

October
First

New Review

Ten
Cents

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. III. 10c. a copy Published on the first and fifteenth of the month. \$1.50 a year No. 15

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
IMPOTENT NEUTRALITY	249	THE WALSH REPORT ON IMMIGRATION	260
Ernest Kempston		Isaac A. Hourwich	
A SPORTING PROPOSITION FOR LABOR	252	LAMPITO ON SOCRATES	261
Helen Marot		Floyd Dell	
IN NEW ZEALAND	253	CURRENT AFFAIRS	263
Edward Tregear		L. B. Boudin	
POTENTIAL SOLIDARITY	254	A SOCIALIST DIGEST:	
Austin Lewis		Revolution in Russia; Social Democracy and War Aims; Reform Demands of the Russian Liberals; British "Laborism" Against Conscription and For the War; The Propaganda For a German Peace; Austrian Socialists' Peace Manifesto; The Illusion of Financial Omnipotence.	
"REVOLUTION BY REACTION"	257	CORRESPONDENCE:	
Louis C. Fraina		From A. S. Headingley; Katherine C. Linn; L. B. Boudin	

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

Impotent Neutrality

By Ernest Kempston

SHOCKING as have been the great incidents of the present war, they do not call for any greater indignation than does the incredible weakness of neutral opinion as revealed by those incidents.

An innocent country has been devastated, mines have been sown in the open seas, defenceless people have been bombarded from the air, neutral ships have been sunk, the most fiendish devices have been employed upon the battlefields themselves, poisonous gases, explosive bullets, burning liquids, guns of immense range whose missiles have the effect of a cyclone—every foul perversion of human ingenuity has marked the progress of this conflict—yet what has humanity had to offer? Nothing but words.

Rape, robbery, arson and assassination, those familiar friends of militarism have, of course, been present, but our enlightened age has improved upon these primitive barbarities. We organise systematic plundering, we burn villages on principle, we murder—even those officially admitted to be innocent of the crime of self-defense—in accordance with the lofty theories of the twentieth century military honor and dignity. What is the comment of humanity? Partly to excuse, and partly to mitigate, by charity, the effects of these actions, but never to challenge the forces from which they spring. Week after week some fresh abomination is reported—passenger ships are torpedoed, prisoners of war are

made the subject of dastardly reprisals, but still the feelings of humanity are held in check. A cloud of charges and countercharges rises immediately to obscure each atrocity, a breath of sentiment stirs the air for a moment, but the crimes against civilization continue to be perpetrated as—or worse than—before.

It would be absurd to deny that some pretence has been made of asserting the rights of civilization since the war began. If speeches, newspapers, pamphlets and books could be admitted as evidence we might say that human nature had asserted itself. Unfortunately no such evidence is admissible as proof of a serious desire to restore the world to a sense of human rights and dignity. Much of this verbal protest comes from one or other of the beligerents and is thereby rendered, if not worthless, at least immaterial to the case we have under consideration, the case of the neutral countries. Apart from this, all these speeches and books and articles are of no more account than the platonic resolutions passed by local debating societies, and similar small groups of well meaning persons, calling upon their government to put into practice some favored policy. Neither in national nor international affairs can any object be obtained by pious resolutions, votes of thanks or votes of censure, unless they represent tangible power. No, not all the indignation meetings nor all the vituperative journalism of the neutral countries in the Old and the New World can

weaken the discreditable fact that nothing has been *done* to protect us from the criminal propensities of the militaristic Powers.

The consequences of this passive policy are only too clear. Not only are the warring Powers encouraged to flout all the laws of decency, to violate every international agreement that obstructs the free play of lawlessness, but the neutral Powers are condemned to an ever-increasing impotency. The longer the war lasts, the more impossible it becomes for neutrality to make itself heard. The public sense becomes blunted by the succession of barbarous or illegal acts with which the progress of the war is punctuated. Decent men and women who shuddered at the destruction of Belgium, and were horrified by the bombardment of Rheims, are learning to regard these things as mere trifles in a general campaign against culture. When we have been regaled for months with stories of wholesale slaughter, of burnings, executions, poisonous bombs, and the like, we no longer realise to the full the savagery of consigning 1200 civilian passengers to the relatively painless death of drowning. What are their sufferings as compared with those of the men mangled, maimed, blinded and insane of which eye-witnesses tell—these hapless victims of modern science and progress? The imagination ceases to visualise what is happening, our capacity for receiving sensations is lessened. This is all the more natural because simultaneously one is losing one's power of belief. The false and the true have become so inextricably mixed that men soon cease to attach credence—full credence, at least—to what they hear. We are further indebted to triumphant militarism for the confusion of all sense of values, all notion of right and wrong, truth and untruth.

The European War surely deserves to go down into history as the war of cowardly lies and mean insinuations. The practice of besmirching one's enemy is, with scientific savagery, the contribution of up-to-date militarism to the usages of warfare. The notion that one's adversary might be brave and honorable has been consigned to the same limbo as the old-fashioned virtues of fair-play and personal courage. The new-fashioned "leader" remains well in the rear posing to reporters and moving picture operators, his pride is to destroy a community from a distance of twenty miles, his men are pleased to kill an enemy they have never seen alive. At the same time his spokesmen are sent everywhere to accuse his opponents of foul play, to deny them their successes and to belittle what cannot be denied. Never will one side admit that the aviators of the other have struck anything more belligerent than an orphan asylum, a kindergarten school or a convoy of wounded. Similarly, while all agree that they must attack only in overwhelming numbers—the mere idea of equal combat has become grotesque!—all deny with equal unanimity that such has been the

case, when they are victorious. All the time our ears are deafened by these accusations and denials, charges of cruelty and counter threats of reprisals, obviously meant to keep the neutral world turning in the same vicious circle in which the militarist necessarily finds himself.

That this trick has been successful cannot be denied, for few impartial judges care to pronounce upon the cases of atrocities submitted to them. The only people who cry out are those directly concerned either in proving or disproving the facts alleged. They have done this so effectively as to rally about them groups of partisans, whose sole desire is to bolster up their racial and political prejudices. But all this noise, hatred and hysteria does not offer any occasion for the exercise of man's indefeasable right to vindicate the claims of civilization. This can be done only by responsible neutral opinion, speaking collectively, and prepared to enforce its judgments. It is not the business of the neutral to enquire who initiated the policy from which some particular act of barbarism derives, but to denounce every such act on principle. We may leave to the belligerents the childishly cruel logic of the tit for tat methods they employ.

It is not sufficient to explain the inaction of the neutral Powers, who might easily transcend the letter and interpret the spirit of international law, if occasion demanded it. In fact, they might with more justification violate them in the interests of civilisation, since they have been violated without scruple in the interests of militarism. In order to ascertain why no strength has been manifested in the support of these laws whose sanction is higher than that conferred upon them by diplomatic convention, we must look elsewhere. This acquiescence reposes upon something more material than mere respect for technicalities. Technically none of the neutral signatories to the Hague Conventions could interfere with the actions of the signatories who violated them. Morally the former were as much called upon to interfere as the latter were to conform.

When war was declared the duty of holding the combatants within the bounds of justice and humanity devolved upon the neutral nations. When the first great crime against civilization was perpetrated, when a neutralised state was crushed between the forces of two imperialisms not a step was taken to save her. Once the irreparable had happened, intervention was certainly a difficult matter. But the calamity did not fall at once, its approach was evident, it was announced in unmistakable terms. A word in time from the governments of the neutral Powers, declaring their intention to defend the proposed victim against *any* encroachment upon her territory, would have sufficed. The active hostility of two great neutral countries, and of some half-dozen minor ones could not have been incurred by all or any of the belligerents. They would have

faced a boycott so powerful, industrially and socially, that they would immediately have remembered obligations other than those of "military necessity." Even after the evil was done, when militarism was already covering itself with glory at the expense of an inoffensive people, the recall by the neutrals of their diplomatic representatives and the handing of their passports to the representatives of the governments concerned would have been an eloquent gesture of disapproval. It would have saved us the humiliation of condoning the first of a series of infamies in which every neutral feeling has been insulted or trampled under foot.

As we know to our cost, no such action was taken. Tears, words and charity were all that could be spared. The reason is clear. These enabled the average neutral citizen to relieve his indignation, without forcing his government to compromise itself by a declaration of principle which would have been a declaration of faith. Such a declaration could be made only by a government whose conscience was free from all doubts as to its complicity, and whose intentions excluded the possibility of the position being reversed. With the exception of those countries, happily too small and too prosperous to permit of the hope of aggressive patriotism, none of the larger neutral states could have dared to stand for a principle, principles being entirely incompatible with imperialism based upon armaments. Add to this the commercial advantage accruing to non-intervention, the customers for war supplies who must not be offended, the financial opportunities open to any great Power not embroiled in a war which is absorbing the wealth and energies of all its large competitors. Then it is not difficult to see why the healthy, instinctive movement of revolt which all neutral peoples have felt has never been translated into an act of public policy.

The unfortunate consequences of the conditions outlined are now before us. The neutral world, in spite of all the obvious imperative reasons for unity, is disunited and incoherent. The non-combatant peoples are not only unable to take concerted action, they are divided amongst themselves. Wherever any differences of race compose the population, friction and antagonism are bred. The war has acted as an acid upon the body politic dissolving elements that were slowly approaching cohesion. The race-maniacs, whose prefix is "Pan," are turning their eyes towards their future prey, glad that no international agreement, no federation, can protect the communities which harbor branches of their stem. The megalomania of militarism has poisoned the air, and little is heard but the demand for greater conquests, larger armies, more powerful armaments.

Yet, in the midst of all this we are asked by the belligerents to be judicial. . . towards "the enemy," of course! The work of the most efficient militarists naturally gives rise to more of these appeals.

Having no illusions as to the rights of neutrals, knowing no limit to the audacities of the militaristic spirit, they more frequently provide opportunities for expressions of neutral indignation. These expressions, though necessarily nothing more, are particularly prized by the powers militarily less perfectly equipped and therefore less ruthless. They ask us to protest against the destruction of passenger and other unarmed ships. But how can neutrality protest since it has swallowed so many affronts and has remained impassive while so many crimes were being committed? Are we to raise points of international law? We have already waived them with an impartiality as perfect as our acquiescence.

Neutrality is reduced to impotence, our opinions are of no weight and our natural movements of indignation are condemned to a futility which distorts them. What belligerent can take seriously the protest of the neutral nations, since they have proof that none dared to act upon the convictions of all disinterested spectators of this war? Until the people have the power to influence the conduct of their foreign affairs, no respect for neutrals will be forthcoming. The governments of the warring Powers are well aware of the unimportance of popular manifestations, so long as the latter have no relation to foreign policy.

Significant is the contrast between the attention paid to every expression of mob sentiment when the atmosphere for an aggressive war must be prepared, and the indifference to all public comment upon foreign affairs when a question of human rights is at issue. Militarism has a great regard for popular opinion, when inflamed with jingoism, it will even organize most thoroughly the necessary outbursts of hysteria, but should the same opinion voice the principles of humanitarianism, then it is received with polite indifference or accused of sentimentality. So long as we accept such treatment our influence as neutrals upon world politics will be infinitesimal. Wars will grow more and more barbarous, the insolence of armaments will be increasingly intolerable, but we shall be impotent. Unable to assert ourselves we shall certainly be powerless to uphold the rights of others. Our feeble demands will be ignored, unless their nature is such that we can advantageously be bribed into silence. This is the lesson of the war for the neutral peoples. Military and naval experts, engineers and aviators, all who have contributed their science to the destruction of human life, are busy learning their lessons. The hideous sufferings of men, the fearful devastation of art and industry, serve simply as indications to experts of successes achieved and "improvements" to be made. Shall we allow them to learn more from this war than we? Are they to be left, after the conflict, with their destructive powers enhanced, while we remain with our human instincts diminished? If we do not see to it that the laws of civilization are clearly formu-

lated, if we do not place ourselves in a position to insist upon their enforcement, we shall have allowed ourselves to be beaten by the agents of barbarism. For we may be sure that the militarists, and all who minister to their special needs, will profit greatly by the horrors they have seen. They will find a way to bring all knowledge to the service of their abominable ends. Surely we, who are on the side of humanity against them, can do as much? We, too, can transform the knowledge we possess into an instrument of social justice. We have but to guide the hand that controls the mechanism.

A Sporting Proposition for Labor

By Helen Marot

IN his personal report to Congress, Mr. Walsh, chairman of the Industrial Relations Commission, finds labor chiefly responsible for the general state of industrial misery. Men who had represented the public on commissions relating to the affairs of capital and labor, had either failed, before the coming of Mr. Walsh, to place responsibility for conditions or left the responsibility for change to capital and the general public. Also the investigators of social conditions had invariably assumed that capital and the public represented the responsible section of the community. This was particularly true of those unofficial reports which have issued from voluntary organizations of citizens, not from the government, for the purpose of furnishing a basis for legislative appeal for labor reforms. It has been the practice of unofficial investigators, with the enactment of some beneficent law in view, to overload labor with Pity. If labor, and in particular any section of the labor group which had been fighting mad, could be made sorry for itself on top of the Pity which had been induced for it, the result, inevitably, was a bill of alms for labor where there might have been a labor Bill of Rights.

I do not understand that capital is ever keen about assuming the responsibility for industrial exploitation, but direct union action has made it more or less clear that the safer and surer way of preserving the industrial status is to hold capital and the general public (never seriously inconvenienced by responsibilities thrown upon it) responsible for change. A bill of alms might prove inconvenient and expensive as a proposition but a Bill of Rights attacks controlling power.

Although Mr. Walsh, during the two years spent by the commission in hearing 10,000 witnesses, had large opportunities for judging the comparative fitness of the men from the world of finance and the men from the world of labor as directors of industrial change, he makes it quite clear that

his decision is not made on the ground of personal ability but on economic laws which govern the production and distribution of wealth. He has recognized that capital or its representatives are excluded as possible factors in effecting changes of radical significance on account of the nature of capital; that the existence of capital is dependent on its competitive function in the markets of finance; that this competitive function places definite limitations on capital to effect change of radical significance to labor in the industrial world. He finds that labor, on the other hand, on account of its economic position and function, on account of its inherent interest in change, holds the power to effect change of a radical nature on questions of control of industry and relationships in wealth production.

In his personal report to Congress Mr. Walsh points out: "The social responsibility for these unfortunate conditions may be fixed with reasonable certainty. The responsibility and such blame as attaches thereto cannot be held to rest upon employers, since in the maintenance of the evil of low wages, long hours, and bad factory conditions, and in their attempts to gain control of economic and political advantages which would promote their interests, they have merely followed the natural bent of men involved in the struggle of competitive industry. The responsibility for the conditions, which have been described above, we declare rests primarily upon the workers."

After recognizing the interest of a large mass of citizens in the prosperity of labor and the share of their responsibility, Mr. Walsh concludes:

"But until the workers themselves realize their responsibility and utilize to the full their collective power, no action whether government or altruistic can work any genuine or lasting improvement."

It would seem from these findings that when the Commission found that John D. Rockefeller Jr., and the Rockefeller interests created the conditions which lead to the strike in the Colorado coal fields the contest with the Rockefellers was over their denial that they "followed the natural bent of men involved in the struggle of competitive industry." It was a notorious denial when the world pays them the respect of recognizing that they go "the natural bent" of other men one better. But Mr. Walsh, whatever the expressed attitude of the Commission toward that classic relation of capital to labor, during the period of massacre, in his final conclusions and summary, holds the working people of America responsible for permitting the Rockefellers, in kind and big and little, to hold control, to keep advantages resulting from the control of wealth production.

When Mr. Walsh and the labor men of the Commission hold labor responsible for industrial condi-

tions and relationships, they invite a complete overthrow of the present system, which in essence is the servitude of labor and the rule of capital. Mr. Garretson, Mr. Lennon, and Mr. O'Connell have never been recognized among industrial revolutionists of America but in signing the minority report along with Mr. Walsh they assume revolutionary responsibilities.

Professor Commons and the signers of the majority report come out of their two-year inquiry at the point they went in. They hold Everybody responsible for conditions as they are. They have no intention of shifting the responsibility, of effecting radical changes in control of industry, of affecting in any respect the relationship of labor and capital. They have no intention of affecting *real* wages. Mr. Commons, as it is well known, would like to shift rates of wages, so that highest and lowest would more nearly approximate and the least efficient worker in the world of industry would be brought into the new ideals of efficiency. He would also like to bring sanitary standards in wealth production up to the sanitary standards of modern community life. I do not know how much Mr. Weinstock and Mr. Ballard would like to do the same, but it is possible, after listening to the intentions of some of the radical labor men of the country as well as such financial experts as George W. Perkins, that they consider certain reforms proposed by Mr. Commons financially desirable.

If Mr. Commons had been blessed with Mr. Walsh's imagination he would not of course be Mr. Commons and he would have had less confidence that he and his experts could more satisfactorily settle the affairs of other people to the satisfaction of those people, than they could possibly settle them for themselves. He gravely proposes that the people of the United States leave industrial unrest and the relations of capital and labor to him and his kind.

As the Commission closed, Mr. Walsh was reported in an interview as saying that "the application of citizenship to industry is the great basic remedy" for industrial unrest. By this I understand Mr. Walsh to mean that the administration of wealth should be in the hands of the men and women engaged in its production and distribution. He recognizes what every stockholder of a corporation knows, that is, that the administration of wealth gives control over wealth and that title to wealth is relatively unimportant.

Mr. Walsh offers labor a sporting proposition. Whatever discoverable sport there is in the proposition offered by Mr. Commons is reserved for experts. The proposition suggests a concentration of interest in the subject of the relations of capital and labor; it suggests a monopoly of interest in monopolies, perhaps the last monopoly.

In New Zealand

By Edward Tregear

NEW ZEALAND, like all other British possessions, has been deeply affected by the war. At present, we are merely in a transition period, our ideas changing from day to day with each differing aspect of the great conflict and with no possibility of any decided line of action until national decisions have been arrived at on the other side of the world.

At first there was with us a very general conviction that with the sudden advent of the great war Socialism had received a crushing and overwhelming blow. The universal defiance of all the principles we held dear, the practical denial of human brotherhood, the determination to relegate questions of Right and Wrong to the arbitrament of the bayonet, and the deification of Force as the only manifestation of God in the world, all these were absolutely paralyzing to men who had for years spent their strength and energy in advocating the claims of all members of the human race to govern themselves in terms of the Higher Laws.

To these large issues there was added the lesser conviction that International Socialism was visionary, since the millions of professed Socialists in Austria, Germany, France and Russia proved under the aegis of military conscription, as earnest in trying to tear one another to pieces for national or racial reasons as the most extreme Individualists possibly could be.

As, however, the months rolled on, a new impression and a new disposition began to exist amongst us. Our intense loathing of war, as war, became dulled by the moral inequality with which the conflict was carried on by the opposing forces. That soldiers should fight soldiers at the bidding of the privileged classes is an idea as abhorrent to Socialists as it always has been, but that men should arm and should risk death or injury to protect their women from outrage, their homes from destruction and their freedom from bloodstained bullies is quite a different matter. The soldier in peace-time, if regarded as one with whom homicide is a profession, may well be looked on with horror, but when he stands between the civil population and destruction, then he becomes a hero for whom the Socialist, as well as all others whom he protects, must express his gratitude. We Britons, who know what enormities have been perpetrated on innocent people in Belgium and Poland, who have shuddered to read of the massacre of merchant crews and unarmed passengers, we understand perfectly what would be the fate of the citizens of Britain and of the over-seas Dominions, if the brutal Teuton heel should press upon our necks. It is better for the people of the

great democracies of France, Belgium, Italy, Britain and the United States, that their sons should "flash their souls out with the guns" in bloody trenches than be slowly trampled into the mire as victims of German "Kultur." If this be true for the men, then, as to the women "the rest is silence."

In writing the above words, I recognize that there are many Socialists here (as elsewhere) who, apart from the religious motive, passionately deny the principle of opposing force to force. They know

that whichever side loses—and all are enduring enormous losses—the capitalist and the money-lender will emerge triumphant. Therefore they disapprove the European war. Until, however, the mass of mankind gain sufficient sanity to insist on a rational order of society and a sound system of economics, the profit-maker will continue to gather profit out of tears and bloodshed whether the fight is carried on in military terms of open war, or in industrial terms of a more destructive peace.

Potential Solidarity

By Austin Lewis

HOW far is it possible at present to achieve that solidarity among the workers without which no really important advance can be made to the solution of the present difficulties and the attainment of that monopoly of the labor supply, which is the essential preliminary to any real attack on the employers' position?

Solidarity among the skilled crafts is practically out of the question by reason of the absence of that coherence which is the condition precedent of solidarity. In a case where the grievances were obvious, such as the hop industry in California, organized labor rallied readily and vigorously to the aid of the oppressed workers even when they were organized under the auspices of the Industrial Workers of the World. The dislike even of the labor leaders to that organization was generously laid aside in California and men who were the admitted and open enemies of the Industrial Workers came out splendidly and manfully on the side of the hoppers.

But there was nothing of a distinctive labor nature in this action, for large portions of the middle class were also keenly in sympathy with the oppressed migratory workers and displayed that sympathy in a variety of ways. On the other hand the ordinary newspapers and the official organs were distinctly against the accused men although they supported with more or less enthusiasm the efforts to mitigate camp conditions.

It is for this reason that we are obliged to conclude that the sympathy of the organized labor bodies in the case under consideration was really not an expression of labor solidarity, but was rather the fact that when the boycott was declared on the hop-picking fields the unions were ready to aid to the utmost of their power although the operations were conducted by an organization other than their own.

In this connection, however, it must be remembered that the hoppers and the migratory workers nowhere came into collision with the organized crafts, for where there had been an attempt to start

laborers' unions by the American Federation of Labor these had been placed in the building trades organizations. So that in supporting the hop-pickers the unions were not helping a body of men with whom they might subsequently have trouble in the matter of organization. The migratory laborer in the country comes seldom into collision with the organized trades, and to improve his position means to a certain extent to mitigate the rigors of competition in the cities particularly during the winter season when work is scarce and the migratory laborers thronging into the towns make the struggle for existence more deadly than usual.

Besides, the employment of women and children in that specific industry tended to develop sympathy to make the appeal for assistance much easier than under ordinary circumstances.

The behavior of the American Federation unions in the Eastern part of the country where there has been an attempt to form industrial unions and to actually take part in the organization of the greater industry has been in marked contrast to what we have shown in the case of the hop-pickers. In many instances wherever the Industrial Workers have endeavored to establish an organization in the East they have been met by the most severe opposition of the greater and older organization which has not hesitated to employ the most extreme methods to prevent the organization. In fact, so keen has been the antagonism of the American Federation of Labor to every movement of the younger body that it has practically paralyzed its efforts in many sections of the country and it has hardly been able to survive at all except as a purely propaganda organization.

Even when the organization of the unskilled and migratory laborers in the country towns had been undertaken by the Industrial Workers they were met by the competition of the organizers of the United Laborers, the name given by the American Federation of Labor to its unskilled organization.

The American Federation men complain that the propaganda of the One Big Union idea by the In-

dustrial Workers not only prevents them from organizing the unskilled, but that the Industrial Workers are incapable of organizing them, so that they are not organized at all. It is certainly true that, in California, where much time and money have been expended on the organization of the unskilled, the latter are still generally very unorganized, and neither party to the labor controversy can claim much in the way of results.

When the American Federation of Labor organizes the unskilled, the United Laborers Unions so formed are made a part of the local trades organization and are thus under the control and management of the skilled trades. Why do the skilled trades want to organize the unskilled workers? Is it in order to benefit the unskilled and migratory laborers? This is by no means the main object of such organization. On the contrary, the aim is the prevention of undue competition with the established trades and thus the attainment of the security of the crafts as at present organized which we have seen are in their very essence incapable of the solidarity concept.

The organization of the unskilled side by side with the crafts places the former at the mercy of the crafts and thus fixes them in a definite status. For example, an unskilled laborers' union cannot undertake independent action except in terms of the crafts. As they all belong to the same council and as the laborers are but a unit in a council which is composed otherwise of the organized crafts, it is very easy to see that the unskilled cannot better their condition, except in terms of the wishes of the crafts. These will not in other than exceptional circumstances, give support to a movement of the unskilled tending to disturb their relative position with reference to the organized crafts.

Thus, the crafts endorse a scale of pay which will mark off distinctly the line of demarcation between the skilled and the unskilled but they will not endorse a scale of wages which will bring the unskilled approximately to the level of any of the skilled crafts. In proof of this we may call attention to the objections raised in the Building Trades in California to the effort on the part of the unskilled to raise their pay to the three dollar a day level. There is no doubt that the unskilled could, in the building trades at least, have secured that scale by their own efforts, for the contractors in several places were willing to concede it. But to do this would have brought the wages of the laborers to a higher level in relation to the wages of skilled labor than the latter could contemplate with equanimity.

The reason of this is sufficiently clear. If an unskilled laborers' union is able to raise the scale of pay to a point where it can bear comparison with the wages of skilled labor, what is the advantage of the craft union with all its paraphernalia of juris-

dictions and its cumbersome staff of officers? These questions are hard to answer in the skilled crafts. Thus the members of a craft which has been heavily assessed and which has a high initiation fee, a high dues rate and the other concomitants of the present craft organization would not be averse to raising the question as to the economy of their investment, in face of the fact that a laborers' union without any of these burdens had actually succeeded in gaining considerable concessions from the employer.

It must not be inferred from the preceding that the alliance with the Building Trades on the part of the unskilled laborers is altogether to the advantage of the latter. In fact, it may be a distinct advantage to the members of their organization, in so far as it secures them jobs in connection with the regular building trades, and may, owing to the by-play of politics and the influence of the building trades in municipal politics, actually give the laborers' union a monopoly of labor-work in municipal construction. In fact, this is the result in one or two places where there is a laborers' union in connection with the local building trades. The members of the laborers' union have, under these circumstances, the advantage of not having to struggle with the mass of unskilled and unorganized labor for these jobs and to that extent they are removed from the sphere of competition.

But, at the same time, they are confined to their status as laborers. They cannot compete with the crafts for jobs which belong to the crafts where the union shop is the prevalent type and they are, as we have seen, under the jurisdiction of the crafts in the conduct and operation of their laboring work, as well as in their relations to their employers.

This is of great value to the crafts, particularly to those which do not rest upon any substratum of particular skill but which have been able by manipulation to gain a practical monopoly. Thus the laborers cannot compete with the hod carriers and a laborer is obliged to take out a card in the hod carriers union before he can do that work, even though he carries a card in a union which is affiliated with the same building trades council as the hod carrier. This question has arisen in connection with the tile setters. Certain laborers having taken tile setters work, the tile setters union would not endure the competition and required the payment of an initiation fee and the passing of an examination as preliminary to allowing a laborer to engage in that class of employment. Such regulations practically rendered the tile setters union immune to competition with members of the laborers union in the building trades and effectively confined the laborers to their specific work, thus emphasizing their status as laborers and nothing else.

It is clear enough that while the advantage above set forth may accrue to the members of a laborers'

union the general position of the unskilled masses is unaffected thereby and nothing is gained in the direction of solidarity.

Besides, even where the unskilled have been organized in connection with the trades, the latter will make no sacrifice on their behalf and certainly will not suffer the hardships of a strike. This is freely admitted by the leaders even by those who are most active in organizing the unskilled. Under the circumstances, they cannot be expected to do so and in any event they would not do so, because, as we have already pointed out, the essentials of solidarity are lacking. There can be no essential economic solidarity between the skilled craftsmen and the unskilled ordinary laborers. The economic basis being absent, the possibility of solidarity does not exist.

There may be a humane desire on the part of the members of the crafts to come to the assistance of those of the laboring masses whose sufferings are dramatically expressed, as in the case of the hop-pickers. In fact, such feeling unquestionably exists and is promptly shown, for the working class is warmly sympathetic with the sorrows of the unfortunate. But in all this sympathy there may not be an atom of solidarity. In fact, the tendency of skilled labor is the same as that of all other classes which have the appearance of a temporary superiority. These show their superiority by an attitude of benevolent kindness to the more unfortunate members of the lower class. As everyone knows, such an attitude is in itself the opposite of solidarity. It marks the existence of that patronising tendency which people who fancy themselves secure always show to those struggling beneath them.

Because the distinctions are economic and material they are also social. They are mirrored in widely differing modes of life. The unskilled worker is poor. How poor, relatively, a visit to a local of the United Laborers will show. There you will see very few men of middle age showing that the stress of toil has already disposed of most of them early. Their clothing and tobacco are inferior, their attitudes tell the story of a life of hardship and physical overstrain. They, even their leaders, rise diffidently to make their speeches and stammer through their remarks, typifying their class which is struggling for articulate expression and just beginning to make itself heard. Contrast with this the good clothes, the confidence and the oratorical readiness of the members of trades which have established themselves and whose members are in reality a part of the governing class.

In California, as I write, the avenues to political preferment are crowded with aspirants from the organized labor bodies. Members of the skilled crafts are jostling the lawyers and in some cases each other for a chance to get on the tickets of all parties at the primaries. We find skilled organized

craftsmen as candidates of every stripe and complexion, Republican, Progressive, Democrat, and occasionally, Socialist, though these last are few in number as the chances of election are slight. A fever for political preferment appears to have struck them. We have conspicuous trade unionists elected to prominent public offices, congressmen, mayors, supervisors, justices of the peace. Others have taken their bar examinations and graduated out of the unions, (in which, however, they still continue to hold cards), as assistants in the office of the district attorney. Scores occupy subordinate and appointive positions in the municipal, county and state administrations. Thus it is no exaggeration to say that the trades unions have achieved general recognition and have become a part of the governmental system.

This means that the trades unions and the smaller bourgeoisie are practically at one as regards their concepts of government at the present time. This in turn implies that the unskilled and migratory masses are outside of the pale and are subject, to a greater or lesser degree, to the oppression not only of the recognized exponents of capitalistic society but also of the trade union officials. The scorn with which a promoted trade unionist will treat an Industrial Worker can only be compared with that of the Los Angeles member of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association for a member of the metal trades prior to the strike of 1910.

In some instances, indeed, the ordinary trade unionist of the official type will actually go so far as to wage a physical force fight upon the representatives of the unskilled. In Sacramento, during the unemployed demonstrations, numbers of the union men hired out as specially paid thugs for the purpose of beating the harmless and starving hoboos who happened at that time to be a nuisance to the citizens of that city.

But the actions of these trade union officials and of the haughty skilled crafts are becoming ever less popular with the rank and file of the unions. The Sacramento union men who clubbed the unemployed were condemned by their unions. Every time the question of the unskilled and unorganized comes before the organizations there is greater and more evident sympathy for them. Action in their favor is received continually with more approval and constantly requires less explanation. The group which makes "solidarity" its watchword grows ever greater in the local councils and this group naturally and indeed unavoidably makes the interests of the unskilled and unorganized its own.

In other words the mass of the skilled trades by very necessity are beginning to look downward to the proletariat instead of upward to the smaller middle class. They understand that their own fate is becoming ever more closely interlocked with that

of the masses and that they cannot retain their exclusive and favored position forever. This fact in itself is pregnant with significance for solidarity.

On one occasion I called the attention of a prominent trade unionist to his statement that the trades would not strike on behalf of the unskilled. To which he replied that his statement must be modified by the additional clause "unless the unskilled are sufficiently well organized." In other words, our trade unionist, who knows his subject thoroughly and who is quite exceptionally well trained, recognized that a sufficiently numerous and well organized unskilled group could enforce the active co-operation of the skilled trades and thus compel a solidarity which otherwise would not exist. This is no doubt true.

The only potential solidarity rests in the organization of unskilled labor. Such organization is the first step to a recognition of the existence of the masses of labor, for without it they cannot compel attention and they have no means of making them-

selves felt. To obtain recognition they must develop power, for recognition does not proceed from sympathy or pity. No solidarity can be founded on any such basis. Some of us who were idealistic socialists long ago fancied the organized trades as helping the unskilled and the miserable out of sheer altruism and because they were all members together of the working class. But such expectations were very vain. For in the first place, there is no reason to suppose that the working people are any less inclined to yield to motives of self interest than the rest of mankind, and in the second place the sole way in which the unskilled can make themselves felt is by a declaration of their own power.

That they cannot show this power in conjunction with the skilled trades is for the present obvious enough as we have seen. The only remaining path lies in the organization of the unskilled on their own account supplemented by such co-operation as the growing tendency to solidarity in the skilled trades may produce.

"Revolution by Reaction"

By Louis C. Fraina

IT is no unusual thing for a revolutionary and revolutionizing scientific theory to be transformed into a prop of social reaction, the simplest illustration being the Darwinian theory of the "survival of the fittest," which was used to justify competitive Capitalism and its *laissez-faire* philosophy. Obviously, if this transformation occurs in the domain of natural science, it occurs oftener in the domain of social science, the most complex of the sciences.

The doctrinaire Socialist may consider the parallel inexact. He conceives Socialism as a sort of super-science unaffected by the conditions which affect "bourgeois" science. This illusion has an apparently materialistic basis. The doctrinaire Socialist assumes that there are no class divisions within the proletariat, its interests being *one*; and that, accordingly, Socialist theory possesses a unity of thought impervious to reactionary influences. If this assumption were correct, the sharp disagreements among Socialists would appear a product of insanity—or worse. But the assumption is not correct. The immediate interests of the proletariat are *not one*; it is split by class divisions; and Socialist theory is not only susceptible of reactionary interpretation, but is *being used* for reactionary purposes by powerful groups within the movement.

The student of Socialism is aware of how certain aspects of Socialist theory are being distorted. The brilliant concept of the materialistic conception of history, with its full-orbed recognition of the non-economic factors involved in the social process, has

in some quarters been distorted into a rigid and preposterous "economic determinism," emphasizing an *exclusive* and *personal* economic interest as the determinant of social action. The direct actionist bases his apotheosis of violence upon the Marxian generalization, "Force is the mid-wife of the old society pregnant with the new;" while the pure-and-simple political actionist uses the generalization, "Every class struggle is a political struggle," as the justification for an exclusive emphasis upon politics as the tool of the revolution. —It is unnecessary to pile up illustrations: they are numerous and familiar.

These distortions of Socialist theory, however, might be dismissed as the consequence of error in interpretation, or simply of downright ignorance;—although the controversy over direct action and political action springs largely from divergent group interests within the Socialist movement. They are clearly not in a class with the transformation of the "survival of the fittest" theory into a prop of reaction.

It is different with the subtle transformation of Socialism from a revolutionary into a conservative social force. Where Socialism previously attempted to express the interests of the proletariat as a whole, the Socialist movement now generally expresses the interests of the skilled portion of the proletariat and the lower middle class. This change has been crowned by the transformation of the Socialist movement into a movement of social reform, and the

transformation of official Socialist theory into a theory of State Socialism. This is indeed the transformation of a revolutionary and revolutionizing theory into a prop of social reaction, insofar as the interests of the unskilled proletariat and revolution are involved.

The war has accelerated this transformation of Socialism. We are now witnessing the astounding phenomenon of Socialist theory being used to justify Imperialism, and all that Imperialism implies—Imperialism, as being in the interests of the proletariat and revolution. I do not refer merely to the German Socialists who politically support Germany's plans for conquest, but to the *theoretical* defense of Imperialism made by such an honest and cogent thinker as Heinrich Cunow. This clinches the parallel: *as the "survival of the fittest" theory was used to justify competitive Capitalism, Socialist theory is being used to justify Imperialistic Capitalism.*

* * *

Cunow maintains, rightly, that there will be no immediate collapse of Capitalism and no early victory of Socialism; that illusions arising out of this belief are responsible for Socialist disappointment caused by the war. Cunow counsels a closer scrutiny of the actual course of development, and proceeds to a defense of Imperialism:

"The new Imperialistic phase of development is just as necessarily a result of the innermost conditions of the financial existence of the capitalist class, is just as necessary a transitional stage to Socialism, as the previous stages of development, for example, the building up of large scale industry. . . . The demand, 'we must not allow Imperialism to rule, we must uproot it,' is just as foolish as if we had said at the beginning of machine industry: 'no machine must be tolerated, let us destroy them, and let us henceforth only allow hand-work.'"

The spirit of Cunow's attitude expresses a dangerous tendency latent in Socialist thought. It is what may be called the "historical imagination," the tendency to view contemporary phenomena as one views the phenomena of history. This necessarily leads to reactionary concepts and paralysis of action. If there is error in the judgment of history, how much more error must there not be in judging history in the making? Even in history there are few developments which can be considered inevitable, except the broad general tendencies of social evolution. One may speak of the "inevitable this" and the "inevitable that" after the event, but it is dangerous to do so before the event. And particularly if we possess an insight into the processes of history: for of what practical value is this insight if it is not used in an *attempt*, at the very least, to direct the course of history?

Cunow sees in Imperialism a "necessary transitional stage to Socialism." The German Socialists

seem to possess a perfect genius for discovering "transitional stages" to Socialism in any and all things except Socialist activity itself. A generation ago, the conquest of political democracy was considered "a necessary transitional stage to Socialism," and ended in making the Social Democracy a party of bourgeois democracy and social reform. Now the German party seems to have forgotten this "transitional stage," and seems allying itself with a very opposite tendency, Imperialism, which is the arch-enemy of democracy. Is not the conclusion sound that this new "transitional stage" will prove as illusory as the preceding one? Cunow's attitude amounts to a suggestion that the Social Democracy repeat the error which more than any other single factor resulted in its inglorious downfall.

The essential *economic* characteristic of Imperialism is the export of capital—investments. The circumstance that there are nations weak economically and politically develops the essential *political* characteristic of Imperialism—"spheres of interest" and ultimate conquest. But there is no inevitable connection between the two. The export of capital may take place without ultimate conquest. Should Mexico be conquered by the United States, the Socialist Imperialist would contend that it was an inevitable consequence of Imperialism; but allow Mexico a decade to strengthen its government and organize itself socially and industrially, and the excuse of the Imperialist for conquest—disturbed conditions of political and economic life—would no longer exist and the idea of conquest vanish into thin air. The problem confronting the Socialist, accordingly, is simple: Shall we encourage the conquests of Imperialism, or shall we use our power to compel Imperialism to hold itself in restraint, and encourage the peaceable national development of Capitalism in countries now the prospective prey of the Imperialist? The Socialist Imperialist argues that Imperialism performs a useful function by economically developing pre-capitalist countries. But this function can be performed without Imperialistic conquest, a consummation to be striven for by the Socialist. Japan developed capitalistically without Imperialistic conquest: why should not the phenomenon be repeated in China and Mexico? The comparison of Imperialism with machine industry is not pertinent: there *is* an alternative to Imperialism, there was none to machine industry.

Assuming that Cunow's analysis is correct at all points, his tactical conclusion, "we must not fight Imperialism," would still remain untenable—suicidal. Should Socialists cease their opposition to the exploitation of labor because that exploitation is necessarily a result of Capitalism? Is Socialism to become the historian analyzing the development of Capitalism, instead of a dynamic and revolutionizing factor in that development? Is the Socialist

movement to renounce its revolutionary heritage for the flesh-pots of Imperialism? In fighting Imperialism the Socialist movement doubly fights Capitalism; in abandoning the fight against Imperialism it would simultaneously abandon the fight against Capitalism.

* * *

American Socialists have usually imported their ideas from Germany, their contributions to those ideas being of a caricature nature. It is not surprising, therefore, to find an American Socialist adopting Cunow's ideas, but repeating them in a form that would probably astound and shock Cunow.

In the Milwaukee *Leader*, Ernest Untermann has published a series of articles expressing definitely Imperialistic ideas. He accepts Cunow's thesis, and then proceeds to apply it. In the course of this application, Untermann uses the phrase, "Revolution by Reaction"; and this phrase, caricature as it is and because it is caricature, aptly characterizes the attitude of the Socialist Imperialist.

Untermann quotes a saying of Engels, "Our reactionaries are the greatest revolutionists," and then says:

"Militarism and colonial imperialism today seem the worst enemies of Democracy and Socialism, yet no other power so rapidly and effectively enforces co-operative discipline, kills anarchist individualism, destroys petty business disorganization and undermines the whole capitalist system nationally and internationally so thoroughly as these arch enemies of the common good are doing."

Those of us who thought Imperialism strengthened Capitalism had better recant. And cease our opposition to American Imperialism, for, according to Untermann:

"Our American Imperialists, like their European brethren, must work for the revolution, whether they like it or not."

Imperialism is a blessing in disguise to the people it conquers:

"Now the alternative facing the American capitalists is: Either a constitutional government of Mexicans controlled by influences hostile to American capitalists, or annexation of Mexico. If they choose annexation, they will give to the Mexicans with one hand what they take with the other. For if Mexico is annexed, the Mexican people lose their national independence, but they gain—admission to the American labor movement and to the American Socialist party."

The Mexican revolution is an illusion, and "Mexican independence not among the things that history has provided for, at least not so long as Capitalism rules this world:"

"The Mexican revolutionists, especially the little landholders and the peons, have simply been the credulous pawns of foreign adventurers."

Strange as it may seem, the hope of Mexico lies in Imperialism: it is a "perfidious illusion" to hope that "American intervention can and must be prevented:"

"The real revolutionists in Mexico have been in modern times the American and English capitalists. They were the instigators of the present revolution, they will be the real spirits back of future capitalist revolutions. Peace can come to Mexico only by an agreement between these foreign capitalists. Whatever may be the surface indications, whatever may be the illusions of Mexican patriots, there can be but one outcome to the struggle in Mexico: The control of the country's fundamental wealth by international finance. The sooner this end is achieved, the more Mexican lives will be saved, the more rapidly will the Mexican people enter upon that stage of their development which will ultimately emancipate them from all capitalist finance and from all Capitalism."

Untermann's insinuation that it would be an advantage for the Mexican people to "gain admission to the American labor movement," is a strong argument against Mexican annexation. It would intensify the racial prejudices which are the curse of the American union movement. If the American labor movement oppresses and discriminates against the alien in this country today, that discrimination and oppression would be a hundred-fold worse against the Mexicans should they enter the American labor movement as a conquered race.

It is difficult to characterize the arguments of Untermann. The role they ascribe to the Socialist movement is that of Lazarus feasting on the crumbs of the Imperialistic Dives. They are a complete abandonment of Socialism. The Untermann attitude leaves the Socialist movement without any definite revolutionary function to perform, and strengthens Imperialism by imputing to it the fatality of the inevitable. Support American Imperialism in Mexico and you must support it against the Imperialism of other nations: and the vision evoked is of Imperialism fighting Imperialism, with Socialism supplying the justification of historical necessity and the enthusiasm of the fatalist.

The Socialist bases his conception of the movement upon the development of the working class, as determined by the development of Capitalism, while the Socialist Imperialist bases it upon the development of Capitalism. But Capitalism in itself is capable of an infinite development: the old theory of the inevitable collapse of Capitalism is untenable. There is no hope of revolution except in the development of the revolutionary proletariat.

The issue is this: Shall the Socialist movement organize dynamically for the overthrow of Capitalism, or shall it organize for the perpetuation of Capitalism?

The Walsh Report On Immigration

By Isaac A. Hourwich

IT was to be expected that a report signed by three representatives of organized labor would recommend restriction of immigration. But the Walsh report is not content "to regulate immigration in proportion to the actual needs of American industry," it goes far beyond the mere economic objects of restriction. It recommends:

"The enactment of legislation providing that within six months from the time of entry all immigrants shall be required, under penalty of deportation, either to declare their intention to become citizens by taking out their first papers or to definitely register themselves with the proper authority as alien tourists, and further providing that all immigrants who have failed to take out their first papers at the end of two years shall be deported, as shall all who fail to take out their second papers when they become eligible, deportation in each case to act as a bar to future entry."

Let us see what such a system of regulation would involve.

I. Resident representatives of foreign business firms would be required to take out naturalization papers, or to take a trip over the Suspension Bridge at Niagara Falls before the expiration of two and a half years after each arrival in the United States, under penalty of deportation, which would act as a bar to future entry.

II. Inasmuch as the naturalization law requires every applicant to be able to speak English, and as there are large numbers of foreign-born workmen employed in mines and mills who are brought in contact with people of their own nationalities only, which gives them no opportunity to learn the English language, great numbers of them would have to be deported after a residence of seven and a half years, to be replaced by new immigrants.

What would the United Mine Workers gain through the periodical deportation of its foreign-speaking members of a few years' standing and their displacement by newly-arrived immigrants? This aspect of the question, evidently, never occurred to Mr. Walsh, Mr. Manly, or the A. F. of L. members of the Commission.

Neither have they given any thought to the question, What should be done with the exiles' infant children born in the United States and enjoying the rights of American citizenship? Would they also be deported, together with their parents?

The enforcement of the scheme would necessitate the adoption of a passport system upon the Russian

plan. Every immigrant, of course, would be required to register with some institution. In order to enforce this rule, however, it would be necessary to impose upon the landlords the duty to see to it that their unnaturalized tenants were duly provided with certificates of registration. Still it would be impracticable to delegate to the landlord the duty to see to it that his tenant should take out his first or second papers in due time. This would have to be done by some official body vested with police power. All certificates would have to be properly vided whenever the unnaturalized immigrant moves from one house to another.

Nor could this system be confined to unnaturalized aliens. There is no physical test to distinguish a naturalized citizen from his unnaturalized countryman. So all foreign-born residents would have to be brought under police supervision. Bearing in mind that the foreign-born form one fifth of the total population of the United States, and in some of the great cities more than one half of the adult population, it is no exaggeration to say that the United States Immigration Service would have to be transformed into a sort of a Federal constabulary akin to the Russian Imperial Police Department. It would have to be vested with the power to visit and search every house in order to detect evasions of the passport laws. A thorough enforcement of the law would involve the right to visit and search the houses of native-born citizens who keep roomers or boarders. Think of the unlimited opportunities for graft such a system would open to a police force trained in the enforcement of our blue laws!

The scheme is too visionary to be taken seriously. But it reveals the state of mind of our social reformers, who seek a remedy for the evils of Capitalism in a reversion from the *laissez faire* doctrine to the political philosophy of the German *Polizei-Staat* of the epoch of "Enlightened Absolutism."

This new tendency has come to the United States through the direct influence of the German universities. The growth of the Social Democratic party forced the German Police State to inaugurate a program of "welfare work," for which a theory was supplied by the so-called "Socialism of the chair," nicknamed by some with *Polizei-Socialismus* (Socialism of the Cop). This theory of industrial relations is substantially identical with W. J. Ghent's "Benevolent Feudalism" and William English Walling's "State Capitalism." The seat of the new school in this country is the University of Wisconsin. The gist of its political theory can best be expressed in Russian police slang—"Pinch 'em and keep 'em out."

Lampito on Socrates

By Floyd Dell

TIGRANES, A rich barbarian.

LAMPITO, a Greek slave girl.

Somewhere in the Empire of Alexander the Great. About 320 B. C.

TIGRANES: The merchant from whom I bought you, Lampito, assured me that you are as learned as you are beautiful. Is that true?

LAMPITO: I can repeat the arguments of the philosophers, Tigranes, if that is what you want. I can quote to you the sayings of Zeno the Stoic, such as the one by which he explained why it was not inconsistent for him, who advocated a temperate life, to get drunk every time he went to a dinner party; or I can explain why Epicurus thought it was better to be unfortunate in accordance with reason than lucky by accident; and many things of the same kind. That was a part of my education.

TIGRANES: Such things are too profound for me, Lampito; remember that I am not a Greek. I would rather hear a story about one of these wise men.

LAMPITO: I can tell you about the death of Socrates. But first let me tell you who Socrates was—

TIGRANES: I know! He was the wisest man in Greece. And he was sentenced to be poisoned. On the last day—start there.

LAMPITO: On the last day, his friends came early to the prison, and they commenced to talk, as usual.

TIGRANES: Where was his wife?

LAMPITO: She was there, with her child, weeping, and Socrates sent her away.

TIGRANES: Why did he do that?

LAMPITO: Because, as he said, he wished to die in peace.

TIGRANES: By the gods, that was an unkind speech! I have had you only three days, Lampito, but if I were condemned to die, and you were sorry for me I should not begrudge you your tears. But go on. What did they talk about?

LAMPITO: Socrates told them he had been writing poetry.

TIGRANES: Was he a poet?

LAMPITO: No. But he had often had a dream which bade him to make music. He had always thought that this referred to the study of philosophy, but he was not sure of this, and he thought he would be safer, now that he was about to die, if he made some verses.

TIGRANES: So Socrates believed in dreams.—What did they talk about then?

LAMPITO: They talked about suicide, which Socrates showed was wrong.

TIGRANES: How did he show that?

LAMPITO: He said that if you owned an ox or an ass, and it put itself out of the way before you were ready to kill it, you would be angry, and would want to punish it.

TIGRANES: So he was afraid of the anger of the gods .

LAMPITO: If you let me tell the story as I learned it, Tigranes, it would sound more beautiful, and Socrates would appear more wise. Between us we are spoiling it.

TIGRANES: Very well; go on in your own way.

LAMPITO: Then Socrates showed that death was nevertheless dear to the philosopher, inasmuch as his whole life is a pursuit of death.

TIGRANES: I cannot understand that.

LAMPITO: Neither could the friends of Socrates, until he pointed out to them that a philosopher cares nothing about eating and drinking, love, the wearing of clothes, in short he despises the body, which only hinders the acquirement of knowledge—

TIGRANES: Did he mean to say that sight and hearing are not helps to the acquirement of knowledge?

LAMPITO: Sight and hearing have no truth in them, Socrates said. Knowledge is acquired by the soul.

TIGRANES: And the body has nothing to do with it?

LAMPITO: The body is a hindrance, which the philosopher wishes to get rid of. The life of the philosopher is as much like death as possible.

TIGRANES: Did Socrates say that?

LAMPITO: He did. And if you would listen to me, I would repeat the whole argument. Death is a separation of the soul from the body. After death the soul remains—

TIGRANES: How did he know that?

LAMPITO: There was a long argument about it. Two of his friends said that the soul died when the body did.

TIGRANES: That was inconsiderate of them, Lampito. They should have realized that this man, being about to die, wished to believe that part of him would live. If I should die, Lampito, you must assure me that in another moment I will awake in another world. It will console me.—But I am interrupting.

LAMPITO: Well, there was a long argument, and finally Socrates proved to them that the soul could not die.

TIGRANES: How did he prove that?

LAMPITO: He got them to agree that the soul was that which gave life to the body; and that a thing could not partake of the nature of its opposite; and that the soul, being that which gives life, cannot admit of death.

TIGRANES: And you say that convinced them? Now, Lampito, I know I am not a philosopher, but

how about this? The snow is cold; the sun melts it—!

LAMPITO: Socrates brought up that argument himself: the snow, he says, retires at the approach of heat; it takes its departure. It does not, being cold, admit heat. It does not become hot snow. In the same way, the soul, being alive, cannot become a dead soul. To say "the soul dies" would be like saying "the snow has become hot."

TIGRANES: You and Socrates are too clever for me, Lampito. It is a trick with words, but I cannot untangle it. I am only a barbarian. —So the soul cannot die. Then what becomes of it?

LAMPITO: They agreed that the souls of the wicked linger near the scenes of their ill-deeds, and are seen by the living.

TIGRANES: Socrates believed in ghosts, then.

LAMPITO: And the souls of the gluttonous and the wanton and drunkards pass into asses and animals of that sort.

TIGRANES: So my old nurse used to warn me when I ate too fast.

LAMPITO: Other souls pass into the bodies of wolves and hawks, or of bees and ants, or even back into the forms of men, according to their deserts. The philosophers alone are permitted to dwell with the gods.

TIGRANES: And it is in the hope of this reward that the philosophers abjure the pleasures of love?

LAMPITO: Yes. And it was for this reason that Socrates stayed in prison to be poisoned when he might have escaped to Megara or Boeotia. For to have fled would have been to obey the body instead of the soul, an action unworthy of reward hereafter.

TIGRANES: No! There you do him an injustice, Lampito. He stayed because he was a brave man, and too proud to run away. I can understand that, though I am not a philosopher. And now that I think of it, I am convinced that the philosophers abjure the pleasures of love and wine and beautiful clothing because they do not care for them. Sometimes I have felt like that myself.—But continue.

LAMPITO: Then Socrates discoursed on the beings that live in the sky. And also about the dreadful place in the center of the earth, which is called Tartarus, and the four rivers: Oceanus, which bounds the earth; Acheron, on the shores of which the souls of the dead stand waiting; Pyriphlegethon, which throws up jets of fire; and the Stygian river, Cocytus. Here in the interior of the earth the wicked are tortured according to their crimes.

TIGRANES: Did he say nothing about his children?

LAMPITO: They asked him if he had anything to say about them, and he replied "nothing particular." I must remind you, Tigranes, that he was a philosopher.

TIGRANES: They were a hard lot. Did no one shed tears?

LAMPITO: Yes. The jailer wept when he came to tell Socrates that the hour had arrived.

TIGRANES: I am glad the jailer was not a philosopher.

LAMPITO: His friends also wept, but he rebuked them, saying he had sent away his wife because he did not want anything like that to happen. —And then they gave him the poison.

TIGRANES: This is all very curious to me, Lampito, and I cannot help saying that it does not give me any great enthusiasm for philosophy. Still, I must concede that he was a brave man. And his friends seem to have loved him. —What was the last thing he said? Perhaps he kept his finest words till the very end.

LAMPITO: He uncovered his face and said, "Crito, I owe a cock to Asclepius. Will you remember to pay the debt?"

TIGRANES: Is that all?

LAMPITO: That is all. And I must say, Tigranes, that though you have made me tell it very badly, you are a most unappreciative audience. A man I used to belong to in Alexandria would make me tell this story to his friends— Oh, it was much longer, it took hours!—and they all cried when I finished.

TIGRANES: I'm sorry, my dear. —Aren't you hungry? I am. If you will just ring that little bell, we'll have the slaves bring us in some supper. What kind of wine would you like?

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

Published by the New Review Publishing Association

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALFAXANDER FRASER	JULIUS HEIMAN	LOUIS C. FRAINA
President	Treasurer	Secretary

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

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

Current Affairs

By L. B. Boudin

The Evil and the Remedy.

THE seriousness of the situation created for the working class of this country by the Dumba strike-agitation, and for the true friends of peace by the Henry Weissmann "peace-propaganda," is beginning to dawn upon the minds of some people from whom these "movements" had hitherto received whole-hearted and enthusiastic support. This is particularly noticeable in some Socialist quarters which were hitherto committed to these "movements". It is quite manifest that the repudiation by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Mr. Weissmann's "Peace Congress" has had a most salutary effect in clearing somewhat the atmosphere within the party. But evidently only to the extent of making the honest dupes of the German propaganda feel uncomfortable,—they still cannot see the way out of the jungle into which they had been led by their more crafty and less honest brethren.

One of these uncomfortable souls laments in the *N. Y. Call* of September 9th:

"This situation is unfortunate for organized labor, in a measure, and unfortunate for those who stand against war, in a measure."

Aside from recognizing the situation as "unfortunate" this lost soul has seen the light sufficiently to appreciate that:

"The purely capitalistic and selfish machinations of a Dumba or a Viereck are one thing; the working class in its fight against the capitalist system and its various manifestations is another."

But here the light failed, and we are left completely in the dark how to keep these two things separate,—how to extricate ourselves from the "unfortunate" situation in which we are placed by the fact that Messrs. Dumba and Weissmann have kindly offered us their services. Gloom and darkness must evidently continue to prevail, and the "machinations" of Messrs. Dumba and Co., must continue to exert their influence in this darkness. Truly, most unfortunate!

And yet the situation is by no means unique, nor even novel, in the history of the Socialist movement. Messrs. Dumba and Co., are not the first of their ilk to attempt to use the Labor and Socialist movements for their own purposes through "selfish" and other "machinations". But these "machinations" have seldom had any "unfortunate" results for the enlightened working class. And for a very good reason: Among the first things that a truly enlightened working class has learned is the unalterable oppo-

sition between the interests of the Messrs. Dumba and Co., under whatever name or guise they appear, and those of the working class,—an opposition which makes co-operation and mutual aid quite out of the question. The lure of assistance from Messrs. Dumba and Co., never tempted the enlightened working class, and it therefore never became the victim of any entangling alliance with such gentry, nor did it have to suffer the consequences of any suspicion of such an alliance.

The enlightened working class has always realized that the integrity of the labor movement depended upon its freedom from such outside influences, and from any *suspicion* of outside influences. It also realized at a very early stage of its development that the way to keep above such suspicion is not only to spurn every such proffered assistance, but to regard every such offer by Messrs. Dumba and Co., as a design upon its integrity which must be fought with every means at its command and particularly by the never-failing means of instant public exposure. Of course, there have not been wanting in the past,—no more than in the present,—those who have from honest or dishonest motives advised the working class to "use" Messrs. Dumba and Co., for its own purposes, under the specious plea—so often heard nowadays—that it makes no difference where the means to a good end come from. But the enlightened working class has always regarded such advisers as its deadliest enemies, even though they bore the visage and wore the garb of friends.

A recent incident from the annals of the present war may serve as an illustration:

Before Italy's entry into the war, the Italian Socialists carried on a vigorous peace-propaganda, designed to keep Italy neutral. It so happens that the Italian Socialist Party is not particularly rich, and an energetic peace propaganda requires funds. Bearing this in mind an *American* peace-lover offered to the Italian Socialist Party 200,000 lire for its peace propaganda. The offer was made *without any terms or conditions whatsoever*. The money was to be turned over to the Socialist party for such use as it saw fit *in the continuance* of its peace-campaign which it had been carrying on for many months past. Surely, if ever, here was a case when outside aid was permissible: the money came from a neutral and honestly pacifist source; it was to be used in a truly neutral way and to keep a neutral country from going to war; and its purpose was to enable the Socialist Party to do work which it was doing anyway, for which it was using its best energies and using up its meagre resources.

Nevertheless, the Italian Socialist Party spurned the proffered gift, resenting it as an attack upon its integrity—considering the good-faith and honest

motives of those who made the offer as quite irrelevant—and *published the facts to the World*.

Had the *Call* treated the "selfish machinations" of Messrs. Dumba and Co., in the same manner in which the Italian Socialist Party treated the honest offer of an honest pacifist, there would have probably been no "unfortunate situation" for it to bewail. The "unfortunate situation" was not created by Messrs. Dumba and Co., but by the lost souls on the *Call* and similar purveyors of Socialist public opinion in the United States.

A Struggle Between Systems?

THE forty-seventh annual British Trades Union Congress which was held this month at Bristol, England, was an event of more than ordinary import. It was the first labor congress to be held in any of the warring countries since the outbreak of the war, and was a credit to the English working class as well as to the English nation. The English working class has again demonstrated its independence from the political domination of the capitalist class, while England has shown the value of her political institutions by the mere fact that such a congress could be held. The more the pity that this congress should have shown the English working class, so splendidly independent of capitalist *political* domination, still dependent on this same capitalist class for its ideology. This dependence upon the bourgeoisie for "light and leading" was strikingly illustrated in the opening address of the chairman, J. A. Seddon, who declared that the present war "is a death-struggle between systems,"—"Prussian militarism" on the one hand and "democracy" on the other. This division of the warring nation-groups into opposing "systems" evinces an utter inability on the part of Mr. Seddon—and the great majority of the English working class which he represents—to emancipate himself from the shackles of bourgeois ideas, and a consequent failure to grasp the real meaning of the great struggle now raging.

Definitely Imperialistic.

IN our issue of September 1st, I commented in this place on the action of the German Socialists in voting the last war-credits and the speech delivered in the Reichstag by their spokesman, Dr. David, on that occasion. It now appears that immediately before the opening of the Reichstag there was a joint conference of the Socialist Reichstag group and the National Committee of the party lasting three days, at which the course to be pursued was decided upon. This conference, besides deciding to vote the new war-credits also formulated a declaration of the aims and purposes of the war and terms of peace to be advocated by the German Socialists.

These "Socialist" terms of peace are the most remarkable documents emanating from such a source since the commencement of the war. By this time one is quite used to nationalistic documents emanating from Socialist conferences, and to Socialist pronouncements couched in language taken from the political arsenal of the old bourgeois-democrats revived by the capitalist class for war purposes. But this document is a real novelty. For it is not merely nationalistic in the old sense of that term. It is as definitely imperialistic in conception and outlook as anything that any group of imperialists has ever written. In this respect it is quite unique in official Socialist literature, and should be carefully studied by all those who are interested in the "new drift" in the Socialist world.

I don't know by what majority this declaration was adopted at the conference, except that it commanded a majority of each constituent group of the conference,—the Reichstag delegation, and the National Committee. That it was opposed very strenuously by a considerable minority is evident from the fact that the conference lasted three days. Also from the fact that the granting of the war-credits was opposed by a stronger minority than on any one of the previous three occasions.

The adoption by the majority of a definitely imperialistic attitude makes the break-up of the present Socialist party in Germany an absolute certainty. The purely nationalistic attitude of the majority as it has hitherto appeared on the surface could perhaps be viewed in the light of a war-craze,—a malady which would disappear after the restoration of peace. And optimists were not wanting who chose to take that view of the situation, declaring cheerfully that everything will be right again "after the war is over". No such hopes can possibly be entertained about the *imperialistic* attitude,—that looks beyond the present war to the *character of the peace* that shall follow it, and it is not a matter of feeling but of politics—economic policy. The restoration of peace will, therefore, only accentuate the breach between the factions and make their co-operation in the future impossible.

If You Buy Books—

You want to concentrate
and get efficient service

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE

256 Broadway, New York City

A Socialist Digest

Revolution in Russia?

THE prorogation of the Duma was the Tsar's answer to the determined and systematic efforts of the radicals and progressives to compel the government to grant concessions and reforms to the people, following the disastrous Russian defeats in Galicia and Poland.

It appears that early in September the progressives secured control of the Duma, and presented a program of reforms to the government that virtually amounted to an ultimatum. The influence of the progressives became so strong that it was rumored the resignation and re-organization of the cabinet were imminent. The government, following the defeats in May and June, appealed to the people, asked them for further sacrifices to prosecute the war, and stressed the necessity for a national rally to the support of the country. Certain concessions were made, chiefly to the capitalist conservatives. But the representatives of the people demanded larger and more fundamental concessions. This aroused the apprehensions of the government, and at a conference between the Tsar and Premier Goremykin, the prorogation of the Duma was decided upon as a crushing blow to the progressives and radicals.

According to a Stockholm report, the Socialist Deputy Teheidse (whose denunciation of the government was reported in our last issue) and seventeen other members of the Russian Duma have been arrested. This report has not yet been confirmed. The Duma buildings in Petrograd and all railway stations have been occupied by the military.

The session of the Duma at which its prorogation was announced lasted but three minutes. There was a muttering from a section of the Laborite and Radical Deputies of "It is a crime" as the imperial message was read by the Vice-President, but the Constitutional Democrats maintained silence.

All the Deputies immediately left the hall, only Deputy Kerensky, a Laborite, who shouted "Down with all traitors!" attempting to speak. The leaders of the Duma decided there should be no debate because M. Kerensky insisted upon his right to say what he liked.

It is understood that in the Cabinet deliberation which preceded the draw-

ing up of Premier Goremykin's report for the imperial headquarters the prorogation of the Duma was opposed by M. Krivoshein, Minister of Agriculture; Prince Shtcherbaoff, Minister of the Interior, and Count Ignatieff, Minister of Education.

Goremykin urged that the Duma had already done all that could be expected of it, and the continuance of its sessions would have a disturbing effect on the country. This the Government could not permit. During prorogation, under the powers conferred on the Executive by Clause 87 of the fundamental laws, a number of measures tending to satisfy the demands put forward in the program of the Progressive bloc could rapidly be adopted by the Administration, and this would have a good effect on public opinion, and possibly the Progressive Nationalists and even the Octobrists would be satisfied by what would be done in this way, and thus the bloc would be weakened, if it was not actually broken up.

To this the opposition element in the Cabinet replied that if the Duma was prorogued at this time its role would in all probability be taken up by a conference of associations of Zemstvos and municipalities. Goremykin stated, however, that steps had been taken against such a contingency, the Governor and police of Moscow having been summoned to the capital to receive instructions.

The prorogation of the Duma seems to have created wide-spread discontent among the people. When rumors of the impending prorogation were ripe, Paul N. Milinkof, leader of the Constitutional Democrats, made a veiled threat that if the Duma was prorogued, it would meet again in spite of the government.

The battle between the progressives and the government, it appears, may be renewed at the congresses of Zemstvoists and municipal leagues. Judging from the speeches and the resolutions passed by the local Zemstvoists and the City Council in Moscow during the middle of September, the congresses will strive to calm the public, particularly the workingmen. The resolutions of the provincial Zemstvoists call attention to the necessity of preparing military stores, though they re-

peat the popular demand for a strong and wise government which enjoys the confidence of the country and is supported by the majority in the Duma.

The district Zemstovists formulated their resolution somewhat differently, urging a government which enjoys the confidence of the Emperor, the Duma, and the country. It was unanimously resolved to place the scientific forces of the country wholly at the disposition of the War Office. Russians were called upon to drop factional strife and unite in defending the empire against "an enemy who is resolved to seize the Baltic Provinces, Poland, Lithuania, Little Russia, and the Caucasus, and to cut off Russia from the seas."

It must be borne in mind that all news from Russia is heavily censored, and comes from pro-government British correspondents. It is therefore impossible to accurately gauge the extent of popular discontent. It is obvious, however, that it has reached enormous proportions.

An Associated Press dispatch from Stockholm, dated August 16th, gives an insight into this discontent:

"The most rigidly censored press in the world and a national and inherent inhibition of free comment of any sort have failed to check the avalanche of criticism and the accusations which have been made against the Government officials who are held responsible for the graft and inefficiency culminating in the disastrous Russian defeats in Galicia and Poland. For once, expression of opinion in Russia has become free and unhampered. No attempt is made to conceal this reproach against the methods of the bureaucrats who are accused of having crippled Russia's fighting strength and materially delayed the end of the war. It is not expressed alone by men of revolutionary inclinations or opposition tendencies, nor is it uttered in hushed voices or secret places, but it is loudly and clamorously current everywhere among men of all parties and classes.

A prominent member of the Duma said to an American correspondent in Petrograd a few days ago:

"The Russian people are on the threshold of a great awakening. Every one in Russia, officer, civilian, and moujik, knows why Russia has been compelled to surrender a large part of her territory. They know that they have good officers and that the fighting strength and spirit of the Russian troops are as high as at the beginning

of the war. They know also that they have been forced to retreat or stand helpless before the murderous fire of German artillery, while their own guns have had only a few rounds of ammunition that had to be sparingly used.

"Without understanding the peculiar methods of the purchasing commissions whose business it is to supply them with ammunition, they at least realize that their Government is at fault, that they have been sent into trenches impossible to defend, and that tens of thousands of them now lie dead as a result of the delay in the delivery of ammunition.

"In my opinion in this present awakening of the army and the people to the criminal neglect and corruption of their officials, there are the germs of the most serious revolution Russia has ever known—a revolution supported by the army. This revolution will come as soon as the war is over."

The officials of the government, particularly those engaged in the purchase of munitions, have been subordinating the national interest to their private interests:

"The allegation was made that the

Social Democracy and War Aims

AT a joint meeting of the German parliamentary group and the Party Executive, held August 14th, 15th and 16th, the question of the aims of the war was taken up. The discussion was opened by David for the majority, and Bernstein for the minority. Both spokesmen presented resolutions as a basis for action. The majority resolutions were finally adopted one by one. It is not stated what the minority proposed, nor how strong that minority was numerically. The fact that it took three days to reach a decision speaks for itself. The adopted resolutions say:

"Considering the national interests and the rights of our own people, and in view of the life interests of all peoples the German social democracy strives for a peace that carries within itself the guarantee of endurance and leads the states of Europe to a closer community of rights, economical and cultural. Therefore we postulate the following view-points for the establishment of peace:

1. To secure the political independence and integrity of the German Empire it is imperative to reject all the enemies' aims at conquest directed against the territorial sphere of the Empire. This also relates to the demand of reannexation of Alsace-Lorraine to France, no matter in what form that might be striven for.

2. In order to secure the liberty of

Russian officials who superintended the purchase of war munitions were primarily interested in seizing the opportunity which the war offered them of amassing a fortune at the expense of the Government, and insisting upon such a large commission on all contracts that the business of buying war materials waited while the purchasing commissions adjusted satisfactorily the amount of commission which they were to obtain.

"American and English business men who have been trying to sell ammunition to the Russian Government state that, without an average payment of 10 per cent. commission on all sales, it was impossible to do business with the Russian purchasing commissions. In some cases the contract, they say, is delayed while the amount of commission is adjusted, and it is not an unusual thing for this delay to be a matter of months."

The only hope of a Russian victory, it is now apparent, lies in a revolution. And revolution is pending in Russia. It seems only a question of time when the storm will break.

economic development of the German people we demand:

The Open Door, that is equal right for economic activity in all colonial territories;

Embodiment of the clause of the Most Favored Nation in the peace treaties with all warring powers;

Promotion of economic approachment through the utmost removal of custom and commercial carriers;

Equalization and improvements of the social-political institutions in the aims striven for by the workers' International.

The freedom of the seas is to be secured by international treaty. For this purpose the right of capture on the ocean is to be abolished and the Internationalization of all straits important for world commerce is to be established.

3. In the interest of Germany's security and its economic freedom of action in the South East we reject all war aims of the Quadruple Alliance directed at the weakening and smashing of Austria-Hungary and Turkey.

4. Considering that annexations of territory of foreign peoples violates the rights of self-government of the peoples and that by such annexation the inner unity and power of the German national state would only be weakened and its political relations abroad permanently injured most seriously, we struggle against such plans

of short-sighted conquest politicians.

5. The terrible suffering and destruction brought upon mankind by this war have won the hearts of our millions for the ideal of a world-peace secured permanently by international rights institutions. It must be the highest command of ethical duty to strive for this aim for all called upon to co-operate in the establishment of peace. We therefore demand the creation of an international court of arbitration to whom all future conflicts between peoples are to be submitted."

It is to be noted that the German Censor struck out several lines in demand 4. Were they a trifle too definite as compared with the haziness of the rest?

Reform Demands of the Russian Liberals

AN apparently reliable report summarizes as follows the reforms demanded by the Liberal and Democratic parties in Russia:

1. The autonomy of Poland, the three divisions to be united within ethnographical limits under one Parliament with common Ministers for war, marine, and foreign affairs.

2. Full civil rights for Jews and removal of their present disabilities in inhabiting Russia proper.

3. Amnesty for all political prisoners.

4. Removal of disabilities of workmen and recognition of right of organization in trade unions, etc.

5. Appointment of a special Minister of Munitions and eventually of a mixed Munitions Committee.

6. A liberal and tolerant policy in respect of Finland.

7. Complete autonomy and emancipation of commerce, especially from German restrictions.

8. Alterations in the export arrangements of wheat in South Russia and generally in rates of exchange after the ultimate opening of the Dardanelles and the probable possession of Constantinople.

In addition to the above it is urged that the following concessions be granted after the war, or otherwise as soon as practicable.

1. Appointment of a new legislative body elected by universal male suffrage.

2. Autonomy of Lithuania, Siberia, and the Caucasus.

3. Reform of the schools, autonomy of the universities, and the establishment of secular elementary schools.

4. Reforms in the Church, restriction

of the powers of the Synod and the restitution of the Patriarch.

5. Repeal of the Statute of the Ziemstvos of 1890 and reform of municipal administration, the power in which is at present largely exercised by great landowners.

6. Restriction of those privileges of local Governors which at present are exercised in defiance of the Minister of the Interior.

7. Restriction of the powers of the Upper House—the Council of the Empire.

8. The responsibility of Ministers.

9. Liberty of the press, of speech, and of Assembly—in a word, recognition of the essential rights conceded in

the manifestos of October, 1905, and April, 1915.

10. Agrarian reforms.

11. The greatest possible encouragement of industries.

12. Conclusion of a new commercial treaty with Germany with terms designed to protect Russian industry; failing this the declaration of a tariff war.

The enactment of these reforms would make Russia a full-orbed capitalist country with a constitutional government. It would strike an irreparable blow at the chances of German victory. But the Tsar seems willing to invite disaster in order to perpetuate his autocratic prerogatives.

British "Laborism" Against Conscription and For the War

THE first trades-union Congress to be held in any belligerent country since the war, has taken place in England. The congress convened in Association Hall, Bristol, and was attended by more than 600 delegates. The Congress broke an important precedent, thus commented on by John Stokes, (Secretary, London Trades Council) writing in *Justice*:

"It has been customary to receive a welcome from the Mayor, backed up by the Members of Parliament for the constituencies, preceded by a sermon on the Sunday from a bishop, if possible, who would be likely to tell the delegates and the world in general of the dignity of Labour. On this particular occasion all their services have been very well dispensed with, and I congratulate our Bristol friends on having taken this step, particularly emphasized by Mr. Widdecombe when he stated that 'the Trades Council felt that there would be no interest on the part of the Congress in being welcomed by a representative of the class they were incessantly fighting for their rights and their trade unionism.' This is all to the good, and will lead, let us hope, to a better discrimination in the future with regard to civic dignitaries being asked to welcome trade unionists to the town or city in which Congresses are held."

The resolution against conscription, unanimously adopted, was as follows:

"That we, the delegates to this Congress representing nearly three million organized workers, record our hearty appreciation of the magnificent response made to the call for volunteers to light against the tyranny of militarism.

"We emphatically protest against the sinister efforts of a section of the reactionary Press in formulating news-

paper policies for party purposes and attempting to foist on this country Conscription, which always proves a burden to the workers, and will divide the nation at a time when absolute unanimity is essential.

"No reliable evidence has been produced to show that the voluntary system of enlistment is not adequate to meet all the Empire's requirements.

"We believe that all the men necessary can, and will, be obtained through a voluntary system properly organized, and we heartily support and will give every aid to the Government in their present efforts to secure the men necessary to prosecute the war to a successful issue."

A resolution calling for peace was voted down by the Congress.

It was very soon evident what would be the attitude taken on questions relating to the war by the delegates. Councillor W. H. Ayles, who joined in welcoming the delegates as President of the Labour Representation Committee, stated that "some of them believed in the war, others felt they would rather not be in it, but being in it, they had to get out of it somehow; whilst others like himself were resolutely opposed to anything that compelled one working man to shoot down his comrade in any country." These remarks were received in comparative silence. This attitude was all the more pronounced when, during his speech, in referring to Belgium, the Chairman declared, "if the assurance is needed, our determination that their once fair land shall be restored to the people of Belgium *before we agree to lay down the sword.*" This was received with tremendous applause, as was the telegram from the Belgian Labour Party to the Congress, thanking them for the assistance given to Bel-

gian workmen fighting for liberty and people's rights.

The discussion on the whole was an interesting one. The Northcliffe Press came in for some very vigorous denunciation. Clynes declared that it was beyond dispute that Germany was the aggressor in the war. Our position if we failed to win this war would be that of a beaten and demoralized democracy. Carmichael pointed out that men were forced into the Army under the voluntary system just as under Conscription, and warned them against the Cadburys as well as the Northcliffs. Smillie said that if the Congress declared unanimously against Conscription, it would be the duty of organized Labour to prevent Conscription.

The British Socialist party has issued a manifesto against conscription, one part of which reads:

"The present Press agitation in favor of Conscription contains a serious element of danger to national and democratic interests. It assumes a shortage of men, which is neither proved by events nor vouched for by any responsible military or Government authority. In this sense the demand of the Conscriptionists is calculated to create a totally false impression abroad, while here in Britain it represents the reactionary ideal of conscript militarism, which its promoters in times of peace have frankly avowed, and which even now they cannot hide. Speaking at the Services Club, on August 26 last, Colonel Sir Augustus Fitzgeorge is reported as having said: 'Compulsory service was necessary at this time, as the people were a bit out of hand.'"

The Propaganda for a German Peace

THE "peace" program of the pro-war faction now in control of the German Socialist Party opposed annexations. But many of the members of this faction have openly favored compulsory military and economic treaties to be forced upon Belgium and other conquered territories under the form of "guarantees"—leaving the form of political independence without its substance. Helferich, the Imperial Treasurer, says there will also be heavy indemnities; on this point again the "peace" program is silent. Delbrueck, the Kaiser's minister in Prussia, says that Germany should seek "compensation" for the surrender of European conquests and demand the cession of new colonies, and he is supported in this by Dernburg and a large

and influential party; again the Socialist "peace" program is silent.

This attitude leads the *New Statesman* to state the position of the Allied Socialists on this "peace" propaganda:

"A 'reasonable peace' has recently been interpreted by a German writer in a Dutch paper to mean a peace in which 'the victors will not annex peoples of a race and language different from their own,' but a peace which nevertheless 'takes account of the results achieved on the battlefield.' In other words, the Allies are to purchase the retirement of the German armies from their territories—just as the French purchased their retirement in 1870—and the price is to be paid, the writer hints, *partly in cash and partly in territory outside Europe*. We cannot complain of this interpretation. On the present showing Germany has undoubtedly won, except as far as this country is concerned; and in Germany, where the price paid for them is realized, her victories are estimated as far greater and more decisive achievements than they appear to us. After a full year of the heaviest fighting that the world has ever known the Germans look around and find that everywhere on land they are in victorious possession of their enemies' territory. It is not particularly unreasonable of them, therefore, to imagine that the Allies may be willing to discuss terms; and it is not at all unreasonable of them to expect such a discussion to be based on 'the results achieved on the battlefield'. If this war were an ordinary war that would be the most natural course of events; and the refusal of the Allies to 'listen to reason' will probably be regarded quite honestly in Germany as a piece of deplorable insanity forced upon France and Russia by the vindictive and unscrupulous machinations of this country.

"It is, of course, true that France and Russia have suffered so severely that if there were no more at stake than has been at stake in most of the wars of the past century, they would both probably be prepared to consider proposals which would avoid the necessity of another winter in the trenches. As so often before, it is on the moral question that the Germans are at fault. It is plain that they do not in the least realise the nature of the forces they have invoked against themselves. The truth—namely, that the Allies are one and all even less willing to negotiate now than they might have been a year ago—is incredible to them. They do not understand that we are not fighting for terms, but for victory. The reasonable terms which we may suppose they are willing to offer are, of course, ut-

terly unacceptable; but even if they were ten times more acceptable, the most generous imaginable, we still could not discuss them. In fact, their very generosity would be an added bar, for it would be an advertisement to all the world of the fact that Germany's military supremacy was such that she could afford to be generous; and that is the exact opposite of what the Allies have set out to prove. We may or may not ultimately deprive Germany of all her colonies, we may or may not wrest from her Posen and Alsace-Lorraine, we may or may not exact full financial reparation for the damage she has wrought in Belgium and France; these are comparatively unimportant ques-

tions beside our main and unchangeable purpose of showing beyond possibility of mistake that German militarism is not invincible. *If we should fail, then that system with all its moral and political implications must inevitably become the example which the whole world will emulate because it must*. It is to prevent this that we are fighting, and all talk of "reasonable" terms is therefore irrelevant until Germany is plainly and admittedly beaten.

"What will be the date of the initiation of the preliminaries of peace no one can tell, but it is almost inconceivable that it will arrive before the summer of 1916."

Austrian Socialists' Peace Manifesto

LIKE their German comrades the Socialists of Austria issued a peace manifesto addressed to the Austrian workers. After referring to the united interests of the two Central Empires and to the desire for peace common to the workers of both, the essential parts of the Documents were:

"Almost for a whole year of war the peoples of Europe suffer; it is a year of unheard of effort and of tremendous sacrifice for all; unspeakable woe has visited all families. The suffering masses have no other thought but peace.

"None of the warring powers has now to fear the objection that any talk of peace betrays lassitude and weakness. For in that year of bloodiest battles they have demonstrated to each other that no people shows paralysis in its forceful determination for self-preservation. This determination is forfeited by the warranty of experience as to the immense military superiority of the defensive.

"But as sure as the power of self-defense, as dubious and deceptive is the gamble for conquest. The armies of the Czar had that experience after their terrific invasion had been beaten back, so that even the hope of permanent security as against their ever threatening aggression as well as the resurrection of the Polish people seems to come in sight.

"Together with the unshakable determination for self-maintenance as long as bloody necessity for it exists, the wish and will for peace is growing daily and hourly among all the warring peoples. It is the duty of the responsible elements to listen to that call and earnestly to seek the road to peace.

"It is time that the horrible condition of embittering the peoples against one another make way for a condition of mutual confidence. It is the duty also of the governments to seize every opening that may lead to peace whether

such opening be created by efforts of neutrals to mediate or whether it springs from the longing for peace among the suffering masses.

"For it has become manifest during this year of war that the great problems placed before Europe; the securing of national self-guidance of peoples and the ordering of world economies through the establishment of freedom of trade and intercourse for all the states of the world cannot be solved by way of weapons but only through agreements between all civilized peoples in the sense of equitable exchange of interests and in co-operation a basis of equality for solving all national problems before Europe. It is first of all the will and the duty of the workers, parties of all countries to influence their governments in that sense with the utmost candor and with tireless energy.

"The social democrats of Austria before the war did everything in their power to prevent the war. As long as it lasts they have loyally discharged the duty of defense laid upon them; but they have never ceased to announce solemnly that they first and last want peace and that they cherish no greater hope and no more sacred wish than that the members of the proletarian International place their entire insight, varified by destiny, into the service of the work of peace.

"We admonish the Austrian proletariat to persevere. The ranks of our organizations are thinned by heavy losses; sacrifices of every kind have been laid upon the workers; the war has placed upon our trusted workers new, heavy and responsible problems. We may state with satisfaction that they have been able to cope with the situation and we feel sure that they will not hereafter bend or let our flag fall to the ground. The war was not of our choosing. Nothing now remains but to persevere, to preserve loyalty to our proletarian ranks, to main-

tain our organizations until the hour when the proletariat will be able to continue its work of rising and liberation.

"With us is Time, with us is the Future!"

The document is more remarkable for its omissions than its assertions. The somewhat tortuous phraseology may easily be explained by the military censorship. But was it really impossible to express in some way a protest

against the invasion of Luxemburg and Belgium, against the wanton killing of non-combatants, against the whole horrifying tactics of "frightfulness"?—Could not the conditions of a lasting peace be formulated by the spokesmen of the Austrian proletariat? And have those spokesmen now no duty to voice the demands of the proletariat in the domain of the Hapsburgs? The Austrian workers are paying a frightful toll of blood and wealth. What for?

ruptcy would not imply a cessation of fighting:

"A century and a quarter since, when France was in the throes of the great revolution, the country was literally bankrupt according to all modern standards, and under these conditions the revolutionists were attacked by practically all Europe, Prussia, the German States, Austria, England and Spain. The revolutionary committee, 'swallowing all formulas', raised an army for the defense of 'La Patrie'.

There were no loans negotiated for equipment; there was nobody to borrow from. But every formula was suspended. Bayonets and gun barrels were made by the blacksmiths and the elements of gun-powder extracted from the soil of Paris cellars. Aristocrats and royalists were stopped in the streets and stripped of their shirts and shoes to equip naked recruits; their houses were ransacked and every article of possible value to an army taken from them. The soldiers had no pay and scanty rations, but were informed that 'with bread an iron you can get to China'. Generals who did not win battles were promptly guillotined, without any hearing or excuse. The result was that the ragged sans-culottes flung back in headlong rout the finest equipped armies of Europe, and this particular feat still forms one of the most stirring incidents of the great revolutionary period. There was no thought of banks or bankruptcy. France went ahead as if they had not existed, and the lack of banks or fear of bankruptcy did not stop the struggle for one moment.

"And there is no reason for believing that in case of "bankruptcy" Germany or France, or, in fact, any other combatant, would necessarily be reduced to complete impotence. What actual resources are still in the various countries are always available and the "swallowing of formulas" by "confiscation of capital" is still as possible as it was in 1793.

"Those who regard bankruptcy as a stopper for the present war are simply possessed with a capitalistic fetish, which sees in the bank a magic before which all human effort must be paralyzed. The final results of the war will probably disabuse their minds of this obsession."

The Illusion of Financial Omnipotence

THE war has shattered many illusions, among them being the illusion of financial omnipotence. A few years ago predictions were general that a great war was impossible, as international finance would prevent the catastrophe. But the war came. It was claimed that Turkey could not fight as her finances were shaky and bankruptcy would result. But Turkey fought, and is still fighting. The strength of a nation has been shown as latent not in finance but in the enthusiasm and productive power of the people.

In spite of this, people are still talking of "national bankruptcy." They are saying that German finances cannot hold out. The *New Republic*, in this connection, says:

"It is not difficult to prove that the German financial system is still quite solvent. At the outbreak of the war the debt of Germany, including both the Imperial and the state debts, was less than four and a half billion dollars. A very large proportion of this debt was covered by productive assets—railways, telegraph systems, etc.—and is no more to be regarded as a financial burden than are railway stocks and bonds in private hands. A billion and a half is the maximum that can be allowed for the net debts of the German Imperial government and states. Add to this an issue of four billion dollars—a liberal estimate of the amount required to finance the war until January 1, 1916, and we have the huge sum of five and a half billions. England in 1815 bore up under a debt of £861,000,000, or over \$4,200,000,000. The population of Great Britain and Ireland in 1815 was considerably less than one-third of that of the German Empire today, and the per capita income was probable at least one-third less than that of Germany. There are, to be sure, important points of dissimilarity between the economic situation of early nineteenth century England and that of Germany today. It cannot be affirmed dogmatically that Germany can bear so easily a debt of \$16,200,000,000 as England in 1815

bore her debt of \$4,200,000,000. But the burden of proof is upon those who will assert that Germany cannot stand the financial drain of a war continuing at an annual cost of three billion to four billion dollars until July, 1920."

"The financial problem is merely one of adjusting the burden in such a way as not to break the spirit of the civil population and leave its productive activities," says the *New Republic*, and concludes:

"Complete (financial) exhaustion can hardly supervene before 1919 or 1920, at the earliest. And we cannot confidently predict that even financial exhaustion will force the German to lay down his arms. Our own Confederacy fought best when its finances were most utterly demoralized."

This leaves the larger problem of "national bankruptcy" itself unconsidered. On this head the *New York Call* says:

"No doubt the insistent teachings and suggestions of the capitalistic system is responsible for the prevalent conception of 'bankruptcy' as synonymous with stagnation, inaction and utter impotency, and the widespread assumption that a nation, or series of nations, "bankrupted" by wasting their resources in war, or preparations for war, become thereby reduced to utter inaction and powerlessness.

"The idea has been so widely inculcated that in, by and through the 'bank' society lives and moves and has its being and always must; that the human mind can make no mental picture except that of prostration and utter inertia.

"Yet society has never experienced such a thing as universal bankruptcy and probably no human mind can even approximately depict just what would happen in case the world became unable to pay its creditors. The only analogy it can work upon is the condition of the individual bankrupt, who, it is readily seen, is utterly impotent in the hands of his creditors."

Each belligerent hopes for the financial bankruptcy of the other. But bank-

Correspondence

French Socialists Unanimously Support the War

To the NEW REVIEW:

ACCORDING to correspondence reaching England, it would seem that in the middle of July a very false impression was produced in America concerning the state of feeling prevailing among the Socialists in France. This seems due in a measure to the fact that Miss Jane Addams was content to obtain her information about France from a semi-German. We, of the old Internationale, remember full well how Longuet, Minister of Public Instruction of the Paris Commune, came to London as an exile. Though he was a Radical rather than a Socialist, he nevertheless visited Karl Marx and ended by marrying one of Marx's three daughters. Jean Longuet was born and his earliest impressions were engendered in his mother's German family and among the long file of German pilgrims who came to pay homage to Karl Marx and Frederic Engels. It is the knowledge of all this that has always secured for Jean Longuet a warm welcome among Socialists; but it also accounts for the more lenient view he takes of the Germans; so lenient, indeed, that quite recently he created no small scandal by defending Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, M. P., in the columns of *L'Humanité*. As M. Jean Longuet is a good linguist, it is often his mission to accompany foreign visitors who cannot speak French, and thus the opinion spreads abroad that he takes a leading part in the French Socialist movement. The severe defeat he has just experienced shows that today he has little or no influence. Most imprudently—for being in part a German, he should have kept silent during the war—M. Jean Longuet adopted, with great vigor, the pacifist policy of the four deputies, four Socialist deputies out of a hundred and one Socialist deputies, who, at Limoges, passed a peace at any price resolution early in June.

This symptom of discord caused great anxiety to the Party which had boasted of the unanimity in favor of the war manifesto, not only by the Socialists of all shades, but by the Syndicalists of the Confédération Générale du Travail and the Anarchists, notably Jean Grave. Therefore a congress was convoked for the 14th of July to deal expressly with this slight rift in the lute. Here again, Jean Longuet committed the gross blunder of pleading in favor of the Limoges resolution. He was defeated not only

by the majority but by the Limoges delegates themselves. Finally the resolution, now known as the Resolution of the Fourteenth of July, was carried unanimously. Everyone agreed that it was necessary to be unanimous. There will be no talk of peace and no international gathering with the Germans, so long as a single German soldier remains in France or Belgium. In the words of the resolution voted, even by the Limoges delegates, the French Socialist Party:

"Pursues, with all the country, with the Allies, the liberation of the territory of heroic and loyal Belgium and the invaded districts of France, as well as the restoration of rights to Alsace-Lorraine."

One feature of this pacifist agitation is especially suspicious for it smells of German influence. The pacifists are not content with arguments in favor of peace. They also indulge in gloomy, despondent accounts of discouragement among the soldiers and the civil population, not of Germany, he it observed, but of the Allies. Whether soldiers are weary of fighting or not, has obviously nothing to do with the rights or wrongs of the case. Why then is exhaustion mentioned and always in a manner favoring the German military interests?

A. S. HEADINGLEY.

London, England.

England and the War

To the NEW REVIEW:

IN the interests of Truth, I am impelled to come to the defense and support of Mr. H. W. Isay, whose contribution to your April number has been so violently denounced and discredited by a recent correspondent in the last issue of July.

As one who was here at the outbreak of the war and has spent the intervening months on these British Isles, coming into close touch with hosts of people and the opinions of a varied press, I can thoroughly substantiate all the writer avers in "War in England" and find the article remarkable both in insight and statement of fact.

To the enlightened Socialist, the truth concerning the British Navy is so obvious that further comment is superfluous.

Scarcely less obvious are the contentions regarding the Belgians, the Liberal Government and the attitude of the British women.

In England—he who runs may read!

Finally, as to the "venom and hatred" so exclusively ascribed to the nation the other side of the Rhine, I can only say that, whatever the quality of the Teutonic brand, after personal experience in attempting to rescue innocent victims of British persecution, I am convinced the former could scarcely surpass the latter in malignity or cruelty—and would abundantly justify even our Nationalist—Socialist friend in the "unpatriotic" suspicion that all the Huns are not confined to Germany!

Katherine C. Linn.

Edinburgh, Scotland.

Suedekum Interview

To the NEW REVIEW:

PERMIT me to say a few words with regard to Comrade Frank Bohn's interview with Dr. Suedekum, published in the August 15th issue of the NEW REVIEW. Like a true American interviewer, Comrade Bohn prefaces the interview itself with a complimentary account of the interview, even not omitting the cheap trappings of Dr. Suedekum's military uniform when he returned from the front "where he was hourly risking his life for the Germany he loves better than anything else in life". If this were all perhaps we could pass this interview in silence, leaving it to the judgment of discerning readers. Unfortunately Comrade Bohn couched his prefatory remarks in language well-calculated to create the impression that Dr. Suedekum's sincere belief in the statements he made to Comrade Bohn is beyond question. It is this that moves me to utter a word of warning, so as to prevent others from sharing the fate of the gullible interviewer.

I presume that Dr. Suedekum is a thoroughly honest and well-meaning man,—according to his lights. But those lights are very peculiar. I do not know whether or not Suedekum really loves Germany more than his life, as Bohn assures us, but I am quite sure that he loves her more than the truth. For I have not the slightest doubt that Dr. Suedekum does not believe one half, nay not even one tithe, of the things that he handed out to Comrade Bohn for eventual American consumption. I happen to know that Dr. Suedekum is not the blabbering idiot that he would have to be in order to believe any appreciable portion of that stuff. He simply acted on the proposition that "anything is fair in war," and that the end justifies the means. The end being the advantage which is to accrue from the interview to "the Germany he loves so well," etc.

New York City. L. B. BODIN.

Make Your Dollar Go Far

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

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

Cotton's Weekly

Sample Copies

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

Ask For Them

If you like PEARSON'S MAGAZINE

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

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

AND SEE; then subscribe through us—

HERE'S A BARGAIN

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

3.00

OUR PRICE - \$2.00

A NEW VENTURE--

We have decided upon a venture which means much for the future of the NEW REVIEW. It is our purpose to publish, from time to time, books upon important aspects of Socialism.

The development of a sound and original theoretical literature, germane to the economic, social and political problems of the day, is a work which is absolutely indispensable. The American movement should lead the International in the power and originality of our Socialist literature.

SOCIALISM AND WAR. By L. B. Boudin. (Ready October 25th.)

THIS book, by the author of *The Theoretical System of Karl Marx*, is an eminently successful attempt at a Socialist interpretation of the Great War. It is the first book of its kind published in this or any other country. And it includes a stimulating discussion of the general problems of Socialism and War, Nationalism and Internationalism. Indispensable to a student of world-politics and Socialism.

Price, \$1.00 Net.

"SOCIALISM" OF NEW ZEALAND. By Robert H. Hutchinson. (Ready Dec. 25th.)

M R. Hutchinson studied conditions at first hand in New Zealand. His book is a masterly analysis and criticism of State Socialism in New Zealand. Its causes and results are described. A chapter on the influence of the Great War on State Socialism lends an added value to the book. After the War, State Socialism will be dominant, and a knowledge of "how it works" in New Zealand will be valuable to all interested in Social problems.

Price, \$1.25 Net.

SOCIALISM AFTER THE WAR. By Louis C. Fraina. (Ready January 25th.)

THIS is a study of the future of Socialism in the light of the changes wrought by the Great War. It discusses fully the *revolutionary* Socialist attitude toward the more important social problems arising after the war. It discusses vigorously and at length Nationalism, Imperialism, political and economic action, the "backward races," the revision of Socialist theory and tactics, etc.

Price, 75 cts. Net.

STUDIES IN SOCIALISM. By Isaac A. Hourwich. (Ready March 10th.)

THIS is a remarkably suggestive series of studies in social and economic development. Among the chapters are: "The Trust and Socialism," "Social-Economic Classes in the United States," "Industrial Arbitration," etc. They deal adequately and brilliantly with some of the most important problems facing the Socialist movement. Dr. Hourwich is the author of *Immigration and Labor* and other works, and is an authority in economic and political theory.

Price, 75 cts. Net.

These books will be cloth-bound, extra good paper and binding; and from a mechanical standpoint will compare favorably with the best books issued by the large publishers. *Advance orders will facilitate the work of publication.*

New Review Publishing Ass'n

256 BROADWAY . . . NEW YORK CITY

A SUCCESSFUL TOUR---

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

ARRANGE A DATE NOW!

Dr. Hourwich leaves San Francisco November 25th. His return trip will take him through the southern and central states. Now is your opportunity to engage his services for a lecture. His tour westward is starting successfully; we want to make his tour eastward even more successful.

Write *now* for reservations before they are exhausted.

LECTURE SUBJECTS

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

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

DR. HOURWICH AND HIS CAREER

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

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

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

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

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

New Review Lecture Bureau, 256 Broadway, New York City