

had been criticising the President for holding the same views that he himself had held in September, 1914.

The matter is of no great importance, for only a small man takes pride in never changing his views. But it happens the evidence in this case is against Mr. Glynn. In the current issue of *The Outlook* Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott, one of its editors, points out that the Glynn quotations from the Roosevelt article omit some important qualifying phrases. These phrases make it evident that Colonel Roosevelt was carefully refraining from expressing his opinion on the duty of the United States in the Belgian matter.

In addition, Mr. Abbott adds his personal testimony that at the time the article was written Colonel Roosevelt had repeatedly

expressed the same views in private conversations in the *Outlook* office that he has been expressing publicly in recent months. But he had refrained at that time from publishing them, so as not to seem to be criticising President Wilson without giving the President time to act.

The "Star" can add confirmatory evidence. Colonel Roosevelt spoke in Kansas City, Kansas, on September 21, 1914. To at least one member of the "Star's" staff at that time he expressed forcibly his views regarding the duty of the United States toward Belgium, and added that he did not know how much longer he was going to be able to keep from speaking out on this subject. A few weeks later he made his first public declaration in criticism of the Administration's attitude.

"LA BATAILLE" AND THE OUTLOOK

IN its issue of February 17, 1916, "*La Bataille*," the syndicalist Paris daily, published a translation of the article which appeared in *The Outlook* of January 26, 1916, on Liebknecht, Kautsky, and Bernstein. The French paper justly said that these were "the three German Socialists best authorized to express opinions on the general situation in Germany and on the attitude of German workmen in the world conflict."

In its issue of March 2 "*La Bataille*" states that it has learned that Bernstein and Kautsky published in the Berlin "*Vorwärts*" of February 27 a strong protest, categorically denying the affirmations of *The Outlook's* representative, as follows:

We have never seen *The Outlook's* representative and have expressed ourselves in such terms to no one, for we have been made to say the contrary to what seems to us just and necessary to say.

We have searched our file of "*Vorwärts*," and especially the issue of February 27, without discovering the above denial. Again in its issue of March 12 "*La Bataille*" quotes the Brunswick Socialist organ, "*Volksfreund*," as printing the following letter, dated February 27, from Dr. Liebknecht:

I have never been interviewed by a representative of *The Outlook*. My opinions are known and are decided opinions. That which *The Outlook's* correspondent makes me to say is

contrary to these opinions and—on certain points—to the facts.

"*La Bataille*" is mystified. In its issues of March 2 and 12 it discusses editorially the controversy between *The Outlook* and the three German Socialists. From these editorials we translate and combine the following paragraphs which give a fair representation of the not unnatural mystification of "*La Bataille*:"

The Outlook of New York has a reputation for accuracy. As an indication of this we need only to remind our readers of the interview it obtained and published with Sazonoff [the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs]. That interview has received the seal of approval from the most competent critics. Moreover, the opinions which Liebknecht, Kautsky, and Bernstein expressed, according to the anonymous correspondent of *The Outlook*, are so plausible and reasonable, according to our view, *that they form the only explanation which can serve as an excuse for the conduct of the German Socialists* [the italics are "*La Bataille's*"]. . . . We propose to send the present issue of "*La Bataille*" to the Editors of *The Outlook*, inviting them by letter to give us the reply of their correspondent [to the alleged denial of Dr. Liebknecht and his colleagues]. . . . When we have received a reply from New York, we shall be able to tell our readers whether the correspondent of *The Outlook* has indulged in a hoax, or whether there is some misunderstanding regarding the meaning of the word interview.

... We published the three interviews because they seemed to us to exactly coincide with the actual facts. Investigation confirms us in our belief that in several respects the language attributed to Karl Liebknecht by the American journalist corresponds, word for word, with statements which we have read in other places from the pen of Liebknecht himself. ... We cannot at present regard as satisfactory the meager statement of Karl Liebknecht that The Outlook interview is contrary to his opinions and—on certain points—to the facts.

These denials of the three German Socialists raise issues far more interesting than that of veracity. The issue of veracity, however, we are ready to meet. The Outlook stands squarely behind the correspondent responsible for its account of the interview with the three German Socialists.

From this correspondent we have received the following statement:

"The interview with Liebknecht, Kautsky, and Bernstein, published in your issue of January 26, 1916, took place as described. Liebknecht I saw in the private office in which he does his work as a member of the Reichstag. Kautsky and Bernstein I interviewed in a private apartment-house in Berlin. The gentlemen have a right to change their minds, and, of course, they may say that the interviews misrepresent them. At the time I wrote the article I believed, and I still believe, that it is an accurate account of what took place."

The Outlook withheld the name of its correspondent for two good and sufficient reasons: The first had reference to the welfare of the three Socialists interviewed; the second cannot be explained until after the termination of the war. It should be said here that the interviews were not published in The Outlook until Dr. Liebknecht's reported utterances in the Reichstag went so far beyond those given in the text of our interview with him that we felt that its publication would not in any way jeopardize his safety. That we did not overestimate the possibility of personal danger to Dr. Liebknecht arising from the publication of his views may be judged by the remarks which Dr. Liebknecht himself made to an American university professor of high standing. We reported these remarks as follows in our issue of March 29:

Dr. Liebknecht said that the position which he had taken in opposition to Germany's action had put him in personal danger, so much so that it was not beyond the bounds of possibility

that he might at any time disappear and never be heard of again. As he said this he significantly drew his hand across his neck, and then added that the fortunes of an individual were of no consequence.

The more interesting issues raised by the denials of Liebknecht, Kautsky, and Bernstein are clearly indicated by the following quotation from "La Bataille":

One thing is certain: German Socialists of the Opposition have not taken into account the interest with which the entire world awaits what they decide to say frankly and without reservation on questions of principle and tactics, and they should not leave their comrades in other countries in doubt as to their attitude regarding the German Government and the Social Democratic majority.

Although the German Socialists failed to make themselves felt on August 1, 1914, is it still "just and necessary" (to use the words attributed to Kautsky and Bernstein by "La Bataille") that their leaders fail to express themselves frankly until the end of the war? Is it "just and necessary" for their leaders to say one thing in their studies and another thing in their despatches relayed to us by the Wolff Telegraphic Bureau?

Is it "just and necessary" that they allow themselves to be pictured as loyal supporters of the Government, or, at worst, as harmless members of a purely vocal Opposition? Is it "just and necessary" for them to dodge what "La Bataille" indicates is the world-wide interest in their attitude regarding the German Government and the Social Democratic majority?

The Outlook agrees with "La Bataille" that the next word on these subjects belongs to Kautsky, Bernstein, and Liebknecht, and wishes that it might have a frank, direct, and uncensored expression of their views. We content ourselves with adding that our correspondent, whose interviews with the three influential German Socialists have become the subject of an international discussion, is a highly educated and thoroughly trustworthy American who has lived in Europe and is in sincere sympathy with international Socialism. It is true that Dr. Liebknecht and his colleagues did not know that the interview was to appear in The Outlook, nor did our correspondent represent himself as connected in any way with The Outlook. But that does not affect the authenticity of the interviews, and we still insist that the three Socialists uttered the opinions ascribed to them in these pages.

CARTOONS OF THE WEEK

Nelson Harding in the Brooklyn Eagle



UNPREPAREDNESS

Nelson Harding