

a predominantly unconscious one. For the striker has not made an astute evaluation of the industrial system, any more than the stockholder. He has no higher ideal of the social service of industry. He is an uneducated, somewhat primitive man, who knows that his pay is inadequate and his life wretched—and that his employer has cut a melon. There are indeed passions at Lawrence, and these are not of inferior significance to the minor question of wages and hours.

The hostile races were not irretrievably divided by the circumstances under which they worked side by side in the mills. They are now striking side by side. The general strike committee meets every morning in a dingy hall—the home, evidently, of a Syrian religious society. Approximately forty delegates come to this hall from the various

language groups. Within its four walls, incontinently displaying faded pictures illustrating the Book of Revelation, Lawrence has formed her league of nations. That Syrian religious stronghold is vibrating with a new eloquence. New emotions, some of them powerful and portentous, are coming to unheralded expression. The hostile races are now allies.

It is a union without form and without a name, but it was welded with something of the same fervor which brought together, under strangely different conditions, the labor organizations of Seattle for a general strike. It would be folly to declare that this power in Lawrence is generated by merely local difficulties. This is not a New England problem; it must be solved one day for every community where workers and profit-makers compose the industrial family.

Russia and the British Press

By KENNETH DURANT

AN important section of the British press has ceased scolding the Bolsheviks and begun stating the facts about Russia, so far as they can be learned. The new policy is likely to be more dangerous for the Bolsheviks than the old, though some of the lying about the Soviets has been exceedingly effective. In England and America especially, the falsehood about the "nationalization of women" will prevent many persons from ever considering the Bolsheviks as anything but the most abhorrent monsters. It is the kind of untruth that appeals to the imagination and credulity of England and America. This story was spread on the pages of the *New Europe* for October 31, 1918, and has been given wide currency and acceptance in other journals scarcely less careful and responsible. The *New Europe* of March 13, 1919, withdrew it unreservedly, declaring that the statement had been received from an Englishman

personally well acquainted with Russian conditions during the war, and of unquestionable good faith. . . . We now find that he was inaccurate in quoting the document from the official Bolshevik organ *Izvestija*, and that he confused it with the local Vladimir newspaper of the same name (*Izvestija* being the Russian for *News*.) As this puts an entirely different complexion on the matter, and as the central Moscow Government cannot be held responsible for the lucubrations of every local committee, we desire to withdraw unreservedly the imputation and to express our regret for the mistake.

Dr. Harold Williams, the well-known English correspondent, writing upon the same subject says:

I have made particular inquiries among friends recently arrived from Russia as to the alleged nationalization of women, and they all assure me positively that they have never heard or read of such a decree. It is certain that the Central Bolshevik Government has issued no order of the kind, and if Anarchists in Smolensk or school boys in some other provincial town have printed such abominable productions the Central Government cannot be held responsible. . . . Personally I cannot be accused of any prepossession in the Bolsheviks' favor, but just because I feel so acutely the enormity of their real crimes and the iniquity of their whole régime I consider it wrong to weaken the case against them by imputing to them crimes they have not committed.

Other falsehoods have not been so successful as the nationalization story. The tales about executions worked for a while, but they were overdone. Too many people

were killed too many times. I do not remember how many times Madame Breshkovsky was killed, but everybody was glad that this particular happening turned out to be a fiction and that the grandmother of the revolution came alive and free out of Russia to testify before the Senate against the Bolsheviks. The yarn about the general massacre of the bourgeoisie on November 10 last gave everybody the creeps for several days before the event, but turned out badly through the cunning perversity of the Bolsheviks in choosing that day to declare a general amnesty for political prisoners. The untruth about the Soviet Government being a branch agency of the Wilhelmstrasse was intricate and well told. It survived long enough to collide with the story of Berlin being a dependency of Moscow. These two tales did not mix and much confusion resulted from their juxtaposition. It is not yet certain which will prevail.

A writer in the *Round Table*, that excellent "quarterly review of the politics of the British Commonwealth," who knows that Bolshevism is a "very real menace to the peace of Europe," believes that there is a need for "a purely historical analysis of the Bolshevik movement." Like Dr. Williams, this writer feels that the case against Bolshevism has been weakened by lying. "Rumors have been published which have afterwards had to be denied." The result has been "a most unfortunate confusion of ideas" which actually drove many persons into sympathy with the Bolsheviks. The first of these "rumors" to be disposed of by historical analysis in the *Round Table* is the current one that all Bolshevik leaders are self-interested scoundrels.

It must be frankly admitted that these leaders, however fanatical they may be, are perfectly genuine and sincere in their beliefs. Many of them have suffered years of exile and imprisonment. Some of them have already perished for their convictions.

Of course there is corruption in their ranks. The Bolsheviks admit it.

All civilized societies . . . possess . . . a residue of degenerates and criminals. . . . The Bolshevik efforts to cleanse their administration have been attended by only partial success, and even today there is little in the shape of false passports, Bolshevik documents, provisions, grain, eggs, butter, in a word, of anything over which the Bolshevik employees have control, even life and death, which cannot be bought for a price.

There have been many rumors about Lenine. The *Round Table's* historical analysis of Lenine is in part as follows:

Whatever his faults may be, few who have been brought into contact with him will deny that he is in many respects a remarkable man. Some day he may possibly rank as a great man. . . . Quite apart from his very considerable intellectual powers, his chief asset as a leader is his undoubted courage—his almost fanatical confidence in his own judgment.

The historian appears to share this confidence in Lenine's judgment. "His chief claim to greatness lies in the fact that he foresaw sooner and more clearly than anyone else that pathological state of unrest and discontent into which the whole world was to be plunged as the result of four years of unprecedented warfare." One could wish that Lord Milner might have consulted Lenine.

In one of the most interesting of the latest crop of Russian articles—new style—appears the following appreciation of Lenine:

Is Lenine a genius? Many Russians have denied it, and certainly there is nothing in his personal appearance to suggest even faintly a resemblance to the super-man. . . . He looks at the first glance more like a provincial grocer than a leader of men. And yet, on second thoughts, there is something in those steely grey eyes that arrests the attention, something in that quizzing, half-contemptuous, half-smiling look which speaks of boundless self-confidence and conscious superiority. . . . The almost fanatical respect with which he is regarded by the men who are his colleagues . . . is due to other qualities than mere intellectual capacity. Chief of these are his iron courage, his grim, relentless determination, and his complete lack of all self-interest.

Do I hear an indignant protest that this is not truth-telling about Russia, but sheer Bolshevik propaganda? I have quoted it from the first of a series of "Bolshevik Portraits" in the *London Times* of March 25, 1919. I do not think that Bolshevism has yet captured Printing House Square.

Ways and Means is an English "weekly review of industry, trade, commerce, and social progress." It would be as quick as Dr. Harold Williams to resent any charge of "prepossession" in favor of Lenine or the Soviet system. Nevertheless in its issue of March 22 it prints an exceedingly interesting account of these two phenomena. The writer, who signs himself "Intelligence Officer," wants to know "why men of sense persist in hurling the term Bolshevism about as loosely as they do." There is no mistaking Intelligence Officer's prepossessions. He thinks that the Soviet is a germ, "like that of Spanish influenza," generated, to use his metaphor, in the "cesspool of Bolshevism," and he declares that "it infects the atmosphere of the whole civilized world." Intelligence Officer has nothing to say "on behalf of the Bolsheviks" except that they are a "product of Russian conditions and Russian history." But he has this to say of the Soviet:

That it is an idea that has arisen spontaneously out of the war chaos, that it shows a surprising tendency to take root, and that, therefore, it is to be seriously considered.

Intelligence Officer explains the Soviet as the antithesis of the representative system.

The Soviet is not a constituency. It is hardly a trade union. It professes to be the concrete embodiment of a function or active limb of the industrial organism. The "acid test" of membership is work—i. e., performance of a necessary function. This does not necessarily mean that only workmen or peasants can be members of the Soviet, though in practice it proved to be so for a long time in Russia. Brain workers, academicians,

doctors, lawyers, journalists—all can and now do form their own Soviet, or association, or guild.

Intelligence Officer does not like this system, which is plainly a "complete reversal of our political thinking." But he has observed with much interest that it works. Lenine works it!

It was not until the beginning of last summer that he started seriously upon the work of reconstituting the Soviets. He has, it must be admitted, made very great progress. A machine has been already erected on a very large scale. What is more interesting and astonishing is that its wheels are beginning to move. Fitfully and irregularly, it is true, yet unmistakably. An intense propaganda has been started among the workmen. They are being taught the gospel of work. And, at least, here and there, they are showing some response.

Intelligence Officer can scarcely believe his eyes, but he appears to be well informed of the facts. He thinks that Lenine is becoming moderate, and at any rate he notes that "moderate leaders" like Gorky and Martov and Chernov have accepted his invitation to join the Soviet Government. He suggests that Russia is ceasing to be Bolshevik—"but, Bolshevik or not, Russia has been Sovietized." And Lenine means to Sovietize the world. "I have," concludes Intelligence Officer, "I need hardly say, no sort of belief in the Soviet system, but it is certainly a very remarkable experiment and needs more attention than it is being given."

Mr. Hamilton Fyfe is another who strongly advises telling the truth about Russia. Mr. Fyfe, as the editors of the *English Review* point out, has known Russia for ten years; he "warned the Asquith Government privately" that Russia was going out of the war; he foretold the revolution while Lord Milner, just back from Petrograd, was saying that all was well. His opinion, therefore, the *English Review* thinks, is "entitled to a hearing." He does not defend Bolshevism. "I do not like it," he says:

But I see a very grave danger in stirring up public opinion against it by abuse and exaggeration with the object of attempting its suppression by military means. . . . In the first place we do not clearly know what kind of Government the Bolsheviks have set up, or what their objects are. Of first-hand "news" from Russia there is scarcely any. What passes for news is gossip, much of it *invented* in order to stir up ill-feeling; almost all of it envenomed by prejudice.

Mr. Fyfe's conclusion is this:

Foolish persons in Government employ repeat incessantly that the Bolshevik leaders (men of high education themselves) aim at "exterminating the educated" and at destroying trade. Yet officials in this country, at the Foreign Office, at the Board of Trade, know that Trotzky appealed to the educated class in Russia to assist in building up a new system, and that many responded, including Maxim Gorky, Russia's foremost man of letters. They know that the Bolsheviks, far from desiring to see commercial relations extinguished, are ready to discuss them. But the truth is concealed from the nation. Those who fancy their interests would be served by making war upon Russia, those who are duped easily by such catch-words as "restoring order," the generals and staff-officers who see long periods of safe and lucrative employment stretching before them. The newspaper writers who love to inflate grandiose schemes with the wind of their phrases, have, therefore, had it their own way.

But it is plain from these and many similar recent articles that they are to have it their own way no longer. We are going to undertake the disagreeable business known as "facing the facts." The Bolsheviks have been in power in Russia for a year and a half, and it is high time we knew something about them. But we must not be greatly surprised if the new truths are stranger than the old fictions.

The Need for a Jewish Homeland

By JACOB H. SCHIFF

IN the International Relations Section of the *Nation* of April 5 there is reprinted, under the title, "The Jews in Poland," a letter written by the Berlin correspondent of the Amsterdam *Handelsblad*. The author of the letter had been sent by his paper to Galicia to learn the truth about the alleged Polish attacks upon the Jews. The conditions, he reports, are frightful indeed. The horrors and cruelties practiced in the Middle Ages were apparently hardly comparable to what is now going on in Poland and part of Galicia, under the very eyes of the Government. Conditions in Rumania, in Lithuania, in the Ukraine, and elsewhere in the Near East are reported as not greatly different from those prevailing in Poland; there is little doubt that the life of the Jewish population in the Near East—embracing several million souls—has become hard and terrible almost beyond human endurance.

The efforts now being so energetically made before the Peace Conference at Paris to assure to the Jewish people equal rights with the rest of the population of each and every country, and the demand that the protection of these rights shall be assured at all times by the proposed League of Nations, must not be abated, and should finally be successful unless the Conference is prepared to stultify itself. But it will remain an open question whether in the Near-Eastern countries, where the Jewish population is so shamefully persecuted, and where anti-Semitism in its ugliest and most brutal form appears to be inbred in the people, any mandate of the Peace Conference concerning Jewish rights and protection will have any greater practical effect than the similar solemn covenant in the Treaty of Berlin has had, so far as Rumania is concerned. Up to this time that country has simply ignored and defied the obligation imposed upon it by the Treaty for the granting of civic rights and protection to its Jewish population. Should it therefore, in any event, not be made possible for the Jew to leave these inhospitable countries? Though he and his forbears have lived in them for centuries, yet instead of becoming home to him, they have grown for the Jew almost into a hell.

But whither can he turn? Everywhere—even in the United States—immigration is being curtailed, and it may no longer be possible for a multitude of foreign elements to flow into this country without considerable restriction.

No land, it will readily be conceded, has so magnetic and great an attraction for the Jew as Palestine. The reasons for this are generally understood, and it is not necessary to recapitulate them here. But Palestine cannot in its present state take care of and support any large population. This will become possible only if the land be—so to say—made over, through irrigation and other modern processes. This being done, it is the opinion of experts that Palestine with its hinterland—particularly Mesopotamia and the Euphrates Valley—would be capable of supporting a population of upwards of five millions.

Here then it is where great cultural work for the lasting benefit of suffering Jewry, in the countries of its persecution, can and should be undertaken with every promise of success. Not by continually dangling before the eye of the Jew the chimera of the foundation anew of a Jewish nation and the reestablishment of a Jewish state in Palestine—at present a land with hardly any Jews—but rather by a restoration of the land to its former high state, making it once more such as it has been—a land flowing with milk and honey again capable of gradually receiving and providing prosperous homes for a multitude of Jewish people. Under the benign control of Palestine by Great Britain, such a proposal should not offer insurmountable difficulties, even if it may take time to carry it fully into effect, and here it is that the Zionist Organization can do great and practical constructive work.

But to obtain such coöperation, its political agitation and aspirations must cease, and in coming decades, after the population of Palestine shall have become overwhelmingly Jewish, the Jews actually there can determine for themselves what kind of government to choose; for a state cannot be supplied ready made, but must be developed, nor can a nation be built solely upon the basis of past glory.

The sooner practical steps are taken to create in Palestine a homeland pure and simple for Jewish people who may desire to settle there, the sooner the Jewish question will begin to come nearer its solution. So long as national aspirations remain in the foreground, so long real progress will not be made, so long shall we continue to hear of pogroms, persecution, and intense prejudice against the Jew, wherever he finds it necessary to segregate himself from the rest of the population, as is the case in most of the countries of the Near East. So long also will it continue to be necessary for Western Jewry to collect huge sums with which to alleviate the suffering and misfortune of its Eastern co-religionists. Such suffering is unfortunately chronic; it has existed for years, and has only been accentuated and made more horrible by the war, because the actualities of the war, to so great an extent, occurred in the area so largely inhabited by Jews, against whom the meanest human passions have in consequence been brought into play.

With the first opening of Palestine to larger Jewish immigration, with a steady, even if at first a slow, outflow of the Jewish population from the scenes of its present suffering and persecution, a bettering of these conditions is likely to begin.

Political Zionism for the time being has fulfilled its purpose. Its leaders, from Herzl down, have deserved well of Israel, for the movement they have inaugurated and promoted has awakened in the Jew self-respect, self-consciousness, and perfectly justifiable race pride. It has swept away indifference and kept within Jewry many who were on the way to being lost to it. The task ahead of it, however, is still greater, if it is to be courageously undertaken, without any side issues. It is the redemption of Palestine in the practical sense of the word: a great system of irrigation, that shall make the land available to the husbandman; a system of popular and vocational education, in which Hebrew shall become once more a living language; and the provision of all the paraphernalia required in the upbuilding of a new country. Truly, here is a task worthy of the best efforts of great and efficient leaders, with whom all Jewry should join hands in this work.

Nothing, however, must and should at any time be permitted to alter the position of the Jew in those Western countries where for many years he has exercised the rights and duties of citizenship, and where he has become part and parcel of the general citizenry. He will ever remain in America an American, in England an Englishman, in France a Frenchman, in Italy an Italian, in Germany a German. Those who will choose Palestine as their homeland will probably in due time ask to be entrusted with the responsibility for the local government of the country, through autonomous municipalities under the sovereignty of Great Britain.

Palestine is, however, by no means to be a refuge or an asylum. On the contrary, it is to become the land where opportunity will present itself to the Jew to live under conditions which, freed from the materialistic influences of the western world, will make it possible for him to develop to the full those qualities which have enabled the Jew to make such valuable contributions to the highest assets of mankind. A Jewish homeland in Palestine will mean a reservoir for Jewish learning and for the further development of Jewish literature, of which the world already possesses so many great examples.