

Our Readers Have the Right of Way:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The New Review

Vol. II.

OCTOBER, 1914

No. 10

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

BY ISAAC A. HOURWICH.

I.

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

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

that his client has no defense upon the merits. We are asked to reserve judgment until we hear what the European Socialist leaders have to say in justification of their course. Yet do not the facts speak for themselves?

The Social-Democratic representatives in the German Parliament voted for the special war appropriation. This is an undeniable fact. The Belgian Socialist leader Vandervelde has, with the approval of his party, accepted a place in the Clerical-Conservative Cabinet, which he had fought before. This also is a fact. Jules Guesde and Marcel Sembat have accepted places in the French war Cabinet. This is not an invention of the press agencies. The political meaning of these acts is plain beyond all quibbling. The Socialist delegation in the German Reichstag, by voting for war supplies, has assumed responsibility for the war against France and Belgium. The Socialist parties of France and Belgium, by accepting representation on the Cabinets of their countries, have assumed responsibility for the war against Germany. Thus the Socialist Party of Germany stands arrayed against the Socialist Parties of France and Belgium, and vice versa, just as much as the capitalistic parties of those countries. It matters little that the war was declared by the Kaiser and the Czar; the all-important fact is that the German Socialist Party has responded to the call of its Kaiser, and the French Socialist Party has come to the support of its ally, the Czar. Now, they may all think with the bourgeois peace advocate, Mr. Carnegie, that there are some wars which are good. It cannot be denied, however, that this view is a departure from their former professions of opposition to war generally. The Socialist Party of each country claims that it is merely taking part in a defensive war: the German Socialists are defending their homes against the Czar and his French Socialist allies, and the French Socialists are defending their homes against the German Socialists in military uniforms. It is obvious that this excuse does not hold. The plain and unvarnished truth is that the Socialist Parties do not differ in their attitude towards the war from the capitalistic parties of their respective countries.

There are optimists among the American Socialists who believe that this war may end in the establishment of a German Republic, some even think that the war may lead to the "Social Revolution." Since everybody has gone in for prophesying, I, too, will venture the prediction that there is not the remotest probability of a republic being established in Germany in the course or after the end of this war, no matter which side wins,—let alone what is called "the Social Revolution." But the war has wrought confusion within the Socialist Parties themselves, which it will take a long time to repair.

II.

Let us briefly review the development of the conflict. We must go back to the revolt of the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875, which led first to the war between Serbia and Turkey in 1876 and then to the Russo-Turkish war of 1877. The Berlin treaty of 1878 gave virtual independence to Bulgaria and ended the suzerainty of Turkey over Serbia and Rumania, but Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had stood the brunt of the fight, were put under the "protectorate" of Austria. The Servians of those countries detested the rule of Austria as much as the Egyptians do the protectorate of the "greatest democracy of Europe," which is now waging war against German Imperialism. In 1908, taking advantage of the Turkish revolution, Austria formally annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their dream of national independence was destroyed. The people were too weak to offer armed resistance to Austrian usurpation. Terrorism is the customary method of revolutionary warfare by weak minorities. The Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary, as the recognized head of the militarist party at the Vienna court, was held responsible for the annexation of the Servian provinces and lost his life at the hands of a revolutionary Servian Nationalist. One of my distinguished colleagues on the editorial board of the NEW REVIEW apparently disapproves of this act. He thinks it "was not a very fine or a *very modern* way of settling a political question."

To be sure, in modern democracies, where the government is elected by the people, terrorism has become antiquated, since everybody realizes the futility of defying the will of the majority. It must be borne in mind, however, that the government of Bosnia is not a modern democracy. As for the ethical aspects of the case, the slaying of a foreign invader by a militant Nationalist is upheld by biblical authority in the story of Judith and Holofernes. To take a more recent case, when General Huerta settled in the same way the political controversy between President Madero and the Cientificos, all the diplomatic representatives of the European powers at Mexico City acquiesced in that act, and our own Hon. Henry Lane Wilson strenuously urged recognition of Provisional President Huerta by the United States.

There appears to be a fine distinction, however, between the assassination of a president by a band of successful conspirators backed by a mutinous army, and the assassination of a high dignitary of the State by a small group of conspirators who are staking their own lives. The Austrian government promptly recognized Huerta, but it demanded from the Servian government the prosecution of the persons identified with the movement which led to the

conspiracy against the life of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand. In that demand it had the support of the German-speaking Social Democratic representatives in the Austrian Parliament. In their manifesto published on the eve of the war they say:

We recognize that Austria-Hungary is within its rights in asking from the Servian Government the prosecution of the participators in that crime; we understand that Austria-Hungary demands that the underground plotting against the security and peace of the Austrian Federation of States shall be stopped, that the Servian rulers shall put an end to the encouraging toleration with which they have hitherto regarded this secessionist movement. But we are convinced that the Servian Government would not have been able to offer any opposition to these demands of Austria-Hungary, which are sanctioned by international law, and would, in fact, have offered none.

The assertion of the Socialist authors of this official declaration that these demands of Austria-Hungary are sanctioned by the Law of Nations is radically at variance with the policy of modern semi-democracies. Every revolution in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was prepared by "underground plotting" in foreign countries. The Russian revolutionary organizations, prior to the revolution of 1905, had their headquarters in Switzerland, in England, and in France. The headquarters of the Young Turks, prior to the revolution of 1908, were located in Paris. The Chinese revolution was hatched in England, in Japan, and in the United States. Some of the leading Polish Socialists in the Austrian Parliament were in their younger days in league with revolutionary conspirators against the Russian government in Russian Poland.

It has been the dream of Russian diplomacy to create an international police for the hunting down of revolutionary conspirators throughout the civilized world, but the free nations whose governments are in no fear of revolutionary conspiracies, have assumed an attitude of "encouraging toleration" toward "underground plotting against the safety and peace" of foreign governments.

Bearing in mind, moreover, that King Peter of Servia owes his throne to the assassination of his predecessor, the government of Austria-Hungary was naturally disinclined to rest its claims against Servia upon the "sanction" of the Law of Nations. If Austria-Hungary was justified in her claims, as conceded by her loyal German Socialist representatives, then she cannot be condemned for having chosen the only available method of enforcing her claims. Again, conceding her right to demand from Servia the suppression of the anti-Austrian secessionist movement, one cannot blame her diplomats for declining to submit the dispute to arbitration: Servia would have had no difficulty in proving that the Austrian demands

were an infringement of her sovereignty, and it is a settled principle of International Law that issues involving sovereignty are not "justiciable." It would seem that between the Vienna diplomats and the German-speaking Social-Democratic statesmen of Austria, the former had the better of the argument.

Austria-Hungary was unquestionably in the wrong: as well might Russia demand from the United States the suppression of the organizations of the Russian Social Democrats, whose program advocates the overthrow of the monarchy by an armed uprising of the people. Yet, by declaring war against Servia, Austria-Hungary did not involve any other nation. The Powers had not interfered in the Russo-Japanese war or in the recent Balkan war, and they could have held their peace while Austria-Hungary and Servia fought it out between themselves. But at this moment Russia stepped in and gave the signal for a world-wide war.

Strangely, public opinion in the United States puts the blame upon the Kaiser for this war, overlooking the fact that it was the Czar that threatened Austria-Hungary with war, and that Germany was bound by treaty to aid her ally against attack by Russia, whereas Russia was under no obligation to aid Servia. It was not the Kaiser that forced France to go to war, but the Czar by his interference in the quarrel between Austria-Hungary and Servia. France merely paid the penalty for having agreed to become the vassal of the Czar, in consideration of the prospect of regaining Alsace and Lorraine. It is uncertain whether she will accomplish this end; meanwhile, however, the French youth are driven to slaughter, in order to aid the government of the Czar in its schemes of territorial aggrandizement.

Next came Belgium. From the point of view of the prize ring, the Belgian light-weight, by defying the German heavy-weight, has well earned the applause of every lover of sport. But judged by a higher standard than the traditional idea of "patriotism," the government of Belgium is guilty of wantonly murdering its own citizens.

Belgium is a neutral state, whose independence is guaranteed solely by agreement between the Great Powers. A neutral state is required to resist a violation of its neutrality as far as lies within its power, but in a conflict with a first-class military power its own army does not count. The Duchy of Luxemburg was bound to resist the invasion of its territory by the German army, yet no one seriously expected the army of Luxemburg to go into action against the German army. The Duchess of Luxemburg entered a formal protest against the violation of the neutrality of her territory and quite sensibly declared that she yielded to superior force. Com-

pared with Germany, Belgium is in a class with Luxemburg. When Germany announced her intention to enter Belgian territory, the government of Belgium should have entered a protest with the Powers that had guaranteed her neutrality, but should have refrained from armed resistance.

Neither the independence, nor the integrity of Belgium was threatened by Germany. The German government admitted that it was breaking the rules of International Law, but pleaded military necessity and was willing to indemnify Belgium after the close of the war. In this era of international arbitration Belgium—a neutral state with an army merely for dress-parade—could have rendered an invaluable service to the cause of peace by setting the precedent of invoking arbitration to settle its complaint against a military power. There was a time but a few centuries ago when disputes between individuals were decided by combat. Nowadays, if a ranchman should drive his cattle through your farm, the law will not permit you to shoot him or his cattle, but you must sue him in court for trespass. This would have been a humane and sensible course for Belgium to pursue. The damage which would have been caused to her by the passage of the German troops through her territory would have been as nothing compared with the destruction brought on by her foolhardy resistance to German invasion. Even if France had sent troops to meet the German army on Belgian soil, the damage would have been incomparably smaller than that which Belgium has actually sustained. As it is, her territorial integrity and, possibly, her independence, hangs in the balance.

The violation of Belgian neutrality was seized upon by Great Britain as a pretext to declare war against Germany. The world seems to have forgotten that Great Britain herself set the precedent during the Boer war, when she moved her troops through neutral Portuguese territory in South Africa. That the righteous indignation of British diplomacy is mere pretense, was openly charged by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in his statement which appeared in the *Labor Leader* of Manchester:

It has been known for years that, in the event of a war between Russia and France on the one hand and Germany on the other, the only possible military tactics for Germany to pursue were to attack France hot foot through Belgium, and then return to meet the Russians. The plans were in our War Office. They were discussed quite openly during the Agadir trouble, and were the subject of some magazine articles, particularly one by Mr. Belloc. Mr. Gladstone made it clear in 1870 that in a general conflict formal neutrality might be violated.

Germany's guarantees to Belgium would have been accepted by Mr. Gladstone. If France had decided to attack Germany through

Belgium, Sir Edward Grey would not have objected, but would have justified himself by Mr. Gladstone's opinions.

III.

There is a tendency among orthodox Socialists to blame everything upon capitalism, and more specifically upon the capitalist class, or "the capitalist governments." This habit of thought is particularly strong in the United States, where the capitalists are the dominant, although not the only, power in politics. As I have had occasion to show elsewhere, even in the United States the capitalists and the wage-workers are not the only social-economic classes. In Europe there is no nation whose government can be scientifically defined as a "capitalist government." In every European country there is a readily distinguishable warrior caste, which is founded very largely upon the hereditary principle, albeit not as rigidly enforced as in ancient Egypt. In a fluid society, like our capitalistic world, the warrior caste can exert an influence upon the government only through co-operation with other classes, or social groups, yet it has its own caste interests and caste psychology. The manufacturers of armaments are the only group of the capitalist class that is directly interested in militarism. The Imperialistic adventures further the interests only of a limited group of manufacturers, directly or indirectly interested in the export trade with the colonies. Nowadays piracy is no longer an integral part of maritime trade, as in the days of the Phoenicians. German manufacturers can safely ship their goods to South America in competition with English manufacturers, without the protection of the German navy. It is therefore misleading to seek the cause of the present war in the wiles of "the capitalist class." The farmers and the small shopkeepers of France, who have invested their savings in the Russian military establishment, do not belong to the capitalist class in the Marxian sense of the term, since their income is derived solely or mainly from their own labor, not from surplus-value.

This war has been quite correctly characterized by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald as "a diplomats' war." It is the work of the military caste, which is a survival of the pre-capitalistic period. It was not undertaken with a view to furthering the commercial interests of the countries drawn into the conflict. The Russian diplomats, who took up the cudgels for Servia, did not give a thought to the interests of Russian trade and manufactures, as Russian trade or manufactures had nothing to seek in Servia, or in Bosnia. It is the old dynastic and military game which was played at the European courts in the days of Queen Elizabeth, Louis XIV, or Peter the Great, and at the bottom of it is the military psychology

of that period which has survived in the military caste amidst the commercialism of our own day.

It is quite irrelevant that France is a republic and Great Britain a semi-republic with a *rex sacrificulus** as its nominal head, while the Kaiser is a semi-autocrat. We in the United States, with a Republican party that is not republican and a Democratic party that is not democratic, ought not to be imposed upon by appearances of republican forms. France and Great Britain are fighting the battle of Russian militarism against German militarism. The outcome of the contest cannot be the triumph of republicanism or democracy over militarism, but the victory of Russian militarism over German militarism or vice versa. Of the two, German militarism is decidedly the lesser evil.

Compare Germany since 1870 with Russia throughout the same period. During the worst times of the anti-Socialist law, in 1878-1890, there was incomparably less political proscription and persecution of the Socialists in Germany than at any time in Russia, excepting the few weeks after the general strike of October, 1905. Since the repeal of the anti-Socialist laws political and economic conditions in the German Empire have improved to such a degree that it has ceased to be a country of emigration and has become a country of immigration, while millions of Russian subjects have during the same period emigrated from Russia to other parts of the world. Germany has known no legal discrimination against any class of her subjects, no pogroms, no general proscription of labor organizations or of the labor press, no wholesale imprisonment of newspaper editors, no government raids upon the universities. All these things, and worse, are incidents of the daily routine in Russia. The German Parliament, notwithstanding its limitations, is still a check upon the power of the Kaiser and of the military caste. In Russia the Duma is, by virtue of its very organization, nothing but a subordinate agency of the Autocracy. If it has not been abolished altogether, it is merely because the ruling coterie has recognized the advertising value of that institution for the floating of public loans in foreign financial markets. Weak as she is believed to be, Russia has been able to exercise powerful pressure upon her allies. When the French Parliament, yielding to the anti-militarist sentiment of the people, reduced the term of service in the army to two years, the government of the Czar, under the threat of terminating the alliance, demanded that the three-year term should be restored, and the French government yielded. In this manner the French army was, by the command of the Czar, increased by one-half.

*In Rome the office of "king" was retained for ceremonial religious purposes after the abolition of the monarchy.

The effect of the *entente* upon British home politics has been equally destructive of the prerogatives of Parliament. Mr. MacDonald is authority for the charge that Sir Edward Grey entered into a secret agreement with Russia, pledging the honor of his government to the support of Russia and France without even letting the Parliament into the secret, with the result that the people of Great Britain were eventually drawn into the war and their representatives had not a word to say in the matter until it was too late to withdraw. Is the conduct of Sir Edward Grey toward the British Parliament any different from that of the Kaiser toward the Reichstag? There is this difference, however, in favor of the Kaiser that he has acted within the law, such as it is, whereas Sir Edward Grey has trampled under foot the British Constitution. Under the German Constitution, the Kaiser has the right to declare war and his Cabinet is not responsible to the representatives of the people. Under the British Constitution, the Cabinet is merely a parliamentary committee and is at all times subordinate to the majority in the House of Commons. By assuming to act in a matter of such vital importance without consulting Parliament, Sir Edward Grey restored to "the Crown" (*i. e.*, in fact, to the Cabinet) such powers as it had been forced to yield to Parliament.

Talk of the liberalizing influence of Great Britain and France upon Russia! Throughout the years of the Franco-Russian alliance and of the triple *entente*, neither France nor Great Britain dared to make any suggestion to Russia in behalf of civil liberty. A few years ago the Russian government refused to visé the passport of Sir Samuel Montague, an under-secretary in the British Cabinet, because he was a Jew, yet the proud British government refused to "interfere with the internal affairs of a friendly nation." On the other hand, Russian autocracy has exercised a subtle influence, through the press, upon the public opinion of France and Great Britain. The following excerpts from the French and the British press in the September *Current Opinion* are typical:

The Czar of all the Russias, to follow the Paris *Figaro*, has the soul of the artist—its melancholy, its sweetness and its incapacity to make itself understood save to a discerning few. . . . The poets will understand this Czar, we read, and the painters. He will be intelligible to those priests who share the beatific vision and to all who dream to any purpose. Only within recent years has the greatness of Nicholas II. been suspected, seeing that his great gift—the artist faculty—is hateful to the materialists who in all lands to-day make him the victim of their calumnies and misrepresentations.

According to the Paris *Gaulois*, he has "the temperament of genius":

In his private capacity Nicholas II. is a country gentleman with a passion for the arts and a melancholy and romantic soul.

This eulogy brings to mind another ruler "with a passion for the arts," who is said to have played the harp while his capital was in flames.

Nicholas II., to follow another study of him in the London *Standard*, is a type of sovereign new to Russia. . . . The present ruler of Muscovy is rather of the type of the scholar, turning and hesitating too much like a Hamlet, perhaps, but in all things gentle and lovable. Modest, unassuming, and a thinker, Nicholas II. has an enchanting frankness of manner. . . . Nicholas II. has the melting, trustful eyes which all artists of the devout and orthodox school lend to their saints on the ikons. The expression of the imperial countenance accords well with the eyes, is, in fact, a completion or complement of them, in gentleness, in melancholy and in that subtle but ingratiating something which commands sympathy and interest. The voice, too, is renowned for its sweetness precisely as the manner is unexampled in its courtesy. . . . His career confirms his temperament, for from the day he ascended the throne twenty years ago it has been his consistent practice, we read, to refrain from all personal acts of despotic power. He gave from the outset and long before anything like a constitution was deemed attainable a wider range of freedom to his people than any other Russian ruler ever gave before. He listened to more widely diverging schools of political opinion than any other Czar had listened to. The one school of thought whose destruction he has sanctioned is the school of anarchy which recognizes dynamite as a political weapon and incendiarism as an argument against the rights of property.

Even the New York *Independent*, which has published letters from Walling and Bullard on the Russian revolution and claims to be a progressive magazine, in an editorial discussing "Russia in the Alliance," expresses the view that the Russian people, "if governed at all, are to be governed by an autocracy." Inasmuch as no one will suspect the editor of the *Independent* of insinuating that Russia should not be governed at all, he evidently meant to say unqualifiedly that Russia must be governed by an autocracy. This is the effect of Russian militarism upon public opinion in those countries which sympathize with the allies. If they win, this view will be widely circulated in the American press, for Russia will need the money of American investors.

The defeat of Germany, therefore, does not mean a victory for democracy, but on the contrary a reaction in favor of autocracy and the removal of the European centre of gravity from the reactionary Berlin to the more reactionary Petrograd.

If Germany is beaten, she too will dream of *révanche*. Her

armaments will grow apace with the armaments of victorious Russia, and other nations will have to follow suit.

A republic in Germany? Who will make it? The only party in Germany with a Platonic preference for the republican form of government is the Social Democracy. But the Social Democracy is opposed to rebellion. If there ever was a time which might seem propitious for an armed uprising against the Kaiser, it was the present war, when the army was engaged by the foreign enemy, not to speak of the moral effect of an insurrection upon the chances of war. Yet the German Social Democracy believed that it was too weak to resist the government, because any attempt at resistance would jeopardize the lives of the Socialists. Obviously, the danger of being shot by German soldiers appeared to the Social Democrats more immediate than the probability of being shot by foreign soldiers in the field. Such being the psychology of the German Social Democracy, it is unreasonable to expect that after the war is over and the danger of being shot is over, the Socialists will again court the risk of being shot in an attempt to dethrone the Kaiser.

On the other hand, in Russia victory over the foreign enemy will strengthen the autocracy of the Czar and will make resistance to the government hopeless.

But if the Czar is defeated in the war, the effect at home will be the same as after every preceding unsuccessful war: the opposition will be strengthened, the army will be "demoralized" as the word goes, *i. e.*, weakened, and the government will be forced to make concessions to the people. In France the defeat of Russia will make an end to the alliance with the Czar, which has given France nothing but troubles for her pains. The billions of francs of Russian government bonds will heavily depreciate and hundreds of thousands of French bondholders will lose their savings. This will strengthen the anti-militarist sentiment among the masses and will result in the election of a new Parliament with a more radical complexion.

In Great Britain the sentiment of the people is divided. The resignation of John Burns from the Cabinet is significant, especially in contrast to the acceptance of Cabinet positions by Vandervelde, Guesde and Sembat. An influential faction of the labor forces is opposed to war even now, while it is in progress. The success of Germany would strengthen the anti-Imperialist sentiment among the British voters, and this would inure to the benefit of the Socialist and Radical element at the next election for Parliament.

IV.

What were the Socialist parties to do in this crisis? The Russian Social-Democratic and "Laborite"* members of the Duma set the example of uncompromising devotion to principle. On August 8, one week after the beginning of hostilities, Representative Khaustoff, in open session of the Duma, read a declaration protesting against the war, after which the Social Democrats and the Laborites withdrew from the session, thus declining to vote for military appropriations. If it be remembered that thirty-two Social-Democratic members of the Second Duma were given life terms in Siberia upon trumped up charges, the difference in the mental and moral make-up of the Russian Socialists, on the one hand, and the Socialist delegations in the Parliaments of Germany, France and Belgium on the other, will be the more clearly appreciated.

The French Socialist Party, at its convention held two weeks before the war, decided by a large majority to recommend to the International Socialist Congress, which was to assemble in Vienna, the adoption of a resolution in favor of an international general strike in case of war. This was the plan of Jaurès, the opportunist. The most orthodox, "holier-than-thou," revolutionary, uncompromising, *plus marxiste que Marx*, Jules Guesde vigorously opposed this plan. It is said, concerted action by the International Social Democracy was prevented by the war, which made the holding of the International Congress impossible. This is a very poor excuse. The idea of an international strike against war was first presented to the International Congress of Zurich, as far back as 1893. Certainly, there has been ample time for discussion. But the German Social Democracy, and the Socialist Parties of other countries which worship at the shrine of the German Social Democracy, always opposed this plan. The opposition came, not from the unholy Revisionists, but from the so-called "revolutionary" majority.

The epithet "revolutionary" is cherished by the Socialist Parties from the same sentiment as the epithet "apostolic" by the Greek Catholic Church: it is a pleasing tradition. In actual practice it has become devoid of any definite meaning. We are told that "the historical period in which one possessing and governing group gives way to another, is known as a *revolution*." According to this definition, the Great French Revolution began under Louis XIV, with the system of Colbert, if not before, and was concluded at the close of the nineteenth century, with the defeat of the last Monarchist conspiracy by the Cabinet in which Millerand fell

*The "Laborites" are a party of radical peasants led by intellectuals of Social-Revolutionary antecedents; their fundamental demand is land nationalization.

from Socialist grace. It took all these two hundred years for the feudal aristocracy to give way to the capitalist class as a possessing and governing group. It is evident that what is meant in that definition is not "revolution," but "evolution." Throughout those two hundred years there were popular uprisings, secret conspiracies, spells of terrorism, and periods of peaceable reform. If all these methods are thrown indiscriminately into one pile, nothing but confusion must result.

The truth is that, with the exception of the Russian Socialists, none of the Socialist Parties of the present day is "revolutionary" in the sense of favoring an insurrection of the masses against constituted authority. The belief in a "Social Revolution" as a remote possibility, like the belief in the Second Advent, may still linger with many, but it has no bearing upon their every-day practice. This accounts for the stubborn opposition to the idea of a general strike against war. First it was argued that a general strike was impossible. The success of the general strike in Belgium and particularly in Russia led the "revolutionary" Social Democrats to modify their judgment. The term "general strike" was tabooed by reason of its Anarchist origin and was replaced by the strictly "kosher" term "mass strike." But the opposition to a "mass strike" of the transportation and mine workers in the event of war nevertheless remained as determined as before. It was argued that a mass strike must inevitably develop into a revolution, not of the two-hundred-year variety, but one of physical force; and, if the proletariat were now ready for a revolution it would not have to resort to a strike, it could strike a blow for "Socialism" at once.

In this argument the theory that "revolution" is synonymous with "evolution" is forgotten and it is assumed that the transition from Capitalism to "Socialism," *i. e.*, to a social system based upon collectivism in industry, with the workers in control of the government, can be accomplished at one blow by some "revolution." This is, however, only parenthetical. The main point is that the orthodox Socialist view considers a general strike dangerous or hopeless for the present. That being so, the International Congress, if it could have been held in Vienna, would most probably have voted down the insurrectionary proposition of Jaurès, the Revisionist, which was favored by the moderate Keir Hardie, against the opposition of the Stalwarts. One is forcibly reminded of the lines of Tennyson:

There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in all the creeds.

Certainly there is room for argument upon the practicability

of an international general strike against war. Nevertheless, it does not follow that the Socialist Parties of Germany, France, and Belgium ought to have acquiesced in the declaration of war, as they did. A minority party is under no obligation to assume the responsibility for the conduct of the affairs of the nation. Its function is purely critical.

When the Chancellor invited the Social-Democratic leaders to a conference, it was their duty to tell him that the proletariat of Germany did not want to shed its blood over the dispute between Austria and Servia, that the proletariat of Germany had had no voice in the making of the treaty between Germany and Austria-Hungary and was therefore under no obligation to back up the Austrian government by force of arms even in case Austria should be invaded by the Russian army, and that the German Social Democracy advised the German government to keep its hands off. If Italy was able to find an excuse for repudiating her treaty obligations, surely Germany could have found a good excuse. No doubt, the German Social Democracy would have been decried as "unpatriotic" and might have forfeited the sympathy of many patriotic voters. But what of it? If it is a party that stands for Internationalism, the time to stand up for it is when it is endangered by the expectation of an immediate war which is to set the workers of one nation against their comrades of other nations.

Of course, the objection of the Social Democracy would not have stopped the war. If it had refused to vote for the military appropriations, the anti-Socialist majority would nevertheless have voted the funds demanded by the Kaiser. The danger of the Fatherland being turned into a Russian province would have been averted. But the German Social Democracy would have disclaimed all responsibility for the war, and after the war intoxication was over the Social Democracy would stand before the sobered masses of the German workers as a consistent advocate of international solidarity. As it is, all its protestations before the war have been nullified by its action in voting for the war budget. In fact, these professions merely emphasize the variance between words and deeds. It is an elementary proposition of Constitutional Law that a representative who votes for an appropriation bill assumes the responsibility for the use of the money by the government. It is wrong to hold the Kaiser solely responsible for the war, the Social Democracy has voluntarily assumed a share of the responsibility together with the Kaiser. Had the Social Democratic representatives the right to do so? They were elected upon a platform which expressly forbade them to vote for the budget. It was a breach of their platform pledges to go back upon this inhibition. If they

thought that extraordinary circumstances required a change of policy, it was their duty to resign as representatives and to go back before the voters. Think of the denunciation which the Socialists of the United States would pour upon the head of some "union card" Congressman if he voted against some plank in the A. F. of L. declaration of principles. But when the whole Social Democratic Party in Parliament went back upon a fundamental principle of its policy, the Socialist press of this country urged its readers to reserve judgment until they could hear what the German "comrades" had to say. The statement of Mr. Scheidemann, for a short while vice-president of the Reichstag, is now before us. What does he say? He claims that the German nation had to defend itself against enslavement by Russia. This is preposterous. The days when one nation could turn another great nation into a dependency are gone. Russia could never dream of swallowing up Germany, and what is more, Russia's present allies would turn against her, if she attempted to hold Germany. The question is merely whether German Poland should continue to be enslaved by Germany, or should henceforth be enslaved by Russia. It seems that in such a question the German Social Democracy could well have afforded to observe strict neutrality.

Still, in justice to the staunch republicanism of the German Social Democratic representatives it must be mentioned that, though they voted to give the Kaiser all the money he wanted to murder their French comrades, they declined to shake hands with him!

Not even such a plea, however, can be entered for the Special Envoy of the King of Belgium, "Comrade" Vandervelde. Mr. Mac Donald shows by reference to the White Book that Germany was willing to guarantee the independence and integrity of Belgian territory. There was no justification whatever for the Belgian government to take a hand in the fight. It was the duty of the Belgian Socialists to take a stand for peace and international arbitration. Instead of that they confined themselves (so we are told by Comrade Vandervelde) to singing *L'Internationale*, while firing at their German comrades. Another effect of the contact of royalty with the Socialist Cabinet Minister was the fact, says the Chairman of the International Socialist Bureau, "that the Russian Embassy has conveyed a message from me to the Socialist members of the Russian Duma." The Russian Social Democrats have not been accustomed in the past to communicate with the International Socialist Bureau through the good offices of Russian embassies.

Still the Belgian Socialists claim in justification of their course

that their country was invaded by the Germans. But Great Britain was not invaded. She rushed voluntarily into the fight, ostensibly to protect Belgian neutrality. Yet even this diplomatic drape was swallowed by a portion of "the British section of the Socialist International" (to speak in spread-eagle style).

The French Socialists of all schools claim that their country has been invaded and they are waging a war of defense. They forget the fact that France has been drawn into the war only to aid Russia's schemes of expansion. Jaurès had for years urged the French government to terminate the alliance with the Czar. In the critical hours preceding the declaration of war the Socialists in the French Parliament ought to have demanded the immediate termination of that unholy alliance. But the French Socialists all turned jingoes and rushed to the support of the holders of Russian securities, who have brought on this war.

Jules Guesde has entered the Cabinet together with Millerand, whom he had driven out of the Socialist Party for joining a coalition Cabinet in order to save the republic, which was threatened by a monarchist conspiracy. It was wrong to join hands with the representatives of the bourgeoisie for the express purpose of saving the republic, but it was right to do the same thing in order to divide with the bourgeoisie the responsibility for the sufferings inflicted upon the people by the alliance with the Czar. One of the colleagues of "Comrade" Guesde is M. Delcassé, who was the French Minister to Russia in 1905, when the government instigated the massacre of Armenians by Tartars in Baku. Delcassé knew from the French consul the whole truth about that pogrom, but he officially whitewashed the Russian government of all blame.

The record of the strike-breaker Briand, another conspicuous colleague of the uncompromising anti-ministerialist Jules Guesde, is too well known to be recited here in detail.

V.

The present war has dealt a heavy blow to the accepted principles and policies of the Socialist movement. Its Internationalism has proved but an empty sound.

If there may be wars in which it is the duty of the Socialists to support their governments against a foreign enemy, then of course the nation must be prepared for such emergencies. Socialist opposition to armaments is therefore illogical. Until a general plan of disarmament is adopted by international agreement, every European nation must maintain a large standing army. Militarism is perfectly justified, and the Socialists are guilty of inconsistency when they refuse to vote for the war budget in times of peace. Away then with Socialist anti-militarism!

Heretofore the Socialist found comfort in the faith that Socialism would usher in peace on earth and good will towards men. Can we now be sure even of that?

The majority report submitted by the Committee on Immigration to the Socialist Party convention of 1912 gives little encouragement to that hope. This report was signed by Ernest Untermann, Joshua Wanhope, J. Stitt Wilson and Robert Hunter, all prominent leaders of the party. The following quotation is very instructive:

Race feeling is not so much a result of social as of biological evolution. It does not change essentially with changes of economic systems. It is deeper than any class feeling and will outlast the capitalist system. . . . It exists, not because the capitalists nurse it for economic reasons, but the capitalists rather have an opportunity to nurse it for economic reasons because it exists as a product of biology.

It is bound to play a role in the economics of the future society. If it should not assert itself in open warfare under a Socialist form of society, it will, nevertheless, lead to a rivalry of races for expansion over the globe as a result of the play of natural and sexual selection.

We may temper this race feeling by education, but we can never hope to extinguish it altogether. Class consciousness must be learned, but race-consciousness is inborn and cannot be wholly unlearned. A few individuals may indulge in the luxury of ignoring race and posing as utterly raceless humanitarians, but whole races, never.

Where races struggle for the means of life, racial animosities cannot be avoided.

If race feeling "will outlast the capitalist system," if there is bound to be "a rivalry of races for expansion over the globe" under Socialism, if "where races struggle for the means of life, racial animosities cannot be avoided," where then is the assurance that this struggle will not "assert itself in open warfare under a Socialist form of society?"

A very thoughtful discussion of this question is found in an article by Mr. Ray Stannard Baker, a non-Socialist, in the September *American Magazine*. It is written in the form of a dialogue between the author and an advocate of Asiatic exclusion, whose views coincide with those expressed by the Socialist authors of the majority report on immigration, but have the great merit of being free from all cant.

The author propounds to his friend the following question, which might just as properly be addressed to the above named official spokesmen for the American Socialist Party:

"The Japanese, Chinese, Hindus, and in large measure the Jews, live in overcrowded lands; many of them actually starve every year.

There are vast areas of land in America and Australia which are either partially tilled or else held wholly vacant. Have we, either as individuals or as nations, the right to hold the earth barren while other people or other nations are overcrowded and starving? Is not land monopoly as intolerable among the nations as among individuals?"

His answer is:

"A nation, like an individual man, has a right to decide for itself what it shall hold, and what it shall use."

"But supposing that these overcrowded people of Japan, China, and India, these enormous populations,—starving as they are at this moment in parts of Japan and India,—supposing these starving people should burst out upon us, either as hordes of ill-equipped marauders or, having a better education (as in Japan), with armies, and force their way to a living upon our vacant lands?"

"That is a real danger," said he, "and that is why I believe in a strong navy and a well-disciplined army."

"But with invention the world is growing smaller, and with enlightenment these Asiatic peoples are coming to be as strong as we are, and they are far more numerous. They, too, are getting modern navies and armies. What then?"

"We must fight, if necessary."

This is the only logical conclusion from the race theory of the leaders of the Socialist Party in America.

It is patent that a revision and restatement of Socialist theory will be imperative after the close of the present war. It can hardly be expected that the whole Socialist world will endorse the new policy of the German, the French and the Belgian Socialists. It is characteristic of the bureaucratic spirit of the German Social Democracy that the official theologian of the party, Mr. Karl Kautsky, has hastened with an admonition to the faithful, in the name of "unity," to refrain from criticizing the course of the party in the present crisis.

THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR

BY WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

I—HOW THE GERMAN SOCIALIST PARTY BACKED UP THE KAISER

There has been an almost endless controversy both in the Socialist and non-Socialist press as to the attitude of the German Party in this war, but there are no longer any doubts whatever. After the war had once been declared the German Socialist Party did everything in its power to support the Kaiser in the prosecution of the war. Government credit, as everybody knows, is a very vulnerable thing, especially in war, and the vote of the Socialists in favor of the war grant may be worth billions to the German government. Everybody knows, too, that soldiers cannot do the best fighting without moral enthusiasm. The Socialist Party endorsed the war as being a war of defense, and documents issued by the central committee since the celebrated speech of Haase, on August 4, take the same position, that this is a defensive war. The invasion of Belgium and the concentration of two-thirds of the Kaiser's troops in the invasion of France made no difference whatever.

Before the war the attitude of the Party was all that could be expected or desired. At the meeting of the International Bureau in Brussels on July 29, the same Haase (chairman of the Party) said that the German proletariat would be against war, even if Russia declared war against Austria.

No wonder that the Dutch Socialists and the New York *Volkszeitung* called the voting of the war credits absolutely "incomprehensible"! No wonder that the greatest living political leader of the Marxian school, Jules Guesde, enters the French bourgeois cabinet "to fight against the traitor workmen" of Germany!

What was the exact sequence of events in those troubled days at the beginning of the war? By August 3, Germany and France, as was admitted in the Berlin papers, were engaged in hostilities without any declaration of war. It was on this day that the German Socialists held the conference at which their fateful action was decided upon. And it was also on this day that they had their meeting with the Chancellor, Von Bethmann-Hollweg, at which, as their later action showed, they allowed themselves to be convinced in the essential points by this later and smaller edition of Bismarck. They were converted to his view that "Russia had applied the torch to the house," as Haase's official statement for the Party showed on the following day.

On August 4, in the morning, the Reichstag members went to the Kaiser's palace to shake hands with the War Lord; the Socialists did not disgrace themselves by being present. In the afternoon the Reichstag was called in session and the Chancellor made the statement in which he said that Luxemburg had already been invaded and that if Belgium had not already been invaded it soon would be. Even without this outrage it would still be true that France was regarded as a hostage by the German government, and that Austria, as *Vorwärts* had declared for nearly two weeks, had brought on the war. But suddenly Haase and the majority of the Socialist leaders walked into the very trap that *Vorwärts* and the Leipzig *Volkszeitung* had just said was being laid for them; that is, they put the whole blame on Russia and completely exonerated the German government.

It will be well to quote the essential passages from Haase's speech:

Should the Russian despotism which has stained its hands with the blood of the best of its people achieve a victory, our country and the freedom of its future would lose much, if not everything. It is our duty to obviate that danger and to hold our shield over the civilization and the independence of our country. Therefore we do what we have always promised; in the hour of need we shall not fail our country. In this we feel ourselves in accord with international Socialism, which always admitted the right of every country to national independence and self-defense. In accordance with its teachings, we shall object to a war of conquest. It is our demand that this war must end as soon as we have the certainty that our country is secure, and must be ended by a peace which will make friendship between us and our neighbors a possibility.

Of course, after a speech like this the Kaiser and his government were able to claim that the Socialists favored the war. The truth is that they opposed the declaration of war, though it can no longer be questioned that they supported the war after it was declared. The Chancellor, for example, said:

With our fate that of other countries is bound up. This inspires us with double zeal, for in this war social difficulties have disappeared; even Social Democrats stand behind us. It is an inner moral force that drives us forward.

So delighted were all the enemies of Socialism that the famous German Anti-Socialist League suspended its activities, announcing satisfaction with the Socialist stand and expressing the hope that it would not have to resume its activities after the war.

Nor was this all. The Kaiser himself has given the Party his royal-imperial approval. We quote from the *New Statesman*:

The *Vorwärts*, which in the past could not be sold at the book-

stalls of the State Railways, has now been invited to enter those sanctums of officially stamped loyalty. Restaurants which were boycotted by the military on account of their taking in Social-Democratic newspapers or giving facilities for holding Socialist or Trade Unionist meetings, have had the ban removed from them. Hitherto German workmen who were known to belong to the Socialist Party have been refused work in the Government factories as a matter of principle. General von Bissing, the commander of the Seventh Army Corps, has now placarded the country condemning that reprehensible practice. The event is all the more noteworthy as this gentleman's name appeared, some years ago, signed to an official document which instructed the military as to measures to be taken in case of civil war and street fighting. The document reached the public by means of one of the subterranean channels connecting the German workers' party with the bureaucracy, and created a great sensation at the time.

II—HOW THE GERMAN SOCIALIST LEADERS DEFEND THEIR ACTION

How have the leaders, who at the present moment control the Socialist Party in Germany, explained the action that was taken? A cable from Amsterdam, quoted with approval by the American Socialist press, reports Scheidemann as saying that the German Socialists did not know of the action about to be taken against Belgium. Either the report is false or Scheidemann expressed a falsehood.

It seems that either the German Party or the German government sent the Socialist leaders as emissaries to several countries. Scheidemann was sent to Holland, Haase and Suedekum to Italy, and Fischer to Belgium. Fischer took exactly the opposite position attributed to Scheidemann—if we are to believe the very creditable report, for Fischer has always been an extreme opportunist.

"The march through Belgium was unavoidable because of the life and death struggle," said Fischer. "Stories of German atrocities are lies. Army, consisting of one-third Socialists, above suspicion. Reprisals due to Belgian treacherous attack."

Haase and Suedekum, it seems, were sent to Italy in an effort to induce the Italian Party to use its influence to have Italy join Germany in the war. They were very properly told by the Italian Socialists: "We hope that this infamous war will crush those who provoked it."

Philipp Scheidemann, last year vice-president of the Reichstag, has practically as much right to speak for the German Party as had the chairman, Haase, having occupied even more important positions of responsibility in the Party.

On August 21 Scheidemann wrote a letter to the New York *Volkszeitung*, which was published on September 10. It contains a complete and almost official defense of the action taken in support-

ing the Kaiser in the present war. Scheidemann's letter is so important that all its leading points must be mentioned.

He says that *nobody* wanted the war in Germany and underlines the word "nobody," so that we are given to understand that the war was not desired even by the Crown Prince and the war party.

In spite of the repeated statement of *Vorwärts* to the contrary, he puts the chief blame for the present war upon Russia. In spite of the statement of *Vorwärts* to the contrary, he takes the Russian mobilization as a sufficient cause for the war.

"When France, Republican France, has allied with the Russian absolutism for the purpose of murder and destruction, it is a difficult fact to conceive that England, parliamentary England, democratic England, is fighting side by side for 'freedom and culture.' That is truly a gigantic, shameless piece of hypocrisy." And the sole motive of England is "envy of the economic development" of Germany.

It does not seem to have occurred to Scheidemann that the action of France and England may have been dictated by fear of German militarism. Suddenly this German militarism, which was the arch-enemy of German Socialism, has been forgotten. He continues: "We in Germany have the duty to protect ourselves. We have the task of protecting the country of the most developed Social Democracy against servitude to Russia." But France and England have been called to the greater duty to protect their more democratic civilization against the military absolutism which—by the confession of the German Socialists—governs Prussia and dominates Germany.

Scheidemann passed quickly from this defensive patriotism into the more aggressive and common variety. The superiority of German civilization over all others seems to be so profound a conviction that he takes it as a matter of course: "Russia, France, Belgium, England, Servia, Montenegro and Japan in the struggle for freedom and culture against Germanism, which has given to the world Goethe, Kant, and Karl Marx! This would be a joke if the situation were not so desperately serious."

Scheidemann says that German Socialists are as much Germans as they are Socialists, but the conclusion cannot be avoided from his whole argument that he wants them to be Germans first. He says, "We Social Democrats have not ceased to be Germans because we have joined the Socialist International."

It was reported, as we have said, that Scheidemann recently in Holland had defended his party against the bitter attacks of the Dutch Socialists on the ground that the Germans did not know that Belgium was invaded. In his letter Scheidemann takes the opposite

position and defends this invasion. He approves the German Chancellor's defense of this action, namely, that it was "necessary." It may be true, as he says, that it was used by the British government as a mere pretext. But this invasion was no mere pretext to the International Socialist Movement. The one anti-war principle upon which all the Socialist Congresses agreed unanimously was that neutral countries must not be attacked, and that even Socialists must defend their country against unjust invasion.

After the German government had broken its sacred promise not to violate Belgium, surely the world could not be expected to believe the second promise from the same government that it would withdraw its troops later. It was this invasion that has caused the Socialists of all the smaller countries of Europe to resent the German Socialist action, and has also persuaded the majority of American Socialists to take the same hostile attitude.

Scheidemann is guilty, in the closing part of his letter, of what German Socialists have called "murder patriotism." He wants Germany to conquer France at the earliest possible moment and to force peace on that country, although, being fully acquainted with German imperialism, he must know just what sort of a peace this would be. Moreover, leading German Socialists have often said that the victory of German militarism would enormously strengthen the reactionary forces of Germany, and that only defeat could lead to revolution and progress. He even takes up the exact position of the professional German patriots in this country, claiming that Germany in the early part of the war had everywhere been victorious, that all contrary statements were lies, that German victory was absolutely certain. He goes so far as to claim that the German Socialists have full responsibility for this war, and we may even say that he demands they should have full credit for carrying it on. He quotes Bebel's statement to the government in the Reichstag in 1904: "Gentlemen, you cannot carry on any victorious wars henceforth without our aid."

But Scheidemann's "murder patriotism" is a less serious matter than his perversions of the truth. He says that the whole German people are united for the war and that the Socialists in the Reichstag unanimously voted the war credits. He does not mention the fact that there was a strong minority against this action in the Socialist Central Committee, and that the radical minority in the Socialist group in the Reichstag was bound by party rules to vote with the majority. Last year, it will be remembered, 47 out of 111 Socialist members were against voting military supplies to the government. At least a part of this radical group certainly stood with the minority of the Central Committee and demanded that Socialist

principles be maintained. What do Socialist principles require? There can be no doubt whatever of the answer.

Bebel and Liebknecht refused to vote the war credits in 1870. If two men can take such a stand against the whole of the Reichstag in 1870, surely 112 can safely take the same position today.

III—HOW THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT RECEIVED THE ACTION OF THE GERMAN PARTY

The Socialist press of the world—with the exception of a part of the American and British publications—received the action of the German Party, or of its majority, with the most extreme indignation. *Het Volk*, the official organ of the Dutch Party, declared that there was no doubt that Germany was the aggressor, and Troelstra, leader of the Party and a moderate to boot, said that he hoped the International would be reorganized on a new basis after the war.

The *Volkszeitung* of New York, the leading paper of the German Socialists in the New World, has attacked the German Party leadership in editorial after editorial. It declared it to be "simply unbelievable that our comrades suffered themselves to be driven into their incomprehensible position through fear of the bugaboo of Russian despotism." The *Volkszeitung* contends that the German Party had no ground whatsoever for this fundamental abandonment of Socialism. The *Chicago Arbeiter Zeitung* took the same position. It denounced the action of the German Party, especially for the paralyzing effect it would have upon the masses who had been taught that Socialists were opposed to war. The *Arbeiter Zeitung* summed up the case in these words: "The famous Social Democracy has delivered our cause a blow from which we shall certainly not recover soon," and it continued:

The circumstance that we see Russia on the side of the Western powers undoubtedly makes the matter more complicated for the judgment of the average man of the people. It appears to be clear that one must put himself on the side of those who are fighting against the "Realm of the Knout." But Russia is no longer the center of the reaction in Europe as it was sixty years ago; Germany has taken its place. Besides, the political constellation is a direct result of the politics of Bismarck—i. e., of his unnecessary humiliation of France, which was thus directly driven into the arms of Russia. These circumstances, moreover, make very much less the danger to civilization which might result from a possible defeat of Germany.

Among numerous illuminating arguments of the New York *Volkszeitung* several deserve special mention. It points out, for example, that the victory of Germany would very probably result in the destruction of the French republic and the resurrection of the monarchy. It demands that neither France nor Germany should be

crushed after the war. And finally, it asserts in the most positive way that Germany was the aggressor. For example, it brings this decisive argument against the "patriotic" New York *Staatszeitung*:

The German Emperor, said the *Staatszeitung*, declared war constitutionally, because Germany is attacked, and the whole German people will support the "War Lord," that greatest of generals, in repulsing this attack. By whom has Germany been attacked? By whom has Germany been injured? Up to now no one had heard that war had been declared because Germany had been attacked; we thought, rather, from the official declarations of the German authorities and the Kaiser, that the grounds for war lay in the alleged mobilization movements of Russia. Just how it stands, however, with this mobilization of Russia—which, according to William's speech, was practically completed—is revealed in yesterday's official communication from Berlin (August 10th), where it is stated that at least six weeks more will be required before it can be fully accomplished.

The position of the two German American Socialist organs is identical with that taken by the Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, the second most important Socialist paper of Germany, in the days immediately before the war. Said this famous Socialist organ:

It is the intention of the German government to stir up the German proletariat to a war with Russia by means of an outworn ideology (that of 1848) . . . A war of Western or Middle Europe against Russia is no longer for the revolution; it is a war against the revolution.

IV—THE REVOLUTIONARY WING OF THE GERMAN PARTY STILL STANDS FOR INTERNATIONALISM AGAINST NATIONALISM

It must not be supposed for one moment that the whole German Party participated in this extraordinary moral collapse. It will be remembered that at the last Party Congress the tacit principle of proportional representation, which had hitherto governed the elections to the Executive Committee was abandoned—against vigorous protest. Though the revolutionary minority represented more than one-third of the Congress, it was given only one or two members on the Central Committee. Yet we read that even in this ultra-opportunist body one-fourth were opposed to the surrender of Socialist principle. We can therefore assume that, of the Socialist members of the Reichstag, the usual proportion held out for revolutionary action—that is, 40 or more members out of the 112—being bound, however, by the obligation to vote with the majority in the Reichstag. And when we say revolutionary action, we refer not to the idea of the general strike, which probably did not have a single supporter, but to the action taken by Bebel and Liebknecht in 1870. They did not go so far as to vote against the war credits at that time, for sufficient reasons of personal prudence, but they *abstained*

from voting. Nobody can deny that it was open to the German Party to do so at the present time. But the main point is that the majority not only forced the minority to vote for the credits, but actually labelled the Kaiser's war as a defensive war and so gave it their moral support.

It must be noted that both before and after the war *Vorwärts*, which shapes its course very largely according to the desires of the revolutionary Socialists of Berlin who constitute the majority of its readers, took a very different position from that of the Central Committee. Over and over again, in the days before the war, it declared that Austria was responsible for the war, that it might lead to defeat and to revolution, and it even went so far, only a day or two before the war broke out, as to say that even Russian mobilization was not sufficient ground for the declaration of war by Germany. And even since the war *Vorwärts* has used every effort to keep before the German people the fact that France and Belgium are being attacked and invaded. It has pointed out that the French people are resisting to the utmost, that the Belgians are doing the same, and that this is no more than should be expected. *Vorwärts* has gone so far that bourgeois correspondents have caught its drift and praised it for its courage. For example, it protested against the treatment of the civilian population of Belgium and said that it was doing no more than the German law allowed the Landsturm to do in case of invasion of Germany. Incidentally, it may be said that the declarations of the German government itself leave no doubt whatever of its organized and purposeful brutality—the evident object being to save troops which might be required to guard the line of communications by keeping the population in terror. Not only was the whole city of Louvain "punished" according to German government declarations, but official warnings issued to the French and Belgian governments threatened that the war might become brutal and cruel, while putting the blame, of course, on France and Belgium. This is in direct contrast to a similar declaration of the French government, which was merely an appeal to the civilized conscience of neutral countries.

The *Vorwärts'* editors, facing the danger of instant execution under martial law, continued their intrepid exposures from day to day. Another splendid illustration was printed in a New York *Times* dispatch of September 10:

The *Vorwärts* of Berlin says that war prisoners are now being treated badly in Germany as the result of the revulsion of feeling caused by the press criticism of women who at an earlier stage of the war gave cigarettes and chocolates to prisoners arriving at the railway station.

The *Vorwärts* cites the cases of a nurse who was severely reprimanded for writing his will for a dying French count, and of the killing of a Belgian clergyman in a prison camp in Saxony on the ground that he had incited a civilian attack on the Germans in Belgium.

The *Vorwärts* concludes by asking whether the troops have not instructions to afford proper protection to prisoners of war.

The New York *Call* produces more evidence concerning the courageous attitude of the *Vorwärts*:

The *Vorwärts* did not even have a line of comment on the matter of the Socialists voting in favor of the war budgets. Had the comrades of the *Vorwärts* felt that it was a right step on the part of the Socialist parliamentary group they would have defended their action. Of course the censor would not have prohibited the publication of an article in favor of the Socialist parliamentary group. . . .

When Germany entered Belgium the *Vorwärts* could not say any more than the following:

"Now when the war god reigns supreme not only over Time but also over the press, we cannot say about the invasion of Belgium what we would like to express about it. . . ."

When it became a well established fact that Italy had decided to break with the Triple Alliance, every "patriotic" German cried out against Germany's former ally. But not the *Vorwärts*. Instead of condemning Italy, it spoke enthusiastically in favor of its maintaining the position of neutrality. Regarding Italian neutrality, the *Vorwärts* said:

"Unfortunately, we also hear workers condemning the position of Italy—workers who have for years been considered as enlightened, and to whom the menace of imperialism has been preached for years. We must confess the preaching evidently was not very effective. . . ."

On Monday, August 3, when the Social Democratic group in the Reichstag decided to vote in favor of the war budget, the *Vorwärts* printed an article condemning German "patriotism" and the "patriots" who suddenly became warriors for "freedom against Czarism."

The article, which is entitled "War Against Czarism," expresses the fallacy of German patriotic jingoists who have for years been trying to plunge the country into a war by crying that it is being menaced by the enemy.

It also ridicules the position of the government which for years has sided with Russian barbarism and the Czar and persecuted Socialists for "insulting" Nicholas, but which suddenly changed its front and adopted the stand of Marx, Engels and Bebel, who always spoke of the necessity of smashing the Czar's rule.

The article continues:

Since the above-named leaders of the Social Democracy ex-

pressed their opinion that it was necessary to wage a democratic war against Russian despotism, conditions have changed considerably.

Russia to-day is no longer a stronghold of reaction, but it is a land of revolution. The overthrow of the monarchy and Czarism is now the aim of the Russian people in general and the Russian workers in particular.

The article then goes on to state that shortly before war was declared Russia was in the midst of a revolutionary blaze that was sweeping the country. Czarism has not been weakened by the declaration of war, but on the contrary it has been considerably strengthened. The war has given the despotic government a chance to distract the hatred of vast numbers of Russian people against the monarchy and Czarism, and gain the confidence of the people by its incitation against the Germans. By its agitation, the German Socialist Democracy had shown the Russian people that its enemy is not across the border, but right in their own home.

Nothing was more unpleasant to the Russian reactionaries, the "real Russian" jingoes, than to hear of the great peace demonstrations of the German Socialists, continues the editorial. Oh, how glad they would have been to come out to the revolutionary working class in Russia and say, "Why, the German Socialists call upon the people to war against the Russian people."

The "little father" at St. Petersburg would have felt as though a great burden had been removed from him. He would have exclaimed: "That's just what I need! Now, that the German Socialists call upon the people to war on Russia, my worst enemy, the revolutionary movement has broken its backbone. The international solidarity of the working class is now smashed, and I can get a chance to let out a yell of patriotic nationalism. Oh, I am saved!"

Prussian militarism, extending the normal methods of Prussian absolutism (we saw it at Zabern) to more civilized countries, finally aroused not only the public opinion of all countries, but the action of the International Socialist Movement. Even this, as we see from the following dispatch, was not enough to detach the Socialist Nationalists from their new alliance with the Kaiser. Here we have the beginning of the end. "Socialistic" Nationalists are taking one road, International Socialists another. The dispatch reports that "a part of the board" of the German Party indignantly protests against the action of the International Bureau:

Vorwärts published declaration of board of German Socialist Party, strongly condemning the manifesto of the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau. *Part of board* indignantly protests against concealment of step by Executive Committee to German Socialist Party, which so had no opportunity to counteract. *Part of board* protests against suspicion expressed in manifesto against German soldiers' humanity; states that manifesto is inciting neutral countries against Germany while concealing Belgian franc-tireurs' and Russian Cossacks' atrocities.

We need not doubt that a considerable part of the board, a still

larger part of the Reichstag members, and perhaps even a majority of the Party members will remain with the International. It is probable that at least 400,000 members of the German Party still maintain the revolutionary position and that these members will grow rapidly in case of military defeats. If we remember, also, the very violent and successful anti-military agitation of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg during the last year, we may confidently hope for a revolutionary outcome—provided the war lasts long enough for a revolutionary movement to develop, say six months or a year. For it must be recalled that the German workmen in the last few months have been more embittered than ever. Rosa Luxemburg, it will be recalled, collected 32,000 cases of recent military abuses and even secured over a thousand persons who had the courage to offer themselves as witnesses against the military authorities.

So there is every reason to give credence to the widespread expectation of a German revolution after a crushing defeat, as we read, for example, in the dispatch of a Danish correspondent of the *New York Times*:

The Socialist workingmen—what of them? Their newspapers reveal a strong undercurrent of criticism amid apparently patriotic protestations. The Socialist journalists of Germany are experts in implying sedition in cleverly written articles which nevertheless keep within the limits of law. In the last four weeks many of them have been writing anti-militarist articles under the guise of patriotic appeals. Their comments reveal a differentiation between Germany's war against Russia and Germany's war against Belgium, France, and England. Their advice to the workman to defend his country zealously against the Russians rings true; but their opposition to attacks on the western countries is evident.

When the German soldiers return home and tell the story of the war and compare notes with their Socialist comrades there will be a terrific upheaval against the theory of "Kanonenfutter" ("food for powder"), which is really the foundation of the whole military system of the country. The experts of the German General Staff regard the common soldier as "fodder for the enemies' cannon," as the phrase goes. This has been clear enough in all the battles of this campaign, and the German troops themselves must fully realize it by this time. I predict that the survivors will be bloodthirsty revolutionists when they reach home again; and many of us who know the latent strength of the German Socialist movement will not be surprised if the Kaiser and his principal advisers are hanged on the lamp posts of Unter den Linden at the end of the campaign.

V—THE POSITION OF THE GREAT GERMAN SOCIALISTS

There is a very careful though brief statement of Kautsky in the *Neue Zeit* of August 16 as to the probable results of the war. It begins with endorsing the position of the Party that France and

England had followed Russia into the war—apparently not even considering the supposition that the militarism of Germany was so powerful as to force France and England to call in Russia to help to crush it, a supposition absolutely justified by the subsequent difficulties of the Allies.

Very wise is Kautsky's remark that the objects of the war would first crop out when the relative strength of the various powers is settled. Then the victors will suddenly have the courage for all sorts of demands.

However, some results of the war already appear as highly probable, especially in reference to the nations not directly involved. The United States, for example, is sure to get very great benefits. Moreover, this will have the result that American industries will develop to such a degree that Europe will be absolutely unable to continue her vast armaments and still compete effectively with us.

Next Japan, China, India, Persia, Turkey, etc., will be in large measure relieved from the oppression of the European powers. This will not only strengthen them but will lead to a second result of world-wide benefit. For the stronger these outlying states become, the less practicable is the continuation of the present imperialistic politics of the great powers.

Kautsky is also absolutely confident that there will be a great shifting of the balance of political power within each nation, and that this shifting will be in favor of the democracy, though he does not hazard any calculation as to how far it will go. In fact, he says at the beginning of his article that his mouth is closed on the most important phases of the situation.

Kautsky's conclusion seems most mistaken and unfortunate. He makes an appeal for Party discipline as being especially necessary in war time. On the contrary, one of the greatest results to be hoped for from this war is the destruction of Prussian military discipline and then of Prussian Socialist discipline, its direct result—a method of organization totally unjustified in more democratic countries. The heat with which Kautsky speaks of this matter, however, leads one to suppose that he sees a very near menace of a Party split. We can confidently hope that his feeling is correct and that the reformists will be thrown out as they were in Italy. They can then form a powerful and very valuable social reform Party with the bourgeois radicals—a party which will not make any pretense to internationalism. This will leave the Socialist Party in exclusive control of Socialism and Internationalism.

But we can find still stronger German Socialist authorities against the action just taken by the German Party. The *Volks-*

zeitung of New York reprints an article written by Engels for the *Neue Zeit* in 1892, in which occurs the following passage:

"No Socialist of whatever nationality can wish the triumph of the present German government in the war, nor that of the bourgeois French republic, least of all of that of the Czar, which would be equivalent to the subjection of Europe, and therefore the Socialists of all countries are for peace. But if it comes to war nevertheless, just one thing is certain—this war in which fifteen or twenty million armed men will slaughter one another, and all Europe will be laid to waste as never before—this war must either bring the immediate victory of Socialism, or it must upset the old order of things from head to foot and leave such heaps of ruins behind that the old capitalistic society will be more impossible than ever and the social revolution, though put off until ten or fifteen years later, would surely conquer after that time all the more rapidly and all the more thoroughly." Engels, then, expected the advance of Socialism from a general European war, not through the patriotic defense of any country by the Socialists, but through the revolutionary action of all at the proper moment. The victory of Germany would be quite as bad, or almost as bad, as the victory of Russia.

But, better still, we have a very wise expression of Karl Marx bearing immediately upon the situation, in an address to the International Workingmen's Association, delivered on September 9, 1870. In this address he made the following remarkable prophecy:

Do the Pan-Germans really believe that the freedom and peace of Germany are assured, if France is driven into the arms of Russia? If the fortunes of war, the arrogance of victory, and the dynastic intrigues of Germany, result in the plunder of French territory, two ways remain open: Either Germany must become the open tool of the Russian spirit of conquest, or it must prepare itself, after a short period, for a new "defensive" war. Not one of those "localized" wars, but a race war against the allied Slav and Latin races.

Here we have, in Marx's bitter satire, a branding of the idea that the present German war is a "defensive" one, in view of Germany's conquests of 1870, and also of the pretended efforts of the German government to "localize" it.

WAR-TIME REFLECTIONS

BY FLOYD DELL.

For the breakdown of "International Socialism" in this war, the world has already mockingly forgiven us. But we shall find it less easy to forgive ourselves. For we believed in the international pretensions of our movement.

Putting aside the moot question of the general strike against war; putting aside the vain boastings of those who believed that in the loose confederation of all the various national Socialist movements we possessed an efficient machinery for blocking the decisions of governments bent on war,—there remains the fact that we did expect the Socialists of any nation to do *something* to keep that nation from precipitating a general conflict.

We expected them to try, and in some measure to succeed. It is impossible for us to say that they could not have succeeded. All we know is that they have not tried. Perhaps success would have been out of the question. Perhaps there could have resulted nothing more than a splendid failure, like the Paris Commune of 1871. But the last thing in the world that we did expect was that the Socialists of a nation bent on precipitating a European war would join in giving aid to that intention. This, however, is what the Socialists of Germany have done.

We know little about the feelings which prompted the German Socialists to their action. But we do know that the Socialists in the Reichstag voted the war credits demanded by the Emperor. We know further that two Socialist members of the Reichstag went on a mission to Italy to try to persuade Italian Socialists to bring pressure on their government to take sides with Germany.

Whatever feeling against the war existed in the German Socialist movement, it was slight enough to be inoperative. And whatever the reason for the action of the party's representatives in the Reichstag, whether cowardice, or hysterical fear of the Slavs, or vulgar considerations of party advantage, or some carefully reasoned conviction that the German working people would benefit by such a war, their motives cannot affect our judgment of what they have actually done. We are under the obligation of assessing their actions, of viewing them in the light of Socialist purposes, of anticipating as best we can the verdict of history upon them. And what we find, according to our present knowledge, is that they have identified themselves with the cause of militarism, and betrayed the hopes of Socialist Internationalism.

It is necessary, if we are to have a sound view of this war, to fix this responsibility where it belongs. It is not necessary to waste

indignation in words upon those we condemn—especially as it is impossible in such an article as this to discuss and dispose of all possible defences to be made for them.

Of course, the view that the German Socialists have acquiesced in the starting of a world-war depends upon the view that the German nation did start this world-war. And that view, in spite of the elaborate explanations of German officials and civilians, is so solidly based on the facts revealed in the diplomatic correspondence preceding the conflict, as to be hardly a matter for dispute. Whatever Germany thought to gain, or avoid losing, by plunging the world into such a war, the responsibility for the war rests with her.

But no less important than that is Germany's responsibility for the militarism antecedent to, and inevitably provocative of, this war. Given the militarism which Germany has forced upon Europe with increasing rigor since 1870, there could be no other outcome than such a war. And if the war had been begun, not in insolence by Germany, but in a panic of fear by the Allies themselves, the responsibility would still rest where it does now.

The actual precipitation of the war has made this at least plain to us—that militarism has been a far greater menace to the plans of Socialism than was ever guessed. And with that should come another realization—that the duty of the Socialist movement to smash, to help smash, militarism, is more important than we ever guessed. We are confronted now with the inescapable fact that nothing can be done, that nothing that has been done can stand, that programs of social reform and of revolution alike are futile, until the menace of militarism is driven from the world.

But we are not back in the times when this realization could have been made effective in peaceful propaganda, in education, in political measures. We are in the midst of war. In this war must be determined to some extent this very issue of militarism.

To some people it may seem ridiculous to conceive of a war against militarism. Yet more than anything else, in the light of our Socialist purposes, the war conducted by the Allies against Germany assumes the aspect of a war against militarism. At least we can believe that the crushing of the power which has forced militarism on Europe, and which stands before the world as the great example of a militaristic nation, would leave the way clear for a thorough, determined and efficient campaign of anti-militaristic propaganda. With Germany triumphant, the success of militarism blazoned to the four ends of the earth, we must be prepared for a period of militaristic enterprise too desperate for sanity to hold out against. It is a tragic necessity now to crush by force of arms the great exponent of the virtues of militarism.

The defeating of Germany is a task in which the Allies should have our Socialist sympathies. In a very real sense this is "our war."

It may again seem preposterous to some people that Socialists should take any side in a war. They may be under the impression that "Socialists do not believe in war." It is necessary to correct that impression.

Socialism is not identical with the humanitarianism that says, "There never was a good war or a bad peace." Socialists do not believe that the shedding of blood is too high a price to pay for any great gain of human liberty and happiness. The actions of Socialists in the past, and the plans of Socialists for the future, should be a guarantee that we do not fear to assume the responsibility for taking and losing human lives in behalf of a cause. The rifle has not been discarded as a weapon of last resort in the revolutionary movement. Socialists are ready to meet the supreme test of a conviction—a test which though it cannot prove the truth of a conviction, can at least prove its reality—to kill and be killed for it.

But that is a special case. Socialists might indeed be ready to fight for their ultimate convictions, without being willing to fight, or to look with sympathy on the idea of fighting, for anything less magnificent. To such a view the action of Belgian and French Socialists, who are certainly not fighting for the co-operative commonwealth, might seem as inconsistent with Socialist internationalism as the action of the German Socialists.

But the trouble with that view lies in the ironical refusal of life ever to give us a chance to fight for our ultimate ideal. We must always fight for something smaller. To wait for the thing really worth fighting about would be merely a pretty way of refusing to fight for anything. And things after all must sometimes be fought for.

It is a pleasant assumption habitually made nowadays that war is no longer an agent in the process which we call civilization. It is granted that wars in the past have sometimes been necessary and even good for the world—that they have freed people from oppression, destroyed old institutions, made mankind in the long run happier. But it is beautifully assumed that the time when wars could produce such results is past. Nowadays, in the pacifist view, all wars are foolish and useless. At what date precisely this change in the nature of war took place they neglect to inform us.

In the absence of such information we may safely assume that war to-day is what it has always been—a terrible and cruel proc-

ess out of which there *may or may not* come beneficent results.

We have grown too conscious of its horrors, and we are too uncertain of its results, to invoke it lightly. But the time comes when with a full consciousness of its horror and uncertainty we are compelled to invoke it in the name of all that we believe in. Such a compulsion has fallen upon Vandervelde in Belgium, on Guesde in France. Such a compulsion has come upon the former anti-militarist, Hervé. And if it be lightly said that the same compulsion was felt by the German Socialists in the Reichstag, we can only reply solemnly that they were wrong, and the others right. They there in the Reichstag were lending their strength to the support of militarism, and the others in France and Belgium were giving their strength to its destruction.

Socialists, it may be repeated, are not against war. They have sometimes advocated war, as did Karl Marx in 1848, when he called for war against Russia, which at that time occupied the position of the German Empire to-day, as the greatest stronghold of reaction in Europe. He wanted such a war, with all its tragic price of death and pain and destruction and women's tears, as the best method of strengthening the forces of progress and democracy in Europe. And the result showed that the inexorable Marx was right and the sentimentalists were wrong. At the call of the Hapsburgs, the armies of the Tsar crushed the revolution in Hungary, and this was followed by the defeat of the revolutionary movements everywhere, in Italy, in Prussia, and throughout Germany.

Marx's cry for war against the rock of European reaction was raised at a time of revolutionary upheaval. In a period of social stagnation and philanthropic "betterment," such as we have been living in, no Socialist, were he even as prescient and as daring as Marx, would have ventured to call such horrors from the void. But one can at least go so far as to emulate Marx's example in the 'sixties, when he analyzed our own Civil War, and showed by the most cogent and forceful reasoning that the interests of civilization required a victory by the North over the South. Moved by his argument or by their own similar beliefs, thousands of German Socialists in this country took up arms against the Slave Power. The war for the Union became their war. And a letter from Lincoln to the head of the International, expressing appreciation for the services rendered to the Union cause by the agitation among the starving factory operatives of Lancashire, shows how important this issue seemed to the great Socialist leader. He knew that the Socialist movement does not create its own issues and hold aloof from all others. It fights where it can and must.

So much has been said here of the menace of militarism, that

it may be well to point out that Socialism holds no fixed hostility against preparations for national defense. Militarism has been an enemy to civilization, precisely because it expends the wealth of a nation in times of peace in preparing for a war that will be waged—if for any reason at all besides the hysteria of fear—in the interests of the ruling classes; and by expending that wealth for armament, prevents its being used for purposes of education or social amelioration. It is now an even greater enemy, not because it is engaged in killing off some hundreds of thousands of men and women and children—civilization can survive that—but because it threatens, with German triumph, to waste the next century in more stupendous preparations for war—by Germany for new aggressions, by the other nations for resistance and “revenge.”

But if—let us imagine it—any nation should come, through the partial or complete triumph of Socialist ideas, to occupy a position similar to that of France during the great Revolution, then national defense and even national aggression might quite conceivably become a policy of such a nation. Campaigns would be waged to advance the cause of liberty, and war would carry Socialism into hostile lands—in which, to be sure, the oppressed workers would join the armies of the invader.

It is perhaps not pretty to think about. But progress is not pretty. Progress comes through all the ugly and evil things of the earth—through slavery, and serfdom, and capitalism with all their horrors—those that are natural to them as well as those that accompany their birth and dissolution.

It is our high privilege as Socialists to face this truth and admit it. It is because we have seen mankind working through these dreadful agencies toward happiness that we are Socialists. Only through these things, we know, can happiness come to the human race. We cannot turn from this last horror of Armageddon. We must think about it: and perhaps fight in it. It is our war.

THE ATTITUDE OF ITALY

BY ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

From the very beginning of hostilities between Austria and Servia there was not the slightest probability that Italy would side with the Austro-German cause. There was some ambiguity in Premier Salandra's declaration of July 28 that in the event of war Italy “would adhere to her duty in the strictest interpretation of her treaty obligations.” It was this declaration that was heralded by the press of Berlin and Vienna as an assurance of Italian support; and as late as the battle of Liège the Kaiser was announcing that “Italy was awaiting only the favorable moment to enter the conflict as part of the Triple Alliance.” This view may have been favored also by the editorials of a few clerical newspapers in Italy, which were as a matter of tradition sustaining the theory of contract as inviolable even against questions of national interest. But the trend of Italian opinion clarified itself somewhat on the declaration of neutrality on August 2, which among other things forbade the exportation of all munitions and foodstuffs from the kingdom. The immediate effect of this was the cancellation of enormous orders from Austria for wheat and coal in Italian ports. Salandra's justification of this stand was to all intents and purposes a nullification of the Triple Alliance. The fact that owing to internal disturbances and to the presence of the English fleet Italy was strategically unable to declare war was subordinate to another most significant declaration: that Italian interests had not been considered or consulted in the commencement of war; that Italian interests had been ignored in the assault on Servia without seeking Italy's opinion; and finally that while Italy was bound by treaty and was still ready to sustain Germany and Austria against Russian aggressions, no interpretation of the treaty of 1912 could possibly oblige Italy to become party to a *German assault on Russia and France*. What went on in Rome during the first week in August is of course a matter of speculation. But the government press was quite free in characterizing German tales of French aggressions in Alsace, aimed at establishing a *casus foederis*, as “miserable inventions.” And when the Italian ambassador at Vienna brought to Italy the offer of Trent as a bribe for Italian support, the same press openly proclaimed that when Italy entered Trent it would not be with Austrian permission but with the force of Italian arms.

But the Triple Alliance was not broken by Salandra's position in

this crisis. So far as popular opinion was concerned, the Alliance came to an end with the annexation by Austria of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Italo-Turkish war might still have saved the situation. But Austria's threat to intervene in the event of Italian attacks upon Valona and Turkish Albania made it clear to everyone that the main purpose of the "Triplice" was to affirm Austrian predominance in the Balkans without interference from Italy. The Italo-German-Austrian alliance had been in Italy a matter of official attitude, without roots in popular consciousness, which was always, as it still is, bitterly anti-Austrian. Austrian tactics of the last five years have progressively tended to lend to that official attitude a coloring of humiliation and cowardice.

Meanwhile the Italian government has had much to contend with in preventing a popular stampede toward the Triple Entente. Salandra's urging of internal disturbances as preventing him from war was somewhat hypocritical. The republican and anti-monarchical movement in Romagna, and the Socialists generally would enthusiastically support a war, but a war only against German militarism and against Austrian outrages in Illyria. It was officially reported in Italy that during the first week of August fifty executions took place in Trieste alone. Refugees from Dalmatia reported a veritable reign of terror. At Ragusa the Italian mayor was shot. In the bombardment of Antivari only the docks of the Italian steamship lines were damaged. The popular reaction to these outrages was enormous. It is difficult to imagine the intensity of the execration that under the ominous reserve of the Italian populace was secretly rising against the Austrians. On the 15th of August the English fleet was reported off Pola and the *Corriere della Sera*, a conservative paper, predicting the annihilation of the Austrians, recalled the Italian dead sleeping beneath the waters of Lissa and lamented that when the hour of vengeance was sounding Italy was inactive and about to let the stain of defeat become indelible. There is, to be sure, great actuality in the question, "Will Italy enter the fight?" But to those who have followed the course of events in Italy the question takes rather the form, "Why has Italy kept aloof so long?"

The fact is that we should never speak of "Italy" as we speak of "France" and "Germany." There is, without doubt, more meaning in the word "Italy" than there was twenty years ago; but if then the word was a geographical term it is still largely a geographical term. The very fact that a "nationalistic" party can spread through the country with such novelty of propaganda shows that the danger of the trend represented by the secret unions of the South is felt as a reality to be combated even by violent means.

For in tactics the new nationalistic party may be described as the I. W. W. of the Northern bourgeoisie. "Italy" as a political term means the Italian government in Rome representing the great industrial interests of the North, which, in return for the lucrative profits to industry guaranteed by a high protective tariff, give it undivided support against republican and socialistic agitation and against the separatist tendencies of the South. The South's part in this government is, as regards the populace, of no account. The South is controlled by the government through an intricate scheme of political corruption, from which the veil was partly lifted in the Palizzolo case in 1900-1904, the Nasi case in 1906-1908, the famous Viterbo cases of recent date, and in June began the rumbles of a new scandal involving a high Italian diplomat and the Naples police. Color this picture lightly or darkly as you wish. Italy is divided by economic pressure into at least two distinct units, whose immediate interests are at present irreconcilable. The industry of the North can compete at home with German and French competitors only with a high protective tariff. Italy's predominance in the foreign market is exclusively agricultural and to the advantage of the South. But here the South meets the retaliatory tariffs of France, Switzerland and Germany. The present Italian government rests, then, on the impoverishment of the South to which the North sells at increased rates and which it compels to sell under adverse conditions. If Italy enters the war, the day of reckoning, whatever the outcome of the conflict, would soon be at hand. The South, more populous, would foot a larger share of the bill, both in taxes and in blood. Will the government dare to face the danger of readjustment at home that would be sure to follow, and follow all the more rapidly when the free traders of the South, would, as regards loyalty to any Northern ministry, become the allies of the revolutionary proletariat of the North? The popularity of a war against Austria would for the moment, beyond any question, temporarily sustain an aggressive ministry. Italy in Trent, and possibly in Trieste, Pola, Cattaro and Valona would indeed serve some purpose in an elementary class in geography and history. But would the "control" of the Adriatic, with all its emotional compensations, make up entirely for the dreary visitations of the tax collector for some years to come? The most enlightened representatives of the Northern bourgeoisie are asking themselves this question very earnestly. Thus far they have considered as least risky the policy of "watchful waiting." They have spread their baskets beneath the tottering empire of the Hapsburgs, praying to the Italian martyrs of '48 and '59 that some bits of the debris, whoever wins in the war, may fall. Overzealous partisans of the Allies are calling Italy's attitude an

example of cowardice, suggesting that at the end Italy will jump in on the winning side. Italy cannot fight for Austria against France and England. Such a course would produce a popular rebellion in which the House of Savoy would collapse. The most immoral nationalist fears this quite as much as he does the English fleet. Will she enter with the Allies? It is doubtful whether war would bring her in the Adriatic greater gains than she may actually be able to dictate as the price of neutrality. This accounts for Italian inactivity thus far. Should any situation arise endangering Italy's African conquests and extending Austrian dominance in the Balkans, her course can change. But the Northern bourgeoisie must become clearly conscious either of a vital danger or a positive gain before it is willing to confront a rejuvenated problem of the South.

FRENCH SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR

All reports, both Socialist and non-Socialist, indicate that Belgian and French Socialists are now unanimous for war. They were unanimous against it until the violation of Luxemburg and Belgium.

A despatch in the *New York World* of September 7th sums up the view of the French Socialist Party:

French Socialists have issued a manifesto in three languages as proof to international Socialists that the French and Belgian sections have done their duty in favor of peace as against war. It recalls the French section's opposition to armament, colonial expansion, the Government's Moroccan policies and the three-years' term of service, which was the result of Germany's increasing army.

The party kept itself in close contact with the French Government during the crisis due to Austria's ultimatum to Servia. When Servia's pacific reply was rejected, proving that imperialist Germany inspired and desired war, the Socialist party assured itself that France had made every effort to maintain peace.

German Socialists in Paris fully approve the party's attitude, but Socialists in Germany seem to have been deceived, says the manifesto, in regard to the facts.

The manifesto says that the accusations are false that French aviators dropped bombs on the city of Nuremberg, that French troops were invading or preparing to invade Belgium before the violation by Germany of the neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg.

The manifesto concludes that the Socialists of France and Belgium submitted to the hard necessities of war, convinced that they were thereby upholding the principle of liberty and the rights of peoples to dispose of themselves.

More important even than the French Party's endorsement of the war is that the leaders of its two wings, Guesde and Sembat, have actually entered the Cabinet and become part of the Government in order to carry it on. Guesde's cabled statement explains that he entered the Cabinet to fight against "traitor workmen" as well as to fight against German militarism:

I go into the Cabinet as an envoy of my party, not to govern, but to fight. If I were younger I would have shouldered a gun. But as my age does not permit me to do this, I will nevertheless face the enemy and defend the cause of humanity.

I am confident of final victory, and without hesitation as to its subsequent role in France, the party will never deviate from the line of conduct laid out.

France has been attacked, and she will have no more ardent defenders than the workmen's party.

The solidarity of workmen does not shut out the right to defend themselves against traitor workmen. Nor does international solidarity exclude the right of one nation to defend itself against a government which is traitor to the peace of Europe.

The New York German Socialist daily, the *Volkszeitung*, does not hesitate to declare that Guesde and Sembat did no more than their duty required.

Still more convincing of the unity and earnestness of the French revolutionists is the attitude of her "syndicalists," whose daily organ took the attitude described in the following dispatch as early as August 12th (the news reaching us much later by mail):

The *Bataille Syndicaliste*, the organ of the syndicalists, prints the following sketch of the state of mind in which "our boys" have joined the colors:

"They were syndicalists. They were revolutionaries. They were pacifists and internationalists. Hatred of militarism pushed them to proclaim themselves 'anti-patriots.' To-day, when they see their hopes of peace, of union among peoples, of social transformation for the benefit of the working masses take flight amid the smoke of arms directed against liberty and humanity, they take their route by the side of those who do not think as they do, and who in their ignorance used to regard them as traitors to their country.

"Had it been a war of conquest that they were called upon to make, how quickly would they have risen in revolt. They would have stood up before any of their rulers who would have been mad enough to hurl them on the hearth and liberties of another people. But it is exactly the opposite which has occurred. They know that the men who are at the head of our destinies have tried everything, even to the point of appearing weak, to save the lives of thousands and avoid the horrors of devastation."

ITALIAN SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR

On the very first day of August, we learn through the Belgian *Peuple*, the Italian Socialists let the government understand in no uncertain terms, just what their position is in this war. And the partial success of their general strike of 2,000,000 in June, together with the fact that a large part of the middle-classes are with them now in their hostility to Germany, caused their warning to be heeded, as all reports agree.

Their ultimatum to the government was in part as follows:

It is not a question of ourselves, but of Italy.

We can assure that if Italy mobilizes her army and commands it to march to the *direct or indirect support* of the Germans against France, that very day there will be no need of any effort on our part to make the Italian people revolt.

The insurrection would be unanimous and terrible.

M. Salandra [the Premier], do you doubt it?

It is not possible that you do.

During a whole week the most prominent supporters of the present order have come to us and have said: If Italy is forced to go with the Triple Alliance, that is the hour for the revolution. It would be a patriotic revolution if it stopped Italy from giving her support to Germany and Austria.

The Berlin *Vorwaerts* gives us the very interesting news that even before this, on July 29, the Socialist Mayor of Milan, Italy's largest city; had appealed to her soldiers in a public meeting not to shoot if they were ordered to march against France. The Paris *Humanité* informs us that the Socialist agitation has been so vigorous, that one of the Socialist members of the Chamber of Deputies, Canepa, has been prosecuted by the Government for referring, in the *Lavoro*, to William II as "a criminal fool responsible for the massacre inflicted on the world." The Government's ground was that this was an incitement to murder! Perhaps it was.

Similarly when Suedekum and Haase came on their mission from the German Party, the Italian Socialists, as elsewhere mentioned in this issue of the *NEW REVIEW*, replied that they hoped that those who were responsible for the infamous war would be crushed. It is probable that they referred to Haase as well as to the Kaiser. They pointed out that the German government could not claim to represent civilization after it admitted its "punishment" of Louvain and that *German hegemony would be a greater danger than that of Czarism*.

The Socialist Reform Party also declared that "the victory of the Triple Entente would not only aid universal disarmament, but at the same time would open the way to an exchange of national opin-

ions and so would help the proletariat both socially and economically."

But like other "Socialist" Reform Parties, and like the present majority of the German Party, Bissolati's organization is nationalistic rather than international. It went on to declare its satisfaction that the victory of the Triple Entente "would assure Italy's predominance over Austria-Hungary in the Balkans." It will be recalled that this same Party also defended the Tripolitan war.

ANTI-WAR MANIFESTOES

We herewith give the full text of the anti-war manifestoes of the two Socialist Parties of Great Britain:

THE INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY

It has long been earnestly urged by the Independent Labor Party that the diplomatic policies pursued by European rulers, including our own, and supported by the force of murderous armaments would lead inevitably to universal war or universal bankruptcy—or both. That prediction, based upon facts and tendencies, has been only too swiftly and tragically fulfilled.

THE CAUSE OF THE WAR.

Instead of striving to unite Europe in a federation of states, banded together for peace, diplomacy has deliberately aimed at dividing Europe into two armed, antagonistic camps, the Triple *Entente* and the Triple Alliance. Diplomacy has been underground, secret, deceitful, each power endeavoring by wile and stratagem to get the better of its neighbor. Diplomats have breathed the very air of jealousy, deception, and distrust. Each country, in turn, largely through the influence of its Jingo Press, has been stamped by fear and panic. Each country has tried to outstrip other countries in the vastness and costliness of its war machine. Powerful armament interests have played their sinister part, for it is they who reap rich harvest out of havoc and death. When all this has been done, any spark will start a conflagration like the present.

It is difficult and perhaps futile to try to apportion at this moment the exact measure of responsibility and blame which the various countries must bear. It is just as untrue to say that British policy has been wholly white and German policy wholly black as to say that German policy has been entirely right and British policy entirely wrong. Simple undiscriminating people in both countries may accept unreservedly one or other of these

alternatives, but, as past experience shows, history will tell a different story.

SECRET DIPLOMACY

For the present Sir Edward Grey issues his White Paper to prove Germany the aggressor, just as Germany issues a White Paper to prove Russia the aggressor, and Russia to prove Austria the aggressor. Even if every word in the British White Paper be admitted, the wider indictment remains. Let it be acknowledged that in the days immediately preceding the war, Sir Edward Grey worked for peace. It was too late. Over a number of years, together with other diplomats, he had himself dug the abyss, and wise statesmanship would have foreseen, and avoided, the certain result.

It was not the Servian question or the Belgian question that pulled this country into the deadly struggle. Great Britain is not at war because of oppressed nationalities or Belgian neutrality. Even had Belgian neutrality not been wrongfully infringed by Germany we should still have been drawn in.

If France in defiance of treaty rights had invaded Belgium to get at Germany, who believes we should have begun hostilities against France? Behind the back of Parliament and people, the British Foreign Office gave secret understandings to France, denying their existence when challenged. That is why this country is now face to face with the red ruin and impoverishment of war. Treaties and agreements have dragged Republican France at the heels of despotic Russia, Britain at the heels of France. At the proper time all this will be made plain, and the men responsible called to account.

We desire neither the aggrandisement of German militarism nor Russian militarism, but the danger is that this war will promote one or the other. Britain has placed herself behind Russia, the most reactionary, corrupt, and oppressive Power in Europe. If Russia is permitted to gratify her territorial ambitions and extend her Cossack rule, civilization and democracy will be gravely imperilled. Is it for this that Britain has drawn the sword?

Tens of thousands of our fellow-workers are in the front of battle, knowing not if they will ever return again. Already many have fallen, and soon the death-roll will mount appallingly and the wounded lie suffering on the battlefield, on the decks of ships, and in the hospitals. Among those who are bravely facing this fate are many of our Socialist comrades serving in the regular forces, the reserves, and the territorials.

Hardly less dread is the position of the women and children at home who are dependent on those who are under arms, and the countless workers and their families who are plunged into unemployment and destitution by the war. Almost no conceivable effort—even if the food supply of the country holds out—will prevent the occurrence of fearful privation among them.

GERMAN WORKERS OUR COMRADES

And what is true of the soldiers and the workers and their families of our own country is no less true of those in France, Bel-

gium, Germany, and other lands. Is it not right that we should remember this?

To us who are Socialists the workers of Germany and Austria, no less than the workers of France and Russia, are comrades and brothers; in this hour of carnage and eclipse we have friendship and compassion to all victims of militarism. Our nationality and independence, which are dear to us, we are ready to defend; but we cannot rejoice in the organized murder of tens of thousands of workers of other lands who go to kill and be killed at the command of rulers to whom the people are as pawns.

The war conflagration envelops Europe; up to the last moment we labored to prevent the blaze. The nation must now watch for the first opportunity for effective intervention.

As to the future, we must begin to prepare our minds for the difficult and dangerous complications that will arise at the conclusion of the war.

The people must everywhere resist such territorial aggression and national abasement as will pave the way for fresh wars; and, throughout Europe, the workers must press for frank and honest diplomatic policies, controlled by themselves, for the suppression of militarism and the establishment of the United States of Europe, thereby advancing toward the world's peace. Unless these steps are taken Europe, after the present calamity, will be still more subject to the increasing domination of militarism, and liable to be drenched with blood.

SOCIALISM WILL YET TRIUMPH

We are told that international Socialism is dead, that all our hopes and ideals are wrecked by the fire and pestilence of European war. It is not true.

Out of the darkness and the depth we hail our working-class comrades of every land. Across the roar of guns, we send sympathy and greeting to the German Socialists. They have labored unceasingly to promote good relations with Britain, as we with Germany. They are no enemies of ours but faithful friends.

In forcing this appalling crime upon the nations, it is the rulers, the diplomats, the militarists who have sealed their doom. In tears and blood and bitterness the greater Democracy will be born. With steadfast faith we greet the future; our cause is holy and imperishable, and the labor of our hands has not been in vain.

Long live Freedom and Fraternity! Long live International Socialism!

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY.

THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY

To the Workers of the United Kingdom:

FELLOW CITIZENS—The great war, long threatened and feared, has suddenly come upon us. The attack made by Austria upon Servia has involved the nations of the Triple Alliance and those of the Triple Entente, and this country is drawn into the general struggle by the declaration of war upon Belgium by Germany on

account of the refusal of that little State to forego its guaranteed neutrality in the interest of the attacking Power.

At this time of serious danger we are anxious you should thoroughly realize that this awful catastrophe, which will turn the greater part of Europe into a vast shambles, and send thousands to their death at sea, is the result of the alliances, ententes, and understandings entered into and "assurances" given by the Governments and Chancellories of Europe without any reference whatsoever to the peoples themselves. It is not a war of the peoples. Be sure of that. The workers of Germany declared vehemently against war. No one knows to-day how many German Social-Democrats and trade-unionists have been shot down or imprisoned for their opinions since martial law was proclaimed. At this moment of natural hatred of German aggression we appeal to you to distinguish soberly between the mass of the German people and the Prussian military caste which dominates the German Empire.

The misery and starvation which must accompany the present terrific military and naval struggle will fall most heavily upon you. You will be faced with rising prices of the necessaries of life on the one hand, and increasing unemployment on the other. The Government has moved quickly in naval and military mobilization and in dealing with the purely financial situation. You must demand with no uncertain voice that the same activity shall be shown in safeguarding the food of the people. "Assurances" that there is no occasion for panic and high prices will be of no value to you if wholesalers and retailers raise the cost of your food.

Fellow Citizens, we of the British Socialist Party, recognizing that the feeding and employment of the people are the supreme questions of the moment, urge the following proposals:

(a) The immediate passing of measures to secure the state and municipal control of the purchase, storage, and distribution of the necessaries of life, and the fixing of maximum prices throughout.

(b) The immediate adoption by local education authorities of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, and its extension, as a matter of immediate necessity, to the feeding and clothing of all children in the common schools.

(c) Prompt exercise of compulsory powers by representative Health Committees for the supply of milk to nursing mothers, infants, young children and sick people.

(d) Immediate application by the Government through all channels now available (Development Commissions, Road Boards, Unemployed Workmen Act, etc.) of the powers to commence works of public utility by the state and municipality; together with the setting on foot forthwith of co-operative useful productive work for unemployed men and women at a high standard of life, the goods so produced being distributed communally outside of the competitive market.

(e) We demand that the Insurance Act shall forthwith operate without any deduction from wages whatever.

(f) We also insist that rent shall be included in the present and all future moratoriums and that all hire-purchase agreements and tallymen's charges shall be placed on the same footing.

From the very first, and all through, the International Socialist Party has declared for peace, whilst always maintaining the right of nations to defend their national existence by force of arms. It is the working class in all lands who are called upon to bear the heaviest burden in this fratricidal conflict. Wives will lose their husbands and mothers their sons in tens of thousands before the power of Prussian militarism is broken and the German people themselves are freed from a crushing Imperialism. Hunger and starvation will be the lot of millions who do not fall by sword, shot or shell.

Never again must we entrust our foreign affairs to secret diplomacy. Never again must we regard foreign policy as being something with which we have no concern. The terrible period which we have vet to encounter and pass through must teach us a never-to-be-forgotten lesson. The war will break down the ententes, alliances and understandings made without our knowledge and consent. Then will come the opportunity for a genuine democratic agreement between the peoples themselves.

Such an agreement between the peoples of France, Germany and Great Britain will be a solid guarantee of peace and a powerful bulwark against the encroachments of Russian despotism, a result which may easily come of the present war. To that end we shall continuously work, and we appeal most earnestly to you to keep this bright hope for the future before you through all the coming days of darkness and death.

Away with the War! Social Democracy for ever!

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY.

THE MUDDLE IN ENGLAND

The Socialists of Great Britain, as usual, occupy a position different from that of any other country. To use an expression they apply to their methods, they are in a muddle. The confusion consists in the fact that the revolutionists and the Laborites, usually bitter enemies, are for war against German militarism to protect the democracies of Belgium and France. The Socialistic Laborites, led by J. R. MacDonald and Keir Hardie, are in favor of letting the Kaiser proceed.

But this is only the beginning of the tangle. The opposition of the I. L. P. leaders to England's participation in the war looks like internationalism. But on examination it will be seen that their motives were identical with those of the Socialist war party in Germany and that *Keir Hardie endorses the position of Haase without qualification!* Just as Haase and Scheilemann are ready to help

the Kaiser to crush France, so MacDonald and Hardie are ready to *allow* the Kaiser to crush France. And the underlying motives, also, are the same. The German Party expects to get votes by catering to militarism, the British I. L. P. expects to gain votes by concentrating on local social reforms, even if every democracy in Europe is annihilated.

H. M. Hyndman, the leader of the British Socialist Party, has ably supplemented its manifesto (published elsewhere in this issue of the *NEW REVIEW*), in *Justice*:

We of the B. S. P., however completely some of us may have been convinced for years past of the detestable truculence of German militarism, were at one with the extremest of pacifists in our determination to avert war, if it was at all possible to do so. That is the reason why, as a party, we took our full share in the great peace demonstration in Trafalgar Square. That is why we joined with our comrades in every European country in their declarations against war, as injurious to the workers of the world.

But after the invasion of Belgium the Party's position, like that of the French and Belgian Parties, was reversed. Hyndman continues:

It has been my own personal opinion for many years that, had we acted in the best interests of humanity, Great Britain would have kept up an overwhelming navy and established long ago a citizen army on democratic lines. The objects at which Germany was aiming were quite clear. Had we pursued this policy and refrained from any secret agreements such as those to which the Czar referred in his letter, I am firmly convinced that peace would have been maintained, that we should not be calling, in semi-panic, for 500,000 untrained men, that we should not now be engaged in an offensive and defensive war in co-operation with Russia, and that we should have been in a very much better position than we are to-day to uphold our treaties, to defend the small Powers, and to prevent France from being crushed.

As it is, we cannot disguise from ourselves that, though everybody must eagerly desire the final defeat of Germany, in view of the crime committed in Belgium, nevertheless the success of Russia, which must inevitably follow, will be a misfortune to the civilized world.

Hyndman, we see, is far from having become a nationalist. He concludes with a parting shot at British jingoists of the Kipling type, who say that all social distinctions have now disappeared: "By far our worst enemies are the landlords and capitalists of Britain."

H. G. Wells also, though he has written much trash about the war, has displayed his usual erratic brilliance at times. One passage especially must be quoted as showing the depth of feeling and

idealism that moves many British Socialists. We quote from the *New York World*:

We fight not to destroy a nation, but a nest of evil ideas. We fight because a whole nation has become obsessed by pride, by cant of cynicism and vanity of violence, by the evil suggestion of such third rate writers as Gobineau and Stewart Chamberlain that they were people of peculiar excellence destined to dominate the earth.

The ultimate purpose of this war is propaganda—the destruction of certain beliefs and the creation of others. It is to this propaganda that reasonable men must address themselves. . . .

By a propaganda of books, newspaper articles, leaflets and tracts in English, French, German, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Italian, Chinese and Japanese we should spread this idea, repeat this idea, and impose this idea upon the war—the idea that this war must end war.

Of as wide a reputation among Socialists as Wells is Robert Blatchford, and his pen at times is equally trenchant. In the *Clarion* he expresses an almost identical opinion:

The Prussian policy, built upon the theories of Clausewitz and Bismarck, is the most devilish theory ever adopted by the Government of a civilized people.

It is the theory that might is right. It is the theory that the manhood of a nation shall be forcibly drilled into a huge and efficient engine of aggression and shall be used when ready for the injury, abasement, and plunder of any other nation which appears to be weaker or less alert. To this end duplicity and treachery of the basest kinds must be employed. By royal speeches and Government protestations and by the prompted falsehoods of the press the ruthless War Lords will deceive their own people as well as the people whom it is their hidden purpose to attack.

Taking a dramatically opposite view, we find Keir Hardie, J. R. MacDonald and the Socialist Independent Labor Party. They allege that the war was caused by Sir Edward Grey's "secret treaties" with France and Russia. No doubt. Usually they don't say just why they criticize these treaties. But the reasons have gradually been stated. The treaties help Czarism and bring England into the war. But some causes, surely, would justify war. And the Czar might have to be used, however deplorable that might be. These arguments seem superficial.

The *Labor Leader*, the Party organ, now gives us deeper arguments. It says that the motive of the British government was merely to crush Britain's commercial rival:

German militarism is, of course, arrogant, and no one hates it more than we do. But to suggest that all the War Lords, naval or military, are resident in Prussia, and none in England, is either

prejudice or cant. We are fighting Germany not because we think the mailed fist of her military caste is a danger to Europe or to small peoples or to German democracy. We are fighting Germany because we are jealous and afraid of her increasing power; for that reason and that reason only. If we were in this war to uphold European civilization, the liberties of minor nationalities, and the freedom of the German masses, should we be allies of Russia? The defeat of Germany means the victory of Russia, and a Europe under the heel of Russia would be worse tenfold than a Europe under the heel of Germany.

This is undoubtedly true. But motives are of small importance. What counts is the result. Whatever Sir Edward Grey's motive, the crushing of German militarism and the overthrow of the Kaiser would be worth any price—except the substitution of the Czar for the Kaiser, which is scarcely a remote possibility.

The *Labor Leader* points out one factor, however, that will remain more important than ever after the war:

It is all very well to speak of Germany's military arrogance, but what of Britain's naval arrogance? At the Hague Conference in 1907 the German representatives supported a proposal by which merchant vessels would, had it been accepted, have been made immune from attack in time of war. Because Great Britain had a supreme navy, the British delegates at the conference opposed this proposal; they knew that the British fleet, armed to the teeth and patrolling the trade routes of the world, could make short shift of the unprotected ships of other nations peacefully carrying food, and the material and products of trade, from one land to another. The defeat of the proposal to remove merchant vessels from the stage of war made it inevitable that Germany should build a strong navy to protect her trading vessels.

Keir Hardie endorses Haase's speech *in toto*, and swallows whole the arguments of the German "patriots":

Let anybody take a map of Europe and look at the position of Germany: on the one side Russia with her millions of trained soldiers and unlimited population to draw upon (its traditional policy for over a hundred years has been to reduce Prussia to impotence, so that the Slav may reign supreme), on the other side France, smarting under her defeat and the loss of her two provinces, Alsace and Lorraine, in 1870. For a number of years past these two militarisms have had a close and cordial alliance. What was it that brought the Tsardom of Russia into alliance with the Free Republic of France? One object, and one alone, to crush Germany between them. German armaments, and the German army, were primarily intended to protect herself and her interests against these two open enemies.

In a late issue of the *Labor Leader* MacDonald supports his position with the following arguments:

I want to go right down to the foundation of things. German

military autocracy was bad for Europe—so is British secret diplomacy. But to try and break either by a war is stupid and criminal. Is it really true that in *Anno Domini* 1914 the only way to dethrone the German military caste is for Britain, France, and Russia to fight it? It is not. The end cannot be secured in that way, and, if it could, the price is too dear. I would rather that militarism had flourished for another ten years than that we should have sent thousands of men along the path of privation, hate, and pain to death, that we should have clouded thousands of happy fire-sides, that we should have undone our social reform work for a generation, that we should have let loose in Europe all the lusts of battle and all the brutalities of war.

And that is not the full price. For a generation or so Europe will be paying for this war in an arrested civilization and a weakened population, an increased poverty. We are but replacing one European menace by a greater one. We hope to remove the fiend with blood-splashed foot from Berlin and take in exchange the dreaded rider on the white horse as the monarch of Europe. . . .

Well, when Germany is down who will be up? We can gain little. A colony or two to add to our useless burdens perhaps. France will also have a colony or two, maybe, and Alsace-Lorraine. It may or may not claim money payments. This will rankle in the German heart just as the loss of Alsace-Lorraine rankled in the French heart. But with strong democratic movements these things might be adjusted in a scheme of lasting peace. With Russia the case is different. It, too, will want something, but above all its autocracy will be rehabilitated, its military system will be strengthened, it will become the dominating power in Europe. No invader can touch it, as Napoleon found to his cost, and as Germany to-day assumes in its scheme of military tactics. It will press in upon us in Asia. *Our defense of India will be a much bigger problem than it is now; China will be threatened; Persia will go. It will rivet upon us the Japanese Alliance, one of the greatest political menaces to our Imperial unity.* Above all it will revitalize the Pan-Slav movement, and if ever Europe is to be made subject to a new barbarism this movement is to do it. I know that if the Pan-Slav movement could be democratized it might be harmless. But the Government of the Slav is just that which will yield last of all to democratic influences.

MacDonald has freely stated in his books that India should be held indefinitely, if not forever, and that race war is inevitable. He regards the Japanese alliance as a "menace to our Imperial unity" because he approves of the exclusion of Japanese from British colonies, but he wants to retain India, notwithstanding the exclusion of Hindus from the colonies.

Against such imperialistic pacifists, and pacifists for a purpose, commend us to the genuine peace movement, represented in England by the *Nation*. In an article by Canon Hensley Henson we read:

The Socialists of France and Belgium are making no mistake, when they see that the cynical militarism which is supreme in Germany must be broken before a better day can dawn for the peoples of Europe; and they are men enough not to shrink from the necessary sacrifice.

Still more important is a leading article on "The Workers and the War," from which we quote several paragraphs, for they represent better than any other expressions we have seen, the underlying position of the British workers:

The labor movement cannot be isolated from Europe. The labor movement stands for ideas, and those ideas are not shut up within one nation, nor are their destinies unaffected by the conduct or the fortunes of other peoples. The columns of one of the earliest newspapers, *The Voice of the People*, published in 1830, are full of the wrongs and the struggles of Poland. The international sympathies of the labor movement have since been developed by the relationships that common employment and common interests have promoted. Non-intervention, the deliberate policy of one school of British politicians, has never been the policy of labor. The representatives of labor have never stood aloof on the questions of Armenia, the Congo, Persia, Finland, or any of the crucial questions that have raised the issue between the rights of men and the rights of power. Non-intervention may be the right policy in given circumstances, but it is not the policy of labor on principle; the case for or against it depends on its merits.

The article then endorses Guesde's criticism of the general strike idea:

If the strike could be made general, its purpose would be answered and nothing could be better. If, instead of a general strike, there is merely a strike among the more enlightened nations, the policy is nothing else than an invitation to the Powers that are the most independent of such influences to make aggressions. Could anybody, for example, say that at this moment it was the duty of the Belgian Socialist to refuse to take up arms? If Russia, Germany and Austria can count on mobilizing an army when they want just because the military classes are more powerful than those in Western Europe, the policy of striking against war is the policy of surrendering the Liberal nations to the governments that have been most successful in crushing the working classes.

The *Nation* shows that the British are fighting for industrial capitalism against militarism—in its most dangerous and efficient form:

But of course the battle is not for Belgium alone; the battle is for all the small peoples that are threatened by Prussian aggression—Holland and Denmark. The working classes at home are helping to decide whether there is to be an industrial civilization or a military civilization in these countries, whether these people are to govern themselves or whether they are to be governed from Berlin.

And Berlin, in this connection, means the rule of a small class, not the ideas of the German Social Democrats, with whom the working classes have no relations but those of friendship.

The whole of modern science is turned to the uses of militarism, to keep foreign races and Germany's own people in subjection. The *Nation* is surely justified when it concludes:

Western Europe is defending herself—and defending the working classes of Germany—from this power.

AMERICAN SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR

Apparently less than half a dozen of the hundred leading American newspapers take the German side, and nearly all the rest are more or less strongly anti-German. The Socialist papers are divided. Partly owing, no doubt, to this anti-German stand of their enemies, some of them incline to the anti-British side. There is no Socialist logic in this position. Socialists have never hesitated to ally themselves with modern capitalism against feudalism. This would line them up with France and England and against Russia, Austria, and Germany—for every leading German Socialist has admitted the strong proportion of feudalism in present-day Germany. Allied with capitalism and science, this military absolutism is by far more dangerous than that of Russia or Austria. And unfortunately, not only Germany's peasants and middle classes, but even the more prosperous layers of her workingmen have become imperialists, willing subjects of this system.

The obsession that precipitated and supports the war is not confined to Germany's rulers [says the *New York Journal of Commerce*], but has evidently extended to the mass of the subjects of the Empire and filled them with enthusiastic loyalty.

It is the policy of blood and iron, of the mailed fist, of *preparation for war as a means of preserving peace and dictating its terms*, the militarism that has begotten a swollen pride and a brutal cast of loyal patriotism under a dominating power, which has bred this obsession that all the world is in arms against Germany, and that she must fight and conquer or die as a great Power of the earth.

But some of our Socialist writers, ignoring for the moment this salient fact, have concentrated their attention on the capitalistic motives of our non-Socialist press and of the British and French governments. Such writers do a public service, for they bring to the foreground those factors of the situation that are most ignored.

The most brilliant example of a Socialist article directed against England and France was printed anonymously in the *Masses* under the title, "A Traders' War." It demands quotation at some length:

The real war, of which this sudden outburst of death and destruction is only an incident, began long ago. It has been raging for tens of years, but its battles have been so little advertised that they have been hardly noted. It is a clash of Traders.

In 1909, King Edward—a great friend of Peace—after long secret conferences, announced the *Entente Cordiale*, whereby France promised to back up England in absorbing Egypt, and England pledged itself to support France in her Morocco adventure.

The news of this underhand "gentleman's agreement" caused a storm. The Kaiser, in wild indignation, shouted that "Nothing can happen in Europe without my consent."

Even when they scored this big commercial victory—the blocking of the Bagdad Railroad—the English diplomats protested their love of Peace and their pure-hearted desire to preserve the Status Quo. It was at this juncture that a Deputy in the Reichstag said, "The Status Quo is an aggression."

The situation in short is this. German capitalists want more profits. English and French capitalists want it all. This War of Commerce has gone on for years, and Germany has felt herself worsted. Every year she has suffered some new setback. The commercial "smothering" of Germany is a fact of current history.

This effort to crowd out Germany is frankly admitted by the economic and financial writers of England and France. It comes out in a petty and childish way in the popular attempts to boycott things "Made in Germany." On a larger scale it is embodied in "ententes" and secret treaties. Those who treat of the subject in philosophical phraseology justify it by referring to the much abused "Struggle for Existence."

But worse than the "personal government" of the Kaiser, worse even than the brutalizing ideals he boasts of standing for, is the raw hypocrisy of his armed foes, who shout for a Peace which their greed has rendered impossible.

What has democracy to do in alliance with Nicholas, the Tsar? Is it liberalism which is marching from the Petersburg of Father Gapon, from the Odessa of Pogroms? Are our editors naïve enough to believe this?

We, who are Socialists, must hope—we may even expect—that out of this horror of bloodshed and dire destruction will come far-reaching social changes—and a long step forward towards our goal of Peace among Men.

But we must not be duped by this editorial buncombe about Liberalism going forth to Holy War against Tyranny.

This is not Our War.

This is all strong writing, except that a war that is not ours at the beginning may become ours at the end.

Two of the conclusions, however, are radically faulty:

At any time in the last few years sincerely liberal ministries in

Paris and London could easily have made friends with Germany—and the Kaiser would have crumbled into dust.

There can be nothing surer than that the Germans as a whole are not bellicose, that they support the Kaiser and all the heavy charge of militarism because they know they are menaced.

On the contrary, the majority of the Germans, if not an overwhelming majority, are bellicose. London and Paris—as long as Germany is a semi-absolutism—could not make friends with Germany except by supporting the Kaiser. When Germany is a democracy the case will be different.

The Party leaders are not pro-German. But their attitude seems to imply that it is a matter of indifference to Socialists whether democracies or oligarchies are victorious. Since war is wholly bad, all the governments engaged in it are equally bad! For example, Debs writes in the *American Socialist*:

Despotism in autocratic Russia, monarchic Germany and republican America is substantially the same in its effect upon the working class.

Berger's attack on German militarism as a more important cause of the war than capitalism itself is very significant. We reproduce it at length:

The third factor playing an important part in causing this war is militarism. Germany alone is usually blamed for this, and rightly. It is a fact that of all modern nations, Germany alone still has a fixed and hereditary class which makes war and service in the army its foremost business and occupation in life. The ruling element of Germany, the one that is really deciding the destiny of the empire, is not the wealthy and ambitious German capitalist class—contrary to the common conception of the average Socialist.

The ruling element in Germany is still the old feudal landed nobility—the Yunker class. It is a hereditary caste like the castes of old India and Japan—with this difference that occasionally a man with much money may buy himself into it, or at least marry off his daughter to some Yunker.

This nobility is favored in every possible way by legislation, protective tariffs and freight rates.

This nobility furnishes the overwhelming majority of the army officers. It has a monopoly on all the higher posts of officialdom in Germany. And the mere existence of a caste of that type is a standing menace to the peace of Europe, because Yunkerdom is the personification of German militarism.

German militarism, while everywhere hated, was everywhere imitated. But nowhere with the same success. In other countries it lacked the foundation—the co-relation between the Yunker and the peasant. This relation was destroyed in France and England by successful revolutions. And it is on the point of being destroyed in Germany by industrial evolution and—by the Social-Democratic party.

German militarism, however, meant the heaping of almost unbearable tax burdens upon the people. All European nations had not only to support immense standing armies but also to provide armament for the millions of additional men to be called in case of war. In Germany, the last war levy was no longer one on income—it practically began to confiscate at least some of the capital. Neither capitalism, nor feudalism in Europe could stand that much longer. There was so much powder stored up that it exploded.

But Berger weakens this impression by giving even more prominence to the uneconomic conception of “nationalism and race hatred” as a supposed cause. And so he prepares the way in this country for a nationalistic and racial Socialism similar to that of the Party majority which has just betrayed the International in Germany.

Hillquit is chiefly concerned with protecting the reputation of the German majority. His interview in the *New York Call* on his return from Europe was wholly devoted to this difficult task. He fears the failure of the German Party may damage the reputation of his own organization. He said:

When it was seen that the general war could not be prevented, the Socialists decided to fight along with Germany, rather than risk Russia getting a foothold. Just at the time war was declared the Socialist members of the Reichstag had a conference with the German Chancellor over the menace of Russian ascendancy. Russia is the most reactionary power in the world and because of the situation created by Russia being at war with Germany, the Socialist members of the Reichstag afterwards voted for the war appropriation. The Socialists are as a matter of principle opposed to war, but it was a choice of evils and anything was better than an invasion by Russia.

While our Comrades are aiding to fight reactionary Russia at the same time our Comrades in the Reichstag will take the first opportunity of urging a cessation of hostilities, if there is any chance of ending the war by mediation or arbitration. The fact that they are aiding Germany against Russia does not militate against the continuance of their efforts to bring about Socialism.

Apparently Hillquit's German “comrades” are not aiding Germany in her invasion of France and Belgium!

The *New York Call*, in one of its editorials, took a similar defensive position:

An unwilling man is caught in the war machine, and his being a Socialist makes no more difference than if in times of “peace” he were caught in the capitalist factory machine, as is the actual fact. But because a Socialist is forced to become a soldier it no more militates against his intention to destroy capitalism than when he is forced to become a wage slave and serve it in that capacity.

Our European Comrades have done their best. Temporarily they have failed, but their turn will come soon, when militarism and capitalism commence to devour themselves.

“Our European Comrades,” some of them, at least, have done their worst, when, instead of refusing to vote the war credits like Bebel and Liebknecht in 1870, they both voted them and approved the war. But further:

German Socialists have taken the stand that it was necessary to repel the Russian invasion; that Russia, as a reactionary power, threatened the Socialist cause more than any other factor. But this does not mean that they have been reconciled to German imperialism and militarism. It is, in their minds, a case of choosing the least of two evils, and no Socialist is hypocritical enough to make a virtue out of necessity.

And so they invaded—Belgium!

This is also the position, it need not be said, of the official party organ, the *American Socialist*. The *Call*, however, had a later editorial (on September 12) of a far different character, evidently from the pen of Wanhope, who published a similar article under his signature in the *Sunday Call*. It makes the all important point that the German government in this war represents a pre-capitalist stage of social evolution, and that the forces of capitalism have combined to destroy it. The editorial referred to says:

Practically every influential paper in America takes the position that peace is not yet desirable, even were it possible. They all, of course, protest they love peace and are eager for it, but they don't want peace that isn't put on what they call “a lasting basis.” It is better to have the war go on. And it is not difficult to see that their advocacy of the continuance of war is based on the belief that the Kaiser is now getting the worst of it, and that his ultimate defeat is assured. If it were not so, they would advocate instant peace at almost any price. . . . They are all saying exactly what the organs of the English, the French, the Russians, the Belgians and other allies, and even “neutrals” like Spain, Portugal and Italy, are saying. Whether it is true or not may be left open to opinion. But the real question is, how comes this strange unanimity?

Capitalism from the very beginning has decreed the doom of the Kaiser and his imperialism, and its spokesmen are now beginning to show their hands and talk freely of the necessity of his downfall. The general rejection of peace at this particular time can mean nothing else, and it is but one of the innumerable proofs of the existence of this project. Capitalism is telling us that the Kaiser must go, and that there will be no peace until he does.

The motives of the world's financiers, according to the *Sunday Call* article were, first, to subject the German military oligarchy to capitalism, and second, to remove the danger that it might lead to a Socialist revolution. It is noteworthy that Prof. Herron published an article several years ago (also reproduced recently in the

Sunday Call) of the same tenor. English and French capitalists were resolved, he said, that Germany should not expand and should be financially dependent upon them. They are the wealthy nations. The only way Germany can escape the laws of modern capitalism is to take refuge in a far worse thing—military absolutism. Similarly, as a capitalistic nation Germany must struggle against Russia. Said Herron:

As the United States stands between Germany and South America, as England stands between Germany and Africa, so Russia bars the German road to Asia. Both the German and the Slav must have room. Under Socialism, they would have it already, and to spare; but under capitalism, they must expand. Without Socialism, the German and the Slav will inevitably fight it out as to which is to have the hegemony, not only of Europe, but of Western Asia.

The struggle of Germany with all three of the great powers, Herron shows, is forced upon her under capitalism, because she must choose between expansion and collapse of her present military and industrial system; under Socialism there would be no such dilemma. How insane, then, for the German Party to support the Kaiser in his desperate efforts to maintain the present system against Socialism!

Charles Edward Russell, in the *Call*, correctly points to the greed for easy profits from colonies as one of the chief motives for war on the part of the German capitalists and their Kaiser:

In the event of another war like that of 1870, France would be shorn of these valuable possessions, which would then become German. More colonies meant more commerce, more commerce meant more profits, more profits meant more power. That way the pressure inevitably tended, and even if no one had ever designed war nor intended it, under the existing system war was certain.

The apparent destiny of German commercialism, exalted by its many victories, was to annex the French colonies, to enlarge with Germany's enlarged borders, and to raise Germany above all competitors to the supreme commercial command of the world. It saw nothing but easy victories, added provinces and added business. Controlling a great part of the press, and moving hand in hand with a government sympathetic and lusting for war, it dragged the sane part of Germany into the struggle, and down came the red deluge.

Then Germany, declaring itself to be threatened by an attack from Russia, rejected all proposals of arbitration and all appeals for peace, and met the alleged Russian attack by moving a million troops upon France before she had declared war against that nation, and while her Ambassador was still in Paris.

It will be recalled that at one stage of the diplomatic negotiations, the German Chancellor, in order to obtain a promise of British neutrality, was willing to guarantee immunity to the French

Channel ports from attack by the German navy, but refused to include the French colonies in such a guarantee.

But capitalistic greed alone is not an adequate explanation. The political structure is an equally important factor. German imperialism is a fusion of capitalistic ambitions and militaristic delusions. It can flourish only in a country subject to an oligarchy headed by the Kaiser:

It was so here. For many years men that knew better have acquiesced in the surviving feudalism that is expressed in monarchical institutions. We have tried to convince ourselves that if a nation had some kind of delegate assembly, a parliament or a reichstag, meeting to pass some laws and fiddle about the skirts of government, why, all was well enough though it still retained kaiser or king.

What difference does it make, we said. It is but a name. Each nation to its own taste. How smart is this kaiser and how clever is that king! There can be democracy in an empire, we said, and as truly might we have said that we could breathe in a vacuum or from darkness draw light.

What difference does it make? We can see the difference.

Another constructive opinion is that of Berger, when he predicts that the war will result in a United States of Europe. But as he does not suggest how this may come about we may quote the suggestion of the *London Nation*, probably by John A. Hobson, that it will come (1) through democratic control of foreign relations, (2) free trade, and (3) an international police:

The creation of a United States of Europe constitutes the only way out of this European State war. The extension of democracy carries with it the three capital needs of the hour, the demand for a full communication of the lines of foreign policy, the growth of international exchange by the disappearance of tariff frontiers, and the cutting down of purely national forces in favor of something that we can truly call an international police, controlled by an international Parliament. So long as Kaiserism dominated Central Europe one may fail to see how a change of such dimensions could operate. But we do not believe that Kaiserism will survive the war. All will and must be changed: the inner thoughts of men, the power of the masses to safeguard their simplest rights, and, above all, the trust of mankind in the wisdom of governing classes, "directing" civilization to its ruin.

An Apocalyptic In Idictment of War:

"There rises a noise of screams and yells, an uproar so unnaturally wild and unrestrained that we cringe up closer to one another . . . and trembling, we see that our faces, our uniforms, have red, wet stains, and distinctly recognize shreds of flesh on the cloth. And among our feet something is lying that was not lying there before—it gleams white from the dark sand and uncurls . . . a strange dismembered hand . . . and there . . . and there . . . fragments of flesh with the uniform still adhering to them—then we realize it, and horror overwhelms us. "Outside there are lying arms, legs, heads, trunks . . . they are howling into the night; the whole regiment is lying mangled on the ground there, a lump of humanity crying to Heaven. . . .

"Is that a human being coming up, running, here? . . . he is coming with a rush . . . he will leap upon our backs . . . halt! halt! halt! He stumbles upright into the trenches, and tumbles, sobbing and howling, among our rifles. He strikes out at us with hands and feet . . . he is crying and struggling like a child, and yet no man dares go up to him . . . for now he is rising on his knee . . . and then we see! Half of his face has been torn away . . . one eye gone . . . the twitching muscle of the cheek is hanging down . . . he is kneeling, and opening and closing his hands, and is howling to us for mercy.

"We gaze at him horror stricken and paralyzed . . . then at length the yokel—and our eyes thank him for it—raises the butt of his rifle and places the muzzle against the sound temple . . . bang! . . . and the maimed wreckage falls over backward and lies still in his blood."—From Wilhelm Lamszus' "The Slaughter House: Scenes From the War That Is Sure to Come."

Send Sixty Cents for
a Copy of this Great
Book!

NEW REVIEW
80 FIFTH AVE.
NEW YORK

Help the NEW REVIEW by Patronizing Its Advertisers

Book Offers

	REG. PRICE	OUR PRICE
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$2.75
"An Economic Interpretation of the United States Constitution," by Prof. Chas. A. Beard	2.25	
	\$3.25	
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$1.10
"The New Unionism," by Andre Tridon25	
	\$1.25	
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$3.00
"Immigration and Labor," by Isaac A. Hourwich.....	\$2.50	
	\$3.50	
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$1.35
"Eighteenth Brumaire," by Karl Marx50	
	\$1.50	
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$1.90
"Progressivism—And After," by W. E. Walling.....	\$1.50	
	\$2.50	
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$1.25
"Socialism As It Is," by W. E. Walling50	
	\$1.50	
The New Review, 1 year.....	\$1.00	\$1.25
"Women as World Builders," by Floyd Dell.....	.50	
	\$1.50	

The New Review

"The Indispensable Socialist Magazine"

80 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

SPECIAL CLUB RATES

	Regular Rate	Club Rate
The New Review, (1 year)	1.00	1.50
The Masses, " "	1.00	
	2.00	
The New Review, (1 year)	1.00	1.50
The Inter. Socialist Review (1 year)	1.00	
	2.00	

THE NEW REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

CONTENTS FOR NOVEMBER, 1914

	PAGE
The Downfall of the International.....	621
<i>Anton Pannekoek (Bremen).</i>	
Freedom of Will and War.....	631
<i>Professor Jacques Loeb.</i>	
The War: Personal Impressions.....	636
<i>Robert Rives La Monte.</i>	
The War and Socialism.....	639
<i>William J. Robinson, M. D.</i>	
A Pro-German View.....	642
<i>Robert H. Lowie.</i>	
French Socialist Manifesto.....	645
French and Belgian Socialists to Germans.	647
Two Book Reviews.....	649
<i>Max Eastman.</i>	

CORRESPONDENCE:

Socialism and Feminism	654
<i>Belfort Bax and Floyd Dell.</i>	
Why a Socialist Party?.....	658
<i>Walter Lippmann and William English Walling.</i>	

A SOCIALIST DIGEST:

Imperialism and Social Democracy.....	663
The German Socialists	667
Position of the Italian Socialists.....	674
Swiss Against German Socialists.....	676
Maneuvers of a Peace Advocate.....	677
Futile Peace Talk	679

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Association

80 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.

ALEXANDER FRASER
President

MAX HEIDELBERG
Treasurer

LOUIS C. FRAINA
Secretary

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

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

1,000 Copies Sold on Pre-Publication Orders!

SOCIALIST WAR MANUAL

*A Revolutionary Interpretation of the European Armageddon and the
Temporary Collapse of Internationalism*

Contains:

IMMEDIATE CAUSES

By Louis C. Fraina

GENERAL CAUSES

By Frank Bohn

MILITARISM

By Floyd Dell

THE ATTITUDE OF ITALY

By Arthur Livingston

**ANTI-WAR MANIFESTOES
SOCIALISM AND THE WAR**

By Isaac A. Hourwich

HOW GERMAN SOCIALISTS DIVIDED

By William English Walling

**BRITISH AND AMERICAN SOCIALISTS
ON THE WAR**

Summary and Criticism of articles
by Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, H. M.
Hyndman, Ramsay MacDonald, Rob-
ert Blatchford, Victor Berger, Eugene
Debs and Charles Edward Russell.

*This Socialist War Manual Will Probably Become Historic. It MUST
Have a Wide Circulation Among Socialists and Non-Socialists Alike.*

Price, 15 Cents a Copy

Special Low Rate, bundles of five or more.

NEW REVIEW
80 5th AVENUE, NEW YORK

Help the NEW REVIEW by Patronizing Its Advertisers

The New Review

Vol. II.

NOVEMBER, 1914

No. 11

THE DOWNFALL OF THE INTERNATIONAL

BY ANTON PANNEKOEK (Bremen)

I.

Exactly half a century has passed since the International Work-
ingmen's Association was founded in London under the leadership
of Karl Marx. It went to pieces after the Franco-Prussian War
of 1870 and the Paris Commune. Exactly a quarter of a century
ago, at the Congress of 1889 in Paris, the new International was
founded. This year the Congress at Vienna was to celebrate the
double anniversary. But just a month before it was to take place
the firebrand of international war was tossed into Europe from
Vienna. With the outbreak of the European War, the new Inter-
national, too, is disrupted.

When the old International was founded (1864), capitalism in
Europe, with the exception of England, was still in its first stages.
Its political form, the bourgeois State, was as yet only partly devel-
oped. In England alone the bourgeoisie was already in absolute
control of the government. There modern industrial methods and
large scale production had produced a proletariat which had, to
be sure, lost all revolutionary spirit in the remarkably prosperous
period following 1850, but which had nevertheless built up strong
organizations by means of which it had fought bitter struggles
in the sixties in order to realize some of its immediate demands.

In France, on the other hand, the old system of small scale
production was still in vogue, though here, too, it was already
being hard pressed by the hot-house like growth of capitalist indus-
try. In Germany the factory system began to grow strongly only
in the sixties. It did away with the old system of handicraft,
impoverished the craftsmen and drove them into the factories.

In these countries the working class was still wholly under