Milwaukee Marxists, Again

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

NEW REVIEW HIT

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

inform others, replies in its March issue:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Where Extremes Meet

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

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

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

BOARD OF EDITORS

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

ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Ass'n

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

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

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

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