

Dec.
15th

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. 19

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
PREPAREDNESS	353	THE BANDBOX	364
Robert Rives La Monte		Felix Grendon	
THE GARY PLAN OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION.....	355	CURRENT AFFAIRS	365
William E. Bohn		L. B. Boudin	
THE MECHANICS OF SOLIDARITY.....	357	BOOK REVIEWS	367
Austin Lewis		Metaphysics of World Power, Simon Strunsky.	
THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST PARTY.....	359	A SOCIALIST DIGEST.....	368
Mary S. Oppenheimer		Dissensions in the Socialist Party Concerning Preparedness; British Workers and the Munitions Act; A Peep into Germany; French Socialist Congress; Swiss Workers' Demands.	
THE SIN OF BEING FOUND OUT.....	361	THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW REVIEW.....	372
Elsie Clews Parsons			
THE "GENIUS" AND MR. DREISER.....	362		
Floyd Dell			

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

Preparedness

By Robert Rives La Monte

T IS a barbarous word, compounded in the true Teutonic barbarous fashion, and as commonly used by the pollparrot agents (conscious and unconscious) of the munition and steel makers it means a very sinister, Teutonic, barbaric thing. In a word it means nothing more nor less than a complete moral and material equipment for efficient wholesale murder. The moral ideal of the hysterical advocates of preparedness is well typified by the serene ruthlessness of character of the Turks who perpetrated the recent massacres of Armenians. But this lofty ideal is a mere counsel of perfection to which it is not expected that Americans tainted by "Pacifism" can attain immediately. To reach the sublime height of the Turkish homicide will, American preparednessers admit, require at least a decade of education by Roosevelt, Gardner, Woodrow Wilson and those intrepid humanists, the Editor of the *Metropolitan Magazine* and Herr Heinrich Reuterdaahl, the richly imaginative concoctor of nightmares for that illustrious disseminator of "Socialism", sweetness and light. On the material side, as commonly employed to-day, the term connotes the possession of such numbers of trained homicides and such vast quantities of variegated murder-machinery and ammunition as enabled their Teutonic Highnesses of Germany and Austria in the first few weeks of the war to overrun Belgium and reach the Marne. But this material ideal is no mere counsel of perfection. Here we go far beyond the teaching of our Teutonic schoolmasters. To subdue Mexico and Central America and carry the Stars and Stripes

to the Andes in a few weeks would ne'er content them; for "is not the Amazon, or perchance the Straits of Magellan, our 'natural' boundary to the Southward"? Where "manifest destiny" leads we must not lack the men and guns to follow.

Preparedness can but be an ugly word. Why should it be a sinister one too? Why can we not prepare for Life as well as for Death? Why not for Peace as well as for War?

I am thinking much these days of Pat Quinlan down there in the jail at Trenton. What was his crime? Was he a thief? Or an advocate of murder or preparation for murder? No; he was an honest man. I knew him well. Many of you who read knew him. We know he was not a man of violence, but an impassioned lover of Peace. But his soul was big and so his vision of Peace was broad. He dreamt not only of Peace between nations, but of that more difficult preliminary, Peace within nations. His rugged commonsense told him we could never be sure of the former until we had conquered the latter. He dreamt of Peace abroad and Peace at home. That is no crime. Many of us have had the same dreams. But Pat's crime was that he had the courage, the simplicity and the sincerity to do his humble best to make his dream come true. He may have blundered and made mistakes. Who has not? But he kept his eyes steadfastly fixed on a noble vision and did one man's utmost to realize that vision in living fact. For that he is lying in jail.

Are we prepared for Life? For Peace? Somehow I can not but feel that a nation that sends its great-

hearted lovers of Peace to jail, and its advocates of preparedness for murder, war and death to the White House is still separated by well nigh an infinity from readiness for fruitful Peace and joyful Life.

But, says some bewildered reader, if you are not for preparedness, you must be a pacifist, and Roosevelt says that pacifists are Chinamen without pig-tails. Well, I fear I am not a pacifist. I honor the pacifist immeasurably. I would that all men would absolutely refuse to fight and kill under any circumstances. But I do not see my way to becoming a pacifist until economic equality shall have been definitely abolished. That is my goal. I believe it to be a goal worth fighting for, worth shedding blood for even. So that as yet pacifism, noble as it is, is not for me. Nor can I see why we should be scared from our Peace guns by Roosevelt's cry of "China-man!" I have no doubt we have much to learn from China as China has much to learn from us.

There was a time when I believed that no Socialist would ever vote a penny or a pfennig for military and naval expenditures. This dream was rudely dispelled many years ago when a comrade elected to office voted for an appropriation for a comparatively innocent armory, which was in fact chiefly used as a club-house and gymnasium by the better-paid workers of the community. But well do I remember the shock this gave me, I was innocent enough to take my Socialist principles seriously. In these days this will, I suppose, hardly be believed.

After reading the reams of apologies that Socialists have written for the treason of the German Social Democracy of August 4, 1914, it appears almost ludicrous that our consciences should once have been so sensitive as to have had great difficulty in digesting that armory incident.

But if we once allow the craving for popularity, the itch for political power, the mania for vote-getting to sway us, it soon becomes an obsession that completely eclipses our principles. The downfall of the German Social Democracy must remain the classical illustration of the corruption of a Labor Party by the greed for political power — a greed which sacrifices the reality for an illusion. Who to-day can doubt that the German Socialists would have sacrificed fewer lives by a revolt to prevent the War than they have lost in the War?

But they had no longer the courage to risk their political power and prestige by taking what they found would be an unpopular course. They could not risk the loss of votes entailed by the appearance of a lack of patriotism. The fall of the German Social Democracy was already complete in 1912 when it voted the money for the increase of the army in order that it might have a voice as to the incidence of the new taxation. A party that could swallow

such sickening sophistry in 1912 was sure to vote the war budget for the aggressive war of 1914.

But can we not learn by these sad experiences? Because the German Social Democracy built up a great political machine, and gradually deteriorated, as it ceased to be (in grand old Liebknecht's unforgettable phrase) "other than the others", are we driven to conclude that political rot inevitably awaits every Socialist Party? In moments of pessimism, the answer is too apt to be 'yes'. But surely we do learn by experience. The corrupting tendency of politics should hence forth be so evident that every Socialist Party should be on its guard day and night against it. This no doubt will make them "impossibilists", "intransigents" and other horrible things. It may even put a quietus in the dreams of "constructive socialism", but we can stand all this, if only we can keep our Socialist Parties sound at the core.

For the present war the treason of the German Social Democracy has set aside all criteria of Socialist judgment. Very sure of himself indeed must be the orthodox Socialist who blames the Socialists of Belgium and France attacked for rallying to the defence and voting all needful supplies. But when the war is over may we not hope for a re-birth of Socialist sanity? May we not hope that in the new and more powerful International, no Socialist Party shall have a voice which does not pledge all its members elected to office to vote unfalteringly against all appropriations for War or War Preparedness?

When we have such an International I shall not repel the name of pacifist. Such an International may not immediately make war impossible, but it will from the very start make it highly improbable.

Let us as Socialists get back to our first principles. Let us remember that the workers of all lands are brothers; that the one hope of the future is their union in loving and fissureless solidarity; and that the supremest treason of Socialism and Humanity is for Socialists and workingmen to fight and kill each other. Let us remember that the present governments are not, even in Democracies, governments of the people but governments of the masters, and that therefore it is not the function of the Socialists and workers but of the masters to provide the means for their defense in the wars precipitated by capitalist Imperialism.

If as Socialists we take our stand on these impregnable foundations we can remain serene amid all the hysteria fomented by the munition manufacturers and the profit-mongers.

But let us forget for the nonce that we are or ever were Socialists. Let us face this preparedness mania as citizens, as Americans, as patriots.

What danger is near? Against whom are we preparing? What nation or race threatens us? Even the Wilson program tacitly confesses there is no im-

mediate menace since it allows for several years of continuous preparation. Surely the nations of Europe will be too exhausted after this war to dream of attacking us till they have had many years to recuperate. Hobson and other victims of preparedness might see visions of Japan invading us. But Austin Lewis who has lived in California for years tells us (in the *New Review* of Nov. 1st) that there is no Japanese problem in California, that the Japanese have ceased to come; that the irritation, unreasonableness and crass provinciality of a few years ago have fortunately disappeared, with the result that a Japanese problem in California might be sought carefully but in vain.

The plain truth is that if we mind our own business as a nation and follow the policy of Washington's farewell address we are in no danger of aggression from any quarter.

Why then should the nation permit itself to be drawn by skillfully stimulated hysteria to adopt the President's Preparedness Programme, which, the Democratic leader in Congress tells us, demands that at one bound, in one year, we shall increase our already immense naval expenditures by more than our total increase during the last 14 years, and by more than the total naval increase of Germany during the five years preceding the European War, and by more than the combined naval increase of all the nations of the world in any one year in their history?

Do we fear Japan? Do we fear Germany? Our navy is far superior to Germany's. Do not be misled by the nightmare of Herr Reuterdahl (I am sure he deserves a von) in the *Metropolitan*. In the December number he says: "Remember that the American Navy is but a lagging fourth in naval statistics and much further down the list in actual efficiency." Admiral Fletcher, the head of the North Atlantic fleet surely knows something about our navy and this very year he testified under oath that "our navy was superior to that of Germany and every other country except Great Britain."

This instance suffices to show one must be on one's guard in reading the outpourings of the preparedness propaganda.

We are in no danger from without. Our real peril is from within. If the Wilson programme be carried out, sooner or later the development of capitalist Imperialism will drive us to use our augmented murder equipment in buccaneering expeditions in Central and South America and the Windward Isles. The Monroe Doctrine will be forced, like charity, to cover a multitude of sins.

We will create a military and naval caste powerful enough to pervert our social ideals.

The awful tragedy of it! Our one consolation for all the awful carnage of the European battlefields and trenches has been the hope that the war might result in the destruction of the Prussian military

power, and thus remove the menace that has been at the bottom of the mad competitive race in the multiplication of armaments and navies. It seemed reasonable to hope that the war might result in a general limitation of armaments and an era of peace long enough to give the new International of the Socialists and Labor Unions time to develop sufficient power to make war impossible. This result seemed almost within our grasp. The pity of it that it should be America, the once great example of Peaceful Democracy, that should dash down our hope of World Peace and compel exhausted, war-sickened Europe to resume the mad race of competitive navy building!

To avert this catastrophe, no effort can be too colossal, no sacrifice too great. All honor to Oswald Villard and the *Evening Post* for their efforts to inform the people of this impending and little suspected peril! All honor to Congressman Kitchin, who is risking his political future to preserve from destruction the ideals of Washington and Jefferson!

May the Socialists and radicals of every shade and hue rally to the support of these men who have dared to lead in the unpopular fight to keep America true to her earlier ideals!

The Gary Plan of School Administration

By William E. Bohn

THE so-called Gary plan is not a new system of education. It is a plan of school administration. A system of education is a program of studies and activities based upon a unifying idea. Ideas fundamental enough to form the bases of educational systems were originated by Pestalozzi, by Froebel, and by a very few others. Such ideas have sometimes been developed by a succession of original educational workers or thinkers. For example, a system might be based on the work of the child psychologists beginning with Herbart and coming down to the latest experimenter at Teachers' College. A system might, likewise, be based on the studies of the child in relation to society which are being carried on by John Dewey and his followers. The system would include the basic ideas and all the machinery and activities necessary to the realization of the ideals involved. Viewed from this point of view the Gary plan is certainly not an educational system.

But if this newly developed scheme is not this one thing it is something else, which may be just as important to us at the present time. It is a practical working plan which may enable many communities to realize certain precious educational ideals under conditions which have hitherto forced us to content ourselves with schools which have satisfied nobody.

Practically all persons who think at all about education will agree that we need three things: greater freedom for the development of the individual child, a richer program of studies and activities, more definite preparation for life, and especially for citizenship. The securing of these things for the children in our public schools has hitherto seemed impossible without the expenditure of money far in excess of our commonly accepted notions with regard to this item in our community budgets. The best experimental schools have attained them in varying degrees. But most of these schools expend at least three times as much money per pupil for plant and remuneration of teachers as is expended by public school boards.

Briefly stated, what the Gary plan accomplishes is to give to all the children of a great public school most of the advantages of these experimental private schools without any great increase in the expenditure of funds per pupil. Of course some private schools can give their pupils certain sorts of advantages to which no public school makes pretense. On the other hand, the great public school, once it has the rich course of study and the variety of equipment necessary for the inauguration of the Gary plan, can give its pupils a democratic environment, and a social inspiration which must be lacking in the private school.

The following outline of the Gary plan is based on observation of it as put into practice in Public School 45, Bronx, New York City. The economy possible under this scheme is due to the fact that two complete schools work and play in one building using the same rooms and apparatus. Every room is used all the time. In Public School 45, the two organizations are known as "X School" and "Y School." While "X School" is doing the ordinary academic work in rooms equipped like any ordinary grade rooms, "Y School" is on the playground, in the garden, the shop, or the auditorium. On certain days pupils of this second school may, if their parents desire it, receive religious instruction wherever priests or preachers or rabbis see fit to provide it. During a second period this arrangement is reversed: "School X" occupies playground, shop, garden and auditorium; "School Y" learns arithmetic, reading and writing in the school rooms. The younger pupils have a day of five hours; the older ones spend six hours a day in school. The great variety of activities indulged in, however, keeps them fresh and active.

It is most unfortunate that most of the criticism of this plan has dealt with unessentials. Many object, and rightly, to the religious feature. But this is not necessarily an organic part. Trips to museums, factories, places of historical interest could be substituted for the voluntary attendance on religious instruction without any essential change in the scheme as a whole.

The important thing about the whole matter is that when one goes into Public School 45, he finds 3500 pupils, ordinary little New Yorkers, studying, working, playing,—and happy every minute. I have visited many New York Public Schools, and I have almost always come away with a feeling of depression. The pupils usually seem to be in the lock-step physically and mentally. There are schools which form notable exceptions to the rule. But they are exceptions. In most of these institutions the pupils spend practically all their time over conventional text-books or reciting from them in a purely mechanical manner.

In Public School 45, there is the stir of life. You go from room to room and see children playing, printing, modeling, carpentering, cooking, drawing, and, half the time, studying books. They are getting something of the freedom and variety hitherto reserved for young people whose parents are able to pay from two to five hundred dollars a year for their education.

But the Gary plan as put into operation in this school is not a money-saving device. Before the introduction of the plan there were in this school 3500 pupils divided into 72 classes, and 75 teachers. The number of pupils is at present approximately the same and the number of classes and teachers is exactly the same. There is, of course, a considerable change in the classification of teachers. Under the old plan there were 72 teachers and 3 teachers classified as special. At present there are 52 teachers of the academic subjects, or regular grade teachers, and 23 special teachers. Though the number of teachers has not altered, the teaching done is, presumably, of a higher type. But there is evidently no saving effected in the payroll.

And the equipment is now much greater and more varied than formerly. The Park Department of the city has placed a "farm" of four acres at the disposal of the school. In addition, the school has made a beautiful vegetable garden of a piece of land across the street. And the necessary equipment of shops and work-rooms has, of course, necessitated a considerable outlay. The increase in expenditure has been slight in comparison with the advantages gained. It need not frighten the most timid school boards which are contemplating an educational adventure. But there has been an increase.

This fact leads to a variety of conclusions. Public officials who are attempting to force this plan on a complicated school system over night with a view to affecting a saving of public funds are not dealing frankly with the people. If they actually succeed in saving money by the change which they advocate, they cannot possibly introduce a genuine Gary system and the people will have no right to expect the advantages which should come from this system.

Moreover a system precisely like the one operated at Gary and in the Bronx would be entirely out of the question in the congested part of any large city. It is entirely possible that an elaborate system of excursions, easily arranged among the multiplicity of interesting places and objects offered by a large city might be profitably substituted for the activities dependent on great spaces of open ground. But such excursions would be almost useless unless well managed by experts. So whenever the system is honestly adopted for the good of the children it will mean the expenditure of more money rather than less.

But to come back to general considerations. The dual system which permits of the operation of two schools in one building is not good in itself. If

"School X" had the exclusive use of the building and equipment of P. S. 45, doubtless a better progress of studies and activities could be arranged than the one at present in operation. The succeeding periods of work and play could be arranged in a manner better adapted to the physical and psychological necessities of the children. But such a consummation is entirely beyond the range of possibility at present or within the limits of any period for which the present generation may reasonably feel called upon to make its educational plans. In view of this fact, the Gary plan, or some other like it, offers us the only feasible method of giving to public school children the sort of education which our present thought and experience make it our duty to provide.

The Mechanics of Solidarity

By Austin Lewis

(Concluded.)

The relations between the two classes of labor have been reversed in many fundamental industries. As a result of the development of machinery and the growth of the technological process the skill of the skilled has begun to lose its commanding influence. It has ceased, in certain essential industries at least, to be the basis of the labor side of production. The dominant factor ceases to be the skill of the individual worker, it becomes the discipline and coordination of the mass of workers.

The almost automatic and rhythmical regularity which marks the modern factory, the monotonous repetition of the same movements, so many to the minute, hour in and hour out, the minute subdivision of the work so as to secure a sort of uncanny dexterity, the handling of subdivided processes with a speed and accuracy which demands incessant and implacable drill,—all these contributed to the change.

Behind these again were the imperious needs of the market which necessitated a competitive effort to produce large amounts of goods to satisfy ordinary needs. Immense profit lies in supplying masses of men and in the control of the market for cheap goods, without refinement and possessed of no artistic qualities. This in its turn implied the falling off of skilled labor as the determining factor. Quantity and not quality becomes the essential element. The whole process of modern industry, then, and the operation of the modern markets appear to have entered into a conspiracy to dethrone the skilled craftsman, at least as the determining and necessary factor in the productive process.

That the skilled craftsman was on his last legs became apparent from the result of his strikes. The period of victory has passed. The conditions which now confronted the crafts offered an altogether un-

anticipated resistance. The new processes, which had at least partially eliminated skill in many crafts, of which molding, glass-blowing and printing may serve as examples, had proven successful; the numbers of the unemployed were a constant menace which rendered the result of every strike at least problematical; the ease with which the new machinery could be learned placed the unskilled almost on a level with the skilled; and the entire terrain of the fighting was thereby so changed as to make a successful campaign on the old lines actually impossible.

The directing intelligence of the labor movement however seemed to have no consciousness of all this. The old and well tried tactics were incessantly repeated. The rank and file responded as loyally as ever to the demands of the leaders. But the forward movement of the crafts was blocked. Here and there a transient gain served to conceal the general loss but on the whole the retrograde movement was marked. This necessarily affected morale and attempts were made in certain quarters to revivify the exploded theory of terrorism.

The fact that the governing class and the industrial overlords were practically identical by this time gave the controlling industrial interests the unrestricted use of the police power, which was all the more readily placed at their disposal, since the wide area of industrial strife threatened ever direr social consequences and increased the dangers of public disturbance. Where the local authorities were unable to deal with the situation and the local militia, as in the recent Colorado troubles, met with armed resistance, the advent of the Federal troops under cover of preserving order put an end to the strike.

In short the crafts ceased to be effective because their industrial background was gone. They were no longer the main factor in industry and conse-

quently they could no longer determine the contest for industrial control. As a matter of fact they had no idea of industrial control. No such notion had ever possessed them. Their minds were incapable of grasping it. Security of employment, a fair day's work for a fair day's pay; a more or less complete ownership of their job, as a job; these represented the sum total of their desires and aspirations. But these aspirations, modest as they were, could not survive the destruction of the system on which they were based.

With the craftsman's system and the craftsman's organization there gradually also disappeared the narrow and circumscribed notion of solidarity conceived among these surroundings.

Such were the conditions antecedent to the new form of industrial action, the mass-strike. As has been pointed out, industry on the labor side became less dependent upon individual skill than upon the organization, control and discipline of masses. As a result, the mass so subjected to organization grew more and more coherent. It began to find expression as a mass, to think as a mass, to feel as a mass, and to have mass aspirations. James Thompson, the I. W. W. organizer, when describing the methods employed in teaching the idea of mass action to the textile workers at Lawrence prior to the strike, tells how the speaker held his hand up, clenched, as an illustration of the proper way to organize and then held his hand up with the fingers outspread as an illustration of the wrong way. Uneducated and inchoate as were the textile operatives they rapidly caught this idea, and, repeating the lesson to themselves, would say "This way, not that way."

The very environment of factory life produced mass organization and the conditions of mass employment necessitated the mass strike. Henceforward the employer would not find pitted against him a more or less loosely assembled collection of labor units but an approximately compact body of employees with an approach to a mass psychology.

This has been made clear by a series of labor efforts both in the United States and Europe, put forward by the hitherto neglected masses of what was at the best but partially skilled labor. The capitalists, like the socialists and the labor leaders, were completely taken by surprise by these demonstrations and in the early days of these movements victories as sweeping as unexpected marked the actions of this new force. In Italy, France, Russia, Argentina and the United States the same phenomenon appeared. In occupation as widely severed as the textile industry of Lawrence and the transportation industry of Great Britain we had the same demonstrations. In some cases they were successful, in others, again, they failed. But their temporary success or failure was not the point to be observed. The principal matter was that a portion of the working

class had at last arrived at the place where mass action was their natural and spontaneous expression; that that portion of the proletariat which had hitherto been considered incapable of organization had consciously striven for a new and effective form of organizations which transcended all its predecessors in its scope and potentialities.

Not only in the sphere of what is ordinarily termed industry, but, more unexpectedly, in agriculture we find the same phenomenon. In Italy the agricultural laborers of the South under very discouraging conditions not only made successful strikes but wonderful to say carried on successful mass cooperation. Their cooperative farming has won a place among the achievements of the international proletariat, where even their warmest sympathizers had hardly anticipated success.

In the United States particularly in the Pacific Coast States where the agricultural conditions necessitate the employment of seasonable labor, we find the unskilled migratory laborer, who is, generally and not without reason, regarded as the least hopeful of workers, actually undertaking to organize himself. After one sharp conflict in the State of California, he compelled the state government to recognize his demands for decent camp conditions and brought about a change in that respect which was little short of revolutionary.

In short the new movement was a mass action movement produced by the mass conditions of employment. It sprang directly from the conditions, which indeed it mirrored. It was not the work of agitators, it was based on no philosophical teachings, though it, naturally and inevitably, developed a philosophy suited to itself, and its own peculiar origin. The basis of this philosophy on the ethical side at least was the rather over-worked word "solidarity."

Of course under such conditions "solidarity" meant something vitally different from what it had hitherto implied. As the working class organization was broader and as mass-organization implied something much more extensive than the mind of the average trade unionist could grasp, the solidarity preached by the new organization was much more inclusive and definite. Instead of reflecting the ideas of a limited class of skilled men, it began to reflect the common desires of large numbers of average men. It was inclusive rather than exclusive. Different from the old trade unions, again, it began to include women and children in its scope. Much was made of the proclamation at Lawrence that the industrial union was for women and children as well as for men.

This new point of view however was not acceptable to the old craft unions. It met with the most vehement opposition in England and America, as elsewhere. In New Zealand an attempt at mass organization of transport workers was violently as-

sailed by the established unions. Various attempts were made to control the new movement by the older unions. In Germany this brought about a struggle in the Congress of German Labor Unions in 1914.

In this last instance the old unions demanded the entrance of helpless and unskilled workers into the trade and industrial unions to which they were eligible. This demand was indicative of the determination of the old unions to control the new labor movement and paralleled the requirements of the Building Trades in the United States that the United Laborers union should affiliate with them.

The factory workers on their part demanded the entrance of skilled workers into the unions of the unskilled to which they were eligible. On this matter the *New Review* (Aug. 1914) says:

"The resolution was defeated and the executive committee's recommendation of an arbitration court was adopted. The factory workers made a statement reaffirming their claims to the skilled workers in establishments under their control and called the proposed court a 'compulsory arbitration court.'

"While the factory workers were defeated by 2,210,000 to 309,000 votes, the transport workers also showed themselves decidedly oppositional. The unskilled opposition, however, is, for the most part, within the great German unions themselves. For there the Metal Workers, Wood Workers, Building Workers, etc., instead of being divided into a number of loosely federated unions are united into single groups. And since the skilled workers are largely organized and the unskilled largely unorganized, the latter are usually in a minority. Yet there has been a great deal of friction of late, especially in the greatest union of all, that of the Metal Workers, which has over half a million members."

It is clear that here we have the beginning of a new conflict which must continue until the structure of organized labor is profoundly modified. The change in the industrial basis involves necessarily a corresponding change in the labor organization. This is already becoming sufficiently recognized to cause an agitation in favor of industrial unionism even among the rank and file of the old craft unions. Such changes as are contemplated by these will not however meet the situation, for the mind of the masses is already prepared for some attempt at an organization on a vastly more comprehensive scale, than is implied in the term industrial unionism as understood by the American Federation of Labor.

The revolutionary changes which have destroyed the craftsman's position have also destroyed the craftsman's ideals. The old individualistic concepts of the skilled worker are gone. Henceforth the worker is compelled to think in terms of the mass, compelled by the very force of circumstance and environment, which shape his thoughts and ideals whether he will or not.

The Suffrage Movement and the Socialist Party

By Mary S. Oppenheimer

IN this article is meant by the Socialist Party the party in Greater New York, or those districts of the city where the Socialist Women's movement has been particularly active in holding meetings and waging propaganda for Socialism and Votes for Women. The writer has never been more than a lukewarm supporter of the separate women's movement within the party and may therefore fittingly praise the skill with which it has been managed of late and the energy and devotion of its workers.

Here in New York this movement has justified itself and proved its value as a political and moral factor. Certainly without it at least half the Socialist men who voted the other day would have left their ballots blank on the suffrage amendment. Plenty of us can remember only too well the stolid indifference of even the best party workers among the men when the question of Woman Suffrage first came up at Branch meetings. The opposition was active as well as silent. If women had the vote it would retard the coming of Socialism was a favorite argument. A good many of the older party members still feel the strength of that statement though they say less about it since the steady growth of the Votes for Women movement everywhere. Secondly, Woman Suffrage was a middle class and not a working class movement, a statement undoubtedly true and just as true now as it was several years ago. The men's verdict was that, while theoretically the thing was all right, it was too middle class, not calculated to advance the interests of the workers, indeed, likely to divert attention from issues of great importance to the workers, and therefore best not made a live party issue. As for the women, they wanted the votes they regarded as their right and the instinct to fight for their rights drove them on with considerable aggressiveness.

The path of the Socialist Women's movement has not been easy and rosetrewn; rather it has been a stony and thorny way, financially and otherwise. A frequent accusation made by party members against the Socialist women was that they were more Suffragists than Socialists. It must be admitted that there was sometimes ground for the accusation.

Once at least, the women openly defied the Central Committee and marched in a suffrage parade against official orders. A second time they would have done the same thing had the Central Committee taken the same stand. The fight that evening was one of the exhilarating events of a usually dull body. The opposition made fiery speeches against march-

ing, though some members who might have opposed the plan refrained from taking an active hand in the proceedings because their wives, all ardent Suffragists, were present as spectators. A few of the men were glad to act as tellers, thus diplomatically escaping committing themselves. Then the husband of one of the most enthusiastic workers appeared, coming late. Seeing, how matters were going, he threw himself into the oratorical fray with energy, advancing the argument that the women were bound to march anyway, with or without permission. The vote was close, but, thanks largely to him, it went in favor of the women.

In the last year the tide of Votes for Women, rising everywhere, has swept the party along with it. The present membership in this city includes a very large proportion of Russian Jews and these, to a man, are warmly in favor of Woman Suffrage. They voted solidly for it too. The three Assembly Districts, two in Manhattan, the Sixth and the Twenty-Sixth, and one in the Bronx, the Thirty-fourth, where the suffrage amendment won out by small majorities, 88, 70 and 153 respectively, are all strong Jewish districts and the Socialist vote is something of a factor. The vote for the amendment was undoubtedly the Socialist vote. The various suffrage associations may not like to face the fact that they owe such meagre majorities as they got in the city to the Socialists and the foreigners, but the truth is the truth. In this case the result is significant of the complexity, political and racial, of New York City to-day.

Really the women workers for suffrage in the Socialist Party were between the devil and the deep sea. Many of the Socialists thought their course unwise, and, on the other hand, it is the fact that, in the main, the different suffrage associations do not want the Socialists. It is true that many individual Suffragists do not share this feeling. The leaders recognize that Votes for Women is a movement big enough to sweep all sorts of women into it: that it does so in the course of its strength and of its growth. Yet lots of members in the rank and file shudder politely when they meet a woman who tells them she is a Socialist. Perhaps a minor reason why the Suffragists would rather we stayed away from their movement is the fact that we are, on the whole, bad marchers and paraders, not over willing to submit to discipline and undignified in exchanging greetings and bits of conversation with the sidewalk onlookers.

The backbone of the Suffrage movement is almost entirely middle class, being made up of the teachers, the nurses, the professional women of brains and liberal education, helped by a few women wealthy even as wealth goes here in New York, the financial centre of the whole country. A working class movement it is not,—not yet. The average Socialist

worker would not feel at home in it, even if she could bring herself to join and try to work actively in one of the suffrage bodies. Yet the Socialist, like every other woman of intelligence and advanced ideas feels a thrill of indignation when she sees a drunken man staggering along on his way to the polls and knows that in a sense that man holds her fate at the ballot box in his hands. That feeling she shares in common with Suffragists of all sorts.

We must not overrate the value of the final result of Votes for Women. If the foreign born working woman had the ballot to-morrow, very large numbers could not vote, either because they are not citizens of this country, or else, being compelled to move about from place to place in search of employment, they are deprived of their vote because they cannot fulfil the qualifications as to length of residence. The same thing is true of large numbers of foreign born working men. Naturalization has become too slow and too expensive a process, devouring time as well as money; it fails to meet the requirements of the case. All these working people, both men and women, are in the main amenable to our laws, but they lack the protection of the vote, even those who would now be entitled to it by right of sex. Our voting system lacks Democracy, and Votes for Women is in the long run but an inadequate means to mend that want. Yet it is immensely valuable for that disfranchised class whom it would reach. It may be remarked that the American women are putting up a far better fight for their rights as suffragists than are the horny handed sons of toil for the rights of their unorganized brothers.

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

ALFAXNDER FRASER	JULIUS HEIMAN	LOUIS C. FRAINA
President	Treasurer	Secretary

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

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

The Sin of Being Found Out

By Elsie Clews Parsons

SACRIFICE of cherished points of view is not least among the costs of science. It is hard, for example, to give up believing in Santa Claus. Nor is the place of fairy tales ever quite filled by the marvels of chemistry or astronomy. When the day comes for ethnology to be recognized as part of a liberal education, a great deal of our favorite humor will lose its point. Time honored jokes will languish. Beloved sarcasms will hang their heads and slink away.

Among the first to go will be that treasured idiom of the cynic—the sin of being found out. Even now one is tempted to challenge it—not with the weapons of its worsted foe, the established morality, but with those put into our hands by the study of comparative culture.

Let me begin by describing the surreptitiousness often required of relations neither illegal nor illicit,—conventional, conformist relations. My illustrations will be taken from the institutions of sex, for it is against them that our sarcasms are for the most part directed.

Making love in public is almost everywhere accounted immoral or at least in bad taste. Aversion to it would appear to be so marked in a tribe of West Africa that anyone caught lovemaking out of doors runs the risk of enslavement. And among us so natural and instinctive is deemed the desire for privacy that the lack of it is thought of as a perversion. But it is of normal, ordinary affairs of sex I would speak, betrothal, marriage.

Engaged couples are generally circumspect or guarded. In one place they may be subject to chaperonage, in another to the condition of not seeing each other at all. That this kind of taboo is not always due to the prudential motive we are prompt to allege, the wish to preclude premature intimacies, the inclusion of others in the separation is an evidence. From the day of his engagement a Bedui youth has to keep away not only from his fiancée, but from her mother. In old times in Albania an engaged girl had to keep out of the sight of her prospective family-in-law and not even speak of them. The Ostyak who calls on the parents of his fiancée is supposed to walk into their house backwards and at no time look them in the face.

The Ostyak is entirely cut off from his fiancée. In other communities, although a man may visit his sweetheart in the most intimate way, the privacy of her parents he is bound to respect. In a Massim courtship the lover may not enter the girl's house until he r parents are presumed to be asleep, and he is

expected to leave her before dawn. The people in the house may be quite aware of what is going on, but decorum requires an appearance of secrecy. This kind of conventional secrecy has been observed outside of New Guinea.

Even after marriage secrecy is required. What else is the honeymoon but a form of surreptitiousness? The newly wed want to be by themselves, we say. The islander of Torres Straits is even franker. His word for marrying is "hiding."

Here again furtiveness is not merely self-regarding. It is expected of the honeymooners by their families. For a certain period their people would rather not see them. It would be awkward, embarrassing, a strain. It is the same sense of strain, I take it, that has led to the custom of the bridegroom visiting his bride by stealth. Such was the practice of the Spartans. The Spartan bride was sometimes a mother before the bridegroom saw her face by daylight.

Constraint with parents-in-law is so formalized in many places that it has been classed as a form of what ethnologists call ceremonial avoidance. Especially marked between the sexes, a man avoiding his mother-in-law, a woman her father-in-law, it has been explained by some ethnologists as an incest prohibition. The explanation is unlikely when one considers that sex relations are commonly restricted to contemporaries. At any rate there are many avoidance rules the incest theory does not account for. Until she was a mother, a woman of the South Slavs did not speak to her parents-in-law. Among the Albanians she did not talk to her husband before his parents. Among the Abchasses of the Caucasus it is disgraceful for husband and wife ever to appear together before her parents or for some years before his parents.

Would not kinsfolk seem to be more concerned about the decencies of marriages than about its intimacies? About its conventionalities than about its personal adjustments? Nor are they insistent merely on the covert character of the relationship; its stability is of great concern to them. If a marriage lasts for better or for worse, no readjustment is required of the outsider, no change of attitude. Therefore, whatever the law of the land, relatives and friends are ever likely to be against divorce.

Of circumstances leading to divorce they are also of course critical—of elopment or other flagrant evidences of adultery. Even if it did not occasion divorce, such conduct they would find reprehensible, for merely in itself it exacts of them readjustments.

Of interest in this connection is the fact that in many communities unchastity is tolerated in girls unless it results in pregnancy, or in men, unmarried or married, unless it is obtruded upon the notice of those who like their mothers or wives would close their eyes, as it is said, to that part of their life.

In other words, illicit relations to be suffered must be furtive. Now furtiveness, however gratifying it may be to outsiders, involves for the furtive themselves a failure of adjustment and a sense of unrest. For those who in their turn want to settle down there is in the makeshifts of deceptions, of secrecy, much dissatisfaction or distress, feelings of indignity or oppression. To escape from entertaining these feelings lovers may cease to be secretive as they are expected to be. They want to give themselves away. They want to be found out.

And so it is by their own search for a quiet life that illicit lovers are tempted into upsetting the people around them, disturbing that most coveted of social facilities, the facility of taking people for granted. Marriage alone affords this facility to perfection. Extra marriage relations must bear the odium of comparison, and indiscretion in them, a lack of furtiveness, the malevolence of the static minded.

Is not the sin of being found out indeed a sin, a plain, indisputable offense, quite too simple for the play of irony?

The "Genius" and Mr. Dreiser

By Floyd Dell

I HAVE always admired the builders of Babel. They said: "Come, let us make a city and a town, the top whereof may reach to heaven."

Mr. Dreiser has said to himself, "I will write a novel which shall be founded deep in the mire of fact, whose boundaries shall include vast territories of human striving, and with a tower of hopes and fears that shall pierce the heavens of illusion."¹

In the Babel project God found a certain lack of modesty, of good taste, and though the Bible does not mention it, probably a lack of finish in the minor architectural details. More pleasing to him was the humbler but more perfected work of the other builders of the period, who carved their cornices with utmost care, and put a high polish on the handles of the big front door. In this respect certain contemporary critics resemble God, and have confounded the presumptuous Mr. Dreiser with the confusion of their tongues.

Mr. Dreiser's theme was in itself vast enough. His theme was the life of one of those persons who

are called, and who believe themselves to be, "geniuses"; who indubitably possess some form of artistic ability, and along with that a peculiar organization of nerves, which makes them the strangest, most alluring, most unstable, and most troublesome of all living beings. He wanted to show the growth of this odd, attractive and vexatious being, his triumphs in art and his failures in life, his preposterous and malignant effect upon the lives of others, chiefly women, his vanity, his rapacity, his cruelty, his folly, his overweening selfishness, his blind graspings at happiness, his tumble into the gulfs of despair, almost of insanity, his twilight wanderings in the region of doubt, his pitiful recuperative beliefs by which he aspires upward toward the sunlight. But this is only the theme.

Mr. Dreiser's book being a novel, it was to be expected that he would represent the drama of his hero's life in some detail, physical and psychological, in front of a living background of American fields, streets, studios, offices, houses. Human knowledge being limited, and human energy more limited still, it was inevitable that some part of this huge story should be passed over lightly, suggested rather than described. But Mr. Dreiser was not content to do that. Nothing would satisfy his pride but he must tell it all, from beginning to end, not neglecting a single economic fact nor a single scrap of background, nor a single incident, nor a single thought of any of his characters which would serve to illuminate his theme or contribute to its solid reality. In this he had the precedent of Tolstoi and of Zola, to be sure. But Tolstoi did not try to put in *everything*; and Zola never had much of a story to hamper him in the amassing of materials. But Mr. Dreiser tried to put in everything and make it part and parcel of a gigantic and moving story, which should break the heart with pity and terror. It was a task requiring superhuman energy and superhuman taste. A being who possessed the powers of Dostoievsky, Defoe and Aeschylus might have accomplished it. Mr. Dreiser undertook the task.

The result shows that Mr. Dreiser possesses superhuman energy, if not superhuman taste. He has written a great and splendid book which contains many dull pages. He has given such a picture of American life as no American writer besides the late Frank Norris ever tried to give. He has written with sympathetic insight a convincing account of one of the most complex and unpleasant characters that fiction has ever dealt with. He has staged a dozen powerful dramas with beauty, sincerity and tragic force. He has exposed the depths of the human soul with a kind of relentless awe.

He has done all this in spite of a carelessness in the execution of details of which anyone else would be ashamed. In the end, one forgets those imperfections. In the shadow of these gigantic pillars one for-

1) The "Genius," by Theodore Dreiser. New York: John Lane. \$1.50.

gets the flaws of workmanship in the masonry. But God, and certain God-like critics remember them, and pour forth the vials of their wrath.

As for me, I have another quarrel with the book. I do not mind the sentences, which serve after all to convey a tremendous story. I do not even mind Mr. Dreiser's lack of a certain intellectual sophistication; what though Mr. Dreiser thinks, like his hero, that Bougureau was a great painter, or, knowing better, fails to tip you the wink when his hero stands in open-mouthed awe before the Bather with her polished toe-nails? Or what though Mr. Dreiser appears to take seriously the jejune philosophisings of his hero? It is the privilege of novelists to be mistaken or inept about things which do not, after all, matter to the art of fiction. Nor do I care greatly that Mr. Dreiser neglects to mention through three fourths of his book the sufficiently obvious fact that his hero is a cad, a vulgarian and a coward, as "geniuses" are only too likely to be. The thing that really concerns me, and the only serious flaw that I find in this story, is the author's apparent unconsciousness of the fact that his hero is an ass.

It is, I am well aware, no part of Mr. Dreiser's intention to pass judgment on his character. The tremendous impressiveness of some of his stories is due to just this, that he tells them without moralistic comment. It is an attitude that has been called Olympian; but if it were Olympian, that is, remote and aloof, it would be offensive. However, it is not that Mr. Dreiser is too far away from his story to care about its moral values, it is rather that he is too immersed in it to know. His faithful attention to exterior detail leaves an erroneous impression at times of his real preoccupation, which is precisely with the souls of his characters. And the soul, that underground world where in darkness are generated the events which afterward appear in the world of action, is one in which there is no such thing as good or evil—there are only conflicting impulses, mysterious desires. To attempt to judge these impulses by moral standards is like trying to cut an atom with a knife; for, as someone has said: "In the world of knives there are no atoms, and in the world of atoms there are no knives." In the world of action there is good and evil; but not in the hidden world of impulse. Over the entrance to that obscure world, as over the gate of Dante's hell, might be an inscription: "Abandon judgment, ye who enter here."

But when all is said, and the high credit given that is Mr. Dreiser's due as an explorer of these shadowy realms, it remains true that half of his story takes place, not in the world of impulse but in the clear daylight of the world of action, where it is difficult if not impossible to abstain from judgment. Mr. Dreiser abstains, considering it none of his business.

Mr. Dreiser tells all the facts about his hero. He

suppresses nothing. But the case needs more than candor; it needs as heightened a sensibility on the part of Mr. Dreiser to comic fact as he has to tragic fact. Mr. Dreiser lacks that sensibility. When Mr. Dreiser was born, fairies came with many gifts, but among those conspicuously absent was the fairy with the gift of humor. Now humor is a thing that a great poet may get along without, but a great novelist needs it badly. It is only after we have been allowed to laugh at what is ridiculous in his characters that we can begin to like them. The hero of Mr. Dreiser's book is not so utterly different from us his readers that we might not like him a little and be sorry for him a great deal if we were first permitted to laugh at him. To laugh is to forgive. But we do not forgive Mr. Dreiser's hero, we detest him.

For example: Eugene Witla, the "genius," while studying art in Chicago, becomes engaged to Angela, a country girl who lives in Wisconsin. He really believes, however, that she is his "inferior," and postpones the marriage while he conducts a series of love-affairs; reluctantly marrying her at last, he proceeds to conduct more love-affairs in a spirit partly of self-righteous revenge against her for marrying him. A seeker after beauty, he descends to the most sordid intrigue, justifying himself in whatever he does, in the manner of "geniuses" and common people. Now if one had known this Eugene Witla personally, one would not necessarily have despised him; his wobblings and straddlings and subterfuges and hypocrisies and above all his solemn self-justifications, would have seemed both comic and pitiful, and when the thunderbolt came that ripped his life to pieces and left him shattered, one would have been really sorry for him. But, with entire gravity, Mr. Dreiser records the gyrations of this Charlie Chaplin of the emotions, until the suspicion that Mr. Dreiser actually thinks him an admirable personage comes near to wrecking the effect of the story. Happily, there is only one genius in the book, and the women with whom Eugene's life is implicated are such that the grave and tender portraiture of Mr. Dreiser does justice to their docile charm and their passionate generosity.

These women are of all sorts and various ages, though Eugene preferred sugared sixteen; they are so different, and so admirably drawn in their differences, one wonders that they should have all possessed the same weakness, the weakness for Eugene. This, in spite of Mr. Dreiser's explanation, remains a mystery.

One knows, however, that the love of women bestows itself most bounteously, in life as in this book, upon those men who are perhaps of all mankind the most certain to abuse the gift. And it is as an account of how that gift is given by women and treated by a "genius" that Mr. Dreiser's book is most tragic and most true.

The Bandbox

By Felix Grendon

THE second bill at the Bandbox is so much better than the first that the two can hardly be mentioned in the same breath. Everybody knows how much the initial bill owed to *Helena's Husband*. But for this brilliant little play of Philip Moeller's, what would have saved the opening set of the season from being ripped untimely from the boards? It was a saving miracle, and all good friends of the Players realized as much with a tremor. For miracles have a regular habit of not repeating themselves—at least, not oftener than once in a blue moon.

Luckily, no miracle is needed to keep the new set of plays from going lustily on all fours. Easily the best of the lot is *Overtones*, the work of Alice Gerstenberg, an American. A good second is Schnitzler's *Literature*. Bracco's *Honorable Lover* is an entertaining third, and de Musset's *Whims* is a poor but honest fourth. One question naturally presses on this summary. It is, to adapt a Florodora refrain: Are there any more at home like Alice Gerstenberg? If so, why not give up the attempt to galvanize into life the mummy of a European reputation, particularly an estimable reputation like de Musset's that deserves to rest in peace? The profit is naught, the retribution swift and fearful. For when the Mummy feels the brisk air of the twentieth century, it crumbles into nothingness as unpreventably as did the Captain of the Phantom ship when he was carried ashore.

Literature is in the vein of delicate and subtle irony that Schnitzler commands with such high competence. It is a skit on the sort of people who make "love for love's sake," want "to live their own lives," and mean "to do something big!" The background is one of kid-gloved Bohemianism, the sham emotions of the effervescent trifler passing for the real enthusiasms of the creative artist. From this background emerge three characters: Margaret, who hides her past love affair from her present lover, but does not extend this merciful reticence to anybody else; Clement, a humdrum prosaic person, who shows a deplorable want of sympathy with the higher psychoses of Margaret's artistic soul; and Gilbert, the ex-lover, who puts a crimp in Margaret's plan of exploiting the passion-tipped love letters of their expired liaison, by exploiting them first.

There are obvious difficulties in the performance of a comedy mirroring an artificial stratum of society where life is one round of romantic intrigue or erotic intoxication, and where men and women, incapable of a genuine moment of deep feeling, clear thinking, or wilful effort, fill huge gaps in character sometimes with pictorial attitudes and sometimes

with esthetic pretensions on a very tall scale. The Players not only made the most of this artificial atmosphere, but extracted from it all the ironic subtleties with which the plot is interlaced. The honors of the playing go to Miss Helen Westley who enriches Margaret's artificiality with an undertow of emotion without which the bare part would hardly seem like flesh and blood. This talented young woman may surely look forward to a very successful stage career, if her patience and industry equal half her natural endowments. Mr. Conroy is a creditable Gilbert both in voice and in action, while Mr. Strange as Clement is almost too true to be good.

The charm and vitality of Miss Florence Enright as Manina reconciled me to the very medieval Bracco play. But nothing could reconcile me to *Whims*. This was not owing to any lack of enterprise on the part of the producing staff. If all the arts of illusion minus the dramatic art could make a play, de Musset's trifle would be a glorious success. As it was, my head went up at the delicate draping of the scene, my pulse quickened at Mr. Herts' furniture, my imagination was touched when the graceful Comte and the alluring Mme. de Léry appeared, and my heart went pit-a-pat as the artless Lydia prattled. But where the stuff that the comedy of life is made of! I never found out. Perhaps it was surfeited to death by the complete estheticism of the production.

Author, players, designer, and producer joined in a pre-vorticist Brotherhood to make *Overtones* the triumph of the evening. In this play, two women are conventionally exhibit to the world, but by their subliminal selves which follow the masks about like astral shadows. The dramatic issue centers around the bitter rivalry between the two women, one having married the man whom the other is madly infatuated with. But all the novelty springs from the ingenious device of four voices, two for the ladies amiably chatting over their cups of tea, and two for the real women contradicting, suspecting, and hating each other.

Unique is the only word for the whole effect. From the scene designed by Lee Simonson, to the acting of Miss Griswold and Miss Meyer, let alone the idea itself, each contribution was knitted structurally into a symphony of fine art. Mr. Goodman, the producer, had a difficult problem on his hands, and solved it ably. The blending of the four voices is affected with such contrapuntal skill that the sense of two clashing personalities (and no more) is always dominant.

Why does Miss Gerstenberg picture the overtones *only* smiling and the real tones *only* stabbing? To reflect life truly, the contrast should not be absolute. I have met very mean people with charming subliminal point and very charming people with mean ones. Is not the good in our souls as much of a Jack-in-the-box as the evil?

Current Affairs

By L. B. Boudin

Let Us Take Ourselves Seriously!

ONE of the most needful things in the Socialist movement of this country is that Socialists, and particularly the members of the Socialist Party, take themselves and their party seriously. The failure to take ourselves seriously is not only one of the crying evils of our movement, but amounts to a positive scandal and is liable to have the most disastrous results.

The question of preparedness has made the situation acute, and it is therefore our duty to attend to this matter without much further delay.

In our last issue I called attention to the fact that while the National Constitution of the Socialist Party contains a very drastic and unconditional prohibition against the granting by Socialists of any military supplies at *any* time and under *any* circumstances, *very* important official party organs are maintaining an attitude and preaching doctrines which might easily land us in the Preparedness camp. And I asked the question: Where does the Socialist Party stand on the question of Preparedness? To some the question may have seemed utterly unwarranted. Our party policy is not decided by this or that leader, nor by this or that party newspaper, but by the vote of the party membership; and the party membership has spoken on the subject recently and decisively. But those who are familiar with our party life knew that the question was fully warranted and quite in order. The painful, but undeniable truth is, that resolutions, particularly those adopted by the membership on referenda, are not taken seriously by anybody, least of all by the party members themselves. The question of militarism and of voting funds for military supplies is an excellent illustration in point, and I shall therefore mention some more examples of the utter contempt with which the party resolution on the subject is treated, notwithstanding the overwhelming majority by which it was carried on referendum.

On November 22nd last the *Call* published an editorial article headed "Under Any Circumstances," in which the writer attempts to show that the party declaration against voting for military or naval expenditures "under any circumstances" does not really mean what it says, and that it is therefore meaningless. And a few days earlier the *N. Y. Volkszeitung*, used editorially the following argument in favor of the holding of a national convention of the party next spring:

"Only a national convention, representing the best

brains in our movement, can state the exact position of our party to the question of 'preparedness' in this country. Only the declaration of such a convention would have the necessary authoritativeness to do away with the diversity of opinion which prevails in our party on this subject . . . The next presidential campaign will be fought on this issue of Preparedness. We must therefore be well prepared to meet that issue. *Not*—as is the situation to-day—with a declaration couched in such general terms as to make it ring *untrue and even ridiculous*, but with a *thoroughly considered program*, based upon realities and clear of purpose."

And when we bear in mind that the *Volkszeitung* is the best Socialist newspaper in this country, and very strong on anti-war and anti-preparedness, the contempt implied in these utterances for the judgment of our party membership as expressed in the resolution which is now a part of our "supreme law" becomes appalling. And we must seriously ask ourselves the question: whence this contempt?

The answer to this question is not far to seek: our decisions are but seldom *thoroughly considered*. And they are not thoroughly considered because we do not take ourselves seriously. We have not as yet acquired the habit of thinking that by our decisions we may be really deciding something of great importance to the world, and we have therefore no feeling of responsibility when passing judgment. A combination of unfortunate circumstances—many years of opportunistic leadership, and an impossibilist phrase-mongering opposition—have prevented the average party member from acquiring the psychological pre-requisite to the serious consideration of any problem—the feeling that upon *his* decisions great events may depend.

It is only natural that our opportunistic leaders and leaderlets, who want a free hand when the time comes for decisions, so that they decide upon important questions as *they* may see fit, should be anxious to continue the present conditions of affairs indefinitely. The more thoughtless the average member in his decisions, the more important the leader. The more impossibilistic the party's decisions, the greater the impunity with which they may be set aside without any fear of serious consequences to the transgressors of the party will. And once the party resolution is set aside, the leader becomes a law unto himself and is free of all constraint. That is why our opportunist leaders, who now treat the party declaration on armaments with utter contempt, never uttered a word against it while it was being voted on by the membership.

If we want to preserve democracy in our party; if we want to shape our own policy, and not be the prey of every opportunistic politician who rises to temporary leadership in the movement, we must consider well before we decide, and we must adopt decis-

ions which may serve as rules of conduct in actual and important emergencies. *We must take ourselves seriously.*

Preparedness and Japanese Exclusion

IN its article on the "under any circumstances" of our present anti-military-supplies resolution which I have already mentioned, the *Call* says:

"There are some among us, no doubt, who will at this moment say that no nation ought to use armed force, even to resist invasion or conquest by a despotic and reactionary power. They are pretty surely in the minority; and—excepting a few who go still further and hold the Tolstoyan doctrine of non-resistance pure and simple—we may doubt whether their conviction would stand such a test as, for example, the present war has put upon the Socialists of France."

All of which is undoubtedly true, and we therefore fully agree with the *Call* and the *Volkszeitung* that the "under any circumstances" of our present resolution is utterly absurd, and due—as I have already explained—to the fact that the party did not take itself seriously when it voted upon it.

But if not "under any circumstances," the question arises: *Under what circumstances?* What are the circumstances under which Socialists may and under which they may not vote for military expenditures? In other words, what is the Socialist policy on the subject which is now uppermost in the minds of all people here as well as abroad: the great subject of war, armaments, national defence, etc.?

The *Call* refuses to enter upon a discussion of this subject upon the plea that for us, here in the United States, the matter is of purely "academic" interest. For, whatever our differences of opinion on the broad subject generally, we may all agree that now and here, in the United States of America under the *present circumstances*, Preparedness is unnecessary. "No one," says the *Call*, "is going to try to conquer the United States. No one is going to try to invade our continental territory, *unless as an accidental strategic move in a war otherwise begun and waged for other ends.*"

As our readers know, I am opposed to Preparedness. Nevertheless, I must protest against the position assumed by the *Call*, and demand that the party adopt a *full program* on the subject; a program which would include not only a resolution to do this or that in a given instance, or with reference to a given measure, but a clearly stated set of principles, and a well-defined policy towards many questions which may be embraced in the *circumstances* upon which our attitude towards armaments may have to depend. For the phrase "present circumstances" or "present conditions" is, in its way, just as meaningless as the phrase "under any circumstances." To our Imperialists, "present conditions" means our

growing commercial expansion, our "national needs," our increased "foreign investments," etc., etc. It is evident that to them "present circumstances" means something else than to us, and that they must, of necessity, regard the question of preparedness from an entirely different angle than the working class, or even the old-fashioned middle class.

And, unfortunately, these differences of point of view cannot all be summed up in the antithesis of Imperialist and anti-Imperialist. There are many questions of national policy on which the labor movement and even the Socialist movement are divided which are directly involved in the question of Preparedness—and which must be decided right before the question of Preparedness can be so decided. Japanese Exclusion is one of them. The organized labor movement of this country has for many years advocated a narrow immigration policy, which found its culmination point in the demand for the entire exclusion of Asiatics, including the Japanese. In 1907 the National Committee of the Socialist Party, led by our present National Chairman, fell for this reactionary policy, and submitted to the Stuttgart International Socialist Congress the famous "American Resolution" embodying this un-socialistic policy. In the eight years that have passed since, the A. F. of L. has not changed its attitude on the subject. Nor have, evidently, some Socialists;—notwithstanding the overwhelming and ignominious defeat of the "American Resolution" at the Stuttgart Congress. To judge from the Immigration Resolution adopted at the San Francisco Convention of the A. F. of L., and from the fact that the Socialist delegates to that convention swallowed it without a protest, we have not made much progress since 1907. Some of us, at least, evidently are for Japanese Exclusion.

But Japanese Exclusion may lead to war with Japan. And in the course of such a war San Francisco might be bombarded, or some portion of the United States even invaded, "as an incidental strategic move," etc. What ought the Socialists of this country do in case of such a war? And ought we not perhaps prepare for such an emergency?

Evidently the question of Preparedness even under "present conditions" depends largely upon the position we take on many national and international problems. We cannot have a clear view of the Preparedness question until we know just what is our position on these questions. Our position towards all of them must therefore be defined as part of our Preparedness Program. But, first and foremost, what of Japanese Exclusion?

Book Reviews

Metaphysics of World Power

TO me the orthodox formula which describes modern war as a scramble for the markets of the world has always been a narrow and inflexible statement of a very complex fact. For the purpose of Socialist propaganda I admit that the phrase has its use. Markets and shipping profits give an added touch of ignobility to the sordid business of war which phrases like national aspirations, patriotism, and world prestige tend to exalt. But after all, these psychological factors do enter into the struggle of nations, whether the clash originates in the South Pacific or on the frontiers of Alsace-Lorraine. And especially the war of to-day with its upflare of elemental hatreds, historic passions and age-old rivalries, seemed to fit with difficulty into the framework of the old formula about world-markets. Sentiments and passions, if you will, which have been brought to the surface by the professional breeders of hatred, but which nevertheless do show the existence of a potential appetite for war to which world-markets and colonies are only one of many conceivable stimuli.

Consequently it was a pleasure, though not altogether a surprise, to pick up a book¹ dealing with the problems of the great war which sets out with the apparent purpose of doing full justice to that complex of forces and emotions which may roughly be described as patriotism and which the world-market formula chooses to neglect. It was not altogether a surprise because one has learned to expect of Mr. Lippmann an individual point of view. With his usual admirable clarity of phrase Mr. Lippmann analyzes what you may call the natural and psychological basis of patriotism—the influence of geography, the play of the gregarious instinct and above all that clutch of the native soil and the native environment upon our senses which internationalism, as it seems to me, had waived aside as a myth previous to July 31, 1914. Of course we are at liberty to insist that the thing is still a delusion and that the nations of Europe are the victim of a sinister hypnotism. But our writer chooses to recognize national sentiment as a fact. Not as the sole fact in the case to be sure—he examines in detail how business exploits patriotism—but as a fundamental nevertheless. To this argument he devotes one-third of his book.

Having thus laid the foundation for an independent interpretation of the great war, Mr. Lippmann immediately kicks the stool from under him and throws his arms around the neck of the good old formula about world-markets. His thesis may be summed up in a few words. War between the nations is caused by a struggle for the control of the backward regions and peoples. The way out is to force the backward peoples under the authority of international commissions or conferences armed with legislative and executive authority. To this specific remedy I shall return. For the present I am concerned with his interpretation of the causes of war, which, as I have indicated, sets out to be psychological and becomes purely mechanic. "The weak spots of the world are the arenas of friction . . . The attempt to explain the world war in terms of Alsace-Lorraine, Poland, Italia Irredenta, and so forth, break down utterly in the face of the real issues which have dominated the armed peace since 1871 . . . I do not think Europe is fighting about any particular privilege in the Balkans or in Africa. I think she is fighting because Europe has been divided into two groups which clashed again and again over the organization of the backward parts of the world." It is true that in the middle of his argument Mr. Lippmann recalls that in his analysis of patriotism he has dwelt much on the factor of national prestige. So he explains that competition in prestige is entirely called forth by the rivalry over colonies and markets.

On this point there is plenty of room for difference of opinion. It is quite true that up to 1914 the cause of wars or of the crises that again and again threatened war would be found in the Sudan, in the Transvaal, in Manchuria, in Morocco and Tripoli. But it is also true that these wars and almost-wars shrink to a pin point when compared with the catastrophe of to-day in Europe. Consequently if the origins of this greatest of all wars would be found to lie in Europe, Mr. Lippmann's generalization for war as a whole will not hold. He makes the cause somewhat easier for himself by including the Balkans among the backward regions. Conceding him that much, it is still a question whether the present war has not been brought about by the fears and ambitions of the nations in the heart of Europe.

To me, for instance, the colonial ad-

ventures of the French, have always been an unreality, a diversion, a balm for national pride sorely wounded by the position of France on the Continent. France swapped her rights in Egypt for Morocco, not because she cared a great deal for Morocco but because she wanted England's aid in Europe. And Germany, in turn, used Morocco as a pawn in the European game. The crisis produced by the Kaiser's journey to Tangier was not settled by any arrangement about Morocco; war was averted by the dismissal of Delcasse, joint-architect of the scheme for "encircling" Germany. The issue fought out on the duelling ground of Algeiras was primarily a test of the solidity of the Anglo-French understanding. I cannot help thinking that the fear of Germany's presence in Antwerp has been fully as acute to England as her fear of the Bagdad railway.

This question whether the nations hate and fear each other more in Europe than they do abroad is in itself unimportant; as I shall try to show. Yet it bears directly on the solution which Mr. Lippmann proposes. Since, the areas of international friction, as he finds, are the backward regions of the earth, he suggests that the nations virtually enter into a self-denying ordinance by which they shall agree not to quarrel about these outlying interests. The trouble has hitherto been that Morocco and the Congo, have been discussed by international conferences which have found some sort of formula and have promptly adjourned leaving it to the colonial functionaries of the nations to violate the agreement by messing up spheres of control, poaching on each other's commercial preserves, and general bedevilment. Let these conferences be made permanent, with legislative and executive power, and acting in harmony with representatives of the local population. Let European capitalists be told, then, that they go into the backward regions at their own risk, that they are under the authority of the commissions, and that they cannot run to their home governments for protection. We now have the Hague, to be sure, but the Hague is an impotent tribunal, at best concerned with conflicts when they have already become quarrels and national animosities are aflame. The permanent commissions would squelch the trouble-maker before he had time to throw the world into turmoil.

Frankly I cannot see that national rivalries and animosities will fail to make themselves less heard in the permanent commissions that under the present system. I cannot see that half a dozen diplomats sitting as a conference will be immune against the jealousies

¹ *The Stakes of Diplomacy*, by Walter Lippmann. New York: Henry Holt & Co., \$1.25 net.

which beset half a dozen administrators working in adjacent spheres of interest, under the present system. What Mr. Lippmann proposes is joint-control of the backward nations. And the only instances of such a system I can think of at this moment, are the Dual control in Schleswig-Holstein which Prussia used as a means of forcing war upon Austria in 1866, the Dual Control in Egypt which ended in England's forcing out France, and the Dual Control

of Russia and Austria in the Balkans under the Mürzsteg programme of 1903 which drenched Macedonia in blood. Also I wonder if England would consent to put India under an international commission and whether China would consent to go.

That is why I think of Mr. Lippmann's analysis of the cause of war and his remedy as mechanistic. It is as if an inn-keeper put two strangers into one bed and made them agree not to fight if

only one their legs got into each other's way; if they clashed in the vicinity of the pillow or the middle of the bed it was different. I fail to see how the nations with their heads and torsos in Europe could be induced to neutralize their legs in Morocco or Asia. Especially if the nations of Europe are not at all concerned with the welfare of their heads and bodies, but only with their legs, as Mr. Lippmann maintains.

SIMEON STRUNSKY.

A Socialist Digest

Dissension in the Socialist Party Concerning Preparedness

CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL has come out in favor of preparedness in the United States—even if it means his getting out of the Socialist Party, according to a report in the *New York Call*. Russell issued a call for Americans to arm themselves and prepare for a death grapple with Germany at the close of the present war in Europe in an address before the Socialist Literary Society.

Russell drew a vivid word picture of Germany reaching out to dominate the world, "an empire animated by a tremendous ambition for world power, bound by no treaties, keeping no faith, no morals except the moral of conquest," clashing with the United States over the Monroe Doctrine in South America, with the inevitable result—war:

"And I don't care who makes the armaments. No man has written more or talked more about armament kings, graft in the manufacture of munitions or denounced frauds and the trusts. I don't care if Charles Schwab or Andy Carnegie or anybody else makes the profit. I say to you, you have got to have the tools. You have got to have guns, ships, fortresses. Let the government make them. Let it make all it can. But get it, get it, get it!"

Russell's argument was based on two propositions—that Germany is winning the war and that the United States refused to abolish the cause of war. He said the cause was the competitive system and that in not voting for Socialism or the Co-operative Commonwealth the people in effect voted for war. Since we are determined to maintain the cause of war, we must arm or face the consequences of being conquered by other powers that do. Night does not follow day more certainly than

that war follows the competitive system, he said:

"The way events are now trending the United States stands to be involved in war. The American people will not suffer invasion without rising in their might, and they will not stand many more insults. They will demand the tools of battle, and if they do not get them, they will fight with bare hands, and their slaughter will be upon the heads of the pacifists.

"The Swiss military system has given them more democracy than there is in the United States. We need not fear a military autocracy. The American people will not consent to be ruled that way. As long as our country rests on its present constitutional basis there is no reason for fear."

"Germany is already preparing for the commercial conquest of South America. The United States is conducting a similar campaign. This is the identical cause of the present war, the attempt of nations to get rid of their unconsumed surplus. There is also the Monroe Doctrine. Whether you believe in it or not, it will be a fruitful source of trouble. You can't make the American people abandon it. When Germany goes there the United States will demand that it be observed, and that is tantamount to a declaration of war.

"Will you say 'Welcome' to Japan, 'Come in and take our Pacific Coast?' Do you wish to become a province of Germany? I do not, for I have been to those lands and have seen them. The alternative is to have an armament better than the best.

"If you imagine the American people will disarm, you do not know the American people. The instant a hostile army lands, the people will demand absolutely that they be permitted to fight.

And you will, too. You who applauded will be rushing to the front as the French Socialists. Have you forgotten Ierve, who spent eleven months in jail because he was an anti-militarist?

"If you say to me that the dangers of militarism are great, I will answer that the dangers of unpreparedness today are greater. Either prepare or face destruction. You may call me a scaremonger, but I am perfectly willing to be a scaremonger if I can prevent damage at hand.

"There is no security in bulk, no security in anything except guns. You say that this is a backward doctrine. I didn't make it. I didn't make the dreams about human progress false. The truth is the truth. You say that after the war we will disarm. How can you fix treaties in which you will have the slightest faith and confidence in face of the violation of Luxembourg and Belgium?"

In answer to a question as to whether he thought he was talking Socialism when he advocated preparedness, Russell said he was, and if it was necessary, in order to stand for it, he would get out of the party.

Meyer London, the Socialist Congressman, who claims to be against preparedness, in an interview seeks to soften Russell's offense:

"My friend Russell, I suppose, is twenty years older than I am in his beliefs. For my part, I think most people are unreasonably afraid of Germany. I believe the New York police force could keep off any army of Germans that could reach these shores.

"We all respect Mr. Russell, even though we may disagree with him, and this frank expression of his opinion on such a matter, while it will get little support anywhere, will not cost him any popularity. The Socialist movement realizes that it must allow a great deal of latitude on such a question as preparedness, in view of the state of affairs in the world. The war has brought up so many problems that a

man must have his own opinion on them. Such problems can not be reduced to a matter of dogma."

The *New York Call* has an indirect reference to Russell's speech, in an editorial article "Getting Back to Fundamentals." This article paves the way for advocacy of preparedness:

"There is nothing easier than to pour the vials of scorn and satire upon 'preparedness.' Nothing easier than to demonstrate up to the hilt that the war financiers, the munition manufacturers and other patriots of the same type are making immense fortunes out of this same 'preparedness.'

"And it is quite as easy to say that 'preparedness' provokes war, but not quite so easy to prove it; for to prove it involves the assumption of the contrary—that 'unpreparedness' promotes peace. And that is simply untrue, but no more or no less untrue than the opposite statement.

"Of course, it is easy to mentally assume the 'if' that postulates all nations as 'unprepared.' Just as easy as it is to assume the thing that is not so, and reason as if it were a fact.

"The hard, disagreeable truth, however, is that the world is not constituted on this plan, and cannot be so constituted. Capitalism stands in the way. The Socialists themselves say so, and have always insisted upon it; proved it, too. If capitalism generates war, it is merely a waste of breath to bring in 'preparedness' and 'unpreparedness.' They don't apply, and the Socialist who tries to apply them must forget his Socialism; forget that the economic system inexorably and unconditionally breeds war, and that it does not take these things into account.

"The militarist has none the worse of the argument with the pacifist. It is a standoff. And if the Socialist uses the common pacifist arguments, he, too, can be as easily held to a draw. And no amount of scorn or ridicule or pointing out the hypocritical character of the war financiers and munition makers will have the least effect, even if it is all true.

"This can be readily seen in the fact that military preparations are going on in this country just as if the pacifist never existed; and they take equally little heed of the existence of the Socialist, either.

"Our opposition to war must be based on our opposition to capitalism. Any other opposition is in reality baseless and a mere stultification of ourselves. We must get back to fundamentals."

The *N. Y. Volkszeitung* attacks Russell and London's covert defense of Russell:

"Now that Charles Edward Russell

has confirmed in a lecture to the Socialist Literary Society of Philadelphia, the position ascribed to him in an interview by the *San Francisco Bulletin*, there is only one thing left for him to do if he is as honest and honorable as we have taken him to be: immediately resign from the Socialist Party which he has irrevocably compromised by his Jingoism. A man who claims in all seriousness that the nation must have a larger fleet and a larger army than any other nation; a man who takes the stand that this country must arm for war without delay so that if we are going to have war the sooner the better; a man who in the same breath in which he places the burden of blame for the entire war upon the majority in the German Reichstag, and then himself agitates for war in the most unjustifiable manner;—a man like that may properly belong to the "National Security League" or a similar organization, but he has lost the right to call himself a Socialist."

The *Volkszeitung* goes on in its next issue to say that although the present war has developed currents and cross currents in both Socialist and bourgeois parties not alone in Europe but to an extraordinary degree in the nation in spite of our remoteness to the field of action, the really important point at the present time is that the Socialists at least should take a definite, clear, united stand in this all-important matter. Therefore, as the question of holding a general party convention was already being considered and was still in doubt, the *Volkszeitung* recommends that this convention should by all means take place and specifically for the purpose of arriving at an adequate solution of the Socialist position towards Militarism and Preparedness in this country at the present time.

British Workers and the Munitions Act

THERE is much discontent and latent revolt among the workers of Great Britain against the Munitions Act. As a London labor organizer points out, the "patriotic" employers are using the Act to further oppress the workers:

"Some employers are taking full advantage of this Act to reduce their workmen to slaves, and for all manner of offences are hauling them to the Munition Tribunals, where the word of the employers is accepted in almost all cases as beyond all question. Employers may discharge workmen when and how they like, but refuse to give a clearance when they have obviously made up their minds to dispense with

men, but keep them walking about for a number of weeks, and then at the court agree to let the men go. It seems impossible to assure these tribunals that the employer is unreasonably withholding consent, for nothing seems unreasonable, from paying below Trade Union conditions to suspension for a month for some offence committed, which means a fine of about £20, whereas the Act imposes only a fine of £3. These men, it is claimed, are employed upon important Government work, and in view of the great outcry that men must hardly stop to sleep if on munition work, the action of these employers, for compelling men to be idle for weeks, should be made an offence, and render them liable to be severely dealt with. There is a growing and justifiable dissatisfaction throughout the division against the action of employers using the Act to impose working conditions upon men which in other times would be strongly resented."

The *New Statesman*, while supporting the war, bitterly attacks the Munitions Act:

"What the Act does is to make it a penal offence for the wage-earner to leave his employer's service without the employer's consent, even at the expiration of his contract of service, and with due notice. It makes it a penal offence for the men in any workshop to refuse to undertake a new job, however low may be the wage or piecework price that that foreman offers. The Munitions Court habitually refuses to listen to the workman's plea that the rate of wages that he was offered was not the proper rate, or was inconsistent with either the contract or service, or with the Munitions Department's undertaking. The Court declines to discuss wages or hours of labor, or conditions of employment—its jurisdiction, it says, extends only to enforcing the employer's will! Thus it has been held to be an offence for any workman, after he has worked the full contract day, to refuse to work overtime, including night-work and Sundays, *whether or not anything extra is paid for such overtime*. A workman may not, even after due notice, change his employment—not even from one munition-making firm to another—in order to get higher wages—however low may be the wages he is getting.

"But it is the lack of mutuality about the proceedings under the Act that the workmen most strongly resent. The employer is allowed to make what arbitrary rules he likes, and to change them from time to time, without the workmen's consent—not merely the model rules drawn up by the Munitions Department (in an unnecessarily harsh and peremptory phrasing, to which the

workmen are not accustomed) but also any rules that the individual employer may choose to make and to enforce by fine (one man was suspended for four weeks, and thus fined £20, yet not allowed to leave the employment). It has actually been held in many cases that, although a workman may not, without his employer's consent, go off to another situation, *the employer is not bound to give him work or wages*. Cases are constantly occurring in which workmen are told to stand by because materials are not ready, or because there are, for the moment, no more jobs. They then lose hours, sometimes whole days,

occasionally even several weeks, earning nothing (although knowing that other firms badly want their services, and would pay high wages); but the employer will not give them the discharge certificate, without which no other employer dare engage them. Every day in the week the Munitions Courts are hearing several dozen cases in which the employer has refused a leaving certificate, *and in about half the cases the court holds him to have been wrong*. But even if he wins the case the workman has no redress for the injury he has suffered in having been refused his discharge."

A Peep Into Germany

IN an article in a recent issue of *London Justice*, a writer gives an interesting summary of conditions in Germany as interpreted by the Berlin *Vorwärts*:

"A perusal of *Vorwärts* from September 10 to 21 would probably surprise the average English reader of the daily papers. Perhaps the first thing that would strike him would be the amount of news in it. We have so often heard of the poor deluded German, who is only told what the Kaiser thinks he ought to know, that it comes as a shock to find the French, Russian and English communiqués published in German papers without, to all appearance, having suffered any excision by the Censor. What seems strange to us, after the pages of comment *ad nauseam* on the daily news in our own papers, however, is the entire absence of comment on the military situation, and indeed on any of the news, except by way of spaced type to emphasize what the editor thinks most important.

"Perhaps leading articles on the military and political situation are forbidden by the German Press Bureau. With the sole exception of the question of the rise in prices, to which the *Vorwärts* leader writer returns again and again, there is nothing approaching criticism of the Government or indeed of questions of immediate practical politics. Such leaders as do not treat of this burning question treat entirely of comparatively academic questions, as, for instance, the adoption of absolute Free Trade in Germany, with the exception of a long and interesting article on the Russian political crisis which led to the dissolution of the Duma.

"In the view of the German Social-Democratic writer the failure of the composite Parliamentary Group, which demanded a Minister relying on popular confidence and support, and the downfall of the bureaucracy, arose from the fact that the Group was too

moderate in its demands. According to his idea, if they had demanded a fully democratic Government, they would have secured the support of the Social-Democratic and Labor Groups and the majority of the nation. As it was, their fear of the democracy appeared to be as great as, if not greater than, their fear of the bureaucracy, and the latter, after making use of them in the Duma, felt that the Parliamentary majority had so little real popular enthusiasm behind it that the Chamber might be dissolved and a practical dictatorship set up. The writer's opinions are then strengthened by a long article from a 'comrade' at Copenhagen, who brings up all the old Russian Social-Democratic threats of general revolution and dreams of a workers' peace.

"Apparently it is not only with us that coalowners and others excuse rising prices by allegations of increased wages and the slackness of output. Taking up the cudgels on behalf of the German miners against the *Berliner Tageblatt*, which had sought to make such excuses, *Vorwärts*, by a long array of statistics, shows first, that the wages of the German miners have, generally speaking, not risen, and secondly, that the output of coal per man has increased, and bitterly attacks the 'coal-usurers.'

"In another article on the rise in food prices some interesting facts come to light, which show that German organization is not altogether as perfect as some would have us believe, and that waste is not unknown. It will be remembered that some time back, in order to save the consumption of potatoes, the German Government ordered the sticking of six million pigs, nearly 25 per cent. of the total number in Germany. Of this enormous number a large proportion was to have been made into sausages and other comestibles that would keep. According to *Vorwärts* there was such a lack

of skilled workers, and the whole business was so hurriedly undertaken, that at least 30 per cent. were utterly spoiled and had to be taken in wagon loads and converted into cart grease.

"'Protection and War Tariffs' is the heading of a leader advocating the entire abolition of protective tariffs in Germany. It is particularly surprising to the Englishman in its, to him, absolute topsy-turveydom. The arguments are all very old friends, but the application so entirely new. The idea of the 'wicked foreigner manipulating his tariffs for the utter economic destruction of Germany' seems laughable to us, but is evidently seriously put forward and believed over there. *Vorwärts*, amongst other reasons, does not believe in it because 'England, in order to carry on an economic war with Germany would have to abandon Free Trade, which would be synonymous with the ruin of her most important industries and the renunciation of her position in the world-market. We have no need to reckon with such a fantastic notion.' This article also contains the interesting information that 'the nourishment of the [German] population cannot during the war be assured by the products of the country.' Germany cannot produce enough cattle to provide the proper amount of animal food for her population. *Vorwärts*, whilst admitting that the Germans can hold out for a long time, contends that this result can only be obtained at the expense of undermining the strength of the people by insufficient nourishment, and the reduction of the stock of cattle to such an extent that it will need several years to bring it up again to a proper level. We are also informed that the production per acre in England of corn and other cereals and root crops is not less than in Germany. The greater amount of foodstuffs imported per head into this country is explained away by the fact that there are more persons to the square mile in England than in Germany, and that the average income of the Englishman is higher than that of the German.

"The world's trade during the first year of war is discussed on September 11, or, to be precise, that of the great Powers, other than Germany. After a consideration of the figures of English trade it is remarked 'from this it is clearly visible that English industry, in spite of all unfavorable circumstances, is beginning to reconquer the world-market.' Turning later to Germany we find: 'As is known, no statement of German trade is published. It is, however, by no means so small as is usually assumed,' and that is all in an article of a column and a half."

French Socialist Congress

UNDER the title, "A Resolution of Solidarity with the Socialists of the Allies", *L'Humanité* reports that at the Congress of the National Socialist Party on November 1 a debate took place on the war, in which the foremost militants of the Party took part. A resolution was carried which, while insisting on the responsibility of international Capitalism for the present war, states that in this tragic struggle two points stand out. If Austro-German Imperialism triumphed, the cause of Socialism would receive a severe set-back, while if it were beaten, Socialism would make enormous progress, particularly in Germany and Austria. As regards peace, the Congress declared its belief that it is necessary to wait for circumstances favorable to the cause of the workers and humanity, as a premature peace would be against the interests of progress and civilization. The Congress decided to communicate this resolution of solidarity to the Socialists of the allied countries.

No mention is made in *L'Humanité* of the opposition to this resolution, says *La Justice Social*. An amendment by Manuel Vigil was defeated by 20 votes against 9, and another opposition amendment moved by Verdes Montenegro by 25 votes against 10. Speaking for his amendment, Vigil stated that, whichever side triumphed, at the finish of this tremendous conflagration the Capitalist classes of all countries would settle down to exploit the workers as ruthlessly as before. In his opinion the primary interest of Socialists was to endeavor to put an immediate end to the war, in which the workers were but the tools of the rival Capitalist groups. What mattered was peace, which Socialists should seek more intensely than the triumph of one or the other groups of belligerents.

Verdes Montenegro, in opposing the resolution, said the war of the workers against Capitalism was his war. The war of Capitalist groups against other Capitalist groups did not interest him:

"You say Germany was the aggressor. That is difficult to determine now,

and perhaps always will be. You say the Germans built up a formidable army, but forget that the British built up a formidable navy, superior to the two next largest naval Powers. You speak of fighting 'militarism.' When kings were the supreme chiefs, the armies fell upon a country, subjugated it, and divided the booty between the king and the army. That was Militarism. Nowadays Capitalism secures the spoils. This is not Militarism, but Capitalism.

"Formerly we maintained that Capitalism was the same in all countries. To-day we make distinctions between the Capitalism of various nations. On May 11, before the war, I remember we were told that the workers had no country. The condition of the world as regards oppression does not depend upon who obtains victory. The industrial hegemony only will be changed, and I repeat that whoever wins the result will be better ultimate conditions for the proletariat."

For some months past the Federation of the Seine has manifested its disapproval of the participation of the three Socialist Ministers in the French Cabinet, stating that such participation has not resulted in any advantage whatever (indeed, many disadvantages) to Socialism. The Federation has just discussed a resolution drafted by the Socialist author, Paul Louis, the deputy of the Seine Bon, Gaston Levy, permanent delegate to the Party and other well-known men in the movement. The resolution reads:

"The Federation begs the Socialist Parliamentary group to indicate to the Socialist minister that they must accord their votes with the wishes of the Party, and that they should resign from the ministry before October 15 if the censure of political matter and publish in the official journal the relations between the contractors and the State intermediaries.

The Socialist deputies of the Seine are instructed to support the foregoing resolution in the Parliamentary group. The resolution was defeated by 5,000 votes against 3,500 votes."

Swiss Workers' Demands

THE Swiss Trades Union Federation and the Swiss Industrial Society have jointly petitioned the Federal Council in regard to measures to be taken against the distress which prevails among the working class. The following are the proposals:

1. Uniform regulation in regard to

contracts, reductions of wages in general.

2. Contributions towards the expenses of the trade-unions (masters' and workers' organizations) in connection with unemployment relief.

The abuses in matters relating to contracts are held responsible for a

great deal. The first measure, proposed towards abolishing the same, is the appointment of a special commission by the Federal Council which commission is to consist of representatives of the Industrial Department of the Swiss Trades Union Federation and the Swiss Industrial Society and is to draft a model bill which is later on to be replaced by a legislative measure.

Further, the procuring of work and the contributing towards unemployment and other relief is demanded from the confederacy. At present more than 10 per cent of the workers, employed in the Swiss industries, are entirely, and far above 30 per cent, partly unemployed. These figures principally refer to indigenous workers. In addition there are a number of small craftsmen but also larger employers without work; others have to put up with greatly reduced earnings and frequently with a considerably diminished number of customers.

Accordingly, the confederacy, the cantons and the municipality are to procure work and the confederacy is, if possible, to grant the means necessary for the purpose. In order to organize the procuring of work systematically, the Federal Council is shortly to convene a conference of the representatives of the confederacy, the cantons and the larger municipalities, as well as of the Trades Union Federation and the Industrial Society. Further, the activity of the labor agencies is to be centralized and the fees to be reduced.

In order to explain this harmony between the organized workers and the employers the "Gewerkschaftliche Rundschau," the central organ of the Swiss trade unions, remarks:

"We should like to point out to such readers who may wonder that the Trades Union Federation and the Industrial Society which, as a rule, have not much in common, should so readily come to an understanding in regard to the various and, at least, partly weighty questions, that 'when the devil is sick the devil a saint would be', no matter whether he is called Trades Union Federation or Industrial Society and that this saying contains the key to all that appears puzzling in this action of national truce. No doubt, the Federal Council will have to believe in the distress, prevailing in trade and industry, if he carefully examines the joint petition

The Third Anniversary of the New Review

On December 18th, the *New Review* celebrates its third anniversary with a dinner and sociable,—the subject for discussion very appropriately being "The Re-Birth of the International".

Three years! In retrospect, it seems impossible that the *New Review* should have survived the struggles of that period.

It was a daring undertaking, this founding of the *New Review*. Business sense was against the project: a weekly paper required a capital of at least \$50,000; a thorough organization along business lines. The *New Review* started with less than \$8,000; and in four months was compelled to turn itself into a monthly, in 14 months compelled virtually to suspend publication. It was at this time, April 1914, that the *New Review* was re-organized.

When the *New Review* re-organized there was not a cent in the bank, and the business income was less than \$150 a month, the deficit each month over \$400. *Since that time the business income has doubled, the deficit reduced more than half.*

Considering our poor resources, the war, etc., this is a magnificent showing. But we have accomplished more than that:

The New Review has been a fearless independent magazine, openminded, alive to new influences and new ideas.

The New Review is the only magazine in this country which has kept its readers fully informed about events in the European Socialist movement, where the future of Socialism is being decided.

The New Review has stanchly upheld, is stanchly upholding the principle of internationalism.

The *New Review* is publishing books in an effort to develop an original American Socialist literature.

The *New Review* is not paying a penny for articles or editorial work, yet look at the contributors it musters:

Prof. Charles A. Beard; L. B. Boudin; Eugene V. Debs; Floyd Dell; Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois; Prof. Mack Eastman; Dr. A. A. Goldenweiser; Felix Grendon; Isaac A. Hourwich; Austin Lewis, Paul Louis; Prof. Jacques Loeb; Dr. Robert H. Lowie; Moses Oppenheimer; Mary W. Ovington; Anton Pannekoek; Elsie Clews Parsons; Theodore Rothstein; I. M. Rubinow; A. M. Simons; Simeon Strunsky; John Spargo; Wm. English Walling, and many others.

It is a magnificent showing, indeed!

Now, more than ever, is the *New Review* needed. At a period when many Socialists are cowardly

deserting their principles, the fearlessness of the *New Review* is a tonic; at a period when confusion of thought is rampant, and free, fearless discussion absolutely indispensable, an independent forum of independent Socialist thought such as the *New Review* is equally indispensable.

Looking back upon the last 21 months of struggle, we find that our efforts have been greatly hampered by lack of funds. The struggle to raise funds to pay off deficits has crippled the efforts to increase circulation.

Are you with *us* to change this? Are you willing to help—not to assure the future of the *New Review*, that is assured—provide *us* with the necessary money to build up our circulation, increase our scope and power? If you are—and you should be—sign any of the three blanks below.

New Review Anniversary Committee
256 Broadway
New York City

Comrades:

I hereby pledge myself to pay \$..... a month for a period of to the *New Review* Circulation Campaign Fund..

Name

Address

New Review Anniversary Committee
256 Broadway
New York City

Comrades:

I hereby donate the sum of \$..... to the *New Review* Circulation Campaign Fund.

Name

Address

New Review Anniversary Committee
256 Broadway
New York City

Comrades:

I am sending you \$..... for which please send me five months subscription cards (at 50c each).

Name

Address

WE DO NOT
ADVERTISE A
BOOK
WE CANNOT
RECOMMEND

New Review Book Service

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

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

Send all orders to

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE, 256 BROADWAY
New York City

VITAL BOOKS
ON ALL
VITAL
PROBLEMS
OF THE DAY

Suggestions for Xmas Gifts

Fiction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Feminism

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

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

Woman under Socialism. By August Bebel. Translated from the original German of the 33rd edition, by Daniel De Leon. This is one of the greatest Socialist books ever written. It is a powerful exposure of the shams of capitalist morality. This is the book from which garbled extracts are taken to show that Socialists advocate "free love." (LN) \$1.00, postpaid.

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

Socialism

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

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

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

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

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

THIRD ANNIVERSARY
New Review

to be celebrated by a

Sociable and Dinner

SUBJECT FOR DISCUSSION:

"Rebirth of the International"

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

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

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

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

SPEAKERS:

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

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

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

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

Tickets can be secured from:

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

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

An Ideal Christmas Present

EUGENE SUE'S:
The Silver Cross



or

**The Carpenter
of Nazareth**

A Tale of Jerusalem

The plain but thrilling story, told in a masterly manner by the great French author gets hold of the reader as soon as he starts to read it. Stripped of the Church garb, Jesus appears before us the type of the earnest, honest, radical leader of the people—a figure which history has reproduced, with slight variations, in every crucial period in the progress of mankind, when the older order of things had reached its climax and was about to give way to the new.

The high-priests of to-day the Caiaphases, are more readily understood after reading Sue's brilliant narrative. And as then so now do we find them lined up with the bankers and other interests of the ruling class, in common league against the working class.

Aside from being a story of most absorbing interest, with dramatic incidents second to none, the book gives the noble character to the teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth which most of our generation—whether Christian, Jew or Freethinker—have failed to perceive through the mass of Church legend which attaches to the story of Jesus.

As a picture of society and the social classes of that epoch, with the class struggle raging within it, this story will throw a strong light on our conditions of to-day.

PRICE, 75 CENTS

New York Labor News Company
45 Rose Street, New York City

N. B. Send for booklet describing Sue's work "The Mysteries of the People, or History of a Proletarian Family Across the Ages."

Sample Copies

A friend of the NEW REVIEW, who feels that the magazine deserves a greater circulation, has given us \$50.00 on condition that we use the money to send sample copies to possible subscribers. If

you can distribute a bundle of sample copies, from time to time, where they are likely to do some good, drop us a postal to that effect. *We need your cooperation.*

Ask For Them

A NEW VOLUME by ARTHUR M. LEWIS

The Struggle Between Science and Superstition

A most entertaining and illuminating book on the age-long conflict between scientists searching for new truth and priests striving to chain the human mind with the authority of church or ancient book. It holds the attention of the thinking reader as no adventure in fiction could do, since it carries us over the blood-stained trail of the pioneers of human liberty. The high lights in the book are the burning of Giordano Bruno and the official record of the recantation extorted by threat of torture from the aged Galileo in which he abjures the terrible heresy of asserting that the earth moves round the sun. Cloth, 50 cents.

This is the FIFTIETH VOLUME in our fifty-cent LIBRARY OF SOCIALIST CLASSICS, containing most of the important Socialist books to be had in the English language, with the exception of some larger volumes necessarily sold at higher prices. The remaining forty-nine volumes are:

Anarchism and Socialism, Plechanoff.	Militant Proletariat, Austin Lewis.
Art of Lecturing, Lewis.	Origin of the Family, Engels.
Class Struggle, Kautsky.	Out of the Dump, Marcy.
Class Struggles in America, Simons.	Positive School of Criminology, Ferri.
Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels.	Puritanism, Meily.
Doing Us Good and Plenty, Russell.	Rebel at Large, Beals.
Eighteenth Brumaire, Marx.	Revolution and Counter-Revolution, Marx.
End of the World, Meyer.	Right to Be Lazy, Lafargue.
Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History, Kautsky.	Russian Bastille, Pollock.
Evolution of Banking, Howe.	Sabotage, Pouget.
Evolution of Man, Boelsche.	Science and Revolution, Untermann.
Evolution of Property, Lafargue.	Social and Philosophical Studies, Lafargue.
Evolution, Social and Organic, Lewis.	Social Revolution, The, Kautsky.
Feuerbach, Engels.	Socialism for Students, Cohen.
Germs of Mind in Plants, Francé.	Socialism, Morris and Bax.
God's Children, Allman.	Socialism, Positive and Negative, LaMonte.
High Cost of Living, Kautsky.	Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, Engels.
Human, All Too Human, Nietzsche.	Stories of the Struggle, Winchevsky.
Law of Biogenesis, Moore.	Story of Wendell Phillips, Russell.
Life and Death, Teichmann.	Ten Blind Leaders, Lewis.
Making of the World, Meyer.	Triumph of Life, Boelsche.
Marx He Knew, The, Spargo.	Value, Price and Profit, Marx .
Memoirs of Marx, Liebknecht.	Vital Problems, Lewis.
Marx vs. Tolstoy, Darrow and Lewis.	What's So and What Isn't, Work.
	World's Revolutions, Untermann.

The Fifty Volumes and A \$10.00 Share of Stock for \$15.00

Our publishing house is the property of nearly 3,000 Socialists, each of whom has subscribed \$10.00 for the purpose of publishing the International Socialist Review and the greatest possible number of the best revolutionary books. Nine hundred more of the \$10.00 shares are still for sale. Each stockholder has the privilege of buying all our books and some other books for sale. Each stockholder has the privilege of buying all our books and some other books at cost. If we can sell these 900 shares within the next few weeks, it will enable us to double our output of Socialist literature. That is why we offer this 50-volume library NOW for LESS THAN COST with a share of stock.

Send \$15.00 and we will send the fifty books by express and a fully-paid certificate for a share of stock. The expressage to any railroad station in the United States or Canada will not cost you over \$2.00,—from that down to 31 cents, according to distance. If you wish us to send by mail, add \$2.00 for Canada, any foreign country or United States east of Denver; \$3.00 for Alaska, Panama, United States island possessions and Pacific coast points.

If you already have part of these volumes, you can substitute any \$1.00 book published by us for two of them, a \$1.50 book for three, or a \$2.00 book for four.

This is the biggest and best offer on Socialist books ever made. Reason, we are long on books and short on cash. Start a Circulating Library with these books and watch results. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & CO., 349 East Ohio Street, CHICAGO

Socialism and War

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Author of "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx."

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

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

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

CHAPTERS.

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

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

Price, \$1.00 Postpaid

Forthcoming Books

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

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

SOCIALISM AFTER THE WAR. By Louis C. Fraina.

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

STUDIES IN SOCIALISM. By Isaac A. Hourwich.

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

New Review Publishing Ass'n, 256 Broadway, New York City