Jan. 15th

New Review

Ten Cents

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. IV. 10c. a copy Published on the first and fifteenth of the month $1.50 a year No. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

CURRENT AFFAIRS:
Leaders 25
Pan-Americanism and the Monroe Doctrine; Socialist Congressional Responsibility; Labor's National Peace Council Indicted.
Notes 28
A PROGRAM ON PREPAREDNESS 29
L. B. Boudin
BRITISH TRADES UNIONS 32
THE FACTORY-FIRE PERIL 33
George M. Price
THE CLASS AND THE NATION 35
Louis C. Fraina
JAMES KEIR HARDIE 37
John Spargo
THE NEAR CONJUGAL 39
Elsie Clews Parsons
LITERARY REVIVAL IN IRELAND—AN ANALOGY 40
Ernest A. Boyd
BOOK REVIEWS 43
David Pinski's "The Treasure"
A SOCIALIST DIGEST 44
The Money Cost of the War; Briand Ministry in France; Swiss Socialist Congress; British Unions and the Munitions Act; A. F. of L. Legislative Program.

Current Affairs

Pan-Americanism and the Monroe Doctrine.

AT the sessions of the Pan-American Scientific Congress, many beautiful things were said about the "unity of the Americas" and the great ideal of Pan-Americanism. The sentiments were sublime, the aspirations inspiring, the tangible political achievements *nil*. Secretary of State Lansing's romanticism bubbled over, giving a touching color to the proceedings: "The American family of nations might well take for its motto that of Dumas' famous musketeers, 'One for all, all for one.'" President Wilson indulged in his usual captivating sentiments, compounded in about equal measure of evasions and generalities.

But there was no approach to a definite, sincere attempt at Pan-Americanism—the unity of the Americas. An indispensable preliminary to this unity is the recognition of the equality of all the American nations—the rejection of the hegemony of any particular nation in the American continents. But the Monroe Doctrine implies just such a claim to hegemony by the United States. The Monroe Doctrine is a *national policy of the United States;* it demonstrates that the United States conceives its political interests as dominant in the American continents, and seeing that within recent years the Monroe Doctrine has assumed a distinctly economic aspect, its economic interests as well. Under the circumstances, real Pan-Americanism implies the end of the Monroe Doctrine, at least as a national policy of the United States.

But in the midst of the ambiguity which was the essential characteristic of the speeches of President Wilson and Secretary of State Lansing, one thing stood out clearly and concretely: the United States, represented by the present administration, has absolutely no intention of abandoning the Monroe Doctrine as an exclusively national policy. Wilson made this clear:

"The Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed by the United States on her own authority. It has always been maintained and *always will be maintained upon her own responsibility.*"

Pan-Americanism was interpreted by Lansing in terms as futile as they are ambiguous:

"When we attempt to analyze Pan-Americanism we find that the essential qualities are those of the family—sympathy, helpfulness and a sincere desire to see another grow in prosperity, absence of covetousness of another's possessions, absence of jealousy of another's prominence, and, above all, absence of that spirit of intrigue which menaces the domestic peace of a neighbor. Such are the qualities of the family tie among individuals, and such should be, and I believe are, the qualities which compose the tie which unites the American family of nations."

This Pan-Americanism—naturally! since it is meaningless—is, said Lansing, "in entire harmony with the Monroe Doctrine." And Lansing emphasized the fact that the Monroe Doctrine "remains unaltered as a national policy of the United States."

Ambassador Suarez-Mujica, of Chili, who presided at the opening session of the congress, expressed the belief that the Monroe Doctrine was about to be absorbed in the larger doctrine of Pan-Americanism. This belief, this hope, was utterly shattered by the declarations of our Chief Executive and his Secretary of State. The United States refuses to recognize the other American republics as sovereign states on an equal footing with itself.

In his speech, President Wilson dealt with his proposed plan for closer union among the American republics. Closely examined, the proposed plan shows slight if any resemblance to genuine Pan-Americanism; in fact, in the phrase of one of the Latin-American diplomats, it merely "legalizes ideas and practices" that have grown up in the relations between the American states. Its chief purpose is to secure economic and governmental stability in the Latin-American republics. Speaking about the proposed plan, Wilson emphasized particularly the necessity of preserving domestic as well as international peace, and made his meaning clear in no uncertain terms: "Revolution tears up the very roots of everything that makes life go steadily forward and the light grow from generation to generation." Accordingly, the proposed plan is nothing more than an attempt to insure conditions of "law and order" in the republics of the South. "Law and order" and "stability" are prime pre-requisites for the protection of American investments.

There is, no doubt, a necessity for genuine Pan-Americanism as a first step to world federation. But, as we have pointed out, this pre-supposes the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine as a national policy of the United States. Is there any such tendency? On the contrary, the Monroe Doctrine is becoming more and more the conscious instrument of American Imperialism. Before the war, there was a certain sentiment among our publicists in favor of merging the Monroe Doctrine into the larger doctrine of Pan-Americanism. But now that American Imperialism is asserting and clarifying itself, becoming aware of the issues at stake and determining to seize world power, if it can, the Monroe Doctrine is being strengthened, amplifed, rough-hewn into an instrument of aggression. The Monroe Doctrine is no longer the doctrine of Monroe, but a doctrine given its definite Imperialistic tendency by President Roosevelt, the end of which is domination of the American continents. Pan-Americanism, in a measure, is the off-shoot of the Monroe Doctrine, the one essentially economic, the other essentially political.

Genuine Pan-Americanism might be based upon the recognition of the equality of all the American states, and the organization of a customs-union—*zollverein*—that should eventually include Canada. But the United States, with its Imperialistic Monroe Doctrine, offers a political obstacle to this plan; while the Latin-American republics offer an economic obstacle, in that their economic interests are much more identified with Europe than with the United States. In other words, American capitalism has a larger stake in Pan-Americanism than our neighbors. The war has changed this, it is true; but it has not essentially altered the situation, has not created a much larger community of interest. The reason thereof lies in the circumstance that the United States seeks to exploit the situation in the interests of Imperialism, instead of pacific Capitalism. American Imperialism does not desire a federation of the Americas, but *exclusive* opportunity for investment and exploitation in Latin-America, protected by the Roosevelt [Monroe] Doctrine and the weight of armaments. And unless the present Imperialistic tendency is checked by the counter forces of Socialism and democracy, the Monroe Doctrine and Pan-Americanism will merge as the definite international expression of American Imperialism.—*F.*

Socialist Congressional Responsibility.

COMRADE LONDON'S taking his seat in Congress brings before the Socialist Party a problem which it faced once before, but left unsolved,—the problem of the responsibility of Socialists elected to Congress.

When Victor Berger took his seat in Congress, on March 4, 1911, this problem was put up squarely to the membership of the Socialist Party, and had it been solved then we would have been spared the humiliating and disheartening discussions which followed the introduction of the "Socialist" Old Age Pension bill, and the irreparable damage which the party suffered in consequence. We would also have had one problem less on our hands. As it is, it is still on our hands and demands immediate solution. And the fact that our present Congressman is less likely to put us in a hole if left to himself is no argument for postponing action. On the contrary, it makes the solution of the problem much easier by placing the discussion on the plane of principle and reducing the personal element to a minimum. Now that we have a Congressman in whom we have full confidence, and before anything has happened to create "sides," is the time to decide the question: To whom is a Socialist Congressman responsible?

Is a Socialist Congressman his own master, responsible only to his "conscience"; or is he responsible to the Socialist Party? And if the latter is the case, how is this responsibility to be enforced? Obviously, the method which we followed in the Berger case of first letting him do as he pleased and then scold him for not doing as we pleased, is both unjust to our representative in Congress and extremely dangerous to the welfare of the party. Not only is an ounce of prevention better than a pound of cure, but in this case there really is no cure. Those who remember the inedifying experience of the Berger Old Age Pension bill will recollect that the final interference of the National Executive Committee in ordering an amendment of that bill, cured neither the bill nor the unfortunate situation in the party which its introduction had created. Had the bill been submitted to the National Executive Committee before its introduction to Congress we would have spared our Congressman from the public rebuke which was implied in the order to amend the bill, and the party from a row which fairly threatened to split it in two.

And let no one think that the trouble then lay in the fact that we were unfortunate in having as our representative a man whose Socialism is of a very peculiar kind,—a kind very unlike that of the great majority of our party membership. That merely made the situation acute. But the root of the problem lay much deeper,—in the fact that while Berger represented the Socialist Party as a whole, and the party as a whole was held responsible for his doings, he was permitted to act according to his own sweet will as if he represented nobody but himself, or at most the few thousand Milwaukee voters who voted for him on election day. And this problem remains the same no matter who happens to be our representative for the time being.

In the nature of things no man can be expected to satisfy everybody by his conduct,—there will therefore always be those who will claim that he does not truly represent the party sentiment, unless his actions are actually directed by the party. Besides,—we are all only human, and an election to Congress does not make one immune from error as to what the party sentiment may be on any particular question, nor does it wholly free him from the other frailties which human flesh is heir to. The best man is liable to differ with the party, and it is important that the collective party view should prevail and not the view of the particular person who for the time being happens to be our representative in Congress.

Comrade London is no exception to the rule, and his short incumbency of the office of Congressman has demonstrated the fact that he is prone to disagree on very important matters not only with many Socialists, but even with the party as a whole,—and that when he disapproved of them, party decisions had very little weight with him.

Since Comrade London took his seat in Congress he acted twice in his official capacity, once in voting for the so-called War Tax and again in introducing his Peace Resolution. According to the N. Y. *Volkszeitung* Comrade London committed a grave error in voting for the War Tax. We shall not enter here upon a discussion of the question "upon the merits." The question as to whether London or the *Volkszeitung* is right as to the merits of the War Tax dwindles into insignificance besides the question who is to decide how our representative in Congress is to vote on so important a question as the imposition of taxes? Is such a matter to be left to the uncontrolled will of the Congressman, or is the party to decide? Can we afford to permit any man, no matter how good and wise, to commit us on so vital a subject?

Comrade London's action in introducing his Peace Resolution has evoked so much and such deserved enthusiasm, that we are prone to overlook the shortcomings of his Peace Program. This is, however, a matter of great importance, as we have already had occasion to point out. But more important even than the question as to whether or not Comrade London has made any mistakes in the construction of his Peace Platform, is the question: On whose responsibility did Comrade London act in making up his list of Peace Terms? Does he represent himself only in this matter, or the Socialist Party of this country?

This question is particularly pressing in view of the fact that in this matter, unlike the War Tax question, the party had spoken officially and solemnly. At its last meeting, held in Chicago last May, our National Committee adopted a Peace Program, which was thereafter approved by a referendum of the entire membership. This Peace Program was unceremoniously set aside by our Congressman, and he proceeded to construct a Peace Program of his own. Here, again, the most important question is not whether Comrade London's or the Party's Peace Program is the better one. The great question before us is: Can we permit our representative in Congress to disregard the party's solemn expression of opinion on so tremendously important a subject? And this, in turn, is only part of the greater question demanding our immediate answer: *On whose responsibility does our representative in Congress act?*—*B.*

Labor's National Peace Council Indicted.

AFTER an investigation lasting about four months, a Federal Grand Jury sitting in New York indicted eight men prominently connected with the mushroom organization calling itself Labor's National Peace Council. The charge is criminal conspiracy in restraint of trade under the Sherman Anti-Trust Law by instigating and causing strikes in arms and munitions plants and factories and carrying on a nation-wide agitation and propaganda to hamper operation of such plants and shipments of their products.

This case is of unusual interest. The prosecution is based on the allegation that the activities of this Peace Council were nothing more or less than a plot of Teutonic agents to prevent the Allies from getting munitions and arms from America, and that money was lavishly spent for that purpose. Not money raised by American Labor and its friends, but money from the treasury of the Teutonic powers.

Now it is to be conceded that Labor's interest is for peace, not for war. At once the question arises why such a peace council should spring into life only at the time it appeared upon the stage?

We have had war at our very gate for a number of years, the civil war in Mexico, war brutal and savage, war which at one time came mighty near involving the United States. We even had the expedition to Vera Cruz which only by hypocritical courtesy we call by another name than war. And yet that war, so near our home, did not create any

Labor Peace Council. Why not? Until we have full information as to the sources from which the Peace Council was financed we may well cherish suspicion as to its purity of purpose. We know from experience how difficult it is to raise the means for a genuine labor campaign. Who paid the bills of the Labor Council?

On the other hand, an indictment by our machinery of the law, sometimes even a conviction, fall short of proving criminality or anti-social acts. Our Grand Juries are representatives of the propertied class, and so are largely also our trial juries. Our judges are steeped in ideas and views way behind present social conditions. The mills of our courts grind out not Justice but legal quibbles. We have seen here in New York John Most, Emma Goldman, Bouck White, Frank Tannenbaum and others sentenced to prison for opinions, not for anti-social deeds. We think of Pat Quinlan in a New Jersey prison, the victim of a frame up fully as revolting as that in the famous Dreyfus case in France. And so we may smile derisively at gabblings concerning the "majesty of the law."

What interests us is the question whether the Council was organized for the benefit of Labor or for other purposes. Granted that it fomented strikes and walk-outs; granted that it carried on an extensive propaganda: what of it? Such activity *per se* we could not blame if carried on solely for Labor's benefit. The capitalists and their mouthpieces abhor strikes and propaganda for Labor. That is not surprising. But we look at things from a different angle. Living in a state of chronic warfare between economic classes, we think the workers fully justified in seizing every opportunity for improving their condition. If the machinists and the workers in iron, steel and powder plants were able to force valuable concessions, they would have been fools to miss their chance.

But self respecting Labor must keep its skirts clean, must decline to be used as pawns in such dirty games of Imperialism. Its splendid cause must not be soiled by contact with Lamars and von Rintelens. Otherwise the results gained may turn into dead sea fruit.—*O.*

Roosevelt and the 1916 *Campaign.*

WITH his usual cleverness, Theodore Roosevelt has launched his boom for the presidential nomination of the Republican party. The Progressive party—what is left of it—is being used as a club to hold over the head of the Republicans. Roosevelt seems to have the support of the "big interests"—the steel and iron magnates, and other capitalists vitally interested in Imperialism. Roosevelt is as thorough an Imperialist as this country has. Hence the probability of his securing the Republican nomination for president.—*F.*

British Labor and Conscription

ORGANIZED LABOR in Great Britain has joined issue with the government on conscription. In spite of the dissent of the Labor members of the Cabinet, and by an overwhelming vote, the Labor Congress, representing the largest body of organized workers in the country, recorded its emphatic opposition to any form of conscription, and particularly to Prime Minister Asquith's "compulsion" measure. Simultaneously the House of Commons overwhelmingly ratified Asquith's proposal.

The general opposition to conscription reasons that, granting Great Britain is fighting for "democracy" against despotism, it is not worth winning the fight for democracy when to do so means abandoning one of the cherished institutions of democracy.

Organized Labor, on the other hand, bases its opposition primarily on the circumstance that conscription is intended to place the workers in the munition factories, and elsewhere probably, on a military basis and in that way suppressing strikes. The contention is that the real purpose the conscriptionists have in view is not more recruits, but the subjection of the unions.

The fight against conscription in England, at the moment, assumes the form of a fight against the reaction produced by the war. The demand for conscription is only one expression of the general reactionary tendency. Another expression of this tendency is the demand, formulated by Lord Headley, that after the war "the British workman would have to consent to work for *lower* wages than hitherto" in order to beat Germany in economic competition.—*F.*

Published by the New Review Publishing Association

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, 10 cents.

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

A Program on Preparedness

By L. B. Boudin

THE first requisite of a Socialist program on war and preparedness is,—that it must not be a mere negation, it must not consist of "don'ts" only.

We must start out from the recognition of the fact that we *cannot* "turn our back" on this life of ours, even in the vale of misery of the capitalist system. "Turning our back" on any real problem, besides being an acknowledgment of our moral and intellectual bankruptcy, simply means to give our opponents a free hand in the matter. Translating "turning our back on it" from theory into practice, means, to use Wanhope's phrase, that we shall not "wrangle about 'preparedness' or 'unpreparedness'," —if Russell wants "preparedness," let him have it. If Benson wants "unpreparedness," let him have it, too. We are neutral.

Of course, Wanhope does not want that. What he wants is that Russell and Benson should stop "wrangling" about this matter, and . . . Well, "teach Socialism,"—whatever that may mean. But when we come to carry out this sage advice we shall meet a heap of difficulties. To begin with, people don't stop "wrangling" about matters which they consider of the greatest moment to humanity just because they are politely asked to. Before people will stop "wrangling," or even cutting each others' throats, about such a matter, they must be convinced that the matter is not really worth while. And that requires quite a different solution of the problem than merely "turning our back" on it.

Besides, we have a perfect right to tell Wanhope that when he "turns his back" on the problem, he merely pretends that he does so. In reality he simply retires from the field, in favor of Russell and preparedness. For, at the present juncture, when all the forces of Capitalism have been caught in the maelstrom of Imperialism, when the only opposition to Militarism manifested anywhere within the ranks of the bourgeoisie is the feeble opposition of selfish and particularistic interests of certain small groups —such as the pro-Germans in this country at this moment when our proposed militaristic adventures have an anti-German point;—at such a time to withdraw the active opposition of the working class to preparedness, means to give it a helping hand to an easy and speedy victory all along the line.

So we really cannot "turn our back" on the blamed thing. We *must* "take sides," whether we like it or not. There is no choice left us in the matter. The only thing we can choose is the side on which to range ourselves: Shall we float with the tide of Imperialism into the haven of Militarism? Or shall we set ourselves in opposition to the current and attempt to stem the tide? And if we are to try the latter, how can we do it most effectively and without running the danger of being swept out of existence?

This brings us to another form of *negative* opposition to preparedness,—the non-resistance creed in its different forms and nuances. At first glance the doctrines of non-resistance seem to be very revolutionary: "We wouldn't fight!" sounds so determined as to be almost reassuring. In reality, however, it is merely another form of "turning our back" on the whole problem,—retiring from the field in favor of preparedness. The very practical men who want preparedness for very practical purposes care very little whether you "turn your back" on them in order to "teach Socialism" or in order to take the vow to rather die than fight. What they are mostly concerned about is that you let them alone *now*, so that they can attend in peace to preparedness and the other preliminaries to war. For *they* know full well—even if some Socialists don't—that man is, fortunately, a fighting animal, always ready to fight for what he thinks are his interests as well as for his notions of right and justice, and can, therefore, always be depended upon to join a "good" fight. *They* also know—even if some Socialists do seem to have forgotten—that Socialism is a fighting doctrine, and the revolutionary proletariat the greatest fighting force in our society; and that the Socialist proletariat will be the first to rush into the fight if it can be made to believe that high ideals are at stake. *That is why the Socialists of Europe are fighting each other to-day.*

And you cannot stop this by taking a pledge not to enlist or to "rather die than fight" or some similar meaningless and *worthless* declaration of good intentions, and then go to sleep on it with a smug self-satisfied feeling of your own superiority to those poor wretches abroad who couldn't rise to your heroic altitude. In an article recently published in the Sunday *Call*, Fred Warren elaborates at length this pseudo-revolutionary doctrine of "rather die than fight." The article as a whole is as much of a declaration of bankruptcy in its own way as Wanhope's is in his. War is inevitable, and if the American Socialists are not made of better stuff than the European Socialists, then we shall of course do in case of war what the European Socialists did. And "better" in this connection does not mean better informed as to the principles of Socialism or the true interests of the working class. Like a true "revolutionist" Warren is not bothered with such "intellectual" problems. To him it is simply a question of courage to die for one's convictions. The generality of mortals is of course not built of the stern stuff that martyrs are made of, and Warren is therefore thoroughly pessimistic as to the salvation of the working class of this country. Of course, as to himself and another few chosen individuals, the situation is quite different: the road to heaven is quite clear for them. And in a true paroxysm of the joy of martyrdom thus tasted in advance Warren exclaims: "Is life so sweet under capitalism that it is worth taking the slim chance offered by the bloody trench?"

To which the shade of Ludwig Frank could well answer: "Shame on you for thus cowardly besmirching the memory of the dead. While you were self-satisfiedly proclaiming your courage and taking pledges which you were not likely to ever be called upon to keep, I have *proven* my courage by voluntarily giving up my life for the cause that lay nearest my heart."

If we are ever to get out of this mire and find a solution of the tremendous problem confronting us, we must give up this lofty moralizing tone,—which in most cases is merely a poor subterfuge for our inability to tackle the real problems involved. The breakdown of the International was not the result of any lack of courage: Guesde, Vaillant, Kropotkin, Frank, Hyndman—not to speak of the hosts of men less known in this country—had plenty of courage. If the European Socialists have nevertheless failed in their duty to Internationalism the cause must therefore be sought on a different plane,—the plane of "accepted Socialist doctrine." The trouble was not due to the European Socialists not having the courage of their convictions, but to the fact that they didn't have the right convictions.

The difficulty with the Second International was that it attempted to reconcile irreconcilables,—*to harmonize nationalism with internationalism.* The result was that our "accepted socialist theories" were really a mixture of the two, every Socialist compounding for himself a compound in which the two ingredients were used in such a proportion as suited his own taste. There were, therefore, all kinds of compounds current in our movement under the name of "Internationalism," none being more "authoritative" than the other. The worst of it was that our "practical men" frowned upon the discussion of these questions as "empty theorizing," "hair-splitting dogmatizing," etc., and very carefully kept the question out from our propaganda literature,—with the result that the faster we grew the less the class-struggle ingredient in our "internationalism."

This double-allegiance to Nationalism and Internationalism was, of course, untenable, and when the storm broke the shoddy character of most of our "internationalism" became apparent. Theoretically, it showed itself in the theory of the "suspension of the class-struggle" in times of war; practically, in enthusiastically doing everything that we solemnly pledged ourselves against in times of peace. The fact is that it is not a question of pledges, but of principles. One *cannot,* and *must* not, pledge himself to act against the dictates of his conscience. And if his conscience forbids participating in a certain war he does not need any pledge to keep him from it. Rosa Luxemburg never took the pledge, but she stood by our guns. The French Syndicalists did take the pledge,—with what results we all know.

The only *practical* way, therefore, for us to pursue is by getting our theories straight,—make it clear to ourselves *what we stand for,* what we are ready to fight for or fight against. And here we must "get back to fundamentals," as Comrade Wanhope very rightly says. Mere declarations against "militarism" won't do,—our German comrades were opposed to militarism before the war, but that did not prevent their enlisting in its service when the war came, and when the nationalistic ideals which were part of their particular brand of internationalism were thought to be in danger. Nor will it do for us in this country to merely oppose preparedness. Mr. George Sylvester Viereck is also opposed to preparedness. We must get back behind these things, and find out *why* one is for preparedness. Forget about your so-called "practicalness," the picayune standard of petty politics looking for "results," according to which we may accept help from the devil himself. This is the most important business of our life, and he who isn't with us on this is against us. And whether or not he is with us depends not on his position on any particular subject dictated by the exigencies of the moment, but on the principles which actuate him in his conduct. Mr. Viereck may be as much opposed to preparedness just now as any one of us, but we should be sorely disappointed if we pinned our faith in his anti-preparedness. And we shall be just as sorely disappointed if we pin our faith in the anti-preparedness of those whose allegiance to the class-struggle lasts only as long as there is peace; or those who are opposed to preparedness because they believe that there will be no war, or those who are opposed to *further* preparedness because they believe we are *already* sufficiently prepared. All of these will be but a broken reed in our hands when the real test comes.

The first article on our preparedness program must therefore be the acquisition of clearness and light on the problem of the class-struggle; and a thorough house-cleaning in the course of which we shall send to the scrap-heap all of the old nationalistic rubbish about nation and country which formed the virus with which the Second International was poisoned. And having made the matter clear to ourselves, we must start in an *intense* *propaganda* of our ideas among the ranks of the working class. *Don't hide the true internationalistic—anti-nationalistic—character of the class-struggle in an endeavor to fool some nationalists into our party.* The European experience has proven that we don't fool anybody but ourselves; and that in the endeavor to fool somebody we fail to do our real work,—*teach the working class the true meaning of the working class philosophy.* Stop propagating the lie about Socialism being a purely "economic" question.

And here I must pause for a moment to say that the idea so assiduously spread by our opportunists that the Socialists do not bear any part of the responsibility for this war, that they were too weak to prevent it, etc., is an absurd and mischevious falsehood. If the present war has demonstrated anything, it has demonstrated this proposition: that *no great modern war can be carried on against the wishes of the working class.* If the German working-class—which really means the German Socialists—had been opposed to the war to the extent of being willing to bring about the failure of its government's military enterprise, war would never have been declared. And if the German imperialistic clique had been hair-brained enough to declare war, their enterprise would have broken down in its early stages, and Europe would have been at peace again more than a year ago. This was made impossible by the nationalistic ideology of the majority of German Socialists, which compelled them to suspend the class-struggle and rush enthusiastically to the support of their nation the moment they were confronted with the *fait accompli* of war.

It is in this field that our chief labors lie. We must teach the working class not only to be opposed to the preparation for war, or the declaration of war; but the fact that even after war has been declared *their first and only duty is to their class.* That they must view the war from the point of view of the interest of their class—which embraces the workers of the entire world—as opposed to the interests of their "nation." And if the interests of their class and their "nation" clash, they must desire the failure of their "national cause." Once the working class becomes imbued with this idea, individual martyrdom will become unnecessary, and whenever necessary there will be willing martyrs a-plenty. To the credit of the human race be it said that there never was any dearth of martyrs where *convictions* were strong.

But in order that you may get the working class imbued with the right convictions—convictions that can be relied upon to stand the test of war—your war-policy must be in accord with, in fact the logical outcome of, your peace-policy. You cannot tell a man that he may keep his nationalistic ideas and ideals in peace times, and then expect him to throw them overboard in war-times. Nor can you tell a working man that the interests of the working class of his "nation" are in accord with the interests of the capitalists of his nation in any respect—as opposed to the combined interests of the working and capitalists of some other nation—in times of peace, and then expect him to uphold the solidarity of the class against the solidarity of the nation when the war-bells begin to ring.

If you want him to maintain class-solidarity in case of war, you must wean him away from the capitalist-made idea that the gains of any so-called "national" commerce and industry in the international market means real gain for the working class of that nation, and that it is therefore in the interest of the working class of each nation that its "national" commerce and industry should succeed as against the commerce and industry of other nations.

The second point on our preparedness program must therefore be the development of a "foreign policy" of our own, which must consist in active opposition to the "foreign policy" of our imperialistic ruling class. For us here in the United States such a foreign policy must include opposition to the acquisition or retention of colonies or protectorates. The Philippines and our other "island possessions" must go. So should our overlordships over Cuba, Santo-Domingo, etc. But it involves more; it involves the repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine as she is taught and practiced in our day and generation. And it means even more than that: it means our opposition to a fortified Panama Canal, in fact to our exclusive control of the Panama Canal in any way, shape or form.

There is real danger of war in our colonies and protectorates, and even more so in the Monroe Doctrine and the Panama Canal "as at present constituted." And you cannot expect the working class of this country not to "back up the nation" in a quarrel on their account so long as it remains under the impression that on these matters its interests are the same as those of the capitalists of this nation, and opposed to those of the workers of the countries with which we may come into conflict. We must, therefore, formulate a program covering these matters, and back it up with a great educationl campaign designed to instruct the working class of this country in the true meaning of World Politics in general and American World Politics in particular, and their relation to the struggle of the workers of the world for their emancipation.

But a proper policy of "foreign relations" must include more than what belongs formally within the domain of international politics, it must include those "home affairs" which have, or may acquire, an international aspect,—such as the question of immigration, for instance. A narrow-minded, restrictive, immigration policy can easily raise real or imaginary war-clouds, as is daily demonstrated by our Japanese Exclusion policy. And imaginary war-clouds are as likely to foster real militarism as real ones. In fact, the only unanswerable argument of our preparedness agitators to-day is that we must be ready to meet Japan in case of friction over Japanese Exclusion.

But this is not all; nor even the most important phase of the question. Far more important than the direct danger of war from a restrictive immigration policy, is the fact that such a policy, being based on a nationalistic principle, wouldn't harmonize with a socialistic policy of "foreign relations." You can no more have a nationalistic home policy and a socialistic foreign policy, than you can have a nationalistic peace policy and a socialistic war policy. The complex of feelings and ideas which we call "human nature," with all its seeming contradictions, is not a chest of drawers or a set of pigeon-holes, with separate compartments for "economics", "politics", "religion", "home affairs", "foreign relations", etc., etc., ranged side-by-side without regard to one another. On the contrary, all of these matters are closely inter-related and interwoven with each other, so as to form a more or less harmonious whole.

You cannot, therefore, base your immigration policy on the principle of "America for Americans", or "America for the White Race", or some similar principle implying the division of the workers of the world along racial and national lines, producing separate "national" interests for the workers of the different nations and countries,—interests which the workers of each country must protect and defend against the onslaughts of the workers of other countries,—and at the same time have a foreign policy based on a denial of these implications. The two wouldn't jibe. You must therefore make your choice: You either have a set of politics entirely socialistic or one entirely nationalistic. If you attempt to compromise, to straddle, you may succeed in fooling yourself and some others for a while: But when the great day of reckoning comes you will find that you have builded upon sand, your nationalistic nakedness will be exposed to the gaze of the world; and the edifice of compromise which your skilled architects—the so-called "practical statesmen"—have reared with so much laborious care will lie in the dust, a heap of ruins.

Our entire policy, "home" as well as "foreign", must therefore proceed upon great principle,—the principle of the solidarity of the working class of all races and all nations, and the struggle of this united working class against the ruling classes of every race and every nation.

If we pursue *such* a policy we shall escape from that awful dilemma, so cruelly but so truly,—"truly," that is, for the present, while we still cling to our "accepted" theories and policies,—described for us by Wanhope: "if you prepare you get war, and if you don't prepare you get war." He states an undeniable truth when he says: "Germany got into the war because she *was* prepared, and England got into the war because she *was not* prepared". But that is only true, in so far as England is concerned, because England attempted to do the impossible,—pursue war-like *policies* without war-like preparations. That is why she bungled her job so miserably. The nations of the world are face to face with a great crisis in which great decisions must be made, and therefore no half-measures will do. Either nationalistic interests and nationalistic ideas prevail,—and then all the nations must follow the example of Germany. Or,—a reorganization of international relations must take place. And we here in the United States are confronted with the same problem, and must make our decision. Theodore Roosevelt is absolutely right in saying that if we want to play any rôle in World Politics we must prepare, and prepare not only by adopting the half-measures so dear to the true "Democratic" heart, but in the real, Roosevelt-William II style. And the only answer that we can give Mr. Roosevelt is,—*that we don't want to play the rôle which he and the other Imperialists are so anxious the United States should assume.*

British Trades Unions

An investigation carried on by the Department of Labor Statistics in Great Britain has yielded interesting particulars respecting the membership of Trades Unions and Trades Councils for the year ending 1914.

At the end of 1914 the total membership of the 1,123 registered and unregistered Trades Unions known to the department was 3,959,863, showing an increase of 0.8 per cent. on the previous year, when the figure attained (3,928,191) was greatly in excess of any previously recorded.

The membership by trades and the percentage of increase or decrease in each trade compared with the previous year are shown in the following table:

Groups of Trades	No. of Unions at end of 1914	Membership at end of 1914	Percentage Increase (+) or decrease (—) in Membership compared with 1913
Building:			
Carpenters and Joiners......	2	97 020	+ 1.4
Builders Laborers..........	16	29 343	—23.0
Others	46	110 161	— 3.2
Mining and Quarrying:			
Coal Mining:			
Cumberland	13	228 603	+ 5.2
Yorkshire	4	128 397	— 3.4
Lancashire and Cheshire..	17	82 246	— 0.9

Midlands	26	164 960	— 1.0
Wales, Monmouthshire	9	176 413	— 1.5
Scotland	11	101 585	— 4.2
Other Mining and Quarrying	10	30 373	+ 0.9
Metal, Engineering and Ship building:			
Iron and Steel Manufacture	13	71 457	—10.7
Ironfounding	9	47 854	— 2.4
Engineering	63	296 796	+ 9.1
Shipbuilding	12	102 201	+ 3.7
Miscellaneous	76	39 433	+ 0.6
Textile:			
Cotton:			
Weavers	43	216 146	— 3.2
Others	104	136 676	— 2.0
Other Textile	91	136 146	— 3.2
Textile Printing, Dyeing, Packing, etc.	39	61 509	—14.1
Clothing:			
Boot and Shoe	11	55 433	+ 1.4
Tailoring and other Clothing	28	46 885	— 8.6
Transport:			
Railway	6	336 671	+ 3.2
Tramway and other Land Transport	18	96 832	÷ 1.5
Seamen	12	128 921	+ 2.7
Dock, Canal and Riverside Labor	23	143 263	— 6.8
Printing and Allied Trades	32	92 055	— 9.0
Woodworking and Furnishing Trades	80	64 686	+ 0.2
Shop Assistants, Clerks, etc.	11	105 880	— 4.9
Other Trades	202	167 329	+ 1.5
General Labor	14	366 539	+10.7
Employees of Public Authorities	82	150 295	+ 3.9
Totals*	1123*	3 959 863**	÷ 0.8

* Exclusive, as usual, of a few Unions (generally unimportant) from which complete returns have not been received.

** The total membership (all trades) includes 39,901 members in colonial and foreign branches, of whom 19,479 belonged to the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners and 18,823 to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

In no group of trade was the rate of increase so great in 1914 as in 1913, and in several groups there was a decline in membership. The general labor group heads the list of increases with 35,000 or 10.7 per cent.; but this increase was entirely due to the growth of one union—the Workers' Union—which advanced in membership from 91,000 to 159,600; in 1910 this union had only 5,000 members. Trade Unions in the engineering industry show an incraese of 25,000 members, or 9.1 per cent. On the other hand, the membership of unions of builders' laborers, of iron and steel workers, and of textils dyers, etc., decreased by 9,000 (or 23.0 per cent.), 9,000 (or 10.7 per cent.), and 10,000 (or 14.1 per cent.) respectively.

The total membership of all trade unions in 1914 increased by 65.1 per cent. compared with 1910, and by 172.7 per cent. compared with 1895, when the membership was lower than in any other year of the period 1892-1914 for which the department has comparable statistics.

The Factory-Fire Peril

By George M. Price

Director, Joint Board of Sanitary Control.

THE perils from factory fires are greater than the dangers of other industrial accidents, because of the seeming trust of the workers in the safety of their buildings and because the workers are entirely ignorant of the terrible dangers lurking at every step in their daily sojourn in factories and workshops.

Within the last few years the workers have been rudely awakened to their daily perils by the great loss of life in the Wolff-Newark, Asch-Triangle, the Binghamton, and, lately, the Diamond-Williamsburgh fires. The loss of life and the spectacular character of these fires have aroused the attention of the public and the workers to the dangerous existing conditions, but this attention is usually lagging and is only revived by the periodic repetition of these holocausts.

Disastrous as have been these fires they are but symptoms of the disease and not the disease itself. More important than the fires that have already occurred are those fires that are likely to occur.

The magnitude of the peril may be gathered from a special report on fire hazards in factory buildings which has just been issued by the Joint Board of Sanitary Control, in the Cloak, Suit and Skirt and the Dress and Waist Industries, New York City.

According to this report it appears that these two industries are concentrated in the loft zone in Manhattan in 2,391 shops located in 928 buildings. These 928 buildings are but a part of the 16,000 loft buildings in the city. In these 928 buildings the workers in the two industries alone represented not less than 75,000 men and women and the total population of these 928 buildings was about one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand.

Now, how many of these 928 buildings do you think could be considered perfectly safe in case of fire?

A building may be considered safe which has sufficient exits in the form of stairways or proper fire escapes to allow all the persons working in the building to escape within three or five minutes, which is a reasonable time before the spread of fire may do harm to the workers. *Out of the* 928 *buildings there were only* 32 *which could be regarded as reasonably safe*, being provided with three or more stairways or a sufficient number of exits for the escape of all the persons working in them.

There were 149 buildings which were provided with only two stairways and I cannot regard such buildings as perfectly safe,—in the first place, because two stairways are not always adequate for all the persons in a building to escape from; and, in the second place, because if one of the stairways, as is often the case, is cut off by fire, the other stairway is usually not sufficient for the exit of all the persons in the building.

Of the 928 buildings investigated, not less than 747, or 80 per cent., of the buildings were found to be equipped with only a single stairway. These buildings I regard as *absolutely unsafe*, for the reason that one stairway is never sufficient for the escape of all the population of a building, and for the additional reason that if this stairway is cut off all means of exit are cut off and the building is converted into a roasting pen for the workers therein. To add to the extreme fire hazards existing in these 747 buildings with a single stairway, 244 of these stairways were of a winder type which presents additional dangers to escape. One of the stairways was found to be only twenty inches wide in one part, scarcely sufficient for one person to pass through; 28 of the stairways were found to be 24 inches and less in width; 29 stairways were found totally dark and 37 were reported by the inspectors in a bad and insecure condition.

The laws on the statute books, passed to safeguard the workers' lives, are dead letters. We have a voluminous Labor Law but it is only a mockery. We have administrative machinery for the labor and fire prevention laws but they are only a snare and delusion,—for the protection given the workers cannot be judged by the number of laws on the statute books but by the number of laws which are actually enforced.

Let us see how these laws are enforced. The same report gives some figures on this question as well. Paragraph 83-a of the Labor Law reads:

"Every factory building over two stories in height in which more than twenty-five persons are employed above the ground floor shall be equipped with a fire alarm signal system, etc., etc."

Out of the 928 buildings inspected by us, we have found only 83 buildings equipped with fire alarm systems and lately we have heard from the Fire Department that only 29 of these have a fire alarm system which is approved by the Fire Department. The other nine hundred buildings are not so equipped, in violation of the law.

We have Section 2 of Paragraph 83-a of the Labor Law which provides for fire drills in all buildings where there are more than twenty-five persons employed above the ground floor. Out of the 928 buildings inspected only 18 were found that were said to conduct a fire drill.

The Labor Law calls for enclosure of all interior stairways in buildings more than five stories in height, but out of the 108 buildings of six stories in height, only 20 had such enclosures and 88, or 82 per cent., were without enclosures, in violation of the law.

The law calls for fireproof receptacles, for prohibition of smoking in shops and for many others, but you and I well know that these provisions are but empty phrases and are hardly ever enforced.

These conditions exist not only in 928 buildings in which the two industries, Cloak and Suit, and Skirt, Dress and Waist, alone are located,—the conditions in these buildings and in these industries are far superior to those existing in the other 15,000 buildings in the city; for the reason that it is already five years since the Cloak and Suit Industry and nearly three years since the Dress and Waist Industry created the institution of the Joint Board of Sanitary Control, and during the last five years the Joint Board has done its utmost by inspection, by persuasion, by complaints and by all means in its power to improve conditions and to make the conditions in its factories as safe as is reasonably possible.

The Joint Board of Sanitary Control has driven a great many factories out of places which were considered by it unsafe, has reduced a great many of the dangers by compelling owners to equip their factories with the necessary fire prevention appliances. The Board has also reduced the danger from panics by conducting monthly fire drills in nearly 800 of the largest shops in the industry, thus protecting over 65 per cent. of the workers in these industries.

These dangerous conditions, however, which we have found and which I have noted before, are conditions over which the manufacturers themselves and the workers have little control and to remedy which it is necessary to apply to the owners of the buildings who must be compelled to do so by the proper municipal and state authorities.

One of the great causes of the existing conditions lies in the general neglect of the human factor in industry, in the fact that the rights of property are put above those of life, that property interests and rights have become a fetish to which all, even life, is to be sacrificed.

The *laisser faire* policy with which the modern industrial system of production began its existence is still rampant, especially in construction of buildings of industrial establishments. The construction of factories is still without any supervision, except as to safety of their walls and floors.

Nor are the laws as at present on the statute books sufficient for the purpose of full protection of the workers in factories.

In Germany, where, so far as I know, there has never as yet been a single worker's life lost by an industrial fire, no factory over five stories in height may be built.

It is, however, not the law itself which is inadequate but also its administration or, rather, maladministration. Instances were already given where salutary laws have been nullified because they are not enforced. There is nothing that causes so much contempt for the law as a law which is on the statute books but which is not enforced.

The Class and the Nation

By Louis C. Fraina

THE Russian Socialist, Paul Axelrod, insists that a thorough historical study of the nation is indispensable for Socialist reconstruction after the war. This is an acceptance of the fact that our attitude to the nation is the decisive factor in the reorganization of the Socialist movement; and our attitude to the nation carries with it the reconstruction of our national and international policy and tactics, not simply in relation to war, but to the whole scope of the movement.

A mere historical study, however, is in itself insufficient; few Socialists would disagree, historically, about the significance of the nation as a creation of the bourgeoisie. The important point is a contemporary study of the nation and its role in social development, and the whole subject of the nation and parliamentary government within the nation. Parliamentary government is part and parcel of the nation, fundamentally one problem and one manifestation, and should be considered as such.

But even historically Socialists are not all in harmony in their conception of the nation. There is an assumption among some Socialists that, while the nation is the particular creation and form of expression of the bourgeoisie, the nation is just as important as the class and that the struggles of nations each with the other function as dynamically as class struggles. History refutes this assumption —*national struggles are a form of manifestation of the class struggle.*

The historical generalizations concerning this problem may be summarized as follows:

1.—The nation is the expression of a particular social and economic system and the class representing that system.

2.—The destiny of a nation is determined by the development of the economics of its social system and its ruling class.

3.—Competing nations represent competing social-economic systems and ruling class interests.

4.—The hegemony of a nation at any particular epoch represents the hegemony of the most highly developed social system,—consequently most powerful ruling class.

5.—Any struggle between nations—national struggles—is the expression of a struggle between classes using the nation in waging their disputes.

These are the generalizations; the practice is not as concrete. Social progress is uneven; nations do not develop simultaneously, although their development is along essentially parallel lines; remnants of the preceding social system persist into the new and affect events; a ruling class often disputes supremacy with its predecessor or potential successor, and is itself often divided into warring groups; nor is capitalism static, its various stages of development being a distinct factor and affecting the course of events. Then, again, the nation—a product of historical factors—becomes itself an historical factor, and at times must be considered as an historical category. But all the historical factors are synthesized into the dominance of class and the struggle of class against class, and are fundamentally determined by the interests of the class struggle. There is a play of forces—of their proportion and relation—which offers a fruitful field for investigation to the Socialist historian. This task is beyond the scope of this article; our task is to indicate and suggest.

The series of bloody wars which signalized the advent of the bourgeoisie and the nation-state was essentially the expression of the class interests of the bourgeoisie, in conflict with Feudalism. The struggles of many years between France and England, marked by the battles of Crècy, Poitiers and Agincourt, were fundamentally a class struggle in the form of war between the rising bourgeoisie of England struggling for territorial conquest and markets, and the feudalism of France,—the triumph of the yeomanry over the flower of the French nobility is symbolical of the character of the wars. It is true that England and France at this period had much in common, historically; both were at the era of territorial consolidation, politically the distinguishing feature of the formation of the nation; but England was much more advanced than France economically; her bourgeoisie had conquered a larger share of power, its commercial interests stronger; while in France feudalism was as yet unshaken by the bourgeoisie. The flourishing manufacturing interests of England were protected and encouraged by the government, and the extensive trade in wool with the manufacturing towns of Flanders was a direct cause of the wars. Undoubtedly, the wars were not purely capitalist wars; feudal interests were involved; but what distinguishes them from the wars of feudalism and gives them their distinctive historical character was the preponderance of bourgeois interests. The national struggles of the era of the Reformation were another expression of the bourgeois urge to power, and the expression in national form of the interests of the class struggle of the bourgeoisie.

The wars of the French Revolution offer the finest illustration of the essentially class character of national struggles. These wars were an extension and continuation of the struggle waged by the bourgeoisie of France against the absolute monarchy and its feudal interests. Never was a nation as thoroughly dominated by its bourgeoisie as was the France of 1793 and Napoleon. The revolution that drastically overthrew the monarchy and its feudal relations struck a terrific blow at monarchy and feudalism throughout Europe. Clearly and absolutely the national struggles that followed were dictated by class interests—the class interests of the bourgeoisie, incarnated in Republican France, in conflict with the class interests of feudalism, represented by monarchical Europe. The class struggle of the bourgeoisie waged in France by means of revolution, was converted into a *national* class struggle waged by means of international war,—emphasizing that national struggles are a form of manifestation of class struggles waged on the field of international politics. The revolutionary and Napoleonic wars were the death-grapple of two social-economic systems struggling for ascendancy.[1]

One feature of the Socialist theory of the class struggle is that the class struggle represents a struggle betwen a dominant economic system and its ruling class, and a rising economic system and its subject class. The national struggles cited were essentially of this character,—struggles between feudalism and capitalism, each seeking social control. But not all national struggles are of this character,—and the answer to this is that *the class struggle theory admits and demonstrates that there are class struggles between rival groups of the ruling class itself.* National struggles not susceptible of our original interpretation fall into this latter category. This is particularly true of national struggles to-day.

An important phase of contemporary Capitalism is the expropriation of the capitalist by the capitalist. In national economics, this expropriation proceeds by means of the concentration of capital. But capitalism reaches a point where, along with other factors, this process of expropriation reaches a certain limit. Expropriation and concentration along national lines become insufficient; big capital and small capital strike a compromise in partial or complete State Socialism; and instead of the expropriation of the individual capitalist, there is the attempt to expropriate the capitalists of a rival national group by means diplomatic pressure, "spheres of influence" and war,—in short, Imperialism.

What confuses the problem of the nation in the eyes of many is the circumstance that general interests—social, cultural, ideological—are bound up with the nation, and that these interests are advanced or retarded by national struggles. But the Socialist admits that a ruling class develops certain cultural factors that are a permanent contribution to civilization. At the present moment, however, the greatest danger to these cultural factors lies in the perpetuation of the nation—the defense of the nation. In the measure that the nation becomes an instrument of Imperialism, the nation becomes reactionary,—in much the same way as absolute monarchy, which at its inception served the interests of the bourgeoisie and progress, and later on menaced those interests.

Imperialism denies the necessity of the democratic federation of nations, a task laid upon Capitalism by the historic process. Capitalism has generated the forces of internationality; it remains for Socialism to organize the forces effectively, into a world-state.

It is inconceivable that Capitalism should produce an actual unity of nations,—which would pre-suppose the dissolution of the nation in its existing form. Identically as with parliamentary government, the nation is the particular expression of the interests of the capitalist class. The capitalist class finds its essential expression in the nation and parliamentary government; the proletariat in the world-state and industrial government. The working class struggle against Capitalism, accordingly, assumes the form of a revolutionary struggle against the nation and parliamentary government.

The proletariat, as a revolutionary class, must project its own governmental expression, its own concept of the relations between nations,—industrial government and the world state. *The embryo of this expression is industrial unionism and international proletarian organization.* This means a relentless struggle against the nation and its interests, and parliamentary government and its social manifestations.

[1] The supremacy of Napoleon and the national risings which finally accomplished his overthrow, do not alter our interpretation. The Napoleonic struggle for world empire, while produced by the necessity of the prevailing situation, was pre-capitalistic in its purposes. Hence the struggle assumed a new form—the class interests and national interests of the bourgeoisies of certain parts of Europe fought against the Napoleonic menace to their interests. At this stage, the struggle is essentially between rival groups of the same ruling class; the wars between France and England at this period were of the latter character.

James Keir Hardie

By John Spargo

WITHIN the short space of two years the international Socialist movement has lost four great, distinctive and variously picturesque figures—August Bebel, Jean Jaurés, James Keir Hardie and Edouard Valliant—and of the four all except Bebel have fallen in the ranks since the great war came to devastate and wreck that which each of the four so nobly and bravely wrought.

My beloved friend and comrade, the great and generous "Old Keir," died, so they say, of a broken heart at the comparatively early age of fifty-nine. He who had so steadfastly fought against militarism, and struggled so bravely to forge the ties of internationalism and proletarian solidarity so strongly that nothing could melt or break them, saw his lifework undone and the nations of Europe plunged into cruel, fratricidal strife. He saw the international solidarity which he valued so highly and trusted so fully consumed in the fiery furnace of bitter war and hatred. And they say that the boundlessness of his grief broke his mighty heart.

To many who had long known of his work in the Socialist movement the announcement that Hardie was only fifty-nine must have been something of a shock, I think. For a score of years almost he had been regarded as a veteran and called "Old Keir," so that it was perfectly natural for him to have been generally regarded as a much older man. And in truth he was much older than the years he had lived. He had toiled and struggled and suffered more than enough to fill twenty more years than he knew. He lived with double intensity, burning the candle at both ends. Hence, he was prematurely aged, and he that died in Glasgow on the twenty-sixth day of September, 1915, was indeed an old and spent man.

It is not too much to say of Hardie that of all the great leaders of the modern Socialist movement he most clearly represented in his person its proletarian character. For he was of the working-class, bone of its bone, flesh of its flesh, blood of its blood. Unlike too many who have been called to positions of eminence, he never forsook the class in which he was cradled. He strove manfully to rise with his class, but was ever too loyal and too great of mind and heart to rise out of his class.

The essential biographical outline of his life is easily enough given. Born on the fifteenth day of August, 1856, he was in all respects a child of poverty. His birthplace was a one-room cottage near Newarthill, Lanarkshire, Scotland. His father was a ship-carpenter by trade, but was almost always ailing or out of work, so that grim poverty lingered always within the simple and humble cottage. As a child, Keir Hardie knew the pangs of bitter hunger quite often, and the memory of that experience was never obliterated. When he was past forty years of age his eyes flashed like coals of burning fire when he told me about his childhood, as we sat and exchanged experiences in the lull of a hard campaign. The hunger and suffering of those early years made him the splendid revolutionist he was.

Keir was the oldest of a large family,—there were, I think, nine children altogether. As he remembered it and told me, "it seemed as if children were always being born in the home." And that meant that the oldest boy must often be deprived of things in the interest of the younger children, and that he must do odd jobs to help the overworked mother. Thus he was robbed of childhood's heritage of play and laughter and freedom. He was barely six years old when he went to work as an errand boy for a shilling a week—no inconsiderable trifle to his harassed mother, may I say from bitter knowledge?

He was little more than seven years old when he went to work in the coal mines, for an increased wage, of course. He had never had a day's schooling, for schooling cost money, and there was so little of that that he had always gone barefoot when running errands. But his good mother—she whose memory he so tenderly revered throughout his stormy life, and whose name he spoke with impressive reverence—taught him to read simple English. In the depths of the sunless mine, during the long and dreary night watches, the boy improved his mind and continued his studies, scratching new and unfamiliar words in the coal dust with a rusty nail, committing them to memory. In his passionate quest for learning and for knowledge the boy, no less than the mature man, symbolized the striving of the real proletariat to possess the learning and the culture of the ages.

Who that ever paid out the hardly earned sevenpences for the weekly numbers of *Cassell's Popular Educator* will fail to understand the process which led young Hardie in his teens to deny himself of all the little luxuries and self-indulgencies enjoyed by his mates, including the seductive pleasures of the tavern, in order to secure that treasure-trove? From its pages Hardie gathered some knowledge of the Isaac Pitman system of stenography, some Latin and, I think, a fair knowledge of the double entry system of bookkeeping. In a word, his was the intellectual equipment of the typical trade union secretary of the time, and of the equally typical Methodist lay preacher.

At twenty-three we find him secretary of a miners' union, marrying, getting victimized in consequence of a strike and suffering all the penalties of the blacklist. There follows an interlude, during which he worked as a newspaper reporter, and then, at twenty-seven, he is president of the Miners' Union, of which he remained a member to his death.

Hardie's parents, it is worth noting, were ardent followers of Charles Bradlaugh, freethinkers. As a boy, therefore, he had grown accustomed to independent thinking upon religious matters, somewhat of a rare experience for a Scottish lad in those days! But the negative attitude of his parents did not satisfy him, and so during his early twenties we find him a local preacher and temperance advocate. And to the end of his life he remained a total abstainer and a preacher, essentially an evangelical. He might not, in his later years, have been willing to accept any particular creed, but he believed in God and in the special divinity of Jesus. When he went to Merthyr Tydvil the first time as a candidate, he frankly announced his position: "My Socialism is the Socialism of Jesus Christ and of the New Testament." And there was no affectation in this. He was, as always, profoundly sincere.

During those preaching days young Hardie was to the front in his locality in all the radical movements of the time, the strange medley of republican and agrarian radicalism found in him a ready exponent.

In 1887 he appeared at the Trade Union Congress and caused a sensation by his attack upon the members of the Congress who sat in the House of Commons as Liberals, men like Thomas Burt, of the Miners, and Henry Broadhurst, of the Operative Masons, my own old union. He was especially severe upon Broadhurst for supporting capitalist candidates of the Liberal Party in the elections. It was the first clear note of Labor's independence. A little later Hardie ran on an independent trade union ticket at New Lanark, following which the Scottish Labor Party was formed, with R. B. Cunninghame-Graham as its president and Hardie as its secretary.

At the Trades Union Congress of 1891 Hardie again made a memorable and epochal fight, carrying against the reactionaries in the movement the amendment in favor of an eight hour work day by legal enactment. Then, in 1892, came the founding of the Independent Labor Party, at Bradford, and the election of Hardie for South West Ham at the General Election. That was when he shocked the House of Commons by going to Parliament escorted by a wagon load of dockers and wearing a workman's cap. This was not, as many supposed, a mere affectation on Hardie's part, the insincere act of a *poseur*. It was quite characteristic—he always loved somewhat bizarre effects in his dress. Before me as I write is the famous cartoon from *Vanity Fair*, called "Queer Hardie," and signed by Hardie himself and sent me as a Christmas card. He was very proud of the cartoon, I think, and certainly it gives one a splendid idea of the man. The brown mottled coat, the vivid scarlet tie, the soft shirt, the low slippers, and the massive, long-stemmed pipe, make up a somewhat bizarre ensemble.

It has often been said that Hardie was the most typical proletarian leader the modern Socialist movement has produced, and yet the most unlike the typical proletarian in his person. To dwell a moment longer upon his manner of dress, no workingman would think of wearing such dress. Sometimes, it seemed to me as if by his language, by his physical carriage, by his habits, he was deliberately setting an example—preaching with his life what he could not have preached in words without being misunderstood. And yet, unlike the typical worker as he was in so many ways, he was the most successful exponent of working class ideals the English-speaking world has produced.

He was not a great theorist, in this respect being utterly unlike both Bebel and Jaurès, with whom his name will forever be associated. But in some respects he was a more practical leader and statesman than either of them. He paid scant heed to theories and formulae—and that was why many of us failed to understand him very often. We were wedded to our theories, our dogmas and classic formulations, and we could not help looking askance at the man who would have none of them, who despised them all. So often there were other men who seemed so much more revolutionary than Hardie because they reduced their beliefs to familiar formulae. Hardie, for example, would hardly ever give formal adherence to the *doctrine* of class struggles, and many of us held that fact against him and regarded him as less revolutionary than those who never failed to do so. But it was Hardie who was always to be found *in* the class struggle as an active participant. He was, indeed, a fighter and not a maker of phrases! And I suspect that it was because he was actually fighting the battle of his class, always in the thick of the fight, that he was hated and despised and feared as no other Socialist in the English-speaking world has ever been.

If his death was tragic, let us never forget that his life was glorious! He personified the aspirations and faith of the proletariat. He symbolized in his person the capacity of the working-class to break its chains, to rise above the brutal entanglements of its servitude, to grasp all the knowledge and culture of the centuries, to win and use its freedom.

Great comrade, teacher, guide and inspirer, love and honor to his memory!

The Near Conjugal

By Elsie Clews Parsons

TO many Italians, I have no doubt, and to at least one Englishman, that sometime Italian institution, the cicisbeate, was an exacting and trying satisfaction. "A *relazione*," writes Lord Byron at Ravenna, "seems to be a regular affair of from five to fifteen years, at which period, if there occur a widowhood, it finishes by a *sposalizio;* and in the meantime it has so many rules of its own, that it is not much better. A man actually becomes a piece of female property." Byron fumed against the *amicizia* he submitted to for even less than its conventional minimal period merely because it reversed the familiar English order, because it was a foreign institution, not, I surmise, because it was an institution. Do we not recall that in England Byron had been capable of exerting his own proprietary or institutional privileges to the extent of making Lady Caroline Lamb swear never to dance the newfangled dance of that day, the waltz? Byron was by nature a conservative.

And yet to his contemporaries he undoubtedly seemed the destroyer he liked to think himself. It is one of the ironies of society that it not only allows the conservative to wear a mask of iconoclasticism, but often thrusts the mask upon him, particularly if he—or she—happens to be one of the lovers it pleases to make notorious. I am thinking for the moment not of Byron, but of the Parnells. Was there ever a more conjugal union than that of Parnell and Katherine O'Shea, essentially a more institutional example of monogamy, the kind of monogamy society most favors? And they of all people were anathematized as innovators in sex, violators of marriage!

From the beginning Parnell and Mrs. O'Shea desired to give their intimacy a conjugal character. Within half a year of the time they met Parnell is writing to Mrs. O'Shea as his "dear wife," and even before that form of address is adopted his solicitude for her is marital. In other illicit relationships one may note the same solicitude, the same feeling of union, the same desire for conjugality. "I loved her with a tenderness which leaves me with a need of loving," writes d'Alembert on the death of Julie de Lespinasse. Although aware he had "never been first in her affections," he had clung to her and cherished her with utter conjugal devotion. Julie herself, a more errant spirit, showed a strong desire for union with at least one of her lovers, Monsieur de Mora. Her more distracted devotion to Guilibert recalls the experience of another woman in the Paris of another day, Mary Wollstonecraft. "I like the word affection," writes Mary Wollstonecraft in one of her supremely affectionate letters to Imlay, "because it signifies something habitual." In the same letter she has told him that scarcely can he imagine "with what pleasure I anticipate the day when we are to begin almost to live together." Poor soul, her pleasure in conjugality was shortlived, only too often the occasion arose for her to declare her wifely principle "that two people who mean to live together ought not to be long separated."

A predominant trait in conjugality is the desire for recognition. A spouse is ever acclaimed a spouse. In the near conjugal relations we are considering the same trait appears. For years d'Alembert and Mlle. de Lespinasse went "out" together as inseparably as the most inseparable American couple. They even paid calls together and, writes de Ségur, no host dreamed of inviting one without the other. Katherine O'Shea tells us herself that, political intermediary as she was, Gladstone and the liberal leaders could not have failed to understand her other relationship to Parnell. "Nay, all the world may know it for aught I care!" exclaims Mary Wollstonecraft of her expected motherhood. Later she writes the American lover who like the veriest of American husbands has been pleading business as an escape from a personal relationship: Never have I "concealed the nature of my connection with you."

But of all instances of the more or less unnecessary proclaiming of a passionate intimacy, that by Lady Hester Lucy Stanhope appears to me most striking, being the least called for. Having taken a position of entire independence in regard to travel, traveling where she pleased and with whom, she deliberately and gratuitously informed her friends that one of her traveling companions had become her accepted lover. She likewise notified the young man's father.

In spite of Lady Hester Stanhope and her anxiety to give herself away, in spite of Mary Wollstonecraft and the conjugality-craving Parnells, in spite of the well defined cicisbeate of Italy and its less self-assertive homologue in France and the *faux ménage* there and elsewhere, in spite of the Anglo-Saxon women one knows today who exploit their "admirers" and advertise their "attentions," in spite of all these instances of the desire for an established and recognized relationship, would one realize, I wonder, that the lover might be quite as institutional a character as the husband but for the simpler expression of that fact in very primitive society?

Let me describe the *pirrauru* custom of Australia and the *eriam* of New Guinea. Among the Dieri tribe of South East Australia infants are betrothed by their mothers and maternal uncles, a sister of the boy being bartered for the girl. The contract for this so-called *tippa-malku* relationship is signalized by the tying up of the navel cords of the children with emu feathers and colored strings. No woman may be a *tippa-malku* or individual wife to more than one man, but she may subsequently become a *pirrauru* or group-wife to other men, to a sister's husband or a husband's brother or temporarily to a guest. The *pirrauru* relationship is also formally entered into; there is a family ceremony or a ceremony attended by the entire camp. . . . When a man has a number of *pirrauru,* the Elders may recommend him to keep to one, letting the others go. Jealousy, the Elders know, attaches to the relationship. Each of a pair of *pirrauru* spies on the other to preclude new ties. The *pirrauru* of an unmarried man is particularly watchful. The better to keep an eye on him she makes him camp near by and she never dozes off, it is said, until assured he is safe asleep. Suspect, he—she too under reversed circumstances—runs the risk of being given a shower bath of boiling water. . . . Age rather than kinship is the prominent feature in "group marriage" among the Melanesian hamlets of Southern New Guinea. There a Massim has the privileges of access to the wife of his contemporary, of a member of his age-class, his *eriam.* It is a privilege he avails himself of particularly when his own wife is pregnant. . . . The women make no secret of having been visited by one of their husband's *eriam* and they will generally mention it to their husband. . . . A tendency towards monogamy is notable even in this *eriam* relationship, for the man seeks the company of the wife of one particular *eriam* more frequently than that of the wives of his other *eriam. Eriam* and *pirrauru,* lovers to be sure, yet lovers as conjugal as lovers can be, the personal choice well limited, the relation entered upon ceremonially and maintained with the "fidelity" of an exclusive spirit.

Blackfellow and Melanesian ways help us understand, I think, the ways of our more immediate acquaintances, but enlightenment through the ethnographic parallel may be twofold. Insight into modern society may bring insight into Blackfellow or Melanesian society. Their so-called group marriage is one of the vexed questions of their culture. Is it a check on a hypothetical original promiscuity, a step towards monogamy, or is it not? Modern illustrations of "group marriage" suggest at least that it is a differentiation in monogamy, not an antecedent. That it should ever be taken the other way round is due, I venture to say, to the pull of popular thinking upon the scientist. In popular thought promiscuity is the necessary alternative of monogamy, monogamy itself is an arduous achievement, a labored progress under divine or legalistic guidance. In popular thought there is nothing natural or instinctive about marriage. Therefore since the modern man is ever ready to fall back into promiscuity, was not his original savage state, argues the facile psychologist, a state of promiscuity?

It is high time not only for science but for ethics to question these presuppositions. Is man, savage or civilized, ever set upon promiscuity? Rather has he not a veritable instinct for monogamy, an instinct most plain perhaps in those very instances which are brought up to prove the waywardness of his sexual nature? Is it not because unmarried he so longs to act as if he were married that he commits the sin of being found out? Surely it is the near conjugal, not the transitory and furtive, not the act of promiscuity that tempts him into that unpardonable sin.

The Literary Revival in Ireland—An Analogy

By Ernest A. Boyd

IT is usual to find Belgian literature cited when a parallel to the Irish Literary Revival is needed. To those interested in the intellectual life of the small nations this must always seem a little arbitrary, inasmuch as Belgium is not even the only European literature in French outside of France. Switzerland, for example, has produced writers, from the time of Rousseau, who rank with the best of Belgium or of France itself. French Switzerland, apart from the world-famous names of Madame de Staël, Rousseau and Amiel, is far from being an indistinguishable annex to the literature of France. It would be easy to mention a number of Swiss writers who have been intensely national, in the best sense of the word. During the last ten or fifteen years a flourishing movement has come into existence to prove that the successors of the Father of the Revolution are still preserving a literature in which the Protestant revolutionary tradition finds its clearest expression in the French language. But the sturdy virtues of Swiss democracy are too easily ignored by a world which knows Switzerland only as the centre of the hotel and scenery industry.

In the United States, however, there is another reason why the inevitable reference to Belgium should not be accepted as the only possible comparison with Irish literature. Within the limits of a short journey from New York it is possible to come upon a literary manifestation which suggests an interesting parallel. Neither in Belgium nor Switzerland do the circumstances present so complete an analogy as exists between French-Canadian and Anglo-Irish literature. If the former has not shared the attention of the outside world to the same degree as the latter, it is because of the general indifference to French writers not consecrated by Parisian opinion. After all the Swiss Edouard Rod and the Belgian Maeterlinck were not accepted by foreigners until they had secured recognition in Paris.

Obviously the first point of resemblance between the French-Canadian and the Anglo-Irish writers is that both have endeavored to preserve the national identity of a race which finds itself in the minority. In each case, moreover, the reaction is against the same majority—the English. From one standpoint the Canadian situation differs from the Irish, in that the substitution of the English language has not been so successful. French Canada is in the same position as Ireland was a couple of centuries ago, when Gaelic was still the medium of literary expression. On the other hand, since the Celtic Revival which dates some thirty years back, we have had in Ireland a twofold renaissance. Not only is there a growing literature in Gaelic, but our Anglo-Irish writers have so moulded the language imposed upon them that it has become an adequate reflex of the national spirit. Gone are the generations of Anglicized Irish writers who were, at best, provincial Englishmen. The work of men like W. B. Yeats and J. M. Synge cannot possibly be confounded with that of any other race. They are as essentially Irish as Kipling or Galsworthy are English. While the Celtic element in Yeats is more impalpable, in Synge it has materialized sufficiently to stamp the idiom he used with unmistakable racial imprint. For all practical purposes Anglo-Irish speech is no longer an obstacle to the manifestation of the Irish spirit. Consequently our writers have turned it to the same account as the Canadians have French. It has become the means by which the minority announces its intellectual independence and protects itself from the majority.

The literature of French Canada, like our own, was thrown back upon the history of its lost freedom of its material. The tendency to revert to past times and events has sensibly decreased. But for many years the instinctive movement of writers engaged in asserting their national right to existence was towards such periods as most strikingly illustrated their thesis. It was easier to be national politically than intellectually. Hence the vast quantity of printed matter in Ireland devoted to the praise of dead heroes and the denunciation of living enemies. The great achievement of the Celtic Revival has been to divert attention from old hates and to make known a broader and deeper conception of nationality. Irish literature within the last quarter of a century has been concerned with the legends and traditions of the people, rather than with the political struggles which succeeded the classic period of Irish culture. In Canada Philippe Aubert de Gaspé initiated a somewhat similar change when he published in 1863 *Les Anciens Canadiens*. This epic of French-Canadian history surprises some of his critics by its absence of rancor. A well-known historian of Canadian literature, Abbe Camille Roy, even reproaches him with being too ready to approve of "national resignation" in the face of England's victory. Identical were the comments upon Yeats' propaganda, when he began to wean the young poets of their admiration for writers whose politics were less open to censure than their art. It is significant that de Gaspé's work attained extraordinary popularity and is one of the few contributions to French-Canadian literature which has been translated. The new generation of Yeats and A. E. and their successors in Ireland are similarly more famous than any of the purely patriotic poets who preceded them. Literary jingoism has given way to genuinely national poetry and drama.

The dominance of the folk element in contemporary Irish literature has been widely commented upon, and has formed the subject of much discussion in Ireland. The Irish Theatre, which began, under the direction of Yeats, Moore and Edward Martyn, as an institution for the development of literary drama, came to an abrupt close because of a divergence of opinion on this point. Nevertheless Anglo-Irish literature must necessarily be almost wholly rural in its setting. The country it represents is agricultural rather than industrial, and the most characteristic expression of the people is not to be sought in the cities, where the dehumanising work of industrialism is everywhere killing individual life. In addition, Ireland depends largely upon the comparatively un-anglicised countryside for the preservation of those traits and customs which have come down in direct line from the Gaelic source. The unwritten folk-literature of the peasantry has been of such evident value in the work of the Literary Revival that it would be unwise and ungrateful to attempt to ignore the rural existence of the Irish people. It is true, this concentration of attention upon one side of life—even though it be most important for us—has had some depressing results, but these are attributable to want of talent rather than to any inherent weakness in the subject itself. J. M. Synge has shown that with the peasant play, and the idiom of the countryside, the most powerful drama and poetic effects may be obtained. The mediocrity of the popular Irish melodramatists explains their success and . . . their failure, from an artistic standpoint. It does not reflect upon the merits of folk-drama.

The Canadians have also written mainly of rural conditions, for they are faced with the same problem as their Irish contemporaries. It is not in the half-anglicised drawing-rooms of Montreal that the French-Canadian spirit is strongly developed, but in the smaller communities and isolated farm houses outside the range of urban influences. Consequently, while Canadian drama, such as it is, concerns itself with historical subjects, in the absence of a folk-theatre, the novel relates the incidents of country life. The lack of good novelists has been the most striking anomaly of the Literary Revival in Ireland, but for the reason is not far to seek, when one remembers the composition of the people. It is difficult to write a novel out of the simple, and perhaps scanty, material furnished by village communities. We have had a few writers of fiction, mainly of short stories, who have given some charming pictures of the Irish countryside. Shan F. Bullock, Jane Barlow and Seumas MacManus are well known. But we have had no Hardy to give us the equivalent of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure.* Shan F. Bullock has perhaps approximated most nearly to that point. Unlike the others, he prefers the novel to the short-story form. *By Thrasna River, The Barrys* and that fine study of the returned American, *Dan the Dollar,* entitle him to a high place in the history of contemporary Irish fiction. He has taken the novel as seriously as the majority have taken poetry and drama, and has avoided the temptation, to which they have often succumbed, of regarding fiction as a "pot-boiler."

While the French-Canadian novel can boast of no very unusual talent it has been since Gaspé's *Anciens Canadiens* the form of literature most frequently practiced, except verse. The Canadian novelists have written along very similar lines to those noticed as characteristic of Irish fiction. Apart from the few writers who have emulated Gaspé, such as Laure Conan, the majority have studied the rural civilization of the old *habitants* and their successors. The first novel of importance was *Charles Guerin,* which had considerable success about the year 1848, but the author, P. J. O. Chauveau, was not familiar with the manners of the Canadian, except as they revealed themselves in the half-French, half-English society of the large cities. His book owed its reception largely to the fact that it was written with more care for style than was usual in the writers of the period. The typical fiction of French Canada dates rather from Gérin-Lajoie's *Jean Rivard,* written some twenty years later. Here at last is a novel which attempts to render the epic of colonisation, the struggle of man against nature on the virgin soil of a new country. There is a peculiar, naïve savour to this fiction through which the practical wisdom of the agriculturist pierces, even to the extent of notes of interest to the farmer! Since it was written others have developed the theme with a less obviously utilitarian intention. The hardships and adventures of the pioneers and backwoodsmen, the great life of the fields and forests—these are the eternal subject of Canadian fiction.

It is evident that the limitations imposed upon the Irish novel apply also in this case. In spite of the fine work of Dr. Choquette in *Les Ribaud* and *Claude Paysan* in recent years, the novelists are mainly engaged in tracing the more or less external aspects of the rural communities. Historical fiction has attracted the attention of only one author of distinction already mentioned, Laure Conan, who has successfully written of the Anglo-French war period. Two years ago a young writer, Hector Bernier, made an innovation by publishing *Au large de l'Ecueil* and *Ce que disait la Flamme,* both novels of contemporary middle-class society. Unfortunately the clerical note, so predominant in French Canada, makes the reading of the former work rather difficult for the uninitiated. In the latter, however, the author advocates the cause of the people, in whom the factors and sense of nationality are strongest, and champions their fight against a form of snobbery which holds it unfashionable to speak French. The same problem exists in Ireland amongst the so-called West-Britons, who profess to find everything Irish too vulgar for their adopted sensibilities. The great triumph of the Revival has been its power to demonstrate the absurdity of this attitude.

The flowering of poetry in Ireland finds it counterpart in Canada, whose finest poets have made French the language of their verse. Since the death of Louis Fréchette in 1908, his erstwhile rival, W. Chapman, is the most notable figure in Canadian-French literature. In both countries the poets are characterised by their passionate attachment to the national cause. The plaint of a defeated but unconquered race is heard through their songs, together with an intense love of the external features of their native land. The poetry of Chapman and Fréchette is impregnated with the atmosphere of the North; the crisp snows and the great forests are as integral a part of their work, as the mist and bogland of the Irish poets. They are never so thoroughly Canadian as in the descriptive passages. But a vast difference is noticeable between the spirit of the two races, and it finds its most striking manifestation in their verse. French-Canadian poetry is predominantly Catholic, whereas Irish poetry is pagan.

Contrary to the popular impression, there is not a single writer of the first class in contemporary Irish literature whose work betrays the influence of Catholicism. The greatest names are invariably those of Protestants, nominal or actual, A. E., W. B. Yeats and J. M. Synge. The Catholic writers either keep their religion out of their work, to their advantage, or they introduce it, at the expense of their art. With the sole exception of Katharine Tynan, there is no Irish Catholic poet at the present time whose reputation extends beyond a narrow circle. The half-English poetry of Lionel Johnson alone expresses the Catholic soul in terms worthy of the general level of poetic achievement associated with the Celtic Revival. The explanation of the two different phenomena is that, whereas Catholicism has been at the very roots of French Canadian nationalism, Irish Nationality springs from the old Celtic soil which saw the conflict between bard and saint. The bardic literature of Gaelic Ireland is eloquent of the hostility with which the cultured of the period received Christianity. The fundamental exoticism in Irish life has been the grafting of Catholicism, reinforced by anglicisation, upon a civilisation alien to either.

Book Reviews

David Pinski's "The Treasure"

I HAVE just finished reading David Pinski's *The Treasure*[1], and it has left me with very many impressions and half-thoughts. I have no time to exercise care and sit back and ponder my half-thoughts until they shall have grown whole and secure, so I must needs set them down here for what they are worth as "reactions."

Up to the middle of the book the question was very present to my mind: Why should a translator take the trouble to translate this play, and how could a publisher hope to find a sufficient sale for it to make it worth his while, financially, to publish it? For though I believe that Mr. Benjamin Huebsch has something more than a merely commercial interest in the matter he brings out, he can hardly be expected to undertake the publication of books that are, apparently, but little entitled to even a forlorn hope of finding an extended circle of readers. And the things in the first half of the play that raised these questions in my mind were the following:

1st. *The Treasure* is not only what Mr. Lewisohn says it is, "bitter comedy," but it is harsh and on the whole grotesque farce. It gets its effects by unbelievable situations, and its note is, almost without variation, mean and squalid.

2d. It is medieval in conception, or nearly so. True, Chaucer, had he written a play, would not have used the same methods of character delineation nor possibly quite the same methods of creating interest in his situation, but I feel that he would have blocked in his characters with the same broad allegorical values as Mr. Pinski uses. Mr. Pinski's stage people are scarcely people at all; they are embodiments of an oppressive and horrible greed, differing only in the fact that one embodiment is dressed in woman's clothes, one in man's clothes, another is of a different station, and so on. At bottom they all typify a cancer-like greed that not only eats away their human vitals but seems to consume their faculties of speech and action, so that in situations where a word would go far to avert the approach of misery they are strangely dumb. In short the characters are drawn not from life but from Mr. Pinski's need of preaching a moral.

3d. The author, largely because of his allegorical-moral attitude toward his people, lacks sympathy with them (the worst fault a dramatic writer can be guilty of). Their grief, pain, anxiety, despair (or what should be those emotions or conditions, were they considerately drawn), are only ingredients to be braised in Mr. Pinski's mortar almost with the detachment with which a chemist puts up a prescription.

Because of these characteristics in the first half of the play I could not bring myself to see a good reason for translating and publishing it; but in the second half I thought that the author to a certain degree succeeded in rising superior to his limitations of conception (though never of technique) and achieving a preachment, at least, that was not without justification, even if it seemed without a philosophy or a conclusion. Ultimately it was borne in upon me that the matter was bigger than any individual author. As I read I seemed to see in this play certain qualities that, though I am speaking without due time for reflection, I would be inclined to characterize as qualities of Yiddish literature, in so far as my very slight acquaintance with it (mainly through *East and West*) would justify me in judging. For instance:

Mr. Pinski in this play offers, I think, these two utterances as the keynote of his theme: "Marriage is a pious and a Jewish matter and so is money." This is spoken by a lusty young woman at the opening of the play: the following is spoken by a ghost in a graveyard at the end of the play: "They who are in life still stand at the same point. Generation dies after generation and all remains as it has been. As it was aforetime, so it was in my time and so it is today." The occasion for this remark of the ghost is that the whole Jewish element, well-to-do and poor alike, in a city of some size are thrown into a state of half crazed ferment by the fact that a half-witted boy in burying his dog in the grounds of the congregational churchyard has come upon a little end of treasure, some twenty to thirty imperials in all. Immediately the whole "ghetto" (may I say?) is aroused to a frenzy of cupidity in the hope that by ransacking the graveyard they may find further wealth.

Such is the theme of the play. From beginning to end no other note is struck; between the living and the dead it is bandied back and forth with this for a conclusion: "Money . . . Money . . . Money . . . and yet it must lead to something. Surely there must be a goal. . . . Only God knows what . . ."; and so, after our "traffic" for four or five long hours (the play as it stands would probably take six hours to carry through on the stage) we have as our crumb of not very consolatory and not very hearty philosophy: God knows what it is all about, and only God. Meantime, however, money is "a pious and a Jewish matter."

Now, though it may be unfair to charge this attitude toward money to the Yiddish mind as a determining note, still I think it is not unfair to say that it seems to represent a mastering passion in the Yiddish spirit. This morbid attachment to the *idea* of money—I write idea of money wittingly—is not in Yiddish literature alone (it is prevalent enough, heaven knows, in the studies of such writers as Guy de Maupassant), but somehow when the Yiddish writers or Mr. Glass use it for their theme there seems to be an implied acceptance of it as a vital human characteristic that leaves the unfortunate impression in the end that though the writer scourge it, as Mr. Pinski does, as a fallacy and an indignity yet he is on the side of it as a fact of life.

This may mean no more than that the writers of Yiddish literature are honester and more straightforward than the writers of Gentile literature; that money is a brush with which we are all willing to be tarred: yet by virtue of the better appearance of correcting a vice that seems to be in

---

[1] *The Treasure*, by David Pinski. Translated by Ludwig Lewisohn. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $1.00.

Gentile literature it has the advantage I believe of being more helpful. At the end of a play like this of Mr. Pinski's one feels that the satiric lash that is being laid on the back of Jewish character is a feathery or a shadowy lash. It does not hurt because it is not wielded with conviction. It comes out too much a mere dramatic exercise rather than a powerful exhortation, artistic or moral. Between *The Treasure*, for instance, and such a play as William Boyle's "The Building Fund" or Murray's "Birthright" (Irish School) there seems to me to be an impassable gulf. Boyle and Murray write their plays in the spirit of repudiation, Mr. Pinski writes in a spirit of tolerance. "Only God Knows!"—In other words, let us lie down under the affliction of being money-lovers until we know God's will about it. . . . When I get to this kind of a note at the end of a Yiddish play, still more when it is larded into me, vulgarized, by such students of Jewish life as Mr. Montague Glass, I distinctly feel that I have been cheated. Not that I want to see chastisement fall upon the evil-doers, but I want the author to be on one side of the fence or the other. Instead, were I to believe Yiddish and other Jewish literature, I would get the impression that this blinding passion for money is deep in the Jewish grain. I happen to know enough of Jewish character, through twenty years of close acquaintance with it, to be able to say that that is false and misleading. It may be Yiddish or New York East Side (in spots), but it is not Jewish.

Next again, I find in this Yiddish literature an almost ferocious liking for the merely painful, apparently for the merely painful's sake. Things gratuitously disagreeable are lugged in with a sort of gloating delight as in Zola, so that one is reminded almost constantly of R. L. Stevenson's definition of melodrama as a trampling on people's feelings with hob-nailed boots, —Stevenson I think might have added: mainly for the value of the exercise to the trampler. If it were not relieved at times in the pages of Yiddish literature by many a passage of sly humor it would be gruesome beyond bearing. By the way, why should not the Yiddish writers seek to make as much of their quality of humor as their quality of hypochondria? It is a lively quality when it does appear: why should it not appear more frequently? Because the life of "Yiddishers" is hard? Yes, but life will remain hard as long as the attitude of the liver is the attitude of futile complaint, with "God only Knows" for the note of interpretation. T. D. O'Bolger.

A Socialist Digest

The Money Cost of the War

As the war continues, the money cost rises steadily to staggering figures.

Within one year, from Christmas, 1914, to Christmas, 1915, the cost of the war daily has more than doubled; in England it has risen from approximately $10,000,000 a day to approximately $25,000,000 a day. [In men, the war daily sacrifices 20,000 men in killed and wounded.]

The credits already voted in France and demanded until the end of March, 1916, exceed $7,000,000,000; those of Great Britain amount to almost $9,000,000,000, while those of Russia are between $6,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000. Thus the cost of the war to the Allies has already passed $20,000,000,000, without counting Italy, Belgium, Serbia and Japan. The German war-credits already voted are approximately $10,000,000,000.

The bare figures in themselves do not provide an adequate basis for comparison, as the purchasing power of money varies in the different countries.

Francis W. Hirst, editor of the London *Economist*, on the basis of existing official information to guide him to approximate estimates, draws up a set of figures of what may be the new debts incurred by the six chief belligerent countries:

	New war debt in millions sterling	Annual burden for interest
Germany	1,800*	90
Great Britain	1,500*	65
France	1,500*	80
Russia	1,200	70
Austria-Hungary	1,000	60
Italy	300	20

* Excluding loans to allies.

The loans of the six chief belligerents, for the period of the war ending December 31st, 1915, are as follows:

Great Britain	$7,222,470,000
France	5,616,000,000
Russia	3,110,000,000
Italy	415,000,000
Germany	7,171,556,000
Austria-Hungary	2,549,000,000

These loans represent perhaps the greatest economic burden of the war—a burden that will weigh down future generations. All the belligerents, except England, are adopting the policy of financing the war by means of loans. England is adopting the policy of financing the war as much as possible by levying new taxation. All this is staggering, particularly when the huge destruction of invasion and battle—a destruction that, for the first six months of the war was estimated by Yves Guyot at $11,600,000,000 in Western Europe alone.

According to David Starr Jordon, in the *Scientific Monthly*, the huge national debts of Europe are virtually all war debts:

"The chief motive for borrowing on the part of every nation has been war or preparation for war. If it were not for war no nation on earth need ever have borrowed a dollar. If provinces and municipalities could use all the taxes their people pay, for purposes of peace, they could pay off all their debts and start free. In Europe, for the last hundred years, in time of so-called peace, nations have paid more for war than for anything else. It is not strange therefore that this armed peace has 'found its verification in war.'"

At the close of the Napoleonic wars Great Britain owed $4,430,000,000:

"The savings of peace duly reduced this debt, but the Boer war, for which about $800,000,000 was borrowed, swept these savings away. When the present war began the national debt had been reduced to a little less than $400,000,000, which sum a year of world war has brought up to $10,000,000,000.

"The debt of France dates from the French Revolution. Through reckless management it soon rose to $700,000,000, which sum was cut by paper money, confiscation, and other repudiations to $160,000,000. This process of easing the government at the expense of the people spread consternation and bankruptcy far and wide. A great programme of public expenditure following the costly [Franco-Prussian] war and its soon repaid indemnity raised the debt of France to over $6,000,000,000. The interest alone amounted to nearly $1,000,000,000. A year of the present war has brought this debt to the unheard of figure of about $11,000,000,000. Thus nearly two million bondholders and their families in and out of France have become annual pensioners on the public purse, in addition to all the pensioners produced by war.

"Germany is still a very young nation and as an empire more thrifty than her largest state. The imperial debt was in 1908 a little over $1,000,000,000. The total debt of the empire and the states combined was about $4,000,000,000 at the outbreak of the war. It is now stated at about $9,000,000,000, a large part of the increase being in the form of 'patriotic' loans from helpless corporations."

There is much talk among Socialists and pacifists about "national bankruptcy" and "repudiation" of war debts. But there are no concrete indications of such eventualities—indeed, they seem utterly wrong. But the task of economic reconstruction is going to be a terrific one for Europe.

The Briand Ministry in France

IN a letter to the Jewish *Forward* of New York the Briand cabinet is discussed by L. Martoff, one of the leading Russian socialists, who has been living in France for many years.

After the resignation of M. Delcassè as Minister of Foreign Affairs, the whole cabinet of which he had been a member resigned. Viviani, the prime minister, not obtaining a decisive vote of confidence in the Chamber, felt it was useless to stay in office without the vigorous support of all parties.

His place was taken by Aristide Briand, who had been Minister of Justice in the Viviani cabinet. At one time Briand had been one of the leaders of the French socialists, a preacher of the General Strike. He developed into an unashamed traitor, being a politician without any principles, using the class struggle and the class interest for the building up of his personal career. He rose on the shoulders of the working class, first taking the position that the French socialists should unite with the radical trading class in order to defeat the clericals and conservatives and to pave the way for great reforms. Once he had reached his goal and become the head of the government he found himself confronted with the dilemma either to give up his power or to abandon his reform plans vigorously opposed by the capitalists. Not for one moment did he hesitate: he gave up his reforms and his radical program. But that did not keep him on the crest of success. Thereupon he changed front and advocated union with the clericals and capitalists, of course in the name of the power of France.

In the elections of 1914 he was the leader of the new party combination that demanded a three year term of military service (instead of two years), supporting President Poincare, the open advocate of militarism and Imperialism.

At the beginning of the war when disasters overtook the French government, Viviani formed the "Government of National Union." Briand entered the ministry and kept rather quiet for about a year: he did not want to lose the confidence of the Democracy. He was obviously biding his time, watching his chance. That chance came when Delcassè and Millerand had proven failures in their new policies. With them fell Viviani, and now Briand made his entry again upon the center of the stage.

Millerand came to grief for backing up the demands of the generals for full power and control. The chamber had no real supervision of military organization. The military censor had muzzled the press and many things relating to the army had been done badly. Capitalist contractors had filled their pockets to the extent of fully a milliard francs, it was charged. So Millerand was sacrificed to the wrath of the Democracy. His place was taken by the military governor of Paris, General Gallieni, whose military career in the African colonies was marked by notoriously cruel treatment of the natives. Gallieni is a man of the "strong hand." He has nothing in common with Democracy. Of the three cabinet members without portfolio, besides the well known socialist Jules Guesde, it may be noted that they belong to the conservative, even reactionary element.

Why have such men been chosen to serve in the same cabinet with the two socialists, Guesde and Sembat? First of all, to make a show of a united France before the French people and their allies. Under Briand's leadership all parties have united from the monarchists to the Socialists. It follows that the government must protect conflicting interests.

The socialists decided that comrades Guesde, Sembat and Thomas may remain in the cabinet only if the government pledges the following: Change of the censorship, taxation of the war profits, no annexations in case of victory. The government did not and could not give these pledges.

Martoff thinks that Briand, the "strong man," was placed in power to master the discontented in case of defeat, to bring the great war to an end and to prepare for a second war sooner or later.

Swiss Socialist Congress

THE annual Congress of the Swiss Socialist Party, which was held at Aarau on November 21, was the beginning of a new epoch in the history of the party, which was reorganized, the reorganization implying that the party will henceforth be controlled by its left or thoroughly Internationalist wing, says the *Labour Leader*. Until now the committee of the "Grütli," an organization which existed before the Socialist party, and had been amalgamated with it, has had a privileged position and has been included *ex-officio* in the executive. The "Grütli" did great service to the cause of Swiss democracy in the past, but it was not originally Socialist, and, although it had become so, it was out of touch with the majority of the party, although it controlled the executive. It represented the right wing of Socialism and was less Internationalist than the majority and also more *bourgeois*. Working-class opinion in Switzerland had for some time been dissatisfied with the situation, and the recent Congress was preceded by lively discussions in the Socialist press and local organizations.

M. Grimm, who represents Berne on the National Council of Switzerland, led the reform party, which won the day by a large majority, all the delegates having received instructions from their organizations. By 273 votes against 127 the Congress abolished the privileges of the "Grütli" and decided that in future the executive shall be entirely elected by the Congress. The party organization is thus "unified," whereas in the past its executive was elected partly by the Congress and partly by the "Grütli." Three representatives of the "Grütli" were elected on the executive, which consists of fifteen members.

It is as yet uncertain whether the "Grütli" will accept the situation or will separate itself from the Socialist party, in which it is merged by the new system.

By an imposing majority—330 votes against 51—the Congress expressed its adhesion to the manifesto of the International Conference, held at Zimmerwald in September. A resolution calling on the proletariat of all the belligerent countries to stop the war, "if necessary, by revolutionary action," was carried by 258 votes against 141. The Congress also decided to provoke a national "initiative" for the suppression of courts-martial for military offences in time of peace, and instructed the executive to consider the question of provoking an "initiative" on a proposal to make the pay of officers and men the same, officers being supplied with uniforms by the State like soldiers. It was also decided to propose a graduated tax on large fortunes and incomes to meet the expense of mobilization.

British Unions and the Munitions Act

A CONFERENCE of British trades unions was held November 30 last, to submit proposals to amend the Munitions Act. The amendments proposed by the conference lay it down that no change in workshop regulations shall be made, and no rules, other than the model rules issued by the Minister of Munitions, shall be enforced by employers, or taken cognizance of by a Munitions Tribunal, unless they have been agreed to by the unions and the employers concerned. Any firm acting contrary to this provision shall be guilty of an offense. The present system of absolutely tying down a worker to his employment is scrapped. All engagements for work connected with munitions shall, under the new plan, require a week's notice (or such longer period as now exists). On notice being given by either an employer or a worker, the case may be brought before the Local Committee within three days. If the notice is upheld, it shall take effect at the end of six weeks from the date of the first application. In considering applications from employers who desire to retain the services of workmen, the Local Committee is instructed to take into account any complaints that trade union wages and conditions are not being observed, or any plea that the special skill of the workmen could be better employed in another form of employment.

It is proposed that the Local Committees to which reference is made in the previous paragraph shall be equally representative of employers and employed, that the employers' side shall be elected by the employers in the district and the workers' side by the trade unions in the district. The committee shall meet at least once a fortnight and within two days of a demand from either side. The committee is instructed to report to the Minister of Munitions all cases in which either side considers that the rules concerning limitation of profits are being evaded or that government work is being put aside in favor of private work, or otherwise hindered. No matter within the jurisdiction of the Local Munitions Tribunal under Part II. of the Act is to be brought before it until the Local Committee has failed to secure a settlement. The Local Committee shall enforce the payment of trade union rates of wages, and any person failing to conform to the decision of the Local Committee in this respect shall be guilty of an offense. Subject to the provisions of Schedule III., all proposals to abrogate or vary any trade union regulation or custom, *to import new classes of labor, or to utilize semi-skilled or female labor* on automatic or semi-automatic machines, shall be brought before the Local Committees and shall come into operation only with the sanction of the Committee or the Minister of Munitions should the Committee fail to agree. Any persons acting contrary to this provision shall be guilty of an offense. A schedule of all departures from trade union regulations and practices shall be kept by the joint secretaries of each Local Committee and copies shall be published in the Board of Trade *Labor Gazette*. This schedule shall include all departures made since the outbreak of war. *The Local Committee shall enforce the restoration of pre-war practices after the war, or the unions concerned may appeal to the Board of Trade, which shall have power to enforce the restoration of pre-war practices.* The above propositions shall also apply to national factories established during the war, which shall be under the direct management of the Local Committee or a Joint Committee representing equally the trade unions and the Ministry of Munitions. In any munitions tribunal dealing with cases in which women are concerned, one at least of the assessors shall be a woman. A new clause lays it down that no person shall be imprisoned for an offense under the Act, or for a refusal to pay any fine exacted. Another insists that all rules and regulations made shall be published in the ensuing issue of the *Labor Gazette* and shall, on the first opportunity, be submitted to Parliament.

When any change in working conditions is proposed, the workman in the shop concerned shall be asked to send a deputation, together with the trade union officials, to whom particulars of the proposed change shall be explained. Should the deputation be unable to concur in the change, opportunity should be given for further local consultation with representatives of the trade unions, and no departure shall be made while the matter is under discussion. Before female labor is employed *in the highly skilled branches of the engineering trades*, the proposal shall be submitted to the Minister of Munitions. Where women are employed, a forewoman shall supervise their work and, as far as possible, they shall be employed by day.

A. F. of L. Legislative Program

THE American Federation of Labor's complete program of legislation to be pressed upon the present Congress, exclusive of the declaration of the San Francisco convention, is as follows:

Immigration restriction.

Empowering States to regulate the admission of goods manufactured by convicts in other States.

Prohibiting importation of goods manufactured in whole or in part by convicts of foreign countries.

Preventing interstate transportation of goods in which the labor of children under certain ages is employed.

Compensation act for District of Columbia workers.

Compensation act for Federal employees extended and liberalized.

Compensation for railroad employes engaged in interstate commerce.

Amend the hours of service (railroad men's sixteen-hour) law, with a minimum penalty provision incorporated.

Eight hours for interstate railroad telegraphers.

A liberal and comprehensible industrial education bill.

Additional safety laws, and placing the enforcement of same under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Labor.

Old-age pensions and retirements.

It is suggestive to compare the above with the legislative demands adopted by the Railway Brotherhoods some months ago:

A bill to secure safe clearances for trains and the removal of dangerous obstructions along the roadway will be supported.

Any action upon the question of limiting the length of trains will be held in abeyance.

No action at this time to amend the Federal employers' liability law.

Cooperation with other labor organizations in securing desirable legislation, and will support the bill restricting immigration, the convict-labor-made-goods bill, and the child-labor bill, and will oppose the repeal of the seaman's law or any modification therof detrimental to the interests of labor.