April, 1916 15 Cents

New Review

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

The Assault Upon Mexico

A New Formulation of Pacifist Ideals

A ONE-ACT PLAY: Will He Come Back?

By FELIX GRENDON

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
256 Broadway, New York

New Review

Contents, April, 1916

IMMEDIATE ACTION THE ONLY ANSWER

A stage has been reached by the NEW REVIEW where certain definite things must be done as the only alternative to suspension.

Unless an immediate and favorable response is made, this issue of the NEW REVIEW will be the last.

The response required is the pledging of an additional $75 a month to our Sustaining Fund, for nine months.

If this amount is raised immediately, the NEW REVIEW will be permanently out of danger. If not, we suspend.

A general meeting was held recently to discuss whether the NEW REVIEW should or should not suspend publication. The general feeling was against suspension; but it was recognized that the situation is serious, that the magazine cannot be continued under present conditions unless the Sustaining Fund is increased.

It was also decided that the magazine should be reorganized editorially. A new Executive Editor has been secured, the Board of Editors is in process of reconstruction, and a definite co-ordinated program of work is being developed.

But unless the necessary money is raised within three weeks, all plans will be useless and the magazine will suspend publication

We trust, however, that there are seventy-five friends of the NEW REVIEW willing to pledge $1 a month for nine months. In return, each contributor will be sent two five-month subscription cards for every dollar paid, thus increasing both our pledge fund and circulation.

What is your answer?

Do you want the NEW REVIEW to continue?

Send your answer immediately in the form of a pledge.

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASS'N.

Send Pledges to: New Review, 256 Broadway, New York City

New Review

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. IV. 15c. a copy April, 1916 $1.50 a year No. 4

Current Affairs

The Assault Upon Mexico

IN its issue of March 13, a few days after the expedition against Villa was decided upon, the New York *Annalist* had the following paragraph:

"Intervention by the United States in the troubled affairs of Mexico has long been regarded as a possibility which would ultimately redeem all the millions of American capital invested in various properties in the Northern States. When it was learned on Friday that the Administration had decided to order troops after Villa several issues by companies operating in Mexico at once enjoyed a spirited advance. American Smelting and Refining rallied 2⅝ from the low of the day, Mexican Petroleum 5½, Southern Pacific 2⅛, and Greene-Cananea 2⅛. Southern Pacific has a $50,000,000 investment in Mexico which has been more of a liability than an asset since the natives took to shooting up one another. There was a wild cheer on the floor of the Exchange when a rumor was received that Villa had been captured and Carranza assassinated."

A more frank and brutal explanation of the motives of the interests demanding intervention in Mexico could not be imagined.

And that these interests believe the punitive expedition will ultimately resolve itself into an army of invasion is attested by innumerable facts. President Wilson has been compelled to denounce the "unscrupulous interests" responsible for the vicious campaign of misrepresentation waged in the American press to force intervention.

There is no mystery about the motives of the advocates of intervention, but there is a good deal of mystery about the motives behind the Villa raid into New Mexico. It has been clear for some time that foreign financial interests, particularly American investors, were placing hope in Villa as the only alternative to Carranza. The hatred of Carranza is intense, and Carranza has merited this hatred by compelling foreign interests in Mexico to abide by the decisions of the Mexican government instead of controlling the government. Indeed, Carranza has gone so far as to threaten confiscation of the property of some of these interests that were intentionally embarrassing the government and seeking to hold up the restoration of normal conditions.

The least that should be done is an investigation of the raid, and the punishment of the forces *on the American side of the border* that evidence seems to indicate were implicated in the raid.

Villa is playing the game of Huerta. When his power was crumbling, Huerta tried desperately to precipitate intervention as a means of uniting the Mexicans under his banner to resist invasion. Villa's recent action was undoubtedly partly inspired by a similar motive.

The raid into New Mexico could have been avoided, as John Lind, President Wilson's former personal envoy to Mexico has indicated, had a neutral zone been established on both sides of the border and the border adequately policed. For more than a year a raid such as that of Villa's has been feared, and yet no adequate means were adopted to prevent it. Why? Was there corruption? Was there malice aforethought?

Should the punitive expedition develop into intervention, as it may, the guilt lies upon the head of President Wilson and his administration. And this guilt involves not alone the failure to adopt preventive action, but for ordering the punitive expedition at a time when conditions in Mexico are such as to make it very difficult to prevent such an expedition from turning aside from its original purpose.

The citing of precedents for this action are beside the mark. Previous expeditions of this character were undertaken at a time when Mexico was not seething with revolution, and when there were no interests in Mexico that would profit by turning the expedition into an army of invasion. There has been a great deal of friction between the United States and Mexico lately, and this, together with the almost universal demand in our press for intervention, would justify the Mexican people in resisting. Under the present conditions, this punitive expedition assumes the form of a policy of irritating Mexico into overt acts leading to war, a policy so successful in precipitating the Mexican War in 1846 and the seizure of a large slice of Mexican territory by the United States.

Whether the expedition leads to intervention or no, it will assist mightily in fastening militarism on

this country. The interests behind preparedness are vociferously using the present situation in their militaristic propaganda, and are succeeding in their endeavors.

What are the Socialists doing in this crisis? Meyer London is raising his voice in protest; the New York *Call* is vigorously denouncing the expedition, but vitiates its propaganda by silly talk of Socialist generals in Mexico and how Socialistic Mexico is; but on the whole the Socialist and Labor movements are apathetic. There is no concerted and vigorous protest, the organized protest that alone could hold the Imperialists in check. Indeed, there is an under-current in the Socialist party that favors the action of the administration. The Milwaukee *Leader* editorially says, under the caption, "No Alternative":

"The invasion of the United States by Mexican bandits under the leadership of Francisco Villa, with the subsequent massacre of American citizens, left no alternative to the government at Washington excepting to use the military forces of the United States to pursue the murderers with a view to their capture or destruction.

"President Wilson, even if he had been disposed to continue his policy of placing upon Carranza the responsibility of dealing with the assassins of American citizens, could not have avoided a punitive expedition. The patience of congress has reached an end. The murder of American citizens on American territory by raiding bands of Mexicans must stop.

"It is unthinkable that the government of the United States will ever cease to protect its own citizens on its own soil from foreign invasion. Even in their voluntary associations, American citizens are not denied support of those who have joined with them. The labor union stands by its members when they are attacked by gunmen and thugs. Fraternal associations and church organizations do not hesitate to defend their members when they feel that they have been unjustly accused.

"When citizens of the American union are murdered and their homes menaced by enemies without it is the duty of the American government and of the American people to defend them. A government that should refuse to resent invasion of its territory by an armed force bent on murder and pillage could not long endure."

Views substantially identical were expressed by Victor L. Berger in a public interview. Not even the New York *Times* could be as emphatically nationalistic as the *Leader*,—a complete abandonment of an independent Socialist standpoint, an advocacy of all that Socialists hold in contempt.

The issue is clear: Where do the Socialists stand on national policy? Are they an independent revolutionary factor, or are they simply a part of the national liberal movement? The issue must be decided—we must know where we stand.—*L. C. F.*

"Industrial Peace"—A "Comedy"

A WASHINGTON dispatch to the New York *Call*, dated March 2, gave the contents of a petition "from a group of seventy New York manufacturers, labor leaders, publicists and social workers," for the confirmation of Mr. Brandeis:

"The petitioners praise Mr. Brandeis for contributing to New York's industrial peace by offering the 'preferential union shop' as the basis for arbitration between the manufacturers and employees in the needle trades.' "

Among the signers of the petition were Mr. George Wishnack, general manager of the Cloakmakers' Union; Secretary Langer, of the same union; Mr. Morris Hillquit, its counsel, and other high officials of the same organization.

On the very same day the Cloak Manufacturers' Protective Association addressed a communication to the arbitrators to the effect that the Executive Board of the Association unanimously declined to abide by a decision rendered by the arbitrators. Five days later the Union notified the arbitrators that the repudiation of their award by the manufacturers nullified in effect the agreement between the two organizations. From the letter which the Union at the same time addressed to the Manufacturers' Association, it appears that this act was:

"The culmination of *a long series of actions* on your part [meaning: on the part of the manufacturers] which clearly had for their object the destruction of the standards, rights and safeguards granted to the workers by the Council of Conciliation and mutually assented to by us and the reintroduction of the autocratic and oppressive rule of the employer over the workers in the industry."

This letter was also signed by the self-same Mr. Wishnack, general manager, and Mr. Langer, secretary, of the Union, who but five days before had expressed their satisfaction with the "industrial peace" prevailing in the needle trades.

On March 11, *The Ladies' Garment Cutter*, one of the official organs of the Union, had the following comment upon the termination of the agreement:

"The membership of the Joint Board received the news of the break with the Association with joy. Hundreds who have not taken active interest in the organization were among the first to send their congratulations to the officers for taking the stand forced on them by the Association. And *as a result of the break the organization is stronger today than ever before.*

"*The workers*, especially the operators and finishers, who constitute the bulk of the trade, *were actually starved out under the agreement.* Having made settlements in the slow season at rates below the

living wage without a right to resettle the prices or to strike, *they were bound hand and foot, unable to rectify the prices forced upon them by threats* of sending the work outside. Stoppages or shop-strikes being forbidden under the agreement, the Union was in honor bound to send the workers back to shops where they rebelled against conditions. This made *the workers look upon the officers of the Joint Board as slave-drivers, and they hated the very sight of them. The abrogation of the agreement* by the Manufacturers' Association relieves the officers of the unholy and ungrateful duty, and *will* once more *cement the feelings between the officers and the rank and file.*" (All italics are ours.)

The *New Post*, the Yiddish organ of the Joint Board of the Cloakmakers' Union, said editorially in its issue of March 10:

"To our members we will say the following: Brothers, heretofore the Union was compelled to treat the bosses with all ceremony, now the comedy is at an end. *The Union will fight step by step for the rights of the workers and will see to it that the cloakmakers in all shops shall make a decent living.*" (The sentence is italicized in the original.)

We thus learn on official authority how "industrial peace" was maintained under the far-famed protocol and the recent agreement, in which the principal features of the protocol were reincorporated.

Let us recapitulate:

The workers were starved. They were bound hand and foot, and prices were forced upon them. If they rebelled, it was "the unholy duty" of their officers to play the part of slave-drivers. The rank and file hated the sight of their officers. So long as the agreement was in force, hundreds of members took no active interest in the organization. Not until the agreement was terminated could the Union fight for the rights of the workers and try to secure for them a decent living. The manufacturers maintained the agreement only so long as they could disregard the standards, rights and safeguards granted to the workers by it. As soon as the arbitrators attempted to enforce its provisions favorable to the workers, the manufacturers repudiated the whole scheme. The stand thereupon taken by the officers of the Union in defense of the rights of the membership was forced upon them by the Manufacturers' Association. As a result of the termination of the agreement, the organization of the cloakmakers is stronger than ever before.—*I. A. H.*

The Mind of an Opportunist

THOSE of our readers who have a penchant for American Socialist history will doubtless recall Mr. W. J. Ghent. Few think of him nowadays. But way back in 1912 W. J. Ghent was one of the high and mighty in the Socialist Party of America. Those were the good old days when the "powers that be" in our party for the time being thought that they might perpetuate themeslves as such by adopting the method of expelling the "opposition." In order to goad on the "opposition" to a point where they could be expelled, they engineered the adoption of that once famous, now dead and forgotten, curiosity of Socialist literature known as "Section Six."

Now we can afford to laugh at "Section Six." Most party members don't even know whether it is still on our "statute book." But at one time it was very serious business. It cost the party nearly half its membership, and badly demoralized what remained. Theoretically "Section Six" threatened with expulsion all those who believed in sabotage. In practice it expelled many more members from the Socialist Party of America than there ever were sabotagists in the whole civilized or uncivilized world. For, the moment "Section Six" was adopted a campaign was started not only against sabotagists, of whom there were but few in the Socialist Party, but against the opponents of "Section Six," of whom there were many.

In this nefarious business W. J. Ghent took a leading part. He was then the editor of a paper—since happily gone to its rest—called *The National Socialist;* and no sooner was "Section Six" adopted, than Mr. Ghent "consecrated" his paper to the praiseworthy cause of bringing about the expulsion from the party of all the delegates to the National Convention who voted against the adoption of "Section Six," and any one else who dared doubt the wisdom or propriety of that enactment. Fortunately, the Great Expeller and his friends overshot the mark, with the result that a revulsion of feeling came over the party, and some of the coterie of statesmen who planned and executed "Section Six," among them the Great Expeller himself, were compelled to seek voluntary retiremnt.

Since then many things occurred in the world as well as in the Socialist movement of America. "Section Six" and Sabotage are forgotten, and Preparedness has come to the front as an issue. And it so happens that on the subject of Preparedness Mr. Ghent finds himself in a hopeless minority. And, lo! and behold!—the erstwhile Great Expeller who was ready to expel everybody who dared disagree with him on a question of party tactics, has turned into a defender of the right of minorities to defy majorities not only in opinions but in actions.

It will be recalled that some months ago the

Socialist Party adopted by referendum a constitutional amendment providing for the expulsion of any Socialist *official* who shall *vote* money for naval or military purposes. This has aroused Mr. Ghent's ire to such an extent that he has emerged from his obscurity in order to hurl a fiery denunciation of this decision and the party membership which adopted it, into the columns of the Socialist press. This communiqué is an interesting document in itself. It is doubly interesting because of the source from which it emanates. It shows the opportunistic mind in its pristine purity,—and childish simplicity.

After referring to the adoption of this clause on the referendum by the vote of 11,041 to 782 as "a striking example of the mob spirit in action" and giving some other evidences of his "supermanship," he makes the following declaration:

"I, a member of the Socialist Party, am in favor of a reasonable degree of military preparedness. . . . If ever elected to office I should certainly vote an expenditure for naval or military purposes if the specific measure *appealed to me* as necessary and just. I deny the right of the majority to commit me to the blithering idiocy expressed in the referendum. . . . . I have an individual's share of stock in the corporation known as the Socialist Party, and I propose to hold on to it."

Here we have the opportunist in his nakedness: "Majority rules" when he manipulates the majority either for his own benefit or his pet schemes. The moment, however, he finds himself in the minority he becomes a superman, while the majority becomes "the mob." Furthermore, he believes it to be his "constitutional right" to do as he pleases when elected to office,—for isn't he the official and his electors "the mob"?

It is well to remember in this connection that there is a fundamental distinction between "Section Six" and the clause forbidding the voting of military supplies: The former applies to all members as members, while the latter only applies to Socialists elected to office. And the former applies to opinions, — *prohibiting the expression of certain views;* while the latter only applies to actions,—*the voting of supplies.*

It used to be considered good democratic principle that whenever an elected representative of the people found himself at variance with his constituents on an important subject it is his duty to resign rather than vote contrary to the wishes of those whom he is supposed to represent. But the idea of resigning a job or being accountable to those whom he is supposed to *represent* is so abhorent to our opportunist, that he is ready to trample all democratic usages and traditions under foot, in an effort to "hold on" to the emoluments of a job without bearing its responsibilities.—*L. B. B.*

Birth Control and Democracy

IT is safe to say that 90 per cent. of the married people in the middle and upper classes already use some method of limiting the size of their families, whether it is the method described in the book of Genesis or one recommended by the corner druggist. The facts are tolerably plain to anybody who can count up to four and who observed the number of children in the families of the rich, the professional people, and the tradesmen. Why then does the proposal to legalize Birth Control create a furore in the very sections of society that have most widely adopted the practise?

It would be folly to hold that Birth Control will abolish poverty. Yet who will deny that the masters of politics, business, and industry look with strong aversion on a diminishing birth rate among the poor? The reason is not far to seek. As a general rule, a bricklayer with six children will be more docile than a bricklayer with two children, just as the latter will be more docile than a bricklayer with no wife or children at all. There is nothing that takes the starch out of a man's resistance to oppression like the rub of domestic necessity. Employers feel this by instinct. They realize that along the great industrial battle front where growingly aggressive unions face growingly privileged interests, a single point won may eventually net a gain of incalculable value. And they certainly do not intend to let the wage earners win a point like Birth Control, when they fear that this device, rightly used, will serve the labor camp as another weapon, say an additional high-power explosive. That is why our political and industrial Junkers oppose the limitation of other people's families (while prudently limiting the size of their own) and furiously resist every extension of the practice in the name of patriotism, race survival, and morality.

How far is the middle man taken in by this clamor? It is plain that he does not believe Birth Control to be a blow at patriotism or at the survival of the race, when the measure is adopted in his own home. But he does fear that it may be a blow at morality—when the measure is adopted in his neighbor's home. The argument is so familiar as hardly to need mention here. Make the open sale of contraceptives legal, and what is to prevent our bachelors and spinsters from entering unrestrained upon a carnival of licentiousness and turning life into one long Decameronian spree? Those who raise this object make the bold assumption that chastity is at present the habitual mark of the unmarried state. But are our bachelors mostly Galahads and our spinsters mostly Dianas? The answer may be found in the streets, in the statistical number of illegitimate births, and in the appalling record of abortions.

But even supposing that a majority of both sexes are chaste, can we pretend that chastity is a virtue with those who are bludgeoned into it through the fear of legal or other consequences? People are chaste, either because they are built that way or because, like St. Paul, they would rather "burn than cohabit." All other chastity is purely technical chastity, and implies moral discipline about as much as technical legitimacy implies a moral baby. To call a person chaste who can practise self-restraint only in the absence of all temptation is like calling a man honest who has not stolen your watch because he did not know you had one. Nor can it be held that the chastity thus negatively retained (or the chastity cultivated for purely commercial matrimonial ends) is a habit worth transmitting to posterity. Indeed, the presumption is all the other way.

The attack on the State and Federal laws that heavily penalize any giving of contraceptive information and any sale of contraceptives has split into two parts. A Birth Control League stands for an unqualified repeal of the prohibition. It aims to put the scientific facts on Birth Control within easy reach of all who want them. Opposed to this aim is a Birth Control Committee that wishes to amend the existing laws so as to embrace two restrictions: Only physicians are to give the information and only adults (21 and over) are to receive it. Those who rally around the committee describe themselves as "practical, public-spirited Progressives." We accept their description, merely reminding the reader that Progressives are people whose intentions are as generously liberal as their instincts are deeply conservative, and that it is by Progressives that progressive movements are usually rendered sterile. Their opposition to the League's demand for an unqualified repeal takes the general line that widespread immorality will result, that the minds and bodies of children will be debauched, that quacks will swindle enquirers unless physicians alone are empowered to state the facts, and that, as a matter of practical politics, the public will endorse an amendment to the present statute but will reject a sweeping repeal.

We have already shown that the point about immorality is hardly worth discussing. The attempt to use children as an obstacle to free contraceptive knowledge is on a par with the attempt to use children as an obstacle to sensible divorce. The favorite argument is that, granted a repeal of the law, quacks and vice traders will promptly use spurious Birth Control pamphlets and pictures as a blind for debauching infants and adolescents. With tears in its honest eyes, the Committee asks: "How will you protect the children?" The answer is that we shall presumably treat quacks and vice traders who debauch the young with lewd contraceptive pictures or writings, the way we now treat quacks and vice traders who debauch the young with lewd *medical* pictures or writings. Suppose the laws were repealed. Does anyone really believe that children with decent parents would not be as well taken care of, or that children with vicious parents could be *worse* taken care of than at present? Nor must we forget that there is actually a point beyond which it is neither possible nor desirable to protect boys and girls. "Every new freedom generates a new restraint," says Havelock Ellis. Can we doubt that the legalization of contraception will go hand in hand with the systematic teaching of sex hygiene in our schools and the creation of adequate public measures and home influences to shield our children from the vice-monger?

To amend the law, so that only physicians may explain how to practise Birth Control, would be to establish an intolerable limitation of the right of free speech. There is no knowledge immediately related to public well-being, the purveying of which is now legally restricted to any specific professional group. None but enemies of public liberty would wish to set so dangerous a precedent as the proposed amendment. It is asserted that, unless this restriction be enforced, quacks will flood the country with cheap, inexact, and unscientific information. This is only too liable to happen. But when was quackery ever completely suppressed by law? Since the serpent first insinuated misinformation into the Garden of Eden, no power in heaven or earth has been strong enough to keep gullible people from becoming the dupes of charlatans. It is a matter of common experience that every market, however legitimate, is sooner or later invaded by quacks. Newspaper quacks, food quacks, clothing quacks, medical quacks, quacks of every kind—they flourish in the best regulated professions. People have no recourse but to exercise their common sense, whenever and wherever they happen to buy. They pay their money and take their choice according to their lights. And clearly, the only certain remedy for quackery and humbug lies in a more effective public education, not in a private censorship exercised by a privileged class.

Nor can we agree with the Birth Control Committee that the general public will not tolerate a repeal of the law. The truth is that the great bulk of the American people are so incapable of making up their minds on all questions beyond the range of baseball and business that they will meekly put up with almost any change that a determined minority imposes on them. See how American business men, the most hidebound individualists in the world, accepted a revolutionary income tax without a murmur. Similarly, blue laws, as old as the Mayflower, have gone the way of all flesh with scarcely a farewell sign from religious devotees who were expected to defend them to the last drop of their blood. And look at the ease with which serious

discussions, formerly taboo, now slip unchallenged into every sort of public forum. Yet, only ten years ago, the Board of Superintendents of the New York public schools, only expressed its horror at the appearance of the word "reproduction" in the syllabus of a course in botany. This attitude seems inconceivable now. We may be sure that the attitude of those who contest the legal right of citizens to teach and practise contraception will seem quite as inconceivable ten years hence.—*B. C. L.*

Private Charities—A Public Scandal

THE investigation carried on in New York City for many weeks into the condition of charitable institutions under private management has been publicly stigmatized as a "public scandal." The Rev. William B. Farrell, supervisor of charities for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, attends to the business of stigmatizing, in three pamphlets. They are not official, we are told. All the same there is evidently some underground wiring or some radioactivity at work, for many Catholic pulpits are thundering in the liveliest fashion against the investigators. Not that they are disproving the facts stated under oath by witnesses of upright reputation.

That would be a rather difficult job. Jesuitical methods do not favor contests in the open. It is much easier to impute to the antagonists base and malicious motives, unfairness, and, at least in one case, black ingratitude. Having laid such a foundation, the Catholic spokesman proceeds to assert that the attacked institutions are managed by "our best people, men and women," the poor and innocent victims of "an Anti-Catholic Conspiracy."

Theoretically, church and State are separated under our political system. In practice this means that the State must scrupulously refrain from in any way meddling with church affairs, while the churches in ever so many ways meddle with State affairs. We pay chaplains to open our legislative sessions with "prayers," rather ineffectual, but lucrative. Our legislation is honeycombed with theological rubbish. We have prison chaplains and sky-pilots for the army and the militia. Here in New York even the innocent foundlings are clutched by proselytizing institutions subsidized from the public treasury. The business of reforming the wayward of both sexes is to a considerable extent handed over to religious institutions like the Catholic Protectory, the Houses of the Good Shepherd, Magdalen Houses, and so forth. Helpless children of many sorts and ages, some twenty thousand of them, are handed over to the care of various religious institutions. Their maintenance and education is claimed as high charity while the city pays the bulk of the expense.

This system, detrimental in the long run to the helpless victims, is largely due to Catholic influence at work many, many years. Any criticism, any reform proposal, is howled down as an attack on the Catholic Church. This church desires above everything else to maintain its grip on its members, young and old. In its institutions the saving of souls is the prime object. Hence the children entrusted to them, kept away from the public schools as from contamination, are way behind in their secular studies.

Investigations like the one now drawing Catholic fire, can hardly produce any lasting good results. The whole system of entrusting public functions to irresponsible private and sectarian agencies is vicious and antiquated. Its victims are the flotsam and jetsam of the proletariat.

Of course, we know that religion in the form of churchianism is one of the bulwarks of capitalism. So is charity. The masses are frequently reminded of the vast sums spent in their behalf by their benevolent masters. In the case of New York, the millions invested in charity property are "played up" *ad nauseam.* Many of these claims would not stand close examination. Large tracts of the public domain were originally handed over to so-called charitable enterprises on the basis of a nominal lease of one dollar per annum. The usual procedure was to slip through special legislation to that effect. The land thus acquired paid no taxes, no water rates, no assessments. In the course of years its values increased enormously. Then other legislation was procured quietly, so-called enabling acts, vesting the title in the lessee institution so that it could sell the land and keep the proceeds. With the vast sums thus obtained the institutions were re-located on tracts where low-priced lands were obtainable. Thus many millions now figure in the statistics of charity as the good will of the masters while in fact they are the funds of the community. This is true of some children's institutions as well as of some hospitals.

The property question thus created complicates the problem. It presents a vicious circle. We must provide children to make use of the buildings. Then the buildings must be enlarged to accommodate more children. And there are the hosts of monks, nuns and secular people employed as teachers, managers, nurses, and so forth. A regular mare's nest—not to be disturbed with impunity. If you approach it, none buzz louder or more viciously than the Catholic wasps.—*M. O.*

"Democracy" and Negro Segregation

THE American press is practically unanimous in its condemnation of the Mexican people,—their alleged savagery and general all-around uncivilized habits. But the Mexicans have been fighting, are fighting against injustice and oppression, while the American people are devising new forms of injustice and new means of oppression. Just now, our oppression of the Negro has been emphasized by the adoption in St. Louis of a segregation ordinance.

The question was brought before the electorate by means of the initiative, that palladium of bourgeois progressivism, and the ordinance passed by an overwhelming majority. The sentiment for Negro segregation was hitherto believed to be confined to the South; how much deeper the evil is has been proven by St. Louis. It is all disgustingly discouraging, particularly as the vote cast represented all sorts and conditions of peoples, many of whom have only recently fled oppression to come to this country of equal opportunity.

All this brings to mind American criticism of the Russian "pale." How about the American "pale" being forced upon the Negro? Our gallant defenders of all the bourgeois virtues hysterically condemn "autocracy" and "frightfulness" in Germany. How about the white oligarchy of the South disfranchising the Negro and battening upon his helplessness? How about the policy of frightfulness being practiced upon the Negro? It is all a hideous nightmare. We are a democracy, yes; but we are a democracy in the old Athenian sense, an oligarchic democracy superimposed upon a mass of slaves,—the slaves in our case being the Negro and unskilled foreign labor.

The American Socialist movement has criminally neglected the race problem. It is one of the most potent instruments of oppression in this country. It is a serious obstacle to Socialism. The interests of Socialism, of common decency, require an agitation for justice to the Negro and all subject races.—*L. C. F.*

The Berlin "Vorwaerts"

SINCE the outbreak of the Great War the press dispatches have frequently quoted the Berlin *Vorwaerts* as one of the most important sources of German public opinion. The reason is obvious. The *Vorwaerts,* as recognized central organ of the German Socialist party, was a far more representative voice than any other daily paper in Germany. As such a voice, the *Vorwaerts* has been courageously and consistently anti-jingo in spite of all the obstacles placed in its way by the all-powerful military authorities.

Now the war patriots of the German Socialist organization, acting through a majority of the Executive Committee, make public announcement that the *Vorwaerts* is no longer recognized as the official central organ of the party. The *Vorwaerts* replies that this action is contrary to the party statute and therefor not binding.

The situation thus created is highly interesting. In a strict sense, the *Vorwaerts* is not owned by the party but by a corporation similar to those owning here the *Call,* the *Volkszeitung* and the Yiddish *Forward.* The overwhelming majority of the shareholders are our comrades of Berlin and vicinity. They have so far bravely stood by their guns in support of the editorial policy of the great daily. It is not likely that the latest move of the war patriots will frighten them into submission. Will the jingo element now declare a boycott against the *Vorwaerts?* Or will the official declaration serve as a hint to the authorities that leniency toward the *Vorwaerts* is no longer expected by the majority of the Reichstag Socialists?—*M. O.*

Are Professors Modern Monastics?

THE Professor's place is in the classroom! How sorely these fine old truths need to be reasserted against the challenges of an impudently rebellious age. Luckily, the tradition that political freedom means one thing for ordinary citizens and another thing for criminals, imbeciles, women, and College Professors, has once more found noble supporters. The Trustees of Allegheny College recently requested the Professors in their employ "to keep out of politics." Who says that College Trustees cannot withhold the fat from the fire? Plainly, they know it is time an end was made of a growing, demoralizing practise, the practise of inciting Professors to give up the chaste seclusion of the study for the contaminating influences of politics and public life. Academic freedom and political rights, forsooth! The Professor's sphere is in the classroom.

This question touches our children no less closely than their teachers. Shall we permit the guardians of our College boys and girls to be sullied by worldly experience, to get coarsened with the slings and arrows of outrageous politics, to grow sophisticated through treasons, stratagems, and spoils? Suppose we allow Professors, like ordinary laymen, to stray into the vulgarities of government and public policy. What assurance have we that such adventures will not enrich their personalities, widen their horizons, and deepen their power of underlining the theories of the blackboard with the firm hand of practical experience? It is true that eccentric faddists like Samuel Butler cry out from the public square that a modern Academic training consists in "putting the blinkers on the boys," and in "making the worse appear the better reason." But what have Professors to do with the public square and its defiling slanders? The Professor's place is in the classroom.—*B. C. L.*

Milwaukee Marxists, Again

THE Milwaukee *Leader* again tries to meet our demand that it cite proof for the utterly reactionary and false ideas it attributes to Marx, in this fashion:

NEW REVIEW HIT

The NEW REVIEW, jarred by *The Leader's* hint that certain so-called internationalists should first learn what Marx really taught before attempting to

inform others, replies in its March issue:

"We may be wrong. Marx may not have understood his own ideas. The Socialist cardinals of Milwaukee may be right in their interpretation of Marx —as right as the old cardinals of the church who created a Jesus of their own to further their political ambitions. But still, we are interested in that citation of book and chapter. Won't the *Leader* oblige its erring brethren?"

This beautiful historical parallel limps shockingly. The NEW REVIEW should know that the teachings generally attributed to the man named Jesus were not written by Himself. They were written from 100 to 200 years after His time by people who claimed to have heard those who said they heard Him. Their accounts are based upon hearsay and differ in many important points.

The teachings of Marx are laid down in books written by himself. By asking the *Leader* to tell where in Marx's books the statements attributed to him may be found, the NEW REVIEW frankly admits that it does not know Marx.

Its claim that it judges Marx by himself and that the *Leader* falsifies Marx is based upon the NEW REVIEW'S ignorance of Marx.

The *Leader,* in support of its own position, published a full list of works by Marx, Engels and Kautsky, and a list of official German Socialist party declarations and of the old International's controversies, on its magazine page, Friday, December 31, 1915.

The NEW REVIEW should give its readers the benefit of this list and study it, before risking any further exposure of its ignorance.

We shall, in a subsequent issue, discuss the sources cited by the *Leader*. What interests us just now is the *Leader's* methods of controversy.

In the first place, the *Leader* uses a garbled quotation, suppressing one-half our comment and changing some of the punctuation in the part it does quote—all of which makes our comment ambiguous.

The beautiful historical lecture the *Leader* reads us was a revelation; and, upon consulting the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* we found that it was actually right! Pedantry is certainly a strong point with the *Leader*. But if the *Leader* had consulted its history more closely, it might have found that the cardinals of the medieval church *did* create a Jesus of their own, that they distorted the biblical Jesus and His teachings in order to subserve the political schemes of the church.

The *Leader* injects a new element into this controversy. The original discussion—the statement of the *Leader* that we criticized—centered specifically around the ideas of Marx, and Marx alone. Now it introduces "Engels and Kautsky, and a list of official German Socialist party declarations and of the old International's controversies." This controversy is concerned exclusively with Marx, and not with what his followers have "interpreted" into Marx.

The really subtle way in which the *Leader* proves our "ignorance of Marx" is astonishing; it bears a family resemblance to the methods of the old cardinals of the church.—*L. C. F.*

Where Extremes Meet

PREPAREDNESS, like politics, makes, apparently at least, strange bed-fellows. W. J. Ghent and *Solidarity,*—the high-priest of "Section Six" and the apostle of anarcho-syndicalism,—who would have thought, before Preparedness came to confound the language and thoughts of men, that they could ever be found in the same berth! And yet, there they are; fighting side by side for the proposition that Preparedness is "Privatsache",—a matter for the individual Socialist and revolutionist to decide for himself, and about which the Socialist Party and I. W. W. has no right to "commit" its members.

The close mental proximity of the two need surprise no one, however. It did not come entirely unexpected to those who know "the lay of the land", in the labor movement. Here, as elsewhere, space is round,— and if you follow a so-called "extreme radical" long enough you will presently see him rub shoulders and join hands with the extreme reformists on some very vital issue.

So we need not blame it on Preparedness. The vital affinity between the two camps, supposedly the antipodes of each other, has always existed. Preparedness merely brought it to light. Any other vital question would have done the same.—*L. B. B.*

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Ass'n

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALEXANDER FRASER, President — JULIUS HEIMAN, Treasurer — LOUIS C. FRAINA, Secretary

Subscription $1.50 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, $0.75. $1.75 in Canada and $2.00 in foreign countries. Single copies, 15 cents.

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

An Austrian Socialist Manifesto

[This manifesto is the work of a minority group of international Socialists in Austria. The issuance is secret, no signatures are attached, and its circulation in Austria is prohibited.]

THE truth is stifled in Austria. The people are deprived of every opportunity of giving vent to their desperation at the ever growing poverty and oppression, while being kept in ignorance of the real conditions. Liberty was never "at home" in Austria, but during the war conditions have developed such as only blood-stained Czarism has on its conscience. Not a vestige of the constitution remains; freedom of speech is abolished and the hangman is at work unhampered. The civilized world will some day learn with horror how political reaction in Austria is degrading the law into a tool of the war machine. Any and every attempt at political criticism is stifled by arbitrary secret methods which in turn are justified on the pretext of military necessity. A whole army of censors is let loose against the press. They have organized themselves into secret tribunals, because from the lowest to the highest official they are too cowardly to accept the personal responsibility for their perfidious actions.

The raving against the press is supplemented by threats of the gallows and prison. Judicial murder has become a daily occurrence. We will not speak of the many death sentences pronounced on Tchech citizens for the "crime" of having in their possession copies of the ludicrous "Liberation Manifesto" of the Czar. We simply want to show to what despotism the most harmless expression of political criticism is subjected. A German Socialist in Freiwaldau had some copies printed of a peace poem, which had appeared in the Austrian *Buergerzeitung* and sent same to a few friends. He was condemned to death for this offence, but his sentence was commuted to five years' hard labor. Such is the Austria which feels called upon to fight Czarism.

The voice of truth is stifled in Austria and has not been able to make itself heard outside of the country. But there is a limit to all humiliation and degradation, and we, who are still international Socialists, now call to our brothers in all countries to tell them how we are deprived of the right to speak and the power to act. We want to assure them that we are firmly determined to utilize every opportunity in the interest of the Proletarian struggle for emancipation; that we shall remain true to our ideal, which was and always will be: *Fighting the class struggle of the Proletariat.*

We know that in all places and directions there are comrades who feel as we do; but we do not overestimate the class consciousness of the masses. Notwithstanding that everyone despises the government and that every official scorns and scoffs at the system while permitting himself to be used as its tool, we know to our sorrow how the multitude submits in passive helplessness to the powers that be.

The Austrians have become used to absolutism, and as is the case with all slaves they have become accustomed to the loss of much of their self-respect. In fact, anything can be done with them nowadays. "Patriotic Enthusiasm" is manufactured *a la* Potemkin. From the ministry down to the police all departments of the government have joined forces for co-operative extortion. Bohemia in particular is their field of activity; they extort expressions of loyalty and patriotic demonstrations in the papers; they extort expressions advertising the success of the war loan; they even force the hoisting of *Black and Yellow* flags on all houses. The infamy of this camarilla is only exceeded by the stupidity which believes that this infamy can remain undiscovered and go unavenged.

They have enforced the silence of the grave in Austria. But the time will come when not only the whole civilized world, but the people of Austria-Hungary as well will brand this despicable "Art of Statesmanship" as it deserves. Though we are powerless today the time will come when we will be able to fulfill the task designated by Marx: "One must emphasize the real pressure by adding more pressure, and in this way convey to the consciousness, the pressure itself—emphasize the shame and disgrace by making it public."

We hate blood-stained Czarism with all our hearts, but we bear the same hatred to the Black-Yellow barbarism. We know that with the troops of the Czar the white terror would enter our country, but we also know that if the Austrian powers of today are victorious in this war, we would face a period of horror hitherto unknown. The ruling classes are full of the wildest schemes. They who left for the front crying "Down with Czarism" are planning to force on Austria the stigma of Absolutism. They started to "free Poland" but now openly discuss the fact that Poland, which has come under Hapsburgian control, is to be subjected to the mailed fist of military dictatorship. The Poles will be "freed" from sending their representatives to the Duma, and they must indeed be happy in the thought that the Poles of Galicia like the Poles of Russia are robbed of their rights. Furthermore the Slavs of the North as well as those of the South, are also to enjoy the blessings of Austrian Kultur in the shape of military dictatorship. This conjuncture of affairs is propitious to German despotism in Austria and to the despotism of the Magyars in Hungary.

The Tchechs, the Ruthenians, the Italians and the Slovaks, whose "patriotism" was not great enough, are to be stimulated by the mailed fist to a deeper love of the fatherland.

In contrast to the monstrous plans of the present and the still more monstrous plans for the future, we adhere to our conviction, which the Social Democrats have always tried to bring to the realization of those in power, that *Austria will become a democratic State based on autonomous nationalities or it will cease to exist.*

The Yellow-Black camarilla may revel in the idea that the same whip which is held over the people during the war will be used in times of peace. The Bourgeoisie may cherish the delusion that the time is ripe to subject the ambitious nations of this country to their ever grasping power, with the aid of their German ally. The governing classes in Austria never learned anything from the past, nor do they want to learn anything now. This is proved by their plans to make of Austria a "dynastic domain" instead of a home for its people. Austria can only be helped by a complete overthrow of the prevailing system, by a decisive victory of the national autonomy and the democratic right of choice.

We Austrians have been robbed of the most elemental rights. We have nothing to say in domestic affairs, and even less in foreign affairs. The shameful ultimatum to Servia, fabricated with such unscrupulous cynicism, would never have been possible under the control of a parliament. In spite of all the disappointment that we have lived through we are still convinced that such a decision could only have been arrived at over the dead bodies of the Social Democratic deputies.

We Austrians no longer have any constitution, but we must not forget that the rest of Europe has only half a one. Everywhere we are confronted with the ignominious fact that foreign politics are barred from constitutional control. Vital questions pertaining to the destiny of the people, the decision as to war and peace, are left to a camarilla of irresponsible diplomats.

Unfortunately this absolutism escaped detection at the beginning of the war. The parliamentary farce to which the people are admitted, but over whose head war is declared, succeeded brilliantly. The representatives of the working classes took part in this farce in most countries. Instead of placing the responsibility where it belonged, and refusing to co-operate in parliament, when "accomplished facts" were placed before them, they joined forces with the ruling classes, thereby strengthening absolutism. It never occurred to them that there was in reality no parliament, and that from the beginning of the war it was simply a demonstration meeting in the service of the absolute regime.

In the domestic affairs of many countries the parliament has deteriorated into an empty form, while in foreign affairs it is the mightiest stronghold of absolutism. The uncompromising struggle for the democratic republic is the imperative political duty of International Socialism. In all our future actions the following demands must be first and foremost: *Democratic control over foreign politics; decision for war or peace by the people.*

In foreign as well as in domestic politics the watchword must be: *No solidarity with the ruling system in Austria.* And yet the intellectual leaders of the Austrian social democratic party were not able to rouse themselves to this conclusion. But to take sides with the ruling class was only possible by ignoring the interests of the working class. They thus had to shut their eyes to the realities of the Austrian situation. They ignored the Czarism in their own country, so as to fight Russia with enthusiasm, they deadened their consciousness of the fact that their government had incited a war so as to be able to speak all the more of the "self-defense of the Teutonic people."

Politically there is no unity in the Austrian Social Democracy. It is full of patriots of various degrees from rabid German nationalists to dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries. The *Arbeiterzeitung* was the forum where this mixture of tendencies found expression. But after a war intoxication of short duration, the policy of the paper changed, and gave expression to a longing for peace. A guerilla warfare was still carried on with the censors but remained within the limits of a friendly opposition. You cannot be in favor of war and carry on a policy against it at the same time. However, for the paper, patriotism proved stronger than Socialism.

The war had become a party matter, the party problem consisting in holding out to the end, or "holding through" as the Germans term it. Out of the political party there developed a philanthropic society on a big scale. We do not misjudge the success of this charitable activity but it cannot take the place of the *political function* of the Social democracy. Instead of exposing the present system by militant opposition in principle and holding it responsible, all efforts were directed towards palliative "intervention" in concrete cases.

The constitutional limitations contained in Paragraph No. 14 saved the Social Democratic deputies from the embarrassment of voting the war credits. We do not know whether they would have disgraced themselves in the face of the outrageous provocation by Austria. We *do* know that very many were enthusiastic over the Social Democratic group in the Reichstag. The Austrian Social Democrats renounced their own policy and were taken in tow by the Germans. And thus they identified themselves with the tragedy of the German Social Democracy on and after August 4th.

We are neither Pacifists nor militarists, but something different. We Socialists do not seek the

method of force, neither do we exclude it. *Our method calls not for war, but revolution.*

The international Socialist congress has already declared that once the machinery of mobilization is in motion, it is the most inappropriate moment for action on the part of the proletariat. They did not base their hopes on an international revolution against the war, but on an internal revolution in every country after the war. They pointed out that after the Franco-Prussian war came the Commune, and after the Russo-Japanese war the Russian revolution.

Therefore, the International knowing its weakness did not attempt to hinder the mobilization of soldiers, nor the levying of taxes. *But was it necessary for the Social Democrats to degrade themselves into a tool of warfare?* A war conducted by the ruling classes in the hope of conquest manifests itself to the people on whom the burden falls as a struggle for existence. Thus the people, fighting for their existence, are doomed to sacrifice themselves for the preservation of their integrity. Such are the distressing conditions which force the people into the service of warring Imperialism, from which they cannot escape as long as the war lasts.

This struggle for existence is not the cause nor the purpose of the war, but a natural outcome of its mechanism. It is not by its nature a political struggle but is part and parcel of the political machinery of capitalism.

The "struggle for existence" is a powerful instrument for agitation in the hands of the war party, but has no place in Social Democratic policy. The people are forced into a struggle for existence, but *the Social Democracy loses its standing as a political party when it lends itself as a tool to the war party.*

The people must see this war through because they have no other choice. But did the Social Democrats as a political party have the right to commend the "holding through" policy? The "holding through" policy which means nothing more than "suffering through," "starving through" and "killing through?" The people "hold through" because they have no other choice. But the Social Democracy has no right to champion this suffering. Her task is to denounce all suffering, denounce the present system, denounce the guilty ones, denounce everyone and everything on whom the responsibility rests for *condemning the people to the misery of "holding through."* If the Social Democrats had anything to hold out for, it was their policy and not the war.

The ruling classes are in this war to divide the earth. They are fighting for the control of the world. We have nothing but contempt for the doctrine that the proletariat must uphold the Imperialists of its country, so as to help increase the gain of the war. It is awful enough that the working class is the *tool of Imperialism* in this war; if the working class were to degrade itself into becoming a partner of Imperialism, it would be the grave of all hopes for the future.

The aims in this war are purely the aims of the ruling classes. Our aim is not world power of an Imperialistic caste, but world power of the international proletariat. Whichever way Imperialism may divide the world, the task of Socialism is to conquer it for itself.

The evident and sincere hatred at the beginning of the war of the Austrian and German proletariat for the bloodthirsty regime of Nicholas caused this same proletariat later to become the victim of political trickery and scheming politicians. Prussian generals and privy councillors who never dreamt of professing "Anti-Czarism" in principle, had deliberately chosen this catch-word for the Socialist masses, and they succumbed only too readily.

No international congress decided for a war against Czarism. Nor even to a group was this power given. For the Germans who marched against Russia had to attack France at the same time.

Neither does the alliance of France with Russia against German militarism proceed from the spirit of internationalism. European democracy cannot build its hopes on a victory of either the central powers or the allies. There is but one policy for democracy in this war, *that of strictest neutrality.*

In an era of Imperialism war cannot be the means of democratising the proletariat. The catch phrases against Czarism and Prussian militarism were simply used for war purposes by the ruling classes while accentuating antagonisms in the international.

The arts of diplomacy led all countries to believe that they were attacked. Even the Austrians branded with the stigma of the ultimatum, used the ideology of self-defense. The bluff worked with all the Socialists in all the countries. They immediately declared themselves ready to fight in self-defense. The ruling classes used the word "self-defense" to carry away the masses, in reality thinking only of the possible gains in the event of victory. *For the Socialist proletariat, however, any design to exploit victory for material benefits, would be a betrayal of the principle of self-defense.*

The democratic and the military goal can never be identical. The aim of the military commander is to impose his will on the enemy. The Social Democracy must never go beyond the point of preventing the imposition of foreign dominion. All peoples resist being conquered, nor do they require the conquest of others, for this is the requirement—not of a people but of a ruling class in a class-ruled society. The victory of one nation over another means defeat, misery and oppression; in short all the horrors that "self-defense" is intended to combat. Militarists want to wait until the vanquished

beg for peace. Social Democrats must demand that the peace proposals come from the victor, and that the *status quo ante* shall serve as a basis for peace.

Only through such a peace can all future danger be warded off. But not even to a policy of defense did the Socialists adhere. The sentiment is being voiced from among their ranks that it cannot be expected that war be waged and bloody sacrifices incurred without a return. We must see even Socialists sink to the level of robbing a man when he is down. We must see even Socialists convert the necessity for self-defense into a justification for taking profit.

The aim of the Social Democrats which they announced August 4th has long been reached. The attacks have been repelled. The soil of Austria and Germany has been freed from the enemy; the central powers can feel secure of their integrity should peace be declared now. And still the Social Democrats allow themselves to be carried along by the ruling classes. They do not even put the question: Is the government willing to state openingly that it will make peace at any time on the basis of the *status quo ante?*

The Social Democrats are afraid to put the question because they are afraid to face the consequences of a negative answer, because they are not prepared to throw their weight into the balance and prove the good faith of their preliminary statements to the declaration of August 4th.

The theory of defense was a brilliant means of creating patriotism in the proletariat. However, we are not so naive as to believe that any one of the ruling powers would be bound by such a statement. Therefore the only remaining hope is that the war may end after general exhaustion on all sides, that there be neither victor nor vanquished, and that our wish—the overthrow of all governments and the inviolability of all peoples—be fulfilled.

It is not in the interests of the working class to have any problems "solved" by the war. Its interests are best served if everything remains the same after the war, if the methods of war are compromised as much as possible and if the masses in all countries turn against their respective governments. It is a terrible school for the people to go through, but it is the only way that they can learn to end the madness of the world war and to enforce the policy of mutual understanding among nations.

Our hopes are built not upon victory but upon the ending of the war.

We particularly condemn all conquests based on the theory of the improvement of strategic boundaries; we know that as long as the era of imperialism lasts, the world is always in danger of war.

We protest against the annexation of any territory, whether Belgian, French, or Polish.

We protest in the name of international solidarity against the imposition of any tribute whatsoever. We know that the proletariat is condemned to bear consequences of the wars of Imperialism, but let it maintain its solidarity in doing so. The workers of a country shall not seek relief in the hope that they may unload their burdens on the workers of other countries, but must make common cause with all workers against exploitation everywhere.

The starvation of the masses and the demand for foodstuffs are considered a legitimate field for profit and speculation. If the propertied classes practised the patriotism that they preach, the sacredness of private property would have been subordinated long ago to the human need of saving the masses from starvation. But the ruling class, sooner than confiscate property or property rights, prefers to let the public health collapse.

And verily even we are not content now with the mere expropriation of the expropriators. The people want more than relief from starvation; they want a stop put to this wholesale murder; they want peace. The accumulation of misery and horror is getting beyond human endurance. Cripples, by the thousands, are wandering through the streets of the cities, while nearly every house contains weeping widows and orphans.

The Social Democracy by supporting imperialist politics frittered away the golden opportunity of becoming the instrument of peace. We Socialists, who have remained international, never doubted for a moment that the first decisive defeat in this war, *was suffered by the Socialist International.*

But as a result, Socialist policy will rise from a national to an international level. The masses will learn to realize as a result of the war that they cannot fight the class struggle and a national war at the same time; they must choose *either* to co-operate with other classes in the nation, *or their own class in all nations.* In the bitter school of war they will have learned that their class interests, which are those of the entire human race, supersede the interests of any part or "nation."

ANNOUNCEMENT

With our next issue will commence the publication of the articles of the revolutionary minority group of European Socialists. These articles will appear regularly, as the NEW REVIEW is the English edition of *Verbote,* the organ of the minority, which is edited by Anton Pannekoek and Henriette Roland-Holst.

Japan and the Far East

By Lajpat Rai

WHILE Europe is engaged in a deadly war, of which no one can yet see the end, things are happening in the East which are enough to make the most optimistic pacifist uneasy. China is again in the throes of a revolution, India is by no means quiet and peaceful and Japan is busy in preparing herself for all eventualities. One need not be long in Japan to find out that the political atmosphere there is not what it appears to be on the surface. Technically, of course, Japan is also a belligerent, an ally of the British and at war with Germany. But a few days' residence in Japan makes it clear to a man who has eyes to see and ears to hear, that the foreign policy of the present government of Japan is not endorsed by the nation at large. The Japanese are very loyal to the throne; they are by nature and habit taciturn and reserved. They appreciate the value of showing a united front to the world outside. As such they are not disposed to violently attack the foreign policy of their government. But reading the Japanese papers between the lines and in conversation with the educated classes, one easily finds out the real trend of Japanese public opinion.

There is a certain section of the press which is in open hostility to the government's foreign policy and which strongly criticises the government for having taken the side of the Allies in this war. They think, that, considering Japan's interests in Asia and elsewhere, Germany is the natural ally of Japan, and that in any case the terms of the alliance with Great Britain did not require Japan to enter into the list of combatants, unless the peace of the Far East was in danger or India was invaded *from without*. Some of them would rather see Japan adopting the political morality of Europe, tear up her treaty with Great Britain and seize British possessions in the Far Eastern Countries. The *Third Empire*, an influential Japanese periodical published three times a month, is an open exponent of this view and the younger generation of Japan seems to be in full sympathy with this exposition of Japan's ambition. The more sober opinion, however, is, that Japan need not have made an enemy of Germany and that it would be to the advantage of Japan to make an alliance with Germany as soon as she can find a pretence to back out of her alliance with Great Britain, because that treaty is onesided and has been or is of no use to Japan. At any rate, now that Russia is an ally of Great Britain, it has lost its meaning.

Within a month of my arrival in Japan I was interviewed by one of the assistant editors of one of the most influential of Japan's dailies, the organ of the party in power, who opened his conversation by saying that, although his paper was anti-German, he himself was a strong pro-German. After that I had frequent opportunities of meeting the Japanese journalists from the chief editors down to reporters, and I have no hesitation in saying that on the whole the Japanese press is anti-British, and feels that there is a necessary and natural conflict between the interests of Great Britain and Japan in the East. Japan aspires to a position of supremacy in the Far East. She feels that with a disintegrated China at her door, the possibility of Russia or England or both getting strong in the neighborhood, is a menace to her safety and development, and from her point of view she may be right. On the other hand, Germany is still far away and there is no immediate danger of her preponderance in the Far Eastern politics. Many thoughtful Japanese, therefore, think that it was a blunder on the part of the present government to make an enemy of Germany and plunge herself into the war. In their opinion, the balance of political advantage was in ranging on the other side or at any rate in being neutral.

Within the last four months' time, twice the Japanese press came out strongly and gave expression to anti-British feelings. The first occasion was when it was given out that Britain and her allies were trying to persuade China to join the Entente. It was in connection with this news that the Osaka *Asahi* wrote:

"It has reason in the truth of a report that prior to Japan's declaration of war on Germany last year, the British minister to China advised his government that it was easier to have Germany for a rival in China than Japan and it would be inadvisable to bring Japan into the Entente. President Yuan's adviser, Dr. Morrison, is also credited with a similar attitude of antagonism to Japan. . . . . The paper fears that as long as they stay in China, there may develop from time to time events that might ultimately endanger the Anglo-Japanese alliance itself." (Translation in the Japan *Times* of Dec. 1, 1915.)

In one of its recent issues, *Kokumin*, one of the most ably conducted of Japanese dailies, which is not an opposition organ, remarked that "as it is situated, this country in view of the great war hampering other countries, would have seen its prestige heightened and its influence raised, if only those in power had performed their duties with competency and wisdom." Even the *Hochi*, the semi-official organ of the government, said that there was "a tendency observable among British residents in China which is not very friendly to the Alliance." In a similar strain did the *Yomiuri* ask, "if it was not possible that the Powers' intention was not so much to support as to restrain Japan in China." The *Yorodzu* thought that " if as a result of China being included in the Entente, China par-

ticipated in the coming peace conference, 'Japan will find it very inconvenient.'" The journal did not think that "the Entente powers will dare to side-step Japan, but Japan should watch carefully because there are such men in China as Dr. Morrison and Sir John Jordon, who are half Chinese and half Englishmen. (Sic!) They are trying to serve the good of England and China at the expense of Japan." The *Chugai Shogyo* remarked: "We doubt the sincerity of England and at the same time are displeased with the incompetence of our own authorities." In a long article on the same subject, the *Yamato* called upon Sir Edward Grey "not to lose his head owing to his failure in the Balkans and to devote his energy in correcting the "traditionally dishonorable diplomacy of England."

The *Hochi* bitterly complained that the attitude of Englishmen in China gave the Japanese people cause to suspect the lack of good faith on the part of England.

The other occasion was furnished by the order of deportation passed by the Japanese government against two Indian "revolutionaries." The Japanese press attacked the government with such singular unanimity as jarred on the ears of the British weekly, the *Far East*. Even the government organs did not support the action of the cabinet. So strong was public opinion against the government in this matter, that some Japanese friends of the "revolutionaries" made it impossible for the authorities to carry out their order, by concealing the Indians, somewhere in Japan. Some of the papers, both native and foreign, insinuated that the concealment was connived at by the authorities as the best way of getting out of the unfortunate position in which they had put themselves. The press and opposition attacked the government on the ground that in passing this order, they had made themselves the tools of the British. The authorities explained at first that the Indians concerned were "German spies," but finding themselves unable to prove that, they defended their action on the ground that with the help of Germans, the Indians were trying to create a rebellion in India. The press considered this defence to be untenable and objected to the order on the ground that, so long as the Indians were not doing anything detrimental to the interests of Japan, they were entitled to the protection of Japan.

The incident is not altogether closed yet, as the said Indians are still in Japan. For the last four months the Japanese press has been writing almost daily on the Indian situation, expressing their sympathy with the Nationalists' cause, sometimes even advising the British government to give self-government to India. Once when it was hinted that the Japanese government might send troops to India to quell any disturbances there, the press unanimously opposed the project and the authorities had to explain in a way, that they had no intention of doing so.

The hostility of the Japanese press to the British has several times been noticed by the British and American press in Japan and China, and reading between the lines the papers of the two nationalities, one finds ample evidence to conclude that there is no love lost between the two. It was only the other day (Dec. 17, 1915), that the *Kobe Chronicle*, a British paper, noticed the attempt of the *Yamato* to prove that "the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was never in any way for the good of Japan, but only for the sake of preserving the *status quo* in Persia and India."

So far back as the 19th of November, before any of the two questions mentioned above had arisen, the Japan *Advertiser*, an American paper, had to point out how "a section of the Japanese press had been belittling England's performances in the war." The *Advertiser* said it was difficult to say to what extent these views were "individual products" or "the reflection of public opinion." But "one reads them in so many places, that it seems impossible they should not represent ideas which are widely accepted." The views referred to were summed up in the following paragraph:

"The central powers, said the *Nichi Nichi* yesterday, have won eight-tenths of the victory, and seven-tenths of the failure is due to England. The *Yamato*, while not singling out England, comes to the conclusion that the Entente powers are not in earnest, and says that England and France, having now plenty of munitions, should send huge forces of men courageously to the Balkans. The *Yoradzu* admires the British people, but feels sorry for them as they will not be able to maintain their industrial system after the war. And the *Sekai* puts the top stone on the pyramid by declaring that Japan put her money on the wrong horse and made a mistake when she agreed to join the declaration against a separate peace."

The Anglo-Chinese press has been clearly hinting that Japan is causing disturbances in China and indirectly helping the revolutionaries against Yuan Shi Kai.

In the month of December the *Yamato*, a Japanese daily, has published a series of articles on the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, one of which is from the pen of the President of the Japanese House of Representatives, and the Japan *Advertiser* has in more than one leading article, been pointing out how dangerous such writings are for the maintenance and continuance of the Alliance.

The Asiatics are watching the development with profound interest.

At the Parting of the Ways

By A. A. Goldenweiser

ONE of the most gruesome aspects of the horrible world drama of which, now for many months, we are the witnesses and participants, is the apparent fatality with which one nation after another is drawn into the whirlpool of death and destruction. It is no longer a war of Europe but of the entire world. America alone, in so far as it is not a part of England, has so far escaped; but even in the United States of America the future is no longer clear, and ominous clouds are gathering over our political horizon. From the very first the huge orders of war munitions placed in this country by the Allied powers resulted in an awkward and dangerous situation, incompatible with neutrality, incompatible also with that relatively calm and disinterested outlook on the European struggle, which, under other conditions, might have been expected from the people of this country.

The diplomatic conflict with Germany and Austria over the submarine issue has contributed its share towards that state of mind which after rapidly passing through successive stages of increasing violence and irrationality, has finally crystallized in the preparedness issue, which now faces the country and Congress.

We are told that we must prepare, and the recent recommendations of the Army and Navy Departments, rushed to completion with feverish haste, give some idea of the possible meaning of preparedness.

Preparedness—but for what?

The United States, it is urged, must be prepared to resist an invasion by a hostile power directed either against itself or against any of the states of South America. What power? Not England, nor France, nor Russia, nor the Republic of San Marino. Clearly the only two powers which could seriously be considered in this connection are Germany and Japan. Clearly, Germany, whether she could come out of the present struggle victorious or defeated, will for many years be less in a position to indulge in gigantic aggressive enterprises than she was for years in the past. With the flower of her manhood gone, her finances exhausted, her industries over-strained and thrown out of balance, she will also have to face the continental armies of France and Russia. Neither of these countries are likely to view with indifference a Teutonic invasion of America; and, if successful in the present conflict, they will take good care that any aspirations on the part of Germany towards economic, territorial or political aggrandizement are nipped in the bud; if beaten, these two countries, animated by the spirit of France after 1870, will see in any weakening of Germany brought about by a vast military enterprise beyond the seas, an opportune moment for their *revanche*. Moreover, it is all but inconceivable that the German people themselves should, after the conclusion of the war and for many years hence, countenance an aggressive military policy on the part of the Imperial Government, no matter how alluring the prospects. But even if, disregarding all these considerations, Germany is conceived as actuated upon by a motive sufficiently powerful to induce her to attempt the herculean task of an invasion of America, it would surely be altogether beyond the range of probability to assume that in such an eventuality the British Navy would play the rôle of a passive onlooker. While the Anglo-German naval rivalry continues—and it will continue so long as England is, and Germany aspires to be, the mistress of the seas—Germany will take good care not to risk her entire naval strength by exposing to hostile attack on the open seas her transport armada, while leaving the shores of the Fatherland unprotected.

As to Japan, the natural limits of her Empire lie within the bounds of Asia and the adjoining islands, and nothing but extreme provocation could induce her to send her battle fleet across the Pacific in the foolhardy and suicidal attempt to invade the United States. Such provocaion could only be caused by a vigorous exclusion policy or by high-handed action in the principal area of Japanese influence. The second prophesy as to eventualities, may for the present be disregarded, for it is incompatible with a sincere policy of defense or preparedness, the complex and multiform problems presented by the contrasting characters of Japanese and American labor and standards of living, with sufficient good will and patient investigation they could certainly be settled to the satisfaction of Japan, the individual States involved as well as the federal government.

Thus the theory of a hostile invasion appears to rest on an altogether irrational idiosyncrasy, a mere phantom conjured up by the world-wide reverberations caused by the great war, reverberations of an unreasoned fear, of pugnacity, and of barbarism.

The preparedness which is being advocated, in addition to its unreasonableness, is also unrealizable in the form in which it is being advocated, for, is there such a thing as defensive preparedness? The history of Europe during the last third of a century has demonstrated the opposite. For European armaments have grown out of the theory of defensive preparedness, but who would still believe that the European war is a defensive war, on the part of any of the nations involved, except Belgium and Servia? The theory that a nation can be so strong that no

other nation will dare to attack it, the theory that by utilizing the devices made possible by modern science war could be made so terrible that it would become impracticable, have proved pure chimeras. Those who see an argument for preparedness, for armaments, in the events of the present war would see it everywhere, under all conditions, for the source of their convictions lies not in the course of events, but in the inclinations of their natures and the idiosyncrasies of their minds.

Formidable as are the sums now recommended by those in office for military expenditure, the matter will certainly not rest there. Whatever the present theory of the ultimate purpose of the bigger army and greater navy and the stores of ammunition, the first step will suffice to introduce the United States into the international concert of military powers; new armies will become "necessary," and mightier navies, and the United States will learn something of the weight of those armaments designed to protect the country from foreign invasion. Those who speak of defensive preparedness, of an armed democracy, of an idealism clad in armor, forget the inevitable psychic correlates of the objective aspects of preparedness, forget that the people of the United States are made of no other stuff than the people of Europe. Armies, navies, armaments, inevitably lead to militarism. Such is the lesson of Europe. There arises a powerful and influential class whose profession is war, whose ideals are military ideals; for no military man can rest satisfied with the assurance that his function in life consists in keeping himself in good physical trim, wearing a uniform, and dreaming about deeds of valor never to be realized. From the military the militaristic infection spreads to the civil population; hearts begin to throb at the thought of possible achievements of the hosts of highly trained men placed on icron-clad ships and those other hosts of highly trained men organized in regiments, supported by thousands of cannon of tremendous diameters and inexhaustible stores of ammunition. And somehow it happens that events, countries, liberties, heretofore foreign to our interests, suddenly become of most intimate concern to us, and presently imperialistic policies, couched in innocently moralizing terminology, make their appearance amidst a people who may still deem themselves democratic.

It follows from the preceding that armaments, far from constituting a mere mechanism of war, are perhaps the most fatal among the causes of war in modern times. In the course of history, such causes were many. Pugnacity had its share, religious and political conditions had theirs; during the last quarter of a century economic agents have made themselves felt as particularly powerful factors in this connection. It is, however, more than a paradox to assert that a far more effective and ominous cause of modern war are armaments themselves, military preparedness with its psychic correlates. No one who has without prejudice watched the development of the European situation can doubt for a moment that whatever conflicts there may exist between the interests of the European powers, the real trouble with Europe was the rivalry of armaments, the economic weight of which was becoming intolerable, the correlated spread of militarism and imperialism, mutual suspiciousness—only too well justified—and the belief, which with many had become a conviction, that a general European conflict was not only inevitable but desirable, that nothing short of such a conflict could put a stop to the unbearable strain. Just as ritual, orginally the expression of religion, itself becomes a source of religious sentiment; just as law, from being the voice of custom, becomes the master of it; so armament, in origin and design but the mechanism of war, grows to be the cause of it. When one considers the tremendous complexity of the modern mechanisms of war, and the length of time required to bring them into being and into action, he can scarcely doubt that a completely disarmed Europe would not go to war over any of the issues which now so often obscure the political horizon, and that under such conditions even a relatively ineffective mechanism for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, could be trusted to achieve that end before any armies and navies and cannon could spring into being.

The road to peace is not paved with armor-plate.

The recent history of the peace movement has shown how nearly impossible it is for any of the great European nations, armor-clad as they are, to take effective lead in the organization of Peace. Peace assurance and suggestions sound hollow when accompanied by constructive army reforms and the projection of new battleships. The United States is at present, notwithstanding its huge military expenditures, relatively so little armed that it could without much difficulty become altogether disarmed. In this country such a step, if made soon, would not involve the tremendous social and economic complications which a similar course would bring in its wake if attempted by any of the great European powers. Disarmament, unpreparedness, would, of course, leave the United States undefended. But what as to a possible hostile invasion? It was suggested before that a consistent peace policy on the part of the United States would dispose of all danger of invasion on the part of Germany or Japan. Granted, however, that such danger would not be altogether eliminated, the United States would be in a position to proclaim its policy of peace even at the risk of an invasion. From an economic and political point of view, as at present understood, such a policy might be designated as unreasonable and impracticable; but there is need for sacrifice in international reform as there is in national reform, and our standards of international activity may require revision.

A great nation can afford to ignore the "contempt" based on a code of honor soaked in human blood. Standards of morality born on the field of battle, need not confuse those whose vision reveals a morality of a world at Peace. In the present state of international suspiciousness, however, a nation's willingness to run a risk for the sake of an ideal may be the only means of convincing other nations of the earnestness and sincerity of its course. Disarmament and an unconditional abandonment of all imperialistic policies would constitute a most convincing proof of sincerity.

Every nation must work out its own destiny. Nothing that we might say, or write, or do is likely to affect the course of impending events. However that may be, it must be recognized that the United States is about to pass through one of the gravest episodes in its history.

On the one hand, preparedness, armament, preparedness again and more armament, militarism, imperialism, and, in the end, war. The redeeming feature may prove to be a share in the ultimate peace organization of the world, which, no doubt, will be realized in the remote future, even though the great nation may soon embark anew upon a career of armament and militarism.

On the other hand, disarmament, unpreparedness —even at the risk of an invasion—and a consistent and indomitable policy of Peacefulness. That tremendous strides could thus be made in the direction of World Peace I, for one, do not for a moment hesitate to believe. There is need for national, not individual leadership, in the international struggle for a constructive Peace; and the United States is the only nation available for that purpose.

To be sure, its fitness for that function has in a measure been impaired through the part it has played in the European conflict; but even national sins may be forgotten and forgiven. The chance is still there. After the first Preparedness program is passed by Congress and carried out, it will be too late.

The weight of an armed nation in international affairs is never more than proportionate to the strength of its army and navy; the weight of an unarmed nation may be nil; but, under certain conditions, it may become inestimably great. The United States as a military world power is one possibility, Uncle Sam as an international reformer, is the alternative one. The decision must be made now. As a staunch hater of war, in any form, and a believer in peace, in any form, I, a European, for many years resident in the United States, take this occasion to remind the people of this democratic commonwealth of the fateful issue before them: You stand at the parting of the ways, Beware!

What Kind of Education?

By William E. Bohn

IN the end the people must be the judges. Carpenters and street-cleaners and housewives must decide how our boys and girls are to be educated. Shall we go on giving each child a desk and a few books and call him educated when he has bent over the desk for a sufficient length of time and learned more or less of what is printed in the books? Shall we have vocational education? Shall we have training for citizenship? Shall we have training for fine, free manhood and womanhood? Shall we have the Gary system? Shall we feel free in each town to work out the best system for that town? These carpenters and street-cleaners and housewives must decide. I suspect that in the end they will prove the best judges. Surely our professional experts cannot be proud of their record thus far.

But how shall we go about this matter of judging? A pump draws water; a lamp sheds light; a furnace produces heat; a locomotive draws a weight along a track. Sizing up a pump, or a lamp, or a furnace, or a locomotive, is a simple matter. Which one draws the most water, sheds most light, produces most heat, draws the greatest weight at highest speed? And which one does it with the least expenditure of energy? These questions are answered as soon as the results of experimental tests are tabulated—and the matter is settled. Nobody gets excited. Nobody is called an erratic self-seeker if he suggests a change. And there are no old fogies who want to go on using old sorts of pumps, lamps, furnaces, or locomotives after it has been shown that a new sort is better. We know what the mechanism is supposed to do; we determine by experiment which sort does it best.

Obviously any sensible person would use the same method in dealing with a church, a form of government or a school system. A number of difficulties arise at the very start. What is the product of a school system supposed to be?

The other day an old and excellent teacher was heard to moan: "You hardly ever see one of our pupils treat his elders with the sort of respect which I was taught when I was young." In times past there were in some parts of the world schools run chiefly to secure politeness. Is that what we are working for now?

Recently Mr. Maxwell, City Superintendent of the New York Schools, anounced that the so-called Gary schools are failing. This statement was based on the fact that pupils in these schools did not do as well as some others in what is called an examination. This "examination" is not like the

examination of a pump, a lamp, a furnace or a locomotive. In the case of all these devices an examination is an investigation with a view to determining whether they function productively, whether they do a definite sort of work in sufficient amount. The school "examination" is something quite different. Each pupil is placed at a desk with a quantity of paper and a list of questions about arithmetic, spelling, grammar, or geography. If he can answer a sufficient number of these questions correctly he is said to have "passed" his "examination."

Once suppose that a system of education is not designed to fit young people to sit at desks and write answers to questions and the whole method of "examination" is manifestly inapplicable. You might as well choose a pump for the quality of its squeak or a locomotive for the amount of its smoke as judge a modern educational system on this basis.

But this matter of uncertainty as to function is not the only difficulty. Even if we were agreed as to what it is that a school is to be expected to produce, when, where, and how should proper tests be applied? Mechanical devices are comparatively simple; they are tested every time they are used. We know instantly if they begin to fail. But the school, like the church and the state, is different in the fact that its operations are manifold, slow in mauring and difficult to detect and evaluate. No simple test made at any given time can furnish a sure indication of efficiency.

Public education is carried on in kindergartens, elementary schools, high schools of many sorts, normal schools, colleges, technical schools, universities, experimental schools. Its materials vary from tiny four-year-olds to adult immigrants learning to read and write and experts pursuing investigations in laboratories. Some parts of the system are expected to turn out fourteen-year-old child-workers able merely to read and write; others are to provide us with artists and university professors. Some parts of the system operate in crowded cities, others in sparsely settled frontier regions. What uniform test can be applied to such a vast organization as this?

The product of the schools is the sum total of human beings put through their processes. Those who are graduated from any particular institution are soon scattered over the entire country, if, indeed, they remain within its borders. They get jobs, they marry, they rear children, they function as citizens. Who shall say whether they are a satisfactory product? When and where shall a test be applied? Or, in any case, what test shall be applied?

But if the evaluation of an educational system is a difficult thing it is none the less necessary. The conventional, inherited way of going about the difficult business of helping young people to learn is only one of many which are possible. Which one shall we adopt? We must devise some way of arriving at conclusions in regard to so vital a matter.

First of all, obviously, we must agree about the function, the work to be done. Let us say, tentatively, that public education is carried on in order to help boys and girls to become the sort of people needed in the world at the present time. We live in an industrial age in a political democracy. What sort of people do we need? We need, as the world has always needed, people who are physically well and strong. We need, more than the world has ever needed, people who can think straight and think for themselves. We need people with some moral backbone, people with courage, people who care whether things are right or wrong. We need people able to do their part of the world's work, to return to society as much as they take from it, and a little more. We need, very particularly, people who can find joy in life, have some appreciation of the fine things which have been done and made and will go on to make and do finer ones.

If we agree in this statement, or in some other similar one, how shall we determine whether a particular school is turning out the desired product? Something in this direction could be accomplished by a proper sort of inspection of the product at the moment when the process ceases, that is, at the time of what we call graduation. I use the term "inspection" in order to escape the implications which go with the word "examination." This inspection would take into account all the elements which I have enumerated and perhaps others which I have overlooked. Are the graduates strong and well? Can they think logically and independently? Are they morally earnest enough to take their places in the world with credit? Can they do well some sort of useful work? Are they prepared to live in a fine and full sense of the word? That is, can they get joy out of life and create joy for others? others?

I hardly know where we shall turn to find inspectors to perform this inspection. But there are men and women who could live with a group of young people for a week or two and reach more or less accurate conclusions on most of these points. If there are not many now, there will be more in the future.

But there is another difficulty which is more serious. One of the most precious products of education should be a faculty for growth, ability to expand, to add new powers or improve those already developed. Old teachers are forever discovering that the most promising graduates are often not the ones who shed most luster on Alma Mater in after years. The shy, secretive girl, the apparently dull, unresponsive boy may do more for humanity than the one who carried off all the "honors." The real test of a school is the quality of the product

twenty or thirty years after graduation. But how can this quality ever be determined?

Under modern conditions this is not at all impossible. Many institutions keep in touch with their alumni from the time of graduation until death. It must be confessed that this is done largely for financial reasons. The old "grad" knows well that when he receives a letter or circular under the well known and long loved letter-head he is about to read a touching appeal for much needed funds. But a few institutions have made efforts to discover from their alumni how the educational outfit has stood the tests of life. And the results of such efforts have been uniformly interesting and surprising. Often it has been discovered that what has really been useful has been something not down in the curriculum, not administered in lecture-rooms or laboratories, not examined for and recorded on credit cards. Any inspection of the product of education which is to be satisfactory must include more thorough investigations of this sort than any so far recorded. We must discover whether our protègés have succeeded in the really important affairs of life. How they have prospered in conducting business, working at trades, getting married, rearing children, serving on juries and town councils, organizing labor unions, and getting to the bottom of social and political problems? These are the questions on the answers to which must depend our judgment as to the success or failure of the education received.

I began by saying that carpenters and street-cleaners and housewives must do the deciding. Manifestly they cannot carry on such inspections as I have now in mind. Many of them cannot even learn in any systematic way what have been the results of such inspections when they are made. But those who are parents can carry on from day to day an inspection which will prove an excellent substitute. Let them determine clearly what sort of man and woman they want their boys and girls to become and they will in the course of time become very shrewd judges of the official educational process. If they will not allow themselves to be overawed by the results of "examinations" or by the authority of school officials more eager to defend the inherited system than to provide for the welfare of our children, they will do very well. Let them estimate the progress of their children in terms of life rather than in terms of marks and promotions. Let them bring to school affairs the sturdy sort of sense that they apply to other important matters. And then let them make their judgments felt among school politicians and educators.

Ideal-Less Pacifism

By Elsie Clews Parsons

IN the October number of the *Yale Review*, a well known scholar concludes an article on Italy and the war with these words: "Security of property and safety of skin may become the dominant ideals in democracies of the future, but the old ideals of sacrificing property, limb, life, for some great causes still prevail with most people."

Whether or not stretching a national boundary is not a form of property getting may be open to question. Whether or not to endanger or destroy the lives and property of nationals living under a foreign government by making war against that government, whether such enterprise is a proper expression of group sympathy, this, too, is a moot question. Perhaps less disputable is the contention that nationals are not well off under a foreign government, although to Italianize the government of the United States because thousands of Italians live in the United States, none, not even Mr. Sedgwick, would consider, I suppose, a great cause. But it is not with any of these suppositions I am now concerned, it is Mr. Sedgwick's implied criticisms of pacifism I am taking to heart. They are characteristic anti-pacifist implications, as well as characteristic conservative tactics. To say that the opposition has no ideals or low ideals is to claim idealism as your ally. Also it makes it unnecessary for you to recognize that there is any clash of ideals, that your own ideals are even open to challenge.

Now it is high time, I take it, for pacifists to object to these overbearing tactics. To be sure pacifists have long since asserted that humanism is quite as high an ideal as nationalism, or that without gentleness professions of Christianity are a sham. But some how or other these rejoinders don't get across to the nationalist idealists. Perhaps humanity seems too much of an abstraction to them or Christianity too much like a rubber ball that from much tossing about has lost its rebound.

And yet the arrogance of militarist idealism must be met. How would it do to concede it its contention —and more? To admit freely that although one may be willing enough to die for one's ideals one is unwilling to insist on others dying for them, that one's ideals do seem of less value than the happiness of other people, and that when the issue is between their happiness and one's ideals the latter are to suffer—if not in their integrity at least in their expression? In this sense pacifists might truly be said to be without ideals,—unless refusal to bring misery to any group of people for the sake of one's own group or for the sake of another group, the second group being yet unborn and the profit accruing to it highly hypothetical, unless this refusal may itself be considered idealistic.

The profit to the generations who are to follow may be described fairly as hypothetical because the results of idealism by the sword are so uncertain. War has some effects, of course, but are they ever just the effects military idealists have planned? Take the favorite ideal of great numbers of present-day militarists, their suicidal ideal, the crushing of militarism. Can any one contend in view of the effects of war on such neutral countries as was Italy, as is the United States, that militarism is on the decrease? Is this country more peace-loving today than it was a year ago? Consider Plattsburgh! Consider the "preparedness" budget! One of the most significant results of the European War will be the same as one of the results of the Civil War, or of the Franco-German war, opening new economic and professional positions to women. A year or so ago would men have agreed by the million to fight for this consummation? Methinks the pacifist is not alone open to the reproach of futility. The militarist also seems to be impractical, might we not almost say "a mere theorist"?

If both national and international theory and polity were expressed in terms of wants rather than of ideals it would be, I surmise, of incalculable advantage to society. Between ideals there are few or no points of contact. Between my set of ideals and your set there may be no means of *rapprochement* whatsoever, and so you and I go on thinking the worst of each other. Immunity to criticism is of the very nature of ideals. It is in fact among their self-advertised advantages. Now *wants* do not enjoy the advantage of such immunity. Your wants and mine may conflict of course; they may seem quite incompatible. But they can be compared and discussed; the chances are they can be adjusted or compromised. Such compromise involves no loss of self-respect, no lowering of standards. Let us see if I really have the thing you think I have, the thing you want. If so, perhaps you have something I want. Perhaps we can exchange. And we know it is not only economic wants that are negotiable. Wants, whatever their nature, can be bartered over. Not so ideals. "We can not surrender our convictions," declares President Wilson, "I would rather surrender territory than surrender those ideals which are the staff of life for the soul itself."[1] This is an inaccessible position.—For the sake of intergroup understanding and good will then, group wants and not group ideals should ever be the subject of discussion.

We might agree to this substitution the more readily did we realize that ideals were after all but wants disguised. The higher the ideal, the greater the sublimation, the more complete the disguise. A man of ideals may well be defined as a man who does not know what he wants, one who hides from himself his wants, protecting himself, shall we say, from thinking about them. When two idealists meet what chance is there then of mutual understanding unless their ideals are identical, what chance of sympathy?

And so it is too with groups. Let them once begin to proclaim their ideals and hope of agreement vanishes. "For the vindication of their character and their honor,"[2] as the President puts it, "they are ready at any time to fight." Selfishness, individual or collective, may create difficult situations, but selfishness plus muddle-headedness make an *impassé*.

Besides without its ally, muddle-headedness, selfishness has to fight its way in the open. Were ideals recognized as just as potentially *selfish* as other wants or lusts, fighting for an ideal would be much harder fighting. As it is, it is one of the easiest forms of fighting as yet contrived. But let me once admit that my faith, my sense of honor, my conscience, my *kultur*, are all egotistic, all an expression of myself, my attempts to force them upon others would encounter the same opposition as other acts of ruthless self-assertion.

We appreciate now why the militarist is ever such an idealist. If so greatly helps him to military success.

What war has indeed ever been fought without the help of ideals? One can but think that the most immediate duty of the pacifist is to get rid of his ideals, and to see plainly why he *wants* peace. If he persists in clinging to the ideal of peace, who knows but that the next great war will be a line-up between the idealists of war and the idealists of peace,—or is that properly a description of the belligerents in the present war?

From this standpoint at least we can understand why the self-proclaimed pacifists of Europe believe they can crush miiltarism with militarism or how being the most peace-loving nation in the world, as the President assures us, we are also preparing to fight any one at home or abroad who dares takes this view of us.

[1] From speech made in New York City, Jan. 27, 1916.

[2] Taft did maintain that questions of national honor could be arbitrated. But it was a novel dictum, as great as it was unconvincing, Mr. Taft having forgotten that "honor" had been too long in use as a formula to check thought to be available to stimulate it.

Will He Come Back?

By Felix Grendon

IT is between three and five of an afternoon in the sitting room of a modern flat near Washington Square. "An untrained estheticism," is one's offhand opinion of the room, which is decorated predominantly in blue.

Near the middle of the back wall is a doorway hung with blue curtains. Two blue and gold Chinese rugs, a lady's oak desk, a comfortable sofa, and a small ornamental table with papers, a magazine, and a cigarette case on it, are the chief articles of furniture.

The desk stands at the left wall in front. Between it and the door on the same side is an etching of an American girl by Paul Helleu. Three photographs (one of a group) are on and over the mantelpiece on the right. Their mechanical gloss sends a shiver through two delicate peacock drawings by Clara Tice that hang on either side of the fireplace.

CHARACTERS.

GILBERT SLOANE: *At the desk sits Gilbert Sloane, a handsome red-blood of 30, versed in the ways and dress of the clubman's world, and yet disposed to take the clubman's absorption in tremendous trifles lightly. A banker by inheritance and a dilettante by choice, he hides a deep dislike of ideas under an acquired tolerance that passes for liberalism.*

A taste for works of art is one of the refinements of his strong sensuous proclivities. Being no fool, he appreciates good craftsmanship, too, and goes in for pictures, statues, vases, women, curtains, and rugs—all of a fairly high grade. He is well able to gratify this artistic bent in all its directions, for he has plenty of money, and women find his robust physique and fastidious habits an irresistible combination.

EDITH WEBBER: *The young lady who enters is fair-haired and fair-skinned, and is clothed in a Russian blouse dress of dark chiffon velvet. Her blue fox furs and large black hat would catch the eye of any man, if her figure, hair and complexion were not beforehand. Her hair, so done up as to simulate a Castle cut, makes her look, offhand, like 18 instead of 26. But she is a thing of nerves and tensions, with an effect of being constantly on edge, and her first incisive tones betray her maturer age.*

MARTHA MCCUTCHEON: *Miss Martha McCutcheon is in the prime of her physical and at the beginning of her mental and moral development. Her dark eyes and dark hair match a costume which, though sober, is not severe. In repose, her features are plain. But interest or enthusiasm transfigure her face, besides releasing a vital energy that would strike fire in a stone. This, by the way, is easier than striking fire in a human being, as Martha, in the varied careers of wife, mother, and business woman, has learnt to her cost. And so, having plenty of sense, humanity, and good-humor, she is habitually unexpectant and self-contained.*

* * *

(*Gilbert kisses a love-note he has written, then reads it again. The door opens. He hastily folds the note and puts it in his pocket. Edith enters in a towering rage.*)

EDITH: At it again?

GILBERT: (*With injured innocence*) What do you mean, Edith?

EDITH: Give me that note!

GILBERT: (*Instinctively protecting his pocket*) What note?

EDITH: You know perfectly well, Gilbert. You've just put it in your pocket.

GILBERT: Really, my dear, I—

EDITH: Don't shilly shally. I want to see that note.

GILBERT: (*Retreating*) Edith, there isn't the slightest ground for this unworthy suspicion—

EDITH: What's the use of lying? Caught you slobbering over it. Unless I'm much mistaken, it's another appointment with Jessie Dean.

GILBERT: Oh, well, since you know all about it—

EDITH: I don't know *all*. That's why I insist on seeing the note. (*She snatches at his coat pocket in vain.*) Either you give it to me without further trifling, or we part forever. (*She waits. He fidgets nervously. She turns to go out.*)

GILBERT: One moment, Edith, I give in. I'm afraid I can't do without it.

EDITH: (*Sharply*) Without what?

GILBERT: Your galvanic temper, my dear. I don't say it's any fun to live with. But it jerks me out of the dull stagnation of everyday routine.

EDITH: Are you trying to get around me? (*Peremptorily*) The note!

GILBERT: (*Suddenly yielding*) Here it is. But remember this. If you read one syllable, my faith in your principles will be shattered forever.

EDITH: (*Fingering the letter*) What are you talking about?

GILBERT: You profess to be a radical, don't you? Your religion, you say, is the brotherhood of all men and women—

EDITH: Which doesn't mean the brotherhood of one man and all women.

GILBERT: (*Calmly ignoring the interruption*) You object to the private ownership of land and capital, and even more firmly, to the private owner-

ship of men and women. You believe that the personal relations between two human beings should be sacred, and free from the intrusive prying of a third. How do you reconcile these beliefs with your consuming jealousy?

EDITH: (*Pitching her voice high*) My jealousy?

GILBERT: (*Lighting a cigarette for effect*) Yes, at this very minute, what wouldn't you give to mop the floor with me and Jessie Dean?

EDITH: (*Closing the letter without looking*) So it *is* Jessie Dean?

GILBERT: (*Tantalizing her*) Aren't you going to make sure?

EDITH: (*Scornfully*) You think I'm jealous of your flirtation with a simpering wax doll? You flatter yourself. Keep your note. (*She flings it down on the table. He is considerably taken aback.*)

GILBERT: Do you mean to say you're not going to read it?

EDITH: I can guess what's in it pretty well: (*Reciting*) "Darling, your cheeks are like the peach-bloom, your tresses like the dawn." These notes of yours all read alike, Gilbert. Your love may be fickle, but your moonshine is constant.

GILBERT: (*Indignantly*) I never said that to anybody but you.

EDITH: (*Laughs derisively.*)

GILBERTS (*Gloomily*) All this rumpus because I take a little excursion once in a while—

EDITH: Excursion! You call a three-day jaunt with another woman an excursion?

GILBERT: (*In triumph*) No, no. That's what your favorite author, H. G. Wells, calls it. Like him, I'm all for the sacredness and permanence of one chief union. You must have that as a basis, if you want the rich peacefulness, the large security of a home. But a little excursion, now and then, is relished by the best of men.

EDITH: Indeed. Suppose *I* were to act on that principle, and go gallivanting about with members of *your* sex?

GILBERT: Frankly, my dear, I don't think it would become you. That sort of thing never becomes Woman, lovely Woman. Still, I'm not old-fashioned. I don't stick up for the double standard of morality and all that sort of rot. I'm a natural born varietist myself. And if a woman happens to take the same line, while I shouldn't think it proper to encourage her, I wouldn't interfere.

EDITH: All the same, I notice you are very careful not to take up with any woman that isn't scrupulously monogamous.

GILBERT: (*Airily*) Oh, I won't deny that there's something fascinating about the constancy of a woman to one man.

EDITH: And I tell you there's something disgraceful about the inconstancy of a man to one woman.

GILBERT: Perhaps there is. But, hang it all, I'm not to blame for the cells of my forefathers, am I? What's bred in the bone and all that, you know. (*He goes behind her chair and pets her indulgently.*) Come now, Edith, don't I love you better than all the others put together? The proof of it being that I always come back to you—always.

EDITH: (*Pushing him away*) Oh, yes. I'm a very convenient terminal station for your excursions. But I won't be a convenience any longer. I'm through with you. (*She picks up her furs and puts on her hat.*)

GILBERT: (*Querulously*) Women are positively mad nowadays. I can't get one of them to make a decent, comfortable home for me. (*She walks away contemptuously*) Look here, Edith, don't be unreasonable—

EDITH: (*Turning back*) I'm not. I'm merely monogamous. I think that having more than one partner at a time is filthy and indecent. And I won't live with anyone who doesn't agree with me.

GILBERT: (*With caustic emphasis*) In other words you *do* believe in private ownership, despite your fine-spun theories on the freedom of love!

EDITH: (*Flaring up*) You needn't insult me by jibing at beliefs I hold sacred. Only a fool or a cad expects anyone to share what is intimately personal. Do I share a toothbrush or a bathtub with another woman? No. Well, I won't share a *man* with another woman either.

GILBERT: You class me with your toothbrush, do you? Excellent! (*Sardonically*) Universal brotherhood carried to a logical conclusion, I suppose.

(*Edith's passionate intention of throwing a book at his head is blocked by the ringing of the telephone bell. She takes the receiver.*)

EDITH: Yes—Yes—Miss Who? Miss McCutcheon?

(*She looks suspiciously at Gilbert and repeats*) McCutcheon?

GILBERT: What! (*He runs to her side and whispers with bated breath*) Good Lord, my wife!

EDITH: (*With her hand on the mouthpiece*) Your wife! What could *she* want? (*Calling into the telephone*) Wait a moment.

GILBERT: (*Half to himself*) So she does care, after all. (*To Edith*) You'd better let me manage her, Edith.

EDITH: You! I should think not. I'll manage her myself.

GILBERT: (*Trying in vain to take the receiver*) For Heaven's sake, Edith, leave it to me. (*Swiftly*) You don't know Martha. She looks as innocent and unassuming as a stick of dynamite. But she can outwit the old Nick himself.

EDITH: Then you're the last one in the world to deal with her. (*Into the telephone*) Yes, I'm all alone. (*To Gilbert*) I'm not the least bit afraid. Anyhow, I want to see what she's like. (*Into the telephone again*) Of course, ask her to come up,

please. (*She hangs up the receiver*) And you go into my study where you won't be in the way.

GILBERT: My God! You don't know what you're up against.

EDITH: (*Bristling*) Do you imply that she's cleverer than I am?

GILBERT: (*Retreating to the study*) Nothing of the sort, my dear. But you'll be at each other's hair—

EDITH: Bosh!

GILBERT: (*Trying to assert his masculinity*) An occasion like this requires the sagacity of a man—

EDITH: (*Pushing him into the study*) Go on in, do. She'll be here in a moment.

GILBERT: (*Projecting a final warning*) You'll have trouble, see if you don't. I'll be close at hand, though, to get you out of it.

(*Edith shuts the door with a bang*)

GILBERT: (*Poking his head out again*) Really Edith—

(*The door bell rings. She stamps her foot at him imperiously. With an air of resigning her to a well-merited fate, he shuts the door. Martha comes in. She approaches to shake hands, but Edith anticipates her.*)

EDITH: (*Coldly*) Sit down, please, Miss—McCutcheon.

MARTHA: (*Looking around*) What a pretty flat. Where did you get these curtains! Beauties, I must say. (She walks over to them, and then touches the wall). And quite the latest thing in wall paper.

(*Edith is dumbfounded at her visitor's offhand behavior, yet she cannot conceal her pride of possession.*)

EDITH: It's a grass-cloth.

MARTHA: Stunning. Though personally, I like a flat wash better than a paper. It's so much cleaner.

EDITH: (*Outraged*) You haven't come here merely to criticise my furnishings, I presume?

MARTHA: (*Laughingly*) Forgive me for snooping around like this. I'm an interior decorator, you know. My art always gets the better of my head. Is Gilbert in?

EDITH: (*Authoritatively*) No.

MARTHA: (*With a sigh of relief*) That's good. Two women can talk so much better alone.

EDITH: (*Coldly*) Quite so.

MARTHA: (*Rattling away to keep up her courage*) A man is a most disturbing factor when women have serious business in hand. He affects to despise us for paying him too much attention. But what happens if we forget him for the least little while? He prances furiously all over the shop until we notice him again. And so we *do* notice him. It ruins work, but it's the only way to keep him quiet.

EDITH: (*With studied moderation*) Would you mind telling me what you came about?

MARTHA: About Gilbert, of course.

EDITH: I can guess what you want.

MARTHA: (*Dubiously*) Oh, can you? That would simplify matters immensely. (*They sit down*) It's nearly a year ago now since Gilbert left me.

EDITH: Yes, I know.

MARTHA: (*Disjointedly*) And, of course, I've had my business and the two children to look after.

EDITH: (*With forced sympathy*) I can quite understand how you feel.

MARTHA: (*With real sympathy*) I dare say you can. He's the same Gilbert, that's easy to see.

EDITH: (*Politely*) I don't quite know what you mean.

MARTHA: A decorator gets used to sizing up souls as easily as interiors. If you want to catch a man's soul off guard, study the colors, arrangements, and decorations of his living room. The high lights and the low, the harmonies and the discords —they are so many revelations, trumpet-tongued.

EDITH: What are you driving at?

MARTHA: Look at this mantelpiece. Above, a picture of Gilbert and his Sunday School classmates. On the right of that Satsuma vase a photo of his mother, on the left, a photo of—of you, I judge?

EDITH: Yes.

MARTHA: Well, the mantelpiece in my sitting room is just like this one. The same Satsuma vase, the same Sunday School picture, the same photos—except that the one on the left is a photo of me. And the same graceful Adam desk, the same voluptuous curtains, the same gay disorder in the distribution of things. In short, the same jaunty, sensuous, harum-scarum, sentimental, materialistic Gilbert.

EDITH: (*Menacingly*) Whatever his faults may be, I won't have him abused in my presence. He is my best friend.

MARTHA: (*Affecting solemnity*) He is the father of my children.

(*Edith, too angry to catch the irony of the situation, is slightly overawed by the conventional allusion.*)

EDITH: (*Defiantly*) That gives you a claim upon his purse, a claim that has, I believe, been amply recognized. But it gives you no lasting claim upon his love. Love yields to no law save its passionate need of fulfillment.

MARTHA: (*Relieved*) Why didn't you say so before, my dear? (*She goes over to Edith*) Now that I know you love him passionately, nothing will be simpler than to straighten out this perplexing business. But you must help me.

EDITH: Help you!

MARTHA: Yes. Help me to help Gilbert; help me to save him from this wasteful life of philandering

EDITH: (*Going up to her fiercely*) I know very well what your game is. But you are wasting your time. You can't persuade me to give him up.

MARTHA: Persuade you to give him up! My

dear Miss Webber, I came here to persuade you to keep him.

EDITH: What!

MARTHA: Yes. We've misunderstood each other completely. Come, let's sit down and talk it over like friends.

(*They both sit down on the sofa.*)

EDITH: (*Suspiciously*) Why do you want me to keep him? Do you dislike him?

MARTHA: Does anyone dislike him? You know his personal charm and fascinating ways. Unfortunately, there is one way he treads too often.

EDITH: What way?

MARTHA: The way of a man with a maid.

(*Edith is shocked without quite knowing why. She tries to express the sentiment with greater propriety.*)

EDITH: You mean his weakness for excursions?

MARTHA: Exactly. Of course, he always came back.

EDITH: Just as he does with me! I understand perfectly how you must have felt. His low taste for polygamy filled you with disgust.

MARTHA: Oh, hardly that.

EDITH: (*Severely*) Do you mean to say you accepted his infidelities without a murmur?

MARTHA: (*Apologetically*) Well, his nature was different from mine.

EDITH: Bah! When a woman makes that ancient excuse for a man, she discredits her sex. What's more, she injures him more than she does herself. Just look at his actions. He's been a cad to you and a beast to me, hasn't he? Well, all this suffering is the consequence of your criminal indulgence.

MARTHA: I'm very sorry. But, consider, when two people have been married a year or so, their relations become those of a brother and sister. Why, then, should I begrudge Gilbert a love affair once in a while? I could have had several myself for all he cared.

EDITH: Well, did you?

MARTHA: No, I was too busy. I had two children to look after and I was up to my ears in my business. No leisure, no love. When a man is in love with you, he runs through your time like a spendthrift through a fortune. He won't hear of what he calls a divided loyalty. And all your business must hang fire, while you remain at his beck and call. Now I dropped my business once, when I first met Gilbert. But I don't think I shall ever drop it again. Work like mine is fascinating; there is no end to its change and variety. But what is the difference between one lover and another? Like the difference between one seashore resort and another. The company changes a trifle, but the ocean is the same.

EDITH: What *was* the matter between you and Gilbert?

MARTHA: He was. When he was home, he interfered with my work a good deal; when he wasn't home, he interfered a good deal more.

EDITH: That sounds like a hopeless contradiction.

MARTHA: But it isn't. You see, he'd meet a new flame, pass into a state of exaltation, and off he'd go.

EDITH: (*Recalling her own wrongs*) He goes off still, thanks to your training.

MARTHA: Please don't heap coals of fire.

EDITH: (*Rubbing it in*) There's his latest. (*She shows her the note to Jessie Dean. Martha has seen too many notes of the same import to be curious about this one.*)

MARTHA: (*Gesturing a refusal to read it*) I know it by heart. But what can we do about it? Gilbert is built like that. Some men and women take to sex the way others take to drink or stamp collecting. It becomes a sport or a hobby with them. I simply didn't take Gilbert's hobby too seriously, though his goings-off and comings-back were very trying, especially his comings-back.

EDITH: Then you were always glad to get rid of him?

MARTHA: Strangely enough, no. When he was away, I couldn't get him off my mind. You know what babies men are, how easily they sicken, and how wretched they get away from home. Well, I felt that I had pledged myself to look after him. My conscience kept whispering to me that perhaps my business and domestic interests had driven him away, and that he might be in the hands of some unscrupulous female, uncared for, unhappy, his health gone to rack and ruin.

EDITH: (*Condescending to so much simplicity*) Gilbert unhappy! You *are* easily taken in. Trust him to put himself in clover every time.

MARTHA: One never knows. Anyhow, see for yourself whether my anxiety was groundless. After each absence, he'd come back with a woeful story of disillusionments and misadventures. You can imagine the details: his late partner had disclosed a bushel of faults, her features had begun to pall, and, what was worse, her conversation was trite, her jealousy unendurable, their joint bickerings endless, and so on. Romance had got another black eye. Sometimes Gilbert himself had got one.

EDITH: Serve him jolly well right, the heartless brute! Fancy forcing you to listen to accounts of his sordid infatuations!

MARTHA: He didn't force me. I listened willingly.

EDITH: What!

MARTHA: Oh, it was fun and instruction combined. You've no idea how much we learn of squalid reality from the history of a romance told by one of the principals. The whole history, inside out, from first to last. For Gilbert told me everything, everything without reserve. What else could he do? He had to pour his heart out to somebody, poor fellow.

And who was half so interested in him as I was? Nobody. Besides, he often needed advice which he couldn't get from anyone but me.

EDITH: Advice from you!

MARTHA: Yes. I could tell him exactly how far a girl meant to go when she said yes, or how little she meant to withhold when she said no.

EDITH: Am I to believe that you actually encouraged him to be unfaithful?

MARTHA: Dear, no. Again and again I pointed out that philandering is bound to defeat its own purpose, that it is a game in which you always want what you can't get, and always get what you don't want.

EDITH: Why didn't you get a divorce?

MARTHA: And leave him utterly unprotected? No. With his reckless passion for making love, think of the women into whose clutches he might have fallen! My conscience balked at such base desertion. I felt that I had to hold on, until some competent woman with a firmer hand than mine should be willing to take my legal place. Only then could I resign him without a sense of shirking a responsibility I had assumed with open eyes.

EDITH: (*Uneasily*) Why do you tell me all this?

MARTHA: Because you are the first woman to whom I'm sure he can safely be confided.

EDITH: I'm not so sure of that.

MARTHA: He never stayed so long with any of the others. He's been with you a whole year.

EDITH: Yes. And already he treats me as if I *were* his wife. Goes on excursions and comes back impenitently, just as he did with you.

MARTHA: If you married him, you could change all that.

EDITH: Judging by present results, could I do better than you did?

MARTHA: You forget, I had my business.

EDITH: (*On her high-horse again*) And I have my pride.

MARTHA: But you love him. No, it's useless to protest. You showed your real feelings plainly when you supposed I had come to wrench him away from you. Let's prove that women can show common sense about an affair of sex companionship. You love him; I don't. You're domestic; I'm not. You can manage men; I can't. What can I offer Gilbert? Little beyond my sympathy and my sense of obligation. What can you offer him? The three things he most needs: Love, a home, and protection.

EDITH: Protection! He's a man, not a molly-coddle.

MARTHA: He's a red-blood, and needs protection against the unhappy consequences of his philandering.

EDITH: (*Resentfully*) How do you know he's so unhappy? As far as I can see, he's having the time of his life.

MARTHA: Oh, no, you're quite mistaken. Recall with what dejection he returns from each of his adventures, Miss Webber.

EDITH: By the way, how did you learn my name —and where we lived?

MARTHA: Didn't Gilbert tell you? He ran right into me in the Pennsylvania Station yesterday.

EDITH: And blurted out everything, I suppose.

MARTHA: He made a clean breast of it. I'm afraid it's automatic with him now.

EDITH: The unspeakable cad! To betray my holiest confidences to a stranger.

MARTHA: (*Quizzically*) It was only his wife.

EDITH: (*Lashing herself into a frenzy*) The very last person a gentleman should have confided in. I see it all now. This is a put-up job. You want to get this man off your conscience. And you hope I'll be fool enough to oblige you by marrying him. You expect me to take your place, to become a sort of human phonograph receiving the records of his endless love affairs. Never. You've come to the wrong shop.

MARTHA: Don't be absurd. He may be on my conscience. But he's on your hands, isn't he? He's a solid human problem. And you can't wash that off your hands any more than I can wash it off my conscience.

EDITH: (*Defiantly*) Can't I though?

MARTHA: (*With concise determination*) No. We can't both abandon him at the same time. What would become of him? You must face that.

EDITH: (*At the top of her lungs*) I won't face anything. I won't be dictated to. I——

(*The door opens, and Gilbert enters, cigarette in hand. Has he overheard the conversation about himself? If so, he cannot have caught its drift. For he struts between the two women as a cock struts between two jealous hens, flattered, but determined to stop their bickering.*)

GILBERT: You really mustn't quarrel about me, girls. I'm not worthy of it.

EDITH: Look here——

MARTHA: But we——

GILBERT: (*Persuasively*) There, what did I tell you, Edith? I knew I'd have to interfere. Calm down now, and I'll divide myself in half to oblige you.

EDITH: Oblige us! You can multiply yourself by ten for all we care.

GILBERT: We!

MARTHA: Yes, we're both agreed—that some one must take care of you.

GILBERT: Magnificent thoughtfulness. (*With irony*) And would it be too much to ask which of you the fair savior is to be?

EDITH: (*Snappily*) Neither.

GILBERT: Then what on earth were you wrangling about me for?

MARTHA: (*Apologetically*) I was doing my best

to induce Miss Webber to take care of you permanently.

EDITH: And Miss Webber was doing her best to decline the job with thanks.

GILBERT: (*The truth dawning on him*) You might both wait until you're asked. A fine pass the world has come to when two women dispose of a man behind his back.

MARTHA: What could we do? We both feel responsible for you, I legally, and Edith morally.

GILBERT: Really, Martha, you amaze me.

MARTHA: Why?

GILBERT: (*Appealing to High Heaven*) Why! Good God,, she asks me why! (*Facing her*) Is this a fit place for a woman to meet her husband in, for the sole purpose of discussing their private domestic affairs?

MARTHA: What's fit for the gander is fit for the goose. Now sit down, and let's all be reasonable together.

GILBERT: Impossible.

EDITH: And worse than useless.

(*Nevertheless they follow Martha's commanding lead and take chair.*)

MARTHA: The trouble with you, Gilbert, is that you don't appreciate a good home.

EDITH: (*Pessimistically*) No man does.

GILBERT: Oh, doesn't he? That's where you women are completely off the track. A man loves his home every bit as much as a woman, perhaps more. To be sure, he's not always bragging about it, fussing over it, or giving parties in it. But he works for it, he even marries for it.

EDITH: If only for the pleasure of running away from it.

GILBERT: Quite so. But that's only for the joy of coming back to it.

EDITH: (*Sarcastically*) Or possibly for the fun of confessing your troubles over it to Martha.

GILBERT: (*To Martha*) What, you've actually given me away? Told her all I told you about her? (*He gestures to some one, God perhaps, to witness his wrongs.*) This comes of baring one's soul to a woman. (*Confronting Martha*) You have betrayed my confidence, violated my deepest trust, destroyed my faith in friendship. Tattle-tale, no, tattle-snake, viper! But what can one expect? Give a woman enough rope and she'll hang her best friend.

MARTHA: (*Unmoved*) You are forgiven, Gilbert. We know that your outbursts of blame mean just as little as your outbursts of praise. When things go wrong, you call me a viper. When they go right you tell me that "my cheeks are like the peach-bloom, my tresses like the dawn."

EDITH: (*Jumping up angrily*) What, he said that to you, too?

MARTHA: Hundreds of times.

EDITH: And to hundreds of women, I dare say. Blackguard, deceiver!

GILBERT: The charge of deception comes with poor grace from your lips, Edith, or from Martha's either. You both married me—

EDITH: (*Snappily*) Excuse me, I saved you from adding bigamy to your other crimes.

GILBERT: Well, you both lived with me, then under false pretenses.

MARTHA: (*Good humoredly*) Here's news!

EDITH: (*Indignantly*) What next, I wonder!

GILBERT: My understanding with each of you was that I was to get a home, a woman to take care of it, and my personal freedom.

MARTHA: Man wants but little here below.

GILBERT: (*Savagely*) I asked no more than every man of my generation was brought up to expect.

MARTHA: Can you deny that I gave you your freedom?

GILBERT: My freedom yes, but what about my home? You were so busy decorating the interior of other people's houses that you had no time for the interior of your own house. You cared for my peace of mind. But as for my comfort in body, you positively encouraged me to seek that outside.

MARTHA: But you always came back.

GILBERT: No thanks to you. For when I told you of my love affairs (mostly fictitious at first), you didn't mind them a bit. You actually seemed to enjoy hearing the details. As I live, you egged me on to bring you news of more and more lively adventures. It was unwifely. It was indecent. It was downright immoral.

MARTHA: (*Blushing*) Nonsense, Gilbert, your exaggerations are perfectly monstrous.

GILBERT: Not in the least. You quite forgot that one touch of jealousy makes the whole world kin. You forgot everything a wife should remember. That was what turned our home into a mockery of its name. It ceased to be a home. It became a hotel. And not even a comfortable one at that.

EDITH: Well, surely *I* made a home for you.

GILBERT: A home? You mean a prison. Martha, at least, was satisfied with my constant spiritual presence. But you, radical though you professed to me, demanded my constant physical presence.

EDITH: (*Flaring up*) When a woman goes to the extraordinary pains of making a first-class home for a man, the least she can expect is that the man shall be in it. Those are my terms. Take them or leave them.

GILBERT: I shall leave them, thanks. I won't be a peg for one woman to hang her passion for business on, or another woman her passion for owning a man. The cells of my forefathers rebel against so ignominious a choice.

MARTHA: Very natural of them, too, Gilbert.

But don't forget we've inherited the cells of your forefathers, too.

GILBERT: What of that?

MARTHA: Only this. That our forefathers imposed on the world the type of woman that suited *them.* Well, we have inherited this imposing trait. And we are about to impose on the world a type of woman that will suit *us.*

EDITH: Yes. We've advanced a bit, you see.

GILBERT: Advanced? Look here, Edith. You pick up amorous tid-bits in Greenwich Village, attend lectures on Birth Control, keep a bachelor flat, read the Spoon River Anthology, and give your hair a Castle cut. But do you know what the women in the Oneida Community did, seventy years ago?

MARTHA: (*Eagerly*) No, do tell us.

GILBERT: (*Shocked*) I beg to be excused. But they did all of these stunts and a good many more.

EDITH: Well?

GILBERT: Yet you call yourself advanced. Advanced! Lord, you've said it. You are an advanced woman of the period of President Polk, model 1847.

EDITH: If I were a man, I'd wring your neck. You, who coolly demand a wife, a home, and none of the responsibilities that go with these advantages, of what period are you?

MARTHA: (*Coming between her and Gilbert*) Of every period, age, and climate, my dear. Now do be sensible, both of you. (*She separates them.*) You two were simply made for each other.

GILBERT: Rot. You'd have to go far and search long to find a worse case of incompatibility of temper.

MARTHA: My dear Gilbert, incompatibility of temper is the basis for the happiest marriages I know of. When a husband and wife disagree tactfully, marriage becomes a life-long adventure. On the other hand, too complete a sympathy and too great a community of spirit are death to marital joy. That was the trouble with us. We were agreed on everything, including your right to occasional changes of sex companionship. What was the result of this perfect but tedious agreement? Alarums on my part, excursions on yours.

GILBERT: (*Stirred to the depths*) Don't shift the blame on me. You broke the spirit of our bond, even if I broke the letter. Why, you actually defended my conduct yourself. Wasn't it your doctrine that marriage is a pattern to which 57 varieties of people cannot be fitted? It is an immoral doctrine, one you should never have preached.

MARTHA: You had already practised it, Gilbert. And it was much simpler to fit a doctrine to you than to fit you to a doctrine, for I couldn't very well redecorate your passions. Besides, you can't have your cake and eat it too.

GILBERT: How do you mean?

MARTHA: You want a home, I believe?

GILBERT: Decidedly.

MARTHA: Everybody does, especially men. And you don't want to be tied for life to one companion?

GILBERT: Decidedly not.

MARTHA: Nobody does, not even women. What people desire, however, is a long cry from what they can get. Your practical choice, Gilbert, is between a home if you are faithful, and a hotel if you are not.

GILBERT: (*Flippantly*) To be inconstant is not to be unfaithful.

MARTHA: I don't pretend to understand these fine distinctions. All I know is that you can't have an old-fashioned home run by a new-fangled woman. Indeed. you can hardly induce any modern woman to feed, serve, nurse, and worship a man in the good old style. And I must say I think it is extremely lucky for you that Edith is willing to make the sacrifice, even if she asks you to recognize that the burning question in such a domestic arrangement is not: "What is home without a woman?" but "What is home without a man?"

GILBERT: Ah, Martha, your logic would be irresistible if you were speaking for yourself—

MARTHA: I'm speaking for all three of us—

EDITH: Oh, don't urge him, Miss McCutcheon. There are as good fish in the sea as ever came out of it.

GILBERT: There are. (*He picks up the note to Jessie Dean, and flourishes it.*) Thanks for the reminder. A hotel is better than a prison, anyhow. Good-by, Martha.

(*He is out of the room, almost before they can stir. Martha, who has not reckoned on this climax, dashes after him—too late.*)

MARTHA: But, Gilbert—

EDITH: (*Bitterly*) Don't worry about him. He'll have the face to come back, as usual.

MARTHA: (*Anxiously*) I know. But to which one?

The Failure of Brieux

By Ernest A. Boyd

WHETHER Bernard Shaw is responsible for the vogue of Brieux in English-speaking countries is a question whose answer depends upon the depth of one's faith in Shaw, as the moulder of destinies of contemporary English drama. He has certainly assured us that the author of *Blanchette* is "the most important dramatist west of Russia," since the death of Ibsen. Moreover, he is mainly responsible for the change which now enables us to accept with a certain equanimity the usurpation of the stage by moral and social propagandists, who often vie with their master in defying the laws of dramatic writing.

However much we may tolerate the "arguments", "discussions" and other substitutes for drama which Shaw has imposed upon us, we are at least entitled to revolt when none of the elements are present which enable many to enjoy the Shavian play. Once it is understood that Shaw is not writing a play, in the modern sense, but is attempting an elaboration of the old Platonic dialogue, with scenic modifications, and additional interlocutors, then we may give ourselves up to the interest of the discussion. The interplay of ideas is, or used to be, interesting, while the theses are usually less arduous reading than if they were found in their natural environment—the Blue Book or the Fabian pamphlet. So far as Shaw is concerned the playgoing public has divided itself into two classes, those who think he is a mountebank and those who believe he is a preacher, and who have acquired a taste for sermons in dialogue, interspersed with buffoonery.

The reader who seeks Brieux in his native garb, unadorned by the dialectics of apologists, will speedily be shocked. His prose is so poor, the form of his formlessness is so feeble that one is at once upon one's guard. Brieux, in his dramas, has failed to differentiate himself from the ordinary commonplace journalism or lecture of a social kind. His plays are as colorless as the average leading article of a "progressive" newspaper, with its vague phrases about humanity and equality, and its statistical attitude towards misery. Sometimes he is saved by his interpreters, who manage to galvanize his speeches into some sort of rough eloquence, but the printed page evokes no emotion. Even the very orthodox radicalism of Anatole France takes on the color of life in those fine eloquent speeches which he has collected under the title *Vers les temps meilleurs.* But neither the form nor the content of Brieux's work is stimulating.

What is the content of his work? Brieux has been hailed as a dramatist with ideas. What is his message? Shaw, and the apologists generally, have attempted to answer the question. They assure us that Brieux has a great deal to say about all the important problems of sociology. Syphilis, free love, prostitution, Malthusianism—these are but a few of the themes which have inspired him. It is true *Les Avariés, Les Hannetons, Blanchette* and *Maternité* profess to deal respectively with these questions, but the result has been, to say the least, unsatisfactory. As a bid for the martyr's crown *Les Avariés* may pass. Syphilis is truly a shocking subject, but no self-respecting censor would mention the word, much less allow it to be discussed in public. But that incredible substitute for a play is too great an insult to one's aesthetic taste to escape with the meagre justification that it is shocking. Does the author seriously believe that we have learned anything new or helpful from this play? Even as a "heart to heart talk" at some meeting "for men only" it would be utterly useless. We have never yet observed that those who knew most about the effects of this malady have avoided the opportunity to contract it. The subject is one with few dramatic possibilities, and these quite escaped the vision of Brieux. His story might have served an instructor in hygiene in the perfunctory discharge of his duties, but no dramatist—of ideas or otherwise—would have entertained it. Some eminently practical Americans have recognized its true value and turned it to this purpose.

Les Avariés is, however, unique in more ways than one. It is the only piece in which Brieux frankly reveals himself as a moral reformer absolutely indifferent to the demands of stagecraft. *Blanchette* is a conventional, lachrymose melodrama, in which Shaw might have recognized all the old stage tricks which he denounces so loudly in others. It is the old, old story of the girl who takes the wrong turning. Of course, we are told it is an indictment of modern education, of this "man-made world" where unprotected females are so fettered and harassed. Because Brieux's young lady is too well educated to stay at home it is apparently the duty of the State to provide her with work and at the same time to protect her virtue. The right to work is, indeed, a sound proposition, but can anyone maintain that Brieux has made it seem so? Blanchette's failure to earn a livelihood is the outcome of conditions a great deal more complicated than Brieux's romantic tale reveals. But then he had clearly no intention of dealing seriously with the problem. Otherwise he would not have altered the *dénouement* in deference to the stupid criticism of the arch-sentimentalist Sarcey. That Blanchette, in the revised version, should return, *virgo intacta,* and marry a respectable youth who always loved her, is very consoling to the patrons of melodrama. It is not exactly what one expects from "the most important dramatist" since Ibsen.

This readiness to make fundamental alterations is significant, nor has it been manifested only once. In *Simone,* for example, where the pivot of the play

is the refusal of Simone to pardon her father for having killed her mother because of her infidelity, this vital feature was obliterated at the last moment. After the dress rehearsal Brieux altered his idea and made the girl quite willing to pardon her father. Having thus deprived his piece of its mainspring, he could hardly pretend to have had any serious intention in writing it. Similarly *L'Evasion,* to take one of the translated plays, shows this indecision. When Dr. Bertry confesses that he has long since ceased to believe in science, we may well ask what he was supposed to represent in the earlier part of the play. All along it was understood that Bertry stood for the scientific ideal, upon that assumption the entire drama centres, yet Brieux abandons his premises in the weakest and most palpable manner. In short, he nowhere shows the courage of his convictions. He sets up his puppets, who declaim their theories; they are so many abstractions who present a problem in an artificial, indefinite way, there being no attempt to arrive at a conclusion. It is possible to read anything one personally believes into Brieux, for he is invariably inconclusive. His characters have no relation to life, and their revolt is wordy and diffuse, without any practical objective.

Had the author any personal ideas, any philosophy in the light of which to criticise, his plays would be, at least, an expression of himself. If his characters were unreal, his plays mere treatises, but at the same time the revelation of a point of view, they might share the interest we accord to the theatre of Shaw. But this is precisely what is lacking in Brieux. He has written one tract on hygiene and a series of melodramas with a veneer of ideas entirely divorced from any general scheme of life. That Brieux feels for the sufferings of the workers is probable, that he is conscious of various abuses is evident, but his plays do not supply a criticism of these things. They force nobody to think who has not already acquired the habit, while the absence of humor, of style, of grace, makes it highly unlikely that he will succeed in touching those who are indifferent to existing social evils.

Book Reviews

A Book on the Nearing Case

[1] The Limitation of Academic Freedom at the University of Pennsylvania *by Act of the Board of Trustees.* A brief of Facts and Opinions prepared by Lightner Witmer, A.B. '88 Wharton School and College, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Psychological Laboratory and Clinic, U. of Pa. New York, W. B. Huebsch. 50c.

THE book is composed largely of reprints of articles written originally for the *North American* and *Public Ledger* of Philadelphia published since June 15, the date of Dr. Nearing's dismissal. There are quotations also from Montgomery's *History of the University of Pennsylvania,* the *Alumni Register,*—the University publication that seems to be dominated by the "conservative" group of the alumni,—the Philadelphia *Inquirer,* George Wharton Pepper's book: *A Voice from the Crowd,* and from utterances of Rev. Dr. Aked, Babson the statistician, and one or two others.

The material brings out very clearly the following essentials of this now famous case: The nature of the dismissal; the activities of Prof. Nearing that led to his being dropped; the economic orthodoxy that has grown up in the Controlling body of the University backed by a clique of the Alumni, and the *real issue*—a part of the universal struggle of Democracy against Autocracy which always seeks to control the expression of opinion. In the introduction he calls attention to the fact that "there is much more than a lightly held opinion that certain representatives of the privileged classes have determined upon a campaign for the control of research and teaching," and in the body of the argument the picture grows vivid before the eyes of the reader of how this is being accomplished at the University of Pennsylvania. The corporation lawyers, gas magnates, Sugar kings and financiers who sit on the Board of Trustees are listed in Chapter IX—*"The Invisible Government."*

Prof. S. McCune Lindsey of Columbia, who investigated the Nearing case, says: "Last spring the faculty recommended him for re-engagement. His record, both as a student and as a teacher, was very high. I took pains to look this up and his record is flawless, and is one of the best of the forty professors and instructors in his department." It is true that the Trustees had served notice in July, 1913, on the assistant professors and instructors of the Wharton School that at the expiration of the period specified in the terms of appointment such appointment would be regarded as terminated unless renewed. This notice was not served on the College instructors, and was taken as a warning to the young and aggressive group of teachers including Conway, Pierson, King, Kelsy, Young and Smith, all teaching subjects concerned with social relations and touching economic questions—to stop questioning "things as they are" on pain of dismissal. The storm of protest from the alumni that followed brought forth the assurance of *"no intention to interfere with freedom of speech in the University,"* and Dr. Nearing was promoted to an assistant professorship in 1914. However, on June 14, 1915, the Board of Trustees of the University voted not to reappoint Dr. Nearing

assistant professor of economics for the year 1915-16, and the Provost sent Dr. Nearing the following:

MY DEAR MR. NEARING:

As the term of your appointment as assistant professor of economics for 1914-15 is about to expire, I am directed by the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania to inform you that it will not be renewed. With best wishes I am,

Yours Sincerely,

EDGAR F. SMITH.

How much chance for appointment in some other University was it reasonable to suppose the dismissed professor had after June 15? The method of "failure to renew appointment" has about it the unpleasant flavor of persecution for expression of opinion.

As to the activities that caused the interests in control of the University to drop Dr. Nearing from the Wharton School faculty, *The Nearing Case* gives us glimpses that enable us to understand why the beneficiaries of special privilege would regard him as an advocate of "dangerous and untried theories." He has published a series of books dealing with burning economic and social issues. Their mere titles—*Income, Social Adjustment, Wages in the United States, Woman and Social Progress, Social Religion,* and *Economics*—show their author's interest in the vital issues of the day. It is easy to understand the effect on the mind of a capitalist like Edward T. Stotesbury or of George Wharton Pepper, author of *A Voice from the Crowd,* produced by such publications. With their training and experience it would indeed be a marvel if they did not consider these books an attack on the foundations of industrial society and the essence of religion. Besides publishing his books Dr. Nearing was one of a group of Wharton School professors who gave active service to the State and Municipality in helping to curb the encroachments of capital. We read a quotation from Mr. H. S. Morris, one of the trustees of the estate of Joseph Wharton, founder of the Wharton School: "They have been of vast use to the present mayor and his directors in showing up the wrongs done the city by corporations whose most powerful directors sit on the board of trustees of the University. They checked the United Gas Improvement Company in its aggressions against the citizens; the Reading Railway was brought to its knees in its excessive freight charges on coal by the service of one of these professors, and the talent and efficiency of the Wharton School have been used wherever possible by the present administration." And again from the *North American* of June 19, 1915: "For years Doctor Nearing has lectured and written against child labor exploitation." A newspaper in Bristol, the home town of Joseph R. Grundy, leader of the Pennsylvania child exploiters' fight against Governor Brumbaugh's child labor laws, sometime ago took occasion to make a vitriolic attack on both Dr. Nearing and a local minister who permitted Dr. Nearing to lecture against child labor in his church. Grundy's editor denounced Dr. Nearing's church lecture against the greedy exploitation of helpless children as sacrilege, and called on the University trustees to rid themselves of such a dangerous professor.

Grundy's senator, Clarence J. Buckman, became chairman of the senate appropriation committee this year. When the University trustees came before this Grundy committee as applicants for $1,000,000 of the State funds they are said to have been reminded of the fact that Doctor Nearing had unpleasantly antagonized "influential men" in the State who had much to do with granting or withholding State appropriations. "Dr. Nearing was actively connected with the movement for improving child labor legislation in Pennsylvania in 1905 and 1906. After this appointment to an instructorship he resigned as secretary of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Committee, where he had been active in reporting violations of law in establishments of prominent manufacturers, coming in conflict with them and with the Chief Factory Inspector over the enforcement of the child labor provisions of the factory law." Since 1907 he has not been officially connected with the movement, although he has publicly expressed his views, and according to Prof. Witmer received intimation on one occasion that the Wharton School budget was being held up because certain instructors in that school were too radical.

Any person having an adequate conception of the close alliance between the political coterie, big business and special privilege that dominates Philadelphia, will easily understand why such activities would not meet the approval of these interests. Relatives and business associates of the trustees are prominent as directors of the General Alumni Society of the University and on the editorial staff of the *Alumni Register.* This close corporation evidently stands for "orthodoxy" — the present regime in economics, and the "old time religion" as they understand it. We are led to believe that these forces and Provost Smith would like to see the college curriculum less elective, and including more Latin, Greek, and Mathematics—less of the "dangerous" new sciences and more of the "safe" disciplinary studies.

Of course Pennsylvania is not the only institution that has been made the almoner of the wealthy. Coupled with the presence of the givers on governing bodies of the beneficiary institutions we have the strong desire of the active administrators to receive additional largesses. So the teaching must not offend possible givers. We must even be treated to the spectacle of Chancellors and Presidents going out of their way to laud Standard Oil magnates and their methods. And all this was the inevitable result of the factors and forces that have played so prominent a part in the United States in the last twenty years.

What is *academic freedom?* What is it that we who demand academic freedom, or free speech in class and lecture rooms demand? Simply that trained scholars, who have mastered the best that modern methods and past achievements have put into their hands, shall be *absolutely unfettered in* their methods of *investigation and in the conclusions at which they arrive.* For if their announcements are statements of observable fact, they will at once be checked by observers and experimenters all over the world. And if they are theories of interpretation of facts, that seem to threaten the present social or religious orders, they must still be free to publish and teach their theories and conclusions. For if they are true they constitute a wholesome criticism on the present order; if false, they will not survive, for they will not answer to the experiences of men and will be rejected because they do not fall into harmony with men's thoughts. Any living system of thought or social structure changes, and changes because men see new relations and try new devices. The men who believe in authority controlling reason, in doctrine or dogma being prescribed, show thereby their deep lack of faith in men. They are frequently the worst of infidels—they fear to learn the truth for fear that the truth may be bad.

W. S. SCHLAUCH.

Sorel on Violence

[1] *Reflections on Violence,* by Georges Sorel, New York. B. W. Huebsch. $2.25.

SOREL and his book represent in miniature the fate which has long been that of Marx and *Das Kapital.* Like Marx, Sorel became the representative of a great popular movement, notwithstanding the fact that he was not essentially a popular leader, and spoke a language hardly understood by the great majority of his followers. Like *Das Kapital,* Sorel's *Reflections on Violence*[1] became "The Bible" of a popular movement, to be often referred to but very little read. And both men as well as both books have been so little understood by most of their respective friends and foes as to be often praised and even more often abused for things which were not in them.

In this country, Sorel is even more of a stranger than Marx. Which is perhaps not surprising when we consider that Sorel is, comparatively speaking, a new-comer into the politico-social sphere of interests; and that he as well as the movement which he represents, while undoubtedly of great proportions when standing alone, dwindle into comparative insignificance when ranged alongside of Marx and the movement *he* represents. And the movement which Sorel represents, the Syndicalist movement, although much spoken of of late years, is practically as much of a stranger to us as Sorel himself. This is best shown by the fact that *Reflections on Violence,* the *chef d'oeuvre* of the man and "The Bible" of the movement, had to wait these many years for an English translation and an American edition, although it has none of the drawbacks which *Das Kapital* offers to either translator or publisher.

As a result, both the man and the movement have been a series of surprises, to us. To mention but two: When the report reached us, a few years ago, that Sorel had joined the extreme reactionary political group in France, the so-called *camelots du roi,* we were shocked. And when we learned at the beginning of the Great War that the French Syndicalists had become war-mad and turned *chauvinists,* we stood aghast. The things seemed incomprehensible to us.

And yet there was nothing inherently improbable or even surprising in these things. In fact, when the man and the movement are thoroughly understood, the events that surprised us so much will appear perfectly natural, and, if not exactly to be expected, at least within the range of probability. For Sorel and the movement which he represents are thoroughly reactionary and highly militaristic in general outlook,—as a reading of the Syndicalist "Bible", which is now offered in a very attractive garb by the American publishers, will easily demonstrate.

It is, of course, impossible to enter upon a comprehensive discussion of the Sorelian philosophy within the limited space of a book review like the present one. And I shall not attempt the impossible. But I want to warn my readers that by characterizing Sorel's philosophy as thoroughly reactionary I did not mean to imply that it was on that account the less interesting, or less worthy of our careful study and consideration. On the contrary, it is highly interesting, both on its own account, and as a *historical document.* For in order to be fully understood and appraised at its true worth the Sorelian philosophy must be considered as a part of the general reactionary trend which has in recent years been manifesting itself in science, philosophy, and art. The book now under consideration is, therefore, interesting, not only because it gives us a consistent philosophy of the Syndicalist movement,—a philosophy which enables us to understand its anti-parliamentarism as well as its chauvinism;—but also because it shows the reflection on the labor movement of such reactionary manifestations of bourgeois life and ideology as Bergsonism-Pragmatism in philosophy; Neo Catholicism in religion; mysticism and sex-obsession in literature; and the revival of the monarchical cult in politics.

There is one aspect, however, of the general reactionary character of the Sorelian philosophy upon

the consideration of which I must stop for a moment —its militaristic quality. Partly because of the timeliness of the subject, and partly because we are so used to associate in our minds Syndicalism with anti-militarism that my ascribing a militaristic quality to the Sorelian philosophy must challenge instant contradiction. But a careful reading of the book now under consideration will show that the anti-militarism of the Syndicalists has a very limited significance,—namely, that the Syndicalists are not interested in maintaining the present State. The Syndicalists are anti-militaristic in the same sense that they are anti-parliamentarian; they believe that both the parliamentary and the military systems are devices by which the ruling class seeks to perpetuate the present state, and they therefore oppose both. But that does not mean that they may not occasionally, and for temporary purposes, use either or both. Besides, the Syndicalists' anti-militarism is a *home* policy, not a *foreign* policy; they are *anti-military-service, not anti-war.*

On the contrary, their entire philosophy breathes the *martial spirit,* in the true militaristic sense of that phrase; a glorification of force and the so-called martial virtues, and an utter contempt for the weak, the peaceful, and the accommodating.

"Pacifist" is to Sorel a term of reproach whose contemptuous implications are only exceeded by the epithet "democrat." A "pacifist," whether in social policy affecting the class-war at home or in foreign policy affecting war between nations, is always a miserable coward, a degenerate willing to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage. It is because of this that violence is glorified. Not as a means to an end, but as something noble in itself. And Sorel expressly accentuates the fact that it is the *brutality* of violence that has this ennobling quality. The greatest danger to our civilization lies in the fact that our capitalist class is growing pusillanimous, weak and accommodating, giving in easily to the demands of labor without showing the proper spirit of fight. The manly spirit of fight must be put back into the human breast, if the world is ever to become regenerate. It is this which makes proletarian violence so important.

"The dangers"—say Sorel—"which threaten the future of the world may be avoided, if the proletariat hold on with obstinacy to revolutionary ideas, so as to realize as much as possible Marx's conception. Everything may be saved, if the proletariat, by their use of violence, manage to *re-establish* the division into classes,, and so *restore* to the middle class (Note: the translator always uses "Middle-class" for capitalist class or bourgeoisie) *something of its former energy; that is the great aim* towards which the whole thought of men—who are not hypnotized by the event of the day, but who think of the conditions of tomorrow—must be directed. Proletarian violence, carried on as a pure and simple manifestation of the sentiment of the class war, appears thus as a very fine and very heroic thing; it is at the service of the immemorial interests of civilization; it is not perhaps the most appropriate method of obtaining immediate material advantages, *but it may save the world from barbarism.*"

And this does not apply only to the class-struggle, but also to the struggles between nations. For the barbarism here referred to, is the barbarism which would result from the effeminacy and *humanitarianism* of the race.

"Middle class cowardice," says our author, "very much resembles the cowardice of the English Liberal party, which constantly proclaims its absolute confidence in arbitration between nations; *arbitration nearly always gives disastrous results for England. But these worthy progressives prefer to pay, or even to compromise the future of their country, rather than face the horrors of war.* . . . We might very well wonder whether all the high morality of our great contemporary thinkers is not founded on *a degradation of the sentiment of horror.*"

After having thus laughed to scorn the cowardly bourgeois for shrinking from the horrors of war and believing in arbitration, he declares that:

"Proletarian violence not only makes the future revolution certain, but it seems also to be the only means by which the European nations—at present stupefied by humanitarianism—can recover their former energy."

L. B. BOUDIN.

Schools of Tomorrow

[1] *Schools of Tomorrow,* by John and Evelyn Dewey. New York: Henry Holt & Co. $1.50

DURING these days there are taking place great and radical reforms in the field of education. The stupid methods of a time that is past are being superseded by the more intelligent and humane ideas of advanced educators. What these reformers in education are accomplishing is only the very seed of what is to come, and so John and Evelyn Dewey entitle their book *Schools of Tomorrow.*[1] If you want to get a very good and comprehensive conception of what is being done in the newer educational world and what it is that the more alert and advanced educators are really driving at, there is no better book you can turn to than this one. It gives a clear and fairly well rounded out picture of the whole thing and is filled with practical examples of what is being done and where success has been met with. At the same time the book sets forth the authors' own views respecting the various methods written about and their own conclusions are stated.

In this book education is treated both theoretically and practically. One strong point of it is that al-

most every point which is set forth in theory is paralleled by some actual example. Education is treated as a natural development, and the factors which constitute natural development are analyzed. Then play is spoken about and the importance of it and the good uses it can be made to serve. A chapter takes up the consideration of the child as an individual, and another discusses him as a member of the social group. Then the school curriculum is examined and also the school as a factor and institution of society.

Considering the important part that education plays in the life of each individual and of the community as a whole this is an excellent book for us all to read; especially those Socialists who send their children to the ordinary Public School.

ROBERT H. HUTCHINSON.

A Socialist Digest

The Attitude of the International Socialist Bureau

CAMILLE HUYSMANS, secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, delivered an address at the recent congress of the Dutch Socialst party. The essential portions of the address follow:

"From all sides I hear the Red International is dead," commenced Huysmans. "Hervé and others have buried it again and again. Honored Comrades, the International is not dead. It cannot die."

The applause thundered through the building. "The Red International will live so long as International Capitalism remains to be smashed, so long as the necessity for a bond between the working classes of all nations remains.

"It is said that the International is dead," Mr. Huysmans continued, "because it did not stop the war. The answer is clear. The International did all in its power to stop the war, but it was not strong enough. We were not deceived; we knew we had not yet sufficient power.

"Others aver that the International is dead because the German Socialists voted for the War Credits. Is the Catholic Church dead because German Catholics are facing Belgian Catholics in the trenches?

"There are others who assert that the International is dead because it is silent. There is a Dutch proverb which says, 'A fish which is silent is not therefore dead.' There is a Latin proverb which says, 'There is a time to speak, there is a time to be silent.'

"But the Internatonal Executve Committee [the smaller administrative committee of the Bureau] is now of the opinion that the time has come to speak. If we have been silent, that does not signify we have done nothing. We have not allowed a single favorable opportunity to pass by without making the utmost use of it."

He proceeded to remind the Congress that the resolutions on the subject of war adopted by the International Socialist Congresses at Stuttgart, Copenhagen, and Basle placed upon the Bureau the duty of doing all in its power to prevent war should it be threatened, and to end war should it break out. He claimed that it had fulfilled these duties. He told how the Bureau intervened when the Balkan quarrels of October and November, 1912, threatened the peace of Europe. He showed how it had intervened in the same way in June, 1914, when the Balkan question again caused the war-clouds to gather over Europe.

"Three weeks before June 23, 1914, the Bureau heard rumors that Austria intended at the finish of the harvest to send an ultimatum to Serbia. The members did not attach great importance to these rumors; nevertheless, we immediately organized meetings in Vienna, Berlin, Budapest, Amsterdam, Brussels, Paris, and other places to warn the people of what might happen.

"What organization, political, religious or social, did more than the Bureau to prevent the war occurring? None.

"Nor have we only talked. Thousands of our comrades have been sent to prison on account of their loyalty to their principles—sent to prison by the people who now mock at us because we failed to stop the war!"

Huysmans then proceeded to relate in careful detail the activity of the Bureau during the fateful days, July 24 to August 4, 1914. On July 24 Austria delivered her ultimatum to Serbia. On July 25, the Executive Committee of the Bureau, consisting of Jaurès, Adler, Vaillant, Molkenbuhr, and others, decided to call a full meeting of the Bureau by telegram. This meeting, which was held on July 29, decided to extend and intensify the agitation against the threatened war and to support the proposal that the Serbian-Austrian dispute should be submitted to arbitration. The German delegates returned to Berlin pledged to use all their influence to secure the moderation of Austria's demands. The French delegates returned to Paris pledged to use all their influence to prevent Russia participating in the conflict. And the British and Italian delegates returned to London and Rome pledged to make every possible effort to influence their governments in the same direction.

"On the afternoon of July 31 I received a wire from Berlin saying that Müller wished to speak to us in the name of the Executive of the German Social Democratic Party. That evening, at eleven o'clock, we had a telephone message telling us that Jaurés had been murdered.

"By three o'clock on the morning of August 1 Müller was with me. After consultation with the Executive Committee, we traveled to Paris, with De Man as secretary. At 5:30 in the evening we had a meeting with the French Parliamentary Group in the Palais Bourbon; the same evening, at 9:30, we met the Party's Central Executive. What Müller here declared you already know from the recent articles in the French and German press. He gave the impression that up to that moment the German party was not inclined to vote for the War Credits. The French comrades declared that if France were attacked, they would feel compelled to vote for the War Credits.

"My personal view was," he said, "that the German party at that moment should have held itself back. It was my opinion that France would not attack Germany, but I understood the German comrades' difficuties, which have since been acknowledged by Vandervelde.

"On the one side France, democratic France; on the other, Russia—bureaucratic Russia! I realized the difficulty of the German Socialists was similar to Bebel's difficulty in 1870. 'If I vote for the credits,' Bebel then said, 'I endorse the Prussian policy; if I vote against them, I seem to agree with the policy of Bonaparte.' It seemed to me that in 1914 the German Social Democratic Party was in that position."

Huysmans argued that the German Socialists had to bear in mind the Rus-

sian menace, particularly since they had themselves pointed out to the German people the influence which the example of Russian's political methods was exerting on their own State administration. "But whilst I appreciated this difficulty," said Huysmans, "I also had in mind the comments which, before August, 1914, had been made in the German Socialist press, not only about German, but about Austrian politics." Huysmans pointed out that Kautsky has recently said that he was in favor of the party abstaining from participation in the voting on the War Credits at the outbreak of war.

"On August 4, when war broke out, the Socialists of all countries disavowed all responsibility for it. Belgium, in spite of her tremendous resistance, was smashed to the earth. The Executive of the International was cut off from the rest of the world, but in its first pronouncement it insisted upon the necessity of maintaining communication with the affiliated parties.

"We knew that for the moment there could be no question either of intervention to bring about peace or even of a meeting of the Bureau. The war fury raged intently. From every side came the demand that the machinery of the International should be put into full motion, a course which was obviously impossible. Some comrades insisted that renewed protests would be effective, despite the war. Others felt themselves called upon to play an international part. We pursued our course, unaffected by all these currents.

"When Brussels was occupied by the German army, we moved the International Sacretariat to The Hague. By this means we maintained direct or indirect postal communication with all the national parties—even though the connection between Party and Party was broken. Not for one moment has the connection between the affiliated parties of the Bureau been severed."

Huysmans showed how difficult the task had been. For instance, it was not always agreeable for a Belgian to meet a Socialist who had voted for the War Credits which had been employed to smite his country with fire and sword. "But I have considered it my duty not to write a single word that could hurt any of the affiliated parties. It has been my belief that before all things the broken and threatened national parties desired a united and powerful International. I have thought it my duty to cover my heart and my feelings with my official robe. I do not regret that I am the International Secretary of all the Socialist parties of the world.

"We have so managed the affairs of the Bureau that we have at least retained the confidence of all the parties of the warring countries. The Belgian delegates have remained upon the Bureau to hold the trust of the International, and they have remained upon it in this capacity on the expressed wish of the Belgian Labor Party. The Belgians did not want war—they have been sacrificed to war. Under such circumstances it would have been shamefully unjust to take out of their hands the trust they had so long held. But in order to give proof of their fairness, they added Dutch delegates to the Executive Committee with the same rights as themselves.

"That course was endorsed by a vote of all the affiliated parties, except the French Socialist Party, which abstained from voting on the ground that in their opinion the Executive ought to remain constituted as it was. The Secretariat and the extended Executive are consequently retaining office so long as the war lasts by the decision of the whole International.

"From all sides demands have poured in that the full Bureau should be called together. We have refrained from fulfilling that demand. If the Bureau had been called together, we knew that certain parties would not attend. That might have meant the wrecking of the entire International. Our set object was and is to bring the different parties together at the right moment in the right way. Our duty was and is to call a meeting of the Bureau with the approval of all the responsible parties in the warring countries. Would a meeting without representation from France, Germany, or Britain be possible? No, it would have defeated its own purpose. We take full responsibility for reaching that conclusion.

"From certain quarters we were bombarded with resolutions which we have not acted upon. Impatient comrades thereupon called International Congresses only to find that the parties most concerned kept away and disassociated themselves from the proceedings. I will not deal further with these adventures. Though the intention may have been worthy, I emphasize the fact, in the name of my colleagues and myself, that despite all separatist plans, the Bureau is sitting at The Hague, and will continue to sit there."

Huysmans described the work of the Bureau as twofold.

(1) To call together separately the Socialist Parties in the neutral countries, in the countries of the Allies, in the countries of the Central European Powers, and to discuss with each group the four points which are the foundation of the Socialist Peace Policy.

(2) To receive special delegations at The Hague to discuss these points in closer detail.

"As you know," continued Huysmans, "there was a meeting of neutral Socialists in Copenhagen on January 17 and 18, 1915; of the Allied countries on February 14, 1915; and of the Central Powers on April 20, 1915. The resolutions adopted did not accord on all points, but all the conferences demanded: (1) The right of peoples to select their own Government, (2) the abolition of secret diplomacy and the democratic control of foreign policy, (3) the reduction of armaments by general agreement, and (4) compulsory arbitration. The united approval of these four points, which formed the basis of the Stuttgart, Copenhagen, and Basle resolutions, was the first definite step. One thing is certain—if the guidance of destiny had been placed in the hands of Socialists there would have been no war. And when the bourgeoisie discover, as they will very soon, to what madness their adherence to Imperialism has driven them, they will only be able to find one way out, and that will be through the application of our ideas.

"We felt, however, that a more precise definition of the points upon which we were theoretically united was necessary, and the Bureau Executive decided to ask delegations to come from the different sections and discuss separately the position. Only after such separate consultations could we judge whether it was desirable to convene the full Bureau.

"This proposition was approved by most of the parties, but it was at first opposed by one and later by two. Belgium, though invaded, came officially and explained its standpoint. Germany came, first unofficially and then officially. France answered that to come to The Hague would mean indirect trafficing with Germany—some Franch Socialists said that so long as Germany occupied French soil such a thing was impossible and all efforts must be concentrated upon self-defence. Britain was originally prepared to come. Henderson's appointment to the Cabinet necessitated a postponement of their delegation; now the British section prefers a conference in London, which is being arranged.

"It seems to me," remarked Huysmans, reviewing these facts, "that from a Socialist standpoint the situation has improved when one compares the declarations and resolutions of 1914 with those of more recent date."

Huysmans then dealt with the particular difficulties in Germany and France. "Germany can go forward for peace because it has a big advantage. France can only desire peace if it is sure it will not be treated as a conquered nation. In France every nerve

is strained for self-defence, and under these conditions all negotiations are regarded as signs of weakness. What would be the feeling in Germany if the French army stood in Cologne and the Russians in Königsberg?

"The influence the Socialist parties can exert is also very different. In Britain and France the Labor and Socialist Parties have much influence, and one can scarcely imagine a policy being conducted in direct opposition to the will of the organized workers. In Germany, however, the workers' influence is more limited. We have still to see Bethmann-Hollweg occupy the Trade Union platform as has Lloyd George.

"In comparing the different resolutions one finds that the greatest difficulty lies in the Alsace-Lorraine problem. Our object in bringing delegations from the different parties to The Hague was to bring about clearness on this issue.

"The possibility of a *rapprochement* is evident. It is very evident when we compare the French party's resolution with those of the German 'minority,' and when we remember that the 'minority' in the Reichstag Group asserts that it represents the majority of the Socialist electorate. In any case, we must note that the French party has for the first time put forward conditions for an understanding. We can say that the gulf is already partly bridged over.

"Comrades, I am confident we are on the right road, especially when we bear in mind that in France also there is a minority, even though it be small."

Huysmans emphasized the point that the war has demonstrated that it is next to impossible to conquer a modern, organized Capitalist nation. Though Germany had won successes on land, Britain had mastered the seas. So far the war had failed in its objects.

"Honored comrades, the organization which sprang into being in Paris in 1880 is not dead. I insist it has done everything that the Stuttgart, Copenhagen, and Basle resolutions demanded of it. The signs of a better day are many. High above all stands the word that the International must stride forward to a policy superior to the position the armies occupy.

"We will continue as we have begun, with patience, foresight, and endurance, fully conscious of our responsibility. At the right moment we will give the necessary lead.

"We will bring the Socialists of the world into harmony so that, even though the war arose against our will, the peace conditions will be such as shall not open the way to a new tragedy. The working class who bear the weight of others' crimes can and will end those crimes. For that *unity* is necessary. Unity must be our object, as it will be our strength."

Industrial Conscription in France

AN interview with M. Merrheim, Secretary of the Metal Workers Federation (*Federation des Ouvriers des Metaux et Similaires de France*) throws a vivid light on the workings of "military necessity" in relation to the rights of the workers during the war. This interview is published by the *Labor Leader*, which introduces it with the statement that the trades union members of Lloyd George's expedition to investigate the industrial situation in France had in no case gone to the workers or the union officials for their information.

Merrheim said that it was perfectly true, as stated in the report of the mission, that trade union conditions as regards labor and wages have been suspended, that there is no restriction on the work that women do, that no limitation of profits exists, and that there has been no strike during the war. "But, the suggestion of the report that this state of things is cheerfully accepted by the workers, and that they make no objection to it, is utterly untrue. Equally untrue are the conclusions of the report that 'the spirit which dominates the nation has prevented difficulties arising in the manufacture of war materials,' and that 'the increased production is due to one cause only—patriotic enthusiasm.'

"The report admits the important and essential fact that the workmen cannot help themselves for the simple reason that the great majority of them—probably about 80 per cent.—are men under the colors and are subject to military discipline in the factories. That is the only reason why no difficulties have arisen. Any mobilized workmen that dared to make an objection, to demand an increase of wages, or to take any action whatever either individual or collective, would at once either be sent back to the Front or tried by court-martial. . . . The trade unions, and, in particular, the Federation of Metal Workers, have never ceased to protest against the abominable conditions imposed on the workers in munition factories. The government, by maintaining the militarization of the workmen in the factories, has handed them over to the mercy of their employers, who exercise an arbitrary authority, and many of whom are making large fortunes by the sweated labor of men, women and children. The profit, for instance, on the shell for the 75 gun, for which the government now pays, I believe, 12 francs, must be quite 200 per cent. The government supplies the material, and the manufacturer has only wages and general expenses to pay."

"Did I understand you to say," Merrheim was asked, "that children are employed in the munition factories?"

"Indeed they are," he replied, "both by day and by night, although I notice that Mr. Lloyd George's mission does not mention the fact in his report. Even in Paris they are odiously overworked and exploited. Here is a revolting fact which came to our notice: In a certain munition factory in Paris [Merrheim told the interviewer the name] the children were so exhausted that they got sleepy at midnight, and they were given black coffee with brandy in it to keep them awake. As for the women, the overstrain to which they are subjected has led to several serious accidents. The Minister of Labor, to whom the facts were reported, replied that he had no power to take any action. As for the Minister of War [M. Millerand] he declared to a deputation of the Federation, which informed him of the facts, that 'there are no longer any factory laws.' In the provinces the state of things is even worse. Here is an example from a report received by the Federation from Montbard (Côte-d'Or): 'Many children from 13 to 17 years of age are employed night and day. . . . at extremely dangerous work, for ridiculously low wages.'

"The Federation," Merrheim went on to say, "has always insisted that the government should commandeer the factories and nominate the employers as managers at salaries, and has also demanded various other guarantees for the workers, but the government continues to take advantage of conscription to supply the employers with cheap labor and, as the report says, has not even limited their profits. The government has also the power to commandeer workmen that are not under the colors, and this power has often been used."

Merrheim added with emphasis: "There are, I think, illusions in England in regard to the powers of M. Albert Thomas, Under Secretary for Munitions, so far as questions affecting the workers are concerned. He is full of good intentions, and has a firm desire to improve the lot of the men and women employed in munition factories,

but he is powerless against the opposition of the employers and the military authorities. It is they who are the absolute masters of the factories, in which their will is law, with disastrous effects both on the quantity and the quality of production."

Merrheim was asked for some particulars about wages, hours, etc. "Here," he said, " is a series of reports that we have received from all over France; you can make what use of them you like. In general the wages paid are lower than before the war, especially in the case of mobilized men. I should say that wages have gone down on an average about 40 per cent., whereas the cost of living has risen from 40 to 60 per cent., according to locality. When this reduction in the purchasing power of money is taken into account, most of the mobilized workmen, at any rate, must be earning about two-fifths of what they earned before the war. There are factories where mobilized men are working for from 50 to 70 centimes an hour, side by side with non-mobilized men who are paid 1 fr. 20. The reason, of course, is that the mobilized men are powerless, and that they prefer even to work for low wages than to return to the Front. The organization is very unsatisfactory; in many cases skilled mechanics are put to do the work of unskilled laborers, while unskilled laborers or women are trying to do the work of skilled mechanics. Then there are men of various trades and professions who have become metal workers for the occasion in order to be *embusqués*. We have compiled a voluminous report giving particulars of the accidents caused by these sham workmen and the deplorable effects of their employment on production. The statement of Mr. Lloyd George's mission that women are paid the same piece-work rates as men is untrue, in general, as our reports will show you; if there any such cases they are very exceptional. I myself know of none. The effect on the health of the women is disastrous, since they are habitually overworked. In some factories the output of the women equals that of the men; in others it does not. The hours are terribly long—a twelve-hour day is the rule—and there is usually no extra payment for overtime or night-work. Sunday work is general, and a day off is supposed to be given once a fortnight; it is, however, left absolutely to the employer to decide whether it shall be given or not. To sum up, only a small minority of the workers employed in munition factories earn good wages; the suspension of trade union conditions and the helpless situation of the mobilized men have resulted in making the workers the slaves of their employers. Although the workers, in present circumstances, can do nothing to better their condition, they feel deep resentment at the way in which they are being treated by a Socialist Minister of Munitions—for, although M. Thomas has not a free hand, they consider him to be responsible—and, when they are once more free to speak and act, they will make that resentment felt."

The Degradation of Slavery

THE most interesting thing about the Child Labor Bill is not its passage by the United States Senate, but the arguments made by its opponents: "The only interesting thing ever said in defense of human slavery," says the *New Republic*, "was that it enables those who live upon it to cultivate a liberal life." But no one who reads the arguments of those who came to Washington in order to oppose the Child Labor Bill will ever claim that the employment of little children makes pleasant human beings out of its apologists. One gentleman did say that you could "go down to the muddiest old pond and pull the whitest lily," but if Mr. David Clark, editor of the *Southern Textile Bulletin*, and ex-Governor Kitchin of North Carolina, are the lilies, then the statement can hardly go unchallenged.

For example: When Mr. William Walton Kitchin, who is a brother of Mr. Claude Kitchin, was Governor of North Carolina, he sent a message to the legislature urging a rigid inspection of factories, and a sufficient force of inspectors for the work. Mr. Kitchin is no radical. He was present at the hearing as attorney for the employers opposed to federal child labor legislation. Mr. Clark did not agree with the Governor's recommendation:

Congressman Keating: "Did the mill owners of North Carolina in the effort to ameliorate the condition of the employees support Governor Kitchin in his recommendation?"

Mr. Clark: "I did not favor inspection."

Congressman Keating: "Was that because you did not have faith in the state inspectors or because you had a good deal of faith in the mill owners?" . . .

Mr. Clark: "It is largely a grafter proposition." . . .

Congressman London: What do you mean by a grafting proposition?

Mr. Clark: "I am not prepared to give you the facts, but my understanding is that if you pay, you get a clean bill of health."

Congressman London: "You believe that your mill owners would resort to corruption in order to escape a fair inspection?"

Mr. Clark: "Not more than any others; not more than was necessary."

Congressman London: "You mean they would resort to corruption of a government official?"

Mr. Clark: "Well, yes, if they were held up."

The editor of the *Southern Textile Bulletin* having recorded his views of political morality, was led on to express himself about compulsory education. He had been complaining that the children taken from the mills would have no place to go.

Mr. Clark: "When these people (the families of operatives) come from the mountains they do not believe in education. That is the reason we do not have compulsory education in North Carolina, because the isolated mountain districts would go Republican if we forced compulsory education upon them."

Shortly afterwards Congressman Dennison asked a question:

Congressman Dennison: "Is the labor employed in your state generally or particularly organized?"

Mr. Clark: "It is not organized at all in my state."

Later ex-Governor Kitchin remarked that "the cotton mill furnishes an opportunity for light and remunerative work for the children"—that is to say, ten hours' work a day. A sort of light refreshment. "Children twelve and fourteen years old can do just as good work as a thirty-year old man with the work he is doing, and help take care of the family. I think that is a blessing."

A doctor employed by a cotton mill testified that a girl of twelve may be employed in a cotton mill eleven hours a day without injury. In this exalted mood various witnesses offered many aphorisms:

"If a mill operating an eleven-hour day employs children only eight hours, it would probably require additional machinery."

"The cotton mill has done more than anything else in the South to save the people from the farm."

"If this law passed and the younger children were taken out of the mill, the families would go back to the farms."

"If this bill passed it would affect 35 children between 14 and 16 in our mill of 400 people. This would necessitate our building eight new houses to take care of the new families that would be brought in."

Nor is this the worst: Things were said in the testimony which touch the bottom of human brutality:

"A roll of cotton cloth made by child labor is just as long, just as wide, just as white, and just as good as if made by adults."

There was this appeal to precedent:

"Congress never tried between 1830 and 1860 to prevent interstate commerce in the products of slave labor."

And then there was this gentle thought about children in general:

"You couldn't fix an age limit for child labor any more than you could tell when a pig becomes a hog."

Scandinavian Socialist Peace Terms

THE Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau has issued to the affiliated parties a copy of a circular letter that has been addressed to it by the Joint Commission of the Social-Democratic organizations of Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

The letter expresses the hope of the Scandinavian Socialists that every means will be employed to put an end to the war and to secure a permanent peace. The Commission desires especially to see the Social-Democracy of all countries preparing to take part in negotiations for the settlement of peace conditions.

The Socialist Conference held in Copenhagen in January, 1915, which was attended by delegates from Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, affirmed its adhesion to the decisions of the International Socialist Congress of 1910, which bound parliamentary representatives to the following programme:

1. Compulsory international arbitration.

2. Limitation of armaments, with complete disarmament as the ultimate aim.

3. Abolition of secret diplomacy, and the establishment of direct parliamentary control over foreign policies.

4. The right of nations freely to dispose of themselves, and the support of a policy of opposition to armed aggression and oppression.

The Commission points out that the Allied Socialist Conference held in London in February, 1915, the Austro-German Social-Democratic Conference in Vienna in April, 1915, and the joint meeting of Swiss and Italian Socialists held in September, 1914, all, in effect, declared their adhesion to a similar programme. Thus, in spite of the unfavorable combination of circumstances, there already exists among Socialists a certain conformity as to the aims of peace conditions, and the Commission expresses its earnest desire that these aims shall now be given a practical form.

The letter goes on to state that, in addressing the Executive Committee of the Bureau, the Commission does not desire to offer any censure. It clearly recognizes the difficulties which have had to be surmounted, but it is anxious that the Bureau should now endeavor to reunite the various sections of the International in a conference where preparatory work for peace can be carried on. Whether this can best be done in one general conference, or whether several separate conferences would be necessary, is a matter for the Bureau Executive to determine; but it is essential that Social-Democracy should act in accordance with the mandate of the International Congress.

In commenting upon the letter the Executive Committee of the Bureau states that the policy recommended is the one that it has pursued.

Correspondence

From a British Socialist

To the NEW REVIEW:

THE condition of Britain from August, 1914, to the opening of 1916 (when I pen these lines), has been one of the most singular paradoxes in the history of the world. Everybody allows that the present European conflict is the greatest of all wars, and it is obvious that the British forces play a leading part in the struggle. But Brtiain itself has lain under a spell of quietude, though it is a quietude that masks an immense energy. It falls to my lot to travel up and down the country fairly often, my work lying among the quite ordinary people; and I am always impressed by this universal equanimity. Before the crisis we had our absurd suffragette noises, our squabbles about taxation, our ill-tempered arguments on church-disestablishment, our threats of civil war in Ireland. When Austria declared war on the small neighbor Servia, and the Germans invaded Belgium, our domestic agitations suddenly ceased. We forgot elections. We gently wiped out our resolution never to build up a great army, and our present 3,000,000 is to grow to 4,000,000. Absorbed in the war, we set aside all other interests. Even the Zeppelins cause disturbance for but a few hours; the damage is repaired; the subject drops.

We British are rightly called the Chinese of Europe. It takes a gigantic shock to move us from our conservative positions, but once moved, we persist. I speak of our conscious national progress. In the normal course, we effect most of our progress by wriggling compromises, or even in absent-minded instinct. But we are awake just now. Our conduct of the war teems with mistakes, as, for instance, at the Dardanelles. But then, the other side also makes mistakes. And it can be said that, on the whole, we do the thing in a truly republican way. The King is an illustrious citizen, respected by all, but he wisely leaves the Cabinet to shape the policy. The Cabinet, first Liberal, then Coalitionist, is itself subject, in a most sensitive manner, to the forces of public opinion. Add the opinion and sentiment of the Oversea Dominions, and you have an extraordinary consensus of national minds as the government power in a world-wide war. I will not pause to compare this republican method with the method of the Central Empires.

At the opening of 1916, how does the problem stand? The German confederacy, with Balkan allies, appears to hold ground and to win victories on all sides, from Hamburg to Bagdad. In effect, this confederacy is besieged by an encircling force, both by land and sea; while, outside the siege area, German Africa and German sea power are lost. Moreover, the people of the British Empire are more resolute for the continuance of the war than ever before.

I will not, however, dwell further on this purely military question, for I have only made these few observations in order to show how a British Socialist, who was never an enthusiast for war, views the salient facts of the situation. I propose rather to consider, so far as I can, in brief paragraphs, the reaction of the war on Socialism and on the ideal of nationality.

In the first place, the British Empire will be more strongly consolidated, and it will most certainly establish a central council representative of the United Kingdom, the Oversea Dominions, and India. As regards India, the result will be to develop its administration in a direct line towards the status of a dominion like Canada; but the rate of the development must depend upon progress in (1) Industry; (2) Popular education, and (3) A larger activity of Indians in municipal and provincial government. It is too often forgotten by advanced Indian

politicians, as it is by the English themselves, that British political progress has been fundamentally secured, not by sensational affairs like beheading King Charles, but by the training of citizens in local government in cities.

The changes I have just hinted at must modify the Socialist outlook, and make it less parochial and more imperial; and I think the logical consequence must be the formation of a Socialist party, or, at any rate, a Socialist federation, for the Home Country and the Oversea Dominions. This in itself is a kind of internationalism, for Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa, New Zealand, etc., are distinct nationalities. For my part, I rejoice to think so many communities, already connected by history, are now to be more intimately bound together, politically and economically. I rejoice, because I believe the Socialist idea will be the more quickly realized (by this if I may so speak), vast spiritual trustification.

Then as to the future of nationality —a question that must concern the United States, as well as the countries now at war. During my two visits to the United States (1911 and 1913-14), I was struck by the fact that a good many Americans did not sufficiently appreciate the tremendous contribution their country was making towards the work of civilization. The great achievement of the States was not the break-off from England; that was, relatively, a small business to the eye of history. It was, and is, the wonderful blending of European races into a totally new commonwealth, with a genius and a manner of its own. I will not go into detail to show how the events of this war have sharpened the sense of the American nationhood, as a very distinct thing from the British, or German, or French, or Italian. But it is also evident that the war will sharpen the national sentiment of England, France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, Servia, and that of Germany will assuredly not diminish. The resentments which the war will leave behind it must be regarded as partly inevitable, partly removable, during the next twenty or thirty years. But for Socialism I anticipate a beneficial future. I am glad to think the Americans will become more American, the British more British, the Belgians more Belgian, and so on, because I think each country will all the sooner develop its industries on a collectivist basis. A vague cosmopolitanism (that is, a feeling of world-wideness which ignores country ties) hinders Socialism, because it checks the efficient division of labor implied in vigorous nationhoods. Capitalism is cosmopolitan, because it has neither heart of love nor bowels of compassion. It must be beaten in a series of national campaigns. I suspect that England and France will lead off in this series.

But it is reasonable to suppose the new Socialist parties in all the nations after the war will ignore the advantages which come from co-operating with other national Socialist parties. The war itself proves that colossal leagues are the order of the age. And whatever superficial observers may say, I am convinced that the regenerated Socialist parties, each working out its special homeland salvation, will more than ever feel the need for international organization.

And so we shall move towards the Republic of the World.

FREDERICK J. GOULD.

London, Eng.

THE GREAT WAR

Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution, by Thorstein Veblen. A scientific analysis of the historical, economic and social factors resulting in Germany's phenomenal industrial progress. Treats the subject from the standpoint of material factors and universal history. "Especially welcome as a help to clear thinking," says Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich. (M) $1.50, postage 12c. extra.

Nationality and the War, by Arnold J. Toynbee. The only book extant dealing with this most important subject. Chock full of material, on the whole ably interpreted. (DU) $2.50, postpaid.

Origins and Destiny of Imperial Britain, by Prof. J. A. Cramb. The Imperialism of Great Britain eulogized and explained by a Briton. Indispensable to an understanding of the general characteristics of modern Imperialism. (DU) $1.50.

The Export of Capital, by C. K. Hobson. Not a war book, but deals with the economic basis of modern Imperialism—the export of capital. A scholarly study of foreign investment—its causes; growth, methods, effects, etc. (M) $2, postage 10c. extra.

Socialists and the War, by Wm. English Walling. A documentary study of Socialist participation in, and attitude to, the Great War. Indispensable for a full and adequate understanding of the subject. (H) $1.50, postpaid.

German Philosophy and Politics, by John Dewey. A pragmatic appraisal, incisive and conclusive. Concludes with an inspiring Internationalism. (H) $1, postage 5c. extra.

LABOR PROBLEMS

American Labor Unions, by Helen Marot. Covers the whole labor union movement. Sincerely critical and concretely revolutionary. Full of facts, and thoroughly interesting. (H) $1.25, postage 10c. extra.

The Militant Proletariat, by Austin Lewis. The unskilled workers as a new and revolutionary factor in the American Labor Movement. A necessary book. (K) 50c. postpaid.

Immigration and Labor, by Isaac A. Hourwich. A study of a vital problem by a specialist. Traces the economic effects of immigration upon American development, and shows the beneficent results. Statistically it is unassailable, theoretically unanswerable. Even opponents of the author's idea of unrestricted immigration concede the value of the book, the only one of its kind dealing with this subject. The *Call* calls it "an epoch-making book." Indispensable to Socialists, radicals and all interested in the future of labor. (P) $2.50, postage 15c. extra.

Wages in the United States, by Scott Nearing. Proves that a large portion of American workers are unable to maintain a proper standard of living. Marshals the facts concerning wage theories, the cost of living, and the problems arising out of the standard of living investigations. (M) $1.25, postpaid.

Sabotage, by Emile Pouget, with an Introduction by Arturo Giovanitti. A sober presentation of the value of Sabotage in the class war. (K) 50c., postpaid.

Syndicalism, by Louis Levine. The new forces in the Labor movement vividly expounded. Sympathetic and critical. "Most comprehensive and illuminating study of revolutionary Syndicalism in the English language."—American Economic Review. Paper (L. G), $1.50; cloth, $2. Postage 10c. extra.

Reflections on Violence, by Georges Sorel. The classic on the philosophy of Syndicalism. In this book Sorel expounds his famous theory of "social myths." (HU) $2.25, postage 10c. extra.

Social Insurance, by I. M. Rubinow. The only comprehensive book on the subject. Includes Employers' Liability, Sick Insurance, Old Age Pensions, Insurance Against Unemployment, etc. (H) $3, postage 12c. extra.

FICTION

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

The Harbor, by Ernest Poole. Presents the American Revolt in fiction. Depicts the great changes taking place in American life, business, ideals and labor. The central character passes from a blind worship of enterprise and efficiency to a deeper knowledge of humanity and the labor movement. (M) $1.40, postpaid.

Violette of Père Lachaise, by Anna Strunsky Walling. The life and spiritual development of a rare and beautiful character—a girl of the masses who gives herself to the cause of social revolution. (ST) $1, postpaid.

The Rat-Pit, by Patrick MacGill. A novel which voices the life and struggle of inarticulate unskilled labor. Realism fused with imagination and sympathy. A new genre in contemporary fiction. (D) $1.25, postpaid.

Tales of Two Countries, by Maxim Gorky. The Russian tales are typical of the old propagandistic Gorky. The Tales of Italy express a new Gorky, mellowed by experience, critical without being a propagandist, artistic as life itself in all its simplicity. They sing their story into your imagination, and stir with a strange beauty (HU) $1.25, postpaid.

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

Send for our Complete Catalogue of Socialist Literature.

New Review Book Service

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

Pelle the Conqueror, by Martin Andersen Nexo. A Danish epic of the proletariat. Overwhelming in its truth, sympathy and realism. A proletarian Jean Christophe. The first volume deals with peasant life, the second volume with life in the industrial city. (H) Each volume $1.50, postpaid.

The Bomb, by Frank Harris. A vivid novel centering around the Haymarket tragedy in Chicago in 1887. (X) Regular price, $1.50; our price, 90 cents, postage 10c. extra.

The Red and the Black, by Stendhal. We refuse to describe this superb novel. If you never read a work of fiction again, read this. (DD) $1.75, postpaid.

The Novels of Dostoevsky, by Feodor Dostoevsky. A new and superb translation. The greatest of Russian novelists. *The Brothers Karomazov:* "The greatest work of fiction ever written, a work so extraordinary that everything else seems insignificant," says George Moore. *Crime and Punishment:* "It is impossible to read this novel without reverently saluting the author's power," says William Lyons Phelps. Other volumes: The Idiot; The Possessed; The House of the Dead; The Insulted and the Injured. These novels should all be read, these novels of a man who disputes with Balzac the claim of being the world's greatest novelist. Uniform binding. Each volume, $1.50, postpaid.

The Way of All Flesh, by Samuel Butler. One of the finest novels, perhaps the finest, in the English language. (DU) $1.50, postpaid.

The Works of Turgeniev, complete, in seven volumes (two volumes in one). An excellent edition in every respect, good paper and typography, bound in neat cloth. Formerly sold at $15. Price for the set (no volume sold separately), $7.50, postpaid.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Social Forces in American History, by A. M. Simons. An economic interpretation of American history, describing the various classes which have ruled and functioned from time to time. (M) $1.50, postpaid.

An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution, by Prof. Charles A. Beard. A valuable and stimulating book by a thorough student of the subject. (M) $2.25, postpaid.

Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy, by Prof. Charles A. Beard. Deals with the period following the adoption of the constitution. The conflict between rising Capitalism and Agrarianism. (M) $2.50, postpaid.

History of the Great American Fortunes by Gustavus Myers. Volume I tells of economic conditions in colony times, and of the origin of the great land fortunes, notably those of the Astor family and Marshall Field. Volume II begins the story of the great railroad fortunes, most of its space being given to the Vanderbilts and Goulds. Volume III tells for the first time, backed by incontestable proofs, the true story of Russell Sage, Stephen B. Elkins, James J. Hill and J. Pierpont Morgan. $1.50 a volume. The 3 volumes for $4, postpaid.

History of the Supreme Court, by Gustavus Myers. "Its bold presentations and analysis of evidence seldom used, its short histories of the judges, of their party affiliations and business connections are all of utmsot importance to him who wants to know the truth and where to find it in case of need."—American Journal of Sociology. Cloth, 823 pages, $2, postpaid.

FEMINISM

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

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

Woman Under Socialism, by August Bebel. Translated from the original German of the 33rd edition, by Daniel De Leon. This is one of the greatest Socialist books ever written. It is a powerful exposure of the shams of capitalist morality. This is the book from which garbled extracts are taken to show that Socialists advocate "free love." (LN) $1, postpaid.

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

EDUCATION

Schools of To-morrow, by John Dewey (professor of philosophy, Columbia University) and Evelyn Dewey. Not a dry-as-dust handbook, but a vital, inspiring study. A survey of all the best work that is being carried on today in America in the way of educational experiment. The authors point to these typical advance posts of progress, search out the truth that underlies them, and from these truths construct the schools of to-morrow. (DU) $1.50, postage 8c. extra.

SOCIALISM

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism, Anti-Duehring, by Frederick Engels. A survey of the Socialist position, elaborated in controversy with Prof. Duehring. $1, postpaid.

Capital, by Karl Marx. The great classic of Socialism. Unrefuted and irrefutable. A study of the tendencies and forces in Capitalist Society.

Volume I, "The Process of Capitalist Production," is practically complete in itself. It explains the thing which, up to the time that Marx came on the scene, had confused all the economists, namely, Surplus Value, 869 pages, $2.

Volume II, "The Process of Circulation of Capital," explains the part the merchant and the banker play in the present system, and the laws that govern social capital. 618 pages, $2.

Volume III, treats of "The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole." Predicts the rise of Trusts and makes clear the cause of panics and industrial crises. Shows how the small capitalist is swallowed. Explains the subjects of Land, Rent and Farming. 1,048 pages, $2.

The set, three volumes, $5, postpaid.

Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy, by Frederick Engels. Translated, with critical introduction, by Austin Lewis. 50c., postpaid.

Anarchism and Socialism, by G. Plechanoff. A masterly study of the subject, by one of the foremost Marxian scholars of the world. 50c., postpaid.

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History, by Karl Kautsky. In five parts: Ancient and Christian Ethics; the Ethical System of the Period of the Enlightenment; the Ethics of Kant; the Ethics of Darwinism; the Ethics of Marxism. 50c., postpaid.

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx, by Louis B. Boudin, author of "Socialism and War." This is an answer to critics of Marx, and to some Socialists who caricature the Marxian doctrines. It is an excellent synthesis of the Socialist ideas of the world, history, society, etc. $1, postpaid.

Send for our Complete Catalogue of Socialist Literature

New Review Book Service

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

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

Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History, by Antonio Labriola, Professor in the University of Rome. An elaboration and synthesis of the Socialist theory of Historical Materialism. $1, postpaid.

The High Cost of Living, by Karl Kautsky. A study of the economic causes for increasing prices; full of facts and figures. 50c., postpaid.

Social and Philosophical Studies, by Paul Lafargue. A series of keenly critical studies of the causes of religion and abstract ideas. 50c., postpaid.

Socialism in Theory and Practice, by Morris Hillquit. The statement of moderate American Socialism. (M) $1.50, postpaid.

The Class Struggle, by Karl Kautsky. The book is divided into five sections: The Passing of Small Production, The Proletariat, The Capitalist Class, The Commonwealth of the Future, The Class Struggle. Cloth, 50c., postpaid.

The Evolution of Property, by Paul Lafargue. This is a clear, concise history of "property rights" in the various forms of society from savagery to capitalism. Cloth, 50c., postpaid.

Karl Marx, Biographical Memoirs, by Wilhelm Liebknecht. This book by Liebknecht is beyond comparison the best pen-picture of Marx that has been written or can be written. Its author was a constant companion of Marx through years of his exile in England, and it is with these years that the book deals in most detail. Cloth, 50c., postpaid.

The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, by Frederick Engels. An interpretation and exposition of the origin of the family and the state in the light of the materialistic conception of history. Cloth, 50c., postpaid.

Philosophical Essays, by Joseph Dietzgen. A collection of articles written by Joseph Dietzgen on Socialism and Science, Religion, Ethics, etc. In the article on "Scientific Socialism" he gives a philosophic explanation of the principles of Marxian Socialism. **$1,** postpaid.

The Positive Outcome of Philosophy, by Joseph Dietzgen. This volume contains the three principal works of Joseph Dietzgen. The first of these is a most remarkable and original study of the data of modern science on the relation of the forces operating in the human brain to the other forces of the universe. $1, postpaid.

Stories of the Great Railroads, by Charles Edward Russell. The true history of the nation's great transportation lines. Full of facts and figures. Describes the beginnings and growth of the great railroads and their subtle influence on government. Cloth, $1, postpaid.

Socialized Germany

By

FREDERIC C. HOWE

Commissioner of Immigration

THIS work is a frank attempt to portray the remarkable programme of constructive statesmanship inaugurated by Bismarck and extended by the present Kaiser, which is largely responsible for Germany's unparalleled commercial and industrial progress.

"A timely, most interesting, most valuable book . . . Interesting because it treats of its subject in a readable way with great clarity of thought and admirable restraint in expression."—*Boston Transcript.*

"This volume deserves the attention it will undoubtedly command among thoughtful readers."—*New York Times.*

"Mr. Howe has produced a work worthy of careful consideration."—*Journal of Political Economy.*

"This book has striking traits which place it well in the van of books relating to the great war."—*Literary Digest.*

$1.50 net; postpaid $1.60.

By the Same Author.

WHY WAR

Dr. Howe approaches this question with a profound knowledge of American and European politics and an intimate knowledge of the secret and invisible forces that lie back of the outward manifestations of government. He finds the cause of the wars, that have been almost continuous since the opening of the present century, in the world-wide expansion of financial interests, overseas investors, concession seekers, and war-munition makers, which have become so indissolubly merged with the governments of Europe that a conflict of these interests is in effect a conflict of the powers.

$1.50 net; postpaid $1.60.

New Review Book Service

256 Broadway, New York.

"The Limitation of Offspring By the Prevention of Conception."

By Wm. J. Robinson, M. D.

EITHER BOOK

Socialism in America

By John Macy

FREE

WE need 1,000 new subscribers. One thousand new readers on our list would go a long way in making the NEW REVIEW self-supporting. If each one of our readers would secure one new subscriber within the next thirty days the existence of the magazine would be assured beyond any doubt. It can be done! Will you do your share?

FOR the next thirty days we will give away a copy of Dr. Robinson's new book, the "Limitation of Offspring by the Prevention of Conception," or a copy of John Macy's "Socialism in America," just published, with each *new* subscription that is sent in by any of our readers. Act at once!

The Books

The Limitation of Offspring

is now the burning question of the day. Dr. William J. Robinson was a pioneer in this country to demand that the people be permitted to obtain the knowledge how to limit the number of their children.

The book is written in plain popular language and should be read by every one who is interested in his own welfare and the welfare of the race.

Price $1.00, net.

Socialism in America

By John Macy

Wm. English Walling says: "I am amazed that Mr. Macy has been able to cover all the most important points, and yet—in spite of the very great condensation this necessitates—has succeeded in making a book, every page of which is interesting. I am convinced that no other writer in this country could have made such a brilliant success of this difficult task."

Price $1.00, net.

This Offer Expires May First

Subscription Dept. **NEW REVIEW**