



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. I

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1917

No. 4

TROTZKY

LENINE

KAUTSKY

ON THE

Russian Revolution!

PUBLISHED BY

THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, 115 WORTH ST., NEW YORK

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. I NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1917 No. 4

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|---------|
| The I. W. W. Trial. By L. C. Fraina . . . | 1—5 |
| Pacifism in the Service of Imperialism. By Leon Trotzky. | 6—14 |
| The Passing of the Nation. By L. B. Boudin. . | 15—34 |
| The Russian Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. . | 35—39 |
| Our Obedient Congress. By Ludwig Lore. . | 40—48 |
| Political Parties in Russia. By N. Lenine. . . | 49—63 |
| Imperialism and the New Middleclass. By S. J. Rutgers | 64—71 |
| The Case of Fraina. By Edward Dryden. . . | 72—79 |
| Stockholm. By Lionel Petersen. | 80—84 |
| The Tragedy of the Russian Revolution. By L. B. Boudin | 85—90 |
| The Task of the Constituent Assembly. A Republic without a President. By Marius. . | 91—99 |
| Current Affairs. | 100—120 |
| The New York Mayoralty Campaign.—Act, Not Withdraw.—The Italian Debacle.—The Neue Zeit, an Obituary.—Making Haste Slowly.—The Situation in Italy. | |

The Co-Operative Press  15 Spruce St., New York

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 NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1917 No. 4

THE I. W. W. TRIAL

By L. C. FRAINA

The great and significant fact in the case of the I. W. W. is that the employers, the national government and the corrupt and reactionary bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. are apparently engaged in a covert conspiracy to destroy a militant organization of labor.

These sinister forces, each for reasons of its own, are banded together in a "gentlemen's agreement" to crush the I. W. W. The employers,—because the I. W. W. is not only threatening their immediate profits, but creating a powerful organization for action in the days to come; the government,—because the employers by refusing to grant increased wages are precipitating strikes that hamper industrial mobilization, and the government, not daring to strike at the employers who are strong, strikes at the workers, whom it considers weak; and the A. F. of L.,—because the I. W. W. in the west is becoming the dominant organization and threatening to drive out the A. F. of L.

Whether one relishes it or not, the fact is that the I. W. W. has not acted against the war; has not carried on a propaganda against the war, and is chiefly if not exclusively at the moment interested in questions of wages and the regulation of industrial conditions. Yet the government charges that the I. W. W. is engaged in a nation-wide conspiracy to thwart the war plans of the country by inciting and organizing strikes,

by the use of violence and various other illegal means. On this question of conspiracy and violence, Robert W. Bruere, who is engaged in an investigation of the subject, said in the *New York Evening Post* of November 14:

"As I write, I have been in Arizona only four weeks, but I feel confident that I have reached pretty nearly to the bottom of the alleged I. W. W. conspiracy so far as Arizona is concerned. If such a conspiracy existed—and we shall not know the whole truth until the United States Department of Justice has presented its full case against the indicted I. W. W. leaders—I am certain that it was not a determining factor in the strikes that have tied up the copper mines during the past four months. These strikes grew out of a long-standing struggle between the forces of 'legitimate' organized labor and the forces of organized business, dominated by the copper companies. So far as there was concerted attack by the I. W. W., it was principally directed against the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. Crimes have been committed in Arizona, but they are not chargeable to the I. W. W. So far as lawlessness is concerned, the chief role of the I. W. W. has been to serve as camouflage."

Mr. Bruere may well characterize the charges of I. W. W. lawlessness as "camouflage." The chambers of commerce, the municipal governments and the thugs in the employ of the corporations have been creating all the violence against the I. W. W. The Bisbee deportations, when thousands of workers were brutally taken from their homes and sent out into the desert to die of thirst and starvation; the infamous assassination of Frank Little, and hundreds of crimes of more or less equal magnitude organized and carried through by the respectable gentlemen of the forces of law and order,—these acts of lawlessness are the answers of the I. W. W. to the false charges hurled against it. Strikers have been forced back to work at the point of the gun. The I. W. W. organizers have been thrown out of town, and imprisoned without warrant of law, as well as hundreds of men thrown into jail for no other crime than being I. W. W. members. In the Yakima Valley

a regular organized and systematic reign of terror was instituted against the strikers and the I. W. W., the soldiers being used, and the open boast made by the local gentlemen thugs that this was the only way of dealing with the I. W. W. And Theodore Knappen, writing in the *New York Tribune* some months ago, reported these facts approvingly!

But this policy of blood and bullets failed to crush the strikes. The movement became larger and larger, more and more groups of workers being forced to strike by unbearable conditions and the arrogance of the employers, who prated of patriotism while they stuffed their coffers with the enormous profits of war prices.

This circumstance is extraordinary significant in more ways than one. First of all, it indicates a spontaneous and general industrial revolt. Secondly, it characterizes the strikes in the west as an expression of industrial mass action on a large scale. Thirdly, it makes it apparent that the I. W. W. was not the chief factor in the strikes.

In fact, the I. W. W. is receiving more credit or discredit than is its due. The I. W. W. in the west is not the centre of activity in any sense. There are a great number of contributing factors, among them being revolutionary Socialists who are actively on the job. But the dynamic factor itself are the workers who have taken the bit into their teeth and are determined to strike in their own way and for their own purposes.

All local action, in spite of its brutality and lawlessness, having failed to crush the strikes, the federal government was called upon to act. Then came the nation-wide raids upon the offices of the I. W. W.; and then the indictments of 160 active members and the arrest of upward of 100. The intensity of the industrial unrest is evident in this fact, that it requires the use of the might of the national government to crush it.

The counts in the indictments against the arrested men are often extremely ridiculous—and dangerous. In some cases, men have been arrested for having "conspired and agreed together and with each other unlawfully, wilfully and feloniously to make or convey false statements with intent to interfere

with the operations for the success of the military and naval forces of the United States," *and the charge is based directly and simply on these men's membership in the I. W. W.*: that they have received cards of membership, voted in meetings, paid dues and distributed literature, etc. These are the "overt acts" on which the government indicts and seeks to convict!

The arrests and the raids, the seizure of records and destruction of property, were a great blow at the I. W. W., but the activity continues relentlessly and intensively. The government's idea that the arrest of the leaders might destroy the organization and the movement it expresses has proven a miserable fizzle. Men from the rank and file have taken over the direction of affairs; mass action can dispense with leaders and continue its activity of itself, spontaneously and successfully.

The coming trial, which will be held in Chicago some time in January, according to present indications, will be perhaps the most interesting and colossal of its kind in this country. It will become historic, as it will be a factor in the decision of certain great issues in the labor movement.

The first count in the indictment charges that the I. W. W. is a revolutionary organization that seeks to secure for the working class "complete control and ownership of all property, and of the means of producing and distributing property through the abolition of all other classes of society (by the members of said organization designated as 'capitalist,' 'the capitalistic class,' 'the master class,' 'the ruling class,' 'exploiters of the workers,' 'bourgeois,' and 'parasites'); such abolition to be accomplished not by political action or with any regard for right or wrong but by the continual and persistent use and employment of unlawful, tortuous and forcible means and methods, involving threats, assaults, injuries, intimidations and murders upon the persons, and the injury and destruction (known in said organization as 'sabotage,' 'direct action,' 'working on the job.') of the property of such other classes, the forcible resistance to the execution of all laws and

finally the forcible revolutionary overthrow of all existing governmental authority, in the United States."

It is apparent from this that revolutionary unionism is on trial, and that the government seeks to use the war to destroy a revolutionary menace to Capitalism. The purpose is impossible of achievement; but its temporary results still may be very disastrous.

Recent developments indicate that the government is trying to "regulate" labor through herding it in the conservative unions of the A. F. of L., and hamstringing its activity through control of the corrupt and conservative bureaucracy. The A. F. of L. national officials are working cheek by jowl with the government; they are crushing all attempts to strike by the affiliated unions; and it is clear that the destruction of the I. W. W. is aimed at as a means to this end. Indeed, in his speech at the A. F. of L. convention, President Wilson vaguely referred to the creation of certain new "instrumentalities" in the government's dealings with labor; and the Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune* interprets this as meaning an attempt to get labor within the A. F. of L. so as to simplify the problem of dealing with it by dealing with the national officials of the A. F. of L.

I feel very strongly on the issues involved in the case of the I. W. W., and the issues, in my opinion, are so vast, that they can be dealt with from time to time as events develop. It appears to me no exaggeration to say that the future of the revolutionary movement in this country is now in process of being determined.

In the meanwhile, the actions of the government are a challenge to every single revolutionist. The I. W. W. should be supported morally and financially. The Socialist Party should do infinitely more than it is doing in the matter, and it is the task of the revolutionary minority within the Party to force action on this most momentous issue.

Pacifism in the Service of Imperialism

By LEON TROTZKY

Petrograd, June 30 (17), 1917.

There have never been so many pacifists as at this moment, when people are slaying each other on all the great highways of our planet. Each epoch has not only its own technology and political forms, but also its own style of hypocrisy. Time was, when the nations destroyed each other for the glory of Christ's teachings and the love of one's neighbor. Now, Christ is invoked only by backward governments. The advanced nations cut each other's throats under the banners of pacifism. Wilson plunged the United States into war in the name of a league of nations and a durable peace. Kerensky and Tseretelli shout for an offensive, in the name of an "early conclusion of peace."

There is no Juvenal for this epoch, to depict it with biting satire. Yet we are forced to admit that even the most powerful satire would appear weak and insignificant in the presence of blatant baseness and cringing stupidity, two of the elements which have been released by the present war.

Pacifism springs from the same historical roots as democracy. The *bourgeoisie* made a gigantic effort to rationalize human relations, that is, to supplant a blind and stupid tradition by a system of critical reason. The guild restrictions on industry, class privileges, monarchic autocracy—these were the traditional heritage of the middle ages. *Bourgeois* democracy demanded legal equality, free competition and parliamentary methods in the conduct of public affairs. Naturally, its rationalistic criteria were applied also in the field of international relations. Here it hit upon war, which appeared to it as a method of solving questions that was a complete denial of all "reason." So *bourgeois* democracy began to point out to the nations—with the tongues of poesy, moral philosophy, and certified accounting—that they would profit more by the establishment of a condition of eternal peace. Such were the logical roots of *bourgeois* pacifism.

From the time of its birth, pacifism was afflicted, however, with a fundamental defect, one which is characteristic of *bourgeois* democracy: its pointed criticisms addressed themselves to the surface of political phenomena, not daring to penetrate to their economic causes. At the hands of capitalist reality, the idea of eternal peace, on the basis of a "reasonable" agreement, has fared even more badly than the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity. For capitalism, when it rationalized industrial conditions, did not rationalize the social organization of ownership, and thus prepared instruments of destruction such as even the "barbarous" middle ages never dreamed of.

The constant embitterment of international relations and the ceaseless growth of militarism completely undermined the basis of reality under the feet of pacifism. Yet it was from these very things that pacifism took a new lease of life, a life which differed from its earlier phase as the blood and purple sunset differs from the rosy-fingered dawn.

The decades preceding the present war have been well designated as a period of *armed peace*. During this whole period campaigns were in uninterrupted progress and battles were being fought, but they were in the colonies.

Proceeding, as they did, in the territories of backward and powerless peoples, these wars led to a division of Africa, Polynesia and Asia and prepared the way for the present world war. As, however, there were no wars in Europe proper after 1871—in spite of a long series of sharp conflicts—the general opinion in *petit bourgeois* circles began gradually to behold in the growth of armies a guarantee of peace, which was destined ultimately to be established by international law with every institutional sanction. Capitalist governments and munitions kings naturally had no objections to this "pacifist" interpretation of militarism. But the causes of world conflicts were accumulating and the present cataclysm was getting under way.

Theoretically and politically, pacifism stands on the same foundation as does the theory of the harmony of social interests. The antagonisms between capitalist nations have the same eco-

conomic roots as the antagonisms between the classes. And if we admit the possibility of a progressive blunting of the edge of the class struggle, it requires but a single further step to accept a gradual softening and regulating of international relations.

The source of the ideology of democracy, with all its traditions and illusions, is the *petite bourgeoisie*. In the second half of the nineteenth century, it suffered a complete internal transformation, but was by no means eliminated from political life. At the very moment that the development of capitalist technology was inexorably undermining its economic function, the general suffrage right and universal military service were still giving to the *petite bourgeoisie*, thanks to its numerical strength, an appearance of political importance. Big capital, in so far as it did not completely wipe out this class, subordinated it to its own ends by means of the applications of the credit system. All that remained for the political representatives of Big Capital to do was to subjugate the *petite bourgeoisie*, in the political arena, to their purposes, by opening a fictitious credit to the declared theories and prejudices of this class. It is for this reason that, in the decade preceding the war, we witnessed, side by side with the gigantic efforts of a reactionary-imperialistic policy, a deceptive flowering of *bourgeois democracy* with its accompanying reformism and pacifism. Capital was making use of the *petite bourgeoisie* for the prosecution of Capital's imperialistic purposes by exploiting the ideologic prejudices of the *petite bourgeoisie*.

Probably there is no other country in which this double process was so unmistakably accomplishing itself as in France. France is the classic land of financial capital, which leans for its support on the *petite bourgeoisie* of the cities and towns, the most conservative class of the kind in the world, and numerically very strong. Thanks to foreign loans, to the colonies, to the alliance of France with Russia and England, the financial upper crust of the Third Republic found itself involved in all the interests and conflicts of world politics. And yet, the French *petit bourgeois* is an out-and-out provincial. He has always shown an instinctive aversion to Geography and all his life has feared war as the very

devil—if only for the reason that he has, in most cases, but one son, who is to inherit his business, together with his chattels. This *petit bourgeois* sends to Parliament a radical who has promised him to preserve peace—on the one hand, by means of a league of nations and compulsory international arbitration, on the other hand, with the co-operation of Russian Cossacks, who are to hold the German Kaiser in check. This radical *député*, drawn from the provincial lawyer class, goes to Paris not only with the best intentions, but also without the slightest conception of the location of the Persian Gulf, and what is the use, and to whom, of the Bagdad Railway. This radical-“pacifistic” *bloc* of deputies gives birth to a radical ministry, which at once finds itself bound hand and foot by all the diplomatic and military obligations and financial interests of the French bourse in Russia, Africa and Asia.. Never ceasing to pronounce the proper pacifistic sentences, the ministry and the parliament automatically continue to carry on a world-policy which involves France in war.

English and American pacifism, in spite of the differences in social and ideologic forms (or in the absence of such, as in America) is carrying on, at bottom, the same task; it offers to the *petite* and *middle bourgeoisie* an expression for their fears of world cataclysms in which they may lose their last remnants of independence; their pacifism chloroforms their consciences—by means of impotent ideas of disarmament, international law and world courts—only to deliver them up body and soul, at the decisive moment, to imperialistic Capital, which now mobilizes everything for its own purposes: industry, the church, art, *bourgeois* pacifism and patriotic “socialism.”

“We have always been opposed to war; our representatives, our ministry have been opposed to war,” says the French *citoyen*, therefore the war must have been forced upon us, and in the name of our pacifist ideals we must fight it to a finish.” And the leader of the French pacifists, Baron d’Estournelles de Constant, indorses this pacifist philosophy of an imperialist war with a pompous *jusqu’au bout* (“to the end”).

The English Stock Exchange, in its prosecution of the war, had need first of all of pacifists of the Asquith (liberal) and Lloyd George (radical demagogue) type. "If these people go in for war," say the English masses, "right must be on our side." Thus a responsible function is allotted to pacifism, in the economy of warfare, by the side of suffocating gases and inflated government loans.

More evident still is the subordinate rôle played by *petit bourgeois* pacifism with regard to imperialism in the United States. The actual policy is there more prominently dictated by banks and trusts than anywhere else. Even before the war the United States, owing to the gigantic development of its industry and its foreign commerce, was being systematically driven in the direction of world interests and world policies. The European war imparted to this imperialistic development a speed that was positively feverish. At a time when many well-meaning persons were hoping that the horrors of the European slaughter might inspire the American *bourgeoisie* with a hatred of militarism, the actual influence of European events was bearing on American policy not in psychological channels, but in material ones, and was having precisely the opposite effect. The exports of the United States, which in 1913 amounted to 2,466 billions of dollars, rose in 1916 to 5,481 billions! Of course the lion's share of this export fell to the lot of the war industries. The sudden breaking off of exports to the allied nations after the declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare meant not only the stoppage of a flow of monstrous profits, but threatened with an unprecedented crisis the whole of American industry, which had been organized on a war footing. Hence the following appeal by Capital to the Government: "Under the ensigns of neutrality and pacifism you have aided the development of our war industries; you now must guarantee the safety of our sales." If the government cannot at once promise the establishment of "freedom of the seas" it can create a new market, *in America*, for the war industries which are now choking with their own products. The act of aiding and abetting the European slaughter

led inexorably to a catastrophic militarization of the United States at a single stroke.

It was impossible for this thing to go on without some resistance from the masses of the people. To overcome their unorganized dissatisfaction and to turn it into the channels of patriotic co-operation with the government was therefore the first great task for the internal diplomacy of the United States during the first quarter of the present year. And it is the irony of history that the official "pacifism" of Wilson, as well as the "oppositional pacifism" of Bryan, should be the chief instruments for the accomplishment of this task: *the education of the masses to military ideals*.

Bryan rashly and noisily expressed the natural aversion of the farmers and of the "small man" generally, to all such things as world-policy, military service and higher taxes. Yet, at the same time that he was sending wagonloads of petitions, as well as deputations, to his pacifistic colleague at the head of the government, Bryan did everything in his power to break the revolutionary edge of the whole movement. "If war should come," Bryan telegraphed, on the occasion of an anti-war meeting in Chicago last February, "*we will all support the government, of course*"; yet at this moment it is our sacred duty to do all in our power to preserve the nation from the horrors of war." These few words contain the entire program of *petit bourgeois* pacifism: "to do everything in our power against the war" means to afford the voice of popular indignation an outlet in the form of a harmless demonstration, after having previously given the government a guarantee that it will meet with no serious opposition, in the case of war, from the pacifist faction.

Official pacifism could have desired nothing better. It could now give to warlike Capital a satisfactory assurance of imperialistic "preparedness." After Bryan's own declaration, only one thing was necessary, to dispose of his noisy opposition to war, and that was, simply, to declare war. And so Wilson did, and Bryan rolled right over into the government camp. And not only the *petite bourgeoisie*, but also the broad masses of the workers,

said to themselves: "If our government, with such an outspoken pacifist as Wilson at the head, declares war, and if even Bryan supports the government in this war, this war must be an unavoidable and righteous war." . . . It is now evident why the sanctimonious, quakerlike pacifism of the bourgeois demagogues is in such high favor in financial and war-industry circles.

Our *Menshevist* and Social-Revolutionist pacifism, in spite of apparent differences, is, in reality, playing the same part as American pacifism. The resolution on war passed by the majority of the Pan-Russian Congress of Councils of Workers, Soldiers and Peasants, condemns the war not only from a pacifist standpoint, but also because of the imperialistic character of the war. The Congress declares the struggle for an early conclusion of the war to be "the most important task of revolutionary democracy." But all these premises are merely mobilized so that they may lead to the conclusion: "until such time as the war may be ended by the international forces of democracy, *the Russian revolutionary democracy will be obliged in every possible way to co-operate in strengthening the fighting power of our army and rendering it efficient for both offensive and defensive action.*"

The revision of the old international treaties, the Congress, like the Provisional Government, would make dependent on a voluntary agreement of the allied diplomacy, which, in its very nature, neither desires, nor is it able, to relinquish the imperialistic aims of the war. The Congress, following its leaders, makes the "international forces of democracy" depend on the will of the *social-patriots*, who are bound by iron chains to their imperialistic governments. Voluntarily restricting themselves in the question of "an early end of the war," to this charmed circle, the majority of the Congress naturally arrive at a very definite conclusion in the domain of practical politics: *an offensive on the military front*. This "pacifism," which solidifies and disciplines the *petit bourgeois* democracy and induces it to support an offensive, ought manifestly to be on the most friendly terms not only with the Russian imperialists, but also with those of the allied nations.

Milyukov says: "In the name of our fidelity to our allies, and to the old (diplomatic) treaties, we must have an offensive."

Kerensky and Tseretelli say: "Although the old, diplomatic treaties have not yet been revised, we must have an offensive."

The arguments may differ; the policy is the same. Nor could it be otherwise, since Kerensky and Tseretelli are indissolubly bound up in the government with the party of Milyukov. As a matter of fact, the *social-patriotic* pacifism of the Dans, as well as the quaker pacifism of the Bryans are both operating in the service of imperialism.

In view of this state of affairs, the chief task of Russian diplomacy is not to make allied diplomacy refrain from this act or that or to revise this thing or that, but to make allied diplomacy believe that the Russian revolution is safe and sound and solvent. The Russian Ambassador, Bakhmetieff, in his speech before the Congress of the United States, delivered on June 10, characterized the Provisional Government chiefly from this point of view.

"All these circumstances," said the Ambassador, "point to the fact that the power and significance of the Provisional Government are growing day by day, that with each passing moment the Provisional Government is becoming better able to cope with all those elements that mean disaster, whether they take the form of reactionary propaganda or that of an agitation by the members of the extreme left. *At the present time the Provisional Government is determined to take the most drastic steps in this direction, resorting to force, if need be, in spite of its constant endeavors for a peaceful solution of all questions.*"

There is no doubt that the "national honor" of our "defenders" remains absolutely unruffled while the Ambassador of "revolutionary democracy" fervently persuades the parliament of the American plutocracy of the readiness of the Russian Government to pour out the blood of the Russian proletariat in the name of "order," the chief ingredient of which is a fidelity to allied capitalism.

And at the very moment when Bakhmetieff stood hat in hand, a humiliating speech passing over his lips, in the presence of the representatives of capitalism, Tseretelli and Kerensky were explaining to the revolutionary democracy how impossible it was to dispense with armed force in its fight with "the anarchy of the left," and threatening to disarm the workers of Petrograd and the regiment which made common cause with them. We know that these threats came just in the nick of time; they served as a strong argument in favor of the Russian Loan in Wall Street. "You see, Mr. Bakhmetieff was in a position to say to Mr. Wilson our revolutionary pacifism differs in no respect from your own brand of pacifism, and if you put your faith in Bryan, there is no reason why you should distrust Tseretelli."

There remains to us only the necessity of putting one question: How much Russian flesh and Russian blood will it take—on the external front as well as in the interior, in order to secure the Russian Loan, which, in its turn, is to guarantee our continued fidelity to the Allies?

The Passing of the Nation

By L. B. BOUDIN

In my discussion of Socialist Terms of Peace in the preceding issue of the CLASS STRUGGLE I came to the conclusion that the solution of the problem of war and peace lay in complete disarmament and international organization.

This gives to the question of internationalism a new aspect. Internationalism ceases to be a mere ideal—always to be striven for but never to be reached—and becomes a practical problem of every-day life. It also ceases to be a purely Socialist principle, influencing the action of Socialists only, but becomes a matter of general practical politics. The question of internationalism, therefore, becomes an eminently practical one—namely, *Has Internationalism Arrived?*

Is the world ripe for internationalism of any kind? This question must be answered in the affirmative, if the conclusions to which I came in my article on Socialist Terms of Peace are at all valid. For if the world is not ripe for internationalization it would be more than utopian to demand it now; such a demand would be a confession that the problem of peace and war is insoluble for the world as at present constituted. When I proposed internationalization as one of the elements of my solution of the problem of war and peace I, therefore, impliedly asserted that the world is ripe for some form of internationalization—that is to say, that it is at least ready to recognize the principle of internationalism, and to make the first step in the direction of its realization. This assertion undoubtedly runs counter to the popular conceptions on the subject, and I therefore feel that on me now rests the burden of proving the correctness of my estimate of the situation and the fallacy of popular notions on the subject. I feel this burden to be particularly heavy in view of the fact that since the war has been upon us, both friends and enemies have united in certifying to the impotency of internationalism.

The war—such was the all but unanimous verdict—has clearly demonstrated the vitality of the nation and the tremendous hold

which the idea of nationalism has upon the civilized world. The outbreak of the Great War was accompanied by a veritable flood of nationalistic literature. The cry of "Teuton versus Slav" resounded from one end of the earth to the other—at least in "popular" journalism. And as the war grew in extent, the number of "national" antagonisms also grew, to account for the new comers into the bloody arena. On the other hand, the International broke down like a house of cards, and the former internationalists were destroying each other for the defence, preservation or glory of their respective nations.

There seemed to be no denying the fact that Internationalism was dead, or at least in a state of coma from which it was not likely to awaken for a considerable time. Its enemies were jubilant, its erstwhile adherents apologetic. In this country particularly, former internationalists were crowding the nationalistic band—wagons provided by the popular drift.

A few months after the outbreak of the war Morris Hillquit, national chairman and international secretary of the Socialist Party of this country, declared in a public address:

"If there is anything the war can teach us, it is that when the National interest comes into conflict with any other, even class interest, it will be stronger. *National feeling stands for existence primarily, for the chance to earn a livelihood. It stands for everything we hold dear, as home, language, family and friends.* The workingman has a country as well as a class, even before he has a class."

And some time later, another prominent American Socialist publicly declared that the war had demonstrated Internationalism to have been merely an ideal, a dream of the Socialists, for which the basis of fact and reality was as yet wanting.

This weight of authority and popular verdict to the contrary notwithstanding, I venture to assert that the world is ripe for internationalism. More than that: That internationalism is in the ascendant—that it has in fact become indispensable and that the Great War has proven the bankruptcy of Nationalism as a material and spiritual factor in the life of humanity. We are in fact witnessing the passing of the nation as an historical factor.

In order that we may get the full meaning of the contemporary events upon which I base my conclusions, it is of importance that we pause for a moment to consider the history and real meaning of that concept and entity which we call "the nation."

To many people the idea or concept of the nation, like that of many others in the same field of thought as the state or the family, contains a mysterious element which cannot be defined or analyzed in ordinary language. To the student of history, however, there is nothing mysterious about the nation—just as there is nothing mysterious about the family or the state. The nation is primarily and ultimately an economic organization: the largest aggregation of people having a common, unified or coordinated economic interest. As is usual in such cases, the economic basis of the nation gives rise to an ideologic superstructure, ornamented with a fringe of mythological fables as to common origin, etc., etc. But to sober thinkers the nation has always been primarily and above all an economic entity—a sort of business organization. Hence the name *National Oekonomie* (national economy), by which the science of economics is still known in Germany. Hence, also, the title of "Wealth of Nations" given by Adam Smith to his great work which expounded the laws by which the then rising capitalist world lives and thrives. In this connection the opening paragraphs of that monumental work are very interesting. They read as follows:

"The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessities and conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labor or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations.

According, therefore, as this produce, or what is purchased with it, bears a greater or smaller proportion to the number of those who are to consume it, the nation will be better or worse supplied with all the necessities and conveniences for which it has occasion."

Clearly, to Smith the nation is nothing but a large producing organization, a sort of extended family, consuming so much of

its own product as directly answers its needs, and exchanging the balance with similar producing organizations for such useful articles as it does not itself produce. And this view is undoubtedly justified by the historic origins of the modern nation.

The conception of the Nation, in our sense of the word, is of comparatively recent date. During the Middle Ages there was no such thing in Christian Europe. When order emerged in Europe from the chaos of the great migration, by the establishment of the feudal system, European Society was, on the one hand, broken up into innumerable small fragments; and, on the other hand, these innumerable fragments of humanity formed one whole, referred to, collectively, as Christendom.

The economy of this society was, on the one hand, uniform—being predominantly agricultural; and, on the other hand, fragmentary—each fragment being self-sustaining and therefore independent of the others. And this economy stamped its character upon the people and fashioned its political, moral and mental organization. The masses of the lower strata of the population were broken up into small local groups having local characteristics and customs, as well as separate dialects and religious rites and observances. And each local group formed a political entity—the feudal Lord being *sovereign* as far as his serfs and feudations were concerned. Whatever allegiance there was, was due to him who was the real Lord—the over-lord claiming allegiance only indirectly. On the other hand, the upper crust—the feudal nobility and the clergy, the possessors of power and the carriers of whatever intellectual life there was then in Europe—formed one family with a common culture and common institutions; *they had one religion, one language, one literature and one political allegiance*. This unity of all Christendom in everything that was not merely local custom was symbolized by the Pope and the Emperor—one representing the spiritual and the other the political unity of all Christian Europe.

Toward the close of the Middle Ages, with the beginning of the development of our modern commercial and industrial era—the breaking up of the old feudal order and the substitution there-

for of what has come to be known as the bourgeois or capitalist economic system—this social and political aspect of Europe began to change. On the one hand the local differences began to disappear, making great bodies of people spread over large areas more akin to each other in manners, customs, religious observances, language and modes of thought. On the other hand, the spiritual and political unity of the upper crust of Christendom began to break up. Capitalism needed larger economic units for its development. The small groups therefore began to coalesce and amalgamate into larger units which would permit of the larger economic life which was the characteristic of the new era. But this very process of coalescence and centralization into larger economic units had as a necessary corollary a process of separation and division, differentiating the larger groups, when formed, from each other. The same process that made people within a certain territory more akin to each other, of necessity made them more different and distinct from people outside this territory, inhabiting some other great district, whose dwellers were acquiring a homogeneous character of their own.

This double process of coalescence and division usually found its natural boundaries in some well-defined geographical characteristics of the European Continent. The sea and the great mountain ranges normally marked the outlines of the several divisions into which Europe was to break up. The dwellers within these boundaries were separated from the rest of Europe and started on the road towards the formation of a separate political, economic, social and linguistic group—towards the formation of a Modern Nation.

Thus arose the nations of Modern Europe, each with its own language and separate and distinct social, political and economic life: England, France, Spain, the Scandinavian countries, Russia, Italy and Germany.

With the breaking up of the homogeneity of Europe and the formation of separate nations, each constituting a separate political state, there began to develop separate and distinct national cultures in place of the common European culture which prevailed during the Middle Ages. The first great manifestation

of this new development was the Reformation. Contrary to the assurances of our school histories and similar sources of information, the Reformation was least of all a religious movement. In so far as it did not directly aim at economic results, it was essentially a political movement resulting from economic conditions.

On its formal side—that is, in the separation of the “reformed” churches from the Church of Rome and the denial of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff—the Reformation was merely a solemn registering of the fact that Europe had broken up into separate nations. That each of these nations, having a separate economic life, must also constitute separate political, spiritual and intellectual entities. That henceforth there would be no common church and no common language, as well as no common empire. The Roman Emperor, the Roman Pope, and the Latin Bible had all become anachronisms, survivals of a common nationless Europe, and must all go. Henceforth each Nation was to have its own independent political head, paying no allegiance to any Emperor; its own independent church, paying no tribute and recognizing no sovereign outside of its own national jurisdiction; and its own literature, with the vernacular Bible as a symbol of its freedom from Latin tutelage.

And all of these independencies—*sacred* “national” possessions all—were to do duty in serving as a means of strengthening and fostering the economic organization which gave them birth.

So while the Anglo-Scotch philosopher Adam Smith was teaching his liberal economic principles as the surest means of increasing the wealth of *nations*, the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte was dreaming of a Prussian bureaucratic closed “national” state—*der geschlossene Handelsstaat*.

But time passes on. What is born is destined to die—and the nation forms no exception. The question only is whether the hour of its passing is at hand. This question resolves itself into two inquiries. First: Has the economic system which gave rise to the nation passed? And, second: Has its passing penetrated into the consciousness of the people, so as to make them ripe for that

revolution of ideas which is necessary in order to establish the international order in the place of the national?

The answer to the first question is comparatively easy: The international character of our modern economic system will hardly be denied by any one at all familiar with the subject. Nations no longer produce for their own consumption, exchanging merely the surplus. Production is now for the world-market, instead of the national market. Our finance-and-credit system, too, is international. That is why the New York Stock Exchange was closed—went on a sympathetic strike, as it were—when the Great War broke out. And the three years of “European” war have shown as how intimately related and minutely interdependent the world’s economic system really is—shown it to us in a way that must have come with the shock of a revelation to most of us. When England and Germany went to war, women’s clothes here in America began to fade, and our local courts became crowded with the suits of furriers against dyers for goods spoiled in the process dyeing.

“National Oekonomie” *as a fact* has indisputably passed out of existence. The only thing that can still be discussed seriously is, whether it has also passed, or is passing away, as a system of thought. And it is in this connection that the expressions of opinion on nationalism and internationalism cited at the beginning of this article are of importance.

Fortunately for the cause of internationalism those views are nothing but the foam upon the sea of contemporaneous thought, raised by the passing breeze: The reflexes of the wisdom of popular journalism that lives upon the interests of the day and the hour. The deeper currents of contemporary thought, the thought that counts, is all the other way.

It is, of course, impossible to give in the space of a brief magazine article a complete survey of contemporary thought on the subject. I shall therefore have to restrict myself to a few examples indicating the drift of thought on the subject, but I have no doubt that the examples will be sufficient to prove by their very existence that the edifice of nationalism is showing signs of readiness to collapse.

In order that we may be able to judge fairly of the tendencies of recent and contemporaneous thought, we must remind ourselves of the ideal political state of the nationalistic mode of thought, which is: *Every Nation one State, and every State one Nation.*

Bearing this in mind it is safe to say that there has not been a serious nationalistic work written within a generation. All the serious books written on the subject within the past thirty years, whether they come from the pen of the imperialistic school or from that of its opponents, preach doctrines contrary to that ideal. In fact, this point, the complete abandonment of the theory and practice of nationalism, is the only point upon which the two schools of real live thought in the domain politics to-day—the imperialists and the socialists—agree. Both recognize that the line of division along what are called “nationalities” does not correspond to the facts of modern life, and they both therefore assume that the so-called “national state” based upon it must be abandoned as unworkable, and something else substituted for it. On the question as to what that “something else” should be they disagree: the one school wants an autocratic world-state, in which one “race” or “nation” would lord it over the rest, exploiting them for its own benefit; while the other wants a democratic world-state or federation in which all groups would live together on a basis of equality and without exploitation of one by any other. But this wide divergence in their aims and purposes should not blind us to the fundamental fact that both of these schools—and, as I have said, they are the only schools of live thought on the subject, *agree that the national state is a thing of the past.* If any proof were necessary, the very existence of these schools, with no other real thought to offset them, would be proof positive that the facts of existence, the economic foundations of our society, have passed beyond the national stage. And since the economic facts are beyond dispute, the very existence of these two schools and their unanimity on the point under consideration, is proof positive that modern thought on the subject is abreast of, or at least not far behind, the development of modern economics.

Such was the situation at the outbreak of the Great War. And the war itself has not changed the situation—at least not to our disadvantage. It is true that when the storm broke loose there appeared upon the face of the troubled waters of our existence the foam and froth of which I spoke before, and that those who cannot see below the surface of things were deceived thereby. But the foam and froth are disappearing fast, and the crisis produced by the war, like all crises, has served to accelerate tendencies of development, both of fact and of thought, which were but slowly forging to the front, and to bring out in sharp relief where all may see them facts which might otherwise have remained unobserved except of the few who specialized on the subject. The war has also quickened our perception—so that we are now much better attuned to the voice of the new order than we were before the war. And that voice speaks to us in no uncertain accents.

One of the most interesting things in this field that have come since the outbreak of the war is the so-called Central Europe propaganda—and one of its most interesting manifestations is Dr. Friedrich Naumann's remarkable book, “Mittel Europa”—Middle Europe.

“Central Europe” is to be a super-state, consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Poland, the Balkans, and possibly Belgium, Holland, Italy, and the Scandinavian Kingdoms in Europe, together with certain parts of other continents, forming one political and economic organization, under the hegemony of Germany. Those who get their information and ideas from newspapers may be disposed to pooh-pooh the idea of Middle Europe as being nothing but the old dream of the Pan-Germans in new form—a dream which is bound to be shattered when the Pan-German hopes of a world dominated by Germany shall have been laid to rest on the battlefields of Belgium and Northern France. But this is a great mistake. It is true that Middle Europe has considerable likeness to the ideas of Pan-Germanism. But only in so far as Pan-Germanism itself was based on certain economic facts and politics—social factors. For the rest the two are quite distinct.

In this connection, it is well to remember that Dr. Naumann is neither a militarist nor an imperialist in the ordinary sense of the word. On the contrary, he is a democrat, and there are people who think he is almost a Socialist. It must also be borne in mind that the propaganda for Middle Europe is not confined either to Pan-Germanist circles or to pseudo-Socialists like Dr. Naumann, but that it has received the sanction of official Socialist circles, both in Germany and Austria. Middle Europe is in fact being created as a matter of economic reality, and accepted in one form or another as an idea. In fact, the only opposition to it—outside of a few selfish special interests—comes from those who object to it not because it attempts to create a super-state, thereby transcending the national state idea, but because it does not go far enough, thereby shutting the door against a real world-federation.

But what is "Middle Europe"? Whatever else it may or may not be, one thing is certain: *It is a complete abandonment of the nation as a political entity in theory and in practice.* The national state is to be given up in favor of an *international* organization, called for purposes of convenience a "super-state," but which will in reality soon become *the* state. The Austrian Empire, which was considered an anachronism among modern states because of the dozen or so nationalities which it contained, is to become the prototype of the state which is to emerge from this war.

Dr. Naumann is not a "dreamer"-internationalist working for a world-federation, but a German *Realpolitiker*, what we call a "practical man"—that is to say, a man who has his eyes in front but does not see beyond the next step. He does not see the world-federation, at least not in the near future, but he cannot help seeing the disappearance of the nation as a sovereign state, and he lays his plans accordingly.

"All the allies in the Great War—says he—feel without argument that neither now nor in the future can small or even moderate-sized Powers play any large part in the world. Our conceptions of size have entirely changed. Only very big states

have any significance on their own account, all the smaller ones must live by utilizing the quarrels of the great, or must obtain leave if they wish to do anything unusual. *Sovereignty, that is, the freedom to make decisions of wide historical importance, is now concentrated at a very few places on the globe.* The day is still distant when there shall be 'one fold and one shepherd,' *but the days are past when shepherds without number, lesser or greater, drove their flocks unrestrained over the pastures of Europe. The spirit of large-scale industry and super-national organization has seized politics.* People think, as Cecil Rhodes once expressed it, 'in continents.' The country which desires to be small and isolated will nevertheless become of its own accord dependent on the varying fortunes of the Great Powers. This is in conformity with an age of intercommunication and of centralized military technique . . . Prussia is too small, and Germany too small, and Austria too small, and Hungary too small. No single state of this kind can survive the world-war . . . Such things are no longer possible. Their day is past."

The national state having passed, and the world-federation not having as yet arrived, Naumann sees the world divided into three or four large super-national states, of which Central Europe is one. The drowning of the individual nationalities in this Central European ocean does not trouble him, because this war has already drowned them. This war has been a melting pot for the European nations, and they cannot, therefore, possibly go back to their individual existences. Their struggles were not national, and any possible justification for them must be sought in the creation of some super-national political entity as their result.

"Thus only—says Naumann—shall we Central European nations appear finally justified for having shed our blood for one another."

Otherwise the whole thing was purposeless, meaningless.

"What was Serajewo to us Germans of the Empire? What were we seeking in the Carpathian passes? Why did Hungarians or the Southern Slavs trouble themselves about Zeebrügge?

Why should German Bohemians or Tzechs have defended the Ridge of the Vosges?"

There must have been some serious interests that made these people fight these—to them, at any rate—non-national fights; and these serious interests can be relied upon to weld the different nationalities into one super-national whole.

"Central Europe—says Naumann—is at the present time a geographical expression which has so far acquired no political or constitutional character. But Austria, too, was once merely a geographical expression, and Prussia was a provincial term denoting only the most easterly portion of the Kingdom. *It is not so very long since it was said that Germany was only a geographical concept, and what a content this word has acquired in the interval!*"

Austria has become a solidified state and Germany a magnificently powerful Empire because of the force of historical circumstances, and so shall it be with Central Europe. The historic factors are already there doing their work. And, primarily, the economic factor.

"The German economic creed must become in future more and more the characteristic of Mid-Europe. The military defensive alliance will thus grow into a genuine partnership. A united *economic people* will develop, cutting across all constitutional boundaries. This could not succeed were it the freshly conceived scheme of individuals. But we are only putting into words what has for long been taking shape of itself; *we express it in order to further a process that is already going on.* The Austrians and Hungarians have already had a share in our life, *for economically they are of our race, even those who speak a different language.*"

It does an old-fashioned Marxist's heart good to hear a man like Naumann speak of an "economic race" which transcends the boundaries of "nation" and language and which is the real force in determining "the life" of peoples, including their most fundamental political institutions such as the state itself. For Nau-

mann is no adept of the Materialistic Conception of History. The world, Naumann reminds us, does not move by economics alone. Says he:

"If an historical entity is to be made of Mid-Europe, a fresh historical consciousness must grow up, for economic considerations, however serious they may be, will not of themselves suffice to arouse the necessary enthusiasm. Of course, a scheme of this nature cannot be carried out without numerous calculations as to material advantages and disadvantages, but it is a false rendering of history to believe or wish to believe that great political transformations can be accomplished by the spirit of calculation alone. Each new social creation has its birthplace in the human soul, and this soul is never merely economic; from time immemorial, and still today, it is compounded of impulses and desires, material and ideal, definite and vague, variously mingled but yet pressing forward."

All of which is very true, in a sense, but need not worry us much nor detain us long, any more than it does Naumann himself. For when the basic, definite and calculable economic facts are there, the vague impulses and ideals will be there, too. When the super-national "economic race" has put in an appearance, the life of the soul will throb in response to the appeals of internationalism instead of nationalism. Witness Naumann himself, and the successful propaganda for Mid-Europe, notwithstanding the fact that Central Europe is the worst hotbed of historical discords on the face of the globe. When the economic conditions are ripe for a new social or political order, the soul will yearn for it, and the soul's yearning will express itself in the usual ways: the preachers will preach it, the poets will sing it, the fighters will fight for it, and the martyrs will die for it.

But more important even is the fact that as time wears on and the economic conditions grow in ripeness, their import will sink into the consciousness of humanity to such an extent that they will be taken for granted as a matter of course, and there will be no further need for preachment, poetry or martyrdom.

We seem to have reached this, the final stage in the evolution towards internationalism, at least in the form of super-nationalism.

In this connection, another book deserves our attention—a book written about the same time as Naumann's "Middle Europe," and as remarkable in its way as the work of the noted German scholar and publicist. I refer to Professor Roland G. Usher's "Pan-Americanism." In conception and purpose the two books are entirely dissimilar. Dr. Naumann's book is a fervid plea for the creation of the super-state Central Europe. Prof. Usher's book is an emphatic argument *against* the creation of the super-state Pan-America. Nevertheless, the two books supplement each other in any study of present-day thoughtful and scholarly opinion on the subject of nationalism and internationalism. And Prof. Usher's book in its opposition to the particular super-state of which he treats is as much a document evidencing the passing of the national state as is Dr. Naumann's in its eloquent plea for the one which he advocates.

In speaking of the necessary organs of the contemplated body-politic under consideration by him, Prof. Usher says:

"If the foundations of the structure are significant, the structure itself is the visible and tangible evidence of the existence of the new entity, and will be, if anything, more essential to its eventual success than the premises. An *organic union* would have little strength and possess only a very small quantity of organic nexus, unless it was at least a confederation of sovereign states, *with a common executive and legislature*, in whom were vested definite if, perhaps, limited powers to act, and with discretion to decide upon their own initiative, in a way binding upon all members certain matters of mutual interest explicitly delegated to them

"Some common administrative body would be essential. The conduct of foreign affairs by the Confederation, the abandoning by all members of their previous policies and independent dealings with other countries, with either the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, or its assumption by the confederation, would

be highly important. Free trade within the confederation and a uniform tariff against foreign countries, a uniform currency, uniform weights and measures, with uniform banking, bankruptcy, and commercial laws, would be eminently desirable. The courts of the confederation should decide suits between states or between the citizens of various states, as the United States courts now deal with the affairs of individuals and states. *There would of course be taxes for purposes of administration and defense. . . .*

"These do not seem to be excessive demands or prerequisites of a closer Pan-American Union. They mean simply that the new confederation should be a state with organs possessed of independent authority; that the political, administrative, and economic aspects of the new state should be realities and not fictions. They demand that the new state should actually possess the political and economic independence, that its assumed isolation and divergent interests from Europe would make desirable, and to preserve which the union itself had presumably been formed."

Now, a generation or two ago when political nationalism, the idea of the national state, was still the ruling political philosophy, the very statement of such an idea as the Pan-American Union outlined by Prof. Usher would have been sufficient to condemn it. There would have been no necessity to write a book against it, for no one who could be taken seriously could have seriously proposed it. The matter was then simply not arguable. The answer to such a proposition, if made, was ready, short and decisive, *Pan-America is not a nation*. There is no Pan-American nation, and there can therefore be no Pan-American state. There may be such hybrid and unnatural things in the old world, the remnants of an old and, happily, passing order, held together against the will of its people by the overpowering force of an autocratic government. But that free peoples should of their own free will deliberately create such a monstrosity, particularly on this free continent of America—impossible! The idea that a free nation would curtail its own sovereign powers, its own sovereign legislature and independent executive, not to mention

its independent judiciary, and yoke itself to a conglomeration of foreign nationalities, of different race and tongue, and with different history and traditions, was simply preposterous.

But Prof. Usher is not shocked at the thought of Pan-America. And what is more significant, although opposed to it, he fails to advance the *argumentum ad nationem*. It evidently never occurred to him that the fact that there is no Pan-American nation would be a sufficient answer, or even any kind of an answer, to the proposal to erect a Pan-American state. And the reason for it is very simple: That is an answer no longer, at least not among serious people, writing serious books on serious subjects.

Prof. Usher, like Dr. Naumann, recognizes the fact that the nation-state is a thing of the past, or at least will be soon a thing of the past. Like Dr. Naumann, he evidently believes that the "economic race" is *the thing*, at least so far as the state-building of the future is concerned, and not the historic "nation" as we know it. And so he derives his chief arguments against Pan-Americanism from the fact that there is no such economic union of interests in the Americas as might serve as a proper foundation for the structure of a Pan-American political union.

"The theoretical basis of Pan-Americanism—says he—lies in the belief that the geographical proximity of the two continents of the Western Hemisphere has naturally created between their inhabitants mutual interests, and literally predicates different interests in the Western Hemisphere from those of Europe, and a more normal relationship between states located in the Western Hemisphere with one another than with Europe. We shall scarcely need to do more than glance at a map to see that the more developed regions of North America are in actual distance as far from South America as they are from Europe, and that South America is geographically more closely related to Africa and to Southern Europe than it is to New York and New England. . . .

"Pan-Americanism assumes a certain separation of interests between Europe and the Western Hemisphere and a certain identity of interests between the United States and Latin-

America. Let us not mince matters in questions of such grave importance as these. This is a fiction the falsity of which has been exposed by the European War. It was not apparent sooner because of the lack of keen interest on the part of both Europe and the United States in South America. *The significant interests of the United States, the indispensable interests, the prerequisites of economic well-being, are those with Europe. The significant interests of Latin America, the predominant interests, indispensable to their economic well-being, are those with Europe.*"

This argument *against* a separate Pan-American Union is unanswerable. But what an argument for a world-federation!

Incidentally, Professor Usher disposes very effectually, although perhaps quite unintentionally, of the argument often advanced against world-federation: That the peoples of the different regions of the earth are so very different by reason of their remoteness as to make a common government impossible. In speaking of the supposed isolation of some portions of the Western Hemisphere from Europe, Prof. Usher says:

"Real isolation results from a lack of communication and a lack of acquaintance, and is due nowadays almost entirely to the difficulty of communication or to a lack of common interests, neither of which seem to have any necessary relation to geographical distance of location. The railroad and the steamship, the telegraph and the newspaper, have tied together beyond the power of separation in the future places sundered by the length of continents and the width of oceans. Where communication exists, there is neither separation nor isolation; until it exists, even actual contiguity of boundaries will not break that silence and indifference between two countries in which lies complete isolation. Peru and Brazil communicate with each other infrequently and irregularly; both are in constant touch with affairs in London, Paris, and New York. Similarly, the information in New York about Buenos Aires is much more extended, accurate, and contemporaneous than the notions in Maine about Alabama. The great commercial and political centers are inevitably in closer contact with one another than with the parts of their own

country; and nearly any part of the United States has more regular contact with New York or Chicago than with any other part of North America. Isolation is more a matter of time than of space, and common interests are due to the ease of transportation and communication more often than to geographical location."

What Prof Usher says about knowledge in New York about Buenos Aires as compared with the knowledge in Maine about Alabama is of almost universal application. Knowledge of and therefore similarity to other people has only the remotest relation to either distance or "nationality" and only a faint one to language. The dweller of your modern large city is informed daily and pretty accurately not only of the happenings in all other cities of the globe, but also of the state of mind of those cities on different subjects of interests. The mode of life in all modern large cities is almost identical in all important and even some unimportant respects. There is more diversity between the urban and rural populations of any given country, or even any given province, than there is between the urban populations of the world.

On the whole the world, or at least that part of it which we are pleased to call "the civilized world," is "one and indivisible" and is becoming even more so from day to day. We are not only part of the same economic system, making of the entire world one "economic race," but we are sharers in essentially the same culture and even partakers of the same amusements. We here in the United States are much more interested in proposed reform of the Prussian franchise than New Yorkers generally are in woman suffrage in North Dakota; and the proposed constitutional changes in the German Empire interest the average American outside of Massachusetts much more than the proposed changes in the Constitution of that State. They interest us more, because *they affect us much more vitally*.

This is one of the great lessons in internationalism which the World War has taught us, and which will never be unlearned again. We have ceased to be provincial, and so has the rest of the world.

The world has at last come to realize the fact we can no longer live in *national isolation*. The world has become one to such an extent that all of us are interested in everything that is going on the world over, including the question of how each country, and each important subdivision thereof, is being governed. It is no longer a mere matter of *sympathy* with alien people struggling for freedom and democracy, but of actual, live and even vital *interest* to our peace and prosperity. And it is only one step—and a very logical as well as urgent step—from such an interest to desire to promote that interest by intelligent action, which is possible only by and through world-federation.

I appreciate, of course, that Internationalism such as we want is a shocking idea to the average "man in the street." But shocks are the order of the day, and in times like these people learn very quickly. The important points to remember are these: the economic foundations of internationalism are there, and the nationalistic system of ideas has been damaged beyond repair. For a time, those who have been born and raised on them, and who have not as yet been shocked plumb into a new world, will attempt to hedge and compromise. Realizing that the nation has passed, they will, like Dr. Naumann and his friends, attempt to keep the world divided by dividing it into a few super-states. But such a makeshift could not succeed. It is not only highly undesirable, but quite impracticable, except, perhaps, as a temporary arrangement during a truce in the World War. It is quite impossible as a more or less permanent arrangement in a world really at peace. The only thing possible in such a world, at the present stage of our economic and cultural development, is real internationalism and world-federation.

In this connection, it may perhaps be well to remind my American readers that a similar situation confronted this country after the War of Independence. The thirteen colonies became through the Revolution thirteen independent states in theory as well as in fact. The differences between—and their remoteness from each other—were no less than the differences now existing between the different nations of the civilized world, with the single exception of language. There were then men who believed

that a union between the thirteen states was impossible, and that each "sovereign state" ought to "go it alone." There were also those who, like our own Dr. Naumann, realized that it was impossible for each state to "go it alone," but who did not believe that the time had yet arrived when there should be "one shepherd and flock," and who therefore advocated the creation of *several confederations*. The discussions during those days make interesting reading now. Not only because they sound so strange to us who live and work in the actual United States of America, but because they are so curiously like the present-day discussions about the future organization of the world.

We know the verdict of history on the objections to the creation of a real unified state out of the thirteen colonies that broke away from England. The same historical forces which have welded the thirteen colonies into the nation of the United States of America—"one and indivisible"—are welding the shattered fragments of the civilized world into the United States of the World.

The Russian Revolution

By KARL KAUTSKY

The fight for peace, the question of questions in these times, is intimately associated with the problems of the Russian Revolution and the revival of the International. And these two, again, are closely allied with each other. Stockholm was to have been the visible realization of the triumph of both these forces. But the glad hopes that greeted the revolution and the Stockholm meeting have ebbed as the months have gone by. And yet we must not despair. The revolution in Russia is but undergoing the various stages through which every revolution must go. The glorious, most hopeful, most exalted stage is the first, when the power that has threatened to crush and choke everything is swept aside. The people draw the first deep breath of freedom, and look forward upon the open road that leads to progress and happiness. Never, in all the revolutions of the past, has this first stage been the work of a single class; always these upheavals have been the product of the revolt of different classes, all suffering under the same oppression, all straight-jacketed by the same insufferable conditions, all with the same hope, the overthrow of the power that is oppressing them.

This co-operation of classes may be kept up, yes, may even increase during the second period of the revolution, in which the new regime first takes the place of the old.

They are held together by a common fear, the dread that the power just overthrown may again raise its head. It becomes the most important task of the new regime to clean away the refuse that the old has left behind it. Furthermore, the exploiting class hesitates to maintain its own class interests, largely because it fears the strength demonstrated by the laboring masses in the struggle against the rulers whom they have overthrown. They are trembling with fear, and dare not step into the foreground. They still hope to pacify the masses by small concessions and sacrifices.

It was this fear of the masses that led the representatives of French nobility on that famous 4th of August, 1789, to voluntarily sacrifice their feudal rights.

In this stage, coalition governments, with representatives of the working class, may be of value to their interests. But it must be born in mind that this can be only a short transition period. On the other hand, it would be senseless to attempt to curtail this stage artificially or by force.

The class struggle cannot, of course, be set aside for any length of time, so long as class rule exists. The greater the demands of the working classes become, the sharper will grow the resistance of their exploiters.

And so, of necessity, the third stage of the revolution must come: the revival, yes the intensifying of the struggle between the classes which united in overthrowing the old government. Through this stage, too, the Russian revolution must inevitably go. No cleverness of tactics, no terroristic recklessness can prevent it. It will be the deciding stage of the Russian revolution, albeit not its most joyous one. It lacks the glad joyousness, the unbounded hopes of the first stages. But it is the most important period, that period which will determine its historic character, in which the significance that coming generations will ascribe to it, will be decided.

In this period not only the two classes will fight against each other, but tactical differences between the various groups of the same class will appear as well. These tactical questions may make themselves felt under certain circumstances even before the class differences themselves become apparent. The class interests are a deciding factor in politics, but not the only factor.

In war the plan of action of an army is determined not only by the whereabouts of the enemy, but by a fairly definite knowledge of his strength and the strength of one's own forces as well. In an army there may be a variety of opinions. But it stands under the direction of a single commander, and he decides upon a single plan of action for the whole army. The political army of democracy knows no commander in chief. In spite of uniform class interests, yes, in spite of absolute

agreement in political theory, it may be split up by a difference in the estimation of strength of the movement itself and of the power of its enemies.

This is particularly true of a movement that is evolving under conditions such as exist in Russia at the present time. Czarism and the war have made it practically impossible to determine, even approximately, the strength of the various parties and tendencies. It becomes the more important for the consolidation of the revolution, therefore, to find a definite basis upon which this knowledge may be more or less adequately established. The election of a constitutional assembly is an absolute necessity. Not because it will wipe out the differences between the classes and parties, but because it will permit a fairly accurate calculation of their relative strength, giving to their struggles a more rational basis. But even more important for the future of the Russian revolution than a constitutional assembly is peace.

It has become customary to compare the present Russian movement with that of France in 1793. But they are widely different in character. When war broke out between France and reactionary Europe the revolution in France had practically accomplished its work. The agrarian population had already gone over to the new regime, won by the confiscation of church lands and the lands of the feudal lords who had rebelled against the revolution. The war was in the main a war to defend the revolution from the threatening attacks of European monarchs. It was a sort of international class struggle. And in this struggle the revolution gave to its defenders a new war measure of epoch-making importance, placing a mass army raised by popular conscription in the field against the small professional armies of the monarchies. To this it owed its victory and thus the war brought to France, after the first heavy loss, not the misery of invasion, but rich gain.

In Russia war preceded the revolution, and brought to the latter only unspeakable suffering, complete disintegration. It does not preserve for the working class what the revolution has accomplished; on the contrary, it makes it impossible for them to take

advantage of their victory. Nor has the revolution given to Russia any war measure that would place it at an advantage over its opponents.

And there is still another difference. The significance of the French revolution was tremendous. It was the signal for the overthrow of the whole feudal system. The Russian revolution of to-day can have no such efforts. A bourgeois revolution is no longer necessary even in Russia; the capitalist class and even a considerable portion of the agrarian population had secured practically every juridical and economic right they needed, even before the revolution broke out. But the proletariat in Russia is still too weak and too undeveloped to rule the nation, to accomplish a revolution in the Socialist sense of that term.

The significance of the present Russian revolution is, above all, political. Its aim lies chiefly in the winning of democracy as a foundation upon which the proletariat may most successfully carry on its class struggle, may develop and organize its forces for the conquest of political power.

But war and democracy are two forces that cannot easily be brought into harmony. A state of war brings, even in highly democratized nations, for the period of its duration, a certain curtailment of democratic rights.

That was also true in democratic France. The reign of terror, generally regarded as a product of the revolution, was, as a matter of fact, the product of the war. And this explains, too, the fact that the climax of the rule of democratic forces in France, coincided with the climax of political persecution and political death sentences.

This war threatens the very essence of the Russian revolution, its democracy. Furthermore, it robs the revolution of the opportunity to counteract its political sacrifices by economic gain.

An early peace is therefore indispensable for the success of the Russian revolution. But it, too, will endanger the revolution, if it is a peace at any price, a peace other than that formulated and demanded by its leaders, a peace without annexation and indemnities, a peace preserving the right of small nations to

decide their own destinies in every direction. If the war should end with the rape of nations, weakening instead of strengthening this outcome, then revolution, not its aim, but its method, would be discredited for years to come, not only among the Russian people, but among all other nations as well.

Thus they stand between Scylla and Charybdis. The continuation of war threatens economic and political, separate peace, moral bankruptcy.

A revolution that is an outgrowth of existing conditions possesses a gigantic vitality and momentary reverses are by no means cause for despair. But they should bring to us the grave warning, not to leave our Russian comrades alone to their fate. Their cause is the cause of the international proletariat. The collapse of revolutionary Russia would halt the process of democratization in Central Europe that has already begun.

Revolutionary Russia alone is not in a position to enforce a peace upon the terms it has proclaimed. It is time for the International to do its duty, at last, toward itself as well as toward the Russian revolution.

Our Obedient Congress

By LUDWIG LORE

The war session of the Sixty-fifth Congress deserves the good rating it received from the President down to the cheapest politician. For never before did an American parliament so obediently swallow so many bitter pills as did this War Congress.

It is a remarkable fact that this Congress, before war was declared on April 4th and 5th by the Senate and the House of Representatives, was by no means united. A straw vote taken by a leading New York newspaper among members of both houses of Congress on April 2nd and published on April 3rd, indicated such a strong opposition to the final alignment of the United States with the belligerent powers of Europe, that a majority vote in both branches of the Federal Parliament seemed almost impossible. And yet the incredible happened and war was declared with overwhelming majorities. In the Senate this action was taken with 86 against 6, in the House with 373 against 70 votes.

Once the deciding step had been taken, it was only logical that the means necessary to carry out the decision should be granted to the executive branch of the Government. But the enthusiasm, the unheard-of magnanimity with which it was done plainly showed how effectively the whip in the hand of the power that he must have worked behind the scenes. A few figures will give an idea of the immense amounts appropriated for war purposes during those fateful six months of the special session.

The first appropriation was the deficiency act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, which failed of enactment in the previous Congress. It carried \$163,841,400.52 as compared with \$57,034,118.94 in the previous year's bill, and \$11,399,025.69 the year before. An amendment which was written into the bill in the Senate was responsible for an increase of one hundred million dollars. It reads: "For the national security and defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President, and to be immediately available and to remain available until December thirty-first, 1917, \$100,000,000." Furthermore the bill provides that the Presi-

dent need render no account for the expenditure of this fund of one hundred million dollars that he may "expend it at his discretion." It is more than rumored that the treasuries of such noble war propaganda agencies as the "Alliance for Labor and Democracy" are fed from this source.

Next in order was the first big bond issue authorized on April 14 and 17 by the House and Senate with 389 and 84 votes, respectively, in other words, by a unanimous vote of all members present. This act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to borrow on the credit of the United States an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000,000 for the purpose of meeting expenditures authorized for the national security and defense and other public purposes. Besides this the act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury for the more effectual prosecution of the war to purchase, at par, from foreign Governments then engaged in war with the enemies of the United States, their obligations hereafter issued and appropriated for this purpose \$3,000,000,000 or so much of this amount as might be necessary. In addition the Secretary was authorized to borrow from time to time such sums as in his judgment might be necessary and to issue certificates of indebtedness at no less than par, bearing interest not to exceed $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The sum of such certificates was at no time to exceed \$2,000,000,000.

The regular Army appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, passed in the House and Senate on April 4 and 3 with a viva voce vote—i. e., without opposition—carried \$273,046,322.50 as compared with \$267,596,530.10 for the fiscal year ending in June 1917, and \$101,959,195.85 for the year ending in the previous June, showing that the "regular" expenditures for the military establishment had increased almost threefold during the last two years. This same bill authorized the President to take into the immediate possession of the United States any vessel within its jurisdiction owned in whole or in part by a corporation, citizen, or subject of any nation with which the United States might be at war, or under register of such a nation.

The first big war appropriation was passed in the House on May 2 with 362 yeas and 1 nay—that of Mr. Meyer London—and in the Senate on May 19 by a viva voce vote. This act carried an

appropriation of \$3,281,094,541.60 for Army and Navy expenditures arising out of the war. But this insignificant sum of more than three and a quarter billion dollars was a comparatively small item, for the same law granted to the President immense powers which included a money outlay of more than the original sum appropriated therein. The President was authorized to place orders with any person for such ships or material as the necessities of the Government—to be determined by the President—might require during the period of the war; to modify, suspend, cancel or requisition any existing or future contract for the building or purchase of ships or material; to requisition and take over for use any plant in which ships or materials are built—in short gave to the President and to him alone full authority to buy, requisition, order, take over or cancel whatever is necessary for the conduct of the war. The floor leader of the Republicans in the House stated, while this bill was under consideration, that in his opinion “no man on earth has or ever has had such absolute powers as were bestowed by the Congress of the United States upon our present President.”

On July 14 there passed in the House—with a viva voce vote, Mr. Meyer London not objecting—the Aviation Act which set aside \$640,000,000 in a lump sum for the pay and equipment of additional officers and enlisted men, in such numbers as the President might deem necessary, and for the purchase and production of all types of aircraft, guns, armament, aviation fields, barracks, etc. And here the same gentleman who on the previous occasion had complained of the unlimited powers that Congress had granted to the President explained on the floor: “If I had my way about it, I would pass this bill without saying a word.” And though he was not able to shut off debate entirely, nobody seemed to care to discuss the merits or demerits of this bill, for after a few unimportant remarks from some of the would-be authorities on aerial warfare in the House, the act was passed without opposition.

The second bond issue came before Congress in September and was passed promptly and without the slightest opposition on September 6 and 13 in both Houses by a viva voce vote. The Socialist seems again to have been absent. It authorized the Sec-

retary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to borrow on the credit of the United States \$7,538,945,640 and to issue therefor bonds in addition to the \$2,000,000,000 bonds already issued. Of this sum total \$4,000,000,000 was set aside for establishing credits with allied governments. Furthermore, in addition to these bonds and certificates of indebtedness the act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow from time to time such sums as in his judgment might be necessary to meet authorized public expenditures, and to issue therefor war-savings certificates. The entire sum of war-savings certificates outstanding must at no time exceed \$2,000,000,000.

The second war appropriation followed immediately. It was reported to the House on September 6th and passed on the 18th by a viva voce vote—once more without the vote of the Socialist member of the House being recorded against it. It carried \$5,356,666,016.93 and \$635,000,000 for the emergency shipping fund, thereby raising the limit of expenditures under the shipping act to \$1,734,000,000. The last appropriation passed in this session of the Congress amounted to \$176,250,000. It is known as the military and naval insurance act and established a Division of Military Insurance to provide a) governmental family allowances and compulsory allotment of pay for the support of dependents, b) compensation for death, or disability due to injury or disease resulting from service, c) ability to get additional insurance at low cost. It, too, passed without a dissenting vote.

The total appropriations and contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1918—exclusive of \$7,000,000,000 for loans to the Allies aggregate to \$14,390,730,940.46; with the seven billion dollars loaned to the Allies to \$21,390,730,940.46.

But this is only a small beginning, and shows but one phase of the activity of the War Congress of 1917. Far more important, perhaps, is the work of these “representatives of the people” that deals with the rights and liberties of the population. It may be rather bromidic to refer to the worn-out phrase of the “War for Democracy.” But since it is the official version we cannot very well overlook it. Certainly, if it is or is to be a war “to make democracy safe in the world,” the United States Congress has nothing to do with that particular end of the job. It did

everything in its power and a little more to make autocracy and reaction the dominant factor in this country. It talked about the liberties that must be preserved and then acted in exactly the opposite direction. It is a remarkable fact, indeed, that the Senate was doing far more to protect the rights and the constitutional guarantees of the people than the so-called "popular branch" of our government. Men like La Follette, Gronna, Hollis and a few others showed real courage and more independence from the war-mongers and the White House than even the better class of representatives in the House. It was in the American Upper House that the Censorship Bill was defeated, that the Espionage Act was fought so hard that it looked for a few weeks like a sure loser, that the pernicious paragraph in the food control bill was fiercely attacked and that a serious attempt was made to get a strong hold of the war-profits. The House, at best, acquiesced after the Senate had shown fight, but it never originated anything worth while. It proved much inferior to its "plutocratic branch," always playing the second fiddle and ever so often the more vehemently capitalistic one. In this connection again attention must be called to the totally unsatisfactory record of the Socialist Congressman, Mr. Meyer London. His whole activity during this momentous session was of such inferior character, showed such an astounding indifference to every fundamental question that arose and to practically every debate of importance that occurred that several of the more progressive Democrats and Republicans proved themselves of much higher value to the people at large. His voting record is equally bad and not only justifies but demands his expulsion from the Socialist Party, since he either directly voted in favor of or in many cases failed to record his vote against war measures and appropriations for military and naval purposes.

If Mr. London is right, let us do away with the provisions of the Party Constitution which automatically expel any elected official who votes for military or war appropriations. But if he is wrong—and we are firmly convinced that he is—justice should be done, as provided for in our party laws. Nor need we hesitate for fear of making Mr. London homeless. He will be received,

with open arms, by the many-sided, fifty-seven-varieties-in-one National Party to which, in spirit, he already belongs.

The biggest fight in Congress was waged around the conscription act, which was passed in the House on April 28 with 397 yeas and 24 nays and in the Senate on May 1, with 81 yeas and 8 nays. It authorized the raising of all organizations of the Regular Army to the maximum enlisted strength authorized by law; the drafting into Federal service of the National Guard and the National Guard Reserves; and the drafting of a force of 500,000 men upon the principle of universal liability to service. The bill also authorized the President at his discretion, to raise and begin the training of an additional force of 500,000 men; and to raise such ammunition and depot batteries and battalions as he might deem necessary, and such recruiting training units as might be necessary to maintain the drafted forces at maximum strength. From this it can be seen that the President is authorized not only to conscript 500,000 plus 500,000 men but as many men "as be necessary to maintain the drafted forces at maximum strength." That may mean two, three, five or seven million men . . .

We are all familiar with the provisions of this act. But it contains one feature that deserves more than the negligible attention generally accorded to it. It is the clause that exempts members of well-recognized religious organizations whose existing principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form, from service in the naval and military forces, except for such service as the President may declare non-combatant. We find here the same distinction in favor of religious bodies and faiths that has characterized legislation of our times. Only recently, the amendments to the Immigration Laws of the United States recognized the right of asylum for people persecuted for religious reasons but failed even to mention political refugees. Here again we see the same attitude. The man who is a conscientious objector from other than religious scruples is disregarded—nay, more—is branded as an outlaw, as a traitor and a coward. Mr. Baker, Secretary of War, relieved the situation somewhat, it is true, by an order, issued last August, which promised a more lenient treatment of conscientious objectors; how this promise will be carried out remains to be seen.

The Food Bill is, essentially, a measure that would deserve the undivided support of Congress as an act giving the President and the Food Administration the greatest possible latitude in the vigorous prosecution of that group of American profiteers who are coining gigantic profits from the hunger of the masses. But even in this almost revolutionary measure we find a clause, which may, by interpretation, be construed into a prohibition of all strikes and labor uprisings in those fields of industry that are employed in the production of the necessities of life. The strong protest of the few progressive people in Congress did not prevail—the dangerous clauses were insisted upon and labor is threatened with fines and penalties as soon as it asserts itself against exploitation.

The most nefarious piece of war legislation is the so-called Espionage Law. For this act does not—as would be proper and justifiable—provide for severe penalties for spies and espionage, it does not simply place the law concerning enemies of the country on a war basis. It attempts—and results have already shown how effectively—to stifle all anti-war propaganda and peace agitation. It aims its hardest blows against the “enemies within,” the anti-war Americans, the Socialists and Internationalists. Comrade Fred Krafft of New Jersey, a party member who as a delegate to the St. Louis convention signed the compromise minority resolution, and later wrote and spoke for it in the party press and at party meetings, was found guilty under a provision of this law and sentenced to five years imprisonment and a heavy fine, because he was alleged to have said something in a public speech that was regarded as “treasonable.” Twenty-seven Socialists of South Dakota were found guilty under the same act and sentenced to imprisonment from one to five years for the crime of signing a petition to Congress for the recall of the conscription act. And more than two score of similar cases have been reported during the last three months.

Another especially pernicious paragraph of the same law is title xii relating to use of the mail. It declares unmailable every publication of any kind (including a letter) which violates any of the provisions of this act, and every publication of any kind containing any matter advocating or urging treason, insurrection,

or forcible resistance to any law of the United States. Whoever attempts to use the mails of the United States for the transmission of any matter declared by this title to be non-mailable shall be punishable by not more than five years in prison, a fine of not more than \$5,000, or both. The Postmaster-General, who is the Czar over everything that appears in print, upon whose decision depends the mailability of every newspaper or periodical in the country, whose opinion as to what does and does not constitute treason is final, has become not only the High Inquisitor, but Judge as well over the freedom and the liberties of the American people. The more the war progresses, the more will the fiendish claws of this piece of legislation become apparent.

The discussion that took place in the Senate when the Revenue Act came up for a vote was enlightening. The administration bill had been so careful not to hurt the big interests by too heavy taxation, that even Congress rebelled. Senator La Follette brought in a wonderfully illuminating minority report showing the gigantic war profits of the big monopolies and war profiteers, a report that caused a sensation throughout the country and forced an unwilling Senate and an even more unwilling House to adopt an average increase of the tax rate of about 12 per cent. It may be mentioned in passing, that the war industries of Great Britain pay a tax that is equal to 80 per cent. of their war profits.

The vials of wrath that were poured out upon the head of La Follette in the capitalist press—and in the resolutions adopted by such unquestionably patriotic bodies as the Chambers of Commerce of New York, Pittsburgh, Chicago and Boston, to name only a few of the real American and public spirited organizations,—was aroused much more by this minority report with its convincing figures of patriotic exploitation than by the St. Paul speech, which but furnished the ostensible motive for their attacks.

The “Trading with the Enemy Act” would not call for comment had not the astute politicians performed the admirable feat of saddling upon this seemingly technical war

measure a most oppressive provision for the arbitrary curtailment and chicanery of the public press and the freedom of the press. It not only forces upon publications printed in a foreign language disagreeable duties that, in most cases, patently fail to strike the real offender—if by this term is understood the press with real pro-Kaiser leanings and love of the very autocracy that this country has set out to destroy—but provides that it shall be unlawful to transport, carry, or otherwise publish or distribute any matter which is made unmailable by the espionage act. That means, of course, the absolute suppression of all printed and written matter that is objectionable to the Government as represented by Mr. Burleson, Postmaster-General, in whatever language it may be printed.

This law provides penalties as exorbitant, so out of all proportion to the "crime," that the rulers of Prussia might well feel inclined to adopt the American brand of democracy, as superior to their own bungling autocracy. And no one who knows German conditions will deny that our war legislation is, in certain respects, more severe and more reactionary than are the laws of Germany in their present application. This is proven by the whole spirit that dominates our public life at the present time, and is evidenced by the expulsion proceedings against Senator La Follette in the U. S. Senate. Karl Liebknecht used much stronger and more direct language than did Senator La Follette. Yet it did not occur to his worst opponents to demand his expulsion from the Reichstag.

We are far from being apologists for German militarism and autocracy. It, therefore, makes the hurt only more poignant to state the simple truth—that the United States, to-day, stands under the iron heel of a capitalism as reactionary, under the domination of a bureaucracy as arrogant, as was ever suffered or tolerated by Germany or any other European nation.

Political Parties in Russia

By N. LENIN.

(Aids to an understanding of the proposed platform drawn up by N. Lenin for discussion at Bolshevik meetings. The printing of the proposed platform has thus far been held up only by the insufficient typographical resources at Petrograd.)

The following is an attempt to formulate, first, the more important, and second, the less important, of the questions and answers characteristic of the present situation in Russia, and of the attitude the various parties take to the present state of affairs.

QUESTIONS

1. What are the chief groupings of political parties in Russia?

ANSWERS

A (more to the *right* than the Cadets). Parties and groups more *right* than the Constitutional Democrats.

B (Cadets). Constitutional Democratic Party (Cadets, the National Liberty Party) and the groups closely attached to them.

C (Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists). The S. D.'s, S. R.'s and the groups closely attached to them.

D (Bolsheviks). The party which ought properly to be called the *Communist Party*, and which is at present termed "The Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party, united with the Central Committee; or, in popular language, the "Bolsheviks."

2. What classes do these parties represent? What class standpoints do they express?

A. The feudal landholders and the more backward sections of the bourgeoisie.

B. The mass of the bourgeoisie, that is, the capitalists, and those landholders who have the industrial, bourgeois ideology.

C. Small entrepreneurs, small and middle-class proprietors, small and more or less well-to-do peasants, petite bourgeoisie, as well as those workers who have submitted to a bourgeois point of view.

D. Class-conscious workers, day laborers and the poorer classes of the peasantry, who are classed with them semi-proletariat).

3. What is their relation to Socialism?

A and B. Unconditionally hostile, since it threatens the profits of capitalists and landholders.

C. For Socialism, but it is too early as yet to think of it or to take any practical steps for its realization.

D. For Socialism. The Councils of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates must at once take every practical and feasible step for its realization.*

4. What form of government do they want now?

A. Constitutional Monarchy, absolute authority of the official class and the police.

B. A bourgeois parliamentary republic, i. e., a perpetuation of the rule of the capitalists, with the retention of the official (*chinovnik*) class and the police.

C. A bourgeois parliamentary republic, with reforms for the workers and peasants.

D. A republic of the Councils of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates. Abolition of the standing army and the police; substituting for them an armed people; officials to be not only elected, but also subject to recall; their pay not to exceed that of a good worker.

5. What is their attitude on the restoration of the Romanoff Monarchy?

A. In favor, but it must be done with caution and secrecy, for they are afraid of the people.

B. When the Guchkovs seemed to be in power the Cadets were in favor of putting on the throne a brother or

* For the nature of these steps, see Questions 20 and 22.

son of Nicholas, but when the people loomed up the Cadets became anti-monarchial.

C and D. Unconditionally opposed to any kind of monarchic restoration.

6. What do they think of seizures of power? What do they term "Order," and what "Anarchy"?

A. If a czar or a brave general seizes control, his authority comes from God; that is *order*. Anything else is *Anarchy*.

B. If the capitalists hold power, even by force, that is order; to assume power against the capitalist will would be anarchy.

C. If the Councils of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates alone are in power, anarchy threatens. For the present let the capitalists retain control, while the Councils have an "Advisory Commission."

D. Sole authority must be in the hands of the Councils of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates. The entire propaganda, agitation and organization of millions upon millions of people must at once be *directed* toward this end.*

7. Shall we support the Provisional Government?

A and B. Unquestionably, since it is the only means at this moment of guarding the interests of the capitalists.

C. Yes, but with the condition that it should carry out its agreement with the Councils of W. S. and P. Delegates and should consult with the "Advisory Commission."

D. No; let the capitalists support it. We must *prepare* the whole people for the complete and sole authority of the Councils of W. S. and P. Delegates.

8. Are we for a single authority or for a dual authority?

A and B. For sole power in the hands of the Capitalists and landholders.

* *Anarchy* is a complete negation of all government authority, but the Councils of W. S. and P. Delegates are *also* a government authority.

C. For dual authority. The Councils of W. S. and P. Delegates to exercise "control" over the Provisional Government. But it would be pernicious to consider the possibility that this control might prove illusory.

D. For sole power in the hands of the Councils of W. S. and P. delegates, from top to bottom over the whole country.

9. Shall a Constituent Assembly be called?

A. Not necessary, for it might injure the landholders. Suppose the peasants at the Constituent Assembly should decide to take away the land of the landholders?

B. Yes, but without stipulation of time. Furthermore, the learned professors should be consulted, first, because Bebel has already pointed out that jurists are the most reactionary people in the world; and second, because the experience of all revolutions shows that the cause of the people is lost when it is entrusted to the hands of professors.

C. Yes, and as soon as possible. As to the time, we have already discussed it in the meetings of the "Advisory Commission" 200 times and shall definitely dispose of it in our 201st discussion to-morrow.

D. Yes, and as soon as possible. Yet, to be successful and to be really convoked, one condition is necessary: increase the number and strengthen the *power* of the Councils of W. S. and P. Delegates; organize and *arm* the masses. Only thus can the Assembly be assured.

10. Does the state need a police of the conventional type and a standing army?

A and B. Absolutely, for this is the only permanent guarantee of the rule of capital, and in case of necessity, as is taught by the experience of all countries, the return from Republic to Monarchy is thus greatly facilitated.

C. On the one hand, it may not be necessary. On the other hand, is not so radical a change premature? Moreover, we can discuss it in the Advisory Commission.

D. Absolutely unnecessary. Immediately and unconditionally universal arming of the people shall be introduced so that they and the militia and the army shall be an integral whole. Capitalists must pay the workers for their days of service in the militia.

11. Does the state need an officialdom (chinovniks) of the conventional type?

A and B. Unquestionably. Nine-tenths of them are the sons and brothers of the landholders and capitalists. They should continue to constitute a privileged, in fact, an irremovable body of persons.

C. Hardly the proper time to put a question which has already been put practically by the Paris Commune.

D. It does not. All officials must not only be elected by the people, but also be subject to recall by them; also each and every delegate. Their pay shall not exceed that of a good worker. They are gradually to be replaced by the national militia and its various divisions.

12. Must officers be elected by the soldiers?

A and B. No, it would be bad for the landholders and capitalists. If the soldiers cannot be otherwise contented, we must promise them this reform and afterwards take it away from them.

C. Yes.

D. Not only elected, but every step of every officer and general must be subject to control by special soldiers' committees.

13. Are arbitrary removals of their superiors by the soldiers desirable?

A and B. They are very bad. Guchkov already forbade them, even threatening the use of force. We must support Guchkov.

C. Yes, but it remains to be decided whether they must be removed before or after consulting the Advisory Commission.

D. They are in every respect indispensable. The soldiers will obey only the powers of their own choice; they can *respect* no others.

14. In favor of this war or against it?

A and B. Unquestionably in favor, for it brings in unheard of profits to the capitalists and promises to perpetuate their rule, thanks to dissension among the workers, who are egged on against each other. The workers must be deceived by calling the war a war for national defense, with the special object of dethroning Wilhelm.

C. In general, we are opposed to imperialistic wars, but we are willing to permit ourselves to be fooled, and to call this a war of "revolutionary defense," and to support an imperialistic war waged by the imperialistic government of Guchkov, Milyukov & Co.

D. Absolutely opposed to all imperialist wars, to *all* bourgeois governments which wage them, among them our own Provisional Government; absolutely opposed to "revolutionary defense" in Russia.

15. Are we in favor of or against the predatory international treaties concluded between the Czar and England, France, etc.? (For the strangling of Persia, the division of China, Turkey, Austria, etc.)

A and B. Absolutely *in favor*. At the same time we must not think of publishing these treaties, for Anglo-French imperialist Capital does not desire it, nor do their governments, nor can Russian capital afford to initiate the public into all its dirty practices.

C. Against, but we hope that the Advisory Commission, aided by a simultaneous "campaign" among the masses, may "influence" the capitalist government.

D. Against. Our whole task is simply this: to enlighten the masses as to the utter hopelessness of expecting any-

thing of this kind from capitalist governments, and the necessity of giving all power to the proletariat and the poorest peasants.

16. For annexations or against?

A and B. If the annexations are to be accomplished by German capitalists and their robber chieftain, Wilhelm, we are opposed to them. If by the English, we are not opposed, for they are "our" allies. If by our capitalists, who forcibly retain within the boundaries of Russia the races oppressed by the Czar, then we are *in favor*, for we do *not* use the term annexation in this connection.

C. Against annexations, but we hope it may be possible to obtain from capitalist governments a "promise" to renounce annexations.

D. Against annexations. Any promise of a capitalist government to renounce annexations is a huge fraud. To show it up is very simple: just demand that each nation be freed from the yoke of *its own* capitalists.

17. In favor of the "Liberty Loan" or opposed to it?

A and B. Entirely in favor, for it facilitates the waging of an imperialist war, that is, a war to determine which group of capitalists shall rule the world.

C. *In favor*, for our illogical attitude on "revolutionary defense" forces us into this obvious defection from the cause of internationalism.

D. Against, for the war remains imperialistic, being waged by capitalists in alliance with capitalists, in the interest of capitalists.

18. Shall we leave to capitalist governments the task of expressing the desire of the nations for peace, or shall we not?

A and B. We shall, for the experience of the Social-Patriots of the French Republic shows best how the people may be deceived by such a process: say anything you please, but in reality retain all conquests we have

made from the Germans (their colonies) and take away from the Germans all conquests made by those robbers.

C. *We shall*, since we have not yet relinquished all the unfounded hopes which the petite bourgeoisie attaches to the capitalists.

D. No, for the class-conscious worker cherishes no hopes whatever from the capitalist class, and it is our function to enlighten the masses as to the baselessness of such hopes.

19. Must all monarchies be abolished?

A and B. No, certainly not the English, Italian and Allied monarchies, only the German, Austrian, Turkish and Bulgarian, for victory over them will increase our profits tenfold.

C. A certain "order" must be followed and a beginning made with Wilhelm; the Allied monarchies may wait.

D. Revolutions do not proceed in a fixed order. Only *actual* revolutionaries may be trusted, and in all countries without exception, *all* monarchs must be dethroned.

20. Shall the peasants at once take all the land of the landholders?

A and B. By no means. We must wait for the Constituent Assembly. Shingarev already pointed out that when the capitalists take away the power from the Czar, that is a great and glorious revolution, but when the peasants take away the land from the landholders, that is arbitrary tyranny. A Commission of Adjustment must be appointed, with equal representation of landholders and peasants, and the chairman must be of the official (*chinovnik*) class, that is, from among those same capitalists and landholders.

C. It would be better for the peasants to wait for the Constituent Assembly.

D. All the land must be taken at once. Order must be strictly maintained by the Councils of Peasants' Delegates. The production of bread and meat must be in-

creased, the soldiers better fed. Destruction of cattle and of tools, etc., is not permissible.

21. Shall we limit ourselves to the Councils of Peasants' Delegates only for the management of lands and for all village questions in general?

A and B. The landholders and capitalists are entirely opposed to the sole authority of the Councils of Peasants' Delegates in agrarian matters. But if these Councils are unavoidable, we must adapt ourselves to them, for the rich peasant is a capitalist, after all.

C. We might for the present accept the councils, for "in principle" we do not deny the necessity of a separate organization of the agrarian wage workers.

D. It will be impossible to limit ourselves only to general Councils of Peasants' Delegates, for the wealthy peasants are of the same capitalist class that is always inclined to injure or deceive the farmhands, day laborers and the poorer peasants. We must at once form special organizations of these latter classes of the village populations both within the Councils of Peasants' Delegates and in the form of special Councils of Delegates of the Farmers' Workers.

22. Shall the people take into their hands the largest and most powerful monopolistic organizations of capitalism, the banks, manufacturing syndicates, etc.?

A and B. Not by any means, since that might injure the landholders and capitalists.

C. Generally speaking, we are in favor of handing over such organizations to the entire people, but to think of or prepare for this condition now is very untimely.

D. We must at once *prepare* the Councils of Workers' Delegates, the Councils of Delegates of Banking Employes and others for the taking of all such steps as are feasible and completely realizable toward the union of all banks into one single national bank and then toward a control of the Councils of Workers' Delegates over the banks and syndicates, and then toward their nationaliza-

tion, that is, their passing over into the possession of the whole people.

23. What form of Socialist International, establishing and realizing a brotherly union of all the workers in all countries, is now desirable for the nations?

A and B. Generally speaking, any kind of Socialist International is harmful and dangerous to capitalists and landholders, but if the German Plekhanov, whose name is Scheidemann, will come to an agreement with the Russian Scheidemann, whose name is Plekhanov, and if they can find in each other any vestige remaining of their socialist consciences, then we, the capitalists, must hail with delight *such an* International, of *such* socialists, as stand by the side of *their own* governments.

C. A Socialist International is needed that will include all elements: the Scheidemanns, the Plekhanovs and the "centrists," who are those who vacillate between the Social-Patriotism and Internationalism. The bigger the mixup, the greater their "unity": long live our great socialistic unity!

D. The nations need only that International which consists of the really revolutionary workers, who are capable of putting an end to the awful and criminal slaughter of nations, capable of delivering humanity from the yoke of capitalism. Only such people (groups, parties, etc.) as the German Socialist Karl Liebknecht, now in a German jail, only people who will tirelessly struggle with *their own* government and *their own* bourgeoisie, and *their own* Social-Patriots, and *their own* "centrists," can and must immediately establish that International which is necessary to the nations.

24. Must the fraternization between soldiers of the warring countries, at the front, be encouraged?

A and B. No; it is bad for the interests of the landholders and capitalists, since it may accelerate the liberation of humanity from their yoke.

C. Yes, it would be good. But we are not fully convinced that such an encouragement of fraternization should be at once undertaken in all warring countries.

D. Yes; it is good and indispensable. It is absolutely necessary in all countries at war to encourage all attempts at fraternization between the soldiers of *both* warring groups.

25. What should be the color of the flag indicating both the nature and character of the various political parties?

A. Black, for this is the real Black Hundred.

B. Yellow, for that is the international banner of those workers who serve capital through choice and not by compulsion.

C. Pink, for their whole policy is the policy of rosewater.

D. Red, for that is the emblem of the international proletarian revolution.

(Supplement)

Resolution on War, Passed by the General Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party.

April 26-May 9, 1917.

(All voting in favor except seven, who refrained from voting at all).

The present war, on the part of all the belligerents, is an imperialist war, that is, it is fought by capitalists for the division of spoils through their domination of the world, for markets, for financial capital, for the suppression of the backward nations, etc. Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and weakens the powers of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, and later of the neutral countries. In Russia the prolongation of the war involves also a grave danger to the revolution and to its further development.

The passing of government authority, in Russia, into the hands of the Provisional Government, that is, the government of the landholders and capitalists, did not and could not alter the character and significance of the Russian participation in this war.

This fact became particularly apparent when the new government not only did not publish the secret treaties concluded between the late Czar and the capitalist governments of England, France, etc., but even formally confirmed these secret treaties, which promised Russian capitalists a free hand in China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc., without consulting the Russian people. The concealment of these treaties from the Russian people completely deceived them as to the true character of the war.

For this reason the proletarian party can support neither the present war, nor the present government, nor its loans without breaking completely with internationalism, that is, with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all lands in their struggle under the yoke of capitalism.

No confidence is to be placed in the promises of the present government to renounce annexations, that is, conquests of foreign territory, or in the promise to renounce forcible retention within the confines of Russia of this or that nationality. For, in the first place, since capitalists are bound together by the thousand threads of banking capital, they cannot renounce annexations in the present war, as they have not renounced the profits on the billions invested in loans, in concessions, in war industries, etc. And, in the second place, the new government, having, in order to deceive the people, renounced annexations, then proceeded to state, through the mouth of Milyukov (Moscow, April 9 (22), 1917), that it had no intentions of renouncing annexations and to confirm, in the note of April 18 and the elucidation of the note (April 22), the aggressive character of its policy. In warning the people against the empty promises of capitalists the Conference takes pains to point out the necessity of a sharp distinction between a renunciation of annexations *in words* and a renunciation of annexations *in fact*, that is, the immediate publication and abrogation of the secret treaties for conquest, and the immediate granting to all nationalities of the right to determine whether they wish to become independent governments or to become part of any other state.

II

The so-called "revolutionary defense," which, in Russia, has taken possession of all the nationalist parties (national-socialists, laborites, social-revolutionists, etc.), as well as the opportunist party of the social-democratic *mensheviks* (Organizing Committee, Tseretelli, Cheidze, etc.), as well as the majority of the non-partisan revolutionists, embodies in itself, by reason of its class position, on the one hand the interests and the standpoint of the wealthier peasantry and a part of the small landlords, who, like the capitalists, draw a profit from their domination over the weaker nationalities. On the other hand, the "revolutionary defense" is the outcome of the deception by the capitalists of part of the proletariat and semi-proletariat of the cities and villages who by their class position have no interest in the profits of the capitalists and in the waging of an imperialist war.

The Conference declares that any form of "revolutionary defense" is completely intolerable and would actually betoken a total break with the principles of socialism and internationalism. As for the "defensive" tendencies present among the great masses, our party will struggle against these tendencies by ceaselessly emphasizing the truth that any attitude of uncritical confidence in the government of the capitalists at the present moment is one of the greatest obstructions to an early conclusion of the war.

III

As for the most important question of the manner of concluding as soon as possible the present capitalist war, not by a dictated peace, but by a truly democratic peace, the Conference recognizes and declares the following:

This war cannot be ended by a refusal of the soldiers of one side only, to continue the war, by a simple cessation of warlike activities on the part of one of the warring groups only. The Conference reiterates its protests against the low intrigues circulated by the capitalists against our party, with the object of spreading the impression that we are in favor of a separate peace

with Germany. We consider the German capitalists to be the same band of robbers as the capitalists of Russia, England, France, etc., and Emperor Wilhelm to be the same crowned bandit as Nicholas II and the monarchs of England, Italy, Rumania and the rest.

Our party will explain to the people, with patience and preciseness, the truth that war is always bound up indissolubly with the policies of certain definite *classes*, that this war may only be terminated by a democratic peace if the governing powers of at least some of the belligerent countries are handed over to the class of the proletariat and semi-proletariat, who are really capable of putting an end to the bondage of capitalism.

The revolutionary class, having taken into its hands the governing power in Russia, would inaugurate a series of measures to abolish the economic rule of capitalists, as well as of measures to bring about their complete political sterilization and would immediately and frankly offer all peoples a democratic peace on the basis of a definite relinquishment of every possible form of annexation and contribution. Such measures, and such an open offer would create a perfect understanding between the workers of the belligerent countries and would inevitably lead to an uprising of the proletariat against such imperialist governments as might resist the peace offered them under the above conditions.

Until the revolutionary class in Russia shall have taken over the entire authority of the government, our party will consistently support those proletarian parties and groups in foreign countries as are already, during the continuance of the war, fighting against their imperialist governments and their bourgeoisies. Particularly, the party will encourage any incipient fraternization of masses of soldiers of all the belligerent countries, at the front, with the object of transforming this vague and instinctive expression of the solidarity of the oppressed into a class-conscious movement, with as much organization as is feasible, for

the taking over of all the powers of government in all the belligerent countries by the revolutionary proletariat.

* * *

The above was written early in April, 1917. To the possible objection that now, since the forming of the "new" coalition government, on May 6, 1917, it may be a little out of date, I should like to make the following answer:

"No, for the Advisory Commission did not really disappear, but simply changed its quarters, which it now shares with the cabinet members. The moving of the Chernovs and Tseretellis into their new quarters did not change either their policy or that of their party."

Imperialism and the New Middle Class

By S. J. RUTGERS

The ever growing productivity of labor combined with a relatively constant standard of living of the workers, means an increasing volume of products in the hands of the Capitalist class. Personal squander by the individual capitalists cannot dispose of these values; in fact, unlimited luxury as displayed in some other periods of history is against the capitalist morals, the accumulation of capital being a fundamental condition for successful competition.

Therefore Capitalism has to expand, has to crush the remnants of other forms of production, has to increase its field of action, has to extend its markets.

Commercial capital strengthened by the robbery of Far Eastern countries, played an important part in the birth of European industrial capitalism and commercial Colonialism continued to play an important part in the turbulent life of this new giant. But at the same time this colonialism fundamentally changed its character. Instead of robbing the wealth of nature in foreign countries and killing the people, the process reversed into robbing the people and killing nature. A period in which the valuable products of tropical regions were "traded" against a worthless piece of mirror or a bottle of the poorest gin, bribing the native chiefs and taking by force whatever was not given up voluntarily was followed by a period of more regular "exchange."

The European industry commenced to dump its cheap products, especially those of the textile industry into the colonies and insisted upon having the natives produce chiefly those products which are of special interest to western "civilization." This not only resulted in greatly destroying the picturesque landscapes by substituting monotonous plantations for a multitude of inland fields and gardens and cheap cotton clothes for the charming products of skillful home industry, but it meant a new form of slavery as well. The introduction of money as a regular feature of economic life, forced upon the native population, if necessary,

by the levying of taxes, resulted in a greater amount of misery, exploitation and starvation than in the worst periods of direct colonial plunder. This was the era of free trade in which interference with the local affairs of the colonies was generally restricted to dealings with the native chiefs and adequate protection of commerce, especially in ports and big centers of traffic. This was also the era of starvation in British and other colonies.

Again the character of colonial exploitation had to change. The increasing outpour of commodities into undeveloped countries combined with primitive methods of exploitation of the natives reached a point where these commodities got a soul, became active life organizations, became *capital* ready to aggressively exploit native labor, coin native blood into gold.

This change came with a change in the character of the commodities exported from Europe.

The production of commodities for consumption in the old capitalist countries soon reached a point of more or less permanent overproduction. Unnecessary to state that at the same time millions were starving none the less for want of all the necessities of life. But production for profit merely considers wants that can be paid for and the workers get only a small part of what they make. Selling to those occupied in more primitive forms of production; agricultural States in Europe or colonies abroad means exchange for foodstuffs or basic materials for production. Foreign products may help to stimulate luxury and complexity of life and foreign and native primitive people can be educated by missionaries and contact with "civilized" life to use more products of modern industry but the limits are rather narrow. For it would be an absurdity for capital to educate the natives in the colonies and the peasants at home to such a degree of luxury that they could buy largely the good things of life, which would mean higher wages and less profits.

Japan, i. e., the latest achievement of capitalism, did not develop its home market in any extensive way for fear that the low

wages would come to a quick end, but embarked at once on a policy of export and imperialism.

Dumping commodities for consumption, such as cheap industrial products and clothes into colonies and agricultural districts, does not give much relief from "over-production" because they yield in return other commodities for consumption, mostly foodstuffs and luxuries and materials for production. But the workers cannot buy foodstuffs, etc., beyond the extent of their wages and an increase of materials for production only aggravates the surplus of commodities.

What to do with this growing surplus, how to invest the accumulating profits? Production for consumption evidently results in disaster and this fact was already demonstrated in the beginning of the last century by terrible crises in periods of about seven to ten years. A few years of prosperity and the capitalist organization of production again suffered a breakdown. Such a condition could not continue without serious revolt. There was only one way out: increased production of means of production, in order to produce again means of production which constitutes another absurdity in the development of capitalism.

Production of tools of production means more workers, more wages, more material, more mining, more miners, but in some form or other it means an ever growing quantity of products. It can bring only a temporary relief.

Building railroads, canals, harborworks, factories, offices, opening new countries by reclamation and irrigation, building new fleets and equipping armies for future conquest, may continue for a considerable length of time, in fact has continued for the last forty or fifty years but it cannot continue forever. A crisis every seven years may be avoided but the crisis after fifty years means a world war, a revolution or both.

Individual squander is no capitalist feature in the sense as it was in the Roman empire and the latter part of Feudalism, but we notice a *general* "waste" inherent in the system as such, which is far more effective in destroying surplus commodities. I won't repeat the well known elements of wastefulness in the regular

process of production and especially of distribution under Capitalism. I only mention two points: First, the enormous waste in foreign investments and foreign enterprises. A great many of the railroads and other colonial experiments do not yield results or only poor results, and in perhaps a majority of the cases profits start only after a "reorganization" at great loss to the investors. This is logical. The main object of the enterprise was to get rid of capital and means of production at a profit. As long as the bankers who float the enterprise and the big manufacturers who are on the inside get at their money, it does not matter whether a few thousands of smaller capitalists are cheated of several millions.

Second, the fabulous development of militarism and war. Militarism to the extent as known to us, and especially this war continuing for years would be impossible if there was not such an excess in productiveness, if it was not to a certain extent desirable from a general capitalist standpoint to destroy and waste values as well as men who produce those values. It therefore is not in accordance with actual conditions to expect that after this war it will take a generation to rebuild and reconstruct "normal" conditions. There may be expected after the necessary readjustments a short stimulus, a short period of "prosperity," a new and more intensive rush for military equipments and another war.

A world peace and a binding agreement to divide the world into permanent spheres of influence is contrary to the character of present day Capitalism, because a "normal" capitalist development is impossible. Only in a mad race for production of means of production to produce again means of production and means to destroy these means of production, can Capitalism maintain itself, now that it has fulfilled its historic task of increased productivity. There is no place under the sun for all the capitalist countries, there is not even sufficient place under the sun for one Capitalist Country unlimited in its expansion. The only hope for the Capitalist system as such is the mutual destruction of each other's products with a chance for the very biggest and most efficient to keep a larger share in the general cataclysm.

Such is the character of Imperialism in peace and in war. And this character dominates all social institutions and all human relations. It means aggression and brutality, it means an utter disregard of human life and human rights, save the right of the strongest: the strong man policy. It puts into control the basic industries, with steel and machinery in their broadest sense leading, and financial capital as its centralized expression. It creates slavery not only of the workers, but of the smaller capitalists and middlemen as well. In fact all so-called independent capitalists become servants of Big Monopolistic Capital ready to be swallowed or crushed if any thought of resistance should enter their servile brains.

This is an important feature of Imperialism: the submission of the average capitalist and the middle classes in general towards Big Monopolistic Capital, the welding together of all of the capitalist interests into one aggressive power expressed by one brutal ideology of "nationalism" and strong-men policy.

To understand this phenomenon more fully, it is necessary to turn to economic changes as the result of concentration and monopolization of capital and industry. The monopoly tends to overcome free competition, one of the pillars of the capitalist system. Free competition is essential for dividing the surplus value amongst the different classes of capitalists who participate in the production and distribution. We know that through the divergencies between price and value, the general surplus value is divided over different industries, etc., each with a different technical development, so as to establish a tendency towards an equal profit-rate for capital. This is brought about by free competition or free distribution of capital, because capital will invest more readily in spheres yielding a greater profit with the result of lowering prices until the establishment of a kind of equilibrium.

The Monopoly, however, restricts artificially the possibility of freely investing money in its particular sphere and enables to take a greater part of the general surplus value through its

price policy. This price policy is subject to capitalist limitations, but is not governed by the old capitalist law of equal profit for equal capital. This does not affect the total amount of surplus value; it does not affect as such the exploitation of labor, but it does affect the distribution of the surplus value among the different capitalist groups.

A complete monopoly in one of the basic industries could take all the profits from the other capitalist enterprises by means of price fixing. Of course, there is no such thing as complete monopoly, but strong monopolies as we have today go far in securing extra profit. And where the different monopolistic interests are strongly united into Big financial organizations in the hands of a few Moneykings, as is the case in the United States, the power of price regulation is almost unlimited.

What are the limits besides those resulting from the total amount of surplus value created by labor?

Taking away all the profit from so-called independent capitalist enterprises would kill these enterprises, and Monopolistic industry needs for the time being the products and services of outside industries and means of distribution. These can be swallowed gradually, but only as a process of development that cannot be forced beyond certain limits of technique and organization.

Independent capitalists therefore are allowed to continue their existence and to receive a part of the general surplus value, so as to give the average capitalist a living according to certain historic standards, which standards naturally will show a tendency to fall, as the Monopolistic interests continue to grow and become more independent from the co-operation with outside capital.

The capitalist State, as the representative of the *general* capitalist interests, has to look at it that the monopolists do not kill their competitors faster than is compatible with the technical development and the organization of our system of production and distribution. This is in the interest of Big

Capital itself and does in no way interfere with the fact that the State is dominated by the Interests of the Moneykings.

But how to explain that we do not see a strong fight of the "independent" capitalists against the monopolists who evidently take a part from their sacred profits? To those who consider class struggles from the narrow point of mere conflicts between the economic interests of groups and individuals, this lack of fighting spirit must look inexplicable. Conflicts of economic interests, however, only get the wider meaning of class struggles, in so far as they represent the clash of an uprising class with the powers that be. In the conflict between the highly concentrated monopoly and the "independent" capitalist, the latter represents the past instead of the future and his power, therefore, is insignificant. The "independent" capitalist can and will be swallowed by Big Capital, and a real opposition would only help to hasten the process for those in revolt. Only the workers are indispensable for any form of capitalist profit and there lies the strength for final victory. Conditions are ripe for a Socialist commonwealth, if the workers only develop the power of their number and their organization. The only chance for the masters to postpone their downfall is to disorganize and to divide the working class, by bribing certain groups and certain "leaders."

The Moneykings are willing to pay for service and they may grant considerable allowances to "independent" capitalists or leading employers. It is part of their wasteful expenditure for the upkeep of the present system not only to have an army and a police, churches and professors to subjugate and to fool the workers, but also to allow a class of smaller capitalists to gain such profits as to make them feel comfortable enough to support and defend the system. It is this same policy that allows some superior officials and also the upper layers of labor to secure a larger salary or wage.

This explains the ideology of these groups in favor of Imperialism. It goes far in explaining the collapse of the Socialist parties built up greatly on the middle class groups of better

paid workers, intellectuals, officials and small capitalists. The privileged position of these groups when compared with the great army of average workers, combined with the absence of class power to defend these privileges, gives them an interest in supporting the powers that control the privileges and makes them dependent tools of Imperialism. The more powerful the particular group of Imperialists upon whose favors these servile groups depend, the better chances for well paid jobs and other favors and bribes, which gives a material basis for modern "nationalism," whose main feature is the fact that it is not national. Loyal to the Imperialistic Unit, they must adapt themselves to the most curious combinations of heterogeneous nations and governments and must change the object of their devotion with a readiness of mind far more surprising than was ever accomplished under the slogan, "The King is dead, long live the King."

These groups have no economic strength because they are not vital to production. They can be substituted or eliminated if necessary and have largely the character of capitalist servants. And we know that servants never made a good material for the support of class-conscious workers. They will continue to cooperate with the old masters as long as these are in a position to promise rewards for service. They will desert the old ruling class as soon as its power is waning beyond repair. And then they will ask the favor of the new powers by claiming to have been in sympathy with them all the time.

The only class that is fit to bring about the Social Revolution is the great mass of average workers, who produce the surplus value, who are indispensable in the process of production, upon whose exploitation is built the whole system of capitalist organization and capitalist wealth.

Nationalism in its modern Imperialistic form is the ideology which binds together the middle classes, including the upper layers of labor with the plutocratic masters of the world; Mass-action the weapon of the workers to defeat this alliance.

The present class struggle must take the form of mass-action against Imperialism.

The Case of Fraina

By EDWARD DRYDEN

Louis C. Fraina and Edward Ralph Cheyney, arrested at a meeting of Conscientious Objectors, were found guilty of conspiracy to violate the Draft Law by a jury in the United States District Court, New York City, on October 18.

Fraina and Cheyney were arrested as Conscientious Objectors, tried as Conscientious Objectors, and convicted as Conscientious Objectors. This is the first conviction of its kind in the country, and consequently assumes a very important aspect.

Fraina has been a dominant figure in the agitation against conscription in New York City, having actively opposed the introduction of conscription, worked for its repeal, and thrown himself vigorously in the Conscientious Objectors' movement, by speaking at many meetings and through a campaign in *The New Internationalist*, of which he is editor. The prosecution was aware of this revolutionary activity, and pressed the case, particularly against Fraina, Cheyney having been arrested as an accessory to prove conspiracy and strike at Fraina.

The general and specific issues involved are of the utmost importance, and the defense is determined upon fighting the case to a finish, both in the higher courts through appeal, and before the court of public opinion through propaganda.

The first important issue involved is that of conspiracy. Fraina and Cheyney were arrested and convicted under the law of conspiracy—a law that is a monstrous perversion of justice, and that has been used repeatedly and is still being used against the revolutionist when a specific offense cannot be proven. Under the law of conspiracy, it is the easiest thing in the world to secure a conviction, the prosecution being allowed to introduce general evidence in the attempt to get something across that may influence a jury to bring in a verdict of guilty.

In a general way, the purpose of the trial and conviction was to strike at the Conscientious Objectors. But this purpose was turned into a specific menace by the charge of the judge to the jury, under which *it is possible to automatically indict and con-*

vict two or more Conscientious Objectors for implied conspiracy to violate the Draft Law.

The defense introduced two telegrams to show that there was a general public discussion of the status of Conscientious Objectors, of which the meeting at which Fraina and Cheyney were arrested was an expression and a part.

The first telegram was sent to Secretary of War Baker by The League of Conscientious Objectors, under whose auspices the meeting was held, and read as follows:

"Representative of 3,500 Conscientious Objectors in New York whose idealism compels them to decline all forms of military service, we ask: What of the Conscientious Objector? May we have your reply not later than Wednesday, so that it will be possible to advise at our meeting, Thursday, the stand you suggest."

The second telegram was the reply of F. P. Keppel, Confidential Clerk to the Secretary of War, and read as follows:

"Telegram received, but no specific reply at present available, the matter being still under consideration by Secretary of War and President."

It was the contention of the defense that these telegrams specifically, and the other evidence generally, proved that there was no conspiracy, the purpose of the meeting being to create public sentiment for the purpose of securing a favorable ruling for the Conscientious Objector by the Government; and that there was so conclusively no conspiracy that the Secretary of War himself was considering the claims of the Objectors. But the presiding judge, Robert T. Ervin, used the telegrams against the defense and as proving conspiracy. Judge Ervin's charge, in substance, was that if the defendants were aware of the sending of the first telegram, which stated specifically that The League of Conscientious Objectors was an organization the members of which "declined all forms of military service," and if, knowing that these were the purposes of the organization holding the meeting, the defendants nevertheless spoke at that meeting, they were guilty of implied conspiracy to violate the draft law, and the jury should render a verdict of guilty.

If this verdict, gained in such a manner, is allowed to stand, then members of organizations of Conscientious Objectors are *de facto* guilty of conspiracy to violate the Draft Law, and may be indicted, convicted and sent to prison.

It is this which makes the case of Fraina peculiarly important to the Socialist and revolutionary movement, and an active propaganda is necessary to assist the defense in its fight.

The case arose out of a meeting of Conscientious Objectors at the Labor Temple, New York City, Thursday, September 27, one of many at which Fraina has spoken. The speakers scheduled were Fraina, Cheyney, Arturo Giovannitti, James H. Maurer and Charles Sonnenschein.

The meeting was packed, and more than sixty detectives were present in the audience, as well as United States Marshal McCarthy and United States Ass. District Attorney Harold A. Content. Cheyney acted as Chairman, and then Fraina spoke. As Fraina was saying, "They cannot conscript the Conscientious Obector. They cannot do it, because we have made up our minds and we are going to stick," Marshal McCarthy and a squad of detectives charged upon the speaker, dragged Fraina off the platform and brutally dispersed the audience, many women going into hysterics and fainting at the brutality.

In the rear of the hall Fraina was guarded by two detectives, and after the meeting was completely broken up, McCarthy asked him if he had registered. Fraina admitted that he had, but refused to show his registration card upon the Marshal's demand. "You have no authority to ask me that, and I refuse," said Fraina. The Marshal's anger was aroused and he ordered Fraina's arrest on the charge of not having registered. A few minutes later he changed his mind, and said that the charge should be made disorderly conduct. Fraina was taken to Police Headquarters, where he spent the night as a "detained prisoner." In the meanwhile, Cheyney had been arrested on the charge of not having registered.

The next day, however, the two young men were indicted on two counts for conspiracy to violate the draft law, and held in \$2,500 bail each. Hearing was set for the following Friday.

On the following Tuesday Ass. District Attorney Content appeared before the Federal Grand Jury and secured a new indictment on the charge of violation of the criminal section of the Espionage Act, and a hearing was held the following day. Counsel for the defense tried to secure sufficient time to prepare their case, but the government refused, orders having been received from above to rush the case to a conviction.

When the case went to trial, there were two indictments against the defendants, and two counts in each indictment.

The indictment under the Draft Law alleged, (1) that the defendants had conspired to themselves violate the Draft Law by agreeing to refuse military service, and (2) that they had conspired to aid, abet and induce others to violate the law.

The indictment under the criminal section of the Espionage Act alleged, (1) an actual attempt to "willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny and the refusal of duty, in the military and naval forces of the United States," and (2) a conspiracy to commit the same offense.

The maximum penalty under the two indictments is 22 years' imprisonment and \$20,000 fine for each defendant.

The prosecution introduced as evidence the speech made by Cheyney as chairman of the meeting, and the speech of Fraina, as well as his leaflet on "Conscientious Objectors," which was distributed at the meeting.

The passages in Fraina's speech considered most objectionable by United States Assistant District Attorney Content were as follows:

"It has been borne strongly into my mind that it is not simply by force or by physical authority that a reactionary and oppressive government maintains its rule and its control over the people. Force and physical authority go a great way, but the governments and the ruling capitalist interests that governments represent have another power, another force, much deeper and more subtle, much more poisonous and difficult to combat—a force which they use for the purpose of imposing their wishes and interests upon the people, and that is the force of symbols, the power of ideas. This country judging from the capitalist stand-

point is blessed, and judging from the working class standpoint is cursed, with a President who is particularly adept in the making of symbols and in the coining of phrases, which in themselves mean nothing in the struggle for freedom and democracy, but which are so beautiful and fascinating that they exert a poisonous influence upon the minds of the people. There is not a single phrase of this character that the President has coined, which, if put to the test, will not be shown to be poisonous and misleading, absolutely different from what the phrase or symbol apparently means."

"There are hundreds of thousands, aye there are millions of men in this country—some of whom have the courage of their convictions and others who have not—who are unwilling to fight and to be conscripted. But they are equally being conscripted with the few who are willing. They are being taken by the scruff of the neck, and made to fight—in a war for democracy! Is this a conscription of the willing, or is it a conscription of the unwilling carried through by force and imposed upon the people of this country? It is precisely at this point that the Conscientious Objector makes his protest."

"The problem of the Conscientious Objector goes much deeper. We are asked that because this country is in a war, because the war is an accomplished fact, that the Conscientious Objector should submit to the accomplished fact. Because a fact is a fact does not necessarily mean that I should abide by that fact; and if that fact represents reaction, if that fact represents tyranny, if that fact represents something which is a brutal violation of my conscience and my principles, I am not going to recognize that fact, and they cannot compel me."

"It is an evil thing that men are killed at the front. But I shall not prevent those men from being killed by myself going out to kill and be killed. I am then directly promoting the horrible business of butchery; and by standing by the principles of the Conscientious Objector, by striking not at the temporary enemy across an imaginary frontier, but by striking directly at the economic and social causes that promote war, I am doing

effective work to destroy war and to prevent this horrible butchery ever happening again."

"The government is wise in placing a premium upon the religious Conscientious Objector (by exemption) and penalizing the non-religious one, because the system of things that this government represents, the infamous system of Capitalism, has nothing to fear from the religious Conscientious Objector. But it has everything to fear from the non-religious, from the Socialist Conscientious Objector, because he is not interested in his conscience alone. He is interested in the social principles that his conscience represents and is trying to overthrow the infamous system of things that produces war and other evils. In that sense the non-religious Conscientious Objector is dangerous. They may tolerate the Quaker, and grant him exemption. But they are not going to do it with the non-religious Conscientious Objector, because while we represent our conscience, our feelings, our emotions, we represent more than that—we represent a revolutionary principle that strikes directly at the system of things that produces war. We represent a new social order that is going to overthrow this system of things. We are not going to be coddled. We are not going to be exempted. We are going to be penalized. We are going to be compelled, if they can compel us. But I say right now that they cannot conscript the Conscientious Objector! They cannot do it, because we have made up our minds and we are going to stick."

The passages from Fraina's leaflet considered most objectionable by the prosecution were as follows:

"The Conscientious Objector is determined, come what may, to refuse any form of military service."

"He is equally determined to refuse alternative, or non-combatant service."

"Against all forms of military service, because all are objectionable—that is our animating purpose."

"The Conscientious Objector is supremely indifferent to what the government may decide."

During the trial itself, which lasted four days, counsel for the

defense, under the able management of Louis B. Boudin, completely smashed the case of the prosecution.

Boudin first succeeded in having the first count under the Espionage indictment dismissed; and before the case went to the jury, he made a motion to dismiss the Espionage indictment entirely, on the ground that the statute referred to attempts to incite mutiny, insubordination and the refusal of service in the *actual armed forces* of the United States, not among men liable to service, and that the evidence did not show that there were present at the meeting any men actually in the military service of the United States. In spite of the frenzied arguments of Prosecutor Content, the Judge granted the motion. This is an important ruling, as it shows that there should be no indictments under this section of the Espionage Act unless the actual military forces are involved.

In his address to the jury, Mr. Content indulged in a lot of talk about Americanism, and free speech not being free licence, and insisted upon a verdict of guilty.

In his speech to the jury Boudin made a powerful argument on the merits of the case. This was a prosecution of over-excitement. Conspiracy is very broad and indefinite, a peculiar thing, and it is largely left to the imagination to say whether there was or was not any conspiracy. The simple fact is that there has been no evidence introduced to show that these defendants entered into a conspiracy. They had never met prior to the meeting, and it is absurd to contend that they conspired to themselves violate the law by agreeing to refuse military service. Their ideas were determined before they spoke at the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status of Conscientious Objectors, to create public sentiment to influence the government and the President to recognize their convictions. The law recognizes conscientious objections in its provision exempting objectors affiliated with certain religious creeds or organizations. These men were agitating the problem of the non-religious Conscientious Objectors, a general public problem discussed by many individuals, including the President and the Secretary of War, as the evidence introduced by the defense

shows and proves; and this meeting, the speeches and the leaflet were part of this general public discussion. The speeches and the leaflet may be unlawful in themselves, but they have no relation whatever to the charge of conspiracy, in fact, are in flagrant violation of the charge. In order to find these defendants guilty you must find that they engaged in a conspiracy.

When the case went to the jury, there were two counts in the indictment, the one alleging that the defendants conspired to themselves violate the draft law, the other that they conspired to aid, induce and abet others to do the same thing. The jury found the defendants not guilty on the first count, and guilty on the second.

Judge Ervin imposed a sentence of thirty days for each defendant in the Mercer County, N. J., penitentiary. The reason for his light sentence, according to the judge, was the youth of the defendants—Fraina being 25 years old, and Cheyney 21. Prosecutor Content pleaded for a particularly heavy sentence for Fraina, whom he accused of being the more dangerous of the two, editor of *The New International*, and the leader of the Conscientious Objector propaganda.

The case is being appealed, in spite of the light sentence, because of the vital issues involved. This is the first case where Conscientious Objectors have been convicted because of their propaganda, and through this conviction a blow is struck at the whole movement for freedom of conscience and action.

The issue is serious. It must be fought vigorously and determinedly. The defense is organizing a campaign to arouse public sentiment, and needs co-operation and support.

Stockholm

By LIONEL PETERSEN

The recent statement issued by the organization committee in charge of arrangements for the much-postponed Stockholm Conference brings the question of an International Peace Conference again to the fore.

The outrageous and infinitely stupid action of the Wilson War Administration in refusing passports to the American delegates to the Stockholm Conference has had the effect of establishing that Conference firmly in the hearts of American Socialists. The Socialist press of the country deemed it its "patriotic" duty to picture Stockholm as the "Hope of the World," etc., etc., without the slightest attempt at a real evaluation of the forces gathered, or likely to be gathered there, and the work that might reasonably be expected to be there accomplished. The more the pity. For at no time and on no occasion was calm and critical judgment more necessary in connection with a Socialist enterprise than in connection with the Stockholm Conference.

It is perhaps still too early to pass final judgment upon the first, abortive attempt at Stockholm—which is sharply to be differentiated from the later attempt made by the Russian Socialists at such a conference. But the known facts seem to indicate that it was at least of a very dubious character, and that the eulogies showered upon it by the Socialist press of this country was largely undeserved, to say the least. It is only fair perhaps to say in this connection that the New York *Volkszeitung*, which has made so enviable a record for fidelity to principle during the entire duration of the war, has, after some hesitation, finally taken position *against* the First Stockholm Conference, believing it to be nothing but a gathering of "Social Patriots."

This judgment, and perhaps even a more severe one, seems to be justified by the opinions expressed by some of the most valiant fighters against war and imperialism in the ranks of the European Socialists, as well as by some of the facts attending the calling and the meeting of the Conference. There is, of

course, no doubt of the fact that the Dutch-Scandinavian committee which called the Conference was actuated by the very best of motives. But there seems to be as little doubt of the fact that the German and Austrian governments saw a chance of turning this Conference into an instrument for the bringing about of a "German Peace," and that the German and Austrian "Majority" Socialists were willing to lend a helping hand in this scheme.

This is evidently the opinion of a part of the German "Minority" Socialists, led by the veteran Franz Mehring, who refused to participate in the Conference. In a remarkable letter written by Mehring to Tchcheidze as President of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council, Mehring has the following to say on the subject:

"The most burning task for all of us at the present time is the conquest of peace, and the contemplated international conference at Stockholm is to be devoted to this work. As German Social Democrats we protest most emphatically against the admission into this conference of the "Majority" Social Democrats, that is to say, the Government Socialists grouped around the Party Executive. Our protest is based on considerations of principle as well as expediency. We refuse to participate in any consultation with these elements, and we very urgently ask our Russian comrades to oppose with all their power the admission of these elements to the Conference, in the interests of a Proletarian Peace and the re-birth of a true International. *The "Majority" Socialists will not represent at the Conference either the Socialist movement or the German Proletariat, but only the German Government and its interests.*"

And Fritz Adler, secretary of the Social Democratic delegation in the Austrian Reichsrath, and one of the ablest of the younger generation of thinkers and writers in the international Socialist movement, who offered his life on the altar of fidelity to Socialist principle, said, when speaking in the shadow of death at his trial for the execution of Count Stuerghk, the Austrian Premier, that the German and Austrian "Majority" Socialists were going

to Stockholm as the "officially sent commis-voyageurs of the Foreign Office."

But even more weighty than the opinions of these valiant and beloved comrades is the testimony of the known facts surrounding the Stockholm Conference. And first and foremost among these facts is the so-called "strike" of the Hungarian Socialists. This "strike" is one of the most remarkable events in the history of the Socialist movement. It consisted in the refusal of the Hungarian Socialists to attend the Stockholm Conference unless the Hungarian Government promised certain internal reforms. In other words, so anxious was the Austro-Hungarian Government for the "success" of the Stockholm Conference and, therefore, for the attendance thereat of the Austrian and Hungarian Socialists, that the latter used the refusal to attend the Conference as a whip wherewith to exact certain concessions from their Government.

History (as we know it at the present writing) does not record whether this truly remarkable "strike" was successful. The impression left by the incomplete press accounts is that it was not, and that the Hungarian Socialists thereupon behaved at Stockholm in a manner not at all pleasing to their rulers. Whereupon the official Hungarian Press Bureau issued a wail which is in itself the best possible commentary on the role which the Socialists of the Central Empires were expected to play at Stockholm and the hopes which the ruling classes within those Empires placed upon that Conference. Says the Bureau:

"From Hungarian Government circles the news reaches us that the behavior of the Hungarian Socialists at Stockholm has made a very bad impression upon those circles. The Hungarian Government was in hopes that the contact between the Socialists of the Central Empires and those of Russia would serve to dispel many misunderstandings and to counteract the intrigues of those Russian elements which are so friendly to England. In responsible quarters the idea of an international rapprochement was therefore received very favorably, and they saw with pleasure that leading Hungarian Socialists should appear at the Stockholm Conference. But many indiscreet assertions of these leaders at

Stockholm propose quite unacceptable solutions of matters of the greatest importance to Austria and to our ally, Germany. They have also adopted an almost unbelievable attitude with respect to the question of nationalities and the question of the indemnification of Serbia."

It is quite evident that the American Socialists were not the only ones who had put faith in "The Hope of Stockholm." Nor are they the only ones who were disappointed in that Hope.

That does not dispose of Stockholm, however. In spite of the apparent readiness of the "Majority" Socialists of the Central Empires to misuse such a conference for the interests of their governments, an international Socialist conference may yet be made an important factor in hastening the day of peace. But this can only be accomplished if the Socialists of the rest of the world will take good care to remove the danger of its being made use of as part of some scheme for a "German Peace." Just how that is to be done presents one of the most difficult problems before the Socialists of the world to-day. This problem is particularly pressing in view of the call issued by the Russian Socialists for another Stockholm Conference. If we do not succeed in solving this problem there is great danger that the second attempt at an International Socialist Peace Conference will go the way of the first. How, then, is this problem to be solved?

One solution is offered by Franz Mehring: Exclude the "Majority" Socialists from the Conference. Aside, however, from the questionable propriety of raising the question as to who should be included in the re-organized International as a preliminary to a Peace Conference, there is the practical consideration that such an exclusion would make the whole conference impossible, as the Central Empires would not issue passports to any delegation that did not include the "Majority" Socialists. We cannot, therefore, accept this solution. This does not dispose, however, of the Mehring suggestion. For that suggestion is accompanied by the statement that the German Socialists for whom he speaks (the Liebknecht group) would not participate in any conference of which the "Majority" Socialists formed a part. An International Socialist Peace Conference, with some of the best inter-

nationalists and most valiant fighters for peace unrepresented would clearly be in such an anomalous position as to make its labors highly unsatisfactory. A way must therefore be found to make participation by these elements possible. And we venture to suggest that if the true socialist and internationalist character of such a Conference were otherwise assured that would make it possibly for such groups as the Liebknecht-group in Germany to participate therein.

How assure that character? That is the crux of the problem. Lenin. The suggestion made some time ago by the Russian Workmen's and Soldiers' Council that certain principles ought to be agreed upon in advance as the basis for the labors of such a conference is a good one. There ought to be something done by way of preliminary to the Conference which would bind its participants to some common principle upon which *any* International Socialist Peace Conference ought to stand. And, then, by way of neutralizing the effect of the presence of the German Scheidemanns, the Socialists of the other countries must see to it that *their* Scheidemanns at least are kept away from it. If the Socialists of the other countries send to the next Stockholm Conference none but proved internationalists, there will be little danger of the "commis-voyageurs" of the governments of the Central Empires running away with it.

It is up to the revolutionary elements of the Socialist movement the world over—including those resident in the United States of America. If they want such a Conference held, and that it be a real International Socialist Peace Conference they must be up and doing.

The Tragedy of the Russian Revolution

By L. B. BOUDIN

It is the tragedy of the Russian Revolution that it was born in war. It seems that nothing that this war has brought about or ripened to fruition is destined to give us unmixed joy. Just where the latest upheaval in Russia will lead to, it is impossible at the present writing to say. One thing is certain: The blood which was not spilt in the uprising of the Russian people against the autocracy of the Tzar is to be spilt in a civil war following upon the uprising of the Socialists Lenin and Trotzky against the Socialists Kerensky and Tzeretelli. But it is not the blood that will be spilt in this awful struggle of brother against brother that is of the greatest importance. Transcending far the question of lives extinguished, bodies mutilated, and treasure destroyed, is the question of the outcome of it all: For we cannot, we must not, conceal from ourselves the fact that the most probable, nay, the only possible result of the latest uprising is a counter-revolution which will rob the Russian people of the best fruits of the Revolution. And that quite irrespective of the outcome of the battle which is now raging in or about Petrograd.

And yet, the thing was practically inevitable. It is easy, of course, to praise this one or blame that one. Our readers will find in this issue articles by Lenin and Trotzky blaming it on the "moderates," and we dare say that other publications will have served them with a sufficient amount of blame charged up to the "extremists" to even up the account. Unfortunately, neither the outpourings of the "regular" publications, nor the brilliant essays of Lenin and Trotzky really *explain* anything. The stupid and vicious attacks of the "regular" press against Trotzky and his associates as "German agents," etc., etc., cannot, of course, explain the position, aims and purposes, of the Russian ultra-revolutionists. Nor does calling them charitably "honest but misguided fanatics" bring us much nearer to an understanding of these men and their work. But the brilliant invective and raillery of Trotzky is equally impotent to give us a clear understanding why such tried and proven revolutionary Socialists like Skobeleff, Tzeretelli and Tchcheidze should suddenly turn "bourgeois" pacifists.

The truth of the matter is that both Socialist factions in Russia are the victims of a cruel fate which constitutes the tragedy of the Russian Revolution. When the Russian Revolution was accomplished, the Russian Revolutionists who were also Socialists and internationalists found themselves in the presence of a dilemma from which there was no escape, and both horns of which seemed to be fraught with fatal consequences to the Revolution. The old Tzaristic regime which they had overthrown and the old capitalist world which they hoped and strove to overthrow had saddled the Revolution with a war with which it was intimately connected, out of which it was born, and which it was called upon to liquidate. To continue the war meant to play into the hands of capitalist imperialism, giving a new lease of life to the capitalist system to the combating of which they were eager to give their undivided attention, now that their special struggle with the Russian autocracy was out of the way. But to conclude peace meant to give the victory to the most ruthless combination of imperialistic capitalism and militaristic autocracy on the face of the globe, and incidentally prepare the ground for a restoration of Tzarism in Russia.

As a question of principle the problem could be solved easily enough. And certain leading principles covering the situation were accordingly announced. The Russian Revolution was in principle opposed to a separate peace with Germany: The Russian democracy would not conclude peace with the foremost autocracy in the world, leaving it free to vanquish the western democracies. Nor would the Russian Socialists adopt a selfish nationalistic policy of securing peace for themselves only. The Russian Revolution will therefore stay in the fight. But only for the purpose of securing a peace that would be just to all—the Revolutionary proletariat knowing no distinction between “friends” and “enemies.”

But how transform these principles into practice? What are to be the powers outside of Russia on whose assistance the Russian Revolutionists could count in carrying this program into life?

Here was the real difficulty. Here the rock on which the Russian Revolutionary forces split.

One section—the “moderates”—pinned their faith on the “democracies” of Western Europe and the United States. The people of the democratic countries cannot possibly desire conquests or the imposition of such humiliating terms of peace upon their adversaries as would make a real reconciliation and a lasting peace impossible. And these peoples being democratically governed, their will must prevail as against the will of whatever special interests or imperialistic cliques there may be among them. The democratic peoples will force their governments to accept the formula of a *peace without victory*, without annexations or punitive indemnities, and with full regard for the rights of all peoples to fashion their own destinies.

The “extremists” differed from the “moderates” not in their aims or purposes, but in the choice of means deemed suitable for the carrying out of their common aims and purposes. Lenine, Trotsky, and their associates, have no faith in capitalistic “democracies.” They were convinced from the beginning that the ruling classes of the so-called “democratic” countries could no more be counted upon to support a movement for a real, just and democratic peace than Kaiser Wilhelm himself or the Tzar of Russia. The only hope of peace lay, therefore, in a general revolution, such as was accomplished by the former subjects of the White Tzar. The key to the situation lay with the German working class. If the German workers should revolt, Russia and Germany could conclude peace, which would then of necessity become a general peace. But will the German workers revolt? Lenine and Trotsky confidently believe that if properly approached they would.

The “moderates” had their innings first. The workmen’s and soldiers’ delegates gave them their support and the Kerensky government was formed. Under the leadership of the Socialists it strove to carry out its program with respect to the liquidation of the war, but it did not even as much as get a respectful hearing at the court of its “friends.” It was severely lectured by the schoolmaster at Washington. It was put off with fine phrases by the adroit Mr. Lloyd-George. And it was finally ordered about its business in a brusque and insolent manner by M. Jules Cambon—speaking in the name of the Allied governments.

As the "moderates" were being kicked and cuffed by their "Allies" in Paris, London and Washington,—as their demands for a revision of the old secret treaties being refused, and their pleadings for permission to meet at Stockholm ignored—their credit among the masses of Russian revolutionists was diminishing. And when M. Cambon slapped them in the face by announcing that Skobelev would not even be admitted into the holy sanctuary of the Allied Conference at Paris, their influence was at an end.

The Bolsheviks—so reasoned the Russian workmen and soldiers or at least very many of them—were evidently right. All governments and governing classes are alike. A capitalist "democracy" is a contradiction in terms. The thing does not exist. We have dilly-dallied enough with the policy of the "moderates" of begging and pleading at the courts of Messrs. Wilson, Lloyd-George & Co. Let us give the Bolsheviks a chance to try their fighting tactics, perhaps we shall fare better. The governments of the "democratic" countries having failed us, let us try our luck with the *peoples* of the autocratic Central Powers. For all we know they may be ripe for a revolution, even as we were nine months ago, although there was no surface indications of it. There isn't much that we have to lose any way—so why not try?

The attempt to knock at the door of the German working class for the general and democratic peace which the Entente ruling classes and their governments have denied them—commonly referred to as "the Bolshevik uprising,"—led to the armed conflict which we are now witnessing. It is primarily a conflict between two revolutionary factions, divided not so much on the question of the aims and purposes of the revolution as on the means of obtaining that peace which is absolutely necessary for Russia, if the revolutionary gains are to be maintained. Unfortunately, these two factions cannot and will not be permitted to fight this battle out alone. The civil war dividing the revolutionary elements of Russia cannot but endure to the benefit of the reactionary elements of that country, strengthening the gathering forces of the counter-revolution. The attempted Bolshevik "uprising" of last July was followed immediately by the

Korniloff "rebellion"—the first serious move towards a counter-revolution. The Bolshevik uprising having failed, Kerensky was in a position to call upon them for assistance in meeting this first attempt at counter-revolution,—and the united forces of the revolutionary elements proved equal to the task of coping with the counter-revolutionary danger. But now that the Bolsheviks have succeeded in overthrowing the Kerensky government, the elements back of it must fall back upon Korniloff, if they are to assert themselves at all, thus strengthening the hands of the reaction. And even should the Socialist and other radical revolutionary elements refuse to join hands with the Korniloffs, Miljukoffs, et tutti quanti, in an effort to dislodge the Bolsheviks, that would not change the situation any. The Korniloffs are there, and so are the Miljukoffs, and many other elements much worse than these. A retirement of the non-Bolshevik revolutionary elements from the field of battle—if such a thing were at all conceivable—would only serve to accentuate the counter-revolutionary character of the forces arrayed against the Bolsheviks, thus sealing the doom of the Revolution in the event of the success of those forces, which seems almost inevitable.

But this is not all. Were this all, we could hope against hope for a Bolshevik success—deriving comfort and encouragement from the evident courage and ability with which the Bolshevik leaders have thus far handled a bad situation and the apparent confidence which they enjoy among the revolutionary elements of Petrograd and the north generally. The worst of it is, that even a complete success by the Bolsheviks would lead us nowhere. We are firmly convinced that should the Bolsheviks be let alone and permitted to give their own tactics a fair trial—which would be the best thing under the circumstances—they would find themselves within a very short time just where the Kerensky government found itself after six months of fight for a just and democratic peace. For, unless the unexpected happens, the hopes which the Russian "extremists" place upon the German proletariat are doomed to disappointment, even as the hopes which the "moderates" have placed in the "democracies" of Europe and America.

Elsewhere in this issue we discuss the situation in Germany. It is therefore unnecessary to discuss the subject at length here. We shall merely repeat the general conclusion: Germany seems to be marching backward—and the German working class seems to be well in front of the procession.

Herein lies the tragedy of the Russian Revolution—for a real tragedy it is, in the old Greek conception of that term, a fatal situation from which there seems to be no escape. Bolshewik and Menshewik, "extremists" and "moderates," seem to be alike doomed to failure. At least as long as the Russian Revolution is compelled to choose between the Scylla of "democratic governments" and the Charibdis of a "German revolutionary proletariat." For, for the present at least, both are pure figments of the imagination, each bound to prove a broken reed in the hands of any one who places reliance upon it.

The Task of the Constituent Assembly. A Republic without a President.

From the *Iswestia*: "Reports of the Council of Deputies of the Workmen and Soldiers. Petrograd, the 13/26 of April, 1917."

(Translated from the Russian by **Marius.**)

(Foreword by **Marius**)

The article of the official organ of the Council of Delegates of Workmen and Soldiers of Petrograd reprinted herewith seems to me so characteristic of the prevailing public spirit in Petrograd at the time of its publication there, that I permit myself to call special attention to it. It is an historical document worthy of being preserved in the archives of international Socialist literature.

A few details in the article are not absolutely correct; a few others could stand a more minute analysis. The terminology of the Council's writer: "Constituent Assembly," "Legislative Assembly" are borrowed from the Great French Revolution. Nevertheless the fact remains that the Council of Deputies of Workmen and Soldiers know what they want and know what they are talking about. The most unfortunate point however, is that the theoretical statements and deductions in the article—which document seems to have been considered infallible and thought to contain a program certain of realization—appear at present as ideals only, (not to say as unfulfilled wishes), appear as the product of the first weeks after the success of the Russian Revolution, and as the expression of the enthusiastic satisfaction with the great progress made and of the certainty of still greater progress resulting immediately from further development of the Revolution. For now we witness a turn for the worse in Russia. It started with the deviation from the statement that "the Russian nation will not deliver the Governmental power, in whole or in part, not even for temporary use, to any individual." Yet it did—for we did have a dictator in Russia: Alexander Kerensky.

When first chosen as member of the Provisional Government, he started with the significant words before the Council of Deputies of Workmen and Soldiers: "Comrades, do you believe me? Do you have faith in me?" (Cries: "Yes, yes, we have!") "I am ready to die should it become necessary!—Comrades, representatives of the old government are now in my power and I have made up my mind not to give up control over them My first step, as Minister of Justice, was the issuing of an order calling for the immediate liberation of all political prisoners, without any exception; also that our comrades, the deputies of the social-democratic faction now in Siberia, be conveyed herewith honor!—Comrades, having entered the Cabinet of the Provisional Government, I remain the same man as I was, I remain a republican. I made it plain to the Provisional Government that I appear as a representative of democracy, and that the Provisional Government must regard me as the spokesman of democracy's demands."

But after he had been made Dictator, we heard somewhat different notes from Alexander Kerensky. Power intoxicates, power infects, power demoralizes. "If I should be made the Czar of Russia, I would be as rotten as he is," said once one of the old social-revolutionary fighters, and there is truth in it. Kerensky was sitting between two chairs. True enough, he sent Nicholas Romanoff and family to Siberia—but he also proclaimed "blood and iron" to all who did not agree with him. At the present moment his "comrades" are in jail and persecuted by his order; not because they betrayed the theory and practice of revolutionary Russia—not at all! They are in jail because they continue to insist upon the motto of the Russian Revolution: "Land and liberty!" They are in jail because they are for peace; because they cannot be convinced of the present impracticability of their desires and of their warnings not to give in to the dark forces and not to weaken the Council of Deputies. They are "criminals" because the German Emperor is comfortably seated on his throne and the German comrades, the German nation did not follow the glorious example and the brotherly call of the Russian brethren to overthrow their autocratic rulers. If there

had been a revolution in Austro-Germany Kerensky would certainly have agreed that these "criminals," these troublemakers were among the best sons and daughters of the Russian Revolution.

At the present moment, we are informed, that Russia will be saved by—America. America will give money!—But money is of no value where the people want peace—nothing but peace, in which to arrange their own internal affairs. We are living at a time of compulsion. Compulsion here, compulsion everywhere! Keep your mouth tightly shut and—obey the bureaucratic, monarchic and capitalistic rulers! The Russians do not want to obey any more, they are tired of endless massacres, of killing and murder; they wish to enjoy the fruits of the Revolution and—no more deaths in the trenches! The Government will compel them to continue the mutual slaughter until the will of the rival fighting monarchic and bourgeois camps of the world is fulfilled and one or the other dominates.

Let us hope that the historical document printed below, showing the task of the constituent assembly, will not remain a scrap of paper, but will be a picture of the reality in near future.

May we also hope against hope that the Germans and the Austrians will wake up from their lethargy, will make an end to the abominable reign of Hohenzollern and Hapsburg and proclaim a Republic in Germany and Austria. All the pretexts for the prolongation of the war would then be eliminated, would then lose their *raison d'être*. With the abolition of the greatest semi-absolute monarchies in Europe the remaining shadows of monarchic government would be swept away in the upheaval.

The old democracy is played out. Militarism and democracy are incompatible; imperialism and democracy are antagonists; but militarism in its highest potency, and ruthless imperialism, are the most powerful, the most important helpers, and the scientifically proven life-nerves of modern capitalism. It is therefore clear that the maintenance and the prolongation of the life and rule of capitalism presume the abolition of democratic institutions.

The bourgeoisie bowed formerly to democracy, but militarism and imperialism made it wiser. Imperialism has no need of de-

mocracy; it needs slaves, subjects. Militarism cannot stand democracy; it needs soulless machines, tools of destruction. It needs martial law; and the capitalistic classes of to-day everywhere have thrown and are throwing—sometimes shamefacedly—their cherished democracy overboard. Remnants of democratic institutions are still in existence, because they cannot be abruptly eliminated, but they are more and more a thorn in the flesh of modern capitalists and of their monarchical and bureaucratic rulers. Modern capitalism, especially in Germany, will rather fraternize with monarchism, but never with real democracy.

International Socialism alone cannot exist without democracy; democracy and international Socialism are indivisible and inseparable. The resurrection of the social-democratic parties, the resurrection of the International, is the only hope of the human race.

Should Germany and Austria fail to respond to the "mene tekell" on the wall, should Russia fail to establish the real democratic republic, should she fall into the hands of the dictatorship of the Knoute and of the brutal imperialistic and capitalistic drivers—then there will be no durable peace, then there will be misery, hatred, falsehood, hypocrisy and death—death of civilization, death of real Socialism, death of the brotherhood of man—for centuries!

(From the Iswestia)

The cardinal question to occupy the attention of the Constituent Assembly concerns the organization of the State Political Power. The Constituent Assembly must decide how the legislative power is to be organized, i. e., who shall be our lawmakers; how the executive power is to be organized, i. e., who shall administer the laws; the Constituent Assembly must also organize the judiciary, i. e., must declare who is to sit in judgment over Russian citizens for transgression of the laws and who is to defend them and re-establish their rights, in any way abrogated.

These three powers, the legislative, the executive and the judicial, combined, represent the quintessence of the Power of the State. The Revolution transferred the State Power in toto to the people. Instead of the imprudent words of the so-called "fundamental laws" of the overthrown

regime: "To the Emperor of all Russia belongs the supreme, the omnipotent power. To obey his sovereign authority, not only out of fear, but also out of conscience, the God Almighty himself has ordered,"—the Revolution substituted the inalienable maxim: "The supreme power of the Russian State belongs to the people." The people now possess the State Power completely, and the Constituent Assembly *must sanction* by the "fundamental law" *the existing condition*, i. e., *it must establish in Russia a democratic Republic*. A return to monarchy in Russia is an impossibility: The people will crush to pieces all those who would try to take away from them the State Power to deliver it to any new tyrant.

It goes without saying that the first action of the Constituent Assembly must be the proclamation of a Republic in Russia. This action would affirm *that from now on the Government in Russia belongs to the people*. In order, however, that the power of government should really remain in the hands of the people, the Constituent Assembly must create such a system of republican institutions whereby all the people will at all times control the Government and have a constant power to exert immediate pressure upon it. The task of the Constituent Assembly to create the republican departments of the democratically established government will be a most complicated and responsible one. Therefore it is imperative to start immediately the discussion of these questions, at mass meetings and at election meetings, in order that by the time the Constituent Assembly convenes, the Democracy will be in possession of a carefully prepared plan of organization of the republican institutions.

The republican institutions now existing in Europe, America and Australia can furnish many useful examples in the preparation of this plan. Still the Russian Democracy cannot limit itself to the plain and simple copying of the institutions of the "foreign" Republics, mainly and primarily for the reason that the majority of the existing republics are not democratic, but capitalistic, i. e., their Government belongs not to the whole nation, but mainly to the well-to-do part of it. In the majority of cases the republican institutions there are not directed towards inviting the working classes to participate in the life of the State and in the fulfillment of the duties of government, but are directed towards substituting for the will of the people the will and opinions of the representatives of the rich. The results are that the Government in the majority of the Republics is very often active not in the defense of the toiling masses, but in their subjugation. True enough, this subjugation and subjection of the workers is not accomplished with such cruelty as was the case with us in Russia during the reign of the absolute monarchy, nevertheless many of republican institutions of the Old World and of the New World are to be totally rejected by the Russian Democracy, when the Constituent Assembly develops the fundamental principles (Constitution) of our Republic.

Let us take, as an example, the question of the President of the Republic. In a Republic the president appears as the head of the State, just as the monarch represents the head of the State in monarchy. The greatest majority of the republics have had the fundamental laws prepared by representatives of the rich classes, who in the designation of the rights and duties of the presidents have plainly copied those of the monarchs of the European Powers, and the presidents of the republics, therefore, in the majority of cases, represent a special type of "temporary monarchs".

For example, the President of the United States of America is the commander-in-chief of the army and navy and of the national militia. The president of France governs the total army. It does not mean that the presidents themselves lead the armies; it means only that they appoint the commanders of the army and navy.

In the fundamental laws of our old regime, the Czar was given plenipotentiary power of command over all the military of Russia, on land and at sea. The presidents of the United States of America have the constitutional right to make treaties with other governments; the same right, according to our old "fundamental laws," belonged to the abolished Czar. The right of a president of the United States to make treaties behind the back of the nation—treaties which are binding even if very burdensome to the nation—strike mainly the working classes. It is true in the United States treaties, in order to become laws, have to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Senate. But the American Senate, consisting of politicians and profit makers, does not hesitate for a minute to betray the interests of the people, when it concerns capitalistic gains and profits. In the United States the ministers are responsible to the president, only there they are not the servants of the people, nor, at least, the servants of the Parliament; they are the servants of the President, somewhat as in Germany they are the servants of the Prussian King (the German Emperor), and as in Czaristic Russia they were the servants of the Czar. Under such conditions, when a minister pleases and finds favor with the president, he remains in power and at his post, even when it is evident to all that the activity of that minister is detrimental. In the same manner the President of the U. S. can retain the whole staff of ministers, even when their actions are not approved by the people. In old Russia the laws had to be sanctioned by the Czar and the Czar did not allow such laws to pass which were undesirable to him and which he did not like. Just in the same way the President of the United States can, by constitutional right, veto laws made by the Congress (by both houses). Of this right of the President to veto laws passed by the Congress the rich classes avail themselves by using their influence with the president to stop measures which even the Senate considered impolitic to reject. The Russian Czar prorogued the Duma, when it acted against the absolute government. The French president may with the consent of the Senate, prorogue the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate (the French Upperhouse)

consists exclusively of representatives of such classes as are the enemies of the toiling masses, and the Senate is therefore ready at all times to give its consent to the prorogation ("adjournment") of the Lower House, a strong democratic body. (It is true, the practice weakens somewhat the influence and pressure of the presidents upon the Houses and ministers, but the principle still remains.) It is not difficult therefore to recognize that the presidents of the bourgeois republics are a special type of monarchs, be it monarchs "for an hour." Not in vain was the question ventilated in the Constituent Assembly of the U. S. of A. as to whether it would not be in order to make the president's term of office last for life. From the presidency for lifetime there is one step only to the right and privilege of the president to leave the Government to his son in inheritance, in addition to the real and personal estate, in addition to the houses, the stocks and bonds, the trained horses and the sporting dogs, as was the case, for example, in old Russia during the reign of the Romanoff-Hollsteins and as it is still the case in modern Germany governed by the Hohenzollerns. With the help of the prerogatives of the presidents the capitalist class and the large land owners in the Republics strengthen their influence in the State, exactly as the industrial capitalists and the big land owners use the rights of the monarchs, to interfere with the legislature, the executive and the judiciary in favor of their own interests in the monarchies.

It goes without saying that the Russian Democratic Republic must not follow those "samples" of the foreign republics. Once the Russian nation took away the Government from the hands of the Czar and put it in the hands of the nation it will not deliver the Governmental power, in whole or in part, even for temporary use, to any individual.

The preparation of the fundamental laws (constitution) of the Russian Republic is the task which the nation bestows upon the Constituent Assembly. As soon as the Constituent Assembly finishes the work of preparation of the republican constitution it will adjourn sine die and its place will be filled by the Legislative Assembly, elected upon the principle of general equal suffrage, and direct and secret ballot. The Legislative Assembly will differ from the Constituent Assembly in its aims only; The Constituent Assembly must deal with the fundamental laws, the Legislative Assembly with the current legislative work.

If the Constituent Assembly represents the whole nation, and if organized state power from the moment the Constituent Assembly convenes acts solely by virtue of the order given by and in the name of the Constituent Assembly, so must the Legislative Assembly, with the same right, represent the whole nation and act in the name of the nation, after the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly. From the above it follows that all governmental actions, which touch upon and concern vital interests of the people, must originate from the Legislative Assembly. The rights

of the president of a republic enumerated above such as the rule over the military (for the standing army would not be supplanted by general national military training), the making of treaties, the appointing of ministers, etc., etc., must be transferred to the Legislative Assembly. Only in this way can the people be protected and secured against all kinds of surprises in inner and foreign political relation; only in this way can the people possess the maximum power of government and in this way only will the Russian Republic be a parliamentary republic in reality, i. e., the Legislative Chamber (the Parliament) will play the main political role in the land. Under such conditions the only domain of the presidents would be the banquets, the parades and ceremonies—for the maintenance of which all immense sums would have to be spent. Plain enough that a Republic has no need of a president. But the question may arise: How then can the republic be able to exist without a president? This question is very similar to the question, still propounded by the old grandmothers in obscure villages of Russia: What will become of Russia without a Czar? It has been proven, however, that it is not at all hard to live without a Czar, that it is much easier, incomparably easier, than with a Czar. Even the representatives of the most obscure strata of the nation will soon convince themselves of the truth of this. Now then, when the main rights of a president belong to the Parliament, what rights would remain for the president? None whatsoever. And if it is imperative and well possible to invest in the Legislative Assembly (Parliament) all the most important rights and prerogatives otherwise bestowed upon the presidents in modern Republics, then the secondary duties, also falling to the presidents, may just as well be transferred to the Legislative Assembly, or even to any other subdepartment of state. In fact, there are examples of existing republics without a president. The little republic of Switzerland is one, the president is one of the ministers of the Swiss Confederation (a member of the so-called Federal Council), is elected annually at a salary of 5,000 Rubles—about \$2,000. This president has no special rights whatsoever and figures only as the first among his equals—among the ministers. The second example is certainly still more striking: It is the Russian Republic of today, it is getting along very nicely without a president and at an intensely critical period. *And it is clear that in a democratically established parliamentary Republic, a president is a superfluous organ of the State machine.*

Having done away for good with the question of a president, Russia will also be safe from the adventurous intrigues of presidents, known in the history of certain American and European president, and also from the Asiatic Yuan-shi-Kaiism-Republican presidents, favored with the plenipotentiary powers of a Czar, get the ardent desire, under certain circumstances, to transform their position of "King for an hour" into the position of "King for all the time." And such cases have occurred, when a president, by the combination of favorable circumstances, became a "Czar".

Nothing could ever prevail upon our Constituent Assembly to incur such a risk and to make presidential adventures possible.

The position of a president offers temptation by all kinds of adventure, especially and mostly when the president has been *directly* elected by general suffrage (and of another method of election Democracy would not approve). Elected by general suffrage, the president gets the majority of the votes, more than half of all the votes cast. Under these circumstances he becomes the most popular person in the land. Counting on his popularity, the president may very easily determine upon a coup d'etat. And such a governmental upheaval may become successful, as was the case, for example, with Napoleon III in France in 1852. And at the same time, we must repeat again, the people would have to spend immense sums for the maintenance and proper support of such a dangerous state personality as a president.

The Democracy, in its political battle for the elections to the Constituent Assembly, must explain and make perfectly clear to the masses, that a presidentship is a superfluous, needless, most expensive and dangerous office in a Republic.

Current Affairs

The New York Mayoralty Campaign

Apparently the New York Municipal campaign of the Socialist Party was a great success. An increase in votes from 33,000 cast for Charles Edward Russell in 1913 to 142,000 polled for Morris Hillquit in 1917, the election of ten Assemblymen, seven Aldermen and one Municipal Court Judge, have established the prestige of the Socialist Party as a political factor in Greater New York. Not only newspapers like the N. Y. *Evening Post* and *The World*, but political organizations like *Tammany Hall*, with its unparalleled capacity for judging the real significance of election returns, admit that the Socialist Party has become a dangerous competitor.

To the Socialist, this is, however, only one of the criterions by which a campaign may be judged—and by no means the most important one. Does the gain in prestige, before the general public co-incide with a real augmentation of our Socialist strength? Was this campaign worth while, from the point of view of a Socialist? Has it served to bring us a step nearer to the final aim of our movement? Has it made Socialists? Has it done more than to persuade a few thousand people to vote for candidates on a Socialist ticket?

We nominate candidates not for the purpose of electing a few men or women to office—but mainly for the purpose of taking away political power from the capitalist class and placing it into the hands of the working class. And this, again, is done with the understanding that it is not enough to elect workingmen, but people who understand the incessant struggle between capital and labor, and who recognize that the struggle can be ended only by the socialization of the means of production.

If there are to-day, in the city of New York, more working people than there were three months ago who understand the essence of Socialism, then the 1917 municipal campaign of the Socialist Party was a success, was well worth all the sacrifices in time, effort and money that it demanded.

Is the increase in socialist sentiment and understanding in sound proportion to the actual vote cast for our candidates? This, and this alone, is the criterion by which the true worth of this campaign may be judged.

* * *

There is no question that the main issue this year was not Socialism, but Peace. The peace issue overshadowed all other questions. The people at large were indifferent to everything else; the one question of war and peace was everlastingly in their minds. If there had ever been any doubts in our minds as to where the American people, or at least the population of New York, stood on the war, a visit to a few of the innumerable hall and street meetings would have effectually banished them.

At all the many meetings we attended, on the Jewish East Side of Manhattan, or in the heart of the American West Side, among the Italians of Harlem, or in the real cosmopolitan Scandinavian, Irish-English districts along the South Brooklyn water front, even the poorest speaker could not fail to arouse the greatest enthusiasm when he touched upon the demand of immediate peace. On the other hand we could not help noticing how coldly those comrades were received who spoke only of municipal affairs and state problems, and forgot to mention the war situation. We distinctly recollect two such cases, where the speakers were not only of the highest type, but possessed the rare gift of entertaining their audiences while educating them in the fundamentals of Socialism as well.

It was, under these circumstances, inevitable, that the campaign should become one of protest and demonstration rather than one of education. It could not have been otherwise, much as most of us would have liked to have it so. Since it so happened that the Socialist Party was the only political organization that stood in opposition to the war and was not afraid to say so, many who, a year ago, were so prejudiced against Socialism that they refused to listen to a Socialist speaker or attend a Socialist meeting now came to us, read our literature, donated to our campaign-fund, and in many cases were eager to assist in every

way they could. For the first time in the history of the Socialist movement of New York our meetings were crowded with audiences made up of such newcomers. To speak to these people in the phraseology of scientific Socialism would have been more than futile.

One might, perhaps, find fault with the exaggeration of the importance of municipal reform. This is, however, a fault common to all municipal campaigns.

* * *

The one real mistake made in this campaign was the exploitation of a common garden-variety politician like Mr. Dudley Field Malone. If this campaign was a fight for Socialism, this man, an avowed adherent of the present system, surely had no place in it. Neither should he have been allowed to speak from the same platform with Morris Hillquit, Sieverman and Cassidy in a campaign fought with the slogan "Down with the war!" For he declared frankly and unhesitatingly, at every meeting at which he spoke, that he was in full agreement with the National Administration as far as the war was concerned, that there was only one point of disagreement between them: the federal woman suffrage amendment. He supported—from the platform—conscription, favored a thorough war-policy, and indorsed, with special emphasis, the Wilsonian peace idea. He went out of his way to contrast President Wilson favorably with war shouters of the Root-Roosevelt type, contending that they stood for conquest and imperialism, while Mr. Wilson symbolized the highest ideals of Democracy and Progressivism.

To the "business" mind, there was, of course, a third "issue" in the mayoralty fight. The "good" people of New York had united to defeat the bad boy of New York politics. All respectable men and women had joined hands in the Fusion camp once more, to kill that much hunted beast that has the unfortunate habit of always surviving his most expert hunters. Mr. John Purroy Mitchel, this noble representative of the finest of goody-goody politics, controlled and operated exclusively by the big capitalistic interests, was chosen for the second time, to be the savior of society, from the evils of Murphyism. But Mr. Malone,

who, like the Mayor himself, is a graduate and a former ardent and obedient member of Tammany Hall, believed the choice of the reform element to be an unfortunate one, and was sure that Mitchel had no chance of election and supported our candidate, therefore, not from choice, but as the lesser of two evils. Surely, this is the impression that his constant reiteration of the cry: "to beat Tammany you must vote for Hillquit," was bound to create. But even herein he was not quite above board; for he repeatedly emphasized in public statements for the press and at meetings, that he would gladly have supported Tammany Hall had it been led by an upright man like Mr. Smith, the Democratic candidate for President of Board of Alderman, instead of a man like Murphy. Tammany led by a man with the "outward appearance of decency" of Gaynor fame, would to him have lost all of its terrors.

It is already rumored,—and Mr. David Lawrence, the well-informed Washington correspondent of the N. Y. "*Evening Post*," indicated this in the columns of his paper—that Mr. Dudley Field Malone will be a gubernatorial candidate in the coming state election on one of the capitalistic "reform" tickets. This "rumor" receives support from the fact that the new mongrel political organization, "*The National Party*," has announced this oratorically gifted gentleman as one of the twenty members of its National Executive Committee.

It seems to us extremely poor politics from any point of view to have allowed Mr. Malone to present himself before tremendous audiences of the working class as its friend, and to assist him, in this way, in his hunt for bigger game.

* * *

A review of the municipal campaign would be incomplete without giving due attention to the activity of those of our ex-comrades, who under the guise of "Internationalism" took pains to attack and calumniate the Socialist Party, its membership and, with special venom, Comrade Hillquit. If ever there was a disgusting and sorry spectacle, it was the one we were forced to witness in New York, during the month of October 1917.

First came the little band of heroic knights yclept "Alliance for Labor and Democracy" under the leadership of that "mental giant" Chester M. Wright, and his boss, the unspeakable Maisel. Night after night their chariot toured the Jewish districts, and always with the same pitiful success. No one took them seriously enough to listen to their tirades, or even to jeer at them. The population of these districts—even its unsocialistic part—showed its contempt so plainly that these "real socialistic" supporters of the most outspoken representative of the big financial interests, the intimate friend of the Morgans and Vanderbilts, of the Roots and Roosevelts, became the laughing stock of the whole campaign.

Then the big guns appeared upon the scene to save the situation. Mr. Charles Edward Russell, who as the Socialist mayoralty candidate—four years ago—had contributed to Socialist literature a splendid characterization of the scare-crow Tammany-cry, was brought all the way from Michigan to speak for Mr. Mitchel. He spoke just once and—disappeared. The cordiality of the reception offered to him,—the cries of "traitor" and "renegade" that greeted him, sent him back to Michigan, where he is "working for the government." William English Walling, the industrious author of at least five newspaper articles daily—every one of them written for the capitalist press and for the benefit of anti-Socialist capitalist politicians, did his goodly share. Mr. Phelps Stokes, whose honesty and earnestness of purpose everybody appreciates as much as his lack of Socialist understanding, spoke at a number of meetings for the Fusion cause. But saddest of all is the case of Henry L. Slobodin, who has hopelessly sacrificed a splendid record of more than twenty years of useful service for the labor and Socialist movements, by working side by side with Root, Roosevelt and Hughes.

The most amusing,—or shall we say tragic—of the extravagant pretenses made by these men, is their claim to represent in this country, the ideas, principles and tactics of Karl Liebknecht, the staunch and uncompromising foe of capitalism and militarism. They feign ignorance of the fact that this real internationalist and revolutionist has proclaimed it to be the duty of

all Socialists to fight their own capitalist governments and give no quarter. By using Liebknecht's name in this peculiar manner they not only do injustice to the Socialist movement of the United States but create an impression of Karl Liebknecht which cannot but lower him in the eyes of the world.

* * *

To what extent, then, did the municipal campaign prove a success from the Socialist point of view?

The Hillquit vote was somewhat above 140,000, the vote for the head of the state ticket, Comrade S. John Block, candidate for Attorney General, almost 120,000 in Greater New York. The vote cast for Comrade Block is generally conceded to be the straight Socialist vote. Four years ago our candidate for Mayor polled 33,000 votes. A year ago our candidate for governor received 38,500 votes in the city, while our presidential candidate polled about 10,000 votes more. This increase in the straight vote, therefore, is proportionally much larger than that of the floating vote.

This proves one gratifying fact—that the real pro-German vote went to Hylan and not to Hillquit. This vote, undesirable from any point of view, went to Hylan because the typical pro-German represents that element of society that belongs to the middle-class and is essentially bourgeois and therefore anti-Socialistic in its feelings and political affiliations. No branch of the American Socialist movement is so conspicuously lacking in professionals and "intellectuals" as the German Language Federation. Nowhere is the genuine labor element in such an overwhelming majority in the Socialist organization of this country as in the German speaking branches.

The genuine pro-German could have been persuaded, perhaps, to vote for an isolated candidate who "had a chance." He would never, however, allow himself to be so far swayed by his idealism to vote for a lost cause. He will vote the straight Democratic or Republican ticket, as may seem, at the time, most compatible with his immediate interests. But nothing could persuade his penny-wise mind "to throw his vote away." We know of no more reac-

tionary influence in the United States today than that of the average German voter.

* * *

The battle has been fought and won. A new and a bigger fight is on, the fight, not for "humanity and the people," as it was rather unfortunately expressed in our city campaign, but for Socialism and the working class.

Education along the lines of revolutionary Socialism, organization of the newly won forces to prepare them for the final aims of the Socialist movement, the emancipation of the working class throughout the world, now more than ever before must be our goal.

L.

Act, Not Withdraw

One of the interesting by-products of the electoral campaign just closed is a complete change of front on the question of war on the part of Morris Hillquit, National Chairman and International Secretary of the Socialist Party, and that part of the latter organization which follows his leadership.

Like all "strategic retreats" this change of position was made under cover, and under the pretense that the old line is being maintained. But the retreat once made the change of position cannot be concerted, and the battle must be fought on the new battle line thereby established. Like all such retreats it was presumably undertaken because the old position was considered untenable and impossible to defend. The new line reached, the old one must necessarily be abandoned.

When the electoral campaign opened the battlefield ran along a line marked "absolute opposition to the war and demand for immediate peace," but some time in the early part of October this line was abandoned and a general retirement ordered to a new position. Just what the new position is, is not quite clear as yet, but it has been sufficiently indicated to show that it does not mean *absolute* opposition to the war, nor a demand for immediate peace. The first announcement of the new position

came in a letter from Hillquit to the New Republic, in which he said:

"I do not advocate an immediate separate peace, a withdrawal by America. Nothing that I have ever said or written could justify such a sweeping assertion. . . . I *want America to act, not to withdraw.*"

Following this the Socialist Party organizations of Greater New York, through their Campaign Committee, issued a statement to the voters on the subject of "War and Peace" in which the position of the Socialist Party on this momentous question was stated to be as follows:

"The Socialist Party is an international party. *We do not favor a separate peace, a withdrawal by America to leave Europe to struggle alone to its ruin.*"

It is not our intention to discuss here the new question, either as to its correctness or as to all of its implications and consequences. All that we desire to do here is to call attention to the bare fact that a change has taken place, and point out how vast and important the change is.

When the famous majority-resolution was adopted at St. Louis last April, the Socialist Party's position with respect to America in the war was clear and unmistakable: America's entry into the war was a crime, and we therefore demand it withdraw from the conflict immediately.

"The working class of the United States—says the St. Louis Resolution—has no quarrel with the working class of Germany or of any other country. The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of Germany or of any other country. *The American people* did not want and *do not* want this war. They have not been consulted about the war and have had no part in declaring it. They have been plunged into this war by the trickery and treachery of the ruling class of this country through its representatives in the National Administration and National Congress, its demagogic agitators, its subsidized press, and other servile instruments of public expression.

"We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world.

"In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.

"No greater dishonor has ever been forced upon a people than that which the capitalist class is forcing upon this nation against its will."

Our readers know that we are not counted among the admirers of the St. Louis resolution. But there is one thing that we must say for it: There was no equivocation here: no room for doubt. The authors of this resolution—foremost among whom was Morris Hillquit—made their opposition to America's entry into the war and its continuance therein as clear and as emphatic as the English language could make it. The American people were plunged into this war against their will by trickery and treachery; our entry into the war was a crime against our own people and the nations of the world; our war against Germany is the most unjustifiable in all modern history; our continuance therein will cover our people with dishonor. *The American people do not want this war.* We must withdraw as soon as possible.

There could be no mistake about that, and there was none at the time.

At the great public demonstration against the war, held under the auspices of the "First American Conference for Democracy and Terms of Peace," afterwards The People's Council, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on May 30th, 1917, the Chairman read a message from one of the leaders of that movement which shows just where Mr. Hillquit and his associates stood at that time on this question—and that they did not stand where they stand now. That message read, in part, as follows:

"I am conscientiously opposed to the war and in favor of bringing it to a speedy close by any and every legitimate way consistent with the honor of our country. We dishonored our-

selves by declaring war without adequate or reasonable cause. We should do the country the honor of correcting that fatal mistake as soon as possible. . . .

"Alliance with foreign nations should not be tolerated. Our hands should be kept entirely free to negotiate at any time without regard to the interests or desires of any other nations."

But now it is: *Act, not withdraw.*

The reversal of position is complete—but is it final?

B.

The Italian Debacle

The disaster which has overtaken the Italian armies is one of the most important as well as one of the most interesting events of the entire world war. It is important because its necessary result is to prolong the war. Every German military success strengthens the reactionary forces in Germany, and every strengthening of these forces postpones the coming of peace. The question of war and peace is distinctly "up to" the German people; and "strengthening of the reactionary forces" in Germany is simply another way of saying that the German people are not ready for any peace that would be acceptable to the rest of the world.

Notwithstanding this deplorable aspect of the situation, however, there is no denying the fact that there is a certain amount of satisfaction to be derived from Italy's discomfiture, for those who look for abstract "Justice."

For Italy has not only richly deserved her fate, but has directly brought it upon herself by the extreme selfishness of the policy which she has pursued since the outbreak of the world cataclysm.

When Italy entered the war the present writer said in the *New Review*:

"At last Italy has jumped off the fence on which she has been sitting for nearly ten months. Amid all the disgusting things which this war has produced, or has uncovered to the gaze of the world, Italy on the fence was the most disgusting. Not that

she is necessarily worse than those who have entered the struggle before her. Only that we have not seen the others when they were plotting, manoeuvring, calculating. When we first beheld them they were in the midst of the combat, a prey to the fiercest passions. They therefore appealed to our sympathies, no matter how thoroughly we disapproved or condemned their actions. Human nature is so constituted that it is inclined to deal lightly with *crimes de passion*. So we did not think of the sordid motives that actuated the entrance into the war, of some at least, if not all the combatants which were fighting in the arena, and saw only the titanic struggle itself. We were overawed by its vastness, and largely fascinated by the fury of the passions which it unloosed. But Italy, sitting at the crossways and offering herself to the highest bidder, shrewdly and cynically calculating which bid to accept, was simply revolting—a challenge to all decency and morality.'

And her conduct since she *has* entered the war was in full harmony with her conduct before she took the fatal step, being dictated by the same selfish motives. Because of her extreme selfishness Italy has been the cause of more Allied military reverses than any other of the Allies, with the possible exception of Russia under the old regime. Italy was at least one of the principal causes, if not the principal cause of the failure of the Allies in the Balkans, a prolific source of disasters everywhere else.

In this connection, it may be of interest to note that the extreme reactionaries in Italy, like the extreme reactionaries in Russia under the old regime, are pro-German, anti-war, and for a separate peace. If Giolitti has not played the role of a Stuermer or Protopopoff it is not because he would not have liked to, but because he did not have the chance. But the presence of the Giolitti kind of peace advocates in Italy has served to accentuate the underlying selfishness which brought Italy into the war. You can appeal to the working class and other idealistic elements of a nation in the name of democracy and the wrongs of humanity. But you cannot gain the support of the elements that follow the Giolittis in all lands on any such plea. The only way to gain

their support, or to keep them quiet at least, is to appeal to their low instincts which are fed on what are euphemistically called "national interests" and "national aspirations,"—in this case: control of the Adriatic, Albania, etc., etc. And that is just what Italy has been doing: conducting a separate little war of her own with Austria, an interfering with all the Allied plans which did not suit her particular purposes. If her own little war has now turned into a big disaster, Italy has only herself to thank for it. And there will be but few outside her own borders that will weep with her.

But if there are few that weep with her, there are many that worry over her discomfiture. For notwithstanding their separate selfishness the nations engaged in this war are in fact engaged in one world-war in which an injury to one is an injury to all, at least to all on the same side of the battle-line. Italy's disaster is, therefore, an Allied disaster. But how can the Allies avoid such disasters without giving up the innate selfishness of each which has brought them into the war?

It is interesting to read in this connection the explanations which are offered for the disaster, and the suggestions made as to how avoid such disasters in the future. On November 2nd, the N. Y. *Tribune* published a long editorial on the subject, evidently from the pen of Mr. Frank H. Simonds, one of the best military critics in this country, which is fairly representative of the intelligent opinion on the subject in this country. The opening paragraphs of this article read as follows:

"Writing to Robespierre in 1794, the young Napoleon Bonaparte set forth his whole conception of war. He said: 'The management of a war is exactly like the siege of a fortress. You must concentrate your fire on a single point. Once the breach is made the equilibrium is destroyed, resistance becomes fruitless and the place is captured. Attacks should never be scattered, but concentrated. You must divide in order to find food and unite for fighting. Unity in command is essential to success. Time is everything.'

"The more one studies the Napoleonic campaign the more clearly one perceives how completely this Napoleonic doctrine is

therein expressed, and the more one studies the operations of the opponents of Napoleon the more clearly one perceives the reasons why German High Command has won so many successes since the beginning of the war.

"Through all the period of his great wars Napoleon fought coalitions and alliances. His victories in the early period of the Empire were won with inferior numbers under conditions which should have produced victory for his opponents. Austerlitz was possible because of division in the council of Russian and Austrian leaders. It was not until 1813 that his opponents learned to act together with any measure of coherence, and as late as the Marne campaign 1814 division of forces gave Napoleon his last victories and almost enabled him to triumph over vast numbers when his armies had been reduced to a handful."

Mr. Simonds then proves the wisdom of the Napoleonic strategy by illustrations from the wars of Louis XIV. as well as from our own Civil War; he then proceeds to show that Germany has won her great successes in the present World War by following the Napoleonic strategy; and winds up with the following admonition to the Allies:

"The next conference of the Allies, about which so much is being written, must achieve a pooling of all military resources, *an agreement for the subordination of all national schemes to an Allied plan* and the formulation of a concerted programme for the operations of 1918."

But how can all "national schemes" be subordinated to some abstract "Allied plan," when there are *national interests* to be subserved, which *national interests are*, according to all accepted political doctrines, *paramount* to all other interests?

Can Italy or France, or any other nation fighting on the side of the Allies, give up her "national schemes," which means subordinate her *national interests*, in order to further some *international interest*, represented by the proposed "Allied plan?"

Will France or Italy, or any other country fighting on the side of the Allies, give up her separate national interest and with it her "national scheme" of carrying on the war, in favor of the Allied international interest with an Allied international plan of cam-

paign, as long as the Allied peoples are taught by Mr. Simonds and their other "patriotic" advisers that national selfishness is the highest virtue?

Germany is able to follow the Napoleonic strategy because Germany has in fact no allies. Her allies have been conquered by her long ago and are mere subordinates as far as the conduct of the war is concerned. There is no "Allied General Staff" on the German side, such as is now being proposed for the Allies, in consonance with Mr. Simonds' ideas. There is just a German General Staff,—because there is just a German paramount interest. And there is no possibility of a *real* "Allied General Staff" on the side of Germany's opponents, unless one of them should subordinate the rest to her own will. Or, unless they shall learn from the bitter experience of this World War that there is something *higher, more important, and vastly nobler* than "national interest"—*international interest, the interest of humanity.*

B.

The Neue Zeit—An Obituary

On October 1st Karl Kautsky ceased to be editor of the *Neue Zeit*, having been ousted from his position by Messrs. Scheidemann & Co.

To many this may seem too small a matter for notice at a time when our entire civilization is being shaken to its foundations. To those, however, who are familiar with the history of the International Socialist Movement, and the part which Kautsky and the *Neue Zeit* have played in it for a generation, this incident will seem like the visible marking point of the close of an epoch of Socialist history. For the *Neue Zeit*, of which Kautsky was the founder and guiding spirit for thirty-five years, *was not a mere magazine: It was an institution*—an international Socialist University. Many a man who has since become prominent in the international Socialist movement has received his education at that University, and its graduates are the leaders of thought wherever there are thinking Socialists. The present writer is proud of the fact that he

was both a student as well as a teacher at that remarkable institution of learning.

The Neue Zeit was founded in the fall of 1882, when the Bismarck anti-Socialist laws were in full operation and the German Socialist movement at its lowest ebb. But its young founder—Kautsky was then a young man of twenty-eight—succeeded in enlisting the co-operation of the best talent of the Marxian wing of the International Socialist Movement, and when the German Socialist movement revived again and the Marxian wing became the dominant element of the revived International, the Neue Zeit became *the* scientific organ of the International Socialist Movement. The leading Socialist thinkers of the world and the most active workers of the international movement co-operated to make its position unique not only in the field of *Socialist* journalism, but in the field of journalism generally. We know of no publication which has reached so high a level of scientific attainment, while being also the organ of expression of a world-wide practical movement.

Of the first generation of Marxian Socialists who contributed to its pages we may mention Frederick Engels, August Bebel, and Paul Lafargue. Of the next generation: Kautsky himself, who soon came to be recognized as the leading Marxian scholar the world over; then George Plechanoff, Franz Mehring, Edward Bernstein, Belfort Bax. Then came the third generation—a host of young scholars and active workers in the movement scattered throughout the civilized world, but all united by the bands of the great intellectual and practical movement of which they were a part and of the unity of which the Neue Zeit was the best expression.

Such was the Neue Zeit under Kautsky's editorship—and *while the unity of the movement lasted.*

But the unity of the movement is gone—and so is the Neue Zeit. For the Neue Zeit under the new management, under the management of Scheidemann & Co. and as the expression of the Scheidemannized part of the Socialist movement cannot be considered as a continuation of the Neue Zeit that we

knew and loved so well. The Neue Zeit is dead, along with the Second International of which it was the best expression.

There is a time to weep.

But more even than for weeping this is a time for thinking. For in fruitful thought there lies the seeds of the rehabilitation of the movement, of the breakdown whereof the demise of the old Neue Zeit is a visible sign. And we cannot think of a more fitting way of paying tribute to Kautsky and his work in the Neue Zeit as well as doing something towards the rehabilitation of the movement of which the Neue Zeit under Kautsky has served so well than placing before our readers an important thought expressed by Kautsky in the last article which he wrote for the Neue Zeit.

Since the German militarists, junkers and imperialists have started out to "free" oppressed nationalities, many Socialists seem to have lost their bearings and began clamoring for the diverse German-made "freedoms." Foremost among these are the demands for an "Independent Poland" and an "Independent Finland," for which a certain class of "Socialists" in Germany and in this country have been clamoring vociferously. Some of them add an "Independent Ukraine."

Before the war such demands, when not instigated by agents of some rival government, were usually put forward by extreme nationalists or nationalistic Socialists. The revolutionary Socialists everywhere opposed them. So in Poland, for instance: The demand for an independent Poland was made, whenever it was made by the extreme section of Polish nationalists and occasionally by some nationalistic Socialists of the most opportunistic type. The revolutionary Socialists, the Socialists who followed Rosa Luxemburg and other revolutionary leaders of the proletariat always opposed this demand, being convinced that the interests of the Polish working-class lay not in separation from the Russian proletariat—but in forming with it a democratic federal Russian Republic.

When the War came to confound the tongues of men, our tongues and thoughts stand in very great danger of being confounded in this particular—and of our being carried off

our feet by the vociferations of Messrs. Scheidemann & Co. and their following in Germany *and elsewhere*.

It is therefore refreshing to see Kautsky standing by the true Socialist principles, and braving the terrors of the German Government, as well as of Scheidemann & Co. in order to proclaim them to the German proletariat and to the proletariat of the world.

In the course of an article which appeared in the issue of the *Neue Zeit* dated September 14, 1917, Kautsky says that the question of the independence of nationalities must be viewed by Socialists from the point of view of the interests of democratic progress the world over, and then he proceeds:

"Such considerations may under certain circumstances demand imperatively that a great revolutionary state be held together against its reactionary enemies If the Finns and Ukrainians now want to get away from the Russian state, it is merely an after-effect of the policies of Zarism which drove them into opposition to Russia and of a lack of faith on their part in the staying qualities of the Russian Revolution. But they ought to know that their hopes of national independence are intimately bound up with the Russian Revolution—that the only way in which they can secure their independence is *by their standing by Russia and not by their separating from it, thereby weakening it.*"

It would be interesting to find out how much the expression of these un-Scheidemann views have contributed towards Kautsky's separation from the *Neue Zeit*, which not only weakened but destroyed that once justly famous international Socialist institution.

B.

Making Haste Slowly

Germany is making haste slowly along the pathway of reform toward democracy. So slowly, indeed, that to an outsider it may look as if she were going backwards instead of forwards.

The first chapter of the great "crisis" which was to transform Germany from an autocracy into a democracy closed with the

replacement of Bethmann-Hollweg, who had attempted to govern with the aid of the Scheidemann-Socialists, by an obscure unknown bureaucrat of reactionary proclivities. Now we witness the closing of the second chapter of that much heralded "process of democratisation" with the replacement of the unknown reactionary by a well known one. For Count Hertling, who has just been appointed German Imperial Chancellor in place of the stop-gap Michaelis, has spent a life-time in the service of the German reactionaries, rendering them faithful and efficient service.

Unlike his predecessor, Count Von Hertling is a man of conspicuous ability,—which he has always used in an endeavor to stem the incoming tide of democracy. It is interesting to note in this connection that when the Reichstag first "asserted its independence," and the German powers that cast about for a proper man to inaugurate a "strong" policy,—in the place of Bethmann-Hollweg's temporizing policy,—they turned to Hertling. Hertling declined the post, however, but is said to actually have named the man who was to hold the place for him until the time shall have arrived for the *real* man to come to the front. With the Russian Revolution just accomplished and the situation on the Western front none of the best, it was evidently considered too risky a matter to defy the Reichstag majority by appointing to the Chancellorship such an outspoken opponent of parliamentary government as Von Hertling. It was therefore considered policy to put a nonentity in the place, who would keep it warm until more propitious times.

The propitious time for the *real man* to assert himself has evidently arrived. The Russian Revolution has run into such "excesses," that Scheidemann instead of being compelled to take note of it by way of paying tribute to it and making a pretense of emulating it in some degree at least, is now enabled to openly point a finger of condemnation and warning against it. Instead of being compelled by the Russian Revolution to assume a semi-rebellious attitude towards the German Government, Mr. Scheidemann can now lecture the German working class on the dangers of revolution in the midst of war and pride himself on the fact that he had by his leadership kept the German working class from

the pitiful state into which the Russian working class has fallen by following the "extremists."

At the same time the great victories at Riga, and particularly in Italy, have more than offset the semi-failure of the U-boat campaign and have re-established the prestige of the German military clique to such an extent that it can defy Mr. Scheidemann openly should he dare to again "assert his independence." So Mr. Scheidemann has been notified that if he does not accept Mr. Hertling gracefully there will be a military dictatorship. Whereupon Mr. Scheidemann obediently retired to a back seat.

Whether the German working class will accept this new affront with the same humility and meekness of spirit exhibited by Scheidemann & Co., or will be willing to take a chance on the Russian brand of "anarchy" rather than continue to live spiritlessly in their own kind of order remains to be seen. As also remains to be seen whether any kind of humility on the part of the German working class and its leaders will satisfy the German military and annexationist cliques, or whether they will not consider the time propitious for that coup d'etat for which many of them have been yearning for many years past. These hopes and desires have certainly never been voiced with such boldness and persistency as they are now.

In the meantime it is interesting to note that coincident with the appointment of Von Hertling to the Imperial German Chancellorship comes the report that the pretense of an "Independent Poland" is to be cast aside and that Poland is to be annexed to Austria-Hungary, while Lithuania and Courland are to be annexed to Germany. Thus go "Freedom of Poland" and "No Annexations" a-glimmering, while Mr. Scheidemann protests but promises to vote for the next war-credits.

All according to the old Prussian formula of Progress:

One step forward, two steps backward.

B.

The Situation in Italy

The news of the smashing Austro-German offensive against Italy reached this country simultaneously with the news of the flaming forth of a rebellious spirit among the Italian people. Correspondents and editors admit freely that discontent is seething, and that not the least dangerous aspect of the Italian defeats may be a revolutionary uprising, as in Russia.

This spirit of revolt has been gathering momentum for two years, and recent events are bringing it to a head.

The first impulse attending its disastrous defeats was the achievement of a semblance of national unity in Italy. But not alone is it merely a *semblance* of unity, it is in the nature of things purely temporary. Whether the Italian army succeeds in checking the invaders, or whether its defeats pile one upon the other, a reckoning will be demanded, and a situation created in which the forces of revolution will spring into action.

The social and economic situation in Italy is acute. Perhaps in no other belligerent nation are the necessities of life scarcer and their prices higher than in Italy. There is a menacing scarcity of food and of coal, as well as a scarcity of the things necessary for purposes of war. Industrial life has been terrifically disarranged, and Italy's proverbial industrial inefficiency has been emphasized by the war. Italians in this city receive heart-rending reports of the unbelievable sufferings and privations of the peasantry and proletariat in the old country.

During the summer strong food riots broke loose in Milan and other large cities of Italy, and smaller demonstrations are of regular occurrence. The riots during the summer were formidable, assuming the nature of mass uprisings, which were suppressed only after bloody clashes with police and soldiers, in which hundreds were killed and wounded.

The animating force that is directing and coalescing this discontent into active revolt is the splendid and intrepid stand of the Italian Socialist Party against the war.

Recent actions of the party indicate the character and force of its propaganda. Some months ago, Lazzari, the General Secretary, officially addressed a secret communication to munici-

pal locals and officials calling upon them to refuse payment of certain federal taxes in order to strike at the war.

In September, Lazzari followed this up by a circular addressed to Socialist municipal office-holders, calling upon them:

1. To carry on an intensive public agitation against the war and to act generally in a way that would result in their dismissal from office.

2. In the event that their agitation would not result in dismissal, to be ready to resign office on a certain date, when all Socialist officials would simultaneously resign as a protest, and in order not to even have any indirect participation in the war.

Now comes the most significant feature of Lazzari's actions. Lazzari was placed under arrest, but released on his own recognizance. The Imperialists in parliament took the matter up, protested that the traitor should be allowed at large, and a resolution was passed demanding that Lazzari be brought to immediate trial. Lazzari appeared before a Grand Jury, which in Italy consists of Judges, and *the charge against him was dismissed.*

Nor has the government since taken any further action against the "traitor," not daring to force the issue in fear of the consequences. This alone shows how intense is the spirit against the war and the government.

The actions of Lazzari are in line with the whole activity of the Italian Socialist party, an activity that is revolutionary and in direct contact with the masses.

But this is not all. The party is being forced to even more definite and aggressive action by a growing and powerful Left Wing group within the party. The Socialists of Naples and Florence instructed delegates to the party convention to criticize the actions of the Party and to urge more revolutionary activity.

The Italian revolutionists desire international proletarian action against the war and for peace. To them the war is an opportunity for achieving revolution, not simply for securing peace. It is precisely this attitude that animates the revolutionist everywhere.

F.

The Fraina Defense Fund

Louis C. Fraina, one of the Editors of *The Class Struggle*, and Editor of *The New International*, has been found guilty of alleged conspiracy to violate the Draft Law.

Fraina was arrested as a Conscientious Objector, tried as a Conscientious Objector, and convicted as a Conscientious Objector. A vital revolutionary principle is involved in his conviction.

The case is being appealed, and must be fought to a finish. The defense needs funds, immediately. *Counsel for Fraina, Louis B. Bondin, is not being paid a cent for his services, all money being spent for technical expenses and for publicity.*

Will you do your bit in the great cause?

Send money, protest resolutions, etc., to

S. J. RUTGERS

477 East 16th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Assist the I. W. W. Defense!

Revolutionary unionism and the right to strike are on trial in the case of the I. W. W.

Liberty and democracy find highest expression in, and are best represented by, Unionism in Industry, and Unionism is on trial.

The conspiracy against the I. W. W. must be shattered. The defense needs money and moral support. Send your contribution immediately. **DO IT NOW!** To-morrow may be too late.

WM. D. HAYWOOD

1001 W. MADISON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

A NECESSARY BOOK

SOCIALISM AND WAR

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

A scholarly discussion of the causes of the Great War, and a splendid discussion of the economic basis of Imperialism.

It has everywhere been hailed as a fine contribution to Socialist thought, by such men as Eugene V. Debs, Austin Lewis and Joshua Wanhope.

\$1.00 POSTPAID

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

115 Worth St., New York

THE "SOCIALISM" OF NEW ZEALAND

By ROBERT H. HUTCHINSON

A survey of State Socialism "at work," and an interpretation of its basic class and economic origins. Includes a chapter on "The War and State Socialism."

In view of the onward sweep of State Socialism this book is equally indispensable to the thinker and the man of action.

\$1.25, POSTPAID

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

115 Worth St., New York