

waived. But according to all accounts President Wilson did nothing of the kind—instead of consulting with the people's representatives as to the war aims of the country and announcing the result to the world, he called those representatives together and announced *to them* what the country's war aims were. After he made the announcement he went back to the White House, while the Senators and members of the House went about their business—some of them to catch their breath from the shock of surprise. None of them have so far expressed any dissent from the President's war aims. But it is quite evident that this is due more to a feeling of delicacy and what is considered Congressional courtesy than to any real assent, and no one can tell what they will say when their time to speak comes. A perusal of what they did say at the time when war was declared as to the motives which actuated this country in entering into this war and our aims and purposes in fighting it are not at all reassuring on the question as to whether or not the President's present war aims are also those of Congress.

The same is true with respect to the country. It is true that the newspapers have almost unanimously approved President Wilson's message. But it is quite evident that in the great majority of cases that was done from what is commonly called "patriotic motives"—that is, from a desire to "stand behind the President" while the fighting is going on. That this seeming assent will only last as long as the special emergency which has called it forth—the actual fighting—is self-evident. In a vast majority of the cases, the newspapers which had approved the message had up to the very moment of its delivery advocated policies quite contrary to those announced by President Wilson in his message. It is therefore only fair to assume that the moment the pressure of the special emergency is lifted they will revert back to their *real* opinions.

And what is true of the newspapers is true of our "public" generally. And signs are not wanting that the public at least is already beginning to fall back into its former attitude, and dissenting voices are already heard here and there. As these lines

are being written we hear so representative a citizen as Mr. John Burroughs stating in the public press that at least with respect to the economic "war after the war," President Wilson will find, when the time comes, that the country is not behind him.

We may, therefore, be pardoned if we press the question:

*For whom does Mr. Wilson speak?*

## Our National Executive Committee

More than nine weeks have passed since the 25th of November, 1917, when the revolutionary Russian proletariat took the power of government into its own determined hands. And the Socialist Party of the United States has not yet taken a stand.

Not for lack of opportunity; on the contrary the situation has fairly clamored for action from our controlling party authorities. On the 16th and 17th of December the National Executive met in Chicago in its regular quarterly session. A more suitable occasion for a declaration can hardly be imagined. It eliminated even the necessity of an initiative by one of the five members of the Executive Committee. Local Kings County (Brooklyn), and, as we have recently learned, Local Boston, Mass., as well, requested the N. E. C. to issue a call to the locals throughout the country for the holding of meetings in support of the demands made by the Lenin-Trotsky cabinet for an immediate armistice and a democratic peace on the basis of no annexations or indemnities, and the self-determination of nations. The report of this session of the Executive Committee that appeared in the December issue of the National Office Review shows how the question was decided: by motion, action was deferred until the question of party policy would be taken up.

In other words, our five national leaders, the comrades Victor L. Berger, Morris Hillquit, Anna Maley, Seymour