. Her next move will be to seize Constantinople and Asiatic Turkey. The news of the reconstitution of Poland, with a view to including Austrian and Prussian Poland, has already led to misgivings in London.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire will undoubtedly be broken up by the withdrawal of Hungary from connection with the House of Hapsburg. The German nation will remain intact. If a republic succeeds the German Empire, German Austria will undoubtedly be included. The Italian population of Austria, east of the Adriatic, would surely have been united with Italy had that nation joined the forces of the Triple Entente. As it is, Italy will quite likely claim it as a reward for remaining neutral. One of the very greatest territorial benefits of the war will be the conquest of the German fortress and colony of Kiau-Chau, in China, with its sphere of influence, by Japan. The driving of Russian and German drill-sergeants out of the Orient is one of the essentials to civilized progress in that quarter.

SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

From the point of view of the working class throughout the world, the declaration of war on August 29th will prove to be the greatest event in the history of the Socialist and labor movement. Even a political republic in Germany was not possible without war. The power of the Kaiser must needs be broken by force either from within or from without. No one doubts that it would have been better for the working class to have had force applied directly from within. "Those who would be free themselves must strike the blow." Yet the German Social Democracy was wise in biding its time. No political party in the world knew so well that it could

* The inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine, though the vast majority of them speak German, have remained at heart loyal to France. A Germanic party has never included more than government officials and a section of capitalists who profited or expected to profit by the union with Germany. The attitude of this Teutonic population is due entirely to a social cause. With France it took part in the triumphs and the benefits of the French Revolution. After nearly a century of political freedom it could not be made to enjoy "Prussian discipline."

not control the primary forces of history. As in the Paris of 1871, the hour for the working class to strike comes when nationalist patriotism has spent itself. For the Socialists to revolt when the war-crazed mobs of Berlin surged through every street was simply impossible. In any case, the die is cast. There will be sooner or later that uprising of the hosts of German labor for which every revolutionary Socialist has so long hoped with all his heart. Incidentally we may observe that the events which have already transpired have completely destroyed and swept away the historically untrue, politically unsound, and altogether ridiculous set of notions which the compromising and cowardly leaders of "peace at any price Socialism" have foisted from the top upon the international movement. Revolutionary Socialists have been for so long jeered at and misrepresented by a few politicians and misunderstood by so many, that it seemed doubtful whether the atmosphere would ever be cleared. The stupendous forces now unloosed upon the world make further argument unnecessary.

A FINAL WORD

It remains for us in America, first of all, to have confidence in our comrades in Europe. They will, in every land, do their duty. Let us remember that revolutionary periods demand practicality. In Italy, a country until now united with the aggressor, it was happily possible for the Socialist movement to help avert war. If in France and Belgium our movement has been swept along by the general opposition to the aggression of Germany, let us withhold our criticism. Our comrades are quite likely prepared to show cause. In England the vast meetings of the workers in protest against war were noted even by the capitalist papers of this country.

Meanwhile all of us await with firm faith and mighty hope the hour of redemption in Germany.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN SOCIALISTS ON THE WAR

BY WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

The confused state of mind of many American Socialists is exhibited by an editorial remark of the *New York Call*:

As for ourselves, we declare our neutrality. What we are looking for, the one thing we are thinking about, is how far this war will advance the cause of Socialism and Social Revolution. To us it is of minor consequence who comes out on top.

Undoubtedly the Socialist war against capitalism must continue, even in the midst of other wars. But is it a matter of indifference to us whether the Russian and German governments are defeated? Do we not prefer the governments of England and France? And if the war leads to a general overthrow of governments by peoples, may it not be worth the price?

Yet the Socialist Parties of England and America, while predicting that revolutions would occur in Germany and Russia, opposed the war. The American Party declared:

The Socialist Party of the United States, in conformity with the declaration of the international Socialist movement, hereby reiterates its opposition to this and all other wars waged upon any pretext whatsoever.

Even a revolutionary war is here condemned. The declaration continues:

The Socialist Party of the United States hereby calls upon all foreign-born workmen residing in this country, particularly those whose home governments are engaged in the present strife, to hold joint mass meetings for the purpose of emphasizing the fraternity and solidarity of all working people, irrespective of color, creed, race, or nationality.

As four out of five of the members of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party favor Asiatic exclusion, this declaration is obviously insincere—at least, as applied to several colors and races.

Similarly the British Socialists, with the exception of Wells and Shaw, denounced the war—until the German invasion of Belgium, when they divided. They denounced all war, but especially this one—in view of the alliance with Russia. The big demonstration in Trafalgar Square on August 2nd, presided over by Keir Hardie, Hyndman, and Lansbury, protested against any step being taken to support Russia.

At the same time the organ of the British Labor movement, the

Daily Citizen, predicted that the war would lead to revolutions both in Germany and in Russia:

The moment Russia moves toward war the Russian people move toward revolution. And not the Russian people only, but also nationalities like Finland and Poland, upon whom Russia has trampled with clumsy and heavy foot.

Nor is the position of the Kaiser much happier than that of the Czar. Kaiserdom is on its last legs in Germany, even as Czardom is in Russia; the steady advance of democracy will put an end to both. The German workers are peace-loving and do not want war; least of all do they desire to be dragged at the tail of the Hapsburgs.

Are the *Daily Citizen* and Keir Hardie and the rest opposed to democratic revolutions in Russia and Germany? No. But they are not international enough to want to help pay the price. The Russian workers favor anything that promises revolution, and so do the majority of the German workers. But the British do not want to be dragged into Continental affairs. They prefer their relatively petty reforms at home.

So strongly do they feel this that their John Burns resigns from the Cabinet and their J. R. MacDonald from the leadership of the Labor Party—even after the invasion of Belgium—rather than share the great responsibility.

The British Socialist intellectuals, however—unreliable as they often are—have not failed in this great crisis. Both Wells and Shaw refused to participate in the Socialist peace demonstrations in London—and gave their reasons, which were almost identical. And they certainly cannot be suspected of collaboration.

Like all Socialists, Wells would tolerate no attack on the German people or on the integrity of the German nation:

It will be a sin to dismember Germany or to allow any German-speaking and German-feeling territory to fall under a foreign yoke.

Let us English make sure of ourselves in that matter. There may be restoration of alien territory to the French, the Polish, the Danish and the Italian; but we have seen enough of racial subjugation now to be sure that we will tolerate no more of it. From the Rhine to East Prussia, and from the Baltic to the southern limits of German-speaking Austria, the Germans are one people. Let us begin with a resolution to permit no new bitterness of conquered territories to come into existence to disturb the future peace of Europe.

Let us see to it that, at the ultimate settlement, Germans, however great this overthrow may be, are all left free men.

A bloody and embittered Germany, continuously stung by the outcries of her subject kindred, will sit down grimly to grow a new generation of soldiers, and prepare for her revenge.

Here are Wells' main reasons as given in the *New York Times and World*:

The defeat of Germany may open the way to disarmament and peace throughout the earth. To those who love peace there can be no other hope in the present conflict than her defeat, the utter discrediting of the German legend—ending it for good and all—of blood and iron, the superstition of Krupp, flag-wagging, Teutonic Kiplingism, and all that criminal sham efficiency that centers in Berlin.

But be it remembered that Europe's quarrel is with Germany as a State, not with the German people, with the system, not with the race.

The older tradition of Germany is a pacific, civilizing tradition. The temperament of the mass of the German people is kindly, sane, amiable. Disaster to the German Army, if it is unaccompanied by such a memorable wrong as dismemberment or intolerable indignity, will mean the restoration of the greatest people of Europe to the fellowship of the western nations.

France, Italy, England, and all the smaller powers of Europe are now pacific countries. Russia, after a huge war, will be too exhausted for further adventure. [This remark should be much stronger. The Russian government will be bankrupt certainly, and Czarism will probably be overthrown.] Shattered Germany will be revolutionary. Germany will be sick of the uniforms and imperialist idea as France was in 1871, as disillusioned about predominance as Bulgaria is to-day.

The way will be open at last for all these Western powers to organize a peace.

That is why I, with my declared horror of war, did not sign any of these "stop the war" appeals.

Declarations that have appeared in the last few days are that every sword is drawn against Germany. Now is the sword drawn for peace.

Bernard Shaw, in a letter to the *Daily Citizen*, written just before the war, takes the same stand as Wells, though he fully admits that Russia is even worse than Germany, though weaker and not so dangerous:

To us and to Western civilization the worst calamity that can occur is a war between France and Germany, or between either of them and England. All our diplomacy and all our power should be directed to its prevention. And to that end there is only one thing that our diplomacy can do, and that is to represent that in such a war England must take her part, and is ready to take her part, with the object of making a speedy end of it at the expense of the aggressor.

With that responsibility on us, those of us who have nothing more helpful to do than to sing Christmas carols had better hold our tongues.

The alliance between the revolutionary Government of France and the reactionary Government of Russia is a monstrous and unnatural product of cosmopolitan finance. One of its threatened consequences at present is the forcing by circumstances of England

into the ranks of Russian despotism in defense of a Servian assassination.

Shaw, like Wells, desires that Germany should not be beaten too badly, though there is no great danger of that:

Germany is so important a factor in the work of civilization that, even when we are at war with her, we must aim finally at the conservation of her power, to defend her Russian frontier.

This need not discourage us in the field. On the contrary, we shall punch Prussia's head all the more gloriously if we do it for honor and not for malice. Then, when we have knocked all the militarism out of her and taught her to respect us, we can let her up again.

As to non-intervention, it is merely an insular superstition. The leaders of the modern labor movement know that labor politics is international and that, if militarism is to be struck down, a mortal blow must be aimed at Potsdam.

Consider for a moment the mischief already done by this peace retrenchment reform superstition. Why was it that Asquith and Grey did not dare to tell the Commons we had entered into a fighting alliance with France against Germany?

Solely because they were afraid that if they told the whole truth both the labor members and the non-interventionists, as well as the anti-armament Liberals, would have revolted and have abandoned the Premier and his Cabinet to the mercy of Ulster.

The mischief of all this was that it encouraged the Continental conviction that we would not fight. This conviction, true enough, might have restrained France from declaring war, if France had wanted war, but this is just what France did not want.

On the other hand, its effect on Germany must have been disastrous. Germany was the country that needed restraining, and the official prevarication by which the Liberal party was duped encouraged Germany to believe we would back out in the end, and thereby precipitated Germany's desperate rush at France.

Had our Government possessed a real modern foreign policy, Asquith might have said furiously to Prussian militarism:

"If you attempt to smash France, we two will smash you, if we can. We have had enough of the Germany of Bismarck, which all the world loathes, and we will see whether we cannot revive the Germany of Goethe and Beethoven, which has not an enemy on earth."

A stronger reason for not wanting Germany to be beaten too badly is that this might lead to desperation and a revival of nationalism, whereas a lesser blow might fall chiefly on the head of the Kaiser and help the people to form a peaceful republic.

On the other hand, most Socialists do not desire to see the Czar or Kaiser get too easily away. It is not as if Russia and Germany were on the very verge of revolution, as some Socialists and even some non-Socialists have supposed. The war was not declared to head off revolution—even in Russia—but for purposes of conquest.

This mistaken view is expressed for example by the *American Socialist*, the new official organ of our Socialist Party:

European capitalism is fomenting the pending pan-European campaign of wholesale murder as its only hope of checking, crushing and stamping out the continually growing and increasingly formidable rebellion against wage slavery.

If this were true, the revolution—in the shape of a general strike—ought to be declared even before the war.

This idea of an international general strike was advocated by Jaurès right up to his assassination at the outbreak of the war. But it had no real meaning, since he explained a few days before his death that he knew that the German Socialists would not consent to it. Jaurès, like the British Socialists, did not care to sacrifice the French workers for possible revolutions in Germany and France. His interest in reforms was so keen that he said in Brussels two days before his death that he knew that the French government was honest in its efforts to maintain peace. This remark, which—like his advocacy of the general strike—made a sensation, was also empty of all real meaning. For he also complained that the French government had tied itself to Russia. It could be as truthfully said that the Kaiser desired peace, but he had tied himself to Austria.

The Wells-Shaw view is ably supported in this country by Allan L. Benson, author of "The Truth About Socialism" and other writings which have been circulated by the million by the American Party, more in fact than those of any other writer. Benson published in the *New York Call* an article, "Let the War Go On," from which we take the following powerful paragraphs:

I am sorry to hear that the Socialists of New York intend to hold an anti-war meeting in Union Square Saturday afternoon. I am sorry to hear it because I like always to feel that the Socialists are maintaining and increasing their reputation for common sense. I hate war, but I do not hate it so much as I hate some kinds of peace. I regretted to see this war come on, but now that it has come, I want to see it go on until its cause shall have been wiped out of existence.

What is its cause? Comrades may say that capitalism was its cause. Quite so. But that is not sufficiently definite. It is no more nearly definite than it would be to say that the atmosphere is the cause of the aeroplane. Without the atmosphere the aeroplane would not have existed. Without capitalism, the present European war would not have been begun. The present European war is the result of capitalism, plus the predatory and military spirit of Germany as typified by its Emperor.

Germany won an easy victory from France forty-four years ago. From that day to this she has been drunk with confidence and ambition. . . .

Why not stop the war then? We may omit consideration of the fact that it would be precisely as nearly possible to try to stop an eruption of a volcano after it had begun to spout. We should not try to stop the war because the spirit that has caused this war is a menace to civilization. Civilization will not be safe until that spirit is crushed. If it were not to be crushed now, it would cause another war. Until the war came the world would be compelled to arm against it. No nation would be safe over night. The suddenness with which Germany precipitated the present war shows the dangerous character of such a spirit.

Comrades may recall the fact that in this great war as in all others, workingmen are doing the fighting and the dying. Comrades may even argue that German workingmen are fighting and dying only because of their ignorance. Comrades may explain that if the German workingmen knew wherein their interests really lay they would not fight and that therefore it is inhuman to kill them off. Comrades may therefore blame capitalism, as it is expressed in Germany, for the ignorance of the German workingmen. All of which I contend is not to the point. The stern fact is that German workingmen are shooting down the workingmen of other nations. The stern fact is that the workingmen of other nations did not seek this war. The stern fact is that German workingmen have put bayonets to the throats of all the workingmen in Europe except the workingmen of Austria-Hungary and Italy—and Austria-Hungary is spared only because it is Germany's ally in murder.

I don't care who puts a bayonet to my throat, whether he is a capitalist, a workingman or even a Socialist workingman—if I can get to him first I will kill him. The fact that he is misguided will not save him. The fact that he is ignorant will not save him. Not even the fact that he is working against his own interests will save him if I can put a bullet into his skull before he puts a bayonet into my throat. And, if I have any means by which I can take the fighting spirit out of that man so he will let me live in peace in future—I'll use them.

Benson is by no means alone. The official Party organ, the *American Socialist*, also considers Austria the aggressor. We read:

Servia is a haven of hope in Southern Europe. The liberties won by its people match the cruel oppression of the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary as the freedom achieved by the United States challenges middle-aged Russia.

The South Slavs dream of a South Slavic republic. The Servians join in this dream and strive to make the dream real. Such success would mean the wreckage of Europe's trembling thrones and the scrapping of its tyrants' crowns.

The Socialist organ shows that the whole International movement agrees in the legitimacy of the Servian aspirations:

Nearly two years ago at the Extraordinary International Socialist Peace Congress held at Basel, Switzerland, during the Balkan war, the bloody fingers of anti-humanity were seen streaking their hope for war in unmistakable letters across a reddening sky.

The declaration of this congress, Nov. 24-25, 1912, which stayed this war hope for nearly two years, was as follows:

"The Socialist parties of Austria-Hungary, Croatia, Slavonia and Herzegovina must continue with all their strength their hitherto successful efforts to prevent any attack of the Austrian monarchy upon Serbia. They must continue to oppose in the future as they have done up to the present any attempt to take by violence from Serbia the fruits of war and to transform that country into an Austrian province and to embroil the peoples of Austria-Hungary and other nations of Europe in conflict in the interests of the ruling dynasty. The Socialists of Austria-Hungary will have to struggle in the future in favor of securing a complete autonomous democratic government for the whole of the Southern Slavs, now governed by the Hapsburg dynasty within the frontiers of Austria-Hungary."

Victor Berger also sees an advance of Socialism as a result of the war. He is quoted in an interview as saying:

The outcome will decide whether or not there will be a United States of Europe.

One-half of the German army is made up of Socialists. When the time comes they will act.

If the war is to create a United States of Europe—or even if it is to result in several democratic and federal republics, then Socialists must say with Benson and Wells and Shaw: "Let the war go on!" But if the war does more than this, if it leads to real *social* revolutions, to the complete overthrow of the ruling aristocracies and plutocracies of Europe—even though it does not carry any country as far as Socialism—within a few years it will have amply repaid its cost in blood and treasure, no matter how staggering this cost may be.

ANTI-WAR MANIFESTOES

THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The Executive Committee of the German Social Democracy issued the following proclamation on the 25th of July:

The fields in the Balkans are not yet dry from the blood of those who have been massacred by thousands; the ruins of the devastated towns are still smoking; unemployed hungry men, widowed women and orphaned children are still wandering about the country. Yet once more the war-fury, unchained by Austrian Imperialism, is setting out to bring death and destruction over the whole of Europe.

Though we also condemn the behavior of the Great Serbian nationalists, the frivolous war-provocation of the Austro-Hungarian Government calls for the sharpest protest. For the demands of that Government are more brutal than have ever been put to an independent State in the world's history, and can only be intended deliberately to provoke war.

In the name of humanity and civilization the class-conscious proletariat of Germany raises a flaming protest against this criminal behavior of the war provokers. It imperiously demands of the German Government that it use its influence with the Austrian Government for the preservation of peace, and, if the shameful war cannot be prevented, to abstain from any armed interference. Not one drop of a German soldier's blood shall be sacrificed to the lust of power of the Austrian rulers and to the Imperialistic profit-interests.

Comrades, we appeal to you to express at mass meetings without delay the German proletariat's firm determination to maintain peace. A solemn hour has come, more serious than any during the last few decades. Danger is approaching! The world-war is threatening! The ruling classes who in time of peace gag you, despise you and exploit you, would misuse you as food for cannon. Everywhere must sound in the ears of those in power: "We will have no war! Down with war! Long live the international brotherhood of the peoples!"

THE AUSTRIAN SOCIALIST DEPUTIES

The German deputies of the Austrian Social Democratic Party have issued a long manifesto, from which the following is taken:—

Was it really necessary? We Social Democrats, the representatives of the working people, do not shut our eyes to the great injury

which the Servian rulers have done to Austria. As we, true to our principles which repudiate vain deeds of force, condemn the assassinations at Serajevo, so also do we condemn those who bear a share in the responsibility for it. We recognize that Austria-Hungary is within its rights in asking from the Servian Government the prosecution of the participators in that crime; we understand that Austria-Hungary demands that the underground agitation against the security and peace of the Austrian Federation of States shall be stopped, and that the Servian rulers shall put an end to the encouraging toleration with which they have hitherto regarded this secessionist movement. But we are convinced that the Servian Government would not have been able to offer any opposition to these demands of Austria-Hungary, which are sanctioned by international law, and would, in fact, have offered none. We are convinced that all that Austria-Hungary asks could have been obtained, and can still be obtained, by peaceful methods, and that no necessities of State, no consideration for its prestige, compels the Great Power to depart from the paths of peaceful agreement. Therefore we declare, in the name of the working class, as the representatives of the German workers in Austria, that we cannot take the responsibility for this war, that we lay the responsibility for it, and for all the frightfully serious results that may follow, at the door of those who thought out, supported and encouraged the fatal step which has brought us face to face with war.

We are all the more bound to make this declaration since the peoples of Austria have been for many months robbed of their constitutional rights and are debarred from the tribune from which they could pronounce their will. In the face of a war which demands the utmost sacrifices in blood and treasure from every member of the State, the deliberate violation of the will of the people by keeping Parliament out of action is all the more calculated to embitter and irritate.

The manifesto goes on to say that the Socialists desire a free, progressive Austria, based on the self-government of all the nations; a federation of free peoples; a State which will help and not hinder the working-class struggle for emancipation. It closes as follows: "The people cannot decide on peace or war. Parliament, through which it should express itself, is dumb. Chains have been put upon the freedom of the Press and of political meetings. Conscious of this fateful hour our warning shall loudly go forth: Peace is the most precious possession of man, the greatest need of the peoples!

We repudiate all responsibility for this war; solemnly and emphatically we lay it to the charge of those on both sides who have instigated it and wished to let it loose. In this we know we are united with the class-conscious proletariat of the whole world, and not least with the Social Democrats of Servia. We hereby solemnly dedicate ourselves to the work of civilization, to International Social Democracy, to which we shall remain faithful during life and devoted till death.

THE FRENCH SOCIALIST PARTY

Citizens:—The fundamental anarchy of our social system, the competitions of capitalist groups, the colonial lusts, the intrigues and brutalities of Imperialism—the policy of rapine of some, the policy of pride and prestige of others—have created a permanent tension in Europe for the last ten years, a constant and growing risk of war.

The peril has been suddenly increased by the aggressive proceedings of Austro-Hungarian diplomacy. Whatever may be the grievances of Austria-Hungary, whatever may be the excesses of Nationalist Pan-Serbism, as has been declared by our Austrian comrades, Austria could have obtained all necessary guarantees without recourse to the threatening and brutal Note which suddenly gives rise to the menace of the most revolting and frightful of wars.

Against this policy of violence and the brutal methods which may now let loose upon Europe a catastrophe without precedent, the proletariat of all countries must raise their protest. They must express their horror of war and their intention to prevent it. The Socialists, the workers of France, make an appeal to the whole country to use all efforts for the maintenance of peace. They know that in the present crisis the French Government is most sincerely anxious to avert or to diminish the risks of conflict. It is asked to apply itself to securing a policy of conciliation and mediation rendered all the easier by the readiness of Servia to accede to the major portion of the Austrian demands. It is asked to influence its ally, Russia, in order that she shall not seek a pretext for aggressive operations under cover of defending the interests of the Slavs. Their efforts thus correspond with those of the German Social Democrats in demanding that Germany shall exercise a moderating influence on her ally, Austria. Both at their posts of action have the same work and the same end.

It is this strongest and most imperative desire for peace, comrades, which must be expressed in the meetings which we call upon you to multiply. It is to declare all together and most vigorously this common desire of the proletariat of Europe for peace and to concentrate in vigorous common action, that the International meets to-morrow at Brussels. With it we shall work with all our energy against the abominable crime which now menaces the world. The possibility of this crime is in itself a condemnation of the whole régime.

THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY

The following resolution was adopted by the Executive Committee of the British Socialist Party:—

The British Socialist Party joins with its Socialist comrades throughout the civilized world in denouncing the provocative note of Austria-Hungary to Servia, sent before fuller inquiry was made

into the responsibility of the Servian Government for the assassinations at Serajevo. It heartily congratulates the Social Democrats of Vienna, Berlin, Paris, and other centers upon their vigorous efforts to prevent the outbreak of war, and pledges its members to do their utmost to support similar pacific efforts in Great Britain.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU

A special meeting of the International Socialist Bureau was held at Brussels on July 29th. The following resolution was adopted:

In assembly of July 29th the International Socialist Bureau has heard declarations from representatives of all nations threatened by a world war, describing the political situation in their respective countries.

With unanimous vote, the Bureau considers it an obligation for the workers of all concerned nations not only to continue but even to strengthen their demonstrations against war in favor of peace and of a settlement of the Austro-Servian conflict by arbitration.

The German and French workers will bring to bear on their Governments the most vigorous pressure in order that Germany may secure in Austria a moderating action, and in order that France may obtain from Russia an undertaking that she will not engage in the conflict. On their side the workers of Great Britain and Italy shall sustain these efforts with all the power at their command.

The congress urgently convoked in Paris will be the vigorous expression of the absolutely peaceful will of the workers of the whole world.

It was further resolved that "the International Socialist Bureau congratulates the Russian workers on their revolutionary attitude, and invites them to continue their heroic efforts against Czardom as being one of the most effective guarantees against the threatened world war."

THE BELGIAN SOCIALIST PARTY

The General Council of the Belgian Socialist Labor Party issued the following manifesto: —

To the People!

The European war is declared.

In a few days, a few hours perhaps, millions of men who ask only to live in peace will be dragged without their consent into the most appalling of butcheries by treaties to which they have not agreed, by a decision with which they had nothing to do.

The Social Democracy bears no responsibility in this disaster.

It shrank from nothing to warn the people, to prevent the folly of armaments, to drive back the catastrophe which will strike all European communities.

But to-day the harm is done, and by the fatality of events one thought dominates us: that soon, perhaps, we shall have to direct our efforts to stopping the invasion of our territory.

We do so with all the more ardent hearts in that in defending the neutrality and even the existence of our country against militarist barbarism we shall be conscious of serving the cause of democracy and of political liberties in Europe.

Our comrades who are called to the colors will show how Socialist workers can conduct themselves in the face of danger. But whatever the circumstances in which they find themselves, we ask them never to forget, among the horrors they will see perpetrated, that they belong to the Workers' International, and that they must be fraternal and humane as far as is compatible with their legitimate individual defence and that of the country.

THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY

The Socialist party of the United States hereby extends its sympathy to the workers of Europe in their hour of trial, when they have been plunged into bloody and senseless conflict by ambition-crazed monarchs, designing politicians and scheming capitalists.

We bid them to consider that the workers of the various nations involved have no quarrel with each other, and that the evils from which they suffer—poverty, want, unemployment, oppression—are inflicted upon them not by the workers of some other country, but by the ruling classes of their own country.

We bid them to take thought before they allow themselves to be used blindly by heartless and inhuman despots who would spill the blood of thousands, inflict pain and sorrow upon millions, devastate the land and set back civilization in order to further their own wretched plots and schemes.

The Socialist party of the United States, in conformity with the declarations of the international Socialist movement, hereby reiterates its opposition to this and all other wars, waged upon any pretext whatsoever; war being a crude, savage and unsatisfactory method of settling real or imaginary differences between nations, and destructive of the ideals of brotherhood and humanity to which the international Socialist movement is dedicated.

The Socialist party of the United States hereby expresses its condemnation of the ruling classes of Europe and points out to the world that by their action in this crisis they have conclusively proven that they are unfit to administer the affairs of nations in such a manner that the lives and happiness of the people may be safeguarded.

The Socialist party of the United States hereby calls upon all foreign-born workingmen residing in this country, particularly upon those whose home governments are engaged in the present strife, to hold joint mass meetings for the purpose of emphasizing the fraternity and solidarity of all working people, irrespective of color, creed, race or nationality. We call upon the Socialist locals

throughout the country to promote such meetings and to give all possible assistance.

The Socialist party of the United States hereby pledges its loyal support to the Socialist parties of Europe in any measures they might think it necessary to undertake to advance the cause of peace and of good-will among men.

The Socialist party of the United States hereby calls upon the national administration to prove the genuineness of its policy of peace by opening immediate negotiations for mediation and extending every effort to bring about the speedy termination of this disastrous conflict.

By order of

THE COMMITTEE ON IMMEDIATE ACTION.

WALTER LANFERSIEK,

Executive Secretary Socialist Party of America.

LONG LIVE THE GERMAN REPUBLIC

The German Socialist Club of Paris issued the following declaration:—

In this hour of sadness we express our sentiments of fraternity. German Socialists prefer to remain in your country of liberty, refusing to fight their French Comrades. We can no longer love a country which attacks a peaceful nation. Our sympathies are with you in defending the soil of liberty. Go on to victory. Defeat the criminal government of Berlin. Down with the monarchists! Long live democratic France! Long live the German Republic!

THE APPROACHING ELECTIONS

BY CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL

All close political observers outside of the Socialist Party expect the Socialists to make an impressive showing of strength in the election this fall.

The wisest politician in the State of New York said to me a week ago:

"You people ought to make a killing this year. If you could have everything fixed to order you could not possibly have a better situation."

He asked me how many members of Congress I thought the Socialists would elect, and was rather astonished at my estimate because it was so much less than his own.

Predictions of great Socialist gains are common now.

Doubtless they can be realized.

From the remarks of many Socialists I gather that they believe the party ought not to gain any votes nor to try to gain them.

This may be wisdom; I do not pretend here to set up a contrary opinion.

But, of course, if we desire not to gain any votes that is an end very easily attained.

One way would be not to nominate any ticket.

Another would be to carry on a campaign in a vocabulary unintelligible to the American public, without system or tactics, debating all issues except those in which people have a normal interest, antagonizing the voters instead of attracting them, kicking persons in the face that show an inclination to join us, and pursuing methods that the average American cannot possibly understand.

That would be almost as effective as the other to keep our vote down.

Since you do me the honor to ask my opinion, it seems to me that we have a very unusual opportunity to advance the Socialist cause at the coming election, if we desire to do so. But if we conclude that this is our wish and purpose, it will be well for us to remember that additional votes must be sought from a public of certain fixed and unalterable habits of mind and of political procedure, and that no party can ever secure the support of this public that does not recognize its habits.

There is in the United States a larger Socialist sentiment than exists in any other country in the world. How large a proportion of this sentiment has so far found expression in the Socialist Party most observers can estimate as easily as I can.

I should think that the existence of so great a Socialist sentiment outside the party might well be a subject of profound reflection. At least to those that recognize the great truth that in this country we shall make small progress toward the emancipation of the working class except along political lines first.

CARNEGIE, MAN OF PEACE

BY EUGENE V. DEBS

In his lusty prime Andrew Carnegie was a redoubtable warrior; in his doddering senility he has become an ardent philanthropist and an apostle of peace. His name is chiselled above the portals of unnumbered library buildings in token of his philanthropic endeavors, while the Hague tribunal is monumental of his yearning for universal peace.

But there is another distinction to which Mr. Carnegie is entitled of which no mention is made in his popular biographies. It was no less a personage than this great philanthropist himself who

originated and is entitled to full credit for what is now known as Government by Gunmen and Assassination in the United States.

Twenty-two years ago in July the Homestead strike occurred, and the bloody battle fought between Carnegie's private army of gunmen and his army of striking employees on the banks of the Monongahela will be forever memorable in the industrial history of the United States.

It was on July 1st that the four thousand employees in the Carnegie steel mills at Homestead were locked out after their wages had been reduced from 15 to 40 per cent., an average of 27½ per cent., and it was on the morning of the 6th that the battle occurred between the Pinkertons and the strikers, in which ten of the latter were killed outright and many others wounded. How many were killed and wounded on the other side was never known.

It was the first time in industrial warfare that a private army of man-killers, equipped with rifles of the latest pattern, were put into the field under orders to open fire on a body of striking workingmen, and Carnegie's part in this bloody affair will keep his name in loathing long after his so-called philanthropies have been forgotten.

Carnegie had grown fabulously rich, but his insatiate greed prompted him to pile up still more millions by applying the screws to the slaves in his mills. The sweeping reductions he ordered amounted to pure robbery, and knowing that they would revolt, he made deliberate preparations to have them murdered in cold blood, and then he put the wide Atlantic between himself and Homestead.

Everything was cocked and primed before Carnegie left for Scotland to repose smugly in his lordly castle while the army of Pinkertons he had secretly put into commission shot down the faithful old employees whose labor had enriched him.

He was criminal enough to set up the dastardly job and cowardly enough to flee from its consequences.

Henry C. Frick, now a rival philanthropist, was then Carnegie's lieutenant, and they fit each other like the upper and nether jaws of a wild beast.

Frick was made commander-in-chief of the Carnegie-Pinkerton forces, and the first thing that was done in preparation for the impending battle was to transform the mills into military forts. Around these wires were laid, charged with deadly currents of electricity, to shock the strikers to death if they attempted to enter the mills. Special dynamos were installed for this deadly work. Next, the barricade fence was pierced with port-holes, so that the Winchesters in the hands of Carnegie's thugs could command the approaches from all directions.

But this was not all nor by any means the worst of all. Listen to this: Appliances were provided and pipes laid for deluging the strikers with streams of hot water and scalding them to death, and to make certain that the massacre should be complete, an army of three hundred picked Pinkertons, armed with Winchesters, were landed at Homestead in two floating forts, called "modern barges," and when all was ready for the holocaust the future philanthropist stole silently away to hobnob with the princes and parasites of the old world.

When the bloody butchery which followed was at its height, the whole country appealed to Carnegie to cable the word that would put an end to this tragedy of horrors, but he was as deaf as Rockefeller was twenty-two years later, when the whole country was on its knees begging that eminent philanthropist to put an end to the slaughter of women and babes at Ludlow, Colorado.

The following extracts taken from the *Pittsburg Dispatch* of July 7th, 1892, describe the opening of the battle on the morning of the 6th, on the landing of the two barges of Pinkertons:

Soon the first gray streaks of dawn appeared in the sky A moment later and 40 or 50 men stepped out from the door in the end of the nearest barge to the small deck on the bow. Each man carried a Winchester repeater and on every face there was a look of determination. In the doorway behind those on the deck there could be seen many more faces and the glistening barrels of many more rifles.

A gang plank was thrown out and the men on the boat started toward it, then glancing at the multitude of determined men on the shore, they hesitated.

"Don't step off that boat!" was the cry from 50 men on the shore, but a commanding voice from the boat said "forward." Just as the first man was about to step on the gang plank the first shot was fired. No one seemed to know from whence it came, but some one yelled that it had come from a port-hole in the side of the boat and a volley from a score of millworkers' guns followed. . . .

A wild scramble of 3,300 or 4,000 men and women followed. Up the steep banks, 40 feet high, and down the river banks toward the village they scrambled in a wild frenzy of terror. Men fell and were trampled under foot by those who came after. . . .

The first man to drop was Martin Murray, shot through the side. A moment later Joseph Sodak stooped to pick up Murray, when a bullet struck him on the upper lip just below the nose, dropping him dead beside Murray.

When the firing ceased on both sides, ten of the strikers having been slain outright and a large number wounded, a conference was held between the officers of the Pinkertons and the leaders of the strikers. "If you men don't withdraw," declared the chieftain of the Pinkerton army to the strike leaders, "we will mow every man of you down and enter in spite of you." Promptly the spokes-

man of the latter answered: "Before you enter these mills you will trample over the dead bodies of 3,000 honest workingmen."

When this battle was fought I was connected with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and editing its official organ, the *Locomotive Firemen's Magazine*, in which I commented as follows at the time:

It will be observed that after the workingmen had been killed by the murderous Pinkertons, the Homestead men sought for peace, and that their overtures were disdainfully thrust aside and the defiant threat made that they, the Pinkertons, would "mow every man of you down, and enter (the mills) in spite of you." Then the battle raged with increased fury until in the afternoon the Pinkertons surrendered, gave up their guns and ammunition and were ready to leave Homestead.

Thus ended the bloodiest battle ever fought between workingmen and the hirelings of capitalists in this or any other continent, and when the battle was over victory perched upon the standard of labor. The thugs were vanquished. Their prestige was utterly wrecked.

It should be remembered that the workingmen of Homestead were not armed as were the murderous invaders. Their guns were not Winchester rifles. They were not aware until it was too late, of the banquet of blood their friend Frick had prepared for them, but such arms and means as they had were splendidly utilized. We could fill pages with incidents of splendid heroism on the part of the workingmen, of their wives and mothers.

After the battle, quiet reigned at Homestead, the locked out workmen were in possession of the town and of the Carnegie steel works.

Frick besought the sheriff to place him in charge of his works. The sheriff protested his inability to respond, and then the governor of Pennsylvania was asked to send troops—the State Guard—and he finally responded and 8,000 armed men marched upon Homestead, took possession, and with all the pomp and circumstance of glorious dress parade, martial law was inaugurated.

The Pinkerton thug business, the bloody battle, the murder of innocent men, aroused the nation's representatives in Congress, and an investigation was ordered and is going forward as we write.

What the result will be no one knows. Possibly the State will enact laws by which Pinkerton thuggery will be abolished, and in many ways benefits may result from the bloody battle at Homestead.

In writing of Carnegie and Frick in the *Locomotive Firemen's Magazine* of the same issue, I said:

This fellow, Frick, guarded by detectives to shield him from vengeful bullets, colder than ice, heartless as a man-eating tiger, is selected by Carnegie to perfect his murderous plans, and when the streets of Homestead are slippery with blood drawn from the veins of workingmen by bullets fired by Pinkerton thugs, over the land and under the sea messages are sent to Carnegie in hope that the

man who had written the "Gospel of Wealth" would thrill the workingmen of two continents with a command to restore peace by doing justice to faithful men. But no such towering word of justice and humanity came. Carnegie, in sympathy with Frick, would not interfere. Frick's ferocity had his unqualified approval. The ingrate and apostate was pleased with the plans of Frick. In his castle he had smelled the blood of his old and faithful employees, and the tongue of his soul lapped it with a relish such as wild beasts display. *There was no quality of mercy in his heart. Conscience had fled, charity and pity had made their appeals without response. Carnegie, in his castle, was dead to every manly attribute, and became the defender of Frick, upon whose damned soul blood stains are as ineffaceable as the spots on a leopard's skin.*

Paradoxical as it may seem, there are living dead men, men forever on the scaffold with broken necks, still squirming and dangling—men forever in the morgue, where the curious go to identify them and to exclaim, "They are not dead."

Carnegie is such a living corpse, and Frick is his companion.

No assassin should molest them. Let them live and squirm. Let their torture proceed as righteous men flay them. Let their fleshless bones rattle in harmony with the music made by the skeletons of all the Guiteaus of all lands.

A few days after the foregoing was written Alexander Berkman shot Henry C. Frick.

Andrew Carnegie triumphed at last, but at what a price! The red stains of his criminal guilt can never be washed away and the spectres of innocent men murdered at his command will haunt him to his dying day.

There is a striking analogy between Carnegie and Homestead in 1892 and Rockefeller and Ludlow in 1914.

Carnegie refused to utter the word that would have prevented Homestead, and Rockefeller for the same reason has the foul and indelible crime of Ludlow upon his soul.

Both used a private army of gunmen and assassins to slaughter their employees, both blossomed out into philanthropists, and both will be pilloried by history as cold-blooded murderers.

The government by gunmen that now prevails in Colorado, Michigan, West Virginia and other mining states, is the logical development of Carnegie's government by Pinkerton thugs inaugurated at Homestead twenty-two years ago. The appliances for killing by electricity and scalding water have fallen into disuse because of the universal abhorrence aroused by these barbarous methods of taking human life. Andrew Carnegie is entitled to the sole distinction of having devised and employed electric batteries and reservoirs of scalding water to silence the protests of his workingmen against starvation wages.

As I write, the news comes that government by gunmen has been put into operation in the coal fields of Arkansas, but contrary to the expectations of the operators, and to all known prece-

dents, the striking miners routed the private army of corporation assassins, leaving a number of dead on the field, and the mines and tipples in ruins and ashes.

The government by gunmen inaugurated by Andrew Carnegie twenty-two years ago must be wiped clean from the United States, and if it cannot be abolished by those in power then the labor unions must levy assessments to provide a GUNMEN DEFENSE FUND for the arming of their members to fight in defense of their lives and their homes and families against these lawless gangs of corporation assassins.

THE POLICE AND THE UNEMPLOYED

BY MARY HEATON VORSE

"Not even the courts have the power of inflicting corporal punishment. It is repugnant to the whole spirit of our civilization. How much more outrageous it is that police officials, blind with rage, should inflict such a beating upon a citizen."

Editorial, *New York Sun*, May 12, 1914

"Nothing breeds anarchy faster than a lawless police force."

Editorial, *New York World*, May 12, 1914.

This year has been marked in New York by numerous clashes between the police and various radical groups, beginning with the arrest of one hundred and ninety homeless men who on March 4th sought shelter in the church of St. Alphonsus and continuing up to this present moment.

One of the disturbances which aroused the most comment occurred in and outside the Calvary Baptist Church on Fifty-seventh Street. When the Rev. Bouck White arose and attempted to speak in this congregation he was at once thrown out of the church in a violent manner, and his followers so mishandled as to give rise to many editorial comments, of which the above are samples.

There was a wave of public indignation at the action of the police. So sane and balanced a man as Mr. Amos Pinchot in his open letter to Mayor Mitchel said:

Nothing that Mr. White or his friends might have said in regard to the Christianity of Calvary Church and of the gentlemen who support it, or of the standards of Christianity in this city, could possibly have amounted to so scathing an indictment as the furious assault which the city's officials and the frock-coat phalanx of Calvary piously indulged in.

Mr. White, however, was sentenced to six months in the workhouse, as was Milo Woolman, who at the time of his arrest was reading aloud to his wife from the Bible.

This workhouse Mr. Pinchot refers to as a "medieval jail where conditions of overcrowding confine six to ten men for fourteen hours a day in a small, foul cell." He refers to it further as "a sink into which the unfortunate refuse of the city is cast to rot and fester."

There has been criticism of Mr. White's act in coming uninvited to the church, but the public, as a whole, even when not agreeing with his methods, have done him the credit of believing him sincere and full of desire to shed light on the darkness of the calamitous events in Colorado, which culminated on April 20th in the burning of the tent colony at Ludlow, where two women and eleven children were burned to death.

When you grant a man is sincere while not agreeing with his methods of propaganda you show that you have given his conduct enough thoughtful consideration to make some attempt to find out why he acted as he did.

I do not believe that the public has been trying as earnestly to find out what lay behind other radical demonstrations of this winter. To anyone who closely followed these demonstrations there was nothing surprising in the actions of the police in the Calvary Baptist Church.

On the same day that newspapers were commenting on the meaning of Mr. White's arrest and the treatment of his supporters, an item appeared in the papers which stated that Joe O'Carroll, who had been conspicuous in the unemployed demonstrations, was in the hospital for an operation on his scalp, made necessary by police brutality.

Later I saw another item saying that Arthur Caron* was just out of hospital, where he also had been for an operation for injuries received at the hands of the police. He and O'Carroll had been arrested and beaten—Caron to unconsciousness—upon April 4th as they were peacefully leaving Union Square.

Undoubtedly the policemen believed that public sentiment would uphold them—and they would have been right had not the case been so flagrant. The demonstrations of the unemployed were unpopular. It is profoundly disquieting for people comfortably off to witness a great mass of destitute people and their sympathizers walking up Fifth Avenue, assembling in parks and squares and otherwise making their presence felt in the city. So the policemen were probably deeply surprised and hurt when public opinion,

* This is the same Caron who was killed in the great dynamite explosion later in New York. He was known to have opposed violence before the events related here.—Editorial Note.

Magistrate Freschi, and their superior officers united in condemning their act.

No one has condemned the editorials which have repeatedly called upon the police to exceed their authority and to use violent and repressive measures upon the unemployed and their sympathizers gathered together in the public squares.

This was the second time O'Carroll and Caron had been arrested, although the courts themselves, which have not been inclined to look upon the demonstrations with too lenient an eye, have acquitted them of disorderly acts.

This is but one of many times during the past months that the police have abused their authority and that their attitude has been curiously at variance with the openly expressed attitude of the city administration. Indeed, we have had a curious situation in New York—a Mayor who in his public statements has insisted that the unemployed, the I. W. W., and the Anarchists, should have the right of assembly and free speech, a Police Commissioner who has urged moderation upon the men under him, combined with oppressive and irritating acts on the part of the police.

How irritating has been the attitude of the police and how without provocation they have shown brutality of speech and violence of action, it would be hard for anyone to realize who has not himself been an eye witness.

When one considers how many demonstrations there have been this winter in our squares and on our streets, one must acknowledge that the actual acts of disorder have been few. That there have been no more acts of actual disorder is not the fault of the police, and I prefer to give the account of two of the witnesses on two such occasions.

The first time Joe O'Carroll was arrested was in Cooper Union where the Socialists had held a meeting to discuss unemployment. He and the Rutgers Square group of unemployed were present, his followers called for him, and permission was given him to speak at the end of the programme. The programme being ended the meeting was announced closed. O'Carroll rose to speak, trouble ensued, and he was arrested.

This is an account of what followed afterwards, made by Mr. Harvey P. Vaughn, a worker in the University Settlement at 184 Eldridge Street. The attention of the Mayor was brought to this statement:

After a meeting in Cooper Union held by the Socialists to discuss unemployment, a number of people gathered in the open space at the south of Cooper Union. The crowd was quite orderly, and outside of the fact that the speakers called upon the people to pro-

test against O'Carroll's arrest, there was nothing out of the ordinary in their speeches.

I heard a noise of trampling feet and some shouting, but not unusually loud shouting, coming from the direction of the southeast corner of Cooper Union, and on looking that way saw a large number of plain-clothes men and uniformed officers rushing into the crowd in what was in general the shape of a wedge. As they split the crowd open, making way toward the center where the speakers were located, they used their fists in hitting people, their hands and arms and elbows in shoving and pushing them, and their clubs in striking them.

The crowd were taken completely by surprise and tried to give way to this onslaught, but many were not able to get out of the way quickly enough, and of these I saw Lieut. Gegan and Lieut. Gildea catch one and strike him with their fists simultaneously. The man fell and crawled away as quickly as he could, the officers striking at him as he left.

Mr. Vaughn goes on with an account of specific instances, with the names of men beaten by the police. Some were so badly hurt that they were sent to the hospital, and he concludes:

I have lived in mining districts and both in the east and in the north have seen disorderly crowds handled by officers, but I have never seen any brutality that equalled the kind that was used in driving this small crowd of people away from Cooper Union Square Thursday evening. I fully expected every newspaper to call for immediate and severe punishment of the officers responsible, but since I have not seen one word in regard to it, I have taken this means of letting it be known to the proper authorities.

Mind you, this clubbing which occurred on Cooper Square was not mentioned in a single New York paper.

On April 4th the unemployed and a group of sympathizers from the Ferrer School had intended to hold a demonstration in Union Square, but finding the Central Federated Union had planned a protest meeting concerning the Colorado matter, they deferred their meeting until April 11th. The crowd at no time showed any disorder, but as the unemployed started away the mounted police rode them down. Women were clubbed, people were forced to take refuge on the steps of houses to get out from under the horses' feet. A scene of the utmost disorder reigned. Yet investigation failed to show any reason at all for this action on the part of the police.

This is Arthur Caron's statement of what happened to him and to O'Carroll:

I started to leave Union Square a few minutes after the introduction of the first speaker, and with a young lady I walked through the park. As we walked down by Fifteenth street I saw the police with upraised clubs rushing the crowd back.

I ran across the street and saw Joe O'Carroll covered with blood, the blood streaming from wounds in his head, surrounded by uni-

formed and plain-clothes men with clubs and black jacks upraised. I saw Becky Edelson standing over Joe trying to shield him from the blows of the police.

I tried to get to her, but the police rushed the crowd back and I was driven with them into the street. The police dragged Joe up Fourth avenue toward Sixteenth street and I followed with the crowd.

Near Sixteenth street, a plain-clothes man rushed at me with his shoulder lowered, striking me in the shoulder and spinning me around. At the same moment I was struck by some one with a club or black jack in the back of the head and two plain-clothes men grabbed me. I looked around to see who hit me and a plain-clothes man hit me on the left side of the head with his black jack.

Another officer grabbed my right arm and twisted it up behind my back, at the same time pushing my shoulder and I got a smash on the shoulder with a policeman's club. The blows came from behind. I cried out, "For Christ's sake, stop hitting me!" and I got another bang with a black jack on the back of the head and one of the officers said, "You — — — — take that."

I was so dazed by the blows that I was helpless. As I was dragged along they kicked me in the calves of both legs and I was either kicked or struck with a club in the thigh.

I was taken to an automobile that was waiting and in it I saw Joe O'Carroll sitting beside Officer No. —. I was thrown into the automobile and as I stumbled in Officer — said, "You —, we've got you now," and struck me in the face. I fell to my knees with my head in Joe's lap. I tried to get up but got another crash in the face, and Officer No. — said, "You — lie still." I raised my head again and he struck me in the face, crushing in the right side of my nose, and then I was struck again on the back of the head. I don't know who hit me then. The next thing I knew I was dragged out of the automobile and into the police station."

After giving in detail some of the threatening and abusive conversation of the police in the police station, Caron says:

They continued to make jeering and insulting remarks about us until we were taken back to the anteroom and then into the court. For instance, when O'Carroll, Caron and Wolfe began talking in French, Officer No. — told them threateningly to shut up and also said to O'Carroll, "It ain't too late yet to give you a G— d— good beating like we gave this fellow here," pointing to Caron.

Magistrate Freschi, in acquitting O'Carroll and Caron, recommended that their beating by the police be looked into and the offenders punished, but this was not done, because both the young men beaten and the group of people whom they represented felt that punishing individual policemen for acts of violence accomplished nothing and such an act would savor of revenge and retaliation, perpetuating the system against which they protested.

The next time the radical group assembled in Union Square was Easter Saturday. As there had been great disorder, of police making, on the previous Saturday, Commissioner Woods had been urged to see how the crowd would act with only the usual number of police on duty. Afterwards the papers called the afternoon a tame one. They said nothing happened. Opinions differ about that. Some people thought a great deal had happened, for the extreme wing of the New York radical group packed Union Square to see the unemployed establish their right of assembly and of free speech—the same group who had been ridden down and clubbed the Saturday before.

Over this crowd was a nameless feeling of suspense. Moreover, everyone knew that besides the visible police there were stowed away, in empty lofts around, hundreds of men ready at a moment's notice to rush the trouble makers.

The crowd began ebbing out. From a dense, uniform mass it broke up into little groups surrounding isolated speakers. Waiting for the end, I fell into conversation with a policeman.

"It's almost over," I said, "isn't it?"

"It ain't begun yet," he answered, "they'll make trouble for us the last thing. It was late last Saturday when they started up. Them I. W. W.'s always make trouble when they get together." He spoke with conviction.

"Why are you so sore at them?" I asked him.

"Sore?" he repeated, "why wouldn't we reserves be sore? Talk about your eight-hour day! We reserves are on night duty and they've been chewing the rag from one o'clock until now it's near seven. I'm losing my sleep—that's why I'm sore. And that's why there are a hundred men in that hall"—he jerked his hand—"who're sore! And another couple o' hundred scattered around who're sore! Them I. W. W.'s give us an awful lot of extra work."

"I've reported lots of meetings in Union Square," I told him, "meetings of Socialists, meetings of Suffragists, where there was more what you might call 'disorder' in the crowd than there has been to-day, but you aren't sore at them."

"Oh, Socialists and Suffragists—they're *respectable*. We know what to expect from *them*. But these fellows are out for a scrap,—that's all they're out for. They don't know what they want."

"They'd say they knew what they wanted."

"Well, I'd be glad if they'd tell *me*," he answered.

I explained the I. W. W. commonplaces. "What they want is to organize industrially. They want industries to be organized all together in one union, instead of trade by trade."

"Well, now," said he, "that sounds like sense! That's the first

word of sense anybody ever said to me about them I. W. W.'s. This is the first time I ever knew they wanted anything except to make trouble. Is that all they want?" he inquired. He was honestly astounded.

"Well, after that, they say they'd like to have the working men own the industries themselves, and get the profit of their labor for their children's education and for their own good."

"A sort of plan to benefit the working classes?" said my friend. "Well, now, you surprise me! It's a kind of Labor Party you might say, with ideas in it something like the Socialists? Now, I don't believe there are ten men who've been put on duty to look after these meetings that ever heard a word like this. I guess everybody thought just what I thought—that they'd no idea but to kick without knowin' what about and make trouble generally."

He and the hundreds of men around the Square had been put on duty to keep in order an indefinite something called I. W. W.—a trouble-making monster, obscurely potent with the mob. He and hundreds of others were standing on their toes ready to fight this Chimera. No one had told them what these men wanted. To all of them the demonstrations of this past winter were caused by trouble makers who because of their own wantonness gave good policemen much trouble and robbed them of their sleep.

The next clash between the police and the radical group occurred May 1st in Union Square, where the police again charged a helpless crowd without provocation.

It is interesting to analyze the demonstrations this winter. One is forced to the conclusion that when the police are not in evidence or are quiescent, there is neither destruction of property nor menace to life.

Again, one is inevitably driven back to the assumption that when the police beat up individuals they believe they have public opinion behind them. The editorial writers who have repeatedly urged the police to violence—the unemployed call this form of editorial "inciting to riot"—must also have believed they had public opinion back of them. The editorials in a big newspaper do not only lead public opinion, but they reflect it as well. One may with justice make a criticism of the police and of the editors of these papers that their acts and words were not those of intelligent men.

When great numbers of men meet again and again in public halls to protest against economic wrongs, or against war, or to show their sympathy with distant strikers who have been subjected to the utmost acts of brutality and disorder, the use of the club, or the advocacy of the use of the club seems an inadequate answer

for the root of the disturbance. Great numbers of people do not thus gather together for no reason, especially when they do so with the knowledge that they may be ridden down or arrested. Nor do young men like O'Carroll and others of their friends—young men in the best moments of youth—young men of education, many of them with professions, sacrifice themselves and their time and energy for no reason.

There are many people in New York beside my friend the policeman who have looked upon this winter's demonstrations as something that wantonly disturbed their peace, and like him they were "sore." Being sore, they exaggerated the magnitude of the disturbance and did not seek the real source, any more than the policeman did.

There has even been an element of grim humor in the storm of disapproval aroused by the trespassing of hungry men on "private property"—the church of Christ—contrasted with the matter of fact way the comfortable public regards the bitter fact that in this modern city there are hundreds and hundreds of men who have no place to lay their heads. We can face the fact with complacency that in this highly organized and delicately adjusted civilization of ours there are no competent means by which jobless men and work may be joined together, and when society is made to give the matter some attention, society, as expressed by police and press, loses its temper.

The police disturbances this winter demonstrate again that you cannot keep a law without the consent of the public opinion of the State in which that law is enacted. And until the same storm of indignation arises over each act of violence on the part of the police, as that which arose over the maltreatment of the supporters of Mr. Bouck White, the police will continue to be disorderly.

Delight in suffering is rare. The cruelty born of callousness and lack of understanding is common.

The uniformed mine guards and strikebreakers who burned the Ludlow tent colony had that sort of cruelty. So have the men who open their morning papers and read with approval—or even without protest—editorials calling for longer nightsticks to be used for dispersing disquieting demonstrations like those of the past winter.

Trinidad and New York are not so far apart in sentiment. Indirectly, we are each one responsible for that uncivilized condition which makes possible uncivilized acts, such as the police were guilty of last winter in New York City. And while our great newspapers preach longer nightsticks, to be used on people who are indulging their constitutional right to assemble, we may be sure we have in

our midst the germs of the same condition of disorder and oppression, the same callousness toward the needs of the oppressed, and the same disregard of their rights, that made possible the burning of the Ludlow tent colony.

THE REVOLT IN BUTTE

BY M. RHEA

The present situation among the Butte (Montana) copper miners is the result of the working of two forces: First, a general belief on the part of the rank and file that their local union, while costing them heavily in dues and special assessments, was of little or no economic value to them; and second, a rapid growth of radical economic ideas among the miners, ranging from comparatively orderly parliamentary Socialism to the most extreme Anarchism.

The feeling of the rank and file that their union was impotent seems to be based on the following general facts: During its entire history it had never secured, as a result of its own demands, either an increase in wages or an improvement of any consequence in labor conditions. It is asserted that every wage advance has been given voluntarily by the companies, and that even when the formality of negotiations was gone through, the contract accepted was that proposed by the company. The other important change in labor conditions, the adoption of a general eight hour law for mines and smelters, was secured through state legislation and the eight hour law itself was put upon the statute book by a political faction that had been officially opposed by the local miners' union, although it was supported by the rank and file of the miners. It is asserted further that all improvements that have been made in ventilation and sanitation inside the mines have been the voluntary acts of the company, done from business or altruistic motives, and without the prompting or demand of the union.

On the other hand, it is asserted that the officials of the local union have either supported or acquiesced in the creation and maintenance of conditions which it should have been their first duty to prevent or remove. These conditions are numerous, but the most important are: (1) The arbitrary discharge of men by the company without protest or protection from the union. It is asserted that 600 men were simultaneously discharged for Socialistic affiliation and that no step was taken by the organization to have them

reinstated. (2) The establishment of a so-called "rustling card" system (explained hereafter) by the companies without an effectual protest from the union. (3) That the companies deduct from the men's wages one dollar per month, which is paid over to private hospitals, and these, it is said, are not efficient. (4) That the union had failed to take any steps to prevent the spread of tuberculosis in the mines. (5) Most important of all, the union had no machinery to adjust the many grievances which arise from day to day, nor even the large grievances which affect big groups of men.

It seems obvious that such a condition, where the union organization failed to represent the rank and file, was either through apathy on the part of the members or through the lack of democratic machinery through which to make their wishes supreme. The company officials say that it was apathy on the part of the members. It is certain, however, that the machinery of the local union made it easy for a small clique, whether dominated by the company or not, to control the organization by the election of such clerks and judges as would carry out this clique's wishes. And to understand the extent of control the clerks and judges gave, it must be understood that their election, by either faction, was generally conceded by all as equivalent to the election of all nominees of the faction who had succeeded in electing the clerks and judges.

The Butte Miners' Union has been nothing more than a pawn in a political game. Daly always dominated the actual organization. When Heinze succeeded in gaining control of Butte, he did so by winning over the rank and file, but he never succeeded in gaining control of the actual machinery of the organization. This was still in Daly's (which is now Amalgamated Copper) hands. Heinze won and passed the eight hour law in spite of the active opposition of the Butte Union officials.

The reason for this is that it was always a Daly policy to give the ex-officers of the union valuable contracts on the Hill, and at times leases while in office. This made them his tools. This policy was pursued by the Amalgamated for some time, but was discontinued owing to pressure of the rank and file.

Heinze voluntarily gave the first increase in wages in twenty years. The union was in no way responsible for it, for the inner circle of the union was actually fighting him.

After Heinze's elimination from the camp, the rank and file had no employer leader and lost all interest. There were approximately five to seven thousand members in the organization, but it was often necessary to send the sergeant-at-arms to nearby saloons to drum up ten members in order to have a quorum. Under such

conditions it was very easy for a small organized minority to control the situation.

About 1900 there developed a real opposition to company domination in union affairs in the form of Socialistic opposition. As this sentiment grew, the fight for control—that is, between the so-called company men and the rank and file—became more acute. But unfortunately the Western Federation of Miners' constitution provides that the election clerks and judges must be elected from the floor at a regular meeting. The hall in which the regular meetings were held would hold approximately 600 miners, and the company would always send down from the Hill dependable men off the night shift—and pack the hall. They would proceed to elect administration clerks and judges, who in turn would allow all kinds of repeating, even to the extent of allowing administration miners to stick ten or more ballots in the box at one time, and repeat the offense as many times as they desired. And even then if the administration did not have enough, it is asserted that they would proceed to count in enough extras to make up.

This inner circle did all the business for the men, such as negotiating with the company, collecting of dues and assessments, handling of relief funds, etc.

In 1911 and 1912 the Socialist faction finally elected a set of officials. The city elected a Socialist city administration. When a new union election came around, the company (on the night clerks and judges were to be balloted on) sent down enough reliable men from the mines to pack the hall as early as six o'clock in the evening, when the meeting was held at seven. The company again won, and since then has never lost control of the organization.

In December, 1912, immediately after this, the company instituted the "rustling card system," the object being to use it as a blacklist against men who voiced liberal tendencies. In order to get a "rustling card" a workman must go to the Parot mine, give his name, age, residence, and his life's history. He then receives a card, which entitles him to ask for work, but if the company does not want him, it is asserted that a private mark is put on the card, which is a warning to foremen not to hire him, although he has the democratic privilege of "rustling."

This rustling card system was first introduced in the West during the Idaho trouble, but only through the aid of troops. In Butte it was put in operation with the sanction of the local union, if not at its instigation. This naturally caused a great deal of bitterness. A mass meeting was called and the miners demanded that the rustling card be abolished, but the officials of the union succeeded in having a committee appointed, of which they had control, to in-

vestigate the matter and report at some future meeting. The committee reported that the rustling card system wasn't such a bad thing, after all. This nearly caused a riot, which was avoided by the president, Dennis Murphy, snapping out the lights, adjourning the meeting, and in company with other officers, beating a hasty retreat through a rear entrance.

Eight months previous to this, in March, 1912, the company discharged 600 Socialist miners. When the then anti-company officials demanded their reinstatement, the union was again found on the company side. It refused to act without a referendum vote. The vote was authorized. But when it came to selecting the clerks and judges, the hall was again packed, and the clerks and judges—so it is charged—actually counted the votes falsely; at least, the referendum lost.

So important is the matter of selecting clerks and judges that at the last election, when the anti-administration clerks and judges lost, that faction withdrew its candidates. The machinery of the union consists of a president, vice-president, recording secretary, secretary-treasurer, assistant secretary, warden and executive board. The duty of these men is to collect dues and assessments and pay sick benefits. There is not, nor has there ever been, any standing committee to take up and adjust grievances of any kind. Neither the company nor the union recognizes that a man who has been unjustly discharged shall be put back to work. The company is supreme in that respect, even to the extent of not being required to give a reason for the discharge of a man. This places the miner in the position that he has absolutely no protection in his job. It makes him necessarily, in his public acts, a coward. It makes it impossible for him to speak up like a man for his own rights, or make demands that certain evil conditions be remedied.

It also places him in the position, when placed upon a jury to try a personal injury case of another miner, that if he votes for a verdict in favor of the plaintiff he loses his job and his union cannot get him reinstated. There have been 258 miners killed outright in the mines in the last seven years, and not one verdict in favor of their families. During the same period, there have been 569 deaths caused by miners' consumption in the mines, and there has been absolutely no attempt made by the union to enforce sanitary inspection or remedy the conditions. There have been approximately 4,000 other accidents, ranging from total disablement to temporary disability, and no effort made to remedy these conditions.

The union officials worked in harmony with the company in installing the sliding scale of wages. In 1907, when copper was selling at 18 and 20 cents a pound, the committee was asked by the

company to negotiate a contract. The miners were then getting \$3.50 per day. The proposition the company made was that the contract be drawn so that when the price of copper exceeded 18 cents per pound the miner would receive \$4.00 per day, below 18 cents \$3.75, and when 16 cents or less they would receive \$3.50. This was agreed to. Immediately after this, copper dropped to about 13 cents and the miners worked nearly two years for \$3.50. It is believed that the company had actual knowledge of the coming slump. Before the next contract was negotiated, just before the city election, agents gave out the word that if the Socialists were defeated, the miners would get a raise from \$3.50 to \$4.00. The new contract, made after election, provides for \$4.00 with copper at 17 cents or over; \$3.75 between 17 and 15 cents, and \$3.50 at less than 15 cents. For the greater part of the time since the new contract was made, the price has been less than 15 cents.

The union has never been responsible for an increase in wages or for the reduction of hours; never has bettered a single condition; never has pretended to protect the men in their jobs, except the futile attempt of the anti-company (Socialist) officials to protect the members discharged for political reasons in 1912, and never has been really representative of the best in the rank and file.

It has been anti-Socialist, anti-democratic, discriminatory, inefficient, oppressive, cumbersome, and, in election matters, dishonest.

SOME RECENT EXPRESSIONS ON RACIAL INFERIORITY

BY ROBERT H. LOWIE

The relative status of the racial divisions and subdivisions of mankind is so important a problem from both a theoretical and a practical point of view that no excuse is necessary for reverting to it again and again in the pages of the NEW REVIEW.

In a charming account of travels in the New Hebrides (*Südsee-Urwald-Kannibalen*, Leipzig, 1913), Dr. Felix Speiser takes the opportunity to pay his respects to native psychology and arrives at conclusions rather similar to those I expressed in a previous article. Speiser points out that many strata of European society do not enjoy in any sense a better mode of life than the natives and are by no means superior in ambition and moral fiber:

Eliminate the influences that force certain cultural acquisitions on the population of secluded districts . . . and one can readily imagine these whites as rapidly sinking to the level of the "savage."

How many whites are completely satisfied with the gratification of their purely carnal desires,—just like the "savage"; how many colonists here differ from the native only in their greater fastidiousness as to the selection of food; how many of them commit every kind of crime, and how many are restrained from crime only by public opinion and the police. Thus the much-vaunted mental superiority of the whites seems very questionable, and the progress of our culture may be due solely to the efforts of a small minority of geniuses, who push humanity into a path where retrogression is precluded. The bulk of the whites, however, have remained quite passive and, without the constant pressure of relatively few "supermen," would soon stagnate or retrograde.

We need not dwell on the exaggeratedly Carlylean view of history expressed in the last two sentences. It is a moot question whether progress is essentially the work of "heroes" or of the cumulative efforts of "able men," to use Carlyle's terms. The majority of mankind, apart from both groups, may well be passive with respect to new cultural acquisitions and yet be indispensable for the production of new values by making it possible for the supermen and the trained "able men" to specialize in certain lines. Again, so far as the social importance of cultural values is concerned, it is clear that two processes are required,—not only their creation, but also their adoption by the community. But to force upon a naturally conservative species any new concept requires a very different mental make-up from that of the original thinker. Sometimes the two psychological constitutions are blended in a single individual, most frequently they are not; in other words, humanity is pushed into the path of progress not only by geniuses, but also by the (often intellectually mediocre) men of strenuous personality. With these reservations, on a minor point so far as the present issue is concerned, we may adopt Dr. Speiser's statements as a welcome exhibition of unprejudiced observation of primitive mentality.

Strangely enough, Speiser's views are confirmed by a writer whose initial bias is that of a race fanatic. I am referring to Professor Eugen Fischer, who has recently made the praiseworthy attempt to apply Mendelian methods in studying the characteristics of a mixed race (*Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen*, Jena, 1913). According to this anthropologist, the preservation of our race shall be the supreme norm before which all ethical and juridical conceptions must bow down in the dust. Otherwise colonization is unjustifiable from the point of view of universal peace and equality, but "fortunately there predominates instead a healthy desire for expansion on the part of the stronger." In view of such opinions, some of Fischer's utterances on racial superiority are all the more creditable to his sense for objective fact, inasmuch as he baldly admits that the *bulk* of the

white population, whether in town or country, may not excel the colored races in intelligence. What he insists on, however, is that the whites produce constantly and in relatively large proportions supermen, who tower high above the crowd in point of efficiency, and it is this fact that raises us as a whole sky-high above all the colored races (the Mongolians excluded). Recognizing an element of the problem ignored by Speiser, Fischer further contends that even in the case of the Caucasian supermen it is by no means the purely intellectual element that determines their superiority:

Perhaps far greater than the intellectual difference is that in the possession of energy; of imagination manifesting itself in combination, disposition, association, creative producton; of absolute self-reliance that eliminates hesitation and vacillation and permits a rapid and sure grappling with problems; . . . of character, not only in the sense of goodness according to current conceptions, but in the sense of homogeneity, consistency, faithfulness to one's self. Such are the men who create our values, who administer our politics, our industries and technology, our science, as well as our strategy. It is the quality to produce *such* men in *so* great a number that there shall *never* be a deficiency in times of need, that there shall be a constant supply, if not of the A No. 1 type, at least of *many* men of the first and second order, to be followed from time to time by the A No. 1 leaders,—this is the quality I regard as a characteristic of definite races, and this is completely lacking among the colored races.

Fischer formulates this statement biologically by saying that a great many unit characters conditioning the superior qualities must circulate in a race at large in order that there shall be a high probability for their union; if a race completely lacks but *one* of the characters, or if but two of them occur with extreme rarity, possibilities of combination that occur in other races no longer exist, or are at least practically lacking.

The racial trait of producing the superior combinations in great numbers is also lacking, according to Fischer, in all types of mixed-breeds. He recognizes that Booker Washington and Du Bois are men of superior intelligence, but such instances only prove that the several mental qualities of whites and of colored races are inherited separately, and that in rare cases the mixed-blood unites within himself the requisite traits in combination.

But these, according to our author, are isolated individuals towering far above their tribe. In no mixed-breed population is there an appreciable number of factory managers or directors of large commercial concerns, or of executive officers. While there are absolutely and relatively a great many white self-made men in America, there are practically no half-bloods and no pure colored individuals who have displayed any corresponding executive ability. "Thus,"

repeats Fischer, "it is not simply differences in intelligence of the bulk of a population, but the ability of producing from among the members of this population a *great many* peculiar combinations (energy, imagination, intelligence, self-reliance, character, physical ability) that constitutes the racial characteristic." While in this essential respect the mixed-breeds are greatly inferior to the whites, Fischer holds that they are not inferior to the pure colored population and stigmatizes this oft-proclaimed view as nonsensical. Where there is an appearance of inferiority to both parental stocks, Fischer assumes that this is the effect of the unfavorable social environment rather than of the hybrid character.

It will be apparent from the last-cited opinion that Professor Fischer does not scruple to account for differences of achievement by *social* causes wherever it suits him. We naturally ask why such causes may not have effected at least in part the cultural differences between half-breeds and whites or between colored races and whites. Influences of the social *milieu* are not measurable quantities, and if they are admitted in one case, their complete exclusion in the other points to an initial bias that distorts the normal view. Fischer's argument is indeed defective in several respects. In the first place, his ideal of racial efficiency is so subjective that any one who rejects an *olla podrida* of Prussian officialdom and American business "smartness" as the acme of human development must take issue with him from the start. We may ask, parenthetically, whether the racial characteristics that are so prominent in the Germany of to-day were latent during the Napoleonic wars and at earlier periods of history. And farther, whether the relative absence in Scandinavia of self-made multimillionaires, spectacular financial *entrepreneurs*, colonial executives, and the like, establishes the racial inferiority of the fairest and purest of North European peoples. When shall such phenomena be interpreted sociologically, and under what conditions by racial biology? Before definite criteria are established, the use of either historico-sociological or biological modes of interpretation is purely subjective and arbitrary. But Fischer has not only failed to note that the racial characteristic he so greatly admires has been and is relatively rare in some of the most favored Caucasian peoples, he has also failed to discover that among the native races of Africa that very trait is relatively common. The tendency of the African Negroes to develop states with strongly centralized political power is one of their marked cultural characteristics as compared with, say, the North American Indians, whatever may be the significance of this fact, and the history of the Dark Continent shows an unusual number of Fischer's "supermen" who have become powerful potentates

by that exhibition of "character" which has become popular in Germany since the Franco-Prussian war.

In the second place, Fischer entirely ignores the fact that many of the colored and mixed populations are numerically so much smaller than the principal Caucasian peoples that exceptional variations in appreciable number are not to be expected. This may be shown at once in the field of physical measurements. Fischer's "Bastards" average between 5 ft. 6 in. and 5 ft. 7 in. in height, thus comparing favorably with Central Europeans, but the tallest man measured is not much above 6 ft., while of course statures far above this maximum height occur in Central European countries as extreme variations. So far as the *intellectual* feats of the half-castes of German Southwest Africa are concerned, Father Schmidt, the editor of *Anthropos*, pointedly asks in a review of Fischer's book, whether it is fair to expect the creation of new cultural values from the handful of Hottentot breeds, and is skeptical as to the result of corresponding tests in German villages.

Finally, the question remains, whether it is not quite enough for any race to be able to do *average* work in this workaday world of ours. Granting, for the sake of argument, that Caucasians will have a monopoly of exceptional achievement, the greater part of all labor must still devolve on the men of medium ability, and if it be admitted, as Fischer does admit, that the average ability of the whites and of the colored races is about on a level, it will make no practical difference to civilization whether the laborers are white or colored. In other words, on *rational* grounds, based on the needs of humanity, there would be no reason for the artificial restriction of the activities of any race. It may be well to add that the greater *native* variability of the white race is not an established fact, but an hypothesis offered to account for differences in achievement. Such differences, however, are in so many cases due to specific historical conditions that the hypothesis is far from convincing. We should like to have further data, based on objective investigations, that shall not ignore such elementary statistical considerations as the relative numbers of the populations compared.

In conclusion, we may call attention to an interesting parallel. Not long ago anti-feminists asserted an inferior *average* endowment of women as compared with men; now the emphasis is rather on the alleged difference in variability. Race-theorists are apparently undergoing a similar transformation. Instead of denying to the colored races the possession of an approximately equal degree of average intelligence, they are entrenching themselves behind the convenient dogma of greater Caucasian variability.

A SOCIALIST DIGEST

BELGIAN SOCIALISTS FOR WAR

Before Germany invaded Belgium, without the pretense even of any offense by that country, the Belgian Socialists were, of all the world's Socialists, perhaps the most strongly opposed to war. On August 3rd the council of the Labor Party decided to abandon the anti-war demonstrations and resolved to issue a manifesto to Socialist workmen in which it was declared that by exercising the legitimate right of self-defense they were fighting against barbarism and for political liberty and democracy.

The council also decided that the Socialist Party in the chamber should vote the necessary war credits.

Le Peuple, the labor organ, said:

Why do we, irreconcilable anti-militarists, applaud those who offer themselves in defense of their country? It is because it is necessary to protect our hearths, homes, and families, and our ancient freedom at the price of our blood.

Go, sons and workers! Register as recruits. We prefer to die for progress and solidarity to living under a régime of brutal force and savage violence.

This action was justified by the Socialists of all countries—even the German Socialists of this country, where alone they can be heard from, since Socialism is now outlawed in Germany and Austria. They did *not* approve Vandervelde's entrance into the Belgian cabinet, however.

THE RUSSIAN GENERAL STRIKE

The record of the Russian Socialists is in itself enough to convince anybody who knows them that they will take advantage of the first Russian defeats to inaugurate mutinies and revolts. But in addition we have had the definite assurances of the leaders of nearly all factions and national groups—which are once more reunited now—that they are ready to act.

Our confidence is redoubled by the magnitude and aggressive character of the great general strike that prevailed throughout the country from the 17th of July right up to the outbreak of the war, and during the last week turned in St. Petersburg into an

imposing demonstration against the Russian militarists and the Franco-Russian Alliance which was being celebrated in the visit of the French President Poincaré. One has only to read the following account to see that revolution is again at hand and will surely blaze up in a more effective way than it did after the Russo-Japanese war. And there will be no French capitalists this time, in a position to lend the Czar a few hundred million dollars with which to crush the revolt.

The following account reaches us through the columns of the New York *Volkszeitung*:

At the beginning of the movement, the workers, incited by the blood shed at the Putiloff works, in which fifty were injured and four killed, entered upon a three-day protest strike at the call of the active organizations. But the masses were so bitterly provoked by the actions of the police and Cossacks that the decision of the executive councils of the leading parties to end the strike on the evening of July 20—which, however, was kept from the general mass as a result of the confiscation of the two Social Democratic papers—secured no hearing. Until this time, the streets of St. Petersburg were thronged with peacefully demonstrating workers who, when President Poincaré passed by, cried, "Long live the Republic! Amnesty! Down with Autocracy! Long live Liberty!" Then, inflamed to the greatest fury by the attacks of the police and Cossacks, the strikers erected barricades on July 21st in various public places. For the first time since its founding, the Russian capital saw huge barricades spring up behind which the workmen, armed with stones, sought shelter from the assaulting Cossacks.

The fiercest conflicts occurred on the nights and days of July 22nd and 23rd. Several thousand workmen took part in these fights. From most of the barricades—consisting for the most part of telephone and telegraph poles, overturned carts, and stone piles—red flags were seen fluttering. Women and children helped with the building of the barricades. Broken up by the police, the masses of men reassembled at different points in order to take up the fight anew. The police and military volleyed fiercely upon the crowds until, after a time, it became impossible to count the dead and wounded.

During the week, according to the report of the factory inspection committee (which falls somewhat short of the true number), over two hundred thousand workmen took part in the strike in St. Petersburg alone. Even such concerns as the Neva Yarn Mills, the Neva Cotton Mills, and the Thornton factory, which have never stopped work since 1904, discontinued operations as soon as the street fights began in the capital in connection with the general strike—a sign of how deeply inflamed even the less eager sections of the proletariat in St. Petersburg became as a result of recent occurrences. Even a portion of the street railway men and of the shop employees of several railroads ceased work. Only the presence of numerous troops and gendarmes prevented the most important roads from taking part in the strike. The extent and strength

of the movement may be shown further by the fact that the marine barracks were watched by armed soldiers to prevent the sailors housed in them from going over to the strikers.

A leading feature of all the demonstrations after July 20th, according to this and all other reports, was that the workers tore down all decorations in celebration of the Franco-Russian Alliance—French capitalism being generally known as the underlying cause of the failure of the last revolution and of all the misery and horrors of the last ten years.

SERVIAN SOCIALIST CONGRESS

In May the Congress of the Servian Social Democratic Party met at Belgrade, for the first time since the Balkan War. One hundred and twenty-eight delegates took part in the Congress, among them three delegates from the newly-acquired provinces of Servia.

Prof. Kachanitch, of the University, presided. He gave the floor to the foreign delegates, especially to those from the Austrian, Hungarian, Czech, Croatian and Bulgarian Socialist Parties.

The Congress received Comrade Sakasov, the delegate from the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party, and editor of its central organ, with enthusiastic applause. He said:

Our soldiers and yours lived together for many years like brothers, but the intrigues of diplomats, the imperialism and despotism of our dynasties, have pitted them against each other in a fratricidal war.

Continuing his speech, he gave a sketch of the present political situation of the Balkan peoples. At no time have conditions been so favorable for the constitution of a republic in the Balkan States as at the present moment. Bulgaria lost 100,000 men in her wars and has incurred a public debt of a thousand million francs. Everywhere poverty and ruin reign, and an intense discontent on the part of the people with the regime established after the war has shown itself by the election of 37 Socialist deputies to the Bulgarian Parliament at the last elections.

The Congress adopted resolutions demanding the introduction of self-government in the provinces conquered by Servia; equality of all residents of these provinces, irrespective of race, religion, and nationality; and the abolition of the feudal system still powerful in these provinces. The land should belong to its workers.

The Congress also published an appeal to the Servian proletariat, similar to that issued among all the other Balkan peoples, urging them to establish a very close bond between all the Balkan

peoples in order to bring about a Federated Republic of all the Balkan nations.

An imposing demonstration took place after the Congress in favor of a union between Bulgaria and Servia.

I. W. W. VS. A. F. OF L. AT BUTTE

The insurrection in the Butte Union was not conducted by the I. W. W., but a number of I. W. W. members were involved. It therefore stirred up once more the smoldering conflict between I. W. W. and A. F. of L.

The following, published by Frank Bohn in the *Masses*, is from the pen of one who has paid several extended visits to Butte in recent years for the very purpose of studying the unions, as well as to carry on Socialist propaganda:

There has not been for twenty years a serious strike in the mines of Butte. Yet, underneath the generally peaceful surface there has raged a conflict as bitter and relentless as any fought out anywhere in America.

The peculiar form of this conflict is not by any means confined to Butte. In some measure it appears wherever labor is powerfully organized. It has, as yet, no specific name, and we should not attempt to label it here. It is the struggle between the employer and the employee for the internal control of the latter's union. In Butte this curious conflict has raged more openly than in any other city of the country.

Year after year, in May and June, a struggle occurs over the election of officers. Once in, an Amalgamated official machine is as hard to put out as was Tammany Hall twenty years ago. Efforts of the "Progressives" to participate in the business of the union when controlled by the machine are totally unavailing. Of course such efforts from time to time are made by a few bold spirits, whereupon the rules of parliamentary procedure are superseded by fists, clubs, and automatics.

By what methods, one naturally asks, do members of the working class permit themselves to be so misled as to surrender the control of their union to their employers? The answer is simple. In that union are a large number of that new variety of trust retainer—the hired spy. During strikes members of this type serve as gunmen. During times of peace they serve quietly and often successfully within the union. In Butte a few of these gentlemen are employed steadily in the mines. But most of them go under ground just enough to keep their standing as union members. Among their number are men of exceptional ability. Two years ago Butte Number One was supposed to contain about forty of them. Just preceding the election of the union officials or during political campaigns they are permitted to distribute the slush funds which are provided for the occasion. The union election of 1912, at the

outset of the national, state and county campaign, was considered of great importance and Amalgamated is said to have spent \$30,000 to insure victory for its ticket. Even so, the "Progressives," who had controlled the local for two years previously, would have won but for a surprise on the part of their opponents. The election of officers lasts a whole day, thus giving each of the three shifts ample time to vote. The ballot-boxes, as well as all other details of the election, are in the hands of a committee selected at a regular meeting of the local. On the evening of that meeting Amalgamated let those members of its working shift whose votes could be depended upon leave the mines and attend the union meeting. Amalgamated gained control of the elections committee which counted the votes, and thus recaptured control of the union.

The bitterness of this struggle as well as the methods pursued will be understood as soon as the purposes of the "Progressives" are made clear. These "Progressives" are mostly Socialists and industrial unionists. Through their efforts the Butte municipal elections have been twice carried by the Socialist party. Their Socialism is of the most uncompromising kind. They declare, in season and out, that, given the requisite power, they will confiscate the mines. Their immediate programme includes two propositions which Amalgamated will fight to the bitter end. These radicals argue that as soon as they have possession of sufficient political power they will strike for the six-hour day. Already they are advocating the six-hour movement in the union hall, on the street corner and in the mines. The other measure is equally dangerous to the interest of Amalgamated. The mines are located just outside the city limits of Butte and so are untaxed by the municipal government. Furthermore, though valued at \$200,000,000, they are assessed for county and states taxes at only \$8,000,000, or about one-half of their net product.

In the sparsely settled state of Montana, Butte occupies much the same position as does Boston in Massachusetts, or New York City in New York State. Industrially and politically the fears of Amalgamated are well grounded.

Following the union election of 1912, a number of policies were adopted by the incoming officials, which, in the W. F. of M., have always been considered reactionary. To the student of the labor movement East of the Mississippi, as well as to the general public, it will seem strange indeed that the most hated of these was the "closed shop." For to the conservative, old-fashioned unionist the "closed shop" stands for all that is most vital in unionism. It seems to be so conclusive that if the employer can hire only members of the union the advantage lies with the members of the organization. This view is often wholly wrong.

After the famous trial and acquittal of Haywood, in 1907, the W. F. of M. began to grow more conservative. It permitted time contracts. In the teeth of most violent protests by the radical element it began to make arrangements establishing the "closed shop" practice. This means that the union officials recruited their membership by making use of the power of discharge. More dues came into the union coffers, but in return for this favor by the employees, favors, of course, must be granted by the union officials.

And so the conflict came to a head. . . . Butte in the days of the riots was a fit place for Kit Carson. . . . Any one who has seen that crowd face to face knew the result beforehand. Among those who laid the plans and executed them were old fighters from the Cœur d'Alene and Cripple Creek and Goldfield. In that mob were scores who had seen service in the Philippines, in China, in Mexico. Their acts were their reply to years of fraud and trickery.

Eugene V. Debs takes exactly the opposite view in the *American Socialist*, the official organ of the Party:

It is said that they were also members of the I. W. W. This may not be true, but in any event it is certain that the conspirators and would-be union destroyers were known as I. W. W. men and did not deny it, and it is quite probable, judging from the way they did their work, that they were both I. W. W. disrupters and Wadell-Mahon detectives imported by the malevolent powers that were bent upon wiping out organized labor in Butte for that low and infamous purpose.

In this connection it should not be forgotten that the workers at Lawrence and at Akron were most basely betrayed, sold out, and treacherously delivered to their enemies by I. W. W. Judases, who while posing as industrial unionists were at the same time on the pay rolls of the detective agencies in the service of the corporations, and now when there is a union to be wrecked, or a strike to be sold out, or a union hall to be dynamited, or a union safe to be blown and looted, the gang put into commission for that infamous purpose are labelled I. W. W. and are given credit by the capitalist press for being in revolt against alleged wrongs which could not be righted, according to them, in any other manner.

Claiming to stand for industrial unionism by the way of sabotage and direct action, this element is the arch-enemy, the treacherous foe of all unionism, the infamous trafficker in and seller-out of the working class, and after what has been brought to light at Lawrence and Akron and what is certain to be brought to light at Butte, the whole labor movement should be on the lookout for this base and treacherous gang and be prepared to deal with it as it deserves when it projects itself into a local disturbance with professions of loyalty to labor upon its lying lips and treason to labor in its venal heart.

Debs and Bohn are equally honest. But the calm analysis of the latter is surely more convincing than the extreme violence of Debs. Surely no capitalist was ever more bitter, or unfair, to the I. W. W.

Debs' unsupported attacks throw him into the camp of Gompers—whether he desires that or not. If he attacks the only fighting force in the field against the A. F. of L., why should he not work with that other Socialist leader, Ernest Untermann, who, in the *St. Louis Labor*, writes:

The Socialist Party invites organized labor to get control of it. If the whole American Federation of Labor were ready to join the Socialist Party, the Federation could completely control this party and they would be welcome to it.

If there had been no I. W. W., Debs—who was one of its founders—knows that the A. F. of L. and the Socialist Party would probably already be fused.

THE FALLING BIRTH-RATE

Another of Mrs. Webb's series of articles, "Personal Rights and the Woman's Movement," published in the *New Statesman*, bears the above title. It shows that the State Socialist view of child-bearing is almost identical with that of Roosevelt and the German Kaiser.

Mrs. Webb begins with a very valuable admission:

If personal development with mutual consideration be the sole or even the main object of human life, I do not see how we can avoid the conclusion that neo-malthusianism must be regarded as an unmixed benefit. So far as I have been able to ascertain, whether from medical or lay observers, there is no ground for assuming that it has necessarily any injurious reactions, mental or physical, on the individuals concerned. The personal freedom of the married woman—whether seen in her protection from painful illness, by no means free from risk, or in her ability to earn her own livelihood or to develop her own faculties, artistic, literary, or scientific—has been enormously increased. Married life, more especially in the lower middle and artisan classes, has become less strained and more harmonious now that the happiness of conjugal relations can be enjoyed without the cost of child-bearing and child-rearing. Those children who are born have a better time of it.

But all this conflicts with nationalistic or State Socialism:

A distinguished medical man, in a recent scientific memoir read before the Academy of Moral Sciences, describes such a collective agreement among the coal miners of Montceau. After two unsuccessful strikes the members of the Union agreed to restrict the number of their families. Within three years the birth-rate of the whole commune had tumbled from 37 per 1,000 to 21 per 1,000, and to-day it stands at 14 per 1,000. As the average death-rate of France is 19 per 1,000, any such agreement among the whole of the French wage-earners would go near to bring about the extinction of the French within less than a century. Unfortunately for the success of this social *sabotage*, the labor market has become increasingly international. The extinction of the French race would not mean that France would become an uninhabited void, or that the French capitalists would cease to find laborers. The answer of the employer is to fill up the place of the unborn babies with the adults of other races. We find in almost every issue of the French

Labor paper, *La Voix du Peuple*, complaints of the introduction of Italian, Spanish, African, and even Chinese labor. "The Committee . . . formed for encouraging the importation of African labor into France," we were told in a *Times* telegram of June 22nd, "hopes shortly to set 50,000 natives of Algeria and Morocco to work in the industrial regions of Northern and Eastern France." What is happening in France is happening elsewhere. It is at least a plausible prophecy when Sombart tells us that, if the decline of the birth-rate among the Americans of the Anglo-Saxon race continues at its present rate, the United States will in the course of a century be inhabited, in the main, by a colored population ruled over by Jews with a fringe of Celtic Catholics. In the United Kingdom the situation is hardly more satisfactory to those who look below the surface of the statistics. . . . The impending catastrophe of a progressive supersession of the French race—with its splendid inheritance of grace and intellect—by outcasts from Southern Europe, mongrels from Algeria, and coolies from China seems to me a bigger tragedy than any hypothetical defeat by an army of Germans.

So, after all, nationalism is assumed as *the* arm of social evolution. She continues:

Now that family limitation is becoming generally known and almost universally practiced, pre-eminence amongst nations—perhaps even survival among nations—belongs not to those which are able to compel men to bear arms, but to those which can persuade women to bear children. The transcendent folly of preferring expenditure on armies to expenditure on nurseries, to which all Europe is now addicted, seems, to compare great things with small, only another instance of that typical "incompleteness" of an exclusively male government. . . .

The soldier dies and the mother gives birth to children—both to make their nation or race triumph over others.

To sum up, if the principle of personal freedom and mutual consideration is to become the only test of rightness in sexual conduct, we are within measurable distance of the collapse of our own civilization—it may be for the benefit of the Chinese or the Africans!

May not the Chinese or African prove superior? If so, civilization will gain by their preponderance. Nationalistic collectivism, we see, is at every point the deadly enemy of Socialism.

THE RIGHT TO MOTHERHOOD

The following is from a noteworthy article by Candida, in the *New Statesman*:

The assumption that all births within marriage are honorable and all births outside shameful leaves us unconvinced to-day. We know that the only shameful motherhood is unwilling or diseased

motherhood, which is as disgraceful to the husbanded as to the husbandless. While it is probably true that the majority of unmarried mothers have always been unwilling mothers the actual volume of undesired births is greater in wedlock than out of it. . . .

One great argument, however, is forthcoming against the rising claim of the unmarried woman—that of the child's right to a father. The child, the product of two parents in its physical life, is to be denied two parents in its social environment. The right of the philoprogenitive man challenged by the woman's refusal to share her child with him may safely be left in his own hands; but even if the father is willing to be robbed of the child, is it justifiable to rob the child of the father? The woman who would build soundly for the future must beware of the swing of the pendulum. It is no advance to rush wildly from the subjection of the mother to the elimination of the father; it would rather seem to indicate an excessive strength of the maternal property feeling in the child—for whose welfare a joint possession would be less dangerous and less exacting. Love may be a personal matter resting lightly on agreement between the lovers; motherhood introduces that great third party, the child, before whom irresponsibility drops away. No woman dare put her own need above *its* full inheritance; and to this a father is essential, an actual living human father, not a temporary agent called in and then cast out again. Indubitably the child is entitled to two parents. But here the other woman enters to complicate the problem, the mated monogamous woman, jealous of the paternity of these prohibited babies, fighting against the divided allegiance of their father. The pathfinder through the old maze of marriage laws and family customs will find it no easy task to reconcile the warring rights of those affected by the exercise of free motherhood.

But whether the task be easy or arduous, there is the problem; it is useless to ignore it, mischievous to attempt to suppress discussion of it. Some way to a wise solution may be discovered if sane and experienced women give to the question their quota of serious and candid consideration; but if, on grounds of outraged convention, this be refused, the rash and inexperienced may rush from discussion to dangerous and wasteful "experiments." The way of social safety lies surely in frank and rational discussion.

Beatrice Webb tried to answer this in an article significantly called "Maternity Under Free Conditions" (no reference to rights). It is in part as follows (I have placed in italics a curious definition of legal marriage):

"Free motherhood" necessarily entails untrammelled freedom of intercourse between men and women, whether or not it is intended to lead to parentage, and whether or not the persons concerned are mated or unmated—for freedom cannot be limited to those not otherwise mated. It would, of course, be absurd to suggest that "free choice of mates" involves or would lead to a universal and ubiquitous promiscuity. There would still be in our midst men and women choosing chastity or celibacy; there would be many who preferred to accept the rites of religious marriage, Christian or otherwise, and therefore monogamous or polygamous;

there would be those who preferred to protect their future interests by a legal marriage entailing pecuniary obligations. What, in my opinion, would be produced by "free choice of mates" would be the change from our present state of definitely "established expectations" to one of general uncertainty. In selecting a teacher or a foreman, an employer or an employee, a medical man or a nurse, a partner or a friend, we should have no reason to expect one kind of sexual conduct rather than another; and any attempt to inquire would, in such a state of public opinion, naturally be resented as an impertinence. There would be no period in the life of an individual such as is now enjoyed within *legal marriage, of a customary exemption from amatory adventure, an exemption which—to attractive and susceptible natures—has always been one of the privileges of wedlock.* The rapidly growing social and professional comradeship between men and women, whether single or married, in schools and colleges, in administration and on representative bodies, in office work and holiday tours, is only made possible, in my opinion, by fixed sex-conventions. It has, in fact, been promoted by the increasing insistence of public opinion on the chastity of unmarried men, and on marital fidelity. It is to convention that we owe this freedom. The abandonment of all sex-convention for the untrammelled liberty of "self-fulfilment" that "free motherhood" entails might easily throw us back into some sort of revival of the "seclusion of women." Moreover, to me at any rate, experience of life indicates that the state of insecurity and uncertainty, the lack of fixed standards of conduct or accepted common rules involved in such a "free choice of mates" would lead, not only to an amazing waste of time and emotional energy, without any equivalent rise in the quality and quantity of births, but also to a great increase in self-regarding expenditure, in vanity and untruthfulness, jealousy and cruelty.

This is chiefly an amazing and able statement of the cold-blooded view of women of a certain temperament, who like Beatrice Webb are ready to have a State Socialist society crush the individual. Some of Mrs. Webb's suggestions, however, are, as usual, incontrovertible. For example, she writes:

Last, but by no means least, comes the question of the environment for the child. Here Candida admits that it is one of the incidental evils of "free motherhood" that it seems to deprive the child of a continuous and permanent relationship to its natural father. There may be objections to the monogamous home as we know it in the England of to-day. But a home which might be indifferently monogamous or polygamous, the abode of a single parent or of a succession of fathers, or even a "disorderly house," would not, we think, receive the support of a single Eugenist, or ever be consciously adopted by any community. There is thus, in the interests of society itself, a real value in the existence of some definite rule on sex relations—that is, of a law or convention of marriage—however much we may differ about what the rule ought to be.

Her conclusions are also partly sound:

There are always lots of alternative ways of dealing with a

problem. We may, for instance, have so to alter the marriage law as to equalize the rights of the man and the woman, together with their several as well as joint responsibility for the child. We may have to legalize, by a reasonable divorce law, the termination of a relationship which has become painful or demoralizing to one or both of them.

SUGGESTIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Free meals for school children during school hours, and free dental treatment at all times. Extension of compulsory regular public school attendance of all children up to the age of 16 years. Free school books and supplies, and extension of the system of free agricultural schools and of model experimental farms.

The above, a typical Socialist educational plank, is from the new platform of the Party in the State of New York. Maud Thompson subjects it to the following just and scathing criticism in a letter to the *New York Call*:

The only thing more important than education is living. Therefore, second only in importance to our theories about getting a living should be our declarations of educational principles. But our recognition of the vital importance of education in Socialist philosophy is so recent that the educational planks in our platforms are usually hastily drawn and inadequate. Local school needs are substituted for a declaration of our stand on more important educational problems, or the excellent but fragmentary ideas of a busy platform committee are put together without the cohesion of a well-balanced educational plan. This is inevitable as long as we have no definite party position on education and no standing committees composed of trained Socialist educators.

Modern educators recognize that the most important problem of the present generation is how to transform an educational system which was made to train only in professional and clerical work into a system which will train for all the activities of life. There is no class of men to whom this change is so important as it is to Socialists. It is an essential part of their effort to recognize the business of getting a living into a sane and just process. To fail to take an intelligent stand on it is suicidal.

The free school system is established, but not completed. It is well, therefore, to remind the people that to make education free we must furnish all school supplies free, including hot lunches and all kinds of medical attendance. But education is not free if the majority of children cannot stay at school long enough to acquire even what our grade schools offer. Compulsory education laws, even when accompanied with prohibition of child labor, prove helpless before the pressure of family need for wages of the children

under 16. Moreover, education does not progress at the same rate in all children and therefore age tests mean nothing as to equipment for life. Are the Socialists in favor of school pensions to keep in school until they are equipped for life the children who would otherwise leave to earn money? If we have nothing better to offer than a compulsory school law and a sixteen-year limit, we are indeed very much in the rear of the educational progress.

Or do the Socialists abandon the problem altogether until the time of the Co-operative Commonwealth? That method is hard on the children and much harder on the Socialist movement.

Free agricultural schools are a part of the great educational progress toward fitting our children for life. Why should they alone be mentioned and industrial education be ignored?

The letter was ably supplemented by a brief article, in part as follows:

Complicated as are the problems of industrial education, its guiding principle is clear. From the child's standpoint it must be education for life, not for industry, nor for any single phase of life.

It is true that making a living is the first essential of living, but it is by no means all of life, nor is it certain that it is even the most important part. Further, training in a single trade is not even the whole preparation for getting a living. Quite as important as a knowledge of materials is a knowledge of men, and control of the tongue may be as necessary as control of the hand.

The question to be asked of each new educational proposal is: Does it give the child the best all-round equipment for living? We may let other interests take care of industry. Our interest is in the training of children. An industry which creates human well-being depends on well-trained workers and will advance as the education of the child advances.

Industrial education for boys must be tested by the same principle [as for girls]. Will the method proposed enable a boy to find a job as quickly at a slight wage advance over beginners without giving him that culture which will make all his life richer and happier? Or will it teach him to develop all his own resources so that his life, both in industry and in all human relations, will be constant progress? If the school can give the boy this capacity to advance, it matters not who is incidentally benefited, nor who initiates the change. The supreme benefit is to the boy and to the society of the future.

Taken together the letter and the article probably make as good a brief statement as we have yet had from the pen of an American Socialist.

THE SHARE OF LABOR

By degrees conservative and capitalistic organs are admitting the great basic fact upon which Socialism rests, that wealth, or rather income, is more and more unequally divided year by year.

Under the above title the *Saturday Evening Post* tells its two million readers:

The census figures bearing on the subject are roundly as follows:

Selling value at the factory of all products of manufactures in 1909 was—cutting off a row of ciphers—twenty dollars and sixty cents; materials consumed cost twelve dollars; salaries took one dollar; miscellaneous expenses, including everything that can come under the head of expenses except wages, interest and depreciation, took two dollars. That leaves five dollars and sixty cents to be divided between capital and labor, excluding salaried labor. Wage labor got three dollars and forty cents, leaving two dollars and twenty cents for capital.

Reducing it to other terms: of every dollar of the net residuum, capital got thirty-nine cents and wage labor sixty-one cents; but capital's thirty-nine cents is still chargeable with depreciation.

Out of a dollar of the gross value of products of manufactures, as reported by the census, the wage labor covered by the census report gets only sixteen and a half cents. More significant than that, however, is the fact that it got seventeen and a half cents ten years ago; and over a long period the proportion of the gross value going to wage labor has pretty steadily decreased, while the steam horse power employed has rapidly increased. From 1904 to 1909 the gross value of products increased forty per cent., wages increased thirty-one per cent., and primary horse power increased thirty-nine per cent.

There is nothing more discouraging, under this heading, than census figures, partly because they are only rough and more or less questionable approximations, and partly because they indicate no advance whatever in the relative position of wage labor.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Sunlight and Shadow; 93 pp. By Louise W. Kneeland. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. \$1.00.

Songs of Labor and Other Poems; 75 pp. By Morris Rosenfeld. Translated from the Yiddish by Rose Pastor Stokes and Helena Frank. Boston: Richard G. Badger. 75 cents.

EUGENE V. DEBS

WILL SPEAK AT THE **HIPPODROME**

Sixth Avenue and 46th St., New York City

Sunday Afternoon, September 13th, at 2.30

In Protest of the Imprisonment of **BOUCK WHITE**, under the auspices of the **CHURCH OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION**

PRICE OF TICKETS:

Family circle (first eight rows)... 50c
Balance 25c
Balcony (first four rows)..... \$1.00
Balance 75c
Orchestra 1.00

BOXES.

Club box seats..... 50c
Omnibus box seats..... \$1.00
Promenade box seats..... 1.25
Lodge box seats..... 1.50
Proscenium box seats..... 1.50

Secure your seats now. Mail remittance with order. Make checks payable to: **SOL. FIELDMAN**, Director, Church of the Social Revolution, 42 Washington Square South, New York, N. Y. Phone, Spring 6697.

"In her efforts to serve God and Mammon, the Church has become cross-eyed." The Call of the Carpenter.

BOUCK WHITE, author of *"THE CALL OF THE CARPENTER,"* is now in a cell on Blackwell's Island, New York.

He committed the "crime," after the terrible Ludlow Massacre, of attending the Rockefeller church and asking a question.

His publishers have consented to issue a "BLACKWELL'S ISLAND" EDITION of 10,000 copies (paper cover) of the "Call of the Carpenter."

This is the only opportunity to secure this book at less than the publisher's price of \$1.25 a copy.

This edition will be sold for the purpose of aiding in the support of

THE CHURCH OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION
of which **Bouck White** is founder and leader.

Price per copy..... 50c post paid
20 copies \$7.50
100 copies 25.00
1,000 copies 200.00

These rates can be secured only through the Church of the Social Revolution. All orders must be accompanied by postal or express money orders made payable to: **Sol. Fieldman**, Director, 42 Washington Square, So., New York, N. Y.

"THE CALL OF THE CARPENTER"

tells the story of the slavery of old and strikes crushing blows at the slavery of today. Proclaimed by many of the greatest scholars as the best biography of Jesus.

READ THE BOOK!

ATTEND THE MEETING!

WEEKLY SERVICES OF THE

CHURCH of the SOCIAL REVOLUTION

BOUCK WHITE, Founder-leader, **SOL. FIELDMAN**, Director-Lecturer. **EVERY SUNDAY AFTERNOON**, 3 o'clock, **BRYANT HALL**, 725 Sixth Ave., between 41st and 42nd sts. Free to all, irrespective of race or creed. Come, sing with us the folk upheaval and grow a Socialism of the heart. Headquarters of the Church, 42 Washington Square South, New York. 'Phone 6697 Spring.

THE NEW REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alexander Fraser
Jessie Ashley
Louise W. Kneeland
Gertrude U. Light
Arthur Livingston
Max Heidelberg
Louis C. Fraina

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER, 1914

	PAGE
Socialism and the War.....	561
<i>Isaac A. Hourwich.</i>	
German Socialists and the War.....	579
<i>William English Walling.</i>	
War-Time Reflections.....	592
<i>Floyd Dell.</i>	
The Attitude of Italy.....	597
<i>Arthur Livingston.</i>	
French Socialists and the War.....	600
Italian Socialists and the War.....	602
British Anti-War Manifestoes.....	603
The Muddle in England.....	607
American Socialists and the War.....	613

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Association

80 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.

ALEXANDER FRASER

President

MAX HEIDELBERG

Treasurer

LOUIS C. FRAINA

Secretary

Subscription \$1.00 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, \$0.50. \$1.20 in Canada and \$1.50 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents. In bundles of 5 or more, 6 cents a copy.

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

Our Readers Have the Right of Way:

"Success to the NEW REVIEW!"—*Leonard D. Abbott, New York City.*

"I don't want to miss a copy of the NEW REVIEW."—*Sophia Christensen, Chicago, Ill.*

"Your magazine is appreciated here."—*P. R. Whytock, Camp McCoy, Battle Mountain, Nev.*

"The NEW REVIEW is a fine publication and does its publishers credit."—*W. R. Winspear, Managing Editor, "International Socialist," Sydney, N. S. W., Australia.*

"The NEW REVIEW is worth more than its subscription price."—*G. A. Kleene, Department of Economics, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.*

"I am surprised to see how much the NEW REVIEW has been improving. I am willing to start in again with a bundle."—*Louis V. Middleton, Grand Rapids, Mich.*

"I have been greatly pleased at the enlargement of the NEW REVIEW in its size and also its scope. If you continue your present rapid growth you will soon lead the periodicals of this country in dealing honestly, plainly and convincingly—I need not say fearlessly—with the range of problems most vital to the welfare of America. As it is I look forward each month to the appearance of the NEW REVIEW with an eagerness of expectation which is new in my taking in of periodicals."—*Percy Stickney Grant, New York City.*

"I regard the NEW REVIEW as far and away the best Socialist magazine printed, so far as my acquaintance goes. My reason for so regarding it is that it is taking a broader view of the Socialist movement than any other."—*William Thurston Brown, Chicago, Ill.*

"The pleasure I have derived from reading the NEW REVIEW is something not to be equalled by any other publication."—*George J. Allen, Auburn, N. Y.*

"No other magazine appeals to us as the NEW REVIEW."—*Bar-net Braverman, Editor, "Worker's World," Chicago, Ill.*

"I believe you have the best publication of the kind in the world. Don't see how anybody who pretends to keep up with the world of ideas can get along without it."—*F. H. Schoolcraft, Kansas City, Mo.*

"I've read two numbers of the NEW REVIEW (June and July) and hav decided I can't liv longer without it. (I hope you ar not so conservativ as to be shockd by the new speling.) I see the sub. price for a year is one iron man, but I think the magazine is worth at least two, so enclose a check for \$2.00, which deed is also prompted by my being told by John Graham Brooks that you need the spondulix."—*E. T. Dana, Manchester, Mass.*

The New Review

Vol. II.

OCTOBER, 1914

No. 10

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

BY ISAAC A. HOURWICH.

I.

More than once in human history has Internationalism been proclaimed as the essence of a new social theory. In contrast with the national religions of the ancient world, Christianity claimed that it knew neither Greek nor Jew. It succeeded for a time in building up an international religious organization, the "Catholic Church. Nationalism, however, reasserted itself in religion through the Reformation. The French Revolution brought with it a revival of Internationalism, which found expression in the idea of cosmopolitan Republicanism. But bourgeois Republicanism soon cast off its Internationalism. It was again taken up by Socialism and was given concrete shape by the organization of the old International in 1864. For half a century "Workers of all countries, unite" has been to Socialism what "Our Father, who art in heaven" is to Christianity. The bond between Socialism and Internationalism was put to a practical test in the present war, and history repeated itself once more. It is now evident to anyone who would see, that there is no organic connection between "Socialism as it is" and Internationalism. Socialist editors may still, through force of habit, continue to sneer at bourgeois peace societies, at the Hague Peace Palace, etc., but the laugh is now on the Socialists. His Majesty the Lord and Emperor of all the Russias, Nicholas II, the founder of the Hague Tribunal and the aggressor in the Russo-Japanese war, offers no better possibilities to the cartoonist than His Excellency Comrade Jules Guesde, erstwhile Defender of the Internationalist Faith and to-day a member of the war cabinet, with Delcassé as his colleague, not to mention Millerand and Briand.

The official representatives of American Socialism have resorted to the dilatory tactics of the technical lawyer who knows