

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Published by The Socialist Publication Society, 115 Worth St., N.Y. City

Issued Every Two Months—25¢ a Copy; \$1.50 a Year

Editors: LOUIS B. BOUDIN, LOUIS C. FRAINA, LUDWIG LORE

Vol. I

MAY-JUNE, 1917

No. 1

THE TASK BEFORE US

The world-war found the Socialists in a deplorable state of mental unpreparedness, and they were, therefore, quite unequal to the task of coping with the tremendous issues which it brought forward for immediate and radical solution. The questions to which an instant and categorical answer was demanded were not, indeed, new or unfamiliar to Socialists. On the contrary, they were intimately related to the fundamentals of Socialist philosophy and action, to questions, moreover, upon which the Socialist movement seemed to be in almost unanimous agreement—the questions of the international character of the Socialist movement and its opposition to war. But the war, like all great crises, served to reveal the latent weaknesses and defects of the Socialist movement as it then was. Its inexorable demands for instant and radical action revealed the fact that during the peace era that preceded it, the Socialist movement slurred over difficulties instead of solving them; that in order to save the formal unity of the movement agreement on fundamentals was assumed rather than obtained. Mere formal unanimity thus achieved was not only useless in the face of a serious crisis, but served to aggravate it greatly by creating confusion in many minds that would otherwise have been clear, palsying hands that would otherwise have been vigorous, and producing an atmosphere of betrayal where only disagreement existed.

Now, the problems which we have long evaded can no longer be shirked. Even the tremendous price which we have already

paid for this evasion will not absolve us from the task of undertaking their solution. They are pressing upon us. The old International is dead. And unless we are willing to give up all hope of creating a new International based upon the international solidarity of the working class at all times and under all conditions, we must set about this work immediately and with a frankness that shall fully atone for the ambiguities and evasions of the past.

It is not a question of holding courts martial over traitors, nor of sitting in moral judgment over poor sinning souls. Recriminations are useless. The task before us is: *to endeavor to attain clearness of vision as a basis for future action.*

The rock upon which the Second International was wrecked was the question of Nationalism. The international character of the Socialist movement had been so often proclaimed, that it was assumed without question or examination into its real meaning. But the great crisis proved that the Second International, instead of being a perfect union of the working class "one and indivisible," was in reality, to most of its adherents, a mere confederation of national units to whom first allegiance was due in case of a conflict.

The first and most fundamental question, therefore, insistently demanding an answer at the hands of the Socialist movement, is the question of the doctrine of national defense. Another question brought forward by the war and demanding a clear and unequivocal answer is the question of the interest of the Socialist movement in the preservation of liberal-democratic institutions. And a third question, not so important theoretically but of grave practical import to the Socialist movement of the immediate future, is the question of the organization and tactics of the new International, and its attitude toward a possible capitalistic international.

Such are the questions which confront the Socialist movement everywhere; and these are the questions which must be answered by the Socialist movement of this country if it is to participate intelligently and effectively in the rebuilding of the international Socialist movement.

The general mental unpreparedness which wrecked the Second International was particularly marked in this country. An opportunistic leadership with limited outlook has kept the large masses of Socialists in this country in utter ignorance of the deeper currents of thought in the international Socialist movement. At the same time it discouraged all independent thinking, thereby destroying whatever chance there was of the movement in this country muddling through independently to some of the modes of thought indispensable to the modern Socialist movement, and preventing any serious and independent consideration of American problems. As a result, there is practically no independent Socialist thought in this country, and the Socialist ideas elaborated abroad usually reach us only as soulless and meaningless formulae and often as mere reflexes of old-world racial and nationalistic sympathies, animosities, and struggles.

It is, therefore, but natural that the great old-world conflict should have had a most demoralizing effect upon the American Socialist movement. Since the beginning of the great world-conflict the Socialist movement of this country has presented a most pitiful spectacle. It has not only been unable to formulate a policy on the great questions involved, but has not even realized the gravity of the problem, and therefore naturally failed to make any serious attempt at its solution.

The bulk of the Socialists of American stock, whom the currents of European Socialist thoughts have hardly reached, are steeped in the vulgar pro-ally-ism generated in the stifling atmosphere of our export-stimulated love of freedom and humanity. From a sentimental point of view this does them credit. But in a great crisis like the present one, it is straight thinking and clear-cut Socialist action that counts, and not sentiment.

Opposed to this is the offensive and degrading pro-Germanism of a large proportion of our membership and the party bureaucracy, who seek to cover up the sins of Germany and of Germany's majority-Socialists by the mantle of "neutrality."

This part of the Socialist Party of this country was the only considerable body of American citizens who religiously followed

President Wilson's injunction to be "neutral in thought." The action of the German Socialists in supporting the Kaiser's government in this war was either openly approved by our official leadership, or else we were admonished not to *disapprove* of it on the plea of "neutrality."

When Germany inaugurated a peace-propaganda in this country, our party entered upon a peace agitation which was not essentially different in character from that of Germany's official and unofficial representatives. We not only waited with the launching of our peace agitation until the official and semi-official German propaganda in this country was ready for it, but the nature of our demands was largely a replica of that propaganda. The Socialist Party even entered into official relations with that propaganda, carried on in behalf of the governing classes of Germany, participating officially in "peace" demonstrations organized in its behalf.

One of the results of this demoralization was the debacle of the Presidential election of 1916.

Another is our complete and pitiful helplessness in face of the crisis which confronts us now that the tide of the Great War has reached our own shores, and the proletariat of this country is engulfed by its waves.

That the pro-ally element in our party should fall an easy prey to the war-fever when it reached this continent was only natural. To the alleged fight for democratic institutions generally, there was now added an imaginary struggle for the democratic institutions of this country. Their diseased imagination conjured up before their mind's eye a sinister attack by Germany upon the free institutions of the United States, which they, of course, felt called upon to defend, even aside from any promptings of vulgar patriotism.

But the official leadership of the Party have done even worse: piling hypocrisy upon stupidity, only to ultimately land in the same camp as their pro-ally opponents. Their first move after the severing of diplomatic relations was a crude pro-German pronouncement in favor of an embargo which was in itself sufficient

to kill any attempt at an honest peace propaganda along Socialist lines. When this move had to be withdrawn, our National Executive Committee substituted in its place a purely bourgeois pacifist propaganda, instead of making the class struggle the basis of our opposition to war. The *leit-motif* of this propaganda was that "we" of the United States have nothing to fight for whatever "the others" may have at stake, that it was not "our" fight and we ought therefore to remain neutral. This was accompanied by shamefaced justifications of the German government's ruthlessness, repeated assurances of our unfailing belief in Mr. Wilson's high ideals, and occasional choruses of "Down with England."

And to cap the climax, these great opponents of war hastened to publicly assure our capitalist class and its government that our opposition to the war will only last as long as they choose to remain formally at peace with Germany, but that as soon as war has been declared we shall do nothing to interfere with the war plans of our masters. Some of our "peace" leaders, among them our representative in Congress, even going to the extent of promising to "stand by the country"—with all that euphonious phrase implies—in case the capitalist class shall rush us into the war which these "peace" leaders of ours had themselves declared to be a useless and wholly unjustifiable butchery of the masses of people of the United States.

In order to save the Socialist Party and the Socialist movement of this country from utter ruin, it is absolutely imperative that we revolutionize the concepts and modes of action of our movement. The revolutionary forces latent in the toiling masses of this country must be brought to the fore, consolidated, and organized into a living power. As a first step in this direction we must abandon the unprincipled and enervating policies of pro-Germanism masked as peace propaganda, and the virtual repudiation of the class struggle conception of war and peace. A positive policy must be placed before the proletariat of this country—principles worth fighting for and ideals worth dying for.

Such a policy is indicated in the closing paragraph of the resolution adopted ten years ago by the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart (1907), and reaffirmed by the International

Socialist Congress of Copenhagen (1910) and Basle (1912), which declares that:

"In the event war should come notwithstanding the efforts of the Socialists to prevent it, then it becomes the duty of the Socialists to work for its speedy termination, and *to use all the power at their command*, utilizing the political and economic crisis produced by the war, *in an effort to arouse the discontent of the people so as to hasten the abolition of the rule of the capitalist class.*"

The last words particularly must be constantly before our eyes, to serve as our guide in whatever we undertake. The Russian Revolution has proven the great possibilities of this war, and the utter futility of the counsel which would prevent all attempts at revolutionary propaganda because the revolution was not an accomplished fact before it was begun. It is true that unfounded expectations, illusory hopes, may involve great and useless sacrifices. But the price required by the counsels of timidity which would not make a move in the class struggle before success has been assured and insured is far more costly, for it would render the revolutionary class absolutely impotent and would make any real revolution utterly impossible.

The foundation of a positive program such as is here suggested, must be laid by giving clear and unequivocal answers to the questions which we have formulated. And we herewith submit for the consideration of the Socialists of the United States what we believe to be the true Socialist position on the questions involved.

We emphatically and unqualifiedly repudiate the doctrine of national defense—believing this doctrine to be merely an ideologic fig-leaf for the shameful practices of our imperialistic age. Socialists must have none of it, if they do not want to become accomplices in the imperialistic designs of the ruling interests of the respective nations, and the wars which inevitably follow when these designs cross each other.

That does not mean that we are indifferent to the independence of all nations and particularly of small nations. Nor to their right to solve their own problems and work out their own des-

tinies. On the contrary we feel very deeply on the subject. Socialism can only be brought about by the efforts of free men, and must be based on the fullest liberty of all races and nations. But we recognize the two-fold fact, that the small nations, who alone are in danger of losing their independence, are not in a position to defend it, and that none of the big nations would defend the independence of a smaller one except when such a policy is dictated by its own selfish interests. Such a protection is at best insecure, and makes of the small nations mere pawns in the imperialistic world-game played by the big nations. The only security of small nations as well as the protection against the forcible annexation of provinces of alien tongue and nationality—now possible, at least as far as the "civilized" world is concerned, only as the result of such extraordinary upheavals as the present world-conflict, if at all—lies in the ethical concepts and economic interest of the revolutionary proletariat. The freedom and independence of nations cannot, therefore, possibly be served by this nationalistic right or duty which is based upon and seeks to perpetuate a mode of thought which is directly contrary to the moral ideals of the revolutionary proletariat, which, nourished by group interests, is merely the elevation into an ideal of the sordid self-interest which rules the capitalist world both within and without the group called "nation."

Rising superior to the selfishness of the group called "nation," as they do to the selfishness of the individual, the Socialists can see that self-defense is as poor a protection in the case of a weak nation as it is in the case of a weak individual, and that the only real protection to the weak lies in an expansion and amplification of social norms and the protection which a larger society can give to its weak members as against the strong. Concretely, this means a federation of all the nations of the world—an ideal which lies in the opposite direction from the right or duty of national (self) defense.

And even before the Socialist ideal of a world-federation has been achieved the important matter cannot be left to the Socialist "nationals" of the country which is the subject of attack. On the one hand it touches a matter in which all Socialists, whether of

that or any other nation are equally interested. And on the other hand, separate action by the Socialists of the country involved threatens the very foundations of Socialist internationalism—the very life-blood of the Socialist movement. Both, the true interests of the nation involved, as far as the masses of the people are concerned, as well as the interest of the future of our civilization, which is intimately bound up with the growth of the power of the revolutionary proletariat, demand that whenever action in such a matter is necessary it should be taken concertedly by the Socialists of the entire world. In the domain of international relations we recognize the principle, long recognized by us in the domain of intra-national relations, that an injury to one is an injury to all. The Socialist movement denies the duty of national defense, but it also denies the right of so-called “neutrality” which is its nationalistic complement, both being based on the good capitalistic-individualistic maxim: “everybody for himself, and the devil take the hindmost.”

In place of both it seeks to substitute concerted action by the international revolutionary proletariat to prevent war in any part of the world and to prevent aggression by any nation against any nation.

The considerations which lead to a denial of the doctrines of national defense, also determine our position on the subject of defense of democracy as a cause for or a justification of our participation in war.

We are not indifferent to the fate of democracy. On the contrary—we believe that the Socialist movement is particularly charged with the duty of preserving and extending all democratic institutions. Furthermore, we believe that the revolutionary working class is the only social power capable of doing it. But far from this being a reason for our supporting any of the governments now at war, we believe that the interests of true democracy require that we refuse to join hands with any of these governments and the interests which support them and that we work for a speedy termination of this war by the action and pressure of the working class and the Socialist movements of the belligerent nations.

We deny that any of the nations engaged in this war fight for democracy, or that the ends of democracy will be subserved by either side winning a complete victory. This war is largely the result of the general reactionary trend which is one of the most essential characteristics of the imperialistic era in which we live. Modern imperialism is a world-wide phenomenon, although it may be more pronounced in one country than in another. Similarly, the reactionary trend which accompanies it, is as broad as our “civilization,” although in some countries it may assume particularly revolting forms while in others its *forms* may be less objectionable. The only hope of democracy lies, therefore, in those revolutionary elements of each country which are ready to fight imperialism in all its manifestations and wherever found, including the absolute refusal to participate in any imperialistic war whatever. The working class has no interest in the imperialistic ambitions of “its” “national” capitalist class, and must therefore refuse not only to fight for them aggressively, but also to defend them when “attacked” by “foreign” capitalists.

That no capitalist government can be depended on to fight for democracy, or indeed for any thing but sordid capitalist interests, is conclusively proven by the role which the United States government has played during this war. When the great war opened with one of the most lawless and ruthless acts in history, the invasion of Belgium by Germany—an act not merely abhorrent in itself, but completely annihilating the entire fabric of international law which must lie at the foundation of any international arrangement looking toward the ultimate abolition of war—our president solemnly enjoined upon the people of this country the duty of remaining neutral not only in deed by also in thought. By that declaration President Wilson officially and authoritatively announced to the people of this country as well as to the world at large that the existence of international law, the dictates of humanity, the fate of small peoples or of democratic institutions are matters that do not concern us. Not only will we, the ruling powers of the United States, not intercede in their behalf by some appropriate action, but we are entirely indifferent to them. We must not take sides for them even in the secrecy of our thoughts, lest we might betray our thoughts in some unguarded moment,

thereby offending our prospective customers—regard being had to the fact that as matters then stood the Central Empires were as likely to be our customer as the members of the Entente.

As long as our trade was not interfered with we remained neutral. When such interference was threatened, as in the case of the first submarine campaign resulting in the destruction of the *Lusitania*, we protested. And no sooner were our selfish interests protected by proper concessions, we relapsed into our indifference. But now that these concessions have been withdrawn and the enormous export trade which we have enjoyed during the past two and a half years because of our neutrality are seriously threatened, we have suddenly awakened to the solemn duty resting upon us to come to the defense of the democracy, the civilization, and the other beautiful things which are menaced by German "barbarism" and inhumanity.

The hypocrisy of President Wilson and our capitalist class, of which he is the spokesman, is not exceptional. On the contrary—it is typical of capitalism everywhere. There is no hope for democracy in this quarter.

The hope of democracy lies in the awakening of the class-consciousness of the working class—in the realization by the working class, among other things, of the fact that capitalist wars are not its wars, and that in order to be able to successfully carry on the fight for true democracy, political as well as industrial, it must fight capitalist war with all the means at its command.

We are not pacifists. We are ready to fight injustice. We are ready to fight for our ideals. We are ready to fight for the interests of the working class. But we are not ready to shoot each other in a family quarrel of the ruling classes—nor in order to settle the division of the world among our masters. In this country particularly and at this moment, we refuse to fight for the unrestricted right of our capitalists to grow fat on the woes of mankind, and for the unlimited opportunity of our capitalists to coin dollars out of the mangled bodies of what should be the flower of European civilization.

But in refusing to participate in capitalist wars we do not remain "neutral."

Unlike the capitalist class and its smug representatives, we are not indifferent to the great struggle and its outcome. We are deeply interested in its progress, and even more so in its results. For we do not merely desire a cessation of the frightful slaughter. We are not peace at any price men. We know that a true and lasting peace can be founded only on the principles of justice and freedom which neither of the warring sides cares anything about, and which will surely be trampled under by the victorious side, whichever it should happen to be. This can only be avoided if the war is not permitted to run its capitalistic course: if the conclusion of peace is exacted by the pressure of the toiling masses of each country upon their respective governments. Only in such a case can a real and lasting peace be organized, for then the toiling masses which have exacted the peace will also prescribe the terms upon which it is to be concluded.

The latest events in some of the warring countries have shown that the masses are becoming astir—that they no longer follow blindly in the path laid out for them by their ruling classes. This is the Socialist opportunity. Here lies our work: to direct the hunger-lashed masses into intelligent and constructive revolutionary action. Not to permit the anger of the suffering masses to spend itself in blind fury, but to use the forces of revolt thus let loose toward the abolition of all obstacles to a just and lasting peace and the reorganization of society. The termination of the war and the organization of the future peace must both be the result of an intelligent appreciation by the toiling masses of the forces which brought about this war, and of their own true interests which are opposed to this as well as all wars.

This can only come from a true understanding of the greatest of all historic struggles, of the Class Struggle. We must therefore bend all our energies to bring home to the toiling masses the full import of this struggle. We must show them the "two nations" within each nation, and help them to a realization of the fact that fundamentally each of these two nations—the capitalist as well as the working class nation—is international in character and scope. Only then will they realize that the capitalist wars of the present era, like the dynastic wars of old, are mere family quar-

rels which will immediately be patched up the moment the toiling masses should show any sign of revolt—the erstwhile “enemies” uniting their energies in an effort to crush the real “common enemy.”

The question as to which is the deeper and more fundamental division—that along national lines or that along class lines—lies at the basis of all our problems. “It is here that the old International has failed—in not laying the proper emphasis on the correct answer and therefore permitting confusion of thought, timidity of action, and attempts to serve two masters. The work of building the new International which will surely arise on the ruins of the old, like the work of speeding the termination of the great war and the establishment of a lasting peace, can only be done intelligently and with some prospect of success if it is based on a full understanding of this fundamental question, and a full realization that to compromise at this point means to invite a new disaster.

The class struggle is fundamental. It is the acid test of Socialist action. There is not and can be no Socialism that is not built solidly upon the basis of the class struggle. And the class struggle determines our course of action equally within the nation as well as in matters of international policy. The requirements of the class struggle compel the Socialist movement to adopt a policy of aggressive action against Capitalism. There can be no compromise in any shape or form with any party of the capitalist opposition.

The class struggle, moreover, excludes the narrow and deadening conception of political action as meaning merely the participation in elections and parliamentary legislative activity. In the vocabulary of Socialism, political action has a much deeper and broader meaning: it means the struggles and activities of the working class which have the overthrow of capitalism by the working class as their aim, and of which parliamentary activity is only a part. The conception of political action as parliamentary activity only leads to that “parliamentary cretinism” denounced by Marx, which produces the illusion that the whole world and its social process revolve about the parliament.

This conception of political action is false theoretically, and in practice leads ultimately to disaster. In itself it cannot develop the independence and aggressive action of the working class which are necessary in order that it may achieve its final emancipation. But, related to the general mass action of the proletariat, parliamentary action becomes a vital phase of Socialist activity.

This conception imposes the task of developing a new form of economic organization—Industrial Unionism. Craft unionism, as typified in the American Federation of Labor, is an archaic form of organization. It is unresponsive to the industrial development of our day and to the revolutionary requirements of the coming crisis. The A. F. of L. has officially acquiesced to “Burgfrieden” in the coming war, has pledged its support to the government of the ruling class; moreover, it practices a form of “Burgfrieden” during peace, in its concept of the identity of interests between labor and capital—a theory that, however much violated in the every-day practice of the labor movement, exerts a potent influence in great crises, by narrowing the vision and weakening the fighting powers of the working class.

The Socialist Party itself cannot re-organize and reconstruct the industrial organizations of the working class. That is the task of the economic organizations of the working class themselves. But the party may assist this process of re-organization by a propaganda for industrial unionism as part of its general activities, and by co-operation with the most progressive forces in the labor movement. It is our task to do the pioneer work of the working class, to clarify and express its gropings after better things. It is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

These are indication of the forces that must be invoked in the re-organization of the American Socialist movement. And the reconstruction of our own movement is the finest contribution that we can make to the general reconstruction of the International Socialist movement.

Our strategic power is great. Our course of action will influence profoundly the action of the whole international movement. May we meet this task in a spirit worthy of the revolutionary character of Socialism!

Herein lies our task: to bring the needed light and do away with confusion in our ranks, thereby doing our share for the re-establishment of peace upon secure foundations, to the reconstruction of the International and rejuvenation of the Socialist Party of America.

The Russian Revolution and Its Significance

By N. BUCHARIN

The first Russian revolution of 1905 was the expression of a gigantic conflict between the growing forces of production on the one hand and reactionary, industrial and political conditions in Russia on the other. A rapidly growing capitalism demanded the freedom of the inner market, the failure of the Russian Japanese war having made the extension of foreign markets impossible. But the home market was equally unresponsive. The predominating element among the Russian people is its peasantry, whose demands and whose buying power represented the basis for all further capitalistic development. They were equal, it is true, but equal in misery. A pauperized, not a proletarian nation of farmers, peasants who remained on their farms, did not go into the cities, and paid enormous sums for their little rent farms to the semi-feudal gentry landlords. Nobility landlordism on one hand, hungry pauper tenantry on the other—such were the conditions in the agrarian sections of Russia. Capitalistic farm production had taken root only on the extreme outskirts of the nation, in the Baltic provinces and in southern Russia. But its extent was comparatively unimportant.

So the objective "purpose" of the Revolution was the creation of a home market, and the abolition of unbearable political conditions. The downfall of the Revolution meant only the postponement of the great social catastrophe and the possibility of a higher ultimate stage of development.

Nevertheless the proletarian blood that flowed in 1905 was by no means shed in vain. The old autocracy gave place to a new pseudo-constitutional regime, presenting a certain (though very limited) opportunity to conduct the broader work of revolutionary education among the proletariat.

But even from a purely economical point of view, the first Revolution had consequences that are not unimportant. It was followed by fundamental changes in the national industrial structure, and by a consequent readjustment of class relations.

The large landlords, terrorized by the revolting farmers, sold their possessions, either directly to their tenants or through the agency of so-called "farmers' banks" (Krestjansky Bank), the government institution that, as a rule, functioned as the business agency of the nobility. In this way a small part of the possessions of the great landed nobility passed into the hands of the wealthier farmers. By his so-called agrarian reform programme, Stolypin, the Czarist minister, dissolved the old "Mir" (peasant communities), and divided the community lands in such a way that the best portions everywhere fell into the hands of a thin strata of agricultural bourgeoisie. The result was a visible strengthening of this new class, whose members organized everywhere on a co-operative basis.

But the status of the great landholders, too, had changed. The modern capitalist wing grew stronger, a phenomena that may be attributed mainly to altered conditions in the world market. The price of wheat and rye were advancing almost hourly. It became more profitable to produce by modern capitalistic methods; the old primitive system went into discard. So agrarian capitalism gained a firm foothold in Russia.

All these changes kept step with the changes that were taking place on the industrial field. "Our" industries before the Revolu-

tion had been rather peculiarly constituted. "We" had, on the one side, a primitive system of fragmentary, disorganized, small scale production, on the other, gigantic undertakings which frequently employed 15,000 to 20,000 laborers and employees. After the Revolution the concentration of capital advanced in leaps and bounds. In the era of the counter-revolution mighty manufacturers' associations, employers' associations, trusts, syndicates and combinations, banking houses and banking corporations came into existence. In Russia, to-day, monopolization in a few branches of industry is very large indeed; so, for instance, the sugar, the metal, the naphtha, the textile and the coal mining industries, are in the hands of a few syndicates. Thus there grew up in Russia the mighty power of the united bourgeois organizations, the power of financial capital, interested mainly in export and trade.

The Revolution did not create a home market, it is true. This but increased the profit hunger of "our" financiers. Protected by outrageous protective tariffs that enabled them to sell comparatively cheaply in the world market, the Russian capitalist began to sell his wares in Persia, in the Balkans, in Asia Minor, etc., and even in the Far East. Bank operations were augmented, state loans to China, Persia, etc., arranged; transactions that were diametrically opposed to the interests of English, French and German capital were the order of the day.

The first Revolution itself, as we have seen, resulted in no radical upheaval. But the greatest economic phenomena of the counter-revolutionary period is the growth of *financial* capitalism and its policy of expansion, or *Imperialism*.

Two classes were emerging out of the social chaos, the liberal bourgeoisie, which gradually developed into an imperialistic bourgeoisie, and the proletariat. During the first Russian Revolution the specific characteristics of the Revolution were already quite evident, although the objective content of the Revolution was wholly in harmony with capitalism. The demands made by the masses were characteristically bourgeois, and purely democratic and republican in their nature; even the economic reforms were compatible with the interests of capitalism—as, for in-

stance, the eight hour day, the confiscation of land, and others. But though the Revolution of 1905 was the *bourgeois-democratic* Revolution of Russia, the motive power behind this upheaval was by no means the liberal bourgeoisie, but the proletariat, and the revolutionary peasantry who fought in the struggle under the control of the proletariat. This seeming contradiction may be explained by the fact that the Russian revolution came too late, came in an epoch in which the proletariat had already become a mighty factor in social struggles. So our Liberalism was condemned to a vacillating position, between Revolution and Czarism, a policy that finally resulted in the betrayal of the whole revolution. In the most critical period of the revolution, the liberals were already completely contra-revolutionary.

The outbreak of the war almost completely laved the Russian movement. It was the signal of an outbreak, in the ranks of the bourgeoisie (including its liberal as well as its radical elements), an indescribable patriotic fervor. The policy of conquest carried on by the nobility and the landowners was in accord with the thieving plans of the group which controlled the high finance of the nation. Mr. Miljukoff had long been singing the praises of the bloody policy of the Czar's government in Persia and in the Balkan States. Thus the Russian civil peace was born, though a large part of the proletariat was actively and unalterably opposed to it.

But the calculations of the new liberal class were, after all, at fault. The Czarist administration, in spite of the most energetic support of the Liberals, proved ineffectual on every hand. Corruption, systematic thievery, complete disorganization of the whole administration apparatus became more and more apparent. The needs of warfare had practically ruined the rickety economic organism of Russian national economy. Instead of increasing the production of foodstuffs the territory under cultivation was reduced. The strength of the whole nation was drawn off from productive labor and a shortage in a number of important articles of consumption followed.

Chaos reigned in the finances of the state. Securities for enormous war loans and the payment of interest, staggering sums

necessary to pay for all kinds of war manufactures, all these the Czarist government attempted to cover by a promiscuous printing of paper money. This course was followed, naturally, by a steady depreciation in the value of paper money, until it was worth hardly 50 per cent. of its face value. This meant an unbearable increase in the cost of living. High prices, in Russia, during the war, were caused, therefore, not only by actual shortage of supplies, not only by monopoly speculations, but also, to no small degree, by the ruinous financial policy of the government.

At the same time the collapse of the whole transportation augmented the general calamity by bringing about a complete disorganization of the home market. For lack of means of transportation the sale of products was limited to countless small markets in the immediate locality in which they were produced.

Increased taxes were another consequence of the war; all attempts to tax the wealthier classes as well were pushed back upon the shoulders of the proletariat and the peasantry by means of increased prices, intensified labor and the overthrow of the miserable Russian "labor laws."

Upon this "economic foundation" was built up a corresponding "political superstructure."

The central administration, civil as well as military, was in the hands of Rasputin, the Czar, and their followers, the clique of slovenly, religious, superstitious, degenerate idiots and court thieves, who had always looked upon the Russian nation as their family property. The local administration was everywhere in the hands of autocratic governors who ruled their territories like the Satraps of the ancient Orient.

The story of a session of the magistracy of Moscow, in which a serious discussion as to the size of the bribe necessary to persuade the railroad officials of Russia to secure the transportation of Siberian meat to Moscow was the order of business, shows to what lengths corruption had gone.

"Civil peace" in Russia, as in all other countries, was rather peculiar. It meant, in effect, a system of gagging and oppres-

sion such as Russia had not known since the failure of the first Revolution. The labor press was suspended, labor unions dissolved, striking workers were sent to the front, were thrown into prison or summarily shot. In Iranovo-Wosnesensk alone more than 100 workers were killed. Proletariat and the peasantry were segregated on the battlefields and mechanically slaughtered. That Russia has been able to hold out against the Central Powers so long is due alone to its almost inexhaustible reservoir of cannon fodder.

These circumstances, which proved that the Czarist regime was unable to realize even its own plans of usurpation, not to mention those of its liberal supporters, called forth the opposition of the liberal imperialists. The downtrodden and suffering proletariat cast its lot under the banner of civil war, assisted by large groups among the peasantry.

The liberal bourgeoisie (the Cadettes and the Octobrists) and with them the social-patriots, who are but their subservient vassals, were organized mainly in Semstwo and in municipal units. They flirted with Grand Duke Nikolai, with their democratic allies, with the ruling circles within the army. In the Duma the so-called "progressive block" was formed, as the parliamentary expression of the imperialistic bourgeoisie.

Their opposition was, as a matter of fact, rather innocent. They stood by the maxim, "No infraction of the law." In the words of Mr. Miljukoff, "If victory means revolution, I want no victory."

Not so the proletarian masses. In spite of the "pacifying" manifesto of a few social patriotic traitors, the proletarian "Avantgarde" developed an intense revolutionary activity. Street demonstrations, strikes, the general strike and revolts of workers and military groups that fraternized with them were the methods used in the struggle. These mass actions paved the way for the final overthrow of the Czarist regime. The first wave of the second revolution shattered the Russian throne.

The first step in the Revolution has been taken; the social structure of the state machine has been changed, a new class has

come into power. The old, semi-feudal, noble, landowning class is overthrown. In its place stand the new rulers, the modern, capitalist bourgeoisie.

But the second step will inevitably follow: the transformation of the fatherland of the Gutschkoff-Miljukoff into the fatherland of the proletariat.

How did it happen that the *Imperialists* won the victory, although they were anything but revolutionary? The answer is plain. Everything points to a compromise between the ruling classes. The revolution was not yet strong enough to overthrow the capitalist system; it has only effected a shifting of the elements within the bourgeoisie as a whole, has placed the more progressive wing at the helm, by pushing aside the reactionary nobility.

But the revolution is steadily growing. Even now, while these lines are being written, there exist in Petrograd two governments, one, that of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, which was jubilantly greeted by the bourgeois classes of the other allied nations; the other, the governmental machine of the proletariat, the working-men's and soldiers' council.

The struggle between the working class and the Imperialists is inevitable. Even the reforms that have been proclaimed by the provisional government were concessions made out of fear of the threats of the proletariat. But the liberal government will not be in a position to fulfill the programme that has been forced upon it. The high cost of all necessities of life and the growing burden of taxation can be decreased to a measurable degree only by the liquidation of the war, by confiscation, by the annullment of state debts, by taxation of the possessing classes, by fixing hours of labor and wages, by organizing public works, etc.

But Miljukoff and his class must pay the debts they have incurred to the English, the French and the American bankers. They must defend the principle of private property, must continue the policy of usurpation, a policy that is suicidal at the present stage of complete disorganization. So the new government is staggering toward bankruptcy, to clear the way for the proletariat.

But the conquest of political power by the proletariat will, under the existing circumstances, no longer mean a bourgeois revolution, in which the proletariat plays the role of the broom of history. The proletariat must henceforth lay a dictatorial hand upon production, and that is the beginning of the end of the capitalist system.

A lasting victory of the Russian proletariat is, however, inconceivable without the support of the west European proletariat. And this support is fully guaranteed by the present international situation. To be sure, the Russian Revolution has its specific abnormalities. But it is, as a product of the world war, only a part of the coming world revolution of the proletariat, whose first step it represents.

Wars and revolutions are the locomotives of history, one of our Socialist teachers once said. And the present war was destined to produce the revolution. The ruin of all national economy and with it the greatest conceivable concentration of capital, the formation of gigantic units of production, the adoption of state capitalism, the advance of great masses upon the scene of history—and the unbearable sufferings of these masses. The oppression of the people—and its armament—all of these conflicts must find their solution in a gigantic catastrophe.

More than 100 years ago, when the French bourgeoisie had cut off the head of its king, it lighted the torch of revolution in Europe. This was the signal for a whole series of capitalist revolutions. To-day the bourgeoisie stands at its grave. It has become the citadel of reaction. And the proletariat has come to destroy its social order.

The call to arms to this great upheaval is the Russian Revolution. Well may the ruling classes tremble before a communist revolution. The proletariat has nothing to lose but its chains; it has a world to gain.

The War and America

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

The entry of American Capitalism into the war is the culmination of a process interesting in itself, and still more interesting as a token of what is to come.

When the war burst upon the world, America—and I shall use the word as meaning American Capitalism, and its intellectual minions—reacted to the war with an overwhelming sense of fear and horror. Its own interests not being involved, the fear of an unprecedented catastrophe dominant, America's traditional democracy flared up in a flame of protest. Austria was damned for its brutal onslaught on Serbia, Germany for its rape of Belgium; the horrors of war, and this war in particular, were emphasized and the general feeling was that the war might end and end speedily.

These reactions were not wholly insincere. Compounded of fear and prejudice, of a belief that a real menace was loose in the world, this feeling of horror—impulsive and crude, in a measure hypocritical—was still very real and very strong. The idealism of Capitalism, and this idealism is a messy mixture of Capitalism at its best and its worst, cried out against the war and for peace. There was a strong propaganda for international arbitration, disarmament and other schemes to end war.

This feeling lasted about six months. Originally largely impulsive, it gradually turned into an expression of economic needs and economic facts. American Capitalism was hit hard by the war, its industry clogged up and its over-seas trade tremendously reduced. War was seen as a wasteful process, as a menace to industry and trade. The era of fabulous profits was still a thing of the future. Few capitalists, in spite of their vaunted far-sightedness, saw the huge profits ahead. There was a threat of economic disaster. Wall Street experienced a "Black Christmas." Everybody felt heart sore and pocket sore, and yearned for peace. When the Devil is sick, the Devil a monk would be.

As a matter of record, it is pertinent to mention that the talk at this time of the Allied "fight for democracy" was perfunctory and unconvincing. President Wilson, about the time Belgium was invaded, urged our people to be neutral "in thought and deed." The talk about democracy became stronger and stronger, it is true, but no action was urged. It was all simply a pious aspiration. The speedy coming of peace was the dominant thought during 1914.

The year 1915 marked a complete change in the spirit of America. The talk of peace drooped, and a smug, complacent yawping about "the war for democracy and civilization" took its place. The cry of "war to the finish" and "no premature peace" swelled into a mighty chorus. Why?

Largely and essentially because the era of fabulous profits had set in. The war had become Midas. The Allies settled down for a hard war and a long one; the mobilization of every available man and industry for purposes of war and the insatiable thirst of Mars for more guns and more munitions, compelled the Allies to turn to America for food, for money and for munitions. President Wilson, who at the beginning of the war suggested in a proclamation the advisability of not making loans to the belligerents, calmly and complacently forgot all about it when Wall Street floated huge loans in this country for the Allies at usurious interest. It had become a war of workshop against workshop; and the American workshop was kept increasingly busy.

The Christmas of 1915 in Wall Street was different from the preceding one. Bonuses were distributed by men who had made thousands out of the carnage, and generously gave away a penny. The country was feverish; it basked in the shower of Gold, and bent all its resources and all its cunning to wring the last penny out of the Allies—whom the newspapers very generously and very magnificently praised for their heroic struggle against the Hun and the Vandal. But, as the Allies were spending money at an astonishing rate, why not spend a little more so that the high-minded captains of industry in this country might make

two and three hundred per cent. profit? Even an unselfish war for democracy must be made to pay in dollars and cents. Otherwise, what's the good of it all?

Only a supreme novelist could adequately describe the emotions of this period; only a supreme economist analyze the economic factors at work; and only a genius picture for all time the complex of economic and psychological forces that dominated that splendid, marvelous and horrible period of prosperity and death, and of its idealism stalking forth as justification of the shameless exploitation of a world sinking into ruin.

This period gradually flowed into a new one—the two became merged, and the end of one and the beginning of the other are not very clear. This new period, roughly the year 1916, while making still greater profits, was marked by a deeper realization of the causes of the war and its aims—of the great economic and political issues involved. It was seen to be a struggle for world-power, not in the sense of a Kaiser's mad ambitions, but as a clash between two great economic groups struggling for the industrial and financial domination of the world, and particularly for the control of its investment markets.

The war, in a sense, has been the economic education of American Capitalism. Imperialism has not been unknown in this country, but it was in a form weak, parochial, without a world-vision. The war has changed all that, and American Imperialism now stands forth aware of its strength, conscious of its purposes, and preparing its armed power to impose these purposes upon the world.

In a way, the loans to the Allies were a factor in developing this new understanding generally. When, through the parochialism and cowardice of American finance, it became difficult for the Allies to secure loans here, they retaliated by paying for all their purchases *in gold*. The influx of gold became tremendous. It threatened to choke American Capitalism in its own plenitude. Howls of warning arose that this golden flood was swamping the country, that by inflating credit it might produce a panic. Loans were again made easy to secure; and America learned that

foreign trade to-day depends largely upon investments—upon the capacity of an exporting nation to finance a prospective customer.

Where during 1915 it was simply a problem of making money hand over fist, this process in 1916 became a means to an end—the end being *economic and financial supremacy in the world*. Organized endeavor took the place of reckless profiteering alone; the present was related to the future, and immediate economic activity became a phase of the general process of making this country a world power.

The organization of the American International Corporation was the sign and symbol of this awakening to the opportunity of seizing world power, backed up by a vigorous propaganda for mightier armaments. This International Corporation represents the great interests of finance capital, and of such powerful economic units as the steel industry. Its purpose is to seek out investment markets, exploit and control them. It is a definite expression of the new era in American trade—an era of systematic export of products organized by the export of capital. Its capitalization of \$50,000,000 is purely nominal, a mere bagatelle in comparison with the millions upon millions controlled by its sponsors. It is around the activity of this corporation, in China, in Chile, anywhere an opportunity offers, that American Imperialism is organizing itself. It is an ominous sign of the times. And, with characteristic American energy, it is going its European progenitors more than one better.

In pace with this development in its economic consciousness, America experienced a change in its attitude toward armaments. The earlier period of the war, and to a lesser degree the second period, was marked by the aspiration for universal disarmament and the conviction that war is waste—except in the case of a confirmed militarist such as Theodore Roosevelt. But as the war went on, as the economic interests at stake were realized, as American Imperialism became aware of itself, the propaganda for "preparedness" and larger armaments assumed tremendous proportions and inevitably developed into a demand for universal military service.

This change in the policy of armaments is faithfully expressed in the gradual changes in opinion of President Wilson. The New York *Evening Post*, in its April 4 issue, very aptly summarizes this change in the President:

"The stages of the President's changes of opinion are perfectly clear. In December, 1914, he was absolutely opposed to turning America 'into an armed camp.' In December, 1915, he yielded to the demands for preparedness. In January, 1916, he desired 'incomparably the greatest navy in the world.' In April, 1917, he yields to the principle of conscription to which he has hitherto been opposed or at least withheld his consent. From the beginning of the war he argued eloquently against our going into it, and because of his having kept us out of it he is re-elected to the Presidency. In April, 1917, he decides for war, and thereby, curiously enough, wins the acclaim of the very business interests that most bitterly fought his re-election."

The chronology of the President's changes is significant. It fits in remarkably with the three stages of America's reaction to the war that I have previously described. In President Wilson there is seen, accordingly, a man who expresses accurately the needs and demands of the economic interests dominant in the country.

What are the economic facts that have produced this complete change in American opinion and preparations for war, and that lie at the roots of our developing Imperialism?

The credit balance of American foreign trade from the outbreak of the war to January 31, 1917, represents a huge total of \$5,574,000,000. The statistics, as given by the New York *Times*, are as follows:

The foreign trade of the United States, imports and exports combined, since the outbreak of the war in Europe at the end of July, 1914, has amounted to the huge sum of \$15,622,785,853. Exports during this period were a little more than double the imports, and the balance of trade in favor of this country resulting from these thirty months of trade was \$5,501,568,835. This table shows how this vast trade has accumulated and the huge movement of gold which resulted from it:

	MERCHANDISE		Credit Trade
	Exports	Imports	Balance (Excess of Exports)
January, 1917.....	\$613,441,020	\$241,674,851	\$371,766,169
Year, 1916.....	5,481,423,589	2,391,654,335	3,089,769,254
Year, 1915.....	3,554,670,847	1,778,596,695	1,776,074,152
Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1914....	912,641,888	648,682,628	263,959,260
Total since outbreak...	\$10,562,177,344	\$5,000,608,509	\$5,501,568,835

	GOLD		Excess of
	Exports	Imports	Imports
January, 1917.....	\$20,719,898	\$58,926,258	\$38,206,360
Year, 1916.....	155,792,927	685,990,234	530,197,307
Year, 1915.....	31,425,918	451,954,590	420,528,672
Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1914...	104,972,197	23,252,604	*81,719,593
Total since outbreak...	\$312,910,940	\$1,220,123,686	\$907,212,746

Our credit balance from merchandise trade was augmented by our net exports of silver. The balance in our favor was offset by gold imports, the purchase of foreign securities, the repurchase of our own securities and by other items. The two sides of the account in round numbers may be put thus in the shape of a balance sheet:

BALANCE SHEET OF OUR FOREIGN TRADE

Sent Out		Taken In	
Excess of merchandise exports	\$5,501,000,000	Net gold imports.....	\$907,000,000
Net exports of silver	73,000,000	Foreign securities bought	2,400,000,000
		American securities repurchased	2,200,000,000
		Other items	67,000,000
Total	\$5,574,000,000	Total	\$5,574,000,000

The "other items" include payments to foreign ship owners for freight on part of our imports, the net amount of interest and dividends on our stocks and bonds still held abroad and other less important items.

There is nothing in the annals of economic history to compare with this achievement. It marks an industrial and financial revolution in America.

*Excess of imports.

The statistics are not significant because of what they express in foreign trade alone. Trade in itself is not a cause of belligerency between nations to-day. The statistics of trade must be considered in relation to a nation's stage of economic development; they must be related to the whole process of industrial and financial activity and international trade.

The outstanding fact in this industrial revolution is that America, from a debtor nation, *has become a creditor nation*. Two years ago American Capitalism owed the world more than two billion dollars; to-day the world owes America nearly three billion dollars. Where this country previously imported masses of capital, to-day it is exporting capital, and is developing the power to export it in still larger masses. The loans to the belligerent governments, paying good interest, represent a financial reserve for the future. And these loans are steadily growing—at present they amount to more than \$2,500,000,000.

What do these economic facts, this accumulation of capital, signify? The accumulation of capital and the necessity for its export are the urge behind Imperialism. The export of capital lies at the very roots of Imperialism. The export of American capital to Mexico, and to Central and South America generally, has been the factor in the initial development of Imperialism in this country, with its menace to peace and freedom at home and abroad. How much more menacing will this Imperialism become when the export of capital assumes larger dimensions!

To-day, due to the war and as indicated in the statistics, the accumulation of capital in this country is proceeding at a terrific pace; and after the war means must be sought for its profitable investment. Undoubtedly, this capital could be profitably invested in this country; our resources and industrial capacity are as yet only slightly developed; but as the returns would be comparatively small and slow, foreign investments will beckon alluringly. Moreover, the investment of part of this surplus capital in this country, and the impetus it will give to the already tremendous expansion in production, will require new outlets in the way of foreign trade. But export trade to-day must largely be developed and financed through foreign investments. James

A. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation, emphasizes the necessity of the export of capital, of investments, as "a commercial preparedness measure," as the means of increasing trade and exports by financing the needs of these growing countries "which are America's best customers." Great Britain's \$20,000,000,000 of foreign investments, according to Farrell, "retain and strengthen its hold on the neutral markets of the world." Accordingly, an irresistible tendency will arise to invest in undeveloped countries, where returns are both quick and large, and the profits dual—a profit on the actual investment in the way of interest, and a profit on exports which will be stimulated by the investments, as investments in undeveloped countries carry the proviso that the bulk of the purchases must be made in the country of the investor. This tendency is now active in the circles of financial capital, where systematic preparations are being made to secure dominance in the investment markets of the world, and through that dominance in export trade.

The political expressions of these economic forces of American Imperialism are clear and drastic:

Armed force, potential and actual, is required to conserve the exclusive interests of American Capitalism in Latin America, and preserve it for "our own" monopolistic exploitation; armed force and an aggressive foreign policy are required to maintain the "prestige" of the United States in world politics and guarantee American capital a preferential, or at least an equal, opportunity in Asia and the other undeveloped markets of the world; a strong centralized national government is required to back up Imperialism, and to secure a faithful and obedient Working Class the "just distribution" of the profits of Imperialism by means of slightly higher wages and social reforms; and an autocratic administrative control of industry is required to co-ordinate the vast economic units of to-day, and to free the energies of concentrated capital by governmental beneficence and by compelling small capital to compromise and satisfy its interests by sharing in the spoils of a triumphant Imperialism.

The central feature of this development is the unity of Capitalism and its conflicting interests into an efficient, systematized and

brutal State Socialism; and the fusion of bourgeois progressivism with Imperialism in the interests of general reaction.

All these factors have been developing rapidly and powerfully before the war, in this country and Europe; and the consequences of the declaration of a state of war against Germany will tremendously accelerate the process, just as war has done in Europe.

The impulses that organized to force this country into the war are, roughly, three: (1) to protect America's immediate profits, menaced by Germany's resumption of the ruthless submarine campaign; (2) to protect American "prestige"; and (3) to use the opportunity of war to prepare the necessary national psychology of reaction and of armed force for the greater clash of Imperialism that is coming.

The inclusion of "prestige" in these three groups is not incidental, or unimportant. Prestige is a real factor, a strong asset, in the struggles of international Capitalism. Time and again it has been invoked to protect the economic interests of a nation. And the acts of Germany were a menace to the prestige of America—not in the sense of "national honor," but as a political factor to be used for economic ends. This is the idealism of Capital!

Germany's submarine campaign struck directly at the huge profits of American Capitalism. During 1916 America's exports totalled \$5,481,423,000, of which \$4,209,166,000 went to the Allies—seventy-seven per cent. The vast purchases of Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy in this country were partly financed by loans to the Allied governments which in turn yielded a profit. Profit upon profit! And the submarine campaign menaced these profits, and larger profits still to come. From the time of the declaration by Germany that the ruthless submarine campaign would be renewed, until President Wilson acted, the bulk of American exports temporarily ceased. Ships remained in our harbors; traffic congested the railroads, and freight piled up on the wharves. Something had to be done. And the policy of armed neutrality, in itself a compromise, inevitably led to war.

It is out of these profits, menaced by Germany, that America is carving out its imperialistic future. And to protect these

profits, to insure its future as the financial centre of the world, American Capitalism draws the sword!

There is no longer talk of America leading the world to the Mecca of peace. The horrors of futile slaughter no longer evoke sanctimonious tears. Touch its money-nerve, and the beast in Capitalism leaps forth murderous and unashamed.

But, more important than the other factors in promoting war, is the opportunity war provides America to develop the necessary national psychology and armed force for the greater clash of Imperialism that is coming. It is a mistake to assume that America is to fight simply to protect its immediate economic interests. There are larger issues at stake.

A war just now fits in admirably with the plans of American Capitalism. In financial circles, war is accepted as beneficial to industrial expansion. The war will mean more profits immediately; and, what is more important in an age of Imperialism, acquiring military and financial reserves for the future, and making this country a power in world politics. That is the basis upon which the government is proceeding. That is the *leit-motiv* of the propaganda for war and a policy of war. That is the purpose of conscription. They have not urged conscription as an immediate war measure; they have imposed conscription, universal military service, as a measure for the future. They wish to accustom the Working Class to the barracks and the court martial; to "put over" conscription in a time when it is dangerous to resist. In other words, conscription and innumerable other measures of war are not for use in this war particularly, but for use in the days of peace and as a preparation to back up American Imperialism in the wars ahead.

And some of the plans of conquest of this Imperialism are already being formulated. They call for the conquest of Mexico and Central America, and the imposition of some form of economic protectorate over the other Latin American nations. They call for the acquisition of British territory adjacent to the Panama Canal. They call for the creating of a navy as large as that of Great Britain, Germany and Japan combined. The attacks upon

Japan are becoming more and more venomous. A large part of this propaganda is directed against Great Britain as the real menace, and the great competitor after the war! And all this, of course, goes hand in hand with social, political and governmental reaction.

American Imperialism is awake. It knows that after the war it will not be easy going. The nations of Europe, even in the midst of mutual slaughter, are organizing their industrial, social and political resources for the economic "war after the war." Their latent energy is tremendous; and the war is compelling them to forge an organization that, in its marvellous increase of productivity, will largely make up for the ravages of war. And Japan, the America of the Far East, has been making money out of the war hand over fist and preparing industrial and financial reserves for the coming clash.

America, accordingly, is building for the future. It will use the war as a pretext and an opportunity. The real menace of this war is not what it may do here and now, but the instruments of oppression and terrorism that it forges for use in the days of peace.

The future of American Imperialism is now being decided, and of Imperialism throughout the world. The vistas ahead are dripping with blood. Imperialism will again turn the world into a shambles, unless the forces of democracy and revolution latent in the Working Class are aroused and organized for action.

And, in a very real sense, the future of Socialism in this country and throughout the world is being decided. Fidelity to our revolutionary principles is necessary not merely because of what we may accomplish now, but in the moral and physical reserves that we develop for the future.

In carrying through its program of war, American Imperialism is fulfilling its destiny economically and financially.

In carrying through the program of revolutionary Socialism, we shall act as an inspiration to the International and determine its reconstruction along revolutionary lines.

But woe to the Socialist movement in this country, and throughout the world, if it collapses as the movement collapsed in Europe, if it allies itself with Imperialism, or if it adopts a policy of empty protest!

Majority Limitations and Minority Rights

By FRIEDRICH ADLER.

Translated by ERIC NIEL.

PART I. SOLIDARITY.

In the early months of the war a veritable fit of exaltation seized the Bourgeoisie. Its members became conscious of a sentiment heretofore unknown to them, the ecstasy that is founded on the subordination of the individual to community interest; they experienced in its full intensity SOLIDARITY of thought and sentiment.

Under ordinary conditions the sphere of solidarity in the upper classes is very limited. It does not as a rule extend beyond the family, and as often as not is absent altogether so that the ego is then the centre of gravity. This type views the world in the following order of importance—myself first, then the family, after that, friends, finally the community, and on the occasion of very exceptional celebrations the whole of humanity comes in for temporary consideration. This unsocial viewpoint is based on the theory that everything immediately attainable or within reach is reserved for the smallest sphere, it is taken for granted that the outside world is to content itself with the total of remoter blessings that are "left over."

We can readily understand the nature of the exaltation which follows the change from a self-centred to a social process of thought. The ego or family cease to be basic considerations; the primary problem now consists entirely of the needs and interests

of the community. All paths of thought and all efforts travel henceforth not from the individual to the mass but the other way around from the mass to the individual. The reversal of attitude is complete. On the basis of the solidarity of the community, the smaller group adjusts its activity to the allotment that it receives from the larger body, the formation being hierarchical. The whole no longer gets what is "left over" just the other way—the part gets its share by subdivision of the total. The interest of the part is subordinated to the interest of the whole.

In practice we usually figure the interests of individual and community separately before co-ordinating them finally. This reasoning is dialectic, nevertheless, the facts established concerning the nature of solidarity show that where the process of thought is social instead of self-centered, the deciding angle must be the interest of the larger unit exclusively, and not a compromise between the whole and any of its parts.

The community based on Solidarity is far more than the sum of the interests of the individuals composing it. The difference is not alone quantitative but becomes qualitative. The mere combining of interests into a sum total is replaced by the attitude and sentiment of each toward the community as a separate superior entity.

This fundamental change was experienced for the first time by the present generation of the Bourgeoisie, it became conscious of its Solidarity with the rest of the people of the country, in the shape of patriotism. In the proletariat the feeling of Solidarity could not produce the effect of something new or overwhelming, as it was already a living force in the ranks of the wage earners. And all that Socialist teaching does, in the end, is to get the worker to think socially, so as to develop the understanding of the interest of all when taken together, of the community based on Solidarity.

Superficial opponents of the labor movement persist in saddling upon Socialist agitation the objection that it merely aims to awaken the dormant egotism of the proletarians. However, the task of Socialism is not to stimulate individual wants and

demands, which after all occur automatically even without agitation, but to awaken understanding of the destiny of the entire class. The opening up of the field of vision begins with a sense of Solidarity in the factory and the union, and expands in extent until it culminates in the conception of the Solidarity of the proletariat of all countries; this constitutes the highest form of mass action until it is superseded by the attainment of the final goal—the brotherhood of Humanity.

The worker reaches the stage of Solidarity once he realizes that his individual interests are best served by effort in common, or "organized effort." But he has not learned to think in social terms until his interest in organization has attained the breadth of a consciousness of Solidarity, that is to say, when his attitude is no longer based on the personal interest which was its starting point, but when the interest of his class has become the deciding factor. His point of view is social in just so far as it obeys the general law of social thinking, which places the interest of the greater body above any part.

The sentiment of Solidarity at the outset of the war could not be a new thing to the proletariat in view of its entire historical development, but what did prove to be new was the community of interests to which Solidarity was applied. In place of the accustomed Solidarity of the working class of all countries there was unexpectedly substituted the solidarity of all classes within the nation.

Humanity is divided doubly nowadays. On the one hand is the division, into classes, in hierarchical formation, on the other geographically plus industrially into nations, in adjacent formation. Both entities involve solidarity of interests. But we know that solidarities of both class and nation are not eternal essentials of society. They are attributes of a stage indicating a split condition of society. Their existence is a relative manifestation due to an inferior stage of human solidarity. Both will disappear when solved by the higher stage which Socialism aims to establish, a society based on the absence of class lines and national divisions, the Solidarity of Humanity.

National solidarity was looked upon all along as a defensive

instrument, merely intended to preserve existing conditions as a sphere of activity. Class solidarity on the other hand is an instrument of offense which is supposed to contain the germs of a future society. It is not for us to investigate here which of these solidarities is superior. Our problem is to deal with the astonishing fact that whereas the Bourgeoisie underwent a great advance in the direction of solidarity, the war, which turns all things upside down, caused the proletariat to suffer to a marked degree, a decline of its previously known and tried integrity.

The existence of the solidarity of the nation alongside of the international solidarity of the working class, is by no means impossible as a mental conception. On the contrary, the last generation of socialists never dreamed that the necessity of defending the home country would break up the International. In fact many socialists were firmly convinced that the proletariat as an international unit would take the side of the attacked nation, and support its defensive fight, if not by actual participation, at least by all other means mental and moral.

Nothing of the sort occurred. The war disrupted the International, its first victim. And when we ask ourselves to-day why this happened, we see that the present period of history which is an epoch of Imperialism, is based on conditions entirely different than were taken into account in former deductions. All peoples felt themselves threatened, all were under the impression that they were the attacked, and not a single one of the lot waged a purely defensive war such as the democratic leaders of former decades had in mind. A war of such a character might still occur as an exception, in the case of little democratic Switzerland, for example. But as a ruling principle, wars of this sort belong to a period when the peoples were still striving to attain national unity, and are utterly excluded in an era in which the objective is maximum industrial growth based on territorial expansion under the supremacy of the Bourgeoisie which even undertakes to absorb or subordinate any resulting agglomeration of nationalities.

Solely on the assumption that the proletarians of all countries would participate in purely defensive wars only, could the ability

of the International to function effectively have been maintained. As this premise did not exist, the participation of the party in the solidarity of action of the classes of the country, excluded solidarity of action by the international proletariat.

Notwithstanding that the political stand taken in Germany and France on August 4 excluded solidarity of action by the International, international thought and sentiment might have and ought to have remained. But even this vanished in very many instances. We still remember the acute reaction that was produced in our ranks when the English iron and steel workers extolled the war as a weapon of the competitive struggle, thus placing their organization in the service of the imperialism of the ruling class.

Since then we have learned to become accustomed to this sort of thing—not only in England. Nearly everywhere, unfortunately, we see time and again, the consequences that must result when social thinking is sacrificed. The socialist movement loses its foundation whenever the interest of the *entire* proletariat is not made the supreme essential. The struggle of the workers united against the common enemy is then supplanted by the fight of the workers against one another.

Whereas in ordinary times of peace, violations against social thinking used to occur principally in subordinate spheres and minor relations, the war developed a disregard for the unity of the movement in its highest phases, involving the disruption of the International. The proletariat was thereby thrown completely out of its course, Socialist thought was undermined, and imperialistic processes of reasoning were given free field. The only thing for us to do, is to return to the position of the communist Manifesto where Marx and Engels described what we have here called social thinking, as the distinguished characteristic of their movement over against all other proletarian movements. They there stated:

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to

the front the common interests of the entire proletariat independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the Bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole."

To think socially is a necessary premise of all solidarity. But to characterize social thought in this way in respect to form, does not determine the contents or substance, i. e., does not determine which solidarity of interests is considered the highest. We can think perfectly in social terms whether we choose the "Solidarity of classes" of a country, or the solidarity of the workers of all countries as the supreme ideal. Which one is superior depends upon our understanding of the historical evolution of humanity. If a person believes that the International of the proletariat in the present historical situation is not the highest community of interest, or if he formerly believed that it was, but has since become convinced that it is not, we cannot find fault with him for refusing to adhere to a solidarity which his social process of thinking does not recognize. But on the other hand it would be just as mistaken to attach any blame to an internationalist in the Marxian sense if he values *Solidarity of the World Proletariat* above any other community of interests.

PART 2. PARTY RULE

All party work consists of action in common to realize the party program. The result in each instance depends on the decision of the majority of the integral whole. The operation of party rule is subject to two dangers: on the part of the majority and on the part of the minority. There is always the danger that the majority may arrive at a decision which is not in accord with the party program; this then involves a contradiction of principles fundamental to the whole movement, consequently of the supreme interests and purposes inherent in the party itself. There is the danger that the minority may break up the agreed basis of operation by not submitting to the majority, and by going its own way may impede the accomplishment of the result decided upon. Majority as well as minority may hinder the accomplishment of party purposes.

In general we surely agree that action in common by all assembled is to be taken for granted, and that the democratic vote is the basic principle within the party, calling for the obedience of the minority. In the interest of the party and its development, the minority will submit to the decision of the majority even when convinced that the latter is not pursuing the proper course on the theory that, "I will stand by my brother though he be mistaken, rather than break with him and be right."

But this course while proper in general, is true to a relative extent only. Situations are possible where the majority may so violate the common program, on which the solidarity rests, that the unity of the corporate whole is affected.

If a branch of the party decides not to remit any more dues to its local, but decides instead to join an association in its locality devoted to sports and amusements, then the Social Democratic minority of that branch, although outvoted, will nevertheless maintain solidarity, not with the branch, but with the local. And the same sort of thing will recur, only on a much larger scale if the majority of the party joins hands with the "class combination" of the country, thereby breaking through the Solidarity of the World proletariat and destroying the relation to the International, perhaps regretfully but inevitably.

The deviation from the International to the Union of classes actually makes a new solidarity supreme, and so the minority that continues to remain international is confronted by the question whether it is still possible "to stand by my brother though he be mistaken."

The conclusion will depend on how far we have reason to hope that the mistake is transitory, and what the prospects are of rectifying it. If the majority of the party were to decide absolutely to become national we certainly cannot expect anyone who is international to recognize the supremacy of such a solidarity. If we have reason to hope on the other hand, that the majority will find its way back, then it is essential to take into account whether it is more important for the good of the whole movement during such a period, that unity of action be preserved, or that the minority make its influence felt in the right direction.

The parliamentary minority in Germany regarded the action of the majority on August 4 as a violation of the program. But the minority, trusting time and again that the majority would come to its senses, and realizing fully the value of unity, displayed the utmost self-denial toward the political violations of the universal interests of the proletariat, trying by education and analysis to overcome the breaking up of the International without destroying party action. The minority waited and hoped. It grew steadily stronger, but could not possibly think of becoming a majority. Therefore the difficulty grew in intensity so that it finally became necessary to decide whether the highest interests of the proletariat did not demand that the minority choose what it saw to be the only possible way of re-establishing the International. The question whether the unity of the Social Democratic group in the Reichstag, or the recording of the International stand of the minority was of greater importance was finally decided in the latter sense after severe internal struggles. The unity of the group in the German Reichstag was destroyed but a way had been opened up to the proletarians of all countries. The highest solidarity, the Solidarity of the World Proletariat was the deciding factor in the conflict with the solidarity of a limited group.

And it is on this fundamental point that any judgment regarding violation of discipline by the minority must be based. A violation of discipline constitutes a real crime against the interests of the working class whenever used to place the interest of a group above the whole, as it is then a violation against social thinking. But the minority in the Reichstag were not thinking of their own group, on the contrary they were thoroughly inspired by the principles of social thought; their point of departure was based on the International Solidarity of the working class, the highest point of view in the movement, which in their opinion was menaced by the political action of the majority.

We are not investigating whether the minority figured its prospects of becoming a majority correctly—whether the adopted policy was the most practical for that purpose. We merely wish

to make clear this much: that the policy chosen cannot be attacked as a violation of party morality, for it did not violate social thinking, but on the contrary was the result of it. The unity of action was destroyed by the minority. Of course the majority has the power and also the formal right, where unity of action has been interfered with, to resort to the privilege of excluding the opposition from the organization. But even so, morally the minority is in the right. For while it destroyed party unity in the Reichstag, the majority broke up the International. The real crime against the integrity of the working class was committed in all countries by those whose political course involved the disruption of the International, and not by those minorities whose activity was founded on the true spirit of International Solidarity.

The Emergency National Convention of the Socialist Party

By L. B. BOUDIN

The National Convention of the Socialist Party just held at St. Louis was long overdue. The Socialist Party of this country is the only Socialist party in the world that we know of that has not held a convention in five years, and the only one in any country where such a convention could be held that has not held one since the commencement of the Great War. The ruling powers within the party do not like conventions. Like all ruling powers they are opposed to "agitation" and "unnecessary discussion." And conventions have the bad habit of being attended by "agitation" and "unnecessary discussion," both inside the convention as well as outside of the same. Hence, the guiding rule of our party management—avoid conventions by all means.

But, as is the case with all forces artificially repressed, there finally came a time when the demand for a convention could be repressed no longer, and we were given a convention. And, as

is usual in such cases, the convention came upon us like some elemental force, in a haphazard and disorderly fashion, without any chance for a proper discussion by the membership of the work which it was to do, and, in many instances, without the membership having a voice in the selection of delegates.

The convention itself largely reflected the circumstances which brought it about, and the manner in which it has been called together: It showed a considerable excess of passion and resentment over clearly thought out principles and policies. There was in evidence an enormous amount of passionate hatred of war, and strong resentment against party leaders, here as well as abroad, who have led, or were ready to lead, the proletarian masses into the shambles of capitalism. But, I am sorry to say, very few signs of a carefully considered theoretical position on the subject of war and peace, or of a well thought-out rule of conduct which the working class of the world could apply in practice when confronted with this problem. The deliberations of the convention were, therefore, more a matter of groping blindly by instinct than of calm judgment and logical reasoning. That under such circumstances it is particularly human to err goes without saying; and we need not, therefore, be surprised to find many who were seeking a revolutionary mode of action catching at empty but glittering phrases.

It was only natural that such a convention should fall a prey to the machinations of the party bureaucracy which has led it into the wilderness of barren opportunism and which has practically destroyed the party during the past two and a half years by not permitting it to find itself and to take a decided stand on the questions which have agitated the world since the outbreak of the Great War. And it did. With the result that we are now exactly where we were before the convention met, with no definite position on the burning questions of peace and war—the relation of nationalism to internationalism, of the class struggle to national struggles, of the defence of small nations, or how far class-conscious workers may join hands with other social groups in defence of or for the furtherance of democracy. All of these questions were studiously avoided by the astute managers of the conven-

tion, and the declaration adopted by it has therefore nothing to say on these momentous subjects—being nothing better than an ill-assorted collection of soap box immaturities and meaningless generalities; assertions which cannot be defended when taken literally, and which must therefore be taken with a mental reservation which renders them utterly worthless as a definite statement of position; all trimmed and garnished with qualifying adjectives which makes their apparent meaning nothing but hollow pretense. In short, instead of a definite statement of position we have a document which will mean one thing to Berger in Milwaukee, another to Harriman in California, still another to Hogan in Arkansas and yet still another to Lee in New York.

Only one thing is clear and unmistakable about this document: it is as clear a pronunciamiento against the war declared by the United States against Germany as could possibly be desired. This practical declaration is, however, in glaring contradiction to the theoretical basis upon which it pretends to rest, and is rendered valueless for all practical purposes by the absence of a solid foundation of Socialist principle. We have had similar declarations in the past, but they had no practical effect whatsoever because they suffered from the same vice. And signs are not wanting that the present declaration will fare no better. In fact, it has already been flagrantly and ostentatiously violated by our representative in Congress, with the usual result: the party has swallowed the bitter pill with a wry face, but the leaders of the alleged majority who were so loud-mouthed in their pretended revolutionarism in St. Louis keep mum when it comes to real action. It is the fate of all such hypocritical pronunciamientos that their sponsors should not then defend them, whenever such defence might lead to an exposure of the real motives which actuated them in adopting it.

I spoke of the leaders of the "alleged majority" when referring to those who framed the so-called "majority report" of the St. Louis Convention. And I want it clearly understood that the declaration which was adopted at that convention does not represent the views of a majority of the delegates to that convention, and would at no time have commanded the support of a majority of the delegates had the matter been squarely presented to them.

The fact is that the formulation as well as the adoption of the so-called "majority report" was the result of a series of political tricks and manoeuvres such as has seldom been seen before at a Socialist convention.

Leaving out minor differences of opinion, the delegates to the convention formed three main groups: (1) In the first place there were those who were uncompromisingly opposed to the co-operation of the working class with any ruling class under any circumstances. They took their position on the class struggle, which to them meant the opposition of internationalism to nationalism, in the sense that Socialists have neither the duty nor the right to defend their nation because it is theirs, disavowing any common interest between the capitalists and workers of any nation as opposed to any other nation, which could be asserted or defended in war. As a consequence they were in favor of condemning the participation by Socialists in any war declared and prosecuted by the ruling classes. This meant, of course, the taking of a strong position against supporting the present war by the United States against Germany and a readiness to fight it with all weapons at their command. It also meant the condemnation, express or implied, of the support which the European Socialists, particularly those of Germany, gave to their governments in the present war.

(2) Then there were those who believed that there was no opposition between nationalism and internationalism; that internationalism was based on "enlightened" nationalism; that nations and national cultures must, therefore, be preserved; and that the working class of any given nation had certain national interests of a material and spiritual kind in common with the ruling classes of that nation, which it is to its interest and sometimes its duty to defend. They took the position that the European Socialists were justified in supporting their governments in the Great War. But they were opposed, for various reasons, to the present war, and were in favor of the Socialists of this country carrying on an energetic campaign against "our" war, provided the means employed are legal and respectable.

(3) And, finally, there were those who agreed with those in the

second group on all questions of principle, but differed with them on the practical question of attitude to the present war here in this country. Their main contention may be summed up in the assertion that "what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander"—that if the European Socialists had the right to change their tactics after the war had become an accomplished fact, giving up "useless and barren opposition" in favor of a "constructive" policy, the American Socialists had the right and duty to do likewise. Their position to the war, both in Europe as well as here, could be summarized as follows: The war is a fact which we cannot change. It is here against our wishes, but that does not change the fact of its being here. To attempt to oppose it would not only be useless, but against the interests of the working class of this country as well as against the interests of the nation. We cannot possibly desire the defeat of this country—a thoroughly democratic country—by any other country, and particularly not by an autocratic country such as Germany. Such a defeat would greatly injure the material and spiritual interests of the workers of this country. An attempt to hamper the prosecution of the war would, in addition, alienate from us the masses of the people of this country, so that Socialism could not make any headway in this country for probably a generation to come. The only "sane" and "practical" thing to do under the circumstances is to adopt a "constructive" policy looking towards the protection of the interests of the workers in the *manner* in which the war is prosecuted and while it lasts.

The three groups were about equal in strength. Or, if a nearer approximation be attempted it would perhaps be a correct estimate to say that the third, or "pro-war," group could muster on a straight issue about fifty votes, or one-fourth of the convention, while the remainder was about equally divided between the other two groups.

Under these circumstances, it is quite evident that no majority could be found in the convention for any declaration which attempted to state principles as well as lay down a policy, and which at all attempted to be consistent and free from contradictions. The "pro-war" party could agree with the "center" on a declaration of abstract principles, but not on an attitude towards the

American war. The "center" and the "radicals" could agree on the attitude towards the war "in America," but not on a declaration of principles.

That is to say, if the issues had been made and kept clear, and people were honest with themselves and with others. But then that would be against all the rules of "politics." What is the use of having "astute diplomats" and "clever politicians" if not for the purpose of making "combinations" where no unanimity of opinion exists, and so muddle the issues by the use of "judicious" but meaningless phrases, as to catch the unwary? And so the politicians and diplomats in the convention set about making "combinations," and their ink-splashers set about patching up a document which should make as much noise and say as little as possible.

The results were surprising—to those who have never seen these things at work. When the Committee on War and Militarism opened its sessions it was decided to begin with a general discussion of principles. During this discussion Berger, Harriman and Hogan expressed views similar to those of Spargo, Berger going to the extent of expressing a desire that Spargo should be entrusted with the drawing up of the statement of principles, as he was sure Spargo could express his views better than himself. But in the end all three were found among those who signed the "majority report," while Spargo seemingly stood alone in the committee with his views. During the same discussion Berger called the members of the committee who did not agree with his views on nationalism "anarchists" and declared that he did not care to belong to the same party with them. Their statements to the effect that they had no nation to defend elicited from him an angry declaration that they were mere brutes who would not defend their wives and daughters, and that they therefore deserved not to have a nation, wife or daughter, etc., in his well-known jingoistic style. But in the end, he and some of the ultra-radicals were found to belong to the same "majority," and signing a document which purported to condemn all defensive warfare.

The result of "diplomacy" used between the opening session of the committee and its final session was that a committee which

seemed to stand with reference to the three groups above mentioned, as six—five—four—turned out to stand three—eleven—one. The "diplomacy" which was so efficacious in committee was not less so in the plenum of the convention. Instead of dividing 75—75—50, which was the approximate strength of the three groups, it divided, at the crucial moment, into 31—140—5.

Of course there were no conversions. Berger did not change his well-known views, which made him applaud Germany's invasion of Serbia and demand our own invasion of Mexico. Nor did Harriman and Hogan or any of their followers become radical internationalists between the opening of the convention and the adoption of the "majority report."

What happened was this: The "pro-war" element were given to understand that the political exigencies of the hour within the Socialist party demanded that the center and the right should combine to beat the "common enemy," to wit: the uncompromising radicals. This they could do without any real loss of position, as they could always send out a statement of their own to be voted on by the membership. It is true that that involved the rather absurd situation of the members of a "majority" sending out a minority-proposition after the majority-proposition for which they voted had been adopted. But then, "politics is politics."

At the same time the majority-draft—for now that the combination was made it had a majority behind it—was so "doctored" up as to catch some unwary radicals, thereby making the "majority" more impressive. And some radicals—about one-half of those present and voting—were caught by the false sound of the majority-draft and the promise held out to them that they would be permitted to improve it by amendment. A promise, by the way, which was not kept. The radicals soon discovered their mistake and raised a fuss, but it was too late.

The divisions caused by the attempts of the radicals, when they woke up to the situation, to amend the majority-draft showed that more than one-third of the delegates were seriously dissatisfied with the draft because it did not express their radical position. The "pro-war" substituted sent out by the Spargo-Benson group contains the signatures of nearly one-third more of the

delegates. Which proves conclusively that the so-called "majority report" was no majority report at all, and that it was adopted by trick and chicanery—nearly one-half of those voting for it not being for it at all and voting for it merely as the result of a temporary unholy alliance brought about by the machinations of politicians to create an apparent majority where there was none.

It may be added here that the character of the "arguments" used in piloting the "majority" report through the convention was in thorough keeping with the character of the report itself and of the combination which was chiefly responsible for its adoption.

Of the other work of the convention little good can be said, with one notable exception: *the repeal of the famous Section Six.*

In his opening address as temporary chairman of the convention, Hillquit said, in contrasting conditions in 1912 and to-day:

"At no time has a national council of our party met under more critical conditions or faced a more serious task and test than we do here to-day.

"When the chairman's gavel fell upon our last convention, on May 18, 1912, our organization was at the zenith of its youthful vigor. Our movement was alive with the spirit of buoyant enthusiasm and the men and women in it were alive with the joy of struggle and confidence of conquest.

"Within a few years we had increased our membership to over 125,000, represented by about 5,000 live and active locals. We had increased our press to about 300 organs. We were flushed with our first great electoral victories in a number of cities and in legislative bodies, and we had just opened the doors of the National Congress to the first Representative of our party. Socialism seemed to be in the air. The Socialist movement was militant and triumphed. We saw nothing but growth and victory ahead of us.

" . . . Comrades, it will serve no good purpose to close our eyes to the fact that our party and our movement have gone backward since 1912. We have lost members. We have lost several organs of publicity. We have lost votes in the last election. And, worst of all, we have lost some of that buoyant, enthusiastic, militant spirit which is so very essential, so very vital for the success of a movement like ours." (Applause.)

If the delegates paid any attention at all to the speaker they could not help thinking, when listening to these words, that the

downward march of the movement in this country dates precisely from the time "when the chairman's gavel fell upon our last national convention on May 18, 1912;" and that the speaker and his friends who controlled that convention were in no small degree responsible for the disorganization and decay which set in upon its close. The epitome and symbol of that unfortunate convention was Section Six. Within one year after its adoption fully one-third of the 125,000 members of the party left in disgust, and despondency took the place of the buoyancy and enthusiasm which reigned before. It took some years before this came to be acknowledged. But acknowledged it was at last, and Section Six went, unsung and unlamented.

The other work of the convention was of a decidedly different character than the repeal of Section Six. The repeal of Section Six was a frank, if belated, acknowledgment of a mistake once made. Almost every other action was a new mistake made. The most important of these are the abolition of the National Committee and the adoption of a new platform. It must be said, however, in extenuation of these sins of the convention, that they were committed in ignorance rather than in wickedness.

The National Committee has long been a thorn in the side of our party bureaucracy. They therefore sabotaged it, and sabotaged it so successfully that it has been unable to do any positive work; and then they came before the convention and claimed that it was useless. This contention was untrue, because the National Committee still performs an important supervising function, with all the monkey wrenches that are thrown into its machinery. But the convention was too tired after the great excitement incident to the war debate, and not in a condition either physically or mentally to listen to a discussion of this subject on the merits. So it just took a guess, and guessed the wrong way. Let us hope that the membership will consider the matter more judiciously and vote down the change.

As to the platform—it is sufficient to say that it was adopted at the last session—when half of the delegates were gone and the rest were going—*without any debate whatever*, although there were two reports; and it is safe to say that most of those who voted did not know what they were voting for. It should be

noted here that long before the platform came to be voted upon formal protest was made upon the floor of the convention against the convention doing any further business, as the convention was neither physically nor mentally able to combine its deliberations. Let us hope that this platform will be voted down by the membership and that proper measures will be taken for the drafting of a permanent declaration of principles by a committee appointed by the National Committee or National Executive Committee which will do its work at leisure between conventions, publishing all drafts and proposed drafts in the press, so as to give the membership a chance to consider and discuss them fully.

The last thing done by the convention brought its labors back to the question of war, which was its special business. The Committee on War and Militarism had decided that the convention should issue an address to the Socialists of the belligerent countries. The work of drafting this address was turned over to a sub-committee consisting of Berger, Hogan, Sadler and Boudin. Berger prepared an address which was in keeping with the "majority report" and Boudin prepared an address which was in keeping with his own minority report. But after the two draft addresses had been prepared Berger announced that he would withdraw his draft, as he wanted to avoid another fight in the convention. So the Boudin address was adopted "unanimously."

An Educational Experiment

By WILLIAM E. BOHN

We are expending some \$600,000,000 a year on public education. This gigantic sum is spent with little thought about the quantity or quality of the product. Armor plate delivered to the government is carefully tested; we do not even know how to make a test of our educational purchase. The government itself, under which our elaborate educational operations are carried on, fails to recognize the need of a test. The various surveys which have been undertaken deal more with machinery than with the

character of the product. For such an evaluation involves a study of our whole social structure, a determination of the purposes of education. And such a study no expert "surveyor" has been authorized to make. Imagine an ordinance board test armor-plate without knowing what purpose it is to serve!

For the past dozen years there has been a vast deal of talk about these matters. The more intelligent part of the nation is thoroughly wrought up over the formal and definitely unsatisfactory character of the work done in the public schools. Hosts of teachers and school administrators have been thinking and talking. But the school authorities, those who hold the purse-strings and direct our educational destinies, have taken little part in all this. The people, acting through their officials, have neither formulated ideals nor provided for experiments looking in that direction.

Now enters the General Education Board and announces a well-financed plan for an adequate experimental school. At the present writing, more than three months after the formal announcement, the discussion of it has been lamentably unproductive of enlightened opinion. One party, a large and vociferous one, raises the ancient cry that this is but one step more away from Latin and toward perdition. Another group, including some Socialists, conceals its lack of thought by denouncing Mr. John D. Rockefeller. This proceeding is particularly irritating to anyone who is interested in education. If the people of the United States allow Mr. Rockefeller's General Board to carry on the much-needed work of experimentation they have no right to complain of the result. The work must be done. If the people, through their authorized agents, do not do it, the General Board will. At any rate, the new school must be judged on purely educational grounds.

At the present time materials for a serious appraisal of this venture are very slender. We have, of course, the formal statement of the Board and various books and articles representing the opinions and purposes of its experts. The new institution, to be called the Lincoln School, can be known only by its fruits. A really experimental process will naturally be a variable one, and variably successful. Prophecies as to its usefulness are

rather less valuable than the weather forecasts of a Hicks Almanac. Nevertheless it may be worth while to consider briefly the general tendencies indicated by such outlines of the experiment as are available.

The formal announcement issued to the public on January 20 makes mention of two pamphlets. Ex-President Eliot's *Changes Needed in American Secondary Education* and Dr. Abraham Flexner's *A Modern School*. Moreover all of the definite suggestions contained in the announcement indicate that the sponsors for the project based their action on the principles outlined in these two works. It is to their pages, then, that one goes for hints as to the temper, the point of view, the educational theories of men who will control the destinies of the Lincoln School.

Both documents are frankly and refreshingly iconoclastic. Their bias is, firstly, scientific, and, secondly, American. To one who has labored through volumes of philosophically European pedagogy their unconventional method of attack brings something of shock but more of relief. They say, quite simply, science is the great thing in the modern world, so our young people must be trained to observe and to think. Or, they argue, here we are, a great nation with certain social problems born of our new time; therefore let us teach what our young people need to know in order that the nation may grow and justify itself. For a good part of the time Dr. Flexner is close on the track of Pestalozzi, but never once does he name that revered saint. He puts the matter on a recognized, common-sense American basis; why all this fuss about words? It is knowledge of things and ability to think that count. Hitherto America has bowed so humbly before Europe in matters of educational theory that this freshness of attack contains a promise of change if not of improvement.

The purpose of the modern school is to train the young person "to know, to care about, and to understand the world he lives in, both physical and the social world." "The object in view," we are told in another sentence, "is to give children the knowledge they need, and to give them the power to handle themselves in our own world." No subject-matter or activity is to be accepted

on the strength of its traditional claim. A positive case must be made out for each item in the program. The pupil may be forced to learn some things that run counter to the grain of his liking. But the teacher must be quite certain that knowledge of them will serve directly some useful purpose. Nothing is to be taught for the sake of discipline. The learners will get their discipline just as we all get our real discipline; that is, by doing real things, solving real problems. "It is indeed absurd to invent formal difficulties for the professed purpose of discipline, when, within the limits of science, industry, literature, and politics real problems about." So says Dr. Flexner.

Coming more definitely to the character of the curriculum. Dr. Flexner divides the field of activities into four parts: science, industry, esthetics, and civics. A more formal person would have talked of mind and soul on the one hand and of industry and politics on the other. The most significant sentence in his whole discussion is this: "The work in science would be the central and dominating feature of the school." There we have it. This school is to be characterized by the domination of the men of science. Dr. Flexner is perfectly correct in saying that even in our most advanced schools the nature-study work in the grades has been "too incidental." And there is much truth in his remark that the physics and chemistry taught in our high schools is too abstract. The science-teaching, in short, has not been organic; it has not grown with the child, has not been a part of his life. In the new "modern" school the child's whole development is to be based on observation and the consequent natural development of reason. One feels in reading the paragraphs devoted to science that the author speaks with enthusiasm and authority. It is here that he is delivering his real message.

The treatment of industry is far less satisfactory. In this field Dr. Flexner sees little beyond the possibilities of educational experience. Dr. Eliot's discussion of the subject is fuller and more sympathetic. He dwells on the educative value of industry as carried on in the old-fashioned home and in the guilds of former centuries, and then goes on to discuss the part that formal education must play in the industry of our time.

The discussion of esthetics is, in proportion, sufficiently extended, but in spirit and technical grasp it falls below the other sections. Under this head Dr. Flexner includes all the child's art activities, recreations and sports. No classics in literature, painting, or music are to be forced upon the pupil's attention. By every method that proves effective his real interest in the various arts is to be "carried as far and as high as is for him possible." He seems fearful lest his critics may think he has in mind the training of "makers of art." In all this discussion he seems to me to miss the real point. He does not perceive the fundamentally artistic nature of the child. Nor does he see how the art-instinct plays into the whole of life. Dr. Eliot devotes a paragraph to the fact that America has lost immeasurably through the inherited Puritan prejudice against fine art studies. Unconsciously both he and Dr. Flexner are proving this thesis. They believe in the value of dance and song and poem and picture. They know, too, that the children must approach them unconventionally and actively. But they fall far short of ancient Plato in realization of the power of beauty as an organizer of life's forces.

In view of our manifold social problems, the subject of civics is treated in step-motherly fashion. Dr. Flexner merely shows that history should be taught with an eye to "modern needs and demands." There is little enthusiasm here, little sense of the crying need for young men and women of clear insight, sure knowledge, and high ideals.

As to possible results of the operations of the new school, Dr. Flexner is modest enough. The pupils who attend it will, he expects, develop into effective, social units, and he makes haste to add, the freedom permitted them should stir their souls and develop their spiritual interests. But the school is founded with the desire of wielding influence over other schools, of reaching out far beyond the circles of young people directly taught in its class-rooms. The setting up of positive standards, the encouragement given to the inquiring spirit will, he hopes, do much to hasten a change in our system of education as a whole.

In its general features, then, the outlines of the new educational experiment may be said to constitute the contribution of the men

of science to our educational theory. Dr. Flexner's pamphlet is the lineal descendent of Huxley's *Essay on a Liberal Education*. This aspect of the project should be frankly accepted as a great advance. The knowledge which we sum up under the term *science* is the characteristic knowledge of our time. The man of science is our priest; the laboratory is our holy of holies. Here men come nearest to the secrets that control our lives. Here they tap the currents of power which flow out in new forms of civilization. Since this is true, an educational system growing normally out of our thought should be dominated by the scientific spirit.

In another respect, too, this plan is of our own stuff. I have spoken of the characteristically American disregard of great names and philosophical refinements. This approaches now and then almost to a charming-naivete. The easy optimism, also, is a product of our own spirit. Our optimism is, in part, based on a sublime faith in mechanism. It belongs naturally to a scientific and mechanical age. A civilization which tears down fourteen-story buildings in favor of forty-story ones and scraps last year's machinery for this year's model is naturally inclined to believe that cutting loose from the traditional system will quickly solve our problems. The spirit of the men behind this plan is typically American, too, in looking for immediate usefulness. The worst thing and the best thing said of us is that we are "practical." Well, this is the "practical" experiment in education. It is difficult to state these facts without seeming to be critical of them or sceptical as to their worth. But if we are ever to have a theory of life or a system of education based on what our life really is, they must grow out of just such connections as these. If our schools are to serve our needs and to grow with our growth they must be weak where we are weak and strong where our strength lies. So I, for one, am prepared to recognize the very punctiousness of Dr. Flexner's observations as a sign of progress. We should get on faster if we were to strike out thus freely in all lines of intellectual and artistic activity.

But in one important respect the authors of the plan show all the limitations of their class. They have little realization of the social demands which America has a right to lay upon her schools. They are, apparently, hardly conscious of the social problems

which the coming generation will face with the equipment which their school is to give. They would say, if they were cross examined that a person trained to face real problems in a realistic way is fitted to attack the high cost of living or the struggle of capital and labor. And we should be forced to agree that a young scientist is better fitted for life than a young linguist. But we can surely do most for our young people if we begin our educational thinking by taking a look at them. We must study their present limitations. We must know their tastes, their ambitions, and the future that awaits them. Then the special school environment which we provide can be so fashioned as to fit them for the problems which they will face. This is what Dr. Eliot and Dr. Flexner have not done. Dr. Flexner, in fact, bases his theorizing on the supposition that education normally should come to an end at the age of twenty. Much of what he proposes would be applicable equally to those who leave the schoolroom at fourteen. But surely the programs for the two classes would differ in many points. And there are many suggestions which lead one to think that he has in mind the professional classes rather than the manual workers.

There is a lack, it should be noted in conclusion, of recognition for the intellectual and spiritual stimulus which comes from social ideals. What are the young people to be educated for? What is to be the end of it all? Efficiency? Efficiency in what or to what end? What is to rouse the kindling enthusiasm of our aspiring boys and girls? There is to be a breaking away from the past, progress. Toward what? This lack of a social concept is the fundamental weakness of the whole project.

The Red Cross and War

BY JAMES PETER WARBASSE

Modern wars are economic at heart. The day has long since passed when people take religion or king so seriously as to go forth and die for them as once they did. Such wars have ceased, even before "the last king is hung with the guts of the last priest." Modern war is an expression of the complex economic struggle. The soldier is the dupe of the war-making forces. He is an incident. The bankers, the producers of war supplies, the politicians, and the privileged owners of property are his betrayers. They give him the necessary urge to keep him going. In war his function is to do the atrocious deeds. With the delusion that he is to protect his home, he is sent out to destroy life, to maim or otherwise incapacitate his fellow human beings whom he is taught to call "the enemy," to destroy property, and to appropriate whatever may be of aid in these operations.

War is to be expected as a natural result of the present system of production and distribution of the necessities of life for profit. It is not to be wondered at. The wonder, or rather the pathos, is that working men, who are the victims of the system of production for profit, should be willing to go out and lay down their lives in the interest of the system which makes them slaves, which keeps them poor, which deprives them of their liberties, and which could not continue without their poverty. There is only one war which working men should consider; it is not this sort of war.

This sort of war continues until one side or the other has lost so many lives, has so many human beings incapacitated, and so much property destroyed that the remaining people are no longer willing to venture the hazard of being called upon for further sacrifices. The remnant of the nation then stops the war; it ceases to fight, and the war ends.

Certain external agencies keep the war going and postpone the armistice which ultimately brings peace. One of these factors is the Red Cross and the non-combatant activities allied with it.

Though the war-making agencies are largely economic, the Red Cross is no less their accomplice in keeping warfare alive.

Before the United States frankly took its stand as a belligerent nation its first official function in relation to the war consisted in setting aside a day of prayer for peace. After this sanctimonious hypocrisy had been gone through with, the government proceeded to lend its good offices to big business to send over to the soldiers grains, meats and other food-stuffs, guns, powder, shot and shell, to keep the slaughter going—all in the interest of profits.

The question naturally arises, had we a right to lay upon our souls the unction of neutrality by claiming that what we did for one side we were willing to have done for either side? Can one participate helpfully in an iniquitous business and so evenly distribute his force between the two sides as to neutralize himself and virtually not be a participant? Surely we fed the war upon what war needs to keep it alive.

In the same catalogue of neutral hypocrisy is the Red Cross and its allied agencies, with sweet-voiced nurses and bandages and sheets and pillow-cases and goodies and cigarettes and soft beds—all with the assumption that they are mitigating the horrors of war. However much they are mitigating the discomforts of individual warriors, one thing is certain: they are prolonging war; and war is nothing but horrors. Sentimentalism, combined with a confused ethical sense which calls for impartiality, results in the promotion of war. The ingredients in the hellish retort are not neutralized. A simple mind can grasp the fact that, if one helps one side in warfare, he damages the other side. We need yet to push our mathematics one step farther and prove that if we help both sides, we damage both sides.

Sentimental neutrals, if they were really interested in mitigating the horrors of war, would employ their energies to end the war. To end the war is the best way to mitigate war. The last thing that one who really loves his fellow men, and who truly revolts at war, would think of doing would be to go into battle with a double-edged sword and fight against both sides. This is what the well-meaning neutral spirit of the Red Cross would do; and when we look upon the cost of one day of war we may calculate

what will be the cost of the next day—the cost to both sides, for both are daily losing; and in the end both are destined to be losers by the aggregate of their days of warfare.

Were the Red Cross neutrals desirous of mitigating the horrors of war, instead of maintaining merely a commercial and sentimental interest in it, they might be acting more reasonably to throw all of their help upon one side and end it. War continues so long as the damages are fairly balanced. It ends when the balance is lost and an unbalance of damages takes its place.

Official Red Cross organizations, of course, do not pretend to be neutral; they are belligerent organizations. Indeed, in this war when the balance of power was being lost by one side and defeat was imminent, the Red Cross redoubled its efforts to restore the balance and perpetuate the war.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the soldier is a person who goes forth to kill his fellowman. The hope that he may kill but not be killed sends him on his errand. He is not only a cold-blooded murderer; he also is a gambler. He hopes to do his unholy business, come off with his life, and be ever after proclaimed a "hero." Society with its nationalism, patriotism, race hatreds, militarism, perverted histories which glorify war, and the International quest for commercial profits, creates the soldier—the dupe of war. If he *knew* that he were to fare as badly as he *hopes* his "enemy" will, he would not attempt the adventure. The nearer to one hundred per cent. the mortality of warfare approaches, the less will be the enthusiasm for its "glories." If the mortality could be brought up to one hundred per cent. the problem would be solved, and war would cease. Do the activities of the Red Cross make for the abolition of war or for its perpetuation?

If the man of fighting age refused to go to war, or if he was proclaimed the hero who had heroism enough to stay at home and do his work and refuse to participate in the miserable business, then the problem would be solved. Does the Red Cross, which rushes to the front to keep alive this "sport of kings," make for war or peace?

We should contemplate with amazement surgeons and nurses attempting to save lives, and at the same time working in co-operation with murderous men, equipped with the newest appliances of science, bent upon destroying lives—all zealously striving together. Society will some day look back with wonder upon the anachronism of surgical skill, with its infinite possibilities for human service, occupied day and night in restoring to efficiency the butchers of men, that they may be returned to their cruel pursuit.

Neither surgeon nor nurse should refuse to help the injured. The hand of mercy should not be stayed. But the surgeon who saves the life of a soldier, has given that soldier life; and as a recompense the surgeon may demand that that soldier shall not use his life again for the purpose of destroying others. If the surgeon does not make this the condition upon which he gives life to the soldier, he himself becomes a belligerent and is no more worthy of the consideration of neutrality than is any other accomplice of the fighting man. And the soldier is not worthy of life if he betrays the gift of life and the giver.

It is true that the military surgeon will care for the wounded enemy. He will do the thing necessary to save his life. But he will do it voluntarily only on condition that the enemy is a captive and that the life which he restores remains captive and is not permitted to return to its murderous business. The surgeon, on the other hand, will only save the enemy who is to "return to duty" when he himself is a prisoner, deprived of liberty of life, and compelled to perform the service. Surgeons, nurses and other Red Cross non-combatants are belligerents on one side or another, lending their offices for the military success of that side. They are the agents of militarism. Their status should be that of the soldier.

The forces which give respectability to International warfare are anti-social forces. If the Red Cross carries succor to soldiers, it behooves it also to organize a branch to provide comforts for hangmen. These gentry are the agents of governments, performing brutal, unnecessary and shameful functions, as does the soldier. The hopeful sign is that they are not glorified. That is

an indication that we shall soon be rid of them. As soon as we let the soldier go to his brutal, unnecessary and shameful business with no more applause than we bestow upon the hangman, we shall soon be rid of him. God help us when the ladies knit socks and stomachers for the hangman!

Red Cross doctors, who are participating in war, should not beguile us with the claim that they are non-combatants, and inspired only by love of humanity. We shall not be deceived. They are a part of the program of war. When it is over, we shall find them parading among its "heroes" and accepting the recognition which is accorded to those who went forth to kill.

We saw the Red Cross Society go to Mexico, ostensibly to give aid to the people, but in fact to promote the propaganda to bring about war between the United States and that country. This is scarcely a neutral or non-combatant function.

Were the impelling motive behind the Red Cross workers one of love for humanity and a burning zeal to sacrifice themselves for mankind, there are ample fields yet unoccupied in the struggle for life in every land. In our own country the preventable deaths in the economic warfare for livelihood and for profits are quite as appalling to the discerning eye as those of the European charnel. Here are the unaided hurt, crying for help—hurt by machines and dust and poisons and rotten railroad ties and insufficient food and crowded slums—hurt because somebody is making money by withholding rightful human protection from them and robbing others of the wealth which they create.

These suffering and dying millions of workers go down to their graves without the stain of their fellows' blood upon their hands. They are soldiers in the world's warfare against the forces of nature, enlisted to make the world more pleasant and life more livable. They stand for life, and not for death. They need all the surgeons, nurses, Red Cross stockings, and shirts that are now consumed by the blood-thirsty men who go forth to slay the husbands of innocent wives, the sons of guiltless mothers and the fathers of weeping babes.

Here is the answer to this social riddle: War is a ruling-class game. It is the affair of kings, ministers, imperialists, and the

capitalistic seekers for markets and economic aggrandizement. The Red Cross executive, doctor, nurse, and helper prefer the approval and applause of this so-called "upper class." To give themselves to the cause of the lowly and of the exploited poor with the abandon with which they can give themselves to the cause of war would mean also to court the disapproval of those who have the wealth and "honors" to bestow. To interest one's self in securing social justice for the working masses courting the disapproval of the very elements in society that make war and demand militarism. The money-giving public prefers to support the warfare which appeals most strongly to its dramatic sense and economic interest. The exploited poor, on the other hand, in the industrial struggle have nothing to offer but a doubtful gratitude.

Let us not be deceived. There is no neutrality in war. All who are parties to it are warriors—the Red Cross surgeon, the nurse, the sewing woman, and the priest, no less than the blood-lusting soldier—all dupes of the military insanity.

Those who would help humanity must look with disfavor upon the agencies which promote war, and tend to make it honorable and glorious. War is the consummate social crime. We must cease to think in terms of war. It must be considered the impossible and unthinkable thing. It must be regarded as the alternative for nothing. It must be cast out utterly from the program of human events.

After the War Ends

BY ANTON PANNEKOEK

Translated by LILY LORE

While the war is in progress, the highest duty of the socialist proletariat is the fight for its speedy conclusion. But even when peace has been declared, his struggle is not finished. For the effects of the war remain. New problems arise, and must be met.

When the soldiers return to their homes, new misery and new want, are grinning at them. Awful as have been the sufferings that war has brought, in one respect the lot of the proletarians is still

worse in times of peace. In war times the workers are needed; the bourgeoisie needs their enthusiasm, their willingness to sacrifice, their good will, the spirit of the army is an important factor in warfare. Money, therefore, becomes a secondary consideration, subservient to the aims of the war; aid and assistance are granted with unaccustomed liberality. The working class suffers, it is butchered, but those at home at least maintain a certain livelihood.

That ceases with the coming of peace. The workers are no longer needed as soldiers; they are no longer comrades, defenders of the fatherland, heroes. Once more they become beasts of burden, objects of exploitation. Let them look for work, if they are hungry.

But how about work?

After the war has stopped, the whole industrial economy of the country must again be readjusted. Conditions, somewhat similar to the crisis at the beginning of the war will result. At that time the mobilization, in spite of the vast numbers that were drafted into military service, was followed by a terrible period of unemployment which lasted several months until industry had adjusted itself to war conditions, and war orders began to come in. After the war the situation will be exactly reversed; the country must pass from war-production to peace production. But this crisis will be much more severe. In the former case, the old market with its hundredfold demands upon production was replaced by the nation, by the army with its uniform requirements. In place of thousands of competing, haggling customers, there was a single buyer, and such a buyer! He did not haggle, he was exceedingly liberal with his money, for he had billions from which to pay his debts, billions raised by successive issues of war bonds. Small wonder that everyone soon found employment. But when the whole business of war ceases, production must once more be regulated to meet the varied demands of private buyers; and this presents the greatest difficulties.

The old markets are gone. New markets must be found, new connections established. All this takes time. The enormous ante-

bellum export to the belligerent countries cannot at once be resumed, upon that subject we need entertain no illusions. National hatred, influenced to a white heat will continue, and will create bitter antagonism on the industrial field, as surely as they will leave their mark even in the world of culture and science. Each country will strive to become industrially independent and self-sufficient. In the neutral nations necessity, and golden profits have given a palpable impetus to industrial development, have encouraged them in securing foreign markets. The outlook for the rehabilitation of industrial conditions in the belligerent countries are anything but promising.

No doubt there will be periods of activity. The terrible ravages of war must be mended, while the replacement of war material, likewise, for a time, will encourage production. Enormous general losses have been sustained, and will for a time, increase production on every hand. But this cannot mean a lasting state of prosperity, chiefly because the destruction of capital itself has been so great Europe will emerge from this war, poor in capital, deeply in debt to America. It is generally conceded that we will meet a period of general industrial depression. The bourgeoisie will strive to accumulate new capital by intensified exploitation, low wages and unemployment will be the gifts that war will bring to the proletariat.

In the coming years the problem of unemployment will be the burning question, the weightiest problem in the struggle of the working class. The demand for *effective, and sufficient unemployment insurance* must, therefore, be one of the most important demands of the socialist proletariat. It must be raised immediately, must be impressed upon the nation during the great crisis of readjustment.

What, after they have fought and bled for imperialism, shall the workers return, to lie hungry upon the streets? Is not this crisis a direct outcome of the war and shall not the government, having spent billions for the war, add a few more billions to its debt, in order to guide its erstwhile soldiers safely through this critical period? What shall we say of a government that allows its returning, victorious army, to starve on its way home through the desert?

To be sure, such arguments will not be nearly as effective as stern necessity itself, in forcing the bourgeoisie and the government to take heed. But they will maintain their old principle, that in a peaceful, capitalist state of society everyone must take care of himself. Their support will take the form of scanty, charitable gifts, enervating pauperization under humiliating conditions, entailing perhaps the sacrifice of important rights.

In view of this, the workers must demand security of existence for the unemployed as a right. This is a revolutionary demand, to be sure, one that will effect the very foundations of capitalism. Can the government, however, entirely refuse to consider its justification, if this demand is voiced by the millions of armed workingmen that constitute its armies? This demand unites the immediate problem of existence of every proletarian with the aims and problems of revolutionary socialism. For it will not suffice to simply give expression to this demand. If it is to be realized, it must be fought for with all the force of the masses that the proletariat can bring to bear.

* * *

For the ruling class there is, another way out of the difficulty. Reproduction of war material that has been destroyed, and new armaments, will be the foremost consideration for both governments and bourgeoisie. They will demand more effective preparedness for coming wars.

This will necessitate the employment of labor, labor that is about to be dismissed from the army only to be reinstated in a round about way, into military service. Were it not much more efficient to retain these workers in their military capacity, to retain them as soldiers under military discipline for the production of new war material?

The experiences gained from the organization of industry and trade under national control, have impressed the *idea of State Socialism* favorably upon many bourgeois minds. The advantage of uniform, controlled production, over chaotic private production have become too apparent.

The most important of the large industrial branches could be brought, easily, into national ownership. This could be done, without difficulty with the direct war industry.

The question of employment for the returning soldiers, too, would be solved for the Bourgeoisie. The danger that threatens, when great rebellious masses call for work, bread, assistance, could thus be averted, by drafting them immediately into the war industries, and then, gradually, as conditions in private industry become more settled, dismiss them from military service.

Other advantages, too, might arise from such a plan. In the first place production would be greatly cheapened, by the exclusion of all middlemen. Everyone realizes how much could be saved by government organization of production. All technical and organizational improvements of the war period would be applied. It would do away with the problem of unemployment insurance. Wages could be regulated; for against this powerful employer labor unions would be powerless, even if they were permitted to exist. It would mean for the workers increased dependence; would mean greater curtailment of their personal freedom, than was possible under private ownership. National ownership of large branches of industry is synonymous with their militarization. Unquestionably, the ruling class fears the day after the war, when military dictatorship, war-laws, press censorship and the state of siege have become things of the past. The militarization of the national industrial forces will present itself as the most effective means of keeping great masses in harness, and curbing their desire for political opposition.

To the proletariat this state socialism can mean only an aggravation of its sufferings and increased pressure upon the burden of life. Notwithstanding this, it is to be expected that a large part of our Social Democracy will not oppose this plan but will lend it its heartiest support. Their old ideals make them the prisoners of this new system of national exploitation.

Even before the war every proposal to pluck the consumers by new monopolies was heralded as a "beginning of socialism, which deserved our heartiest support!" *Socialism is not based upon*

national ownership, but upon the strength, the might of the proletariat. In the past the conceptions of socialism and state industries have been hopelessly confused in the minds of our Social Democracy; in the future, this party will face the state socialist plans for the increased enslavement of the working class, with neither mental weapons nor a clearly defined attitude.

To the revolutionary wing of the socialist movement belongs the duty to strike the first blow at these new and dangerous shackles upon the proletarians. The fight against *state socialism* will bring in its wake a radical clarification of ideas concerning the relations between the proletariat and the new imperialism. It will usher in a period of new, practical conflict. As the new, imperialistic state more and more unmistakably assumes the guise of oppressor and exploiter the proletariat will see in the nation its great enemy, against whom it must fight, before all others, by means of mass action. And the Kautsky tradition, that we must preserve the state in order to use it for our own purposes, will be practically shattered.

A third cause of coming oppression and new conflict will come to the working class out of the war. The nations of Europe will emerge from this war burdened with enormous debts. War loan has followed war loan, until the war-debts of the belligerent nations amount, already, to more than two hundred billions. National economists and statesmen everywhere are asking the question: "Where shall we raise the billions necessary to pay the interest? Where can we raise new taxes. In the parliaments, in spite of civil peace, class is fighting class, on the tax question. Every class tries to push the burden off on to the shoulders of the other; yet they all know that all must suffer, that it is at best but a question of who shall assume the greater, and who the lesser burden.

The social-democrats consequently, with the exception of logical social-imperialists of the Cunow type, have reiterated their resolutions against indirect taxation, and insist that the burden of war be born by the possessing classes. Unquestionably they are right, when they maintain that the masses cannot bear added burdens,

that added taxation would reduce the standard of living of the working class even more than before. But they forget that the standard of living is not fixed, that it is determined by that which the worker is in a position to demand, and to win from the capitalist class. A militant, firmly organized working class, can win a higher plane of life; where it loses on the political field, by increased taxation, what it has won on the industrial field, this but proves its political weakness and ineffectiveness. Where since August, 1914, the social democracy threw itself at the feet of imperialism and kissed its feet, it so weakened the proletariat, and condemned it to such hopeless stagnation, that it must not be surprised to receive, as a reward for its actions, a rapidly sinking standard of life for its proletariat. Their resolutions are ridiculous and therefore promote opposition to their own actions. *The protest of the working class must express itself in actions. Active opposition against taxation on articles of consumption that must be born by the proletariat.*

Does that mean that we shall demand property taxes? Bourgeois representatives are partly right, when they maintain, that taxation levied upon all incomes derived from the interest on the loans will prevent the accumulation of capital, and will, moreover, encourage the capitalist to unload them upon his employees in the shape of wage reductions. Now the payment of war debts means, in the last analysis, nothing more than the robbery of the working population of all classes in the interest of the holders of war-bonds, by means of taxes of one kind or another. Had the perpetuated classes acted from motives of true patriotism, they would, when the state needed the money to carry on a war in their interests, have placed a portion of their war profits at the disposal of the nation. Not having done this, shall they have the right to demand tribute for all future times from the population? Of all kinds of capitalist incomes, the interests that accrue from state bonds are, socially considered, the most useless. A revolutionary, socialist government will always tend to repudiate this tribute, to annul all national debts. Conditions are such that only this measure, the *annulment of the enormous state loans* can save the nations from the threatening financial débâcle. It is not to be expected that capitalist governments will

turn to this measure, for, to them, capitalist interests are holy. The more will it be the duty of the proletariat to raise this cry against every attempt to burden them with new taxes for the payment of war-debts. Together with *the confiscation of all war profits*, this measure alone will make it possible, to avert the most awful consequences of this war, from the mass of the people.

When the proletariat, during and after the war, resumes its political struggle, it must have a *clear cut program of action*.

The struggle for socialism is always a class struggle for the momentary interests of the proletariat. The methods, the means employed in this struggle, determine its revolutionary character. Of course, a part of the old demands retain their importance in the new program of action, as, for instance, the fight for full democracy in the nation, and the fight against militarism. But both will be given a new meaning, a new increasing prevalence of state socialism will weld industrial exploitation and military enslavement together with political oppression into one reactionary whole. The above article has shown that the demand for the assurance of a decent existence for the unemployed proletariat, as well as the demand for annulment of all national debts, are direct questions of existence for the working class, and must therefore receive the most important place in the program of action of the reawakening proletariat.

Reform in Germany?

By LUDWIG LORE

Reform in Germany? What the struggles of years could not accomplish, fear of a desperate people has brought to pass. The Russian Revolution, like the handwriting on the wall, to the terror-stricken Junkers of Germany and the unspeakable sufferings at home, have opened even the dried-out brains of the German bureaucracy to progressive ideas. Hunger is threatening to overthrow even German discipline and the stormy demands for peace are forcing political reform. The

flood has risen to the throats of the ruling class; and in order to save their valuable lives, and their still more valuable property, they are lending a hand, to a lying and rotten compromise.

First there came, on April 8, the famous "Order" of the Kaiser to the Chancellor, proclaiming the abolition of the class suffrage laws—"after the return of our warriors"—and the reformation of the Prussian Landtag.

"After the tremendous War accomplishments of our whole people"—so we read in the most pregnant portion of the proclamation,—“there is no room in Prussia for a class election system.” The proposed bill will provide, moreover, for direct and secret parliamentary elections.

Those who are unfamiliar with German political history can hardly grasp the significance of this proclamation, for they do not know that a real reform of the Prussian electoral system is practically synonymous with political revolution in the greatest and most important German State, and therefore, in Germany. When we say that this proclamation is one of the most important political occurrences that the world war has produced, we are, in no wise exaggerating its importance. Only he who knows the strength and labor that has been expended in the last twenty-five years in the struggle against the three class shame of Germany, who knows how the question, again and again, has stood in the center of the whole Prussian and German political arena, can appreciate the pressure that must have been brought to bear, to accomplish this change of policy of the German rulers.

The struggle against the Prussian class election system for many decades has been going on, a system that is to-day the most reactionary in the whole civilized world.

The whole Prussian Junkerdom fought against the overthrow of Germany's shame with unparalleled fervor and intensity. Even on the twenty-ninth of March, 1917, the Chancellor most decidedly objected to a discussion of Prussian election reform, during the war, although the Government had, in principle, already declared in its favor. And now, on Easter Sunday, comes the proclamation, marking out the general lines for a new electoral system, and giving it form and content.

We need hardly emphasize that this change of front was not the result of a God-given inspiration. Nor was it gratitude "to his brave, able, and highly developed people" that led the Kaiser to assume this new role; the explanation lies deeper. The ruling class has realized, that it is impossible to hold the fortress of class suffrage, in view of the present conditions in Germany. They fear that the sparks of the Russian Revolution may fly from Petrograd to Berlin, may bury all Germany in its flames. In spite of "closed doors," the dullest of Germany's subjects must needs stumble over the obvious ludicrousness of the fact that the people of barbarous Russia possess democratic rights, while the Roman Empire of Germany still cowers under the whip of the Prussian Junker. Just as the Russian Revolution of 1905 was so strongly felt in Austria, that the government, in fear of a popular uprising, granted the general direct, and secret ballot, so the present Russian Revolution has brought in its wake the fall of the class election system in Prussia. The free, the civilized German people set out, when the war began, to overthrow Russian Asiatic barbarism in the East. To-day Berlin is painfully limping along behind the accomplishments of the men who fought behind the barricades in Petrograd.

The willingness of the German Government to relent in the important question of election reform proves that conditions in Germany leave much to be desired. Hunger is fermenting among the German people—and the rulers know it but too well. For a conference on the question of the national food supply recently heard from an official source that "the morals of the German people had suffered gravely." The government has chosen the lesser of two ends, and is trying to infuse new vigor into the "popular morale," by sacrificing a pint of blood, in order to save its life.

The following instruction that was sent to the food-commissions in April, 1917, presents a graphic picture of the suffering in Germany, and openly acknowledges the inability of the government to cope with it: "In accordance with the wishes of His Excellency Micheles, State Commissioner for public food distribution in Prussia, you are hereby called upon to communicate

at once with your subordinate bureaus and to call their attention to the exceedingly critical conditions under which the urban population, and particularly the ammunition industry, are suffering at the present time. The food-commission must, through those of their members who are themselves farmers, and through others whom they may deem fit to undertake this work, explain the importance of this appeal to every farmer in their respective districts. Written instructions are of little value; neither will large meetings accomplish the desired result. Only by word of mouth can our message be carried. *Teachers and clergymen* particularly, must be pressed into service.

"Every farmer must be made to realize that every pound of corn that he consumes over and above the measure that is absolutely necessary for the management of his own estate, is a wrong done to the whole people, and aids the enemy. Every potato and every turnip that is fit for human consumption must be sent to the city. No healthy adult in the country should drink unskimmed milk. Milk is for children and for invalids and for the manufacture of butter. Calves shall be raised for breeding purposes only and shall receive full milk for not more than one week after birth."

* * *

Under such conditions bromides in the shape of election reform declarations cannot be particularly effective; the people are demanding more than promises, are insisting on actual reforms, are demanding deeds instead of words. Thus the Reichstag has been forced to take action by appointing a committee for the revision of the German Constitution, with special instructions to thoroughly revise the paragraphs concerning relations between government and parliament. This committee—with Philipp Scheidemann as its chairman—is already in action and has adopted a number of motions, proposing a certain curtailment of the powers of the Chancellor and State Secretaries, and increased responsibility of these officials to the Reichstag. According to the proposed revision all proclamations and official acts of the Emperor must be countersigned by the Chancellor, who then becomes directly

responsible to the Reichstag, and, together with the State Secretaries is held liable for all important government actions. Radical as these proposals may sound, even the liberal "*Berliner Tageblatt*" admits, however, that there is actually little gained so long as the Parliament has not the right to unseat a Chancellor who refuses to abide by its decisions, or, on the other hand, to keep in power an official who has incurred the displeasure of the Emperor, against his will. The above-mentioned newspaper regards the decisions of the Reichstag-Constitutional Reform Committee as purely decorative in effect and openly declares that "we are now, after the adoption of these decisions, as far removed from parliamentary form of government, and as deeply imbedded in a pseudo-constitutional regime as ever."

Still more important are a number of other decisions of the Commission, which, however, must also await the final ratification of the Reichstag as well as of the Bundesrat before they become effective. They provide for a reapportionment of the Reichstag election districts upon the basis of 200,000 inhabitants. This new division of Germany would have the identical political effect that awaits Prussia when once the three-class election system has gone forever—the power of the conservative Junker will be broken, the "liberal" capitalist class will step into his place. When, almost fifty years ago, the national constitution of Germany was drawn up, Germany possessed about one-half of its present population. At that time 100,000 inhabitants were apportioned into one election district, the industrial centers and large cities were treated somewhat niggardly and the agrarian districts a little more liberally, so that, in this way 397 election districts were organized, the great majority sending agrarian representatives to Parliament.

What at that time meant a direct advantage for the Junkers who controlled the great landed population, to-day represents a distinct balance of power in favor of the landholding class, during a time of unparalleled development in industry, a situation that must needs lead to unbearable political conditions. More than once this conflict between two mighty classes, wrestling with each other for political supremacy, has made the threatening clash in

the inner-political life of Germany seem imminent. So, for instance, when the Russo-Austrian commercial treaties (*Handelsverträge*) were signed, the opposing interests became involved in a bitter controversy. At that time the National-liberal party, the representatives of the steel and iron and manufacturing industries demanded a re-apportionment of election districts. Only their still greater fear of the power of the Social Democracy, whose parliamentary representation would have been decidedly increased by such a measure at that time held the Liberals in check. Since then political conditions in Germany have greatly changed. Since the beginning of the war the majority of the Social-Democracy has become so tame that it eats from the hand of its erstwhile enemy, William, and, for the price of a cosy tête-à-tête of civil peace, throws its "shocking" republicanism into the scrap heap, to the rest of the principles it has sacrificed. The bourgeoisie may therefore take up its old battle against the Junkers without fear. The "unfortunate political constellation" that once prevented it from grasping the supremacy of Germany is no more. The Prussian election reform, and the re-apportionment of the German Reichstag election districts mean as a matter of fact, only the establishment of the German manufacturing industry as the most powerful factor in the political future of the German Nation. But the seed too is planted, from which will grow, with ever-increasing bitterness and relentlessness, the struggle between capital and labor. The seed is planted. But its fruit can ripen only with the coming of the social revolution in Germany.

As we have seen, the capitalist class of Germany is better prepared for this final conflict, which can break out with full force only after the war is over, than ever before. The concentration of capital has made incredible progress in the last three years. Tens of thousands of small, hitherto independent manufacturers have been hurled into the ranks of the proletariat, or have been relegated to complete industrial insignificance. The circle that represented the real power behind the throne, the real rulers of Germany, has been drawn closer and closer. It has organized its forces in strong manufacturers and trades associations wielding enormous power; organizations that

possessed more influence over the decisions of Bethmann-Hollweg during the war, than the once so mighty Junker court camarilla. The Court-Jews have pushed aside the old Court-Nobility.

* * *

The condition of the German working class presents a sad contrast. It will emerge from the war, weakened in every respect. Its numbers are decimated, its industrial powers of resistance broken, its political strength practically gone. The German labor unions to-day possess hardly one-third of their former membership, and that in spite—or because?—of the fact that they patriotically resolved, on the second of August, 1914, to discourage all strikes for the period of the war, and to sustain the civil peace on the political field, by suspending the class struggle on the field of industry. The law of forced industrial service has deprived them of the right to strike that they had won after a struggle that has lasted more than a hundred years, and adding insult to injury, has commandeered the labor unions to help in the enforcement of its despotic measures.

The industrial organizations of the German laboring class ceased—just as did almost all national labor groups in the other belligerent countries—to be fighting organizations, and became instead benefit societies, go-betweens between the government and the laboring masses; their functions had undergone a fundamental change. It is true, things will not remain thus after the war is over, for the bourgeoisie does not need the complete annihilation of the right of all workers to strike. For the millions who are employed in transportation and ammunition industries, and directly by the state, the prohibition of strikes will continue—and this alone will make labor conflicts on a large scale, an impossibility in the coming years. The impoverishment of the labor movement, and its complete exhaustion will yet be much more effective preventatives.

The political situation is still more hopeless. The policies of the majority, with its metamorphosis from a fundamental opponent of every capitalist government, and its imperialistic aims

to a bodyguard and protector of the Emperor, which not only in the August-days of 1914 fell into the lying trap of the government, but even now, when the true character of this imperialistic war for conquest stands openly revealed still remain the voluntary prisoners of these capitalistic-imperialistic enemies of the people, and frankly proclaim their shame from the housetops, made a split in the German Social Democracy, the pride of the International Social Democracy, inevitable. To the undying honor of Karl Liebknecht it will be remembered that he first found the courage to say openly in the Reichstag, and in the Prussian Diet, what many thousands felt and thought with him, nor has it ever been sufficiently appreciated, that comrades like Franz Mehring, Klara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, Otto Ruehle, and others, from the first day of the war, bravely and unafraid, exposed the military camarillas of Germany and Austria as the real peace disrupters of Europe.

It must not be overlooked that the caucus of the Social Democratic group, that met before the first Reichstag vote on the second, third and fourth of August, 1914, showed a minority of fourteen deputies who opposed a vote in favor of the first four billion dollar war loan. They refrained from open protest to preserve the outward "unity" of the Reichstag group that had become a dogma in the German movement. Even Hugo Haase, who as chairman of the Reichstag group, read the declaration of assent adopted in this caucus before the assembled Reichstag, was a member of this minority group, and led the fight against the majority in the caucus. When the second war loan came up before the Reichstag Liebknecht voted against it, while fifteen of his colleagues demonstratively rose and left the hall as a protest against the loan. In the caucus meetings the number of these opponents to a governmental policy increased, and soon we found a new group in the Reichstag, the Socialdemocratic Labor Community (Sozialdemokratische Arbeitsgemeinschaft), which elected Hugo Haase and George Ledebour as their chairmen, and were being actively supported by Eduard Bernstein, who at first belonged to the members of the majority, but in a very short time broke loose from them and became one of the most energetic adherents of the opposition,

Arthur Stadthagen, Emanuel Wurm, F. Geyer, Adolf Hoffmann, of the Prussian Diet, and Karl Kautsky, the editor of the "Neue Zeit," the famous scientific weekly of the German Social Democracy. Karl Liebknecht and Otto Ruehle, who were excluded from the majority group for insubordination, did not join the new group, but remained independent.

At first it seemed as if the strife that immediately broke out between the opposition headed by Haase, Kautsky, Ledebour, and the Gruppe Internationale (International Group) Liebknecht, Ruehle, Mehring, Luxemburg, Zetkin would create such bitterness of feeling, that a united opposition against the majority group would be out of the question. The Sozialdemokratische Arbeits Gemeinschaft had intimated, in its first declaration before the Reichstag presented by Geyer, that it recognized the duty of fatherland defense, and had, in so doing, completely alienated the sympathies of all truly radical elements. Fortunately this grave mistake was rectified when this group sent two delegates to both the Zimmerwald and the Kienthal conferences. Both of these conferences, representing the International Affiliation of those who had remained true to their Socialist principles, repudiated all wars—of defense and of offense. As the manifestos published by these conferences, expressing the position of the determined opposition, were signed by both Ledebour and Adolf Hoffman the delegates of the S. L. C. open conflict between the two groups in Germany was avoided. Then too, the increasing antagonism between the majority and the minority groups in the Reichstag called out a more radical note from the members of the S. L. C. The abyss between the two groups became so wide that in the easter days of this year, the opposition was fused in a conference held at Gotha—the city which in 1875 had given to Germany, when the Lassalle and Eisenach wings had united its first Social Democracy, into the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany (Unabhängige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands).

Besides these two groups there is a third opposition organization headed by Julian Borchard which is, however, of slight importance.

The two opposition groups that deserve serious attention have thus united, in Gotha into one unified fighting organization. This result was not easily accomplished. Organization and unification alone cannot produce a complete fusion of all divergent views. There will be friction, differences of opinion, and conflicts on questions of tactics and of principle. But the unification shows that these divergencies are not so deep, nor so impossible as it has oftentimes appeared.

On the problems of Imperialism and the attitude of the Social Democracy to international disarmament, and compulsory international arbitration, the forces of the opposition have found common ground, relentless opposition to the government as well as to the majority party, of which today no one can tell whether it is the majority or minority group of the German socialist movement, have been made a part of its immediate program while all collusion with the Scheidemann, Suedekum, Ebert group has been most emphatically repudiated. Two sentences, which once formed a part of the program of the "Gruppe Internationale" and whose general significance was embodied in the program of the Gotha conference will serve to illustrate the fundamental attitude of the Independent Social Democracy, and will show the absurdity of the claims of a certain American Socialist who has branded the German minority as the tool of William Hohenzollern:

"The war has shattered the Second International. Its inability to erect a bulwark against nationalist disruption in time of war, its failure to carry out a uniform tactic and action of the proletariat in all countries, have proven its insufficiency. In view of the betrayal of the aims and interests of the working class by the official parties in the leading countries, in view of its surrender of the proletarian International to their imperialistic capitalist rulers, the creation of a new International has become a necessity, a new International that will take up the fight and the leadership in the revolutionary class struggle in all countries, against Imperialism."

"In the International lies the center of gravity of the class organization of the proletariat. The International decides in

times of peace the tactics of its national groups on questions of militarism, on colonial policy, trade questions, May demonstrations, and the tactics of its national entities in times of war. The next duty of the socialist movement is the mental liberation of the proletariat from the guardianship of the bourgeoisie, and the shackles of the nationalistic ideology by which it has been bound. The national sections must direct their agitation in the press, and in their parliaments, against the old nationalistic phraseology, and must denounce it as a part of the supremacy, as an instrument of mental oppression of the ruling class. The only defense of real national liberty is to-day the revolutionary class struggle against Imperialism. *The Fatherland of the proletariat, to whose defense all other considerations must be subordinated is the Socialist International.*"

* * *

When peace has come the political change that has relegated the conservatives in Germany to the second rank, and has placed the big capitalists in its place, will have been accomplished. The brutal bourgeoisie, emerging from the war, unshackled and all-powerful in its autocratic oppression of the laboring masses whom the war has left torn, disorganized and helpless in its power, will weld the proletariat, in a few short years into a fighting whole with new ideals and new methods. This will be the beginning of the most relentless struggle between capital and labor, whose equal, in bitterness and in magnitude, the world has never before witnessed. This must be understood when we hear the overthrow of *monarchial* Germany proclaimed—by Socialists, we regret to say, as well as by others—as the war aim of the democratic nations of the world. They do not understand that the German bourgeoisie, although it gained its victory over the conservative Junker, with the help of the proletariat, cannot be compared to the capitalist class of Russia or of Italy. Its economic power is so vastly greater, its understanding of the problems that it must face so incomparably keener. It knows the struggles that lie before it, knows the prize for which it is fighting with the working class. The German bourgeoisie has been and al-

ways will, be the most trusted supporter of the monarchy, because it knows, that it needs its help. Like every other capitalistically highly developed bourgeoisie, it will rather sell its soul to the devil than become socialistic, would open the gates of the nation to "hated" England, rather than consent to a new industrial system. So it will bear with the monarchy, even though monarchical rule will hamper its activity here and there, and will combat, with every means at its command, a republican form of government. There are no bourgeois republicans in Germany. The fight against the monarchy is an integral part of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, and can be won only by the working class, against all other classes.

He who hopes for a German revolution during the war will be bitterly disappointed, the fourth of August, 1914, and its consequences, have buried these hopes, once and for all. Still the day is not far distant, when Germany will see the social revolution, a revolution whose growth was augmented by the hot-house atmosphere of the war. Then, and only then, will German culture be more than a vain phantasy.

On the Road to Reaction

By J. KOETTGEN.

Socialist speculations on the probable developments of the near future have in many cases given rise to a blind and dangerous optimism. In some cases the idea that the collectivist war measures of the belligerent powers are pointing the way to Socialism by way of State Socialism seems to arise from an ignorance of the temporary nature of such measures which have their counterpart in nearly all the great wars of history. In other cases that optimism is merely part of the propaganda indulged in by Socialist apologists who have betrayed the International, and who seek to reconcile workingmen to the war by telling them that this war is the very social revolution of which

they have been dreaming. Fundamentally, that optimism is the outcome of a superficial and false conception of the driving forces of this war. Before this war, Socialists who thought at all about international problems agreed that the then prevalent policy of Imperialism would sooner or later lead to a gigantic clash; and when that clash occurred those who did not lose their heads saw in it the fulfilment of their prophecy, the continuation of a world policy by warlike means, a policy whose aims had not changed, though the words of the men behind it had. Nothing has since happened to upset that conception of the war as an episode in the history of Imperialism. On the contrary; everything confirms that view. The late peace endeavors suffered shipwreck because a peace concluded at the present time holds out no hope of stabilizing the relations between the contending powers. German military prestige is still too great, and military prestige is to your financier, concession hunter and exploiter of foreign countries the most important asset; it is to them what good credit is to the merchant. It also appears that the Russian revolution has brought to the front the most uncompromising advocates of war and Imperialism.

It would be foolish for us to remain blind to the fact that Imperialism is still dictating national policy everywhere, and is everywhere shaping future development. Some fatalistic souls pretend to believe with the poet that this imperialism is only part of that power that wills the evil, yet achieves the good. They seem to be hypnotized by such war measures as the regulation of the food supply in Europe, to which distance and an inaccurate knowledge lend a certain charm, which will hardly be felt by the objects of that collectivist experiment. If but for a moment they would take their eyes off Europe and seek in the United States for the signs of that Socialist society which the war is to spawn, they would perceive that we are traveling at present in quite a different direction. As regards the United States, the most fundamental change the war has produced is that astounding change in its economic world position. From a debtor nation it has become a creditor nation; from a nation that for forty years previously had to draw upon Europe for capital

and had to pay annual tribute to the capitalists of the older European nations, it has in a short space of time developed into a country that is able to exact tribute from the Old World and its dependencies. That fact ought to arrest our attention, for the greatly altered economic position of the United States can not but have important consequences both for the general political development of this country and its working class.

Before the war the amount of European capital invested in the railroads and industries of the United States was variously estimated at from four billion dollars and less up to six billions. The lower figure was perhaps nearer the mark. Fairly accurate figures have during the last two years been supplied by L. F. Loree, President of the Delaware and Hudson Company, in regard to stocks and bonds of American railroads held abroad. Mr. Loree began his compilations on January 31, 1915, six months after the beginning of the war, when large amounts of American stocks and bonds in the hands of foreign capitalists had already been disposed of by them in the United States. At that date he found that the par value of American railroad bonds and stocks held abroad (those stocks and bonds are said to constitute about four-fifths of all American securities owned by foreign capitalists) was \$2,704,402,364. By the end of January, 1917, that amount had been reduced to \$1,185,811,486, so that in two years United States railroad stocks and bonds held abroad, of a par value of \$1,518,590,878, have returned to this country in the shape of payments for American goods. That movement is still going on, and the time can not be far away when the indebtedness of American railroads and industries to foreign owners of capital will be wiped out or will at least be very small.

On the other hand we see a contrary movement of capital going on in a similar vigorous fashion. Capital is leaving the United States in the shape of foreign loans the interest on which already amounts to a sum equal to the budget of a European country of respectable size. The foreign loans made in this country since the beginning of the war have been listed by the National City Company as follows:

Great Britain	\$1,131,400,000
France	736,700,000
Russia	148,500,000
Italy	25,000,000
Germany	20,000,000
Canada	334,999,878
Newfoundland	5,000,000
Latin America	160,267,375
Asia	9,000,000
Neutral European Nations	35,000,000

\$2,605,867,253

Loans repaid or refunded 229,271,375

Net amount outstanding \$2,376,595,878

It will be noticed that the capitalists of the United States have not only lent immense sums to England and France, but have also provided money for countries which in time of peace used to turn to the money markets of the older capitalist countries. The American capitalist is thus seen to acquire a grip on countries like Canada and the South American republics, where up to the time of the war investments of capital assured the predominance of European, and especially British, interests.

One clear conclusion can be drawn from the foregoing figures, viz.: that the balance of payments as between Europe and the United States is being reversed—that it will in the future be in favor of the United States. That balance is bound to grow steadily more in favor of this country as the war proceeds, and hence arises the difficult question of how the European countries are going to settle that balance. The question will become particularly acute soon after the end of the war. The European nations will want to import from America food and raw material, possibly also machinery to replace the tools that are now being worked to death. On the top of the payments for such goods they will have to pay the interest on the loans contracted in this country. It is hardly likely that they will be in a position to swamp this country with their goods and thus settle matters;

they possess neither raw materials nor sufficient machinery, and millions of their best workers have been slain, whilst the greater part of the working male population have been estranged from their accustomed tasks, performing the rude labor of war. The productive power of Europe can hardly be very great after this war. Even in times of peace the productive power of men who have just spent two or three years in the army is estimated at a low rate by European capitalists. Such men find it very hard to procure employment, and they have to work for some considerable time before acquiring again their old skill. Of course, there are still large amounts of foreign securities in the hands of European capitalists, and it is possible that these are retained to liquidate debts in the critical times after the war. Thus, British capitalists have large amounts invested in South America. More than once American capitalists have thrown out broad hints that they would like to acquire these South American securities. However, British capitalists show little inclination for that deal. Investments in undeveloped or half developed countries are closely tied up with concessions and other economic advantages which would be lost if the foreign capitalist should release his hold on a railway or some other important undertaking by selling his securities. If the war lasts long enough European capitalists may be obliged to sell out, and then American Imperialism is likely to supplant British and European Imperialism in general. Ancient history will repeat itself; Cathage will again supplant Tyre.

Though it is impossible to foresee how these things will regulate themselves, one thing stands out quite clearly—the American investor, to whom Europe has hitherto merely been a geographical expression, will become a vastly interested spectator of European affairs. He is now being educated by his financial tutors in putting his money in foreign industrial undertakings, and it is very likely that such corporations as the American International Corporation, which proposed in its prospectus to run the whole universe, will direct his attention to the advantages of exploiting the labor of a Europe in great need of capital. What will be his attitude toward European affairs? But even if the development does not proceed on these lines the sums which he has already

staked on Europe are large enough to assure his lively interest. All speculations on the probable internal development of European countries are worthless if the problems arising from the immense national debts are not taken in account. It is evident that at the end of the war there will be two distinct camps in every European nation—the men demanding the interest on the war bonds they own and the people who are expected to pay. These sums will be a crushing burden. It has been calculated that, should the war come to a sudden termination, the German people would have to pay one third of their annual income in taxes. Things can not be much different in the other countries. Will the nations put up with it? Is it not rather likely that tremendous fights will rage around the question of partial or absolute repudiation? Is Europe not heading for an age of violent revolution? What will be the role played by American capital in those struggles? Mexico and other American republics may supply an answer, but a more suitable parallel may be found in the relations between Russia and western European capitalism. Capital is timid and does not like political changes, and where these are unavoidable it only acquiesces in them if assured of the continuance of its privileges, as was recently shown in Russia where the first steps undertaken by the foreign diplomats were to require a promise from the new liberal government that it would fulfil all the foreign obligations of the deposed autocrat. European capitalism was a reactionary force in Russia, and foreign, American capital must be reckoned a reactionary force in the future Europe, especially if, as seems very probable, the struggle in Europe centres around the right of capital to its pound of flesh.

Another probable development is the immense strengthening of American Imperialism, bringing in its train a period of political and social reaction and moral and spiritual perversion. There is no reason which could lead us to suppose that the effects a fully developed policy of Imperialism has on national life will be different in the United States from what they were in Europe. In the epoch of European Imperialism liberal ideas became a farce, democracy a laughing stock. The proconsuls, the financial and industrial chieftains, the soldiers that went out to teach other

peoples their place and stake out places in the sun, spheres of influence and other claims, became the political and spiritual leaders of the peoples, and transplanted to their native country the manners and ideas they had acquired in dealing with so-called inferior peoples. The psychology of Imperialism is very finely described by Hilferding in his remarkable book, "Das Finanzkapital," where he writes: "The place of the democratic ideal of equality has been usurped by an oligarchical ideal of domination. But if that ideal comprises seemingly the whole nation in foreign politics, in home politics it changes into an emphasizing of capitalist authority over the working class. The growing power of the workers strengthens at the same time the desire of capital to increase further the power of the State as a security against the proletarian demands. Thus the ideology of Imperialism arises and conquers the old liberal ideals. It scoffs at their ingenuousness. What an illusion to believe in a harmony of interests in a world of capitalist struggles where the superiority of the weapons alone decides! What an illusion to expect the kingdom of eternal peace and to preach international law when force alone decides the fate of nations! What foolishness to attempt to carry the regulation of legal relations within the state territory across the borders, what an unconscionable disturbance of business is this humanitarian simpleness which has made a question out of labor, has invented social reform at home, and wants to do away, in the colonies, with indentured labor, which forms the only possibility of a rational exploitation! Eternal justice is a beautiful dream, but even at home one can not build railroads with morality. How are we to conquer the world if we are to wait for the conversion of our competitors?" This was written some seven years ago, and depicts the mental condition of the ruling classes of Europe in general.

It might be objected that the reaction Imperialism had upon politics in European semi-autocratic and semi-democratic countries need not be feared in the United States whose people possess strong democratic traditions. But democratic traditions were strong in England, perhaps stronger there than here; at any rate, modern England has produced a greater number of bold and active defenders of democracy than the United States. Yet

the Imperialist ways of thinking made great headway in Great Britain, and its propagandists were the soldiers, financiers, and capitalists immediately interested in a policy of Imperialism. The father of British land militarism was Lord Roberts, who was born in India and who spent most of his life fighting the battles of British Imperialism. At the moment of writing an American naval captain is lording it over the inhabitants of Santo Domingo, apparently by right divine. Others will no doubt follow in his footsteps, and when the heroes come home again they will be overflowing with the new political wisdom and the political efficiency methods they have acquired abroad.

Taking into consideration the fundamental facts of recent economic developments the working class of the United States have every reason to be concerned about their future. It would be the height of folly were they to reconcile themselves to the war as a means by which their interests are furthered in some mysterious, scarcely explicable way. It should be one of the chief functions of the Socialist Party to illuminate the people about the forces at work in international politics and the many ways in which foreign policy reacts upon home policy. In Europe it was the crass ignorance of foreign policy on the part of the great mass of the people and their representatives that helped a great deal to make the cataclysm possible. The extent of that ignorance and indifference could be seen in England where, after all, interest in foreign affairs was most highly developed. When foreign affairs came up for discussion in the Commons the House emptied itself automatically; scarcely a quorum of the people's representatives remained to listen to or take part in the discussion. Yet questions concerning the life and death of the people might be involved. Thus it could happen that at the outbreak of war the mass of the people and their representatives everywhere readily repeated the catchwords disseminated by the ever active Imperialist propagandists. Truth was drowned by the appeals to defend democracy, Kultur, the little Slav brother, and what not. A vigorous anti-Imperialist propaganda, opposing the international ideals of Socialism to the meretricious sophistries of Imperialism, would be the best preparation for the hard struggles that are in store for American democracy.

Current Affairs

CONSCRIPTION

In the name of our war for democracy, freedom, and the national honor of America we have plucked the first fruit from the tree of American militarism: selective conscription. And so, whatever the outcome of this war for culture and liberty and for the other lying pretenses that seek to cover up the imperialistic power-hunger of our national-capitalist groups may be—the American people may take home with them this proud assurance, that military conscription has been forced upon them not only for this war, but—if the capitalists of the United States succeed in carrying out their design—for all times.

For it is the contemptible practice of our ruling classes, to say one thing and mean another. They insist that our self-respect demands intervention, and therefore forces us to arm, when, as a matter of fact, we have entered upon this war in order to force the people into arms, for the purpose of militarizing the nation, for the opportunity of creating an army, a million strong, and the “biggest navy in the world.” They are using this war to be prepared for coming difficulties with Mexico and Japan, to secure for “Uncle Sam” a part of the booty that will be divided up among the “civilized nations” after the end of the war, with its “lasting peace.”

No less dishonest are the arguments that are presented in favor of general military service.

They tell us the conscription represents the fulfillment of a democratic ideal, but neglect to show that Germany as well as Austria-Hungary, where the whole national life is built upon the cornerstone of general military service, have felt but little of its democratic influence; that compulsory military service not only destroys the freedom of the individual, but that it creates in the whole nation a habit of unquestioning obedience that kills every feeling of personal independence and independent judgment.

But neither do they tell us that the system of selective conscription that has been foisted upon the United States by our ruling class, is the worst conceivable, the most unjust, the most autocratic military system in the world, that a handful of bureaucrats and military authorities are given the right to decide over the life and death of our people, and that practically the whole burden of military duty will rest upon the shoulders of the laboring masses. For conscription is not synonymous with compulsory general military service, but means, in fact, the exact opposite. It means military duty for certain men, not for all. It gives to our rulers the right to draft their victims according to their usefulness. Those who are necessary for the organization of the nation's resources are to remain at home. But freedom from compulsory service in the uniform, among the tools of capital at the front will mean only slavery at home, compulsory service in production, for the good of the country. In other words, these workers who are spared the necessity of shooting upon their “enemies,” are delivered bound hand and foot into the power of their exploiters, to “do their bit” in the production of war materials, to produce, for these exploiters, incredible war-profits.

The President, in a letter made public for the purpose of influencing the public mind in favor of conscription, proclaimed the right of one man, or a group of men to determine more or less autocratically out of their superior wisdom, the fate of their fellow men. Neither Nicolai Romanow, nor even Willy Hohen-zollern could or can rule their “subjects” more autocratically, notwithstanding the fact that the latter is about to be democratically chloroformed by Uncle Sam and his allies.

Selective conscription means military duty for the sons of the proletariat, in favor of capitalism. It means that the parasitic class will fill the ranks of officers, while the men and women of labor must supply the cannon fodder. Selective conscription means—even if we do not consider for a moment how great an influence Mr. Graft will bring to bear in this “just” selection—compulsory military service for one, and compulsory labor for another part of the working class. It means further, mental slavery for the American proletariat, and the sacrifice of its most

important privilege, the right to take an active part in the great industrial and political struggles that will break out in this country in the near future.

But it may also be the means of arousing the American working class from its attitude of mental blindness and political indifference.

L.

AMERICA IN THE WAR—THE REASON WHY

The entry of the United States into the World War is such a simple business proposition that it would seem quite impossible to make any mistake as to reasons why. The facts are so plain and unmistakable that it would seem even the blind could not help seeing—the glare they throw is so striking that you might almost touch it with your fingers.

But, truly, none are so blind as those that will not see. And so we are treated to interminable discussions as to the reasons why the United States which has kept out of the slaughterhouse for over two and a half years should have entered it just now—and the longer the discussion the less satisfactory the result.

That is to say, as far as throwing any real light on the subject is concerned. For, as far as *finding* a cause is concerned, there is no real difficulty: *this result* precedes the discussion, and is naturally found at its end. We are in this war in order to preserve democracy against the onslaughts of German Militarism, to protect the international order and sanctity of treaty obligations, etc.; or, we are in it because capitalism means war, capitalists always want war, the capitalists of this country have wanted war from the first day. The capitalists of this country are bound hand and foot to international capitalism—which means, of course, Great Britain—and we have therefore been pro-ally all along, etc. We all know the rest on both sides—whether it is dished up to us in its more vulgar forms from the soap boxers on both sides, or in pseudo-scientific form from editorial sanctums or other “high quarters” on either side of the house.

There is no difficulty there: you can always “find” a result that you have had in your pocket all along—it is much akin to the “finding” of an answer to a mathematical problem propounded

in a text-book, after you have looked it up at the back of the book. The real difficulty of those who attempt to explain our entry into the war at this time is not in finding the answer, but in getting at it—just as the pupil who found his answer at the back of the text-book encounters his real difficulty when it comes to showing the operations by which he arrived at it. And when it comes at “arriving” at the reason for our entry into the war—that is show a *consistent course of action* which *kept us out of the war* for over two and a half years and *brought us into it now*—there is a touching unanimity of confusion among the advocates of the war as well as its official opponents. And no wonder—there is enough in the situation to make any good orthodox formula-repeating citizen on either side go mad with vexation.

Here is a great country watching and looking on at the greatest world cataclysm that history has recorded without apparently taking any interest in it, and then suddenly it plunges right in. Here is a president who is so punctiliously neutral and so meticulously innocent of any knowledge of the sins that have beset the old world that he enjoins upon his people the solemn duty of being neutral not only in deed but also in thought; and then suddenly he plunges us right into the abyss of hell. Has the country been sane for two and a half years and then suddenly gone mad; or has it been callously unfaithful in its obligations to right and humanity for that length of time and then been suddenly awakened to its duty? Has the president kept us that long out of a righteous war, or has he now brought us into an unrighteous one? Does the capitalist class make the foreign policy of this country or does it not? If it does why did we stay out of the war so long, and if it doesn't why did we enter it? Is Mr. Woodrow Wilson the man who could have kept the wolf of “Wall Street” from our door for over two and a half years, then where is his strength now? Who was the Delilah that has shorn the locks of this high-minded idealist,” and what were “the little scissors” with which she did it?

Verily, these be great puzzles. No wonder the “defenders of the faith” on both sides find themselves in a quandary—and therefore write long and argue in a circle, if they argue at all.

The *New Republic* has recently attempted the thankless job of showing "The Evolution of a National Policy in relation to the Great War"—in plain English: an apology for the seemingly inconsistent conduct of Mr. Woodrow Wilson. We recommend the performance to the careful attention of our readers. This journal of high intellectualism occupies with respect to Mr. Wilson the position which Judge Story of the United States Supreme Court occupied with respect to Chief Justice Marshall. Tradition has it, that whenever the great Chief Justice had made up his mind on some political decision he would turn to Judge Story with some such remark as the following: "Story, here is the decision; you can pepper it with authorities." It has been the function of the *New Republic* for some time past to "pepper with authorities"—supply acceptable general principles—for the particular measures taken by Mr. Wilson in the "due course of business" of managing the affairs of these United States for those in whose interests they have been managed by most of his predecessors and in whose interests they will be managed by his successors for some time to come. The "Evolution of a National Policy" was an attempt by the *New Republic* to perform this function in the present instance. And we recommend it to our readers, in order that they may see for themselves the labored attempt and the dismal failure. The failure must not be laid, however, at the door of the editors of the *New Republic*—it was in the nature of the job. No one could find general principles—at least not such that could be avowed by a "high-minded idealist" and his apologists—for a policy which was dictated principally by the exigencies of the business situation. And so we find the poor *New Republic* whining at the end of its great effort at evolving—in this really pitiful wise—in an effort to get the real "administration" of this country that be to do something that will cover its nakedness and permit its apologists to fall back on some kind of general principles:

"Our reading of the neutrality law, ever since the war began, has been partial to England. We have acquiesced in the British blockade; we have evinced a readiness to go all lengths to curb the submarine. We have foregone the right we claimed to send bread to Germany. We have insisted on our right to send muni-

tions to England. *We have made hundreds of millions of war profits by this procedure. Was this our motive?"*

To which the spirits of hell shout the mockingly-responsive echo: "*This our motive.*"

The fact—the only undeniable, outstanding fact—is that "we" have done a wonderful business, made untold millions, by following the "procedure" described by the *New Republic*, and that this result was the *motive* for that procedure. Try what they may, the apologists of the present war cannot get away from this fact, which overshadows all else.

Nor can the opponents of this war get away from this fact try what *they* may—except that it is extremely stupid of them to try. Why resort to alleged eternal principles of capitalist production, when it only befogs an issue so clear, and the clarity of which is so much in our favor? Why assert things that are neither true nor helpful? Neither our capitalist class nor Mr. Wilson were or are either pro-British or pro-Ally as such. Mr. Wilson's only honest and frank statement since the great war broke out was when he asserted to be simply "pro-American." And it is our business to follow him up and show what "pro-American" means in this connection. Only then will we be telling the truth, and telling it to some effect.

When the war broke out, and no one knew who would control the sea, or how far, we were "strictly neutral" as between our prospective customers. Business is business. And it was none of our business to do, say, or think anything against the bad things that we are now to fight or in favor of the good things that we are now to defend. A customer is a customer, and German money is as good as English. We therefore stood aside, ready to serve all comers. Then came the British blockade against Germany, which interfered with our right to sell food to Germany. We protested, for it is a libel upon our government to say that it is concerned only about munition makers. It is the agent of our business interests—all business interests, food as well as munitions, and no invidious distinctions made.

Great Britain did not heed our protest. We did not go to war with her. For, while not heeding our protest, she removed the

cause of complaint—she paid for our food in good current cash, and being strictly neutral English money is as good as German money.

Then came the German submarine, which really threatened "our" trade. Not in the way the British blockade did—by making us take English money for our exports instead of German money, but by making us lose our war-trade upon which "we" have been growing fat. So we threatened war, unless Germany modified her submarine policy so as not to interfere with our gathering in of the shekels. Allied shekels in this case. But it is their being shekels that counts, not their nationality. And as long as Germany was willing to accommodate us in this respect, we were "patient" and "long-suffering" as far as her other iniquities and "horrors" were concerned.

On February 1, 1917, Germany refused to accommodate us any longer. During the month of February our war trade fell off to an alarming extent, and was threatened with extinction. So we were at war with Germany on April 5.

Here, in these few and simple facts, is the true nature of the beast—Capitalism—and the perfect consistency of its American jockey, Mr. Woodrow Wilson.

Both beast and jockey are thoroughly selfish, and do not permit any "outside" considerations to influence their course! They have no "sympathies" nor "general principles." The God they serve is the only God they know—*Business*.

B.

AMERICA IN THE WAR—WAR AIMS

The reason why a nation enters upon a conflict and the aims which it pursues in prosecuting it are not merely closely connected. Ordinarily, these are merely two ways of expressing the same things, and a difference between them can only exist if in the course of the conflict something has occurred which has brought about a change in the original object of the war. As we are still at the beginning of the war, our aims and objects in entering upon it, and the reasons for doing so are, of course, identical.

Our war-enthusiasts, particularly among radicals and Socialists, continually prate about our high aims, purposes in this war: destruction of militarism and autocracy; preservation and extension of democracy; international organization of the world for peace and progress, etc.

We have already pointed out the real reason for this country's entry into the war; and it is clear that a country entering upon a war for such sordid reasons cannot possibly prosecute it for high aims and purposes. And it is interesting to note that we have official confirmation of our view that this war was entered upon by us, and will therefore be prosecuted on our part purely and solely for our selfish and sordid interests. This confirmation is contained in the debates in Congress upon the war question—the reasons given by the pro-war speakers why we should go to war, and the opinions expressed by them as to the aims which we should seek to accomplish thereby. We cannot, of course, reproduce here all of these speeches, so we shall give a few typical samples.

Senator Kirby (Democrat, Arkansas) expressly stated that we were "not going into a world war to establish a democracy for the nations of the earth." Our aim in this war, according to this authority, is "to protect the lives of our people on the open sea, and our commerce."

Senator Harding (Republican, Ohio) said:

"It is my deliberate judgment that it is none of our business what type of government any nation on this earth may choose to have." Which may be good enough doctrine, but rather peculiar for those entering into a bloody war against autocracy and for democracy.

As to our real reason for entering the war, Senator Williams, of Mississippi, a leader among the Democrats in the Senate and an administration spokesman, said, apostrophising Germany:

"We have got nothing to do with the question of your whipping Great Britain; you whip her all you please or can, but do not undertake to whip us (i. e., *do not spoil our business*) while you are about it."

And Representative McCulloch (Republican, Ohio) thus expressed our war-aims in the House:

"I believe that we should enter this war merely for the purpose of *protecting our rights*, and when we succeed in forcing Germany, if we should so succeed, in *recognizing our rights* on the seas and in modifying her submarine warfare, then we should withdraw and have nothing further to do with the controversy."

Messrs. Russell, Walling, Stokes, et al., please note.

B.

THE FIRST VICTIMS OF WAR

War is the same the world over, everywhere it suppresses civil and industrial rights, and the rights of the individual conscience. On the bleeding list of war's victims, the first is democracy and individual freedom at home.

One year ago, two years ago, there were often protests in the press against some of the outrageous actions of the military power and the censorship in the belligerent nations; to-day, actions in this country along similar lines evoke either the acquiescence of silence or open approval.

America has not yet sent an army abroad, its navy has not yet been in action; but already we have our first victims of the war—the imprisonment of men and women active in the struggle for freedom, and who dared assert their principles in this crisis.

And, as a symbol of this development, the detention of Leon Trotzky and a group of eight Russian Socialists in a Canadian detention camp stands out clearly.

Trotzky left this country on his way to Russia, after the Provisional Government had issued a general invitation to revolutionary exiles to return to Russia. Trotzky, his wife and children, and a party of eight comrades, had their passports viséd by the Russian Consul in this city; but when the party arrived at Halifax the British authorities arrested Trotzky and his party, separated him from his wife and children, and imprisoned them in a concentration camp.

Protests were got to the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council at Petrograd, a demand was made upon the British government to

release Trotzky and to allow all exiles to return freely to Russia, but the British paid absolutely no heed.

The action of this government fighting for civilization and democracy is understandable. There is a struggle going on in Russia to-day between the imperialists and the revolutionists, who are against the war and for a general working class peace without annexations and indemnities. Such a peace would be a shattering blow at the imperialistic plans of the Allies, and so Trotzky must be kept out of Russia.

The American government, of course, has taken absolutely no action in the matter. Obviously, since this is a war for freedom and democracy.

But Trotzky is not alone. We do not have to go to Canada for victims. We have plenty right here at home.

The declaration of war was the signal for all sorts of reactionary explosions. Bill after bill was introduced in congress aiming directly against democracy and for autocracy; and the conscription act was passed to compel men to fight in a war that their refusal to enlist showed they were against.

Free speech has been trampled upon. Free press has been trampled upon. Free assemblage has been violated. The terror of reaction is stalking the land, and its menace is growing.

And not only general rights and principles have been ruthlessly violated. Men and women have been imprisoned, shamelessly and occasionally on trumped-up charges.

Over in Blackwell's Island is Henry Jager, a socialist of many years' activity, condemned to six months on a charge of disorderly conduct.

It is the contention of Jager that he never said the words he is charged with saying, that the man who made the charge was venting a personal spite. But in spite of this, he was given six months, the limit on a charge of disorderly conduct—not because of the thing he is charged with having said, but because he was denouncing the reaction of Capitalism and propagating socialism.

There are others; there will be more. And it is our task, it is the task of the socialists and the workers to get into the fight against reaction, and to defend their own. No faltering! On with the struggle against Capitalism! F.

THE AUTOCRAT IN THE WHITE HOUSE

In view of President Wilson's reference in his war address before Congress to the menace to the peace and freedom of the world which "lies in the existence of autocratic governments," we think it would be of considerable interest for the people of this country to find out how much or how little democracy there is about their own government. We shall not refer here to the autocratic power of the United States Supreme Court in all matters of the internal government of this country, which makes our government a "Government by Judiciary." We shall limit ourselves for the present to foreign affairs and the Executive branch of our government. The enormous power of our President in our foreign relations, which means in the decision of the question of peace and war, has been frequently commented upon by writers on our system of government. We shall not tire our readers, however, by references to these learned discussions. Instead, we shall reproduce here a few pertinent remarks by our distinguished fellow-citizen and former close associate of President Wilson—Col. George Harvey, editor of the *North American Review*. We do so with particular pleasure, since it is but seldom that a radical has a chance to agree with that noted publicist. Says Mr. Harvey, in the February issue of the *North American Review*:

"There is no need to look abroad to the Kaiser or the Czar or to the sovereigns of the Balkan States for examples of autocracy. We have a very complete specimen in Washington in the person of the President of the United States. When we inveigh against 'secret diplomacy' as one of the causes of the European war, let us remember that no diplomacy is so secret as our own. When we talk of the necessity of placing public opinion in control of foreign policy, let us quietly reflect that nowhere is that necessity more potent than in the United States, because nowhere is opinion less informed as to the problems of external relationships or less interested in them or less capable of influencing their solution. When we denounce a dispensation that puts it into the power of one man or a

single class or group to hurl millions into war, we ought first to open our eyes and ascertain whether that is not precisely the system under which the international business of the United States is managed or mismanaged. . . .

"Our machinery for handling international crises are abysmally defective. And they are defective in exactly that characteristic which ought never to infect a democratic polity such as ours. They work in the dark, out of the public view, and to a great extent independent of popular volition; and they throw upon one man not only a load of responsibility that must often of late have seemed unbearable, but a power of making in secret vast decisions, and of committing the nation without debate to momentous policies, that is good neither for him nor for us and that is altogether subversive of the cardinal principles of democracy. . . .

"Alone among the Governments of the world, our government publishes no collection of its diplomatic correspondence. Every other people can discover by reading Blue Books and White Papers or by cross-examining Ministers on the floor of the national legislature how their affairs are being managed and how questions in which they are interested are progressing. We cannot. Our function is merely to close our eyes, open our mouths, and take whatever the President deigns to send us. . . .

"The power which the President possesses of negotiating with foreign Governments behind the backs of his Cabinet and of Congress, his ability to commit the nation to new courses by a mere ipse dixit—just as Mr. Wilson has pledged the American people to support a world-league for the maintenance of peace 'with every influence and resource at their command'—his fixity in office, the difficulty, almost the impossibility of reaching him as the Foreign Ministers of Europe, even of Russia and Germany, can always be reached, his immunity from effective checks—a President bent on war could easily force Congress to do his bidding—the general feeling that obtains among our people that foreign affairs are no concern of theirs and that the President is paid to look after them, and the almost grotesque incompetence which Congress, and especially the Senate, displays whenever it plunges into international problems—all these are elements in a situation full of possible danger to our Republic and singularly ill-adapted to stand the wear and tear of the next few crucial years. B.

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION AND ITS WAR RESOLUTIONS

The story of the Emergency Convention of the Socialist Party held at St. Louis April 7-14 is told with some detail elsewhere in this issue. History will judge of the correctness of the respective positions of the three factions of which it was composed,

as well as of the wisdom of those who attempted to "harmonize" it by straddling the issues and create a fictitious "majority" where there was none. In our opinion this was a grave error, as our movement must be frank and sincere above all. If there was no possibility of agreeing on a declaration of principles which would satisfy the great bulk of those who are opposed to the present war, it would have been far better—as suggested by the spokesman of the radical minority—to have adopted no such declaration, but merely a program of action. As it is, the value of the program of action, which is fairly good, is largely vitiated by the unfortunate "declaration."

We do not care to enter upon a discussion of that subject here, however.

For obvious reasons we cannot, under existing conditions, discuss the majority report fully and freely—and we do not care to discuss it in a half-way manner.

But more important even is the fact that *we want the party to adopt the majority resolution*. The draft of the radical minority is not before membership. Because a free discussion cannot be had under present political conditions, and in order to insure the defeat of the pro-war substitute, the radical minority decided not to send its own draft to a referendum. The only two drafts now before the membership are, therefore, the majority report and the substitute of the Spargo-Benson group. And as between the two there can be no doubt as to which we must support.

The majority report, with all its defects of statement and equivocations in matters of principles, is nevertheless clearly anti-war, as least as far as the present war is concerned. The minority-substitute is as clearly pro-war, in the sense that it *accepts the war*, though it regrets the necessity, and seeks to make peace with it upon "honorable terms." Which is exactly the position that the Scheidemanns have adopted when Germany entered the war, a position which has brought about the ruin of the socialist movement not only in Germany but the world over. What the German Scheidemanns have begun our own Scheidemanns seek to finish. They evidently consider that their Ger-

man prototypes have not completed their work of ruining the International socialist movement, so they want to help them finish the job.

The most curious thing about this business is that a good many of our Socialist-patriots who now submit the substitute were among those who vociferously condemned the German Socialist-patriots for doing exactly the same thing. When the Germans did it, it was "treason to Socialism"; but when they do it, it is "loyalty to the American working class."

Let the substitute be snowed under, so that there may be no mistake as to where the Socialist Party stands in this crisis.

Incidentally—don't forget to vote against the proposed platform and the proposition to abolish the National Committee.

B.

A DESERVED REBUKE

The New Republic, one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the war, has administered a well-deserved rebuke to Mr. Gompers and the other labor leaders who have followed him into war-camp, for their excess of pseudo-patriotic zeal. The New Republic, as we have said, is enthusiastically pro-war. But it is also intelligently so. It does not, therefore, feel called upon to wallow in the mire of patriotic servility. It realizes and recognizes that it cannot possibly be the duty of good citizenship to give up one's right to freely criticize the conduct of public affairs because we happen to be at war. Such a renunciation of the rights of citizenship is undesirable even from the purely military point of view, as distinguished from a *militaristic* point of view.

The same is true of the rights of workingmen as workingmen under the present system—those rights which are secured to the workers by the law of the land or the power of their economic organizations. A renunciation of these rights in war-time is very far from being an act of good citizenship, and cannot be commended even from a purely military point of view, provided it be intelligent. The entire experience of this war in England as well as elsewhere goes to show that while it is natural to the militaristic cast of mind to make these demands upon labor, it is extremely stupid military judgment to require the workers

to disregard those safeguards which the law and trade-union rules have established for the protection of their lives, health and efficiency.

The super-patriotic effusions of some of our labor leaders in offering to sacrifice their safeguard on the altar of Moloch and "Patriotism" is, therefore, not only treasonable from the point of view of labor's best interests, but also extremely stupid from the point of view of intelligent "war-patriotism." It is from the latter point of view that the New Republic considers the question, and its rebuke is therefore the more stinging.

In his patriotic zeal Mr. Gomper's recently recommended that the Council of National Defense "issue a statement to employers and employees in our industrial plants and transportation systems advising that neither employers nor employees shall endeavor to take advantage of the country's necessities to change existing standards." In speaking of this recommendation, the *New Republic* calls attention to the fact that "existing standards" are changed day by day through the rising cost of food, and that unless some intelligent provision is made for the raising of wages along with the rising cost of food the workers will necessarily be left in the cold—a situation which is likely to seriously disturb Mr. Gomper's fool's paradise in which the "loyal" wolves and sheep will dwell side by side in peace and harmony. The *New Republic* very properly reminds Mr. Gompers of the undoubted fact that "women cannot do efficient work on a diet of loyalty."

And it is even more merciless in its scorn for Mr. Gomper's followers in the New York State Federation of Labor. Speaking of the "loyalty declaration" of that body, it says:

"On March 28th, the New York State Federation of Labor, speaking 'for the man and woman, age, and the children of American labor who will cheerfully make not only this but other sacrifices on our country's altar' gave advance approval to the suspension of 'those statutes that safeguard our industrial population.' A few days later, a bill appeared in the State Assembly designed to sweep away all restrictions, not only upon the employment of men, but also upon the hours and night-work of

women and children. *This is sheer pathos of misguided sentiment.*"

The boot that kicks it fits well upon the servile back.

B.

KAISER-SOCIALISTS

The Berlin Vorwaerts, the central organ of the German Social-Democracy—or what is left of it—which stands under the censorship of Hermann Mueller, a member of the Executive of the Party, allowing only such views to find expression in its columns as are in accord with the opinions of the Executive Committee, recently commented upon a statement attributed to Comrade Tchcheidze, asserting the Russian proletariat can go together with that of Germany only after the Hohenzollern dynasty has been overthrown. The Vorwaerts protests against this attempt to bring about a political revolution against the monarchical government of Germany by pressure from without. It insists that the great mass of the German people; as the last elections have proven, favor a monarchy, and adds that a number of those who voted for the Social Democracy are likewise of this opinion.

"The abolition of the monarchical system, alone," the Vorwaerts continues, "is of small moment. The democratic character of the monarchy is, after all, the most important factor. That, and that alone, is what the people want. The monarchy that finds, in these times, wise advisors, will establish itself even more firmly than ever before. Then the article goes on:

"As soon as the monarchy fulfills the wishes of the people, all agitation for a republican form of government is without foundation. The question, monarchy or republic, will then be even less a subject for discussion than it is to-day. And all indications show that this will be the case. There will be difficulties that must be overcome, but they will be met, probably in a very short time, and solved, *without a trace of forcible upheaval. without the overthrow of the monarchy.*"

Thus writes a newspaper that, as the central organ of the Social Democratic Party possesses an influence that reaches far beyond the German border, as the cables that come daily to America, reporting the expressions of the Vorwaerts, show. Thus writes

the Vorwaerts at a time when the Russian proletariat has not only swept away the Czarish regime, but dares to carry on the fight for a Socialist republic, over the heads of the capitalist revolutionary government.

This statement, in favor of monarchism, is important in view of its great political significance, for it indicates the possible formation of a "Block" of the Left, after peace has been declared. The Liberals hope, with the assistance of the Social patriots, to substitute for the three-class suffrage in Prussia, a new majority system of elections, that will wrest the power from the hands of the Junkers, the great landholders of Germany, and will place the capitalist industrial class at the helm. The Vorwaerts, the mouthpiece of the Party Executive Committee, has, in practically sacrificing the fight for Republicanism, opened the way for a collusion of the parties of the Left with the government—the Block of the Left is about to be born. The Social-patriots of Germany have at last reached the stage where they have nothing to conceal; the next, and the last step will be a party frankly national-socialistic with the "inventor" of this "variety," Pfarrer Naumann, as the leader.

That the Social Democracy of Germany would consent to play the role of protector of emperors and kings at a moment when the hungry masses rise in revolt and thrones began to tremble, not even the most incorrigible pessimist in our ranks, a few years ago, would have dared to believe.

L.

THE MISSION THAT FAILED

The "peace" mission to the Russians—Philip Scheidemann, apostle—was undoubtedly one of the most disheartening occurrences in the International Socialist Movement since that day of thrice-accursed memory, August 4, 1914.

What the success of that mission—that conclusion of a separate peace between Russia and Germany—would have meant to the world in general and Russia in particular is quite clear to any one who would see. To the world in general it would have meant the indefinite prolongation of the world-war and the wasting of the chance for peace which the Russian Revolution now

presents. To Russia itself it would have meant the strengthening of the reactionary forces still alive within her and the possible, nay, probable crushing of the bud of the democratic Russian Republic which all of us hope to see established on the ruins of Czarism.

It is because of this that Bethmann-Hollweg and his master are so anxious for a separate peace with the Russian democracy. And it is for the same reason that the radical, anti-war, socialists in Germany are opposed to it, an opposition which was manfully and unequivocally voiced in the Reichstag by George Ledebour, the leader of the newly-formed Socialist minority party. This is also the reason why even the extremists among the anti-war Socialists of Russia, men like Trotzky for instance, are as vehemently opposed to separate peace as they are in favor of a general peace.

But this did not seem to deter Mr. Scheidemann from undertaking the mission.

In a way that was to be expected: the issue on the subject is clear-cut—those who opposed the war and fought for peace all along are opposed to a separate peace, and those who supported the war and preached "durchhalten" are in favor of it. Mr. Scheidemann who has all along held high the "durchhalten" banner is therefore naturally found in the separate-peace camp. A little matter like prolonging the war and crushing the Russian Revolution surely cannot be expected to cause him to desert his Kaiser and his Chancellor. Particularly since his organ, the Berlin *Vorwaerts*, solemnly assures us that the German Socialists are not republicans.

And yet one naturally hopes to the last. And so we had hoped that even Scheidemann would not lend himself to such a job—that he would rather be inconsistent with his recent part than with the practice and profession of a life-time.

But there evidently does not seem to be any depth to which Scheidemann & Co. are not ready to descend in their efforts "to serve their country." A matter, by the way, which should be pondered over very carefully by those in our midst who are in a way to follow in Scheidemann's footsteps. It should be remembered, that Scheidemann did not deliberately set out in August,

1914, to uphold the Hohenzollern dynastic autocracy and to undermine the Russian revolutionary movement. On the contrary: he was then fighting Czarism in practice, and in theory he adhered to the innocent-looking formula of being "a German first and a socialist afterwards." But there is no stopping on the road to perdition, once one has definitely started on the inclined plane which leads away from international socialism to the most reactionary nationalism. B.

Documents for Future Socialist History

An Appeal to the German Proletariat

"Comrades:

"Proletarians and Working People of all Countries:

"We, Russian workers and soldiers, united in the Petrograd Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegate Council, send you our warmest greetings and the news of great events. The democracy of Russia has overthrown the century-old despotism of the Czars and enters your ranks as a rightful member and as a powerful force in the battle for our common liberation. Our victory is a great victory of the freedom and democracy of the world. The principal supporter of reaction in the world, the 'gendarme of Europe' no longer exists. May the earth over his grave become a heavy stone. Long live liberty, long live the international solidarity of the proletariat and its battle for the final victory!

"Our cause is not yet entirely won. Not all the shadows of the old regime have been scattered and not a few enemies are gathering their forces together against the Russian revolution. Nevertheless, our conquests are great. The peoples of Russia will express their will in the Constitutional Convention which is to be called within a short time upon the basis of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage. And now it may already be said with certainty in advance that the democratic republic will triumph in Russia. The Russian people is in possession of complete political liberty. Now it can say an authoritative word about the internal self-government of the country and about its foreign policy. And in addressing ourselves to all the peoples who are being destroyed and ruined in this terrible war, we declare that the time has come in which the decisive struggle against the attempts at conquest by the Governments of all the nations must be begun. The time has come in which the peoples must take the matter of deciding the questions of war and peace into their own hands.

"Conscious of its own revolutionary strength, the democracy of Russia declares that it will fight with all means against the policy of

conquest of its ruling classes and it summons the peoples of Europe to united, decisive action for peace.

"We appeal to our brothers, to the proletarians of the German-Austrian coalition, and above all to the German proletariat. The first day of the war you were made to believe that in raising your weapons against absolutist Russia you were defending European civilization against Asiatic despotism. In this many of you found the justification of the support that was accorded to the war. Now also this justification has vanished. Democratic Russia cannot menace freedom and civilization.

"We shall firmly defend our own liberty against all reactionary threats, whether they come from without or within. The Russian revolution will not retreat before the bayonets of conquerors and it will not allow itself to be trampled to pieces by outside military force. We call upon you to throw off the yoke of your absolutist regime, as the Russian people has shaken off the autocracy of the Czars. Refuse to serve as the tools of conquest and power in the hands of the kings, junkers and bankers and we shall, with common efforts, put an end to the fearful butchery that dishonors humanity and darkens the great days of the birth of Russian liberty.

"Workingmen of all countries! In fraternally stretching out our hands to you across the mountains of our brothers' bodies, across the sea of innocent blood and tears, across the smoking ruins of cities and villages, across the destroyed gifts of civilization, we summon you to the work of renewing and solidifying international unity. In that lies the guaranty of our future triumph and of the complete liberation of humanity.

"Workingmen of all countries, unite!

PETROGRAD, April, 1917.

"Tchcheidze, the president."

DOWN WITH THE AGENTS OF MILITARISM AND THE ADVOCATES OF MURDER!

The Secretarial Delegation for external affairs of the Organization Committee of the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party of Russia addresses the following open letter to Comrade Tchcheidze:

Dear Comrade:

The so-called majorities of the English and French Socialists have undertaken a systematic campaign for the purpose of exerting pressure on the Russian Socialist proletariat in the sense that it should discontinue all efforts for peace and should waive any independent political policy founded on International Solidarity and the Class Struggle. Dozens of telegrams have been sent for this purpose by individual representatives and by various groups. From this the Russian proletarian can clearly see the lack of real joy in view of the gigantic revolution accomplished by the Russian people and the complete willingness to sacrifice its freedom on the altar of narrow nationalist interests. They wish to force on the Russian worker a civil peace together with the imperialistic war

aims of the bourgeois liberals, the same as that which demoralized the proletarian movement in England and France. And so incompatible is this with the task of bringing about an actual and genuine democracy in Russia, that Jules Guesde demanded quite openly in his telegram: first victory, and only then the republic. In his own country, moreover, he practiced the same principle inasmuch as he betrayed the republic in favor of those who promised victory.

At the same time that these warnings by the official representatives of Socialism in the democratic countries are being addressed to the Russian proletariat, the government officialdom of England and France are carrying on an equally systematic campaign against the Russian revolution, against democratic demands which have been already set up and realized by the proletariat, and primarily against the demand for a republic and the real and complete elimination of the power of the Romanoffs.

The entire bourgeois press of England and France has been given free rein by the government to calumniate the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates and the revolutionary army. They are trying by agitation to point the provisional government toward a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat so as to set aside the rule of the man on the street, and thus place the destiny of the Russian revolution in the hands of the English embassy. They go so far as to threaten financial boycott, and set up the claim that the French creditors, who invested their money with, and participated in the plunder of the Romanoffs, have a right to interfere in this hour of destiny, in which the Russian people is to decide its future.

The government Socialists of France and of England have neither enough courage nor enough revolutionary consciousness to fight this reactionary activity; in fact, they lend moral support by their demonstrations, and do not even shrink from the insinuation that the Russian Social Democracy, after the manner of the Romanoff clique, is considering a separate peace with Germany "against the French Republic." Thus, while the Russian proletariat is straining every nerve to destroy the reactionary powers which it overthrew and save the country from the danger of counter-revolution, its appeal for international unification to wage the common fight for the salvation of all nations from the bloody butchery, is purposely misinterpreted in a false way to the workingmen and soldiers of England and France. The western masses, hampered by martial law, are made antagonistic to the Russians by this insidious agitation. Comrades B. Brizon, A. Blanc and Rafin-Dugens have protested in the French parliament against this despicable distortion of the truth.

Never has the revolutionary uprising of a people been so betrayed by those very elements from which it was justified in expecting sympathy and support.

The crowning act in this shameless campaign is the decision of the French parliamentary group of the Socialist Party to send three of its members, E. Lafont, M. Moutet and Marcel Cachin, to Russia to influence the Russian proletariat along lines of national sentiment.

The nature of this mission is amply characterized, according to newspaper reports, by the fact that it has the sanction of the Parliamentary Commission of Foreign Affairs, whose chairman is a typical representative of French plutocracy, Georges Leygues. And this mission is sanctioned, without any pretense at hiding its official nature from the Russian proletariat, by the representatives of a party whose program is the Social Revolution, and International Brotherhood.

It is no more than fair to mention, however, that the members Moutet and Lafont have on several occasions in the course of the war defended the interests of Russian emigration of the Russian Volunteers and of the Russian press in France against the ruling powers. But to avoid disturbing civil peace with the exploiting classes, they like the party majority, never even once protested in Parliament or in the public press against the despicable service that the French Republic rendered to Czarism in persecuting emigration and throttling the Socialist press. Like the majority of the party, they too avoided a break with the government at any cost, whether in connection with the execution of the eleven Russian volunteers in France, or in the case of the brutal suppression with the assistance of the French authorities, of the uprising of the Russian expeditionary corps in Marseille. They did all they could to prevent the French proletariat from learning anything of these heroic deeds of the bourgeoisie "for freedom and justice." And now that they bow down to the floor before the Russian revolution, the Russian proletariat is fully justified in reminding them that to the very last, they were silent accessories to the uninterrupted series of misdeeds that constituted the essence of Czarism.

As for Marcel Cachin, it may be of value to the Russian comrades to know that he already did similar service on an officially sanctioned mission, in going to Italy to paralyze the agitation of our glorious comrades when they tried to prevent their government from forcing the Italian people into the world-wide slaughter. The presence of this French Suedekum in the delegation and the absence of adherents of the minority, which really represent the majority in the party, speaks volumes, but does not give evidence of a very high regard for the Russian proletariat nor of a strong desire to come to an understanding with its representatives.

In stating these things, dear Comrade, we hardly consider it necessary to emphasize that this inspired campaign travels under a false cloak in labeling itself as the brotherhood of the French and English proletariat, which latter really desire peace no less than that of Russia and Germany.

These conspiracies and recommendations emanate from that portion of the working class parties which are corrupted by ministerial ambitions, and if communications of a far different tenor from the other portion do not reach you, it is solely because the censorship in conjunction with nationalist spokesmen stifles all free speech. You may be sure that the international section of the French and English Socialists are deeply and honestly interested in the battle which the committee of workmen's deputies is waging for peace and democracy and that they believe as you do, that the Russian revolution can attain victory only if it is not paralyzed by the poison gas of world war.

We are firmly convinced that the French Suedekums will be given the same sort of a reception by the Russian revolutionary proletariat as was accorded their prototypes by the Italian comrades. And we hope that the open and frank expression of what the Socialist advance guard of the Russian revolutionary army thinks of these attempts to exert pressure, will have a beneficial influence on that atmosphere of lying, of deceit, of intrigue, and of insane hatred in and by which the international proletariat is being stifled. Let these envoys of imperialist diplomacy learn, when they come to Petrograd and Moskow, that a nation that has freed itself by its consciousness of its revolutionary power, cannot be chloroformed by such words as the sacredness of civil peace; that those who want to give advice how we should best defend our freedom against the German armies had better regain the freedom for which their ancestors stormed the Bastille, and bled in the Commune, and which they have placed in the hands of militarist plunderers at home. Let them know that we regard as an enemy each and everyone who, irrespective for what reasons, stands in the way of the cause of revolutionary freedom in our country.

The most worthy answer to all such plots and schemes will be the redoubled energy of the representatives of the Russian proletariat in their chosen course.

The confusion created by this policy against the Russian revolution, in the ranks of the proletariat of western Europe, can best be brought to a complete stop if the committee of workingmen's deputies will, over the heads of the patriotic agents of imperialism, address directly to the working class organizations throughout the world, an appeal for international united effort in the direction of universal peace.

Long live the International Union of the proletariat in the battle for freedom.

Down with the agents of militarism, and the advocates of murder!

Long live the Democratic Republic! Long live Revolutionary Socialism!

Secretary Delegation for External Affairs:

P. AXELROD CISTROW L. MARKOW
A. MARTYNOW S. SEMKOWSKY

THE FIRST APPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY OF GERMANY

The German Social Democratic party opposition, which united at a Conference held at Easter in the city of Gotha as the "Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany," has published the following proclamation:

Comrades:—The opposition movement within the Socialdemocratic Party of Germany at a conference held at Easter, 1917, in Gotha, has united into an organization under the name:

Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany.

Independent of imperial government, independent of capitalist parties, independent of government socialists, the newly created organization will conduct its work along independent lines in accordance with our political principles.

In a period of deepest industrial and social upheavals, it will unite the masses of the German proletariat, in the spirit of the International, to hasten the coming of peace.

The masses must be led back to the paths that Marx, Engels and Lassalle have laid out for us, back to the paths along which August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht and Paul Singer, in the past decades, led us to fame and victory. To faithfully carry out their work, to develop what they have begun, for the realization of democracy and Socialism, to liberate humanity from the fear and horror of war—that is our task.

Hundreds of thousands will rally around the new independent organizations, that are already in existence, and the others that will grow up in every district, with joyous enthusiasm proud that in Gotha

the old Social Democracy is risen.

Those who have lost faith in the Social Democracy as they looked on while the party sacrificed its old principles and turned into a national-social-government party, will come to us hopefully and confidently, ready to take up and to carry on the struggle for which they, in the past, gave their best strength, for which they lived for the lofty ideals of socialism.

Comrades: We, the undersigned were intrusted by the Gotha conference with the leadership of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany. In these critical times we can successfully bear the burden of this responsibility only if we can count upon the enthusiastic, determined and tenacious co-operation of our men and women comrades.

Win recruits for our cause,

by unceasing agitation. Found organizations that will proclaim and put into action our principles, wherever they do not yet exist, help diligently in building up those that are already organized. You will overcome the difficulties that may arise here and there, fearlessly and unafraid. We are convinced that we do not appeal in vain to the courage and persistence of the tried fighters for the rebirth of the Social Democracy.

On our Womans' Day, which will be held in the week of May 5—12, the women of our party will demand political equality for their own protection and that of their children, for the end of the horrible massacre of war.

Comrades: We know that we will not appeal in vain to your willingness to sacrifice. Let each one do his share, according to his means, that we may not be forced to leave undone a part of the tremendous task that awaits us, for lack of financial support. The regular membership dues are not enough.

Work for the collection of an extraordinary fund by the sale of stamps and bonds, and by collections on subscription lists.

You know that the money you collect will not be used, as in the past by government socialists, to support a policy harmful to you. It will be used in your interests, for the propagation of an independent self-reliant socialist policy.

Comrades: On the task. Forge the iron while it is hot!

Berlin, April 12, 1917.

The Central Committee: Wilhelm Dittmann, Hugo Haase, Adolf Hofer, Gustav Laukant, Georg Ledebour, Robert Wengels, Louise Zietz.

The Control Committee: Rob. Dissmann, Frankfurt, a. M.; Paul Dittmann, Hamburg; Hermann Fleissner, Dresden; Willi Gruetz, Remscheid; Alfred Henke, Bremen; Sepp Oerter, Braunschweig; Fritz Schnelbacher, Hanau.

ON THE FIRING LINE AGAINST WAR AND IMPERIALISM

Here is a paper that is waging a war on two fronts—a war against reactionary Capitalism, and a war against reactionary Socialism.



A JOURNAL OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION

—is published every two weeks by the Socialist Propaganda League of America, which is organizing the revolutionary forces in this country.

"The New International" is aggressive, a *Journal of action*. It is of the fight, fighting. It is rallying the forces against Imperialism, and organizing the Conscientious Objectors.

Among the contributors to the first three issues are:

LEON TROTZKY ARTURO GIOVANNITTI LUDWIG LORE
J. C. ROVITCH JUSTUS EBERT S. J. RUTGERS

You need this paper—the paper needs you. Get into action!

Issued every two weeks—5¢ a copy, \$1.00 a year.

LOUIS C. FRAINA

Editor

3246 Kingsbridge Avenue, New York City.

THE MASSES

(an illustrated monthly magazine)

is one of the few magazines that are thinking
straight during this war.

MAX EASTMAN'S brilliant editorials are cutting
the ground from under most of our sentimental current
thinking.



\$1.50 a year 15 Cts. a copy.



The Cleverest Radical Magazine
in America

Masses Publishing Company

34 UNION SQUARE EAST
NEW YORK, N. Y.