

The Intercollegiate Socialist

The Problem of Problems

By W. E. B. DuBois

The Indian Question

By Lajpat Rai

Universal Service

By J. G. Phelps Stokes

Universal Service in Peace

By Norman M. Thomas

The Bellport Conference,

including excerpts from addresses of Norman Angell, Louis B. Boudin, John J. Dillon, James W. Johnson, Ellen Hayes, Senator Henri LaFontaine, Algernon Lee, Geo. W. Nasmyth, Harry A. Overstreet, John Spargo, James P. Warbasse and others.

December-January, 1917-18

Fifteen Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Harry W. Laidler, Editor

Caro Lloyd Strobell, Assistant Editor

Published bi-monthly, except June, July, August and September

Entered as second class matter June 20, 1913, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City

15c. a copy

Subscription, 50c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi
Amherst
Barnard
Beloit
Berkeley
Brooklyn Law
California
Carnegie Institute
Chicago
City College (N. Y.)
Clark
Columbia
Cornell

Harvard
Howard
Illinois
Indiana
John Marshall Law
Michigan
Missouri
New York
Oberlin
Ohio State
Ohio Wesleyan
Oregon
Penn. State
Pittsburgh

Purdue
Radcliffe
Reed
Rutgers
Simpson
Syracuse
Union Theological
Valparaiso
Vassar
Washington (Wash.)
Washington-Jefferson
Wisconsin
Yale

The object of the INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY, established September, 1905, is "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." All present or former students of colleges interested in Socialism are eligible to active membership in the Society. Non-collegians are eligible to auxiliary membership. The annual dues of the Society are \$2, \$5 (contributing membership), \$25 or more (sustaining membership). The dues of student members-at-large are \$1 a year (with vote), 35c a year (without vote for the Executive Committee). Undergraduate Chapters are required to pay 35c a year per member to the General Society. All members are entitled to receive THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST. Friends may assist in the work of the Society by becoming dues-paying members, by sending contributions, by aiding in the organization and the strengthening of undergraduate and graduate Chapters, by obtaining subscriptions for THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST, by patronizing advertisers, and in various other ways. The Society's Quarterly is 50c a year, 15c a copy.

OFFICERS INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

President
J. G. PHELPS STOKES, Yale
1st Vice-President
FLORENCE KELLEY, Cornell
2nd Vice-President
ERNEST POOLE, Princeton
Treasurer
MARY R. SANFORD, Vassar
Secretary
HARRY W. LAIDLER, Wesleyan
Executive Secretary
ALICE K. BOEHME

Executive Committee

JESSIE ASHLEY, N. Y. U. Law
LOUIS B. BOUDIN, N. Y. U. Law
EVANS CLARK, Amherst
W. E. B. DU BOIS, Harvard
JESSIE W. HUGHAN, Barnard
NICHOLAS KELLEY, Harvard
PAUL KENNADAY, Yale
FREDA KIRCHWEY, Barnard
WM. P. MONTAGUE, Harvard
JOHN SPARGO
HELEN PHELPS STOKES
CARO LLOYD STROBELL, Vassar
HELEN L. SUMNER, Wellesley
WM. ENGLISH WALLING, Chicago
CHAS. ZUEBLIN, Chicago

Alumni Chapters

Berkeley
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cleveland
Columbus
Detroit
Los Angeles
New York
Pittsburgh
Portland, Ore.
St. Louis
Schenectady
Washington

SECTIONAL COMMITTEE

New England
HELENA S. DUDLEY
VIDA D. SCUDDER

Middle West
GEORGE H. BISHOP
MAX SENIOR

Far West
ERNEST F. BATES
JOHN R. HAYNES

Southern Atlantic
WM. F. COCHRAN
MARY RAOUL MILLIS

STUDENT COUNCIL

DEVERE ALLEN, Oberlin
CLARA ELIOT, Reed
MADELINE HUNT, Vassar

G. E. CUNNINGHAM, Beloit
HARRY L. JANEWAY, Rutgers
J. LIEBSTEIN, C. N. Y.
BROADUS MITCHELL, Johns Hopkins

ROBERT W. DUNN, Yale
AMMON A. HENNACY, Ohio State
HILMAR RAUSCHENBUSCH, Amherst
A. RICKLES, Washington

NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Intercollegiate Socialist Society

Thursday, Friday and Saturday, December 27, 28 and 29, 1917.

The list of the speakers already obtained for the NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society—including, as it does, such names as Norman Angell, Frank Bohn, Louis B. Boudin, Henry Bruere, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Morris Hillquit, Frederic C. Howe, Algernon Lee, Scott Nearing, and John Spargo—is sufficient to indicate the unusually interesting character of this gathering, scheduled for New York City, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, December 27, 28 and 29, 1917.

The detailed program of the Convention appears below. The Convention will differ from that of previous years in several particulars. It will last for three days, instead of two. The big dinner will be held on the first day of the Conference, rather than on the last, and, from the standpoint of the student, a unique feature will be introduced in the form of a PRIZE ORATORICAL CONTEST, in which all undergraduate and graduate students, members of I. S. S. Chapters and student members-at-large, are invited to participate. The addresses at this competition will approximate eight minutes in length. The subjects selected by the Committee are "Socialism—A Necessity for American Democracy," and "The Nationalization of Railroads." Other subjects may be submitted to the Committee for approval. Prizes of \$25 and \$15 will be given to those who, in the opinion of the judges, deliver the best orations from the standpoint of scholarship, style and delivery. In determining the winners, the judges will, of course, give the chief weight to the substance of the speeches. Those desiring to take part in this contest are urged to send in their names at once, together with the subject they wish to present.

Throughout the sessions, an effort will be made to have the philosophy and

tactics of Socialism presented in a scholarly fashion from many angles. The Convention bids fair to be the most thought-stimulating winter gathering ever held by the Society.

Every Chapter is urged to send its full quota of delegates and as many fraternal delegates as can attend the various sessions. Unaffiliated study groups may send fraternal delegates, and students not affiliated with any group will also be cordially welcomed. Those who can attend are requested to inform the Society of this fact at their earliest opportunity. All are urged to cooperate in making the gathering an event long to be remembered for its enlightenment and good fellowship.

The tentative program of the Convention is as follows:

Thursday, Dec. 27, at 2:30 P. M., at Miss Stokes's Studio, 90 Grove St. Report of Delegates.

Thursday, 6:30 P. M., at Palm Garden, 58th St., near Third Ave. Annual Dinner (Tickets \$1.50). Subject: "What Should Be the Next Step in National Policy?" Speakers: Norman Angell, Dr. Frank Bohn, Louis B. Boudin, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and Dr. Frederic C. Howe (Chairman).

Friday, 10 A. M., at C. C. N. Y. Discussion of Chapter Problems.

Friday, 8 P. M., at Civic Club, 12 West 11th Street. Reception to visiting delegates and discussion of "The Future of the Socialist Movement in This Country." Speakers: Algernon Lee, Scott Nearing (probably), and John Spargo.

Saturday, 10 A. M., at People's House, 7 East 15th Street. Oratorical Contest and "Question Box on Social-

ism." Leaders of Question Box, Evans Clark and Ordway Tead.

Saturday, 8 P. M., at People's House.
Subject: "The Future of the City."
Speakers: Morris Hillquit and Henry Bruere (probably).

[On Saturday afternoon, from 4 to 6:30, the New York Alumni Chapter will hold its usual Camaraderie and gives a special invitation to the delegates to be present.]

Those desiring further details regarding the Convention should communicate with the Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City.

Doing Your Bit The Research Director will be glad to get in touch with several people interested to cooperate in the compilation of data for our special studies. Those preferring library work or first-hand field investigation are equally needed. There is a splendid chance for volunteers to make a worth-while contribution to this work, and acknowledgment of their part in it will be gratefully made in our final publications. Please communicate with Ordway Tead, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Society's Finances If the I. S. S. is to survive the present crisis, it must have the most generous financial support of its members and friends. A special effort is being made to raise, between now and the Convention, a sufficient sum of money to permit the Society to continue its educational work. Will not every reader of this paragraph pledge to this

work as generous a sum as possible, the pledge to be read at the Convention Dinner, with or without mention of the name of the donor, and to be payable at a specified date after the first of the year? No words can overemphasize the urgency of this appeal.

Membership The recent elections in this country; the growing influence which the Socialist parties in all of the European countries are again beginning to exert, and the unprecedented leaps in the direction of greater social control here and abroad are among the forces inevitably compelling every educated man and woman who desires to be intelligently informed regarding Modern Tendencies to give ever greater consideration to the philosophy and tactics of Socialism. Never was the time more opportune than at present for inducing collegians and others to join the I. S. S. Will not each member of the Society act as a committee of one to obtain new members? We are depending on your cooperation.

Name of Magazine A number of members of the Society have of late suggested that the Quarterly would gain a wider circulation than it has at present if its name did not seem to indicate that it was of purely collegiate interest. The opinions of members and friends of the Society on this subject will be appreciated. Should the magazine change its name? If so, what would be the most appropriate title for it to assume? In the meanwhile, it is hoped that all may assist in increasing the circulation of the Quarterly. May the editor modestly suggest that an annual subscription to the I. S. would make an Xmas present most acceptable to many a friend?

The Problem of Problems

By Dr. W. E. B. DuBois

There are in the United States today nearly twice as many persons of Negro descent as there are Belgians in Belgium; there are three times as many as there are Irish in Ireland or Scotch in Scotland; as compared with 12,000,000 American Negroes, Servia and Greece together have only 6,000,000 inhabitants and Bulgaria less than 5,000,000. Indeed, the whole population of the Balkan States is only about one-third larger than the Negro population of the United States. The land which American Negroes own in fee simple is as large as the whole island of Ireland and equals in area the land which the Germans hold in Belgium and France, and the land which they cultivate as owners and tenants is as large as half the United Kingdom.

Absolutely, then, this group is of importance in the world. But the problem which I am to discuss is that which arises from the fact that this group has been from the beginning excluded from American democracy and that this exclusion has had a singular and often well-nigh fatal effect upon the nation whenever the nation has sought to follow great ideals or work out any line of unselfish endeavor. This is easily proven not simply in the present crisis but in every spiritual crisis which the territory in the United States occupied by the nation has passed. Mental contradiction and moral disintegration have been the price which the United States has paid again and again for refusing to face the problem of its Negro population.

Think, for instance, of the earliest of our great social problems. Late in the fifteenth century the eyes of the world were opened to see the earth doubled in extent, to realize vast new territories and unknown possibilities and not impossible fairy tales beyond the seas. Conceive the vision, the spiritual uplift that must have followed such a revelation. With this spiritual exultation, however, went the

keen, cold, calculating realization that sufficient forces of brute labor could extract untold and immediate wealth from the known parts of this land. There you have the first spiritual conflict in which the Negro became a tremendous part. It was settled by a compromise which no thoughtful man believed, but which all, thoughtful and thoughtless, were willing to accept. Import workers to work in the mines and on the plantations and thus the heathen would be converted to the kingdom of God! Would not so meritorious a work excuse the horrors of the slave trade?

It was characteristic of this conclusion that few dared go behind it; few dared to call for facts and really argue and discuss the question. Discussion was interfered with by dominant public opinion, and America became a land of slavery.

IN THE "LAND OF FREEDOM"

Then, slowly, in the unwinding of years came a new spiritual conflict. More and more clearly a splendid ideal flamed in the minds of Americans. This was to be a Land of Refuge and a Land of Freedom. The Disinherited of the earth were to have here a chance for development such as the world had never seen before. All men were to be equal, with an equal chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The land was to exist for itself and not for Europe, and the forces for the great fight for Freedom gathered themselves. It was exceedingly unpleasant just here to remember that America, after all, was a land of slavery, to have the enemy turn frankly to the black slaves, like Dunmore in Virginia, and cry: "You are free. Fight for your own liberty against these slave-holding hypocrites!" Something had to be done and the result, again, was compromise. Black soldiers shall be free immediately, said the revolutionary fathers, and slavery as an institution will disappear from the land. But human changes take time and call for sacrifices. The

cost of uprooting slavery must be spread over many years. Let the slave trade gradually be abolished; let emancipation spread state by state and plantation by plantation. Meantime, we will undertake to find a new home in Africa or elsewhere for the freed Negroes, and thus our dilemma will be settled. So, our fathers of revolutionary days fought for freedom and maintained slavery.

NATIONAL EXPANSION

Meantime the world began to change and the new era of economic expansion swept over it. The nation felt the impulse, and in the fateful years when the factory system was being introduced and machinery supplanting crude labor, they were asked to lay the foundation of the first American economic kingdom—the kingdom of cotton—which antedated later kingdoms of iron, of cereals, of meat, and of lumber. Few in the nation or in the world understood exactly what was happening. The great ground swell of the universe revealed itself not as one mighty movement but rather as a new chance to make money, particularly in cotton raising, in tobacco, sugar and wheat. Gradually a demand gathered itself, a demand for more land and more labor. The nation took advantage of the Haitian revolution and got the empire of the Mississippi Valley for nothing, seized North Mexico and annexed the Northwest. We became a tremendous country, spreading from ocean to ocean and dreaming of a realm from the pole to the equator.

Right in the midst of this came the problem of American Negroes. We felt ourselves so large that we tried to sweep it aside, but persistently it returned. Thoughtful Americans knew perfectly well that States' rights advocates bent the Constitution to the breaking point in order to have slave-ridden Louisiana; that we seized Mexico and Florida in order to have a larger area for slavery, and for the same reason we were intriguing in the West Indies; that the real thing that was expanding was not America but slavery, and that new laws and

new customs were checking emancipation and making the Negro a caste to supplant the old caste of manual laborers. Rapidly the leaders of the cotton kingdom took the extreme attitude that the new caste of black labor was an inevitable thing and that so long as it was confined to inferior people it was the ideal organization of labor and of economic empire.

THE ERA OF COMPROMISE

Thereupon came the great attempt at national compromise. Granted, said the nation, that this is the ideal form of labor for certain industries it must be confined within the climatic belt where those industries are dominant, so that the black labor class shall not come in competition with the rising white laborers who propose to emancipate themselves from the caste idea and become a real part of modern democracy. The leaders of the cotton kingdom misread the times and refused to accept the compromise. They said that their system of caste labor depended upon expansion for its very existence and that slaves must be slaves on Bunker Hill as well as in New Orleans; that they would not and, indeed, could not remain part of the country which did not allow this. On the other hand the compromisers pleaded with them. They did not for a moment undertake to deny the caste idea for black men. The very man who is called the Emancipator declared again and again that his object was the integrity of the Union and not the emancipation of the slaves; that if he could keep the Union from being disrupted he would not only allow slavery to exist but would loyally protect it.

It took but a few years of murder, anarchy and rapine to prove to everybody that if the question of black caste labor were settled there would be no need for disrupting the Union and no demand for it. It was, therefore, legally abolished, the Union preserved and the attention of the country turned to further economic development. But the country was, after all, the same country. It loved Negroes no better after emancipation than

it did before and it had no more respect for them. It was just as willing in 1870 that Negroes should be slaves as in 1860, so long as they did not endanger the white man's income.

AFTER THE WAR

Inevitably the problem continued to face the nation. If free white labor was not to be menaced by the slave wage of Negroes then either Negro labor must be confined to the South or to a certain grade of work or the Negro's economic and spiritual emancipation must follow his physical freedom. Again came compromise: slavery persisted, only we called it the plantation system and supported it by vagrancy laws, the convict lease system and lynching. Labor unions carefully guarded against Negro competition in the decently-paid trades, while on the other hand the price of common labor in the North was kept but a notch above Southern wages by world migration.

This was our economic and moral dilemma when this world war burst. There can, as it seems to me, be no real doubt in anyone's mind but that horrible as war is there lies before the world today a stake which may easily justify it. If at the cost of this world war, the death of millions and the sorrow and degradation of many millions more, if at that horrible cost we can put down anarchy among the nations, reduce them to some system of law and order, curb the bullying of the Highwayman by armed international police and make the freedom of nations a freedom under law, as we have done partially with the individual, then the fight is worth every drop of blood that it costs. Every thinking man, too, must realize that if the world battle is a battle for such a stake, for this nation to keep out of it is either cowardice or insanity. But when the nation enters, can it enter and fight for such a stake? Are its hands reasonably clean and its soul sincere? I maintain that the one tremendous handicap which makes it almost impossible for this nation to fight with clear conscience or with untrammelled limbs is today, as yesterday, her attitude to-

ward 12,000,000 American citizens of Negro descent. I can, perhaps, best illustrate my meaning by reminding you briefly of the problems which you are discussing in this conference.

THE NEGRO PROBLEM AND LABOR

You are discussing, for instance, labor. Now the central problem of American labor is the chronic oversupply of common labor. The oversupply has in the past come from migration, first from Ireland, then from Germany, finally from Italy and Austria, and above all from the millions of Negroes in the South recently emancipated from slavery and systematically kept in ignorance. As soon as this war starts a revolution takes place. Those who were formerly killed in industry in America are now being killed in war in Europe. Common labor becomes scarce and wages rise. The Negro, attracted by higher wages in the North and repelled by the menace of lynching and caste in the South moves to fill the new labor demand thus created. The common laborer in the North is caught between the tyranny of exclusive trade unions and the underbidding of blacks. The result is murder and riot and unrest. Those who for a generation have been calling the black man a lazy, ignorant burden and incubus on the South have suddenly developed a determination not to allow the rest of the country to share that burden or pay Negroes higher wages. White Northern laborers find killing Negroes a safe, lucrative employment which commends them to the American Federation of Labor. No discussion of labor problems arising out of the war can take place, then, without first facing this situation of the Negro laborer.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

You are taking up the problem of the freedom of speech. Many of you are vastly upset by the increasing difficulty which you have in discussing this war in America; but I should be much more impressed by your indignation if I did not realize that the greatest lack in freedom of discussion of present American problems comes

not in problems which you are not allowed to discuss but rather in those which you are free to discuss but afraid of. I know and you know that the conspiracy of silence that surrounds the Negro problem in the United States arises because you do not dare, you are without the moral courage to discuss it frankly, and when I say *you* I refer not simply to the conservative reactionary elements of the nation but rather to the very elements represented in a conference like this, supposed to be forward-looking and radical. You may, of course, now and then and with some impatience turn from the things which you really want to discuss and listen skeptically and with little interest to a speaker who tries within twenty minutes to untangle a snarl of twenty decades. But you are perfectly willing to leave it at that, to go away without action, to let the mists of half-discussion and half-understanding lie continually upon this human problem. Ten indeterminate half-truths will sum up your whole knowledge of the Negro problem and the knowledge which you are unwilling to have disturbed. For instance, (1) the Negro is lazy; (2) the Negro is unhealthy and is dying out; (3) the Negro is inferior in mind and in body; (4) the Negro misused the ballot and the ballot was rightfully taken from him; (5) the Negro is lynched for rape; (6) the Negro is abnormally criminal; (7) the Negro's one ambition is to marry your sister; (8) efforts to educate Negroes beyond a certain point are a failure; (9) the South is the best friend of the Negro; (10) the Negro problem is insoluble.

There is not a single one of these propositions that is not a half-truth or a whole lie. As a whole they run counter to easily ascertainable facts, to open scientific proof, and to common sense, yet they are allowed to stand. They can be repeated at any time or place without contradiction. Any person anywhere in America, no matter what his standing or reputation, can rise and with proper gestures and embellishments repeat these ten sen-

tences and sit down in nine cases out of ten uncontradicted and unquestioned.

A nation which thus refuses to discuss intelligently or to investigate the problem which historically and at the present is the greatest of its social problems may whine about and pretend that it wishes freedom of speech, but it deceives itself.

CONSCRIPTION AND LYNCH LAW

You are discussing the conscription of wealth for the national weal, and yet this great, rich country has allowed generation after generation of American Negroes to grow up in ignorance and poverty and crime, because they will not spend as many dollars upon a decent public school system or a system of social uplift for Negroes as they are perfectly willing to spend upon a single battleship. Under such circumstances it will be hard to make conscientious people believe that you believe in the conscription of wealth for the common weal.

You are talking about the public control of food and the necessity in a great national crisis for the national government to come in and curb and guide the anti-social action of states and individuals, and in the face of this you refuse to ask that same national government to come in and conserve the lives which food feeds. You allow lynching and murder to become a national pastime. Nine out of ten of you have practically without protest sat by your parlor fires while 2,867 colored men have been lynched and burned and tortured in the last thirty years, and not a single one of the murderers brought to justice, not to mention the tens of thousands of Negroes who have been killed by mobs and murderers in that time.

You wish universal service in war and in peace, but you are willing that Negroes who are unprotected either in war or peace should give their services and be compelled to give them under circumstances of public insult such as no other part of the nation is asked to endure.

The State Socialism which you discuss is in America the Socialism of a State where a tenth of the population is disfranchised, (not to mention the half who are women), and where the power which at present controls is the power which gets its political rights from a franchise based on the disfranchisement of nine million Americans of Negro descent; and you raise scarcely a single word of protest against it.

THE NEGRO AND PEACE PROPOSALS

I was disgusted with Pacifists long before their present prominence. Today they think war a horrible thing, but yesterday, when war was confined to the Belgian Congo, to the headwaters of the Amazon, to South Africa and parts of India and the South Seas it was not war, it was simply a method of carrying civilization on to the natives, and there were no national conventions on the subject. In the peace proposals that are now being made continually, the future of the natives of Africa, the future of the disfranchised Indians of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, and the disfranchisement of the Negroes in the United States has not only no important part but practically no thought. What you are asking for is a peace among white folk with the inevitable result that they will have more leisure and inclination to continue their despoiling of yellow, red, brown and black folk.

Revolution is discussed, but it is the successful revolution of white folk and not the unsuccessful revolution of black soldiers in Texas. You do not stop to consider whether the Russian peasant had any more to endure than the black soldiers of the 24th Infantry, but you do consider and consider with the utmost care that the black soldiers' cause was lost before they took arms and that for that reason it can be easily forgotten.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO JUSTICE

Thus, in every question which you discuss and in many other great social questions which you might discuss, frankness and honesty on your part is almost impossible because of the fact that the nation is guilty of continual injustice toward one-tenth of its own citizenship, and that the injustice is deliberate as long as they refuse to investigate it or discuss it, and because if today you saw the righteous and honest solution you would be frankly unwilling to receive it, unwilling to carry it out, since you would not want to live in a world where Negroes were treated as men. Under such circumstances you must remember that the integrity of your own souls and minds is at stake. You cannot thus play with a human problem and not spoil your own capacity for reason. You must face the fact that these human beings cannot always remain in their present relation to world movements. I once suggested in "The Crisis" magazine a method of solving this problem which was received with a certain gasp of horror. Yet I venture to suggest it again. I said that every white family in the United States might choose a person of Negro descent, invite him to their home, entertain him and then through some quick and painless method kill him. In that way, in a single day, we would be rid of 12,000,000 people who are today giving us so much concern, or rather so little concern. Remember, that as ghastly as a proposal of this sort appears that it is a good deal better than forcing these Negroes into slums and ghettos and letting them die slowly by a high death rate. It is a good deal better than forcing them to the lowest wages and letting them die of inanition. It is even better than presenting them with a program of life and education which includes universal and continual insult with absolutely no hope of normal citizenship in modern civilization, and, finally, it is the only one decent alternative to treating them as men.

The Indian Problem

By LAJPAT RAI

The Indian problem can be looked at from two standpoints:—the national and the international. In the end, both lead to the same conclusion. If India is going to cease to be an international menace, she must obtain her independence, or, at least, her autonomy, and enter the council of nations as an equal. Those who have followed with any intelligence the development of European policies in the 19th century, know that most of the European wars, in that century, originated from the rival ambition of the Great European Powers to exploit the East.

India and China are the two human beehives of the East, rather, of the world. Great Britain's greatness and prosperity dates from the day she obtained possession of India. With India and her vast human and material resources at her command, she extended her empire East and West and South. All her possessions in the East she won by campaigns from India, with Indian men and money. The success of her industrial revolutions was founded upon India's wealth. She profited doubly. She secured India's wealth and used India as a base for imperial expansion.

A great power in possession of India becomes very readily a menace to the peace of the world. This country, held by an efficient and scientifically up-to-date power, is almost invulnerable. In the North, guarded by the highest mountains of the world, which are inaccessible (except for a short time during the year through narrow gullies, through which large armies cannot pass); in the South and East and West, girdled by the sea, she cannot be attacked except through the North Western passes. India's masters must, therefore, concentrate all their military strength on the north-west frontier, and, in order to do this, must dominate all those countries which it is necessary to cross before a European power can reach Indian frontier by land.

Similarly, in order to guard the sea

routes, India's masters must be strong in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. Thus, the possession of India by a foreign power leads to a constant international disturbance, inasmuch as it places an influence and power in the hands of one nation, to the exclusion of others, calculated to make that nation extraordinarily arrogant and aggressive. As Napoleonic wars had their origin in Napoleon's desire for the mastery of the East, so the present wars are being fought for the mastery of the East.

Asia is inhabited by more than half of the human race. India and China alone claim about 750 millions of human beings. It is no wonder that the imperial nations of the world think it worth their while to fight for mastery in India and in China. Anyone with a grain of political insight can see that if India and China do not in the near future become autonomous and strong enough to withstand the designs of all imperialistic and capitalistic countries, the world will soon have another war which may be even more bloody than this.

There are some people who are inclined to think that a policy of open door in trade secures equal rights to all nations, no matter who holds the political strings. This is quite a mistaken idea. Look at India! The British have followed a policy of free trade and the Germans and Americans and Japanese have, to a certain extent, profited therefrom, but the British enjoy so many privileges and advantages in India that no matter how high their prices, they have in the past managed and shall always manage to keep the bulk of the country's trade in their hands. No other competitor can beat them. Then, if it is true, as has been said, that the world cannot be half slave and half free, that truth has greater application to those nations that are not free at all. India, ruled by a foreign bureaucracy in the interests of the dominating country, must continue to furnish ground for international jealousies and rivalries. A free or autonomous India will treat

everybody alike and will enter the Council of Nations on equal terms, to add to their strength for the maintenance of peace on earth.

Coming to the national point of view, I need not tell this educated audience that no foreign rule, however benevolent, can be a blessing to the subject nation. India was a great manufacturing country, with the balance of trade always in her favor, before the British took possession of her. She is now only a producer of raw materials, "a drawer of water and a hewer of wood," in the words of Mr. Austin Chamberlain, the late Secretary of State for India. All the paying industries are in the hands of the British capitalist, who exploits Indian labor with the fullest help from the legislature and the executive. The tea, the coffee, the indigo, the railway industries are owned by the British. Theirs are the principal banking and insurance houses. The export and import trade is in their hands, and theirs is the shipping, and for the most part the mining concerns. The cotton industry is shared about half and half by the British and the Indian. Over 100 million dollars are paid every year to England in the shape of home charges. The actual drain is even larger than that. More than one-fourth of the revenues are spent for military purposes, and less than one-twentieth on education. Over ninety per cent. of the people are illiterate; more than eighty per cent. of the boys, and over ninety per cent. of the girls get no schooling. There are material losses, substantial and terrible, but what is even worse is

the moral and the spiritual loss involved in foreign rule. A nation of great thinkers, great philosophers, remarkable scientists, fine inventors, high minded statesmen, mighty warriors and sagacious administrators has been reduced to a position of mental and political servitude.

Deprived of all initiative, of stimulus that comes of undertaking great things, and of a sense of responsibility; always discouraged and depressed; with the conviction that the credit and profits of anything great and noble achieved by them will be usurped and exploited by foreigners, the Indians of today are very poor representatives of their great ancestors. A nation of 315 million human beings, capable of doing big things, placed in such a position, is a great loss to humanity. The economic exploitation of the country by the foreigners and the destruction of industries has resulted in millions of deaths. One-third of the population lives in a condition of chronic starvation.

European statesmen and thinkers talk glibly of human progress, but do they realize that the greater part of humanity lives in Asia and Africa and that, unless they are counted, European and American humanity is a mere fraction? Their horizon, however, does not include the great bulk of humanity; they care only for the white races. If so, they should coin a new word, and in future talk only of "white-manity,"—instead of humanity and of Europe and America instead of the world. That would have at least the merit of truth and frankness.

Universal Service in Peace and War

By J. G. PHELPS STOKES

The man or woman who sees a human being in serious trouble and who, being able to help, does nothing, is evidently a pretty poor sort of man or woman. The man or woman who sees the life of another endangered,

and who for purely selfish reasons withholds such help as he or she is well able to give, is a good deal of a cad; while he or she who should look with unconcern upon the torture or devastation of another, taking the

position that the sufferings of another need particularly concern none but the sufferer, would evidently be despicable.

He who is unwilling to help a member of his family or a neighbor in distress, is a pretty poor sort of a person to have in a family, or a pretty poor sort of a neighbor; and similarly the nation or the people that is unwilling to help another nation or another people that calls for help in an unparalleled crisis, scarcely merits a position of respect in the family of nations.

The member of a trade union who is unwilling to bear his share of the common burden involved in protecting and promoting the interests of his union is usually rightly looked upon with contempt, and the man or woman who is unwilling to assume his fair share, or to have his nation assume its fair share, of the burden of protecting such liberties as mankind has painfully achieved, wherever they are threatened, is entitled to little respect from his fellowmen, or even from himself.

The nation that prefers to stand by itself alone enjoying such peace, tranquility and prosperity as can be enjoyed in the midst of a world at war, preferring ease and safety outside the struggle rather than to share in the common task of checking wholesale violators of rights and liberties common and essential to all, has slight claim to the respect of anyone. Such a supine nation would naturally and properly be looked upon with contempt by those who are enduring every hardship and even offering their lives that a great common cause may live and prosper.

It is alleged by some that if all would fold their hands and bend their necks when tyranny is threatened, some providential force would intervene to check the impending blow and the threatened devastation; and yet those who urge this are unable to find in history any instance in which such superhuman force has intervened to save the lives and liberties of a people threatened with destruction, who were unwilling to help themselves.

Perhaps it is true that life of some other kind than physical is saved and

ennobled at times by non-resistance to evil, but it can at least be doubted whether such presumed salvation ever results to those who are sacrificed not by their own voluntary acts, but by the negligence of others; and it may further be doubted whether such presumed personal salvation is ever earned by those who, seeking salvation for themselves, abandon others to destruction.

Perhaps the individual is justified at times in sacrificing him or herself through non-resistance, if the welfare of no other is at stake, but it is an entirely different matter to stand non-resistingly by and see vast numbers of helpless humans sacrificed to the ruthlessness of others, while, being able to help, one does nothing.

In the midst of a world at war, the non-resistant attitude may be the most selfish and immoral imaginable. In those rare cases where self-sacrifice without resistance brings spiritual gain to the individual non-resister, he should consider whether his personal gain is not purchased at too great a price, if in and by paying it he afford freedom of a tyrant group to devastate and destroy the lives of countless thousands, who through such destruction are deprived of opportunity for further gain in body or in character themselves.

Whatever may be said as to the morality or immorality of non-resistance to wrong done to oneself, the case is far different where one knowingly and deliberately permits grievous wrong to be done to others. One may perhaps permit wrong to be done to oneself for the benefit of another, but one surely has not the right to permit wrong to be done to others for the benefit of oneself, or for the sake of any satisfaction one may derive from refusing, as a non-resistant, to help protect and save one's neighbor.

From the earliest days of this republic the obligation of universal service, in emergencies, has been rightly incumbent upon all who are physically capable of serving. Every able-bodied man between 18 and 45 has always been subject to the President's call to defend the liberties of the nation. Every able-bodied citizen has

always been subject to the call of the sheriff of his county to join the *posse comitatus* and do his share, under arms, to preserve internal peace. Every citizen of our great cities has always been under obligations to respond to the call of any police officer for aid in a sudden emergency. The whole tendency of the democratic movement of the times is to broaden the range of the citizen's duty, and to require that each shall serve the state who would be served by it in turn. "There are no rights," said Mazzini, "without their corresponding duties." No man has a right to the physical protection of the state, who will not render reciprocal physical protection to the state that physically protects him; and no man or woman has a right to participate as a citizen in the law-making power of a nation or of a community of nations, who is unwilling to help enforce the laws that he or she helps to make.

Of course there are non-resistants who say they are quite willing to serve the state, but that they must be permitted to serve in ways of their own choosing. This is essentially the anarchistic contention, which denies the obligation of the individual to submit to being governed by the will of another or by any group, great or small. Such non-resistants should frankly class themselves as anarchists, and cease to profess allegiance to the ideals of democracy.

Then there are those who admit theoretically the propriety of majority rule, but allege that governments such as ours often fail to represent the will of the majority, and that unless the individual non-resistant believes the government to be accurately responsive to the popular will, in a given instance, he or she may disregard its decrees. The difference between this position and that of the anarchist is not easy to define; but even if we were to admit (which I shall not do) that an individual anarchist or a group has the "right" to disregard the will of those who support a democratic government, it is at least as true that those who support the government have a no less right to disregard the will of the individual anarchist or his

group. In either case the disregarding is at the peril of him who disregards, but where the supporters of a government believe that they would face a still greater peril by yielding to the will of an anarchistic faction, their refusal to yield is logical; and it is hardly less obvious that for a democratic government to permit its purposes to be frustrated by an anti-governmental faction would be a betrayal of the trust imposed upon it by those who support it in power. Those who place a government in power may not be a majority of the entire population, but until the majority of the people create a form of government more to their liking, they will have either to support the imperfect type they now have, while seeking in lawful ways to improve it, or by disregarding its decrees plunge the community into anarchistic chaos.

He is no good citizen who seeks ease and comfort for himself at the cost of the public welfare. When a conflagration is raging that threatens to destroy a frontier community, he would be no good citizen who should insist upon his right to stay at home while all other able-bodied men joined one another in a common effort to check the common peril.

It is true that "a man's house is his castle," and that a man has a right to occupy and control that which is his own; but he would be a violator of common decency, as well as of law, who should insist upon exclusive control of his house if a fire were raging next door, and if control of his house were temporarily required by the public authorities to fight a threatening conflagration that if unopposed would wreck wholesale destruction.

The citizen has no rights but such as are consistent with the democratic interests of the community. Sometimes the public need takes precedence over the rights of the individual, and the latter are rightly subordinated to the former. Thus by the right of "eminent domain" the community takes possession, at need, of any and all of the property of a citizen, and of all that citizen's rights to enter upon

or use that property for any purpose whatever. The right to exercise freedom of speech, even, upon one's own property, ceases the moment competent authority declares that the public interest requires exclusive control of that property for public purposes by lawfully constituted authorities. In a great public emergency no man's right to freedom of speech, even, or to liberty of any kind, can be permitted by society to have precedence over the public need of self-protection. No gift is greater than the giver. The people who for common benefit give guarantee of liberty to all, may and should modify that guarantee in so far as those are concerned who would use it adversely to the common welfare.

It remains to be determined what constitutes use adverse to the common welfare. Here the opinion of the majority as expressed by their representatives in governmental assemblies, must in democratic communities be taken as the best expression of the public will that can be obtained under the conditions at the time prevailing; and until conditions become so changed that a better method of sensing the popular will can be availed of, it is obligatory upon all who wish the privileges of citizenship to yield to the popular will as declared by the duly constituted governmental bodies; and to exercise more than ordinary care that in their attempts to modify the existing popular will, and pending such desired modification of it, they do not obstruct the fulfillment of its orderly decrees.

Those who attempt by whatever means to thwart the fulfillment of the public will as declared by lawful public assemblies, do so at their peril. Persons who in a democracy seek to thwart in an emergency the will of a government maintained in power by the will of the majority, have but themselves to blame if they be regarded by that majority as public enemies, and if measures appropriate for use against enemies are brought to bear against them.

The paramount duty of a citizen is to serve the community to which he

owes much of his life and all of his liberty. And where the expressed will of that community differs from his own, he should either subordinate his own will, while seeking in lawful ways to bring the will of the community into closer accord with his own, or else should leave that community and seek another more to his liking.

Complete individual liberty is impossible where minds and tempers differ, for the desires of one will inevitably run counter to the desires of another. Those who wish liberty to have always their own way in their relations with the community in which they dwell, wish anarchy. Those who, on the other hand, firmly believe that a condition of anarchy would be less conducive to human happiness, as men are now constituted, then a condition where men yield to the expressed will of the majority, will combat anarchy by all lawful means within their power.

He who will not serve the community as the community wants to be served, has no just ground for complaint if the community refuses to serve him quite as he wants to be served. He who will serve the community only in ways of his own choosing, has no just cause for complaint if the community says in return that it will serve him only in ways of *its* own choosing.

There are persons calling themselves internationalists who say that if their native land and its liberties were attacked, they would join in its defense, even to the point of using arms to prevent the triumph of an invader; but they rebel at the suggestion that they should aid similarly in the protection and deliverance of another land and of another people. Their alleged internationalism contemplates sharing the blessings but none of the serious burdens that friendly international relations entail. The true internationalist, on the other hand, hearing a cry for help, whether from Belgium or from Mesopotamia or from a threatened world, stands erect in his manhood or in her womanhood and says, "Here I am, send me!"

It is obvious that all cannot be sent abroad, since many are needed at home; but the true internationalist does not insist upon choosing his own field for service. On the contrary, he realizes that great human emergencies require highly coordinated efforts for their effective control, and that efficient leadership is essential; and that the best available leadership having been obtained, each true internationalist should offer to serve wherever needed most, in another land as readily as in his own, and should leave the designation of the place and the assignment

of the task to those whose supreme task is to coordinate effectively the labors of all.

In a supreme crisis so vast as that which now confronts the American people together with the rest of the world, every American and every Internationalist worthy of the name in America, should place his services at the disposal of the President, the ablest and wisest leader of the whole people available at the present time, for service under him, either at home or abroad, whenever asked to go.

Universal Service in Time of Peace

By NORMAN M. THOMAS

It does not now seem likely that the United States will adopt universal military service in practice as distinct from theory during the course of this war. For military reasons alone the extension of the principle of the selective draft is probably more expedient, but our security leagues and other similar friends of democracy are at work incessantly to fasten this policy upon us for use after the war. If the final outcome of this war to make the world safe for democracy means the triumph of the security league and its philosophy, America will not escape universal military service. President Wilson is quite right in his emphasis on the fact that disarmament must be an essential feature of an enduring league. Universal military service is the direct opposite of disarmament. Still more important is the fact that any valuable international organization is utterly incompatible with the national psychology which makes such military service tolerable to the people.

In view of all this, it is somewhat discouraging to find apologists for universal military service arising from within the ranks of radicals and democrats. They say if we have to have an army it is at least well that it should be a people's army with an equality of obligation upon all. If we are still to have the same system of capitalistic exploitation, secret

diplomacy, and rabid nationalism on the same scale as in the past, life for the democrat and for the lover of mankind will be so bitter a thing that perhaps it may scarcely matter whether we have universal service or not. But he is surely a pessimist who believes that in spite of the world weariness of war, in spite of the tragedies of these terrible years, mankind will be so stupid as to perpetuate that system of armed camps which the people all over the world hate with all their soul. Our ultimate hope lies not in working *against* militarism, but *for* a new philosophy of life, the substitution of cooperation for competition and the abolition of the capitalistic system.

Yet, because we must fight militarism at every turn, it is worth while to point out the absurdity of the doctrine that a universal obligation for service alone gives a genuinely democratic army. In the first place modern armies are useless without possession of complicated implements of destruction. Do these believers in the power of universal service to secure a democratic army really think that any existing Government is going to leave machine guns and rifles where a popular uprising of social revolutionists may lay easy hands upon them?

Second, no army in the modern sense can exist without its officer caste and that officer caste is essentially the denial

of democracy. Col. Roosevelt's lovely dream of the democracy of the dog tent which rich men and poor men share will not come true on any large scale. The rich man will be in his own crack regiment if he does not become an officer; we will add military distinctions and an officer caste to the social differences we now have. There used to be, perhaps is now, a sort of Y. M. C. A. tradition that all there was to democracy was a pleasant smile and a glad hand. This is profound philosophy in comparison with the modern doctrine that the bitter inequalities of our social system are to be eliminated by the simple device of getting rich men and poor men to serve in the army, while our economic system is unchanged.

Third, of course the deepest reason why universal military service is undemocratic is psychological. Army routine and army methods are meant for no other purpose than to attain that ideal "theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do or die." You have the naive testimony of General O'Ryan to this effect and all the facts of military history. In exact proportion as military training accomplishes its object, it unfits great masses of men for the personal initiative and thoughtful rational action which are absolutely essential to democracy. Even if one believes, as I emphatically do not, that organized violence may cure our ills, universal conscription hinders, it does not help, the revolution he seeks.

The idea that universal military service is necessary to the health of the nation, if true, is the saddest possible commentary on our social intelligence. We all have heard it stated repeatedly that because there are so many million men in the United States with adenoids and defective teeth we ought to have military training. Obviously the same amount of money spent on hygiene and proper physical education of boys and girls will secure enormously better results. Even more illusory than the argument that military service promotes democracy and health, is the contention seriously advanced that it counteracts our national luxury, our softness of fibre and is, therefore, of value. I actually heard it soberly stated as part of the silver lining of the war that \$100 a plate

banquets were no longer given on the Great White Way. In other words, in a country where a small minority is possessed of soul-destroying wealth, while great masses cannot earn a living wage, the best advice our leaders can give to rid us of the curse of luxury is military service for young men!

But the real issues in the minds of this group are raised, not by the arguments of the Security League and Mr. Lyman Abbott, but by men who are sincerely liberal in their habit of thought, who nevertheless are persuaded that we cannot well escape, at least for a long period after the war, from the general idea of universal military service; so they would try to outflank its evils by reducing the military element and increasing the amount of vocational training. Many men believe that this is the "constructive way" to deal with the problem, and nowadays "constructive" is a word to conjure with. In the name of military training, the ruling classes can be persuaded to stand for an expenditure of money on camps for boys and vocational training which otherwise could not easily be secured. Little by little it would be hoped that the military idea could be abandoned and we would have left national service for peace. It seems to me that the best that can really be said for the idea is that it is a little better than old-fashioned military service pure and simple. "He who sups with the devil must have a long spoon," and I doubt if our constructive social reformers have found a long enough spoon to allow them to sup with the grim devil of militarism unscathed. The spirit of militarism is not one to be reformed, but rather one to be exorcised. If the people ever accept military conscription because it carries with it a certain amount of vocational guidance, they need not be surprised to find in some new crisis that the spirit of militarism is once more in iron control. Most of us here would probably agree that the battle of the majority wing of the German Social Democratic Party against their military system was lost when they consented to the increase in the military establishment, on the ground that it was to be paid for by a system of taxation which represented a social advance. With this

example before us, we surely cannot be deluded into embracing militarism because of the nice reform cloak it wears.

There is of course an entirely different approach to the problem of universal service, not universal service for war, but in ordinary life to make peace glorious. William James undoubtedly intrigued the minds of forward-looking folk not merely with his idea of the moral equivalent of war, but with the phrase itself. Grant the incredible heroism war has evoked, what is to be its moral equivalent? Is it not possible that, among the great masses of the people, war will seem to be such a nightmare compounded of cruelty and insanity that to talk of its moral equivalent will be a grim and bitter jest? Already in English, in French and in German we have access to books and to letters which draw a picture of inexpressible horror.

Yet I gladly admit that the capacity to forget one's self in a great cause; the sense of a comradeship of duty and responsibility to society are invaluable gifts. How far war or training for war have really secured them for us it is difficult now to say. They certainly are necessities for the finest kind of social life and if universal industrial service of the type that Professor James and others with him have suggested will secure them for us, we cannot bestow too much careful attention upon working out the dream into actuality.

Here again I think there is a need of a certain wholesome skepticism. Compulsory service is no panacea for the cure of selfishness. As a minister I am surprised to hear the same people assure me that compulsory religion, such as required attendance at college chapel, is the foe of the spirit, but that compulsory national service is the sure and sufficient guarantee of patriotism, unselfishness, and what not. Is it not absurd to expect so comparatively simple a device to take the place of religion, philosophy and the deeper things of life? I am not saying it might not be enormously valuable. I am saying that it is no patent medicine for our social ills. Let me go a step farther. Universal service added on to our present capitalistic system will

be at least as likely to do harm as good. In very backward prisons, in order to give men work, the authorities make them wheel stone or sand from one pile to another and back again. The system of universal service, which leaves untouched the inequalities of our present life, is on exactly a level with this spirit-breaking farce of stone wheeling. Surely no thoughtful men would adopt universal compulsory service in order to mine coal for private owners; to drain marshes for expropriators of the public land, or even to clean streets while the general structure of our civil and social life is unaltered. Under such conditions it has neither social nor educational value.

The real justification of service must be that it promotes not some sentiment of patriotism or a vague sense of social responsibility, but actual equality and liberty among men. In any plan of social reconstruction, the problem of the "irreducible residue of undesirable toil" is most serious. No possible improvement in machinery will relieve mankind from the necessity of doing certain tasks which have about them no sense whatever of the dignity of labor or the joy of creation. We can arrange to give workers at such tasks short hours and good pay, so that they may live, not exist, in their leisure hours, but a man ought also to be able to live in his work. It is this fact which gives real value to a program of industrial service in times of peace. If those socially necessary tasks which are essentially undesirable must be performed, it is fair that we should seek for a way of doing them that will relieve men from any lifelong sentence to them. The doing of them as a real universal social service for a short term of years if properly organized might have a genuinely spiritual and educational effect upon our young men and remove once and for all the stigma that now attaches itself to certain forms of labor—a stigma which may continue even under a pretty thoroughly socialized state, unless some such plan is followed. Now the practical working out of such a scheme is very complex; it is a most important part of our program for social reconstruction. It is bound up with the varying natural

abilities of men and their proper education. It will require the thoughtful attention of the finest minds and the best organizing ability to make it practicable. If by it we can avoid the indefinite perpetuation of a special class of hewers of wood and drawers of water, we have met the fundamental test of equality.

We must not forget the other test of liberty by which schemes of compulsory service, both military and industrial, must be judged. The most difficult of our problems is to know how to combine liberty and equality. Liberty involves the right to be one's self; to follow one's own convictions; to determine one's own vocation. Equality seems to necessitate a certain uniformity which in time of crisis rides rough shod over convictions. Conscription in a certain rough way may approach the demands of equality in a state at war or threatened by war. As a permanent policy we have seen that such service is a peril to democracy, judged even by the test of equality. More certainly does it deny liberty.

If we are to keep liberty, I believe we must think of universal service in terms of value to society rather than as something due to the state. There is a very grave danger in our tendency to put the state in place of society; to say "I owe everything to the state." Nothing of course could be farther from the truth; we are citizens not only of the state but of the commonwealth, of art, education, science and of letters; of the churches of our God, of the great worldwide brotherhood which ministers to us in body, mind and spirit. Ours is a spiritual relation to society which can never be perfectly satisfied by bowing down before the state and offering to it our blind service. The state is no metaphysical entity, it is simply one form of organization of men. Its powers should be increased only insofar as such an increase makes it possible for larger multitudes of people to fulfill the glory of personality, to love, to hope, to

dream, to work together as comrades, each bearing his fair share of the common burdens of life. We must therefore guard our universal service, even if it is not military, from becoming a rite of the religion of the state. If ever universal service is imposed on us under terms that violate the conscience of sane and sincere men, lovers of mankind, it becomes a curse and not a blessing, not alone for the individual, but for the state itself which suffers in such an attempt to coerce the minority. A healthy society cannot crush heresy without stagnation. It is fortunately probable that in a state organized for peace and not for war this particular issue of conscience will not arise. The principle remains one which is vital to remember.

Not only is freedom of conscience an essential of liberty, but also the sense of vocation. Not all men have it, but to some it is very real. If a man feels himself irresistibly compelled to be an artist or a farmer, he will never believe that he is free if a bureaucratic state tries to make him a life long clerk or a machinist, no matter how satisfactory may be his financial remuneration. Universal service will have to take into account this sense of vocation which is necessary to make service efficient: Indeed it may give it wider play because the necessity of perpetual toil at disagreeable tasks will be removed from all men. There is, then, no essential conflict between universal service and the liberty of men to follow what they believe to be their vocation. Yet the need of preserving initiative in the choice of permanent life work in the largest possible measure, must never be lost sight of in any scheme of readjustment. Whatever may be the practical advantages of a powerful state, if these things are sacrificed to it sooner or later men will turn against it. Neither to autocracy, bureaucracy, mob or political majority can we sacrifice all freedom of choice, of conviction, of thought which are the pride of life, the chief glory of men.

Notes from the Bellport Conference

Edited by HARRY W. LAIDLER

In the last issue of this magazine, Caro Lloyd favored the readers with a wonderful word picture of the Autumn Conference of the I. S. S., held at Bellport, L. I., from September 18 to 24, 1917. The rare beauty of surroundings, the fine spirit of comradeship which prevailed throughout the sessions, the high standard of scholarship in set speeches and in general discussion, the eager interest evidenced by all present in the thrashing out of vital problems—all were depicted so vividly and poetically as to make any further comment a ludicrous duplication.

However, the great social value of many of the talks given during the conference renders a rapid survey of some of the most salient points discussed of prime importance.

While every session of the Conference teemed with interest, those of Saturday evening and Sunday morning, addressed by Norman Angell, Senator Henri La Fontaine, Dr. Walter E. Weyl, Professor Harry A. Overstreet, Louis B. Boudin, Crystal Eastman and others were of special note.

NORMAN ANGELL ON THE PEACE SETTLEMENT

On Sunday morning, Norman Angell, the principal speaker on "Socialist Representation at the Peace Conference," urged that minority parties—the "opposition" as well as governmental groups—in each country be represented at the settlement in proportion to their parliamentary strength.

The belligerent nations, he declared, should establish "a Congress to consist of two bodies, a smaller one, composed, as in the past, of the delegates or nominees of the governments participating and a larger body representing proportionately the component parties of the respective parliaments."

The smaller body, he maintained, "should act as the initiating or drafting committee, their proposals being subject to amendment, approval or rejection by the larger body before being finally

ratified by the constituent states of the Congress."

Mr. Angell pointed out that existing governments were not representative. That of England, for instance, is actually Tory, although, before the war, the Liberals had a Parliamentary majority. Peace negotiations will probably be held in semi-secrecy, and when the decision is handed out, it will be too late to protest. Under the old procedure, each representative tries to do the best job that he can for his country, irrespective of future peace.

If, however, each party in a given country were represented in proportion to its strength, the lines of interest would cut athwart national boundaries, would develop divisions along real cleavages, and lead to the discussion of rival principles. The Socialist groups in the various countries would be able to form a coalition and would occupy a place out of proportion to their numerical importance. The speeches of the minorities would help in the development of international solidarity. Because of the small representation of American Socialists in Congress, this plan would help but little, so far as America is concerned. The remedy, however, for this condition is that the Socialists begin at home to increase their representation.

THE NEW SPIRIT IN ENGLAND

Mr. Angell then described industrial tendencies in England since the beginning of the war. He told of the reaction against State Socialism and in favor of Guild Socialism, the spirit of economic adventure on the part of the workers which is being developed by the war, and the demand for conscription of wealth. He said in part:

"Many English publicists are now declaring that the remarkable mass of democratic legislation since the beginning of the war is a definite asset to the working class. I do not think that, in taking this position, they are speaking from close contact with the working people. In England, at the present time, there is a very definite reaction against State Socialism among the rank and file of English labor forces. Conditions are such in many factories that no man can leave unless he has a cer-

tificate which entitles him to hunt for another job. He may be hailed before a court if he is without a job. He is subject to long hours. The workers are saying that if State Socialism has any of that quality, it will lead to a 'servile' state. Repression has led to a definite reaction in the direction of Guild Socialism. Leaders of the Independent Labor Party are drifting in a remarkable fashion in that direction. Ramsay Macdonald is definitely urging a modification of the Socialist program so as to give a larger control to unions in the nation's industries. The Guild Socialist program is that the ownership of industries should be placed in the hands of the state, but that the control should be given over to guilds of workers.

"The workers are now showing more readiness than they did before the war to take Lloyd George's advice to be bold. Some are demanding that the industries of the nation be taken over without compensation except to prevent individual hardship. They are demanding a minimum wage of \$3. They recognize that they may fail, but they are going to make the experiment. Suppose, they argue, that it does fail, is it going to cost Europe ten or fifteen million lives or cause a disorganization of industry any greater than the war is causing? If we can risk our lives for war, they assert, we can take them for social amelioration and help to create a new world. The advocates of war have said that the race needs war once in a while in order to give it a little change. So let us make life a little more adventuresome. We may go too far, but always in the past the workers have not gone far enough.

"The war has also shown the great wastes in the methods of competitive production and distribution, and the savings made possible by collective effort. It has demonstrated that, by coordinated and centralized action, the whole economic structure can, without disaster, be altered to a degree that before the war no economist would have supposed possible. With something like half the workers, and that half the best, drawn from production, the latter cannot only maintain the life of the country at a standard which is materially better on the whole than that which obtained before the war, but they can supply the vast quantity of materials needed for the war itself."

THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF CONSCRIPTION

Mr. Angell then analyzed the effect of conscription on the social philosophy of the British workers. He declared in part:

"In France, Italy and Germany the mind of the people had become habituated to the idea of conscription of life prior to the war. Not so in England. The government of England, during the present war, was, for the first time, given the power to say to its citizens, 'Go out and be killed. The state needs your life for its safety.' In the past, in advocating

public ownership, the Socialists were at a disadvantage. They ran up against the fact that if they took a dollar's worth of property from a private owner and gave a dollar in exchange, they hadn't got much further. They could not advocate confiscation, because the eighth commandment seemed to stand in the way. The conscription act answers the ethical problem. People now say, if the state can take my life, for its safety, it can also take your property. There is thus a changing ethical conception regarding private property."

FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION—A NEED OF THE MAJORITY

Following his talk, Mr. Angell was asked whether, in his opinion, freedom of discussion should be suspended during war time. He declared that, in his opinion, the upholders of free speech had made the mistake in their propaganda of insisting on free speech and free press merely as a right of the minority. Their fight would be far more successful if they demonstrated that it was a real *need of the majority*; that the majority should have the constant criticism of the thoughtful minority if it were to be saved from grave mistakes of national policy during war time.

"Any judge, who only hears one side," he declared, "is bound to go wrong. If only one view is permitted, the people are likely to enforce unsound views. The rule that discussion of terms of peace be discontinued does not stop such discussion. It merely prevents liberal contribution to that discussion."

The Paris Conference, with its forecast of economic discrimination after the war, he believed, would not have been possible had freedom of discussion prevailed prior to the conference. In his opinion, this conference played directly into the hands of the German reactionary forces, for it seemingly gave some justification to their appeal to the people that a beaten Germany would be a Germany throttled in its economic life. This kind of attitude has also proved disastrous from the standpoint of Russia.

Militarists of mediocre mentality, whose opinions of public questions were, prior to the war, looked on as a joke, are given a free field to influence public opinion in regard to the terms of peace, while the thinkers of England are not heard. If the majority are to be saved from further costly errors that may

cause the loss of millions of lives, they should be privileged to hear freely the critical minority.

SENATOR LA FONTAINE ON THE DIPLOMAT

Senator Henri La Fontaine, of Belgium, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, seconded the suggestion of Mr. Angell regarding popular representation at the peace conference. He declared, however, that the case for such representation would be strengthened if the legal reasons for the change were more emphasized. He said in part:

"Kings formerly possessed legislative as well as executive power. In performing their function as legislators, they appointed diplomats to represent them in the making of treaties, which is but international law for the nations. At present the king does not possess law-making power. That now devolves upon the parliaments. He still continues, nevertheless, to appoint diplomats for the purpose of making international law. This power of appointment should now naturally be a function of the legislative bodies. The people should maintain that diplomatists should not be sent to the peace conference. There is a grave danger that the next conference will be in the hands of the same people who brought on the war. The Russian Revolutionists have understood what is to be done, that the people should be represented, people not alone possessing brains, but those who are backed by force. Everywhere the idea of organization should be developed, and labor and Socialist groups should see to it that they have delegates present in the city in which the conference is held. This is important as well as actual representation."

The Senator was also of the opinion that the old parliaments should be dissolved and new ones should be elected. He as well emphasized the fact that war should be definitely looked upon by the nations as a crime outside of the pale of law. He said in part:

"Until the present time, war has been considered by the jurists as a legal process. This was formerly the case with duelling. The judges used to decide the ordeal and for centuries the conception prevailed that God decided who had the right to win. Now, however, duelling is considered a crime."

"In the Hague tribunal, the majority of all laws passed related merely to the rules of war. War must also go the way of duelling and be considered a crime. For it is the consummation of all crimes—murder, rape, stealing, burglary. Yet it is looked on as the highest duty. If war is so regarded, then nations that go to war will be looked upon as criminal nations and so punished. The rebuilding of the world after the war should be a complete rebuilding."

The speaker also favored the slogan within the nation of one man, one vote, one gun, and declared that the people to get their rights had to be ready to fight.

Algernon Lee, who had been selected as one of the delegates for the Stockholm Conference, and was recently elected alderman in New York City, emphasized the growing spirit of revolt among the workers of the world. He declared that even the breakdown of our civilization gave the mass more confidence in themselves, as they discovered that even war cannot be made without them.

"The workers are saying to themselves," he asserted, "that there cannot be anything worse than the rulers of the world have brought upon us. We have little to lose and everything to gain by acting boldly fighting for our rights. There is a silver lining to every cloud. This war has brought the radicals together as nothing else has done. The American people are politically inexperienced. They have had no recent experience in political struggle. However, they are gaining that experience." Mr. Lee also mentioned the determination on the part of the workers to make this the last of the wars. Professor W. P. Montague presided.

OVERSTREET'S PROPOSALS ON PEACE TERMS

The preceding session of Saturday evening was devoted to the question, "What Terms of Peace Should a Radical Propose?" The scholarly contribution of Dr. Walter E. Weyl on that subject appeared in the last issue of the magazine. Professor Harry A. Overstreet emphasized as essential principles upon which a radical should focus in the discussion on peace terms—those of governmental responsibility, political federalism and economic internationalism. He said in part:

"The radical will note with satisfaction that, during the three years of warfare, in the discussion of the terms of peace, a number of principles, hitherto held with a kind of theoretical indecisiveness, have grown into widespread fundamental convictions. The first is the principle of *governmental responsibility*. Whether governmental irresponsibility takes the form of kaiserism, junkerism, secret diplomacy or what not, the conviction is now

clear that no secure peace can be established until all government is, in a real degree, responsible to the governed. In this sense the radical must hold that the elimination of irresponsible government in any land is not a problem of domestic politics for that land alone, but is a problem of world politics.

"The second principle is that of *political federalism*. The principle of unlimited national sovereignty, which is, in effect, the principle of political *laissez faire*, has broken down so egregiously that nothing is clearer than that nations in the future must, in some effective manner, be members of a federal league.

"The third principle is that of *economic internationalism*. This principle, as fundamental as the other two, is not yet so clearly and universally recognized. The radical can perhaps best serve the cause of permanent peace by bringing it into wider recognition. In terms of this principle, the chief factor making for the present war has been the competition for investment control of backward countries. Such competition must be eliminated if war is to cease. The elimination must be accomplished by the strict internationalizing of all spheres of investment in backward countries. In other words, the economic imperialism of the 19th and 20th centuries must be superseded by the economic internationalism of the later 20th century.

"Disarmament, the abolition of wars for aggression, the free development of nationalities, the elimination of all strictly punitive indemnities are wholly derivative of these fundamental principles. The radical should not scatter his forces by much discussion of these; but should concentrate upon the more deep-lying matters which are the *sine qua non* of any peace that is to be permanent."

DR. NASMYTH'S PROPOSALS FOR DISPUTED TERRITORY

Dr. George W. Nasmyth, Secretary of the Massachusetts Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, declared that, at the peace settlement, a League of Nations must supplant the outworn Balance of Power. The success, however, of such a league will depend on the manner in which many of the other problems are settled—the problems of nationality, economic questions, the question of armament and freedom of the seas. In the various complex problems to be settled, American radicals should urge the international, as against the imperial solution. Dealing specifically with several of the problems at issue, Dr. Nasmyth declared:

"For the Balkans, the starting point should be the Treaty of San Stefano of 1876, which did recognize the principle of nationality, only to be made a 'scrap of paper' at the Congress of Berlin two years later. If the principle of

nationality were satisfied in the Balkans, the way would then be open for a federation of the Balkan States.

"For Austria-Hungary, the solution is home rule and federation under a democratic constitution. Dismemberment, with tariff wars and armament competition between all the nationalities of the Hapsburg empire, would be a disaster for all of them.

"For Alsace-Lorraine and Poland, also, the solution is autonomy. Home rule and the right to develop their own civilization and economic life are the vital needs, the denial of which have made the subject nations centers of political inflammation on the map of the world.

"With the establishment of a world organization for justice and peace which will protect all nations against the danger of aggression and unprovoked attack in the future, a great impulse will be given to the forces of democracy in the Central European empires. Militarism is a symptom of the deep-lying disease of international anarchy. It rests upon fear and feeds upon the ceaseless growth of armaments. The democratic forces in Germany are irresistible in their power and a liberalized Germany is inevitable, but radicals can greatly strengthen those forces and hasten the day of their triumph by standing for the principles of world organization, justice and permanent peace, as the dominating ideas of the great Settlement."

A DISCUSSION OF DISARMAMENT

Crystal Eastman, Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism asserted that the world was largely agreed on the fundamentals of peace terms. She spoke of the importance of maintaining democracy at home, of giving women the vote, of permitting delegates to go to Stockholm, and not depending entirely on military methods to obtain democracy, and declared now to be the time to call a parliament of all nations, with the various minorities duly represented.

Louis B. Boudin, the last speaker, declared that we should see to it that peace, when it came, was not merely a *relatively lasting* peace, but a lasting, a permanent peace. Radicals should aim, he declared, not at the limitation of armaments, but at their abolition, in order to make peace permanent. The only effect of limitation of armaments is that of lightening the burdens. It makes peace *cheaper*, but not a whit more *secure*. If it had been the practice of men to arm to the teeth, on congregating at a certain place, and a decree went forth that all should disarm to the extent that they should not be able to

carry any more than one gun, the limitation, as far as safety was concerned, would be worthless. Undeveloped countries should also be internationalized. But internationalization should be complete, as in the case of the Northwestern Territory after the Revolution. It should be such as to permit the independence, the statehood, of undeveloped territories as they develop.

In the ensuing discussion, Senator Henri La Fontaine took issue with Mr. Boudin, declaring that it was necessary to have an armed force in order to maintain peace. However, the military spirit should not be maintained. The countries should strive for the democratic organization of the militia, such as prevails in Switzerland.

John Spargo urged that the working class of America be represented at the peace conference and help to determine the kind of international government that should prevail. W. W. Passage contended that the Socialists should not waste their time in nicely balancing certain terms of peace, but should proclaim that surplus value was the cause of war and demand its elimination. He asserted that only the workers could be depended on to bring about disarmament. To this position, Boudin replied that the abolition of war is possible without the abolition of capitalism, and that we should work for all measures which assisted in the abolition of war.

H. W. L. Dana, Richard W. Hogue also spoke. Helen Phelps Stokes presided.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Many varied views were expressed in relation to the Russian Revolution at the Sunday afternoon session. A. J. Sack, Director of the Russian Information Bureau, was the first speaker.

He declared that only those who recognize the instinct for organization among the Russian people can realize the significance of the Revolution. He told of the quiet in the policeless streets of Petrograd following the revolt and of the growth of political organization in city and country. He portrayed graphically the great sacrifice of millions of Russian people to the old regime; declared that the three years of war had

given the Russians three centuries of experience, and that the Revolution was creating an entirely new mind. If the revolution had been successful in 1905, democratic Russia would have been so strong by 1914, he asserted, as to have made the war impossible.

The forces in back of the Kornilov revolt were described by Alexander Trachtenberg, Director of the Labor Research Bureau of the Rand School, and active in the revolution of 1905. Mr. Trachtenberg described the joy of the reactionaries when they heard that Kornilov was marching on Petrograd. The Moscow conference, he declared, had given the liberals and reactionaries a chance to organize against the revolution. Kornilov was its hero. He was anxious to restore the death penalty so as to suppress the revolutionary forces in the army. Because the majority at the conference were with him, he thought that the majority of the people were ready to assist. The revolutionary democratic forces, however, were prepared, and Kornilov was defeated.

Mr. Trachtenberg declared that the Russian people demanded that the Socialists assume control, because the latter were the only ones whom they could trust, the only ones who favored the radical democratic program. "The confiscation of the land, the nationalization and democratization of industries, a minimum wage and a maximum work-day, heavy income taxation, complete democratization of the institutions of the land—all this must be accomplished to comply with the demands of the Russian people, and the Socialists are the only ones who can accomplish this." In the Petrograd elections, at which 750,000 voted, 78 per cent. of the votes cast went to the combined Socialist ticket. The vote everywhere was between 70 per cent. and 90 per cent. The speaker asserted that the Russian people are determined to retain the political power for which they fought and bled.

The necessity of peace, if a counter revolution in Russia was to be prevented, was emphasized by Isaac Don Levine, author of the "Russian Revolution." He said in part:

"Two great dangers formerly confronted the world—an autocratic Russia and Czarism. The Russian Revolution broke up the one

big danger of Czarism. The Allies are to some extent at fault for the various revolts since the revolution. When the Russians saw that the Allies failed to accede to the formula 'no indemnities, no annexations,' the Leninist revolt became possible. The Russian radicals are dissatisfied with the slowness of the Allies to meet their demands. An immediate peace might bring serious trouble to Russia, but a long continuance of the war is likely to bring terrorism or a counter-revolution under an autocracy. In the latter case, an alliance between Germany and Russia would be a possible outcome, and this would be a menace to the world."

LABOR AND THE WAR

The first two sessions of the Conference, held Tuesday night and Wednesday morning, were given over to the extremely important subject of "Labor Standards in Private and Public Industry—with Special Reference to War Times."

Florence Kelley, the first speaker, vividly described the sweeping away of certain important labor legislation since our entrance into the war; the melancholy sacrifices endured by mothers and children of soldiers away at the front; the forced withdrawal from the ranks of labor and politics of some of the finest of the younger men and the substitution of young women for men in many of the occupations. The special danger of such substitution, she declared, was the small power of resistance as yet developed by the young women against oppressive measures in industry.

They are now, furthermore, suffering unduly from the "speeding up" process. She expressed very considerable pessimism over the present outlook for labor, and drew attention especially to the increased burden on the women folk when the men come back from the trenches crippled and disabled.

Mary R. Sanford and Helen Phelps Stokes, who had spent a considerable part of the summer investigating labor conditions in the factories engaged on government contracts, described the evils connected with home work on soldiers' coats. They told of the burdens borne by little children carrying heavy overcoats to and from their homes; described the difficulty of getting even some of the best of the factories to concede trade union conditions, and urged that the government, while fighting for democracy, should endeavor to enforce

more democratic features at home in connection with contracts for army and navy supplies. However, there is much hope in the fact that the government had appointed a committee to look into conditions in the garment industry of which Mrs. Kelley was a prominent member.

THE DRIVE ON LABOR LAWS

Richard Kitchelt, formerly president of the lithographers' union and prominent in the trade unions of Rochester, N. Y., vigorously criticized the position taken by many legislators and representatives of labor in the beginning of the war in permitting labor standards to be lowered. He, however, felt that the recent agitation for the maintenance of such standards was bringing good results, and urged increased governmental control and increased conscription of profits as a partial solution.

He said in part:

"At the special Labor Conference held in Washington on March 12, just before the United States entered the war, called by the Executive Committee of the American Federation of Labor and representing over 100 of the more important national trades unions of the country, resolutions were adopted which contained the following phrases: Wage-earners in war times must . . . keep one eye on the exploiters at home and the other upon the enemy threatening the national government. . . . Previous wars, for whatever purpose waged, developed new opportunities for exploiting wage-earners. . . . Workers have felt that no matter what the result of war, as wage-earners they generally lost.

"These sentiments were unusually prophetic. Scarcely had war been declared, than the legislatures of numbers of states, especially those in the industrial sections, seemed to inaugurate a competition for the breaking down of labor standards and the abrogation of labor laws. New York seemed to take the lead in this, doubtless encouraged by the statement issued by President James P. Holland in April, practically pledging labor to acquiescence in abrogated standards. The legislature passed laws not only placing hours, working conditions of men, women and children at the mercy of the employer-dominated industrial commission, but also destroying some simple and necessary regulations for the protection of working people from fire and accident, in no sense related to war necessity. Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and other states passed similar measures.

"In some of these states, however, especially in New York and Pennsylvania, the bills were vetoed by the Governors, after protest against such breaking down of labor's protective laws had been made by President Wilson, Secretary Baker and the Council of

National Defense, as well as by labor leaders and workingmen in mass. West Virginia passed a "Vagrancy act," in effect making it a crime to strike. Employers' associations demanded repeal of the Federal Eight-hour law, the child labor law and the Chinese Exclusion law; but Congress did not accede to these demands. These laws and proposals were all made under the plea of 'efficiency' in the face of the report of the British Health of Munitions Workers Committee, which showed that such measures operated directly against efficiency. Mr. Gompers, in his eagerness to support the administration, was placed in an unenviable position. Made chairman of the Advisory Committee on Labor, he selected as half of his committee men who had opposed organized labor. At the same time, six other committees, which had the letting of extensive contracts, were formed without any labor representation whatever, and immediately proceeded to award contracts to non-union concerns which employed cheap and sweat-shop labor.

"It is a relief to note some slowing up in this drive on labor which characterized the early days of our entrance into the war, brought about chiefly by the threat to strike of large bodies of ship workers and miners as well as by the intercession of high officials. At present, while wage rates have been somewhat increased in the more essential industries, the average cost of necessities has more than doubled and labor has been conscripted to fight the nation's battles, while enormous profits are being amassed by favored industries. The hopeful signs are in the tendency toward increased government control of industry and commerce and increased taxation of profits and incomes which may make easier a larger and more democratic control of its own product by labor when the war is over."

LABOR REPRESENTATION IN INDUSTRY

The Wednesday morning session was devoted to a discussion of labor representation in industry and the place of the negro in the trade union movement. Ordway Tead, Director of the I. S. S. Research Bureau, the chairman of the session, described the trade union as the chief agent of working class education and experimentation in the field of industrial control. He declared that it promotes a better standard of living, furthers negotiation in the settling of disputes and helps in the development of machinery for industrial control. He continued:

"The Government would gain enormously in the present crisis, so far as working class opinion is concerned, if it should affirm that union rates of wages will be considered as the standard rate for government payment; and if it should deliberately seek out the union leaders and negotiate collective agreements with the unions already existing in government industry.

"Such concrete evidences of a desire to apply the principles of democracy here at home would do more to give the country confidence that we are in reality fighting a liberating war, than any number of persuasive official proclamations."

In dealing with the question of democratic management in industry, Louis B. Boudin declared that Socialists should look upon the community at large as the deciding factor in industry, not the workers in the individual industry. If they look upon the government as representative of them, they will soon begin to take steps to make it truly representative.

Richard Kitchelt spoke of the strides made in England in democratic representation in industry since the outbreak of the war. In this country, he declared, labor has been given a voice in the shipping and coal boards, as a result of the urgent demands of labor, but these are isolated instances. There is a growing rebellion against this policy of civil truce during war times.

THE NEGRO AND THE TRADE UNION

In dealing with the negro situation, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois told of negro emigration from the South, touched on the East St. Louis riots and vigorously criticised the A. F. of L. for its exclusion of negro workers from their ranks. He declared:

"Previous to this war, the destruction of crops by a cotton-eating insect reduced the profits of the negro cotton growers to a minimum. When the war came, nine-tenths of the European immigration ceased. The demand for labor in the North increased proportionately. There was nothing to keep the negroes South, since they made nothing from their crops. From one-fourth to one-half a million colored hands consequently migrated North.

"For years it has been impossible, with rare exceptions, for the best of the negroes to join a trade union. Many negroes went to East St. Louis. The trade unions were antagonistic to them in various ways. There was also a large group of unskilled in East St. Louis, who had visions of rising wages, and were told that too great a competition of the negroes would lessen their chances. Animosity was stirred up. The result was the East St. Louis riots.

Dr. Du Bois also told of a threatened strike among the machinists of the General Electric Company, because the company employed an intelligent colored collegian, and touched on the exclusion of unskilled white workers. He concluded:

"The most that can be said to-day about the union movement is that it has evolved from a monarchy to an aristocracy. It has not as yet taken the mass of men into its ranks. Its leaders always talk in the terms of labor, but they really refer to the aristocracy of the labor world. Of course, an aristocracy is better than a monarchy, but it is by no means an ideal. It is but a transitional step."

Mary W. Ovington declared that the labor movement should not lose sight of the fact that its big problem was the abolition of exploitation and the overthrow of industrial tyranny under the present industrial regime. Campbell Macmillan declared that, in avoiding unnecessary labor conflicts, one of the most important things is for the workers to know whether or not the firms can afford to give better conditions, and that it is well-nigh impossible to get business concerns to give exact information on this subject. Mr. Ewing, of Boston, Edith Spruance, Mr. Sheldon and others contributed to this subject.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH, PRESS AND CONSCIENCE

Free speech and free press during war time were vigorously defended at the Wednesday night and Thursday morning sessions. Professor Ellen Hayes, opening the discussion, spoke as follows:

The fight for free speech has been completely won on two fields, the scientific and theological. Formerly the struggle was for the right of expression of fact; it is now transferred from the field of fact to that of opinion; from the field of mathematics and physics to that of ethics and economics.

There is now remaining the field of economic and social beliefs, and here we find a large measure of intolerance of certain views and of restraint in the expression of them. As regards economic beliefs, the reason for this intolerance is not far to seek. In the view of those who stand for the existing economic system, it seems necessary to forbid all criticism of the system. Supporters of the present order seem unable to learn any lesson from the history of human thought. Otherwise they would realize how impossible it will be permanently to stay the spread of new economic doctrines.

Among many people to-day there is disheartenment over the flagrant violations of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States. In a rather super-

ficial way, these disheartened people call the amendment a dead letter. The truth is, it has never been alive. This amendment is not the burial robe of a spirit that has passed away; it is the shining raiment of a spirit yet to be born. When we ask why these many suppressions of free speech and a free press are possible, the answer must be: Constitutions cannot back up any guaranty for free speech except as they themselves are backed up by a majority opinion. People do not really believe in free speech, except in a limited degree. They want their own speech to be free and that of those who agree with them; but the instinct to suppress views that one holds to be objectionable is in all of us. It is only by consideration of the rights of the other man and the other organization that we attain to that degree of self-control which may justly enable us to claim that we hold to the belief of free expression of views.

It is asked to-day, with a strong appearance of plausibility, may not the government in a time of stress suspend the right of free speech and free press? To this we must reply, a government need not do this if its cause is just and right. A resort to suppression is a confession, either that it is following an indefensible policy or that the people are too immature and fickle to be trusted with a statement of both sides of the question. It seems improbable that the governors of Minnesota and Illinois, for instance, detected the dilemma here suggested.

This government in its present emergency has no need to resort to medieval methods. The truth is such that the people can be trusted with it, and this in spite of a deplorable lack of education in democracy. In the years to come, the entrance of the United States into the war will be fully endorsed; and among the permanent gains standing over against the frightful losses involved in the sharing in the great war, will be a sounder and deeper appreciation of the right of every man to free and full expression of his beliefs. And this will compose a large item in the new democracy."

Louis B. Boudin pointed out the danger of establishing reactionary legal precedents during war time, for these are likely to be used in suppressing freedom in times of peace. Juliet S. Poyntz declared that free speech could be regarded as a power, not a right, and that this possession was generally conceded to the minority by

the majority when the former showed enough strength effectively to demand it.

The danger in this country, Rev. W. Harris Crook maintained, was that the sneering innuendos of the press and the spirit of suppression in institutions of learning made people in this country afraid to stand out and hold opinions different from those of the crowd. Mr. Crook spoke for the efficiency of ideas as against force and declared that "to fight, and not to reason, was merely proving up to the hilt the efficiency of the Kaiser's methods of Prussianism."

This subject was also ably discussed by Roger N. Baldwin, Secretary of the Civil Liberties Bureau, who reviewed the various suppressions which had taken place during the summer in violation, he maintained, of constitutional rights, and declared that the Espionage Law was but the handle by which the Post Office department was repressing expressions of opinion at variance with the war policy of the government. He continued:

"The effect of these measures, their most potent effect is to amalgamate the radical and liberal forces of the government as never before. For these war-time measures are being used to prevent much of the ordinary agitation of the labor cause. The chambers of commerce and such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers, under the cloak of patriotism, are attempting to prosecute as treasonable all labor agitation.

"The education which we could not achieve by the radical political movements of the past twenty-five years has been achieved by the government's war measures. The people throughout the West who have had their little Socialist papers and weeklies suppressed know now that democratic rights are a sham without political power to support them; they are thinking of a new kind of democracy."

Darwin J. Meserole pleaded eloquently for the observance during war time of the first amendment. Harry W. Laidler, the chairman, described some of the infringements of free speech in the colleges during the last few years and showed that special interests were in back of many of these suppressions.

At the Thursday morning session, the status of the conscientious objector was discussed by Mrs. Foulks, Mr. Schneider, Miss Sanford, Miss Ovington, and others.

CONSCRIPTION OF WEALTH

The last portion of the Thursday morning session was given over to an

unusually able discussion of the question of conscription of wealth, by Joseph L. Cohen. Mr. Cohen vigorously attacked the present method of raising money for the war, and advocated the pay-as-you-enter policy as the method which would develop a sense of responsibility, encourage saving, lead to the foregoing of luxuries and in the end prove cheaper to the nation. He continued:

"The secretary of the treasury at first recommended that taxes and loans should be raised in the proportion of fifty-fifty. This also seemed proper to Mr. Simmons, Chairman of the Senate Revenue Committee. The scheme actually put through, with the support of the administration, however, decided that less than 17 per cent of the estimated costs of the first year of the war be provided by taxation and the rest be provided by loans."

He quoted Mr. Kahn to prove that the Liberty Loan investment was an excellent thing for the well-to-do, warned his hearers that the paying for the war largely by loans forces inflation and tended to bring about a new rich class, told of enormous war profits of such corporations as the American Smelting and Refining Company, Armour and Company and the American Steel Company, and advocated an 80 per cent. tax on war profits. He criticised the liberals of the country for their timidity and concluded:

"You have but to call the roll of American millionaires to remember how many of them laid the foundation for their fortunes in the Civil War. Jay Gould and Black Friday, Morgan and his unsavory munition contracts, which were the subject of a Congressional investigation; Vanderbilt, the ship-purchasing agent of the government, who purchased and sold to the Government condemned and worthless vessels, as the result of which he made unnumbered millions of dollars—all will be readily recalled upon mere mention.

"Doubtless this war too will breed its millionaires. Doubtless, this war too will leave a heavy burden of debt which the industrialists, the workers with brain and hand, will have to bear."

THE FOOD PROBLEM

The enormous waste in the distribution of the food supply was emphasized by John J. Dillon, Commissioner of Foods and Markets of the City of New York. He said in part:

"Much of the food product rots on the ground, because the sale of it will not pay freight charges from the farm to the city. Then there is the waste by the railroads. I have known of carloads of fruit to take longer to come from Poughkeepsie to New

York than carloads from the Hood River Valley. Waste occurs after food reaches the city, inasmuch as no system of credit prevails whereby the farmer trusts the jobber, or the jobber the wholesaler, the wholesaler the retailer, or the retailer the consumer. In New York City the Board of Health stupidly condemns an entire shipment if 15 per cent is unfit for consumption. This waste increases the cost of food and adds to the discouragement of the farmer."

Mr. Dillon vigorously condemned the food profiteers and speculators and proposed the following remedy to present conditions:

"Take the food on the farm, assemble and grade it there, and ship it as cheaply as possible to the city. Establish a market in the city into which the food can be run and employ a man there to break the bulk of the shipment and sell direct to the retailer.

"So long as you maintain the present system by which speculators, jobbers and manipulators each get their profit and take their toll, so long you will pay high prices in the city, discourage food production and drive farmers off of the farm."

Dr. Charles McCarthy, one of the assistants of Herbert Hoover in the Food Administration, declared that his administration was conducting one of the most enormous tasks that ever confronted human beings. "We had to have the statistics of the food of the world under our eyes," he declared. "Two years' supply of wheat is held up in Australia. The Russian crops that used to supply Europe are dammed up. The Indian crops are held up. America must feed the world."

Dr. McCarthy declared that the administration was working under a defective law. "We have no power over the retailer," he asserted. "The retailer has been having a joyous time of it. But that is going to end."

Frederick F. Rockwell, author of "Around the Year in a Garden," etc., presided at the meeting, and showed conclusively that the farmer, under present conditions, was scarcely getting enough to permit him to support his family in decency.

THE NEGRO PROBLEM

Friday morning was given over to the discussion of "Democracy and the Negro." Mary W. Ovington told of the efforts of the negroes to obtain the imperfect thing which we have already—the suffrage. She depicted the black

codes in the South, the virtual disfranchisement of the negroes, after the Civil war, by the device of the primaries, and explained the purpose of the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, the first speaker, gave a vivid word picture of the problem, an account of which is contained elsewhere in this issue.

James W. Johnson, organizer of the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, thrilled the audience with his description of the art and music of the negro. Mr. Johnson declared that the modern dance, the Uncle Remus stories of Joel Chandler Harris, ragtime and the spiritual slave songs were "the only things artistic that had sprung out of American life, and that the negroes were the responsible agents of these. The Uncle Remus stories constitute the only folk lore that America has produced, and the slave melodies, the only folksongs.

Mr. Johnson declared that, of course there were those "who will deny that rag time is an artistic production. American musicians, especially, instead of investigating it, dismiss it with a contemptuous word. That has always been the course of scholasticism in every branch of art. Whatever new thing the people like is pooh-poohed; whatever is popular is spoken of as not worth while. The fact is, nothing great and enduring, especially in music, has ever sprung full-fledged and unprecedented from the brain of any master, the best that he gives to the world he gathers from the hearts of the people, and runs it through the alembic of his genius."

Mr. Johnson also referred to the gospel hymns of the negroes, some "so weirdly sweet, and others so wonderfully strong." He continued:

"Perhaps I cannot better express what I feel about these slave songs than in the following lines I have written:

O BLACK AND UNKNOWN BARDS

O black and unknown bards of long ago,
How came your lips to touch the sacred fire?
How, in your darkness, did you come to know
The power and beauty of the minstrel's lyre?
Who first 'midst his bonds lifted his eyes?
Who first from out the still watch, lone and
long,
Feeling the ancient faith of prophets rise
Within the dark-kept soul, burst into song?

Heart of what slave poured out such melody
As "Steal away to Jesus"? On its strains
His spirit must have nightly floated free,
Though still about his hands he felt his
chains.

Who heard great "Jordan roll"? Whose star-
ward eye
Saw chariot "swing low"? And who was he
That breathed that comforting melodic sigh,
"Nobody knows de trouble I see"?

What merely living clod, what captive thing,
Could up toward God through all its darkness
grope,
And find within its deepened heart to sing
These songs of sorrow, love and faith, and
hope?

How did it catch that subtle undertone,
That note in music heard not with the ears?
How sound the elusive reed so seldom blown,
Which stirs the soul or melts the heart to
tears?

Not that great German master in his dream
Of harmonies that thundered amongst the
stars

At the creation ever heard a theme
Nobler than "Go down, Moses." Mark its bars,
How like a mighty trumpet call they stir
The blood. Such are the notes that men have
sung

Going to valorous deeds; such tones there
were
That helped make history, when Time was
young.

There is a wide, wide wonder in it all,
That from degraded rest and servile toil
The fiery spirit of the seer should call
These simple children of the sun and soil.
O black slave singers, gone, forgot, unfamed,
You—you alone, of all the long, long line
Of those who've sung untaught, unknown, un-
named,

Have stretched out upward, seeking the
divine.

You sang not deeds of heroes or of kings;
No chant of bloody war, no exulting psalm
Of arms-won triumphs; but your humble
strings

You touched in chord with music empyrean.
You sang far better than you knew; the songs
That for your listeners' hungry hearts suf-
ficed

Still live,—but more than this to you belongs:
You sang a race from wood and stone to
Christ."

Mr. Johnson asked whether it was not
strange that this greatest gift of the
negro had been the most neglected of all
that he possesses. He concluded:

"This gift is the magic thing; it is the
touchstone; it is that by which the negro can
bridge all chasms.

"I believe the negro possesses a valuable
and much-needed gift, that he will contribute
to the future American democracy.

Mr. Johnson was followed by the Rev.
Richard W. Hogue, of Baltimore, who

told of the model negro town in Mis-
sissippi which was practically without
crime, as indicative of the fact that the
negro was capable of democratic self-
government. He also urged the need
of better negro education and of protec-
tion against exploitation. The Friday
morning session ended with an address
by Lajpat Rai, the Indian Nationalist,
who called attention to the importance
of India's problem. This speech is also
contained in this issue.

THE TREND TOWARD STATE SOCIALISM

The significance of the drive toward
"State Socialism" was discussed at the
Saturday morning session of the Society.
Dr. Harry W. Laidler, the chairman of
the meeting, said in part:

"The trend toward State Socialism is one
of the most significant facts of the last few
years. The system of transportation and
communication has passed almost entirely
into public hands.

"Since the beginning of the war, collective
control has advanced rapidly. All the large
belligerent countries have appointed food
directors. England has control of its wheat
and sugar, and has taken possession of its
flour mills. Most of the food in Germany
has been placed in charge of 30 to 40 govern-
mental commissions. All live stock has been
confiscated and its delivery to the market
controlled. No middleman is permitted be-
tween producer and consumer. All dealers
in foodstuffs must be licensed. Increase of
price by indirection is made a penal offense.
Many cities take an active part in the dis-
tribution of food. During the first two years
of the war, Berlin distributed about
\$40,000,000 of food to the poor. The munici-
palities of Italy have done much. Rome has
established 160 municipal bakeries, 14 meat
markets and many other stores. It sells as
many as 80,000 eggs a day and is daily im-
porting, pasteurizing and selling 12,000 quarts
of milk."

Dr. Laidler urged that every effort be
made to democratize the collectivism we
have and to help make it a real force for
internationalism.

John Spargo, the next speaker, vigor-
ously criticized the manner in which the
word "State Socialism" had been applied
to those governmental activities that
totally lacked the spirit of Socialism.
Only that should be called State Social-
ism, he maintained, which is undertaken
for the purpose of benefiting the mass of
workers. He described the efforts since
the beginning of the war to create boards
representing the industrial workers for
the purpose of carrying on the war; de-

clared that some of the most significant advances of late toward State Socialism were not in governmental industry but in connection with voluntary cooperative groups and private enterprises and clearly described the ideal of the Socialists. Mr. Spargo, in conclusion, touched upon his contracted obligations with the state when he entered on the duties of citizenship, and declared that those obligations made it incumbent on him to defend the institutions of the state when called on to do so.

A widely different conception of the importance of the state was held by Dr. James P. Warbasse, President of the Cooperative League of America, who emphasized especially the significance of the cooperative movement. Dr. Warbasse said in part:

"The chief function of the modern state is to protect privilege. Examine, if you will, its endeavor to solve the food problem during war times. In Great Britain the government has done little toward a real solution. In the United States the various governmental commissions consist largely of a galaxy of predatory interests who have moved to Washington for purposes of private profit.

"In Great Britain the cooperatives are helping to solve the food problem. They have stood steadfast as an international force. Fifteen million coöperators in Europe were represented at the international coöperators' congress in 1915, and it is hoped that this number will double by 1918."

M. Fainberg, of Russia, connected with a Russian cooperative bank in New York, gave an intensely interesting description of the advance of the cooperative movement in Russia, especially since the Russian Revolution. He declared:

"There are at the present time 47 co-operative societies in Russia, of which 30,000 are consumers' societies. These societies were ignored during the first part of the war. A year after war began they were represented in the council of the country and at present they have charge of the supplying of food and clothing. The Russian government has given to the branch of the Russian cooperative bank in America entire charge of the purchase of rice, coffee, etc. At present there is very great cooperation between the cooperative movement and the revolutionary government. This movement was the only one that could be depended upon to organize the food supplies when the revolution broke out. The Russian cooperatives and the cooperatives of other lands, allied and belligerent, are working hand in hand to build up an industrial commonwealth. The success of the cooperative movement from the standpoint of the workers depends not so much on its form as on its spirit."

EXPERIENCE MEETING

The last session of the conference was an experience meeting on "Why I am a Socialist." Those who were fortunate enough to remain for this intimate gathering, where well-known men and women in the Socialist ranks told some of the vital experiences which opened their eyes to the Socialist vision, will cherish this session as one of the choicest treasures of the entire week. Mrs. Darwin J. Meserole, who had given a demonstration during the conference of the perfect hostess, presided, and among the speakers were: Carl Beck, Louis B. Boudin, Wm. F. Cochran, Professor Ellen Hayes, Rev. Richard W. Hogue, I. O. Hunt, Mary W. Ovington, Mary S. Sanford, John Spargo, Helen Phelps Stokes, Mr. and Mrs. Geo. H. Strobbe, Mrs. F. D. Tuttle and others.

Although many remained for a pleasant jaunt in the open country on Monday, this "experience" session constituted the final gathering of the conference—a conference filled with the inspiration of live thoughts, of high ideals, of sweet comradeship.

College Notes

NEW ENGLAND STATES

After several years of effort, the students of WELLESLEY College were successful last Spring in obtaining permission from the members of the faculty to affiliate their group for the study of Socialism with the I. S. S. Professor Ellen Hayes of Wellesley was the chief speaker this Fall at the organization of the I. S. S. Chapter. Miss Mary B. Spahr is temporary chairman. The new Chapter bids fair to be a strong one.

W. Harris Crook, Assistant Pastor of the First Congregational Church, addressed a joint meeting of various I. S. S. Chapters in and around Boston at RADCLIFFE College in early November. The meeting, at which the effects of the war on Socialism was analyzed, was arranged by the Radcliffe Chapter of the I. S. S., of which Miss Beatrice Jones is chairman.

Robert W. Dunn, of the YALE Chapter, reports good promise for the coming year. The first public meeting was addressed by Alexander Trachtenberg. Over 300 students listened to Mr. Trachtenberg's thrilling account of the significance of the Russian Revolution. Mr. Dunn reports that several of the professors have promised to address study groups this year. Mr. James R. Brown spoke

in early November on "Socialism, Anarchism, or Freedom, Which?" Lajpat Rai, the Indian nationalist, and author of "Young India" is scheduled for a meeting on Dec. 4th. E. Fayette Campbell is Secretary of the club and Walter R. Mead is Treasurer.

James H. S. Hall of BATES College reports that the Political Science Club, of which he is Secretary, is planning to take up Socialism as part of the year's study.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES

The COLUMBIA Chapter reorganized in early November and now contains between 30 and 40 members. Frank Tannenbaum, the President of the Chapter, writes: "Our general policy, in so far as we may be said to have one, is to make the program for the coming year reflect the larger social, economic and political problems arising out of the war. With such a general policy the organization has every prospect of developing into a large and influential organization and making itself felt as a force for good at Columbia." Mr. Aranoff is Secretary-Treasurer. Alfred H. Sachs has been active in the formation of the group.

The C. C. N. Y. Chapter has been keeping the lead in I. S. S. activities and has already sent in dues for the Society for 49 members. The first speaker of the season obtained by the Chapter was A. J. Sack, Director of the Russian Information Bureau. Several hundred listened to an address by him on the Russian Revolution. Between 500 and 600 also gave earnest attention to a talk on this subject by Congressman Meyer London. Dr. I. M. Rubinow, author of "Social Insurance," also addressed a large meeting on Health Insurance, and Dr. Harry W. Laidler, on the "Ideals and Achievements of Modern Socialism." The Chapter hopes to have the Russian Ambassador as one of its Fall speakers. It is planning a Soirée on December 23rd, and already has an unusually fine list of speakers.

Clarence Hotson of CORNELL reports the reorganization of the Chapter at that University and the holding of several interesting meetings. The first gathering held on Nov. 3rd was devoted to a discussion of the New York City municipal campaign. "Barnes Hall was secured," writes Mr. Hotson, "and a fine discussion resulted in several signatures for membership. On Nov. 10th another successful meeting was held, this time on 'Socialism and the Russian Crisis.'" Mr. Louis B. Boudin will speak at Cornell in the latter part of the month.

The VASSAR Chapter has already held a number of study gatherings this Fall. Miss Mary B. Cover is Secretary.

Miss Dora Shapiro, Secretary of the ADELPHI Chapter, declares that their tentative program consists of the study and discussion of Hillquit's "Socialism in Theory and Practice." On October 2nd, the meeting was devoted to "Socialism and Individualism." The members of the Society have attended a number of debates and other meetings throughout the city to acquaint themselves with the actual teachings of Socialist speakers. Miss Shapiro states: "I wish to say

upon my own responsibility, that the Adelphi Chapter shows promise of accomplishing a good deal this year. The members are willing not only to learn more about Socialism, but to put forth effort to do this, to study Socialism sincerely."

A splendid season is promised for the PITTSBURGH University I. S. S. Chapter. Meetings are held every Tuesday—every other Tuesday in cooperation with the Pitt Chapter of the International Polity Club. The officers are J. J. Paglin, President, Sophia Fingeret, Secretary, and Nathan Malyn, Treasurer.

Abe Glassman writes that he will endeavor to organize a Chapter at ALLEGHENY College as soon as possible.

Prof. W. P. Montague addressed the first meeting of the BARNARD Chapter in early November. Miss Adele Franklin is President.

Miss Grace Poole is one of the active members of last year's Chapter at SYRACUSE College who has returned to the college this season.

MIDDLE WESTERN STATES

Mr. O. Flood, Secretary-Treasurer of the WISCONSIN I. S. S. Chapter, writes: "Our Society is holding general meetings every two weeks and there is an added interest shown this year. Professor Dresden spoke on "Ancient Socialists" on Oct. 8, and Professor Westerman on "Pacifists and the War" on October 22. We find that discussion is the vital part of the program."

The University of MISSOURI Chapter has outlined an interesting program. Miss Loretta Funke, President of the Chapter, writes the following concerning its activity. "The Socialist Society has organized to meet only every two weeks this year, instead of every week as was the case last year. The following officers were elected the night of October 13th: Loretta Funke as President, Morris Glaser as Vice-President, and Mildred Mindlin as Treasurer. A tentative program has been made out by the Executive Committee as follows: 1. To study the development of Socialism in the various countries before the war began. 2. To study the development of Socialism since war was declared. 3. To study the problems presented by the war and the method of solving the same. It is the intention of the Society to have specific programs arranged for each meeting."

Benjamin Elconin of the DETROIT COLLEGE OF LAW has inquired regarding the formation of a Chapter at the institution and declares: "We have excellent material for an active and constructive organization which is bound to wind up in appropriating our training to the Socialist movement."

As usual the VALPARAISO Chapter is among the most active in the Middle West. B. Steinhart in his letter, in which he encloses more than \$6 for membership dues, writes concerning the Chapter activities as follows: "The Chapter met last Sunday for its reorganization and election of officers. A study class was decided upon to meet once a week and

use the same book we did last year. The prospects are fine and we hope to do good work." Ira C. Tilton, as in former years, is assisting the organization very materially in its study classes.

The CHICAGO Chapter of the I. S. S. is meeting regularly this year with Frieda Kramer as Secretary.

William H. Foster of the HOWARD Chapter reports: "We had a joint public meeting last week at which Dr. Du Bois spoke on the 'Results of the War.' Dr. Du Bois also gave an account of the Summer Conference at Bellport."

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

The NEW YORK ALUMNI Chapter is beginning what promises to be the most successful season in its existence. Its first big public meeting was on Nov. the 9th. Lincoln Steffens on that evening spoke on the "Russian Revolution" before a thousand members and friends of the Society who crowded the auditorium of the Washington Irving High School. The address is one long to be remembered in I. S. S. circles. On Thursday evening, Nov. 22nd, a symposium on "A Chal-

lenge to New Voters"—dealing with the women voters who have been franchised in New York State at the November elections—was held under the auspices of the Alumni Chapter at Miss Stokes' Studio, 90 Grove Street. Prestonia Mann Martin delivered the challenge, stating that, after obtaining the vote, she had now decided to affiliate herself with the Socialist Party, and the challenge was answered by Mary Simkovitch, Dr. Jessie W. Hughan, Rose Schneiderman, Theresa Malkiel, Elsie Hill and others. Mary R. Sanford presided. The Chapter is planning weekly Saturday afternoon Camaraderies at the Civic Club, 14 West 12th Street, from 4 to 6:30, to which all members of the Society when in the city are cordially invited.

The officers of the Chapter are: Dr. G. B. L. Arner, President; Evans Clark, 1st Vice-President; Alexander Trachtenberg, 2nd Vice-President; Louise Adams Grout, Secretary; Alice K. Boehme, Treasurer; Sara Baruch, Director of the Lecture Bureau; Members of the Advisory Committee—Bertram Benedict, Dr. Edmund T. Dana, Walter M. Hinkle, Evelyn Hughan, Dr. Harry W. Laidler, Cheves W. Perky and Ordway Tead.

The I. S. S. Book Store

Purchase your books from the

Intercollegiate Socialist Society
70 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. City

(Add 10 Cents for Postage to Price Mentioned)

A POPULAR TWENTY-FIVE CENT LIBRARY

Facts of Socialism. By Jessie W. Hughan, Ph.D. Clear, concise exposition of the theory and practice of Socialism written especially for use in I. S. S. Study Chapters. Paper edition, 25c.; cloth edition, 75c.

The Truth About Socialism. By Allan L. Benson. A trenchant argument for Socialism by one of America's foremost pamphleteers and Socialists. 25c.

Socialism Summed Up. By Morris Hillquit. A concise survey for busy people of the more practical phases of the Socialist movement. Paper edition, 10c.

TEN-CENT CLASSICS

Municipal Ownership in the United States. By Evans Clark. An impartial and scholarly survey of the extent of municipal control of public utilities in this country.

Merrie England. By Robert Blatchford. A pamphlet which has gone into millions of copies. A powerful argument addressed to the man on the street as to why the present system should be superseded.

The Communist Manifesto. By Karl Marx and Frederic Engels. The first statement of so-called scientific Socialism ever issued. Published in 1848. A brilliantly written Socialist classic with which all students of the movement should be familiar.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederic Engels. Next to the Communist Manifesto, the most famous Socialist classic ever published. Indispensable to a knowledge of the evolution of Socialist thought.

Cooperation in the United States. By Cheves W. Perky. The first comprehensive survey ever made of the voluntary cooperative movement of consumers in this country.

A CHOICE GROUP OF BOOKS ON THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

State Socialism, Pro and Con. Edited by William English Walling and Harry W. Laidler, with a chapter on Municipal Socialism by Evans Clark. \$2.00. Governments have been doing a large part of the world's work since the war: operating railways, mercantile marines and mines, nationalizing and distributing most of the food supply, declaring monopolies in raw materials and controlling many manufacturing industries. Some of these activities will cease with the war; others will continue and new articles will be added. Moreover, collectivism or "State Socialism" did not originate with the war. It has been advancing at a constantly accelerated speed for a quarter century. The whole recent development is covered in this volume. The volume is in no sense an argument for or against "State Socialism."

The Socialism of To-day. Edited by Wm. English Walling, Jessie W. Hughan, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Harry W. Laidler and others. The first comprehensive source book on the international Socialist movement ever issued. Consists chiefly of original documents, speeches, resolutions, articles, etc., by Socialists and Socialist parties throughout the world. Deals with the attitude of Socialists on all important problems. \$1.75.

Applied Socialism. By John Spargo. \$1.25. The clearest and most logical statement yet written by an American Socialist regarding the probable working out of the co-operative system.

American Socialism of the Present Day. By Jessie W. Hughan, Ph.D. \$1.25. A scholarly analysis of current views of American Socialists on practical and theoretical phases of Socialism.

Income. By Scott Nearing. \$1.25. A fundamental criticism of the present system of industry. The present distribution of wealth is here graphically presented.

Fabian Essays. By Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, etc. \$1.25. A brilliant series of essays, dealing with the development of capitalism and the promise of Socialism, written from the viewpoint of the unorthodox Fabian Society school of thought.

STANDARD 50c. LIBRARY

New Worlds for Old. By H. G. Wells. An analysis of the true import of Socialism written in the same brilliant style which characterizes Wells's other writings.

The American Labor Year Book, 1917. By the Department of Labor Research of the Rand School of Social Science. Gives innumerable statistics regarding the Socialist and labor movements here and abroad and expert analysis of social conditions.

Socialism and Superior Brains. By Bernard Shaw. A telling answer by the famous dramatist and Socialist to Mallock's contention that Socialism will stifle the incentive.

Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. A lucid statement by the foremost Socialist theorist of Europe of the meaning of the proletarian struggle and of the probable outlines of the Socialist Republic. Every student of Socialism should possess this book.

Socialists at Work. By Robert Hunter. Contains a number of remarkably vivid sketches of leading personalities in the European Socialist movement, as well as an account of the activities of the various parties.

A Preface to Politics. By Walter Lippmann. An attempt by one of the most promising of the younger writers of the day to induce the average American to think deeper than present-day political catchwords.

Socialism—A Promise or Menace? By Morris Hillquit and Dr. John A. Ryan. \$1.50. An extraordinarily able debate on the pros and cons of Socialism by prominent protagonists of each point of view.

The Elements of Socialism. By John Spargo and Dr. Geo. L. B. Arner. \$1.50. A college text-book on Socialism covering all phases of the movement in a systematic and scholarly fashion. The most comprehensive text-book yet written on the subject.

America and the World Epoch. By Chas. P. Steinmetz. \$1.00. A keen analysis of industrial development by one of the foremost engineers and Socialists in America.

Progressivism and After. By William English Walling. \$1.50. Gives an intensely interesting account of the collectivist developments in modern society and forecasts future tendencies. A real contribution to social thought.

Violence and the Labor Movement. By Robert Hunter. \$1.50. A dramatic portrayal of the place of violence in the labor movement and of the long conflict between Socialism and Anarchism.

Socialism and Character. By Prof. Vida D. Scudder. \$1.50. A finely reasoned attempt by a master English stylist to show the possible development of the ethical and spiritual in man under Socialism.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of The Intercollegiate Socialist, published bi-monthly, excepting June, July, Au-

gust, September, at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1917.

State of New York,
County of New York.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally appeared Alice Kuebler Boehme, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the Business Manager of The Intercollegiate Socialist and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in Section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Managing Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Business Manager, Alice Kuebler Boehme, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City.

2. That the owners are: Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Membership approximately 2,000. The principal officers are: President, J. G. Phelps Stokes, 88 Grove St., N. Y. C.; First Vice-President, Florence Kelley, 289 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.; Second Vice-President, Ernest Poole, 130 E. 67th St., N. Y. C.; Treasurer, Mary R. Sanford, 90 Grove St., N. Y. C.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: There are no known bondholders, mortgagees or other security holders.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders, who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a *bona fide* owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by her.

Alice Kuebler Boehme.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September, 1917.

John Martin, Notary Public,
Bronx County, No. 59.

Certificate filed in New York County, No. 874; New York County Register's No. 8317. (My commission expires March 30, 1918.)

The Public

An International Journal
of
Fundamental Democracy



Brand Whitlock, U. S. Minister to Belgium, said:

You don't know what a comfort it is to get The Public. In the midst of all the horrors of the world it is one thing I know of—aside from one's own conscience—and the democratic principle down deep in our hearts—by which to correct one's reckoning. It is a compass—never sensational, always calm and pointing in the same direction.

In times that try men's souls—

The Public will furnish you sane, strengthening reading. It is helping thousands to sustain the shocks of each day's news. Its weekly review of the current news of historical value is without editorial bias. Yet it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely. Its editorials are the compass to which Mr. Whitlock referred.

Subscribe to The Public now

The Public costs only \$1.00 a year—52 issues. You could not at this time spend a dollar to better advantage. You will find it not only worth reading, but worth filing and binding, too.

The Public, 122 E. 37th St., New York

Just Out—November-December Issue of

The Class Struggle

Contains:

***Articles on The Russian Revolution by Leon Trotzky,
Nicolai Lenine, Karl Kautsky and Louis B. Boudin.***

Also articles on The I. W. W. Trial, by Louis C. Fraina; Our Obedient Congress, by Ludwig Lore; Imperialism and the New Middle Class, by S. J. Rutgers; The Passing of the Nation, by L. B. Boudin; The Stockholm Conference, The Fraina Case, The Presidency in New Russia; and twenty pages of editorial comment on current affairs.

A Magazine of Revolutionary Socialism

There is no greater task ahead than giving an adequate expression to the groping forces of revolution in our Party particularly, and in the International Movement generally. Our action in the immediate years to come will determine the future of Socialism. In the crisis that is coming, the revolutionary integrity of Socialism must prevail in the struggle against Capitalism.

That is the task imposed upon itself by our magazine, *The Class Struggle*.

But this expression must be revolutionary without being hysterical, sane without being conservative.

And that is the spirit animating our endeavor and guiding all our actions.

Published Every Two Months—25c. a copy, \$1.50 a Year

Send Subscriptions to

The Socialist Publication Society

119 Lafayette St.

New York City.

Agents Wanted—Write for Rates.

ENGLAND'S DEBT TO INDIA

By LAJPAT RAI

A historical narrative of Britain's fiscal policy in India and a comprehensive statement of the economic relations between England and her great possession with all the statements and charges substantiated by British authorities.

The author of *Young India* gives reasons for the exercise of restraint in the determination of the fiscal policy which British statesmen may decide to follow toward India after the war.



THIS MARK ON
GOOD BOOKS



Dr. Karl Liebknecht

LIEBKNECHT'S suppressed BOOK MILITARISM

This is the book whose appearance in Germany made armed autocracy shrink and pale. They promptly put Liebknecht in prison and destroyed his book.

To know the mind of the boldest man in Europe, now in prison again because of his passion to *make the world safe for democracy*, you will read it at once.

B. W. HUEBSCH, Publisher, 225 Fifth ave., New York

MANY members and friends
of the Society are purchasing
books from the

I. S. S. Book Store

for the Yule Tide Season.

OTHERS are sending their
friends as a Christmas gift a
yearly subscription to

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Subscription price, - - 50 cents

How About You?

"The Workers' University of America"

The Rand School of Social Science

7 East 15th St., New York

I—FULL-TIME COURSE offers a thorough
scientific training to men and women to fit
them for effective work as Socialist Party
or labor union organizers, secretaries, writers,
lecturers and speakers.

II—CORRESPONDENCE COURSES for
those who cannot, by reason of distance or
occupation, attend the courses of the school.
Instruction is given by means of scientifically
prepared lesson leaflets with questions
suggestions, and recommended reading.

Also, afternoon and evening courses in Socialism
History, Economics, Civics, Philosophy, English, Public
Speaking, for working people and the general public.

Write for prospectus to **BERTHA A. MAILLY,**
Executive Secretary.