

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Concerning the German Revolution

By Caro Lloyd

Washington and the Coming Re-
construction

By Harry W. Laidler

A Constitutional Convention

By Ralph Samuel

Education and Democracy

By H. W. L. Dana

The 1918 Socialist Vote

By Evans Clark

Guildsmen and American Socialism

By Jessie W. Hugan

The Irish Question

By Felix Grendon

A League of Nations

By Harry Salpeter

Reviews of Books

International Notes

December-January, 1918-1919

Fifteen Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

VOL. VII.

December-January, 1918-1919

No. 2

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

OFFICERS INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY


President,
FLORENCE KELLEY,
Cornell
First Vice-President,
EVANS CLARK,
Amherst
Second Vice-President,
VIDA D. SCUDDER,
Smith
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
H. W. L. DANA, Harvard
ARTHUR GLEASON, Yale
JESSIE W. HUGHAN, Barnard
NICHOLAS KELLEY, Harvard
FREDA KIRCHWEY, Barnard
DARWIN J. MESEROLE, N. Y. U. Law
WINTHROP D. LANE, Michigan
GEORGE NASMYTH, Cornell
JOHN SPARGO
HELEN PHELPS STOKES
CARO LLOYD STROBELL, Vassar
NORMAN M. THOMAS, Princeton
CHAS. ZUEBLIN, Northwestern

SECTIONAL COMMITTEE

New England	Middle West	Far West	Southern Atlantic
EMILY G. BALCH	DR. G. LIPPMANN	M. LOUISE HUNT	WM. F. COCHRAN
VIDA D. SCUDDER	IRWIN ST. JOHN TUCKER	R. A. MAYNARD	MARY RAOUL MILLIS

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.

 NOTICE—The Tenth Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society will be held in New York City on Friday and Saturday, December 27 and 28, 1918.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Tenth I. S. S. Convention All eyes in the I. S. S. world are turned toward the TENTH Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, to be held in New York City, on December 27 and 28, 1918. Conditions are eminently ripe for an intensely interesting Conference.

The two big public meetings of the Convention will be held on Friday and Saturday nights. On Friday evening, December 27, the Annual Dinner of the Society is scheduled for the Aldine Club, 200 Fifth Avenue. The subject of the Dinner will be "Socialism—A Growing World Power," and among the speakers, Norman Hapgood, who has spent considerable time in France since the beginning of the war; Arthur Gleason, an authority on the British Labor Party; Rev. Albert Rhys Williams, the well known journalist, recently returned from Russia; Ludwig Lore, editor of the New York *Volkszeitung*; Norman Thomas, editor of *The World Tomorrow*; Arturo Giovannitti, and Mrs. Florence Kelley, Chairman. Those desiring tickets (price \$2.00) should send their orders immediately to the I. S. S. Office, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

On Saturday evening, at 8 o'clock, there will be a symposium on "The Socialist Attitude Toward a League of Nations," in the Auditorium of the People's House, 7 East 15th Street, New York City (admission 25 cents). Louis B. Boudin, Scott Nearing, H. M. Kallen, H. W. L. Dana, Evans Clark and others will take part in the symposium. After the meeting refreshments will be served to members of the Society and their guests in the Cafeteria of the Rand School.

The opening session of the Convention will be held at Miss Stokes' Studio, 90 Grove Street, at 2:30, Friday afternoon, December 27. Jessie W. Hughan will speak on "The Collegian and American Socialism." This address will be followed by a number of short talks on how best collegians may serve in social

movements. Delegates from various colleges will give their reports and a number of Chapter problems will be discussed. This discussion will be continued on Saturday morning at 10 o'clock at the studio.

On Saturday afternoon, the New York Alumni Chapter of the I. S. S. will tender a reception to the visiting delegates in the rooms of the Civic Club, 14 West 12th Street, from 4 to 6 o'clock. The Secretary will give a resume of the progress made during the year in the worldwide movement toward industrial democracy, and Algernon Lee will conduct the "Question Box" on Socialism. Louise Adams Grout will preside. Full information concerning the Convention can be secured from the office. It is sincerely trusted that all who can will be present and help the Society to make this Tenth Annual Reunion the most profitable event in the Society's history.

The Monthly The Executive Committee of the I. S. S., at its last meeting, decided that the time was ripe to convert our quarterly into a monthly, to be known as *The Socialist Review*, the review to be published as soon as sufficient financial support could be obtained.

It is unnecessary to argue here the need for such a periodical in the present crisis. Nor is it necessary to call to the attention of members and friends of the Society how admirably adapted is the Society to conduct such a venture in journalism. For a number of years, the Society has published the quarterly and the staff, contributors, subscribers, and machinery of *The Intercollegiate Socialist* can be utilized to the full for the proposed monthly. It is also obvious that the expenses incidental to expansion will be tremendously reduced if it can take over the existing facilities of the quarterly.

The educational and non-controversial character of the Society, and the reputation for fairness and scholarship always

enjoyed by it among Socialists of various schools of thought and non-Socialists within and without the college walls, should render it exceptionally effective for just this kind of work. The magazine would, moreover, permit the Society to assist mightily in the strengthening of its work of enlightenment in the Universities and among the educated men and women of America generally.

If the proposed paper is to serve its purpose well, it should be an open forum for discussing the latest American developments in labor, industry, education, and politics. The various foreign situations must of course be accurately reported and explained. Nor need the literary and artistic expressions of our cause be neglected. Indeed, room must be found for every living phase of the world movement toward industrial democracy—be it guild unionism or women's rights, the co-operative adventure or the public ownership trend, the new social psychology or the new education. And no discussion of these topics from any angle whatever will be out of place if the matter is effectively expressed and the conclusions are reached without departing from strictly scientific methods of inquiry. The aim of the paper will be to educate the American people by treating the problems of human liberty with such frankness, fullness, and energy, as will furnish a standing invitation to the whole world to prove Socialist beliefs unfounded or Socialist policies unsound.

Among the supporters of the monthly Review may be numbered a handful of skillful and energetic writers who have volunteered their services in advance. Others will probably come forward as soon as the enterprise is under way. A competent circulation and advertising manager cannot, however, be secured without a salary. This expense, and a few others equally pressing, will have to be met by a fund of several thousand dollars. Those who believe that the project will do a needed constructive work at this time of social transformation are urged to contribute to the full measure of their faith and power. Outright donations, or monthly or quarterly remittances may be sent for the present to

Harry W. Laidler, Editor, *The Intercollegiate Socialist*. Expressions of opinion are also expressly solicited.

I. S. S. Opportunity Never were the opportunities for effective work on the part of the I. S. S. and its college and graduate chapters greater than at the present time. The coming of peace, the growth in strength and influence of the Socialist and labor movements abroad and the discussion of vital problems of reconstruction, national and international, are turning the attention of educated men and women as never before to the fundamental problems of industrial democracy. In the colleges the first of the year will witness a return to normal conditions, and this return will doubtless mean a great reawakening of interest in economic and social problems.

All members and friends of the Society are urged to cooperate with the Society in this period of social renaissance. They can assist the I. S. S. by organizing and strengthening college and alumni groups; by sending in the names of prospective members and by urging their friends to join the Society; by contributing financially toward this work; by securing subscribers to the magazine, and by offering suggestions for future activity.

The Society, besides its magazine proposal and its annual convention, is planning a series of important pamphlets, including study courses on Socialism, booklists and a series on public ownership and democratic management. It also hopes during the Spring to schedule a number of speakers among the colleges and various centers of population. If, however, it is to function effectively along these lines, it must secure the financial and moral assistance of all of its well wishers. If this assistance is forthcoming, the Society may well become one of the great forces in this country leading to a freer and more brotherly civilization.

Russia The next issue of the Magazine will contain among other things a number of vital articles on Russia.

Concerning the German Revolution

By CARO LLOYD

That once proud verse: "Westward the star of empire takes its flight" is in immediate need of revision. Its star is sinking. The slogan today is "Westward the sun of Socialism speeds its light." Across the plains of Siberia, over the grain fields of Russia it comes, gleaming on the domes of Moscow, glinting the waters that curl around the Baltic fleets, shimmering into Bulgaria, Austria-Hungary, and now illuminating Germany. The peoples faint and despairing are beginning to stand erect, the light of the red dawn on their faces and morning courage in their hearts.

All the world is being made over. The word new is becoming decrepid from overwork. Even Elihu Root standing on a recent Sunday in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, said: "Today we commemorate the ushering of the dawn of a new day." Mr. Root's new day looks out upon a world-wide triumphant capitalism led by America. This ideal is first cousin of British imperialism with its boast that the sun never sets on its empire. "Because," said an American wit, "God is afraid to leave them in the dark." Today the voice of the people is being heard the world over, in their cathedrals—the factories, mines, fields, socialist halls—shouting: "The new day is the day of Socialism."

The dawn has been long in Germany. One of our keenest observers returning in 1901, said that a revolution might be expected there at any time, that Socialist and labor organization was so perfected that a notice could reach every member in Berlin in an hour and in the empire over a Sunday. In the world war, capitalism voluntarily created the cataclysm. The Socialist International called upon the workers to utilize the cataclysm to establish Socialism. For four years the workers of Germany marched under their master's flag, but not till November, 1918, when want, defeat, the enmity of the world united the people in one body of sorrow, and the social structure began to topple, did their opportunity arise. Then the party of the Red rushed to the rescue with a strong organization

and program, and like the red corpuscles of the blood began at once out of chaos and paralysis to build new social tissues.

BEGINNING OF REVOLT

The fall of the Empire was rapid. To quell rising discontent, it hastened to grant long refused concessions, and established a parliamentary government under Prince Max, admitting three Pan-German Socialists, who evidently dictated the terms on which they would enter. But the country was not quieted. Peace riots occurred and the press openly discussed abdication. Liebknecht released from prison, stirred crowds by declaring "The day of the people has come," and was answered by cries for a republic. Inside the Reichstag were turbulent scenes, Haase charging that the people had been betrayed, and Dittman in the first speech after his release from jail demanding a republic. Then with Austria and Hungary out of the war and transformed into Socialist republics, and with the surrender of Turkey, every day brought nearer the Empire's crisis. The Bundesrat hastened to grant franchise and other reforms. But it was too late.

On November 6, the sailors on the battleships at Kiel revolted, and soldiers sent to suppress them joined them. The revolt spread rapidly from city to city. On the 9th, the Kaiser in response to the demands of the Socialists signed his abdication, shivering, it is said, as he did so, and he and the Crown Prince, whose family had been royal since 1400, renounced their claims, fleeing in high power cars to Holland. "Going to Paris?" shouted the Belgians. On that day, Berlin arose in the morning under an autocracy and went peacefully to sleep at night with the red flag flying on the Emperor's palace. As by a miracle, there had been only three killed and one wounded. The new order was installed in seven hours amid great rejoicing. In a few days ten of the twenty thrones and principalities were supplanted by Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils practically without bloodshed. Others followed until it was a dull day when no duke took off his coronet and handed it

to the people. Every room of the luxurious Reichstag hummed with revolutionary activity. Majority and Independent Socialists divided the power and proclaimed an eight-hour workday, free press and assemblage, religious liberty, political amnesty, and universal direct secret suffrage with proportional representation for all men and women over twenty. Entailed crown property was seized. Even conservative newspapers made a sudden turn and supported the new government.

Meanwhile German plenipotentiaries led by Erzberger carried the white flag to General Foch's headquarters and received the armistice terms. At the eleventh hour of the eleventh day, eleventh month, they were signed and in a few minutes the whole civilized world was mad with joy, weeping, laughing, parading. German and Allied soldiers exchanged cigarettes on the West front. A new hope ringed the world as the conflict which had killed or maimed nearly 13,000,000 men and cost \$200,000,000,000 involving annual interest of about \$10,000,000,000 was ended. By the terms Germany was helpless. Her transportation paralyzed, she was unable to get necessities either for herself or for the Allied army of occupation which she was obliged to feed.

Thus was achieved almost over night, from November 7 to 11, one of the great events of history. Never did a new regime start under worse auspices. Surrounded by armed foes possessing over it the power of life or death, the new government of German workers stood virtually disarmed and exhausted. But it represented the most highly organized proletariat of Europe, organized industrially in a trade-union movement whose pre-war income and membership was the highest in Europe, and politically in the Social-Democratic party which through a generation of struggle, buffeting opposition and veering with compromise and coalition had become wise and weather-proof. Whereas in Russia the bureaucracy disappeared and the masses by a marvelous creative act originated a new social mechanism, in Germany so far as we know, the social organism has gone on intact, so that the passing from old to new was "a nine day's wonder," and

a cablegram reported that the revolution was progressing "calmly and methodically." While the Russian revolution has impulsively come into being without passing through the intermediary stage of capitalist concentration, to the confusion of strict Marxians, the German revolution has so far been thoroughly logical. For example, in two short weeks starting from a capitalist regime, it passed to a coalition ministry of Liberals and Socialists, and then to a ministry composed of all wings of the Socialist party under the control of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils.

THE NEW GOVERNMENT

At present writing, December 2, the government consists of three parts, a regency council, an administrative council of eight members, and Councils of Workmen and Soldiers. The regency council contains six members who have the power of dictators; three are majority Socialists, Ebert the Premier, Scheidemann and Landsberg; three are Independent Socialists, a group formed by the union of the International or Spartacus group with the moderates or centrists. Barth represents the Spartacides, Haase and Dittmann the moderates. The third division, the Soldiers and Workmen's Councils is syndicalist in structure, and has an executive council in Berlin of delegates from various parts of the Ex-Empire. In this group lies the power, should it get "out of hand," to overthrow the regency council. Thus side by side with a continuance of the old structure is growing the new Russian Soviet system.

The German revolution is apparently at present remaining stable in the moderate stage, peculiarly fitted to do this because of the long and thorough development of the movement. It is moreover held there by necessity, bound hand and foot by the iron terms of the Armistice. On November 14, Chancellor Ebert appealed to the people: "If we can carry on our work for six or eight weeks, new Germany's future is assured, and we also can hope to obtain conditions of peace relatively favorable; but if our adversaries can establish that anarchy reigns among us, they will dictate conditions that will annihilate Germany's

political life." The Red sailors at first rebellious over the surrender of their fleet were telegraphed to: "We shall get peace only if we loyally fulfill the conditions of the Armistice," and they obediently sailed their ships to the Firth of Forth.

THE REVOLUTION AND THE ALLIES

Thus the course of the revolution seems to lie in the hands of the Allies, who now control Germany's food and transportation. If they recognize the new government, and make liberal peace terms, the present balance may be expected to hold for some time. But should the terms be harsh, or savor of imperialistic tyranny, then the people finding themselves facing increased misery, starvation, unemployment, will probably swing the revolution into the Soviet form. The course of true revolutions never runs smooth. The German revolution has only begun. It will continue to revolve, and sooner or later may be relied upon to follow the directions given in the *New York Call* for arriving at "a real republic": "Turn to the Left and keep on going."

The Socialist and labor movements of the world and President Wilson, as spokesman for America, have pledged themselves to the self-determination of peoples. In his message to Congress, the President intimated that American soldiers would not be asked to disrupt the new-born democracies of Europe. But sinister forces are gathering. We read in the *Times* that for a year or more it may be necessary to keep a million or two of soldiers in Europe "to maintain order," and reactionary voices go so far as to declare in favor of a restored autocracy rather than the rule of the Soviets. A British fleet is said to be approaching Kiev. The Socialist and labor forces of Allied and neutral countries stand watching the struggle, and one of the most enthralling phases of the world drama will be their course in protecting their comrades of the new republics in their right to determine their own destinies. So vast are the potential riches of a cooperative Socialist order, so great is the initiative, the talent, the enthusiasm for the common good which it develops in its members, that no fear

need be felt for the recovery of the German and Russian peoples, provided they are let alone.

THE MEANING OF THE REVOLT

If it is true as reported that the German dynasty opened the war partly to repress the Socialist movement, the revolution presents to all Junkers one of the great lessons of history—which of course they will not learn. One of its greatest results must be counted to be the vast access of faith in themselves which it has given to the workers of Germany and the world. These marvelous new revolutions are proletarian and reveal a psychology of which the workers may be proud. They have not been revengeful, they have not been murderous, so that terror is falling away from the thought of revolution. They have demanded only Peace and Work, a chance to earn their own salvation. Not only have their regimes succeeded in establishing comparative order with a skill and rapidity which have astonished the world; but in Russia they have shown creative statesmanship and in one short year have travelled beyond the material into the spiritual, and with the hunger for the higher life of those who have been shut out, are establishing theatres, new schools, reprinting the classics in cheap editions, erecting monuments to the great humanitarians of history, and in general developing a new proletarian culture.

The people see a vision, a promised land which is not a far-off dream, but one to be realized now by their own efforts. There, war and poverty will become old ghost stories. They already see its fertile fields, its shining cities, its dancing children, its joyous men and women. Commerce, science, war are breaking all boundaries, and a new human union is forming. There is no safety, unless this be bound by friendship, and not enmity. The plain people, comrades of all lands, heartbroken over strife, are ready to rush into each other's arms and establish the new brotherhood—the international. That, and the will of the masses to be their own masters, is the inner meaning of the revolution of which Germany has just opened a new chapter.

Washington and the Coming Reconstruction

By HARRY W. LAIDLER

"The armistice has been signed," mused my friend, "and now for the great reconstruction. Profound economic changes are bound to take place. Washington will be the center of the reconstruction movement. It must be today the most interesting city in the world—a seething volcano of new ideas, new ideals."

My friend pictured the big things he thought should happen, must happen if the war was to bring any degree of compensation to humanity. His vision of a new order about to emerge was a glowing one and his enthusiasm was contagious.

A few days later I found myself in the capital city. I had held to the vision. It had been intensified during my trip to Washington by reading anew the letter of President Wilson to the New Jersey Democrats, the letter which described the days of "revolutionary change, when economic and social forces are being released upon the world whose effect no political seer dare venture to conjecture," changes which bid "us search our hearts through and through and make them ready for the birth of a new day—a day, we hope and believe, of greater opportunity and greater prosperity for the average mass of struggling men and women, and of greater safety and opportunity for children."

The city itself had indeed changed during the last twelve months. Huge apartment houses, governmental and private, had sprung up on all sides. Great structures had appeared as if by magic to take care of the new and the old government departments. Incidentally, the cost of living had soared skyward. Hotels had long waiting lists and trolley cars, long lists of strap-hangers.

WAR TIME ACTIVITIES

And war-time activities had developed on every hand. There was the War Risk Insurance Board, one of the many divisions of the Treasury Department. Housed in a dozen buildings in Washington, it had grown within a few months to

be "the largest health and accident insurance company, the largest disbursing organization, and incomparably the largest life insurance company in the world." The bureau by the latter part of November had issued nearly forty billion dollars worth of insurance to more than four million members of the Army and Navy, and in the month of October, a slack month, had written "more than six times as much insurance as the largest commercial life insurance company in the world during the entire year of 1917."

There was the Railroad Administration, which had under its control by far the greater part of the gigantic system of railroads in the United States, formerly owned and controlled by 2,905 companies, containing 397,014 miles of tracks and employing an army of 1,700,814 workers.

In the old Post Office Building could be found the small United States Telephone and Telegraph Administration, which, however, did not function in the same fashion as did the railroad department, but had to content itself with the mere issuing of orders.

On G Street, N. W., there was the Washington headquarters of the United States Shipping Board, which proudly boasted of adding to the Merchant Marine by new construction, from August 1917, to November, 1918, over 500 vessels of nearly 3,000,000 dead weight tons—a larger amount of seagoing tonnage than was ever launched before in a similar period anywhere; of increasing the number of shipyards within a year from 61 to 203; of so adding to American shipways that they now total more than double the shipways in any other part of the world; of employing approximately 386,000 employes, with a weekly pay roll of \$10,500,000, and of raising the United States from the third to the leading ship-building country of the world.

Included in these multifarious activities also were those of the Food Administration, with its \$50,000,000 Wheat Corporation, its monopoly of sugar and its regulation of prices and commissions;

the Fuel Administration, the War Trade Board and the War Industries Board, occupying those long lowlying concrete buildings on the fringe of the town, and armed with manifold powers of regulation; the Department of Labor, with its War Policies Board, its Employment Service and constantly expanding departments, scattered throughout the city, and the Departments of Education, of Agriculture, of Interior, of Commerce, of War and of the Navy, with their greatly augmented functions.

The war had indeed given to the government vast and unheard of powers, and one seemed to see under his eyes the collectivist state in the making—a state without the democratic safeguards which Socialists demand, but far removed from the ideal of the worshipper of *laissez faire*.

And so, enthused by the vision of my friend, by the one-time dream of President Wilson and by a view of war-time changes, I journeyed forth to discover the plans which statesmen were proposing for the great reconstruction which was to come after the signing of peace.

CHANCES FOR RECONSTRUCTION

I tackled a levelheaded radical, devout worshipper of President Wilson, one who, for the past few months had been working day and night at an important job for the government and besides—strange as it may seem—had been observing social tendencies.

"There ain't going to be no reconstruction," he feared. A keenminded Harvard professor assented. A well known social reformer, ever optimistic, admitted that he as yet had made no dent with his plans, but, while not prophesying, believed that something would come out of it all.

"The fight will be," said another, "not to obtain further changes but to retain for the community the advances that the community has already made in labor standards and collective control during the war. That's where the big fight is coming."

What about Congress? Was it formulating any plans calculated to bring in the new day? Apparently not. Neither

the proposal for the Reconstruction Commission, backed by the President, nor the Republican bill had been passed. The Democrats had lost control of both Houses. There was no assurance that, after March fourth, any of the proposals of the Administration would be harkened to by the new legislators. The Democracy from the South had few constructive ideas. Little was expected from such Democratic centers as New York. The Democrats had been trained to keep silent until the President spoke and the Republican leadership was already urging a return to the *status quo ante*.

A few radical Senators and Congressmen were indeed holding informal conferences with another dozen members of government departments and social workers and were proposing a public reconstruction conference, but even the optimistic organizers of the conference did not hope for great practical results. The suggestion at the organizing conference that apparently met with the greatest approval was for such an ownership of the press that the people could know the truth.

I turned to the government departments. Surely, during the war, they had been laying plans for the time when peace should break out. But one found there in most cases little but confusion. Individuals there were in various departments who had given the after-the-war problems some consideration, but in few cases had any policy been clearly thought out and adopted by the department itself. There was little cooperation on vital matters between departments. There was much working at cross purposes, much jealousy, much friction.

The Food and Fuel Administrations were apparently looking forward to utter disintegration. Certain big social implications could be gleaned from their work. Most of the staff seemed unaware of these implications. To continue regulation and prevent speculation and exploitation in times of peace was described by one of them as mere "Prussianism," while public ownership of certain of the necessities seemed chimerical. Hundreds of clerks were hurrying back to their old jobs and it appeared that within a few months little would be left

of these administrations except a memory.

The Railroad Administration? The law said that the railroads were to be restored to private management twenty-one months after the coming of peace. All that the administration could do was to run the railroads the best way possible until the return was made. Congress might of course provide for government ownership. Ninety per cent of the railroad workers favored such a solution. Until the question was settled, the administration, for the most part, must mark time. The resignation of the Director General did not add to the certainty of things in this department. As the magazine goes to press, Secretary McAdoo now proposes retention of the railroads for a five-year period.

A similar uncertainty seemed to pervade the United States Shipping Board, a more permanent institution, pledged to an extensive shipping program which would take several years to carry out. The fight for a return of the merchant marine to private ownership had already begun and was strengthened a few days later by the attacks on public control of "Charlie" Schwab, the director of the Emergency Fleet Federation.

SOME DEFINITE PLANS

A few of the departments did have a definite policy. They knew what they wanted and were beginning to voice their desires. This was the case with the Telephone and Telegraph administration of which Secretary Burleson of the Post Office was the over-lord. "While the control of the telegraphs and telephones is temporary," declared the Postmaster General, "and will exist only until the ratification of the treaty of peace, yet the best results can be obtained only when these systems are owned by the government, made a part of the postal establishment and operated only with the view of serving the public and not making profits or guaranteeing returns on the investment. Government ownership of the telephones and telegraphs should not longer be delayed."

The Secretary of Agriculture had a number of suggestions for making its work more effective and life on the farm

more healthful and profitable—suggestions good in themselves but not exactly calculated to bring about the millennium.

In the Treasury Department, Secretary McAdoo seemed clear on one point—soldiers and sailors should be strongly advised to retain their insurance in the War Risk Insurance Board's hands—such insurance was the "safest, the cheapest, the surest" on earth.

The Secretary of the Labor Department was framing a report bristling with suggestions, but, before its issuance, the word was "mum." And in the meanwhile no one seemed to know what should be done concerning the problem of overshadowing immediate importance, —the question of securing jobs for demobilized soldiers and sailors. Theory there was, but how to whip that theory into practical working order was an unsolved problem. Nor did any dare prophecy concerning the future of such activities as now occupied the attention of the Employment Service and the War Labor Policies Board.

THE LAND SETTLEMENT PLAN

"If you are really looking for measures of reconstruction," said a journalist, "you should investigate the land settlement plan of the Department of the Interior."

Here indeed was a plan that had been formulated and made public. It was first advocated by Secretary Lane in the Spring during his Pacific coast trip and its advocacy, in somewhat different form, led to an unexpected enthusiasm. It was transmitted in a letter to the President, and later distributed broadcast.

There are in this country, in private and public hands, declared the Secretary, millions of acres of land which could be habitable with proper irrigation or drainage. These lands should be reclaimed, and sold by the government to the soldiers on easy terms.

"The work that is to be done, other than the planning, should be done by the soldier himself. The dam or the irrigation project should be built by him, the canals, the ditches, the breaking of the land and the building of houses should, under proper direction, be his occupation. He should be allowed to make his own home, cared for while he is doing it, and given an interest

in the land for which he can pay through a long series of years, perhaps 30 or 40 years.

The plan is regarded as a hopeful sign. Its critics, however, are many. "What the government will do," said one, "is to increase through improvements the value of millions of acres of land, turn this land over to soldiers on easy terms, and then, the soldiers, bored by farm life or unable to get along, will sell out cheap to eager speculators. The scheme will satisfy the peoples' desire to show appreciation to the soldiers, but its chief beneficiaries will be the land speculators, not the soldiers. There is no guarantee in the scheme for a profitable wage. The Department of the Interior has failed to ask the Department of Labor or the Department of Agriculture for its cooperation. The government should lease the land to the soldiers, not sell it. In thus doing it could insure that the soldiers and the community at large, not land speculators, reaped the benefit. If the plan is carried out, at most it will mean a few thousand more farmers. It has no big social significance."

"You see," said another liberal-radical, "why we are not getting excited about reconstruction—why many of us are getting disillusioned. The one scheme outside of the retention of war-collectivism that seems to have any support is that for land settlement, and that is not likely to cause any fundamental change. And as for the retention of war-collectivism, that, at this date, is problematical. Congress is apathic and without a vision. The forces of reaction are united and aggressive. The press is for the return of private control. Liberals, during the war, have been doing little or no constructive thinking. They have either been blissfully leaving everything to President Wilson, or have been clubbed into intellectual unconsciousness. The atmosphere in Washington and throughout the country during the war was such that to talk about reconstruction was looked upon almost as a crime. What was done had to be done furtively."

"A few liberal weeklies, a few scattered groups, and here and there an ag-

gressive group of labor and the Socialist movement seem the only agencies fighting against the return of pre-war individualism and for public ownership and democratic management of the services now governmentally managed and for the keeping up of labor standards. To win out, these must be far more united and militant than they are at the present time."

"Wait," said his chum. Perhaps President Wilson will start a real movement forward in his message of December 2nd."

The President visited the House. He delivered his message. He did mention Secretary Lane's scheme. He did mention the railroads. He told Congress that he had "no confident judgment" of his own on that question. That seemed the limit of his remarks on economic reconstruction, and one was led to wondering whether those who returned from the trenches with their "new view and a new impatience of all mere phrases," would demand "real thinking and sincere action," which was so absent from the president's pronouncements, which seems at present so far removed from the atmosphere of Washington.

THE FUTURE

There is indeed still a chance that permanent and significant advances may be made in our industrial structure as a result of the war. Federal insurance, the federal control of the shipping industry, of the railroads, telegraphs, telephones and cables, and of employment and public health agencies may be retained and extended; these utilities may be nationalized and democratized, and this socialization may bring in its wake an irresistible movement for complete industrial democracy. It is a goal worth fighting for. It may be attained, but if it is attained, it will not come as a result of a blind trust in a democratic leader; it will not come as a part of an inevitable period of reconstruction; it will come only as a result of the most intelligent, the most constructive, the most united, the most sacrificial efforts that believers in industrial democracy can find in their power to make.

A Constitutional Convention

By RALPH SAMUEL.

One hundred and thirty years have passed since the adoption of our constitution, but little or no trace can be found of an attempt to call a convention to propose amendments. Individual mutations there have been, but none through the agency of a constituent assembly. Perhaps our governmental structure, as amended from time to time, has proved passably effective and satisfactory, but we are now concerned with the doubt that it will see us through the post bellum reconstruction days.

Up to the middle of the nineteenth century, when our nation may be said to have come of age, the constitution proved an admirable democratic instrument. The Civil War and the industrial era that followed monopolized the political thoughts and trends of the next few decades to the exclusion of any desires for constitutional reform. Only in recent years has the conviction grown that our political, economic and social progress is in a fair way to be garrotted by the outworn checks and balances so astutely conceived in 1789. More intensified becomes that conviction when we attempt to visualize the likelihood of our adoption of a program comparable to the splendid, unequivocal aims of the British Labor Party.

OBSTACLES TO CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Obstacles and objections, seemingly insuperable, are instantly brought to mind by the mere mention of the practicality of a federal constitutional convention to formulate an effective reconstruction program. The very hugeness of the convention plan is well nigh staggering. The prospect of the years of propaganda; the political obstacles that must be overcome before the convention call is approved by the legislatures of thirty-two states; the doubt that the personnel of the assembly would measure up to the epoch-making task: these are weighty factors that bid for procrastination.

But such a convention may well be the *sine qua non* of the coming reconstruc-

tion movement. Specific amendments may have sufficed so far to guide our progress, faltering and gradual as it has been. In the decades to come it seems beyond doubt that constitutional barriers will balk every effort for economic and social advancement of the nation. Patchwork amendments will not and should not suffice. We have another resort more indicative of adequate results, more compatible with our needs.

CONVENTION PLAN FAVORED

It is surprisingly true that the patriarchal constitutional Fathers, planning the joint government of the thirteen states in 1787, relied mainly on future conventions to render the constitution "adequate to the exigencies of the nation." In Article V is found not only the permission but in fact the invitation to hold other constitutional conventions when political, economic, or social progress make patent the need. ". . . On the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several states (Congress) shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which . . . shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several states. . . ."

A brief survey of the historical details leading up to the adoption of that article is perhaps pertinent. The first conclusion of the delegates in the convention of 1787 on the question of future constitutional changes was to this simple effect: "That provision ought to be made for the amendment of the Articles of the Union whenever it shall seem necessary." Later, in the closing days of the assembly, the *modus operandi* for future political changes was expressed more formally in the following provision: "On the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the Union for amendment to this Constitution, the (National) Legislature shall call a Convention for that purpose."

Until the closing day of the gathering that expression stood as the best thought

and opinion of the delegates; that amendments should only be made through similar conventions. Just before the acceptance of the Constitution as a whole, and the ordering of its engrossing, James Madison introduced an article on amendments which was finally accepted, reading exactly as Article V appears.

So in agitating for a post bellum constitutional convention, egalitarians are after all demanding only the pursuance of that course which the constitution ordained as the main road of amendment to be followed. And, unless we are to travel that road, indubitably our social and economic program having little vitality, cannot be comparable to the sterling doctrines of Henderson *et al.*

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION AND PROGRESS

Perhaps it is an exaggeration to affirm that fundamental constitutional revision is a prerequisite to vital and accelerated well-ordered progress. Perhaps we may be committing an egregious error by minimizing the vision that our two major and controlled political parties possess. However, only optimism can visualize the Republicans or Democrats, in convention assembled, adopting as platform planks the articles for a genuine new social order.

Let us take the charitable view, however, and let us conceive of a Congress and Executive, duly elected, properly following the dictates of the party platform. We should still, unfortunately, be held by a sort of Constitutional "mortmain." The recent vetoing of the Federal Child Labor Law by the Supreme Court emphasizes the intolerable situation we would face. Of what avail would be an apparent victory in putting on the statute books legislation enforcing a National minimum in the standard of living, the regulation of hours of labor, the adoption of national safeguards for education, employment and health? What of uniform marriage and divorce laws? What of old age and sickness insurance? Will the Supreme Court pronounce yea or nay on these weighty matters of progress?

Turning from the social to the economic: Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to establish post-offices. We can not expect to find anachronistic mention of powers to operate, in times of peace, the railroads, the waterways, the telegraph and telephone lines. Further, will any Constitutional proviso be conjured up to negate a national budget or to prevent categorical anti-trust legislation?

From the economic to the political; is not our talk of entering a League of Nations specious and futile? If the decisions of such a league are to be backed up by potential force, we must remember that while our Senate enjoys the treaty-making powers, only Congress as a whole may declare war.

AMENDMENTS IN OTHER LANDS

In no other nation will a rigid constitution impede post bellum progress. England will fortunately need no constituent assembly to precede the adoption of a program that bids fair to be a paragon. For the constitution of England can be altered with the utmost facility. Moreover, it takes no precedent or has no authority over any law of the land, representing solely a collection of enactments over a period of many centuries. In France, the National Assembly, by the passage of an act rendering itself a Constitutional Convention, *ipso facto*, takes on that character. Italy, the German States, Hungary, Belgium, Greece and Norway, among others, all possess constitutions amendable, through one plan or another, with no concomitant difficulty.

The United States alone must tender to the Supreme Court its reconstruction program, there to be judged in accordance with the wishes of the constitutional "Fathers," as viewed by their "divinely inspired" conclusions in 1787. Unless our efforts are linked up with a Constitutional Convention, every step forward will feel the restraining hand of a court, still measuring our needs by the standards of a governmental suit of clothes cut and tailored in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

The Rising Tide of Democracy in Education

By HARRY DANA

When everything else in the world has been made safe for democracy, men may at last turn and apply democracy to our education. One might suppose that democracy would begin with education—that we would first train students in our schools and colleges in those democratic principles which we wanted later to work out in our national and international life. Educational institutions might be expected to be ahead of the time and to offer in advance a model of democratic administration for political governments to follow. On the contrary, if the form of government of our countries is a century behind our ideas, the form of government in our colleges seems to be several centuries behind that of our countries.*

What is the fatal tendency in education which makes it cling so persistently to the past? Essentially education should be a process of evolution by which the old ideas yield, giving place to new; but in practice it seems to be ever an imposition of the older upon the younger. But just as the older professor now dominates over the young instructor, and the teacher over the student and the upper classman over the under-classman; so throughout education the ideas of former generations seem to pre-dominate over those of the present. The President of one of our greatest universities has actually said: "The duty of one generation is to pass on to the next, unimpaired, the institutions it has inherited from its forbears."

A reactionary pull, then, seems to be constantly tugging our education backward. Truth seems to be looked upon not as something living, growing, forever changing and forever undiscovered, but as consisting of certain "eternal verities," once for all delivered. I remember, when we were students at college, how Professor William James brought Mr. H. G. Wells out to look us over and how Mr. Wells came to the conclusion that at our college men acted

as though all the thinking in the world had been done and as if their business were merely to collect the souvenirs. In some ways this was only too true. When we wanted to discuss Socialism and feminism, we were told by our president: "A college is no place for contemporary and contentious subjects."

During the war, certain contemporary and contentious subjects in particular have been taboo. At one school, even so respectable a program as that of the League to Enforce Peace was forbidden as a subject for debate. Peace was not to be discussed until it had become a dead issue. Sometimes this suppression of free discussion has overreached itself amusingly. For example, when Professor Dewey was said to be standing up for the high school teachers' right of free speech, someone exclaimed: "Why, no, that cannot be so. Mr. Dewey is pro-Ally." On the other hand, it was said of a certain Harvard professor that a clear indication of his Teutonic sympathies was his frequent use of the words "peace" and "democracy." What a strange pass have we come to, if "pro-Ally" has become synonymous with opposing free speech and "pro-German" with caring for democracy!

Now that the war is over and the problems of war are giving place to those of reconstruction, we must face afresh what is perhaps the most fundamental problem of all—that of the reconstruction of our education. We talk everywhere glibly of "the rising tide of democracy," but are we so sure that in education this tide is not really falling instead of rising? When we look about us and see in our schools and universities military training imposing an ideal of unquestioning obedience in the place of developing independent judgment, when we see our college courses becoming more conservative and our college control becoming more autocratic, we may well think that the tide is at a low ebb.

THE TIDE TURNING

There are, however, indications in American education that the tide is already beginning to turn. The president

* See the paper by Evans Clark summarized in the last number of the Intercollegiate Socialist, page 24.

of that university whose motto is "Veritas" has actually declared that his professors, both in and out of the classroom, should be permitted to tell the truth. Professors, like other unskilled laborers, are forming their unions. They are demanding self-determination for teachers as well as for Jugo-Slavs and Czecho-Slovaks. College Liberal Clubs have been formed which are suggesting among other things that some sort of social science should be taught even to students of mechanical science. "Social science" is becoming a word to conjure with. The "Rand School of Social Science" has increased tenfold during the year in its new quarters in the "People's House." Alluring plans have been put forth for a new super-college, an "Independent School for Social Science." Even the National Education Association is recommending some study of social science in the secondary schools. The common people are coming to realize that from now on we must entirely change our whole study of industrial and of international relations. If then, for the moment, the tide of democratic education in America seems no painful inch to gain, "far back through creeks and inlets making, comes silent flooding in the main."

EDUCATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION ABROAD

When we turn our eyes across the ocean, we see in the very countries that were in the throes of war, in England and France and Germany, such sweeping educational changes as should put us in America to shame. At the very moment when our Supreme Court was deciding that the prevention of child labor was no concern of the nation, England was totally prohibiting the employment in industry of all children of school age. While a president of an American college announces that of those who pass the admission examinations only those who have a "law-abiding spirit" will be admitted to receive the education, European educators are realizing that these rebel spirits are just the ones who most need the training. While in America classical scholars were meeting in Princeton to build intrenchments about their threatened classics, in England men were turning their eyes towards the new sub-

jects that would need to be taught after the war.

While certain Bostonians were advocating taking all the German books from the Public Library and burning them in a bonfire on Boston Common, the citizens of London and Paris realized more than ever the importance of knowing German. At the very moment when we are insisting on compulsory military training in all our schools and colleges, the English are omitting it from their educational plans on the ground that it has no educational value. Is it not worth while then for us in America to glance for a moment at the revolutionary changes in education which are being introduced by the governments in Germany, in France, and in England?

In Germany the enormous "German Teachers' Union," 125,000 strong, with the help of the Socialists in the Reichstag, is demanding that the German government shall do away with the old-time class distinctions which have divided the current of education into two channels—one for the nobles and one for the common people—and that from now on there shall be one continuous stream of education in Germany for all classes alike.

In France there is a similar movement to extend the bounds of free public education. A bill has been introduced in the Chamber of Deputies proposing to extend the full-time education of every individual up to the age of 16 and to establish a continuation of part-time education combined with work up to the age of 20.

In England the much-discussed Fisher Education Bill does not go quite so far as the French bill, aiming at full-time education for all up to 14 and continuation half-time education for all up to 18, but even this advance is revolutionary in England. Before the war free secondary school education was provided for scarcely one per cent. of the children. Now it is to be provided for all.

This bill, introduced a year ago by the new Minister of Education, Herbert Fisher, has, after twelve months of the most heated discussion, passed the House of Commons and the House of Lords and been ratified as law by the King. When the industrial interests in

the Commons cried out against a bill which would keep the young workers so much longer out of the factories, Mr. Fisher would reply: "There is nothing sacrosanct in itself about industry. The real interest of the state consists not in its industry, but in the maintenance of the welfare of its citizens."

The full fruits of this act will not be seen till the next generation grows up; but by it England has put herself at the forefront of the educational world. This act, moreover, is merely the opening wedge for more wide-reaching plans. A book such as J. H. Badley's* shows what schemes are in store. More books on education have been put forth in England in the last three years, the very years of the war, than in the previous thirty. H. G. Wells, in "The Education of Joan and Peter," shows his interest in these educational problems, and in his "In the Fourth Year" he says: "This and no other is the hour for educational reconstruction. It is in the decisions and re-adjustments of schools and lectures and courses far more than in anything else, that the real future of Great Britain will be decided." Lord Haldane echoes the same idea: "The whole future of the British nation rests on its educational system."

DEMAND OF THE WORKERS

But to me the really interesting thing about this great educational movement in England is that it does not spring alone from the brains of a few high-brows like Fisher or Wells or Haldane, but rises from a demand of the working

classes which cannot be gainsaid. The British Labor Party in its reconstruction program couples together the workers by hand and by brain and demands that the surplus wealth be spent for the teaching of that "science which is the parent of law." The workers' co-operative societies are working out their own plans for a new education. Above all, the Workers' Educational Association, now some fourteen millions strong, has demanded a complete education of all children from 2 to 16—"a highroad that all may travel from the Montessori nursery schools to the University." When the objection was raised of the expense of such a plan they pointed out that for its most ambitious educational schemes a whole year's cost would be less than the expenditure of one week of war.**

The people, then, throughout the world are demanding that the governments shall and must provide an education that will raise every one of their citizens to the level of his highest possible development. It is not a question whether a nation can afford it; it is a question whether a nation can afford to do otherwise. What the people everywhere are demanding is not a reform of education, it is a revolution in education.

And so, in education, as in industry and in art and in national and international government, however remote may seem the rise of democracy, yet those who have ears to hear can hear "down the vast edges drear and naked shingles of the world" the roar of the incoming tide.

* J. H. Badley, "Education after the War," Blackwell, Oxford, 1917. See also F. G. Watts, "British Education after the War," Watts, London, 1917.

** For many of these statements, I am indebted to a chapter on Educational Reconstruction in England in T. E. Sargeant's "Handbook of American Private Schools," Boston, 1918.

The 1918 Socialist Vote

By EVANS CLARK

Several causes have contributed to prevent an accurate canvass of the Socialist vote at this time (December 6th). The soldier vote has held up the early compilation of the official returns by state governments. The anti-Socialist activities of the United States govern-

ment have so clogged and blocked the usual channels of party information and the machinery for its output that the Chicago office has been unable to send out the unofficial returns. Interference with the mails, suppression of Socialist papers, the denial of their mailing privi-

leges, and the indictment of the National Secretary as well as the imprisonment of many local officers made the usual party activity difficult if not actually dangerous.

In spite of these handicaps, however, there is enough information at hand to hazard a guess at the actual state of affairs. Full reports have come through from some localities which may serve as a basis for judgment.

Were it not for the universal attempt by the business-owned press of the country to make Socialism stand for pro-Germanism in the public mind, were it not for the astounding campaign by the newspapers aided and abetted by leading business men, and even certain branches of the Federal government, to make Socialism synonymous with Bolshevism and Bolshevism synonymous with murder, pillage and rape, were it not for this utter pollution of the waters of public judgment and opinion, the first returns from the 1918 election would be profoundly discouraging to those Socialists who do not care to blink the facts. Perhaps they are ground for discouragement even in spite of the circumstances.

At all events the Socialist vote for 1918 apparently has done little more than hold its own. The brilliant promise of the 1917 elections has faded—at least for the present. There are, however, some exceptions to the rule. Minneapolis and Milwaukee have made remarkable gains in the face of every obstacle. But it is doubtful whether the rest of the country will even begin to follow their lead.

New York City is in many respects a poor mirror of things American. Past experience, however, has shown it to be fairly representative of Socialist feeling and strength.

NEW YORK CITY

New York was a Socialist disappointment in the last election. With a very considerable increase in the total vote caused by the newly enfranchised women, the Socialist strength has actually waned since the Mayoralty election of 1917. From 1916 to 1918, however, the Socialist vote for governor increased from 38,000 to 85,000, ap-

proximately 125 per cent; the total gubernatorial vote 42 per cent. The real Socialist gain was therefore over 80 per cent.

The 1916 Congressional vote in New York City districts was 51,618. The 1918 figure was 110,921. But the vote for Morris Hillquit for Mayor last fall was almost 145,000. Of course the Hillquit vote last year was abnormal. Public opinion had not been inflamed against Socialists, the peace sentiment was allowed freer rein, and the character of Mr. Hillquit's opponents certainly worked him no harm, while his own ability was no mean asset and the local issue was clean cut. The stage was set for a Socialist landslide. On the other hand 1916 was a Socialist off-year. The relative strength of the Socialist Party in the United States in 1916 was approximately what it had been in 1904. That the 1918 vote should not have risen to the Hillquit mark is not surprising, but that it should have made a gain of only 80 per cent over 1916 is disappointing.

The loss of eight seats in the New York State Assembly was more spectacular than symptomatic. The Socialist delegation in 1919 will be two instead of ten. But six of the eight who failed of reelection were defeated only by a fusion of the Democrats and Republicans against them. In 1917 their opposition was divided.

Then, too, the districts have been gerrymandered since the last election. The new boundaries were in many cases dictated more by anti-Socialist politics than by public need and desire. The defeat of Rogoff, candidate to succeed Whitehorn, and of Assemblyman Feigenbaum for reelection in three-cornered fights were both in districts re-arranged by up-state old party politicians. Even at that Rogoff's margin of loss was but 200 and it is claimed by the Socialist managers that these votes were stolen.

The defeat of Meyer London for Congress was a fair test at least of his own personal strength in his district. An increase of only 200 votes over 1916 was not sufficient to dominate a combined opposition. It is freely admitted, however, that Mr. London's opposition to the views of the rank and file of his party

was largely responsible for the weakness of his campaign. The result in his district was not so much a defeat for Socialism as a defeat for Meyer London.

Had it not been for a Republican Democratic fusion four Socialist Congressmen from New York might easily have been elected. London would have won hands down, and Lee, Nearing and Hillquit would probably have triumphed had the fight been three-cornered. The three parties would have been split fairly even in the 13th, 14th, and 20th with the odds in favor of Socialists. Nearing's astonishing campaign in the 14th raised the vote from 2,536 in 1916 to 6,168. Lee's increase was 3,471 over 1,644 and in a fight waged for him in his absence Hillquit's vote was 6,005 more than his active personal campaign total of 4,129 in 1916.

One of the most interesting features of the New York City returns was the large increase in districts that hitherto have returned but a nominal vote. For instance, the vote in the 16th district, an Irish-Italian section of the middle East Side, increased from 506 in 1916 to 2,304 this fall. Another district, the 7th, climbed from 452 to 5,566. Only one district, the 4th, showed a lower figure in 1918 than 1916.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES

The few returns from cities up-state are more encouraging even in the face of the increase due to women voting. Buffalo, rapidly striding to the front as a Socialist stronghold, reports a 500 per cent increase over 1916. Brill, Socialist candidate in the 41st Congressional district, polled 6,691 this year. The 1916 vote in this same district was 1,091. The total Socialist strength in the city is 10,000 as against 2,000 two years ago. Syracuse reports that Ervin for Governor received 2,432 last fall, while Lee's figure in 1916 was 931. Russell in 1912, however, polled 1,911 in Syracuse. Yonkers reports a 400 per cent increase over 1916 without the soldier vote. The gain over 1917, however, is only 40 per cent.

Meagre returns from New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Connecticut indicate, if anything, a loss of strength. Bridgeport reports 468 votes against 623 in

1916. The new Labor Party, formed there early in the fall, polled 232. In Hartford the vote fell from 614 to 457. The New Britain and Rockville figures show gains of only a handful of votes although the latter boasts its first Socialist Alderman. After serving four terms in the Pennsylvania State Legislature, James H. Maurer was defeated for re-election in the Reading district. The New York Call of November 7th is authority for the statement that "The Socialists of New Jersey have more than held their voting strength." Newark returns show a Socialist strength of 1 to 15 for the old parties.

THE WEST

Reports from Western States are so scanty as to make any intelligent estimate of Socialist strength difficult. The California State Secretary reports a 55,000 Socialist vote for the state ticket as against 43,263 in 1916 for President. Utah reports a vote of 1700 as against 798 in 1916. A Socialist judge was elected in Hutchinson County, South Dakota, against a "100 per cent American" old-party fusion candidate. A stray report from Arkansas shows that one O. T. Green has been elected Justice of the Peace on the Socialist ticket in Combs with a vote greater than the two other candidates combined.

In Minneapolis, while Socialist Mayor Van Lear failed of re-election against a combined Democratic and Republican opposition, there was a net gain of three members in the city legislature. Van Lear carried seven out of the thirteen city wards but lost by a close margin: 27,542 against 28,715. It is interesting to note that one of the newly elected aldermen succeeds a Socialist who, as the report puts it, "wavered on the party's war position."

It is from Wisconsin, however, that the most substantial gains have been made in the Socialist strength. Victor Berger, candidate for Congress in the 5th district, was elected by a large margin over his Republican and Democratic opponents. Another Congressman would have undoubtedly been elected had it not been for a fusion against him. A delegation of three in the State Senate has

been increased to five and there will be 18 Socialists in the next Assembly, instead of only 13 as at present. The Socialist captured every contested office in Milwaukee, Sheboygan, Calumet and Marathon Counties, and Emil Seidel, former Socialist Mayor of Milwaukee, swept Milwaukee County as candidate for Governor of the State.

The total state vote, all parties included, increased 25 per cent since 1916 but the Socialist vote increased 90 per cent. For the first time in the history of the Socialist movement in the United States the party is the major minority in

a legislative hall. The next State Assembly will show a division of 79 Republicans, 18 Socialists and 4 Democrats.

The evidence is too meagre to serve as a basis for any final judgment on the present state of the Socialist movement. It will not be until well into the new year, in all probability, that the official Congressional canvass will be available for all parts of the country. What scraps of information have come to hand, however, indicate that when the truth is finally known it will be food for sober reflection by those who have the Socialist movement most at heart.

Guildsmen and American Socialism*

By JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

With the tremendous impetus given by The Great War to state control and socialization there has come a natural reaction toward industrial democracy and the self-expression of the worker. In its political form this reaction has fastened the attention of the world upon Russia; in its economic manifestation it is attaining a less dramatic significance in that home of individualism, Great Britain. Guild Socialism is the movement which shares with the Labor Party the enthusiasm of the present-day British radical, and expositions such as those of Richard Roberts and Ordway Tead are spreading the message among us also.

Of the two books under consideration, both have already appeared in large part in *The New Age*. "National Guilds," now in the second edition, represents the ideas of before the war; "Self-Government in Industry" shows mature thought upon the peculiar industrial conditions of England during the last four years.

MEANING OF GUILD SOCIALISM

Without attempting to summarize the suggestive chapters of both books dealing with the nature of industry and of

the state, I will quote at the outset the lucid definition of National Guilds given by Cole:

"We, who call ourselves National Guildsmen, look forward to a community in which production will be organized through democratic associations of all the workers in each industry, linked up in a body representing all workers in all industries. On the other hand, we look forward to a democratization of the State and of local government, and to a sharing of industrial control between producers and consumers. The State should own the means of production: the Guild should control the work of production. In some such partnership as this, and neither in pure Collectivism nor in pure Syndicalism, lies the solution of the problem of industrial control." (p. 109.)

The details of guild organization are worked out provisionally by Cole in his later chapters, in what seems to the layman a very satisfactory fashion. Hobson, in the chapter entitled "The Approach to the Guild," gives a vivid picture of the probable incidents of transition, both authors agreeing in the implication that the fall of the present system is to be brought about entirely by the economic weapon, radical political activity receiving at most mere toleration. (Hobson, Chap. X.)

STATE SOVEREIGNTY

There appears a divergence of opinion in the important problem as to what will constitute the supreme authority in the

*This article deals primarily with *Self Government in Industry*, by G. D. H. Cole and *National Guilds*, by S. G. Hobson, edited by A. R. Orage.

community. Cole speaks of confronting "Parliament with an industrial body which has an *equal* claim to be representative of the nation as a whole" (p. 87, italics mine), and goes on to say "The ultimate sovereignty in matters industrial would seem properly to belong to some joint body representative equally of Parliament and of the Guild Congress. Otherwise the scales must be weighted unfairly in favor of either producers or consumers." Hobson tells us, however, "We remain Socialists because we believe that in the final analysis the State, as representing the community at large, must be the final arbiter." (p. 133.) There seems a slight disagreement also regarding the share of the community as a whole in the product of the guild, Hobson claiming for the State an amount from each guild proportionate to the number of its members (p. 150) thus retaining unequal profits among the guilds, but Cole demanding from each guild the entire surplus product, enforcing in this way an equality of advantage. (p. 283.)

Generally speaking, the vision of Guild Socialism here presented is an inspiring one, and criticisms apply chiefly to matters of detail which will naturally work themselves out in application. First in importance is the discrepancy just mentioned as to the co-ordinate or subordinate position of the Guild Congress as compared with Parliament. To us the latter seems imperative as the only escape from possible deadlock; the history of the House of Lords bids fair to be typical of the co-ordinate body under a democracy. Moreover, a danger seems to us to lurk in the complete sovereignty of the guilds as such because of the fact that these can never become universally representative of the people. Hobson takes up frankly the several classes of workers (artists, preachers, domestics, etc.) not amenable to guild routine, and his disposal of their cases is hardly satisfactory in view of the fact that the non-organized man must lose one-half of his voice in the community and all of his claim upon social insurance. The tremendous class of women who for a period of their lives, at least, must follow the profession of mother and housewife presents another problem, rendered

even more serious because these women are the natural representatives of the necessarily disfranchised class, children. The inherently individualistic character of the mother's profession would render any guild affiliation almost entirely arbitrary in character. Last of all, we have the case of the temperamental free lance, the man or woman who in any society refuses organization. The territorial theory of representation, by which such a person possesses automatic rights of complete citizenship, seems to us the nearest approximation to the thorough protection of the protestant and his utilization as a factor in society. His isolation from the guild must unavoidably deprive him of a voice in industrial control as such; does democracy permit us to deprive him also of one-half his voice in the supreme affairs of the community? The solution of Hobson rather than of Cole, by which the state must in the last analysis be the arbiter, seems to us the only method of securing that prerequisite of democracy, the automatic possession of his share in sovereignty by the non-conformist.

SOCIALISM AND STATE SOCIALISM

While both Cole and Hobson justly claim the name of Socialists as well as Guildsmen, there is a trace of insularity in their more general chapters which is somewhat surprising. Cole, for example, shows no conception of the distinction between State Socialism and political Social Democracy. He uses interchangeably the terms Collectivism, State Socialism, and Socialism, and makes such surprising statements as these:

"They would answer *Poverty*, when they ought to answer *Slavery*—they would answer unhesitatingly that they stand for the *Abolition of Poverty*. On that issue every Socialist is with them. But their answer to my question is none the less wrong." (p. 110.)

"The Collectivist urges that the workman has to choose between two tyrannies, and that the tyranny of State Socialism will be less oppressive, as well as more efficient than that of the Guild." (p. 233.)

The same apparent unfamiliarity with the principles of political Socialism appears in Hobson's declaration that the wage system must be abolished. After nine careful chapters of analysis he arrives at this conclusion, familiar to So-

cialists as the fundamental of Marxism and the common-place of the street speaker, and announces it as "a new hope." (p. 98.)

To both writers the term political Socialism connotes on the one hand the State Socialism which they rightly or wrongly predicate of the Fabians, and on the other the parliamentary tinkering with the wage system which they conceive to be the end and aim of the Labor Party. "There is this in common between Municipal and State Socialism: Both are equally committed to the exploitation of labor by means of the wage system." (Hobson, p. 21.) "When . . . a municipality took over its water or gas works, the Socialists were quick to acclaim it as a Socialist victory." (*Ibid.*)

GUILD SOCIALISM AND THE LABOR PARTY

The attitude of Cole to the Labor Party is courteous, although its tone of patronage is somewhat amusing in view of recent events: "The final result we know: it is a Labor Party of which Capitalism has lost all fear." (p. 103.) Hobson, on the other hand, mars his fine revolutionary spirit by personal attacks upon the Labor Party and its leaders which appear to us inexcusable. Disregarding these actual blemishes, we quote the following: "So deeply ingrained was this idea of wages . . . that Mr. Keir Hardie and his I. L. P. colleagues have always contended that the class struggle is extraneous to the Socialist movement, and that it is heretical to base Socialist action upon it." (p. 9.)

In view of this unfortunate division of Socialist forces in Great Britain, we can understand better than before reading these books why it is that British radicals in this country, more especially the advocates of Guild Socialism, are inclined to remain aloof from the American Socialist Party. To them political Socialism, when it does not connote the doctrinaire Marxism of the old S. D. F., stands chiefly for bureaucracy and State Capitalism. The class struggle and the abolition of the wage system are not as

with us the foundation of a Socialist Party, but new ideas to be injected into the working class movement.

GUILD SOCIALISM AS APPLIED TO THE AMERICAN MOVEMENT

In America, however, we of the Socialist Party are ready, with very little persuasion, to welcome the movement of Guild Socialism as the natural expansion of two ideas which have long been acknowledged, but somewhat undeveloped, among us, namely, industrial unionism and the future control of industry by the workers. In 1911, when, according to Cole, the Transport Strike was setting men to thinking about the future of Trade Unionism, we were already in the throes of an intra-party discussion which terminated in the endorsement of the industrial union principle by the national convention of 1912; and since that date the attitude of the Socialist Party has been represented by the words of Debs, "I am an industrial unionist because I am a Socialist, and a Socialist because I am an industrial unionist."

In their outlines of the Co-operative Commonwealth, moreover, the present generation of American Socialists have always provided for decentralization of control, and for the management of industry by the workers themselves rather than by a superimposed political state.

Rather than quote from later writers, we give the following from Hillquit's "Socialism in Theory and Practice," published in 1909, in order to show how long control by the workers has formed part of American Socialist thought: "The notion that the industrial affairs of the Socialist state will not be administered by officers elected by general popular vote, but by men chosen by the members of each separate trade and calling for their experience and general qualifications is generally accepted by the Socialists." (op. cit. p. 142.)

It is as a working out of the details of this management, and as a stimulus to its initiation in industry, that we welcome the contribution of Guild Socialism to international Socialist thought.

AMERICAN SOCIALISTS AND INDUSTRIAL CONTROL

The State Socialism of Bismarck has furnished a danger signal to collectivism throughout the world, and the tremendous increase of socialization developed by the war has stimulated every working class political party to the struggle for democracy. In our own country the Socialist Party has just made the demand for industrial control the chief point in its Congressional Platform, and those so-called Socialists to whom nationalization constituted the main issue have largely left the political body in enthusiasm for the present administration. While the British Fabians, rightly or wrongly we do not venture to affirm, have adopted the method of combining with state capitalist bodies for specific reforms, we have steadily abjured "municipal ownership" parties and insisted on democratic control as a *sine qua non*. In Germany a strong organization was built up on the principles of centralization; the American Socialist Party has left centralization to the old S. L. P. and perhaps sacrificed some elements of strength to the freedom of the state as against the national body. When war presented in its extreme form the issue of state supremacy, the American party maintained its stand as an irreconcilable minority, the only majority Socialist body among the belligerents so to do.

During the last four years even more than before, we American radicals have come to realize our indebtedness to our comrades of Great Britain—their maturity in international thought as compared with ours, their glorious defense of individual liberty by the Anglo-Saxon weapons of passive resistance, and last of all the thrilling outline of reform which has challenged the world in the platform of the Labor Party. It is natural, however, that in preoccupation with the larger problems of Europe, the British radicals have neglected to familiarize themselves with current movements in American Socialism. In an old essay of Lowell entitled "A Certain Condescension in Foreigners," the author expresses a gentle surprise at his own docility under the criticism of the chance

tourist. Possibly we American Socialists may ourselves be to blame for the evident ignoring of our party on the part of the European radical. The futility of government regulation of big business in the U. S. has, according to Cole, "all along been appreciated by the *revolutionary* wing of American Socialism. W. D. Haywood and Frank Bohn, in their book, 'Industrial Socialism,' declare with emphasis against the anti-trust campaigning of the politicians." In Mr. Cole's apparent belief that this opposition is confined to Mr. Haywood and Mr. Bohn and that the majority of the Socialist Party are followers of the defunct "Progressives," he is, we fear, not alone among European labor writers.

Modesty indeed becomes us, for our party is weak, tragically weak as compared with other members of the International. The American farmer is reactionary because of the presence until recently of the free homestead; the American middle class because of the rooted belief that freedom sprang full-armed into being with the Declaration of Independence; the American workingman because of the successive waves of immigration which have prevented homogeneity and class-consciousness. Yet the very postponement of successful action which our backwardness has brought about may have permitted a quiet solving of problems which in other lands have brought schism.

In Great Britain, for example, the wholesome theories of Karl Marx appear to have been consigned wholly to the doctrinaire Socialist Party, where, coupled with the time-honored hostility to religion, the family and reform, they have studiously been avoided by the Fabians, the Laborites and the Guildsmen alike. In our own Socialist Party, however, while Marx still furnishes a solid substratum to most of our economic reasoning, we find a practical "revisionism" characteristic of our platforms for the last ten years, and a frank disregard of theory conspicuous in the pages of most contemporary writers. The Labor Party platform, again, justly provokes our admiration, but we remember that "immediate demands" of perhaps cruder form have appeared in the 1908, 1912, 1916

and 1918 American platforms, and that our elected officials have worked for the enactment of these into law from 1911 in Wisconsin to 1918 in New York. The U. S., furthermore, notwithstanding, or possibly because of the reactionary character of the prevailing labor body, seems to be the only country where the Socialist Party bids fair to solve without division the problem of political and economic action with the attendant question of state and industrial organization for the future. In France and Italy the syndicalists and parliamentarians seem to be permanently separated; in Germany, until recently at any rate, the political manifestation has appeared supreme; in Great Britain a multiplicity of

groups have brought the antagonisms shown in Hobson's book. In the U. S. alone the principle of industrial organization has been acknowledged by the party since 1912, with the industrial unionist Eugene V. Debs representing the "center" of American Socialism.

From every point of view, then, the principles of Guild Socialism bid fair to be incorporated in American theory and practice—not as a teaching antagonistic to that of political Socialism, and not entirely as an extraneous contribution to be appended to our own theory, but as the careful and logical working out by the British mind of ideas which have long lain undeveloped in our conception of the future commonwealth.

The Irish Question: A Review

By FELIX GRENDON

IRELAND. By Francis Hackett New York. B. W. Huebsch. \$2.00.

According to a cherished literary legend, every Irishman is a rollicking adventurer, a genial vagabond, or a witty daredevil whose sole aim in life is to practise gallantry, perpetuate quips, or die in some chivalrous cause. Sooner or later, some particularly unruly brand of real Irishman runs up against each one of us, and jolts us out of our prepossession with the pleasing Sir Desmond of school lore and myth. When this happens to your Anglo-Saxon, he is fond of epitomizing the offender and all his race in some expression of concentrated venom: "The dirty, rowdy Irish—what can you expect?" The question is so passionately rhetorical as to invite instant suspicion. Are the rude and boisterous exhibitions of Hibernianism really signs of an inherent racial depravity or are they "merely pretty Fanny's way" resulting from centuries of brutal misrule?

No fairminded person will accept the former alternative after reading Mr. Hackett's broad and candid examination of the whole problem of Ireland. Not that this book fosters any illusions about the Irish. Mr. Hackett has no such

illusions. He characterizes the condition of the people with a pitiless veracity unequalled since the time of Swift. But he also takes the natural ground that the Irish today are precisely what any spirited race would become under a systematic rule of plunder, mismanagement, and coercion, or, in short, that Irish manners and morals are what English policy has made them.

"Whoever travels in this country and observes the faces and habits and dwellings of the natives, will hardly think himself in a land where either law, religion, or common humanity is professed." This is not the shriek of the professional patriot. It is one of the milder reflections on Ireland by Dean Swift, who was not even a home ruler, much less a rabid jingo. The sincerity, if not the ferocity, with which Swift attacked English misrule has been repeatedly matched by other energetic high-minded Englishmen since Swift laid down the cudgels. When we add to this fact the almost unchanging spirit of the Anglo-Irish ruling caste, from the time when an English baron ordered Irish babies to be killed because "nits will make lice," down to the brutal murder of Sheehy Skeffington, the British theory

of inherent Irish depravity and incompetence takes on another color, and the contemptuous question: "the dirty, rowdy Irish, what can you expect?" recoils on its English propounder with quite unexpected force.

Mr. Hackett casts all the arts and enchantments of a deep vein of poetry around what he calls the Unwritten Version of the relation between the native Irishman and those who have successively exploited him. The chief wrong of the Irish wage slave, like the chief wrong of the wage slave everywhere, is poverty. What causes this wrong to rankle with unendurable poignancy is the fact that the exploiters of Ireland aggravate their parasitism with all the irresponsible unscrupulousness of the stranger and the absentee. This is the straw that breaks the camel's back. Alike in the cases of Ireland, of other subject peoples, and of the whole female sex, the crying grievance is that there is a special human injustice added to the economic injustice under which the whole world groans.

Two great obstacles stand in the way of Irish self-government. One is the English Tory tradition, the other is Ulster hostility. In so far as the Tory position is not identical with Ulster's, it is summarized in the three objections put forward by Professor A. V. Dicey. There is the moral disgrace of surrender to Irish importunity, the material loss of resources in men and money, and the political danger in the close proximity of a foreign, perhaps a hostile, state.

The plea of "moral disgrace" surely reduces hedging to an absurdity. If we allow England to count this plea as a final argument against the return of her Irish booty, we shall have to allow every first class burglar to count it as a final argument against the return of stolen goods. Mr. Hackett pointedly says that "this moral loss and disgrace has been entailed much more by holding Ireland for the parasites than it could have been by any deliberate surrender. It has been entailed by losing 4,000,000 discontented citizens through emigration in sixty years!"

His answers to Dicey's other objec-

tions are equally pithy. Emphasis is laid on the reflection that, though England may have to take her chances with an autonomous Ireland, the need for practising a little considerateness and deference in place of bullying, wilfulness, and terrorism, will perhaps react wholesomely on the English character. The conversion of England to a decent, equalitarian attitude towards Ireland may even, as Mr. Hackett quite reasonably hopes, transform Ireland from the most vulnerable loop in the British Imperial chain to one of its strongest links.

But what about Ulster, that supposed Achilles heel of the self-determinist? Well, Mr. Hackett does not in the least play ostrich with the evidence, but boldly faces Ulster claims at their grandest. This permits him to strip away the gorgeous padding with which the Ulster bugaboo is tricked out and puffed up, and enables him to expose the death's head of vested interests which is the scarecrow's only solid part. And who or what are these vested interests? They are the Belfast capitalists and pro-English landlords who, in their anxiety to save Ulster from the "dunghill civilization" of the South, have studded the North with the foulest sweatshops and the filthiest slums in Europe.

But Protestants say with heat or passion: "What, sacrifice Ulster to the Romish whoredom?" Mr. Hackett does not try to minimize the religious difficulty. He merely applies a cooling poultice of facts. He points out that two distinct religious communities, as in Belgium, are not of necessity an insuperable barrier to union. He reminds us that any Home Rule bill passed by Protestant England is bound to include every reasonable democratic protection that Ulstermen can think of. And he lays stress on a most important fact, namely, that the Ulster Protestant is not as numerous nor the Catholic Bishop as firmly intrenched as is commonly supposed.

This point can hardly be made too often. Outspoken anti-clericals like Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells have said emphatically that the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland will go the way of the Catholic hierarchy in France as soon as Home

Rule is secure. In support of this view, we may note that Roman obscurantism has been hand in glove with English tyranny on more occasions than one, and that Nationalists like Michael Davitt have little use for the bishops. Says Mr. Davitt tersely: "A very few of the Bishops are moderate Nationalists. The majority are, if the truth were known, more against than for home rule."

Mr. Hackett reminds us that Ulster is an historic Irish province in which, despite centuries of colonization and persecution by Protestant overlords, forty-two per cent of the people are Catholics today. Ulster's claim to exclusion from Home Rule on self-determinist grounds is therefore not much stronger than her claim on religious grounds. Nor would leaving Ulster out save a single Ulster soul or wipe out a single Ulster slum. Exclusion would profit no one but a selfish gang of Anglo-Irish parasites and profiteers. And it would spell ruin at the start for the fiscal policy of any Irish government.

The fisherman's wife, in the Unwritten Version, says to her puzzled mate: "Before the country was born, I was born. We'll be all one people when we've the same justice in mind . . . It's justice I'm dreaming of, and my dream is a million years old." These words strike the keynote of Mr. Hackett's theme and illustrate the high level of noble thought and graceful expression on which the inquiry is maintained. Mr. Hackett surveys his problem with such dispassion and with such an eager consideration of

every angle—English or Irish, economic, religious or political—that his book will be a necessity to every student of international politics. For the strident petulance of the fanatic nationalist, he has no ear. True, Ireland serves to tune his lyre, but it is a fair inference that some form of international democratic government is his real flame. The case of Ireland versus England is the case of one of the most miserable of the subject nations against that master nation which makes the loudest professions of democracy. It is a good case to press against the Power that still drags Egypt, India, Arabia, and Mesopotamia in tow. And it is a particularly relevant time to press the case both because the great Peace Conference is at hand and because the conviction is growing that, as a matter of practical politics, the recognition rather than the suppression of nationality is the *modus vivendi* for a Federation of the nations of the world.

To the tangles and perplexities of his subject, Mr. Hackett has applied an original and insatiably inquiring mind. The Irish question has given rise to vivid writing and energetic thinking before. But it has seldom been treated with such entire freedom from conventional prejudices, current superstitions, and hackneyed political theories. And when has it ever inspired such a generous attempt to give every faction a hearing and every viewpoint fair play? The simple fact is that, while other able writers have intellectualized the story of Ireland, Mr. Hackett has humanized it, too. Therein lies the striking uniqueness of his stamp.

A League of Nations and Permanent Peace

By HARRY P. SALPETER

The Political Conditions of Allied Success. By Norman Angell. N. Y.: Putnam's. \$1.50.

The Structure of Lasting Peace. By Horace M. Kallen. Boston.: The Marshall Jones Company. \$1.25.

The End of the War. By Walter E. Weyl. N. Y.: Macmillan. \$2.

In the Fourth Year. By H. G. Wells. N. Y.: Macmillan. \$1.25.

The World Peace and After. By Carl Grabo. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf. \$1.

The Aims of Labor (including the "Memorandum on War Aims," adopted by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference in London and "Labor and the New Social Order," a draft report on Reconstruction submitted by a sub-committee of the British Labor Party). By Arthur Henderson. N. Y.: Huebsch. 50c. paper cover; \$1 cloth.

The League of Nations. By Viscount Grey. N. Y.: Doran. 5 cents.

We have won the war on the battlefield. Shall we lose it at the conference table? The armies of the Alliance and the German and Austrian revolutionists have succeeded in definitely "crushing" German militarism. Such a victory has been achieved as "military experts" dared not anticipate a year ago. That the Allied armies and the Socialist forces achieved a real, if not nominal, co-operation, no one will deny who is accustomed to facing facts. What will the Supreme War Council make of this victory? Their social and intellectual background hardly disposes them to the kind of settlement which radicals and liberals have announced as the only settlement certain to avoid a repetition of "this terrible thing." They are not men of international minds, who are willing to venture on a radical revision of the old international settlement whereby individual nations sought to gain as much as they could, whether by such a gain they violated the principle of nationality or not or whether by their arrangement they planted the seeds of hatred in the hearts of the conquered peoples. The old peace settlements were made on the cynical assumption that war was a condition of international life and that the duty of each nation was to strengthen itself in preparation for "the next war." Will the peace settlement of tomorrow be made on the same assumption? The great fear is that it may be so made. Says Dr. Weyl, "If . . . an imperialistic peace is made it will take place not because of the wickedness of individual men, but because, given the old standards, the line of least resistance runs in this direction." "Still more may we fear," says Mr. Henderson, "that the problems of reconstruction will be handled by men too impatient to think things through, too tired and cynical to respond to the glowing faith in a finer future for the world which now inspires the multitudes of common people who have striven so heroically and suffered so patiently during the war."

Says Mr. Angell, the most internationally minded among these writers, "The one thing which alone will enable us

to break the vicious circle is the general conviction that though this proposed system (the League of Nations system) *may* fail, the old certainly will. Upon the moral courage to act on that faith depends the survival of the Western democracies." And that for which the majority of the members of the Supreme War Council stand as virtual representatives is the idea of national sovereignty, not of international comity. That the latter excludes the former, men of their type will not readily admit. "Each nationality," says Dr. Kallen, "wants sovereignty. And national sovereignty is irresponsibility. Sovereignty is international anarchy." Our purpose is a moral purpose and the military victory was the necessary prelude to its achievement. Shall we then suffer the moral defeat in the midst of our rejoicing over the military victory? Such a defeat is not improbable and can be averted only by the substitution of a new set of men to take the place of those now at Versailles. Is the group at Versailles congenitally able to frame "a people's peace." They are, essentially, representatives of "governments," not of nations, and as such, disqualified to participate in a settlement whose essential purpose it ought to be to make impossible a repetition of an international war, a repetition which would lead, as even many conservative persons have remarked, to the literal ruin of civilization.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The essential spirit in which the terms of the peace will be written take precedence over the specific plans presented for the new international society, for the nature of the specific plans will be determined, largely, by the spirit of the peace. The true reconstruction may be impossible unless a real peace is achieved. Radicals and liberals must bend their efforts toward the attainment of such a peace.

America has no territorial stakes in Europe. Her victory lies in the adoption of a principle to guide future international policy. If that principle is not adopted, America will have lost. That idea for which this nation was originally committed has been best embodied in the phrase a league of nations. (Wells mod-

ifies the phrase and calls it significantly, a league of *free* nations.)

If the Allies wish to win this war in the ultimate sense, they must courageously face the implications of a democratic peace and generously submit to them. It is not empty rhetoric to say that the fate of the civilized world rests with the men delegated to the peace conference. Either a new world shall there be brought into being or we shall be sunk into the deepest degradation we have known. The world faces portentous alternatives; capitalistic domination, the terrible consequences of rendering such absolute homage to that vague entity, the State, as was never before exacted, except from slaves, the danger of armaments, the danger of universal military service, alternatives, the danger of which Mr. Grabo well points out. It is the faith of the enlightened men who have proclaimed themselves in favor of the prosecution of the war that this is the last war and that the victory of the Allies means the victory of peace. By which they mean, of course, that the Allies represent the international point of view, their governments being governments of the people. But is there not a danger that in the vital matter of making peace, the representatives of the people may be denied a voice? Such a denial would constitute the best proof of the governments' hypocrisy and of the inability of the common people to make their will articulate. I pray that the people may somehow be permitted a choice as to how peace shall be determined and the kind of government which the new world is to have.

SHIBBOLETHS STILL GOVERN

But, say some, the people are still enslaved by the shibboleths of imperialism and nationalism; they are still led by the demagogues of reactionarism. A reactionary press, we observe, is preaching the gospel of hate, of complete military domination, of a war after the war. But the hopeful ones point to Russia, England, France, Italy and now to Germany and Austria as proof that a war prolonged breeds revolution, or, at least, a compelling desire for lasting peace, a concentration of hate, not against the

people of one country but against the kings, crowned and uncrowned, the imperialists, the war-makers, of all countries. It is a question, however, whether a prolongation of war is to be desired that the eyes of the people may be opened to fundamental truth. I believe that the idea of the "nation international" will be accepted by the American people without such terrible and painful suffering as has already been entailed by the other combatants. I hope such a belief is not illusory. If the American people fail to stand behind President Wilson in his desire for lasting peace, if the reactionaries of this country succeed in leading the people away from his leadership to an advocacy of increased armaments and of universal military training for *the next war*, and if the people of this country do not join with the liberated peoples of Europe in working for a new kind of world, the future looks black indeed. Military union between Allied commanders and forces is not enough, political union between the leaders of the nations is not enough; there must be a union between the peoples and a means for the expression of that united opinion. "We Western Allies," says Mr. Wells, "know today what is involved in making bargains with governments that do not stand for their peoples." (He refers to the compact with the imperialist Russia.) "The League of Nations," he continues, "must be supported by sustained, deliberate explanation, and by teaching in school and church and press of the whole mass of all the people concerned. The League of Nations must come about like a marriage"—between the peoples.

A union between peoples of so many diverse nationalities, living under the dominion of the psychology of nationality cannot be effected immediately. But it must be effected sooner or later. The people in Europe have already seen what a voracious idol of human flesh they have built for their own destruction in the idea of national sovereignty. America need not learn through so terrible a sacrifice. To effect a sacrifice of "prejudice and preconception" for which Mr. Wells declares, is not to be so difficult a matter as the sacrifice of youth. America must visualize the phrase, A League

of Nations, just as they have begun to visualize it in England; she must no longer consider it a remote ideal *in vacuo*. "The establishment and maintenance of a League of Nations," says Viscount Grey, "is more important and essential to a secure peace than any of the actual terms of peace that may conclude the war: it will transcend them all. The best of them will be worth little, unless the future relations of States are to be on a basis that will prevent a recurrence of militarism in any State."

The great question is, How soon will the idea of self-sufficing national sovereignty become *universally* moribund? "So long as patriotic cant can keep the common man jealous of international controls over his belligerent possibilities," says Mr. Wells, "will he be the helpless slave of the foreign threat and 'Peace' remain a mere name for the resting phase between wars."

REACTIONARIES DISCREDITED

There is evidence in plenty, fortunately, that the speakers of patriotic cant are being discredited. If we were certain that the jingoistic press of America were really representative of the ideas and ideals of the American people, advocates of the League of Free Nations would not feel so hopeful. We feel that the press speaks for a class, not for the people. The press cannot see that the achievement of a complete military victory such as they desire makes impossible the victory of the idea for which this nation was committed to the cause of the Allies. The people desire Peace, universal, durable peace and some means whereby to ensure that the word Peace shall not be merely a name for the resting phase between wars. In the achievement of such a means the leaders of the Allies will have fought the war to make the world safe for democracy to a victorious end; in no other way.

Review of Books

THE FUTURE OF THE PEOPLE. Karl Liebknecht. Edited and translated by Sidney Zimand. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1918. 144 pp. \$1.25.

Sidney Zimand has performed a distinct service in bringing together the most

telling of the messages of Karl Liebknecht, Germany's famous Socialist leader. The book begins with an excellent preface by Walter E. Weyl and an introduction of Liebknecht, the man.

The volume contains among other documents Liebknecht's speeches and articles in opposition to war delivered at the outbreak of the European conflict, his outspoken refusal to support the military budget and his reasons for that refusal, his thrilling New Year's message to English Socialists written in December, 1914, his defense of Rosa Luxemburg, his telling and embarrassing questions to the government in the Reichstag, and in the Prussian Assembly, his vigorous denunciation of many of Germany's unjust acts during wartime, and the speech which caused his imprisonment. Of particular interest will be found the author's analytical address in the Prussian Assemblage on "Education." "This war," he declares, "which has destroyed so much, has also destroyed the last vestige of the bourgeois ideal of education." He severely criticized utilitarianism in education and the fact that the educational system as now conducted gives opportunities to but a small part of the population, and tells the legislators that "No miracle and no blessing from above can bring the proletariat into the wonderland, in which all the treasures and magnificence of the human soul are to be found," that their salvation depends upon themselves. He was called to order three times during his address and finally silenced, after declaring that "it is our duty to say to the working class also on this occasion: To action! Those in the trenches as well as those here at home, should put down their arms and turn against the common enemy which takes from them light and air."

No matter what one thinks of Liebknecht's attitude toward militarism, one cannot read these speeches and questions, interrupted again and again by the angry cries of presiding officers and of majority Socialist and non-Socialist legislators, without realizing the tremendous courage of the man, Liebknecht, during those intense four years of war and without hailing him as one of the great heroes of the European conflict. H. W. L.

SCHOLAR VERSUS MAN OF ACTION

THE RESULT OF MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC LIGHTING IN MASSACHUSETTS. By Edmond Earl Lincoln. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1918. Price, \$3.00. (Hart, Schaffner and Marx Prize Essays XXVII.)

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP, WITH A SPECIAL SURVEY OF MUNICIPAL GAS PLANTS IN AMERICA AND EUROPE. By Albert M. Todd. Public Ownership League of America, Chicago, 1918.

A certain Christian pastor is credited with answering the excuses of an erring member of his flock with these words: "What you are speaks so loud, I can't hear what you say." Without the slightest intention of placing either Mr. Todd or Mr. Lincoln among the lost sheep, these words must be in part at least, the text of this review.

The interesting thing about these two books is not the printed pages—and they are many and weighty, especially in Mr. Lincoln's. The one outstanding feature is that Mr. Todd is Albert M. Todd, prominent business man, ex-Congressman from the Middle West and President of the Public Ownership League of America; and that Mr. Lincoln is Edmond Earl Lincoln, M. A. (Oxon) Ph. D., Instructor in Economics and Tutor in the Division of History, Government and Economics, Harvard University.

These are the differences that one cannot escape. It is not that Mr. Todd gives a mass of figures to prove that public ownership is desirable and that Mr. Lincoln exhibits a far more impenetrable mass to prove that, after all, there is much to be said on both sides—particularly the opposite.

The greatest interest lies back of all this. The real difference between these books is not the advocacy of one thing or another. It is that Mr. Todd is a man of action, and Mr. Lincoln essentially a scholar.

Here is epitomized a world-old conflict, and be it noted, it is a conflict between friends. No one can doubt that both Mr. Todd and Mr. Lincoln are possessed with a real passion for public service. But Mr. Todd wants most to "get things done," while Mr. Lincoln desires

above all things to think straight. If you asked Mr. Todd if he favored crooked thinking he would undoubtedly deny it as vehemently as Mr. Lincoln would disavow any desire to clog the wheels of progress. It is only that Mr. Todd is a man of affairs and Mr. Lincoln a scholar. The bend of their minds is different.

It must be said in justice to Mr. Todd that he is much more charitable to his friend the enemy than his unconscious antagonist. The man of action doesn't abuse the scholar, he uses him. But the scholar is less tolerant, he is less the gentleman in his work. He loses no chance to abuse the man of action.

"Ardent enthusiasm," "wild assertion," "well-meant efforts," "erratic investigation," "sweeping inference," "superficial advocates," "hopeless junk," "attempted contribution," "frankly propagandist,"—these are some of the names that Mr. Lincoln has flung at those, who like himself, seek to serve their fellow-men. And yet, his aims are high. "Above all," he says, "an attitude of mental neutrality will be maintained throughout." Mr. Todd, on the other hand, has abused no one.

The professional pride of the academic scholar, his intellectual snobbery, is as bad, if not worse, a human failing than the supreme mental self-confidence of the man of action. After all there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it behooves especially soldiers in a common cause to have more sympathy and tolerance with the method by which each one may choose to serve their cause.

Making allowance for personality and method, both of these works are of real value. Mr. Todd skims lightly over the entire area of a vast and intricate statistical morass, while Mr. Lincoln picks his ways with care super-scrupulous among the tussocks of one corner of the swamp. Mr. Todd lays hold of the large outlines of his problem with a swift and sure touch. Mr. Lincoln, engrossed in his meticulous detail, sees them not.

The tests of public ownership are after all not confined to the ledger and the balance sheet. Mr. Lincoln explains in

characteristic line and phrase: "We are in danger of losing ourselves in a maze of uncertainties even greater than those at present encountered as a consequence of attempting primarily to measure the results of commercial business by other than commercial tests." Here is Mr. Lincoln in a sentence. It may well be that the slightly poorer commercial records of the Massachusetts municipal plants are outweighed by advantages purely social and political. Perhaps these Massachusetts towns are better off with inferior municipal plants than with the sinister influence of private utility interests in local politics and the control of the business man in community life. The anomaly of an industrial autocracy in a political democracy has evidently not penetrated to this chair of economics in Harvard University.

As a scientific and exhaustive study of the commercial aspects of public ownership in a restricted area and from a commercial point of view, Mr. Lincoln's

book has no rival. It is the last word on this corner of the subject.

Mr. Todd's work is a popular, somewhat hit-or-miss conglomeration of facts and opinions on public gas plants in a setting of pro-public ownership argument. It is an extremely valuable propaganda pamphlet. If accepted as such it is admirable.

Doubtless Mr. Lincoln would dub Mr. Todd's work, along with every other on public ownership (except *Municipal Electric Lighting in Massachusetts*), a "superficial study" that "barely skims the surface of the problem." Mr. Todd would probably keep his opinion of Mr. Lincoln to himself, but he has one no doubt and probably infinitely more generous.

One thing, however, is certain. Mr. Todd's book will be read by thousands where Mr. Lincoln's will reach a mere handful. There is a lesson in that for those whose desire it is to serve..

EVANS CLARK.

International Notes

BY THE EDITOR

NOTES ON ENGLAND

Of prime interest in the labor and Socialist movements in England at the present time is the election scheduled for December 14, 1918. The Labor Party is running some 300 candidates and expects, in spite of certain untoward circumstances, to gain a considerable number of seats. During the campaign the Labor Party issued a manifesto, "Labor's Call to the People," which calls for:

"A special tax on capital on the ground that those who made fortunes out of the war must pay for the war; free trade; no tariffs; immediate nationalization of all land; immediate nationalization of vital public service systems; better housing conditions; free public education; freedom for Ireland and India; immediate withdrawal of troops from Russia; no conscription; equal rights for women; a peace of reconciliation with no secret diplomacy and no economic war; the charter of labor to be incorporated in the fundamentals of the league of free peoples."

The Party as well demanded the immediate restoration of the Workers' Internationale. It warned the Coalition that opposition to the forward young democracies of the continent and especially intervention on the side of European reaction would be disastrous. The manifesto stated that "labor claimed no mean share in the achievement

of victory, since not only did the workers supply the bulk of the fighting forces and assume the war burden at home, but the democratic diplomacy which found expression in labor's war aims had been one of the most powerful factors in winning the war and must be a powerful factor in rebuilding the world." The Labor Program and manifesto concludes: "It is designed to build a new world and to build it by constitutional means. It is a program of national and international justice founded on permanent democratic ideas."

Arthur Henderson and the Campaign

Arthur Henderson during the campaign issued an address declaring his loyalty to the full Labor Program of Reconstruction, and insisting at the same time that an era of class strife, of strikes, of wage disputes and embittered relations between capital and labor must be avoided. He declared that he had no sympathy as far as he knew with what was generally understood to be Bolshevism. However, these revolutionary tendencies must be combatted not by force or fine phrases, but by impressing the working class with the possibility of obtaining their ideals of social justice and economic freedom by direct parliamentary representation.

Mr. Henderson has also repeatedly set forth what he deemed to be the views of organized labor on the question of a League

of Nations. In a recent pamphlet he declared that organized workers were convinced that nothing would compensate for the failure to secure such international machinery as would help to develop democratic institutions in every country and curb the sinister forces making for war.

"Organized labor, however," he continues, "regards this league as something much more than an organization to prevent war. . . . In labor's view, the ultimate purpose of such a league is to create a common mind in the world, to make the nations conscious of the solidarity of their interests, and to enable them to perceive that the world is one, and not a number of separate countries divided by artificial frontiers. Side by side with the international courts set up for purposes of conciliation and judicial arbitration the workers have, therefore, proclaimed their desire to further the project of an international legislature."

"It is the league itself that will supersede the arbitrary powers that have hitherto arrogated the right of choosing between peace and war. It will bring foreign policy under the control of popularly elected assemblies resolved to maintain the sovereign rights of peoples. It implies the suppression of secret diplomacy and the development of parliamentary control over cabinets. It will mean that a vigilant watch will be kept over the activities of foreign ministers, diplomatists, and the agents of international finance. It involves full publicity for all agreements between states. It will render powerless for further mischief the evil influence of the armament trusts which are so largely responsible for the awful tragedy in which the world is at present involved."

Democracy, Mr. Henderson concludes, stands at the crossroads. Whether the path it takes leads to the new social order or to disastrous revolutionary struggles, he says, depends largely upon the fate of the project of a League of Nations. "If we fail here," he says, "we fail irretrievably. Wars more frightful than the present will waste the substance of our race, and we shall lose even the belief in the possibility of progress."

Labor at the Peace

The Labor Party during the last few months has repeatedly demanded labor representation at the peace conference. In early November a Sub-Committee of the Party Executive and the Trade Union Congress Parliamentary Committee met Mr. Lloyd George on his return from France and pointed out that Labor expected to be represented at the peace conference in fulfillment of the pledge made after the formation of the Coalition Government. The Premier replied that Mr. Barnes would be nominated as labor's representative while he remained in the Cabinet.

Other Labor Activities

Following this conversation Mr. Barnes withdrew from the Labor Party because of the candidacy in his constituency under the

Labor Party's auspices of Mr. John MacLain, whom Mr. Barnes characterized as a Bolshevik candidate. Mr. Barnes believed that he was in honor bound to stay in the Government until peace had been secured.

Of considerable interest in the field of Labor was the recent Annual Conference of the Miners' Federation, during which the resolution was passed to redraft the parliamentary bill for the nationalization of mines so as to embody the policy laid down in the resolution of State Ownership of Mines, of joint control of the mines by the workers and the state.

Noteworthy also is the National Women's Conference held in early November, which declared (1) that all legal restrictions on the entry of women into the professions on the same conditions as men should be abrogated; (2) that women should have equal franchise with men and should be qualified for election on all public bodies; (3) that systematic provision should be made for the representation of women on all committees or commissions, national or local, and that legislation should be immediately passed by Parliament along these lines.

Of unusual importance also to labor is the report to the Minister of Reconstruction on the relation of industry and social conditions to education, in which the committee declared that in the course of their inquiries "they found education to be so hampered by economic obstacles as to make industrial and social reforms indispensable, if its just claims were to be met." On the basis of these findings they recommended a comprehensive system of social and labor legislation.

Camille Huysmans, Belgian Socialist, was finally permitted to cross to France, following the signing of the Armistice, under the protection of the British Seamen and Firemen's Union. Mr. Huysmans had been summoned to attend the assembly of the Belgian Parliament. The Seamen and Firemen's Union, however, prevented Mr. Huysmans, deputy, from crossing from Folkestone as had been formerly arranged.

NOTES ON FRANCE

Up until the signing of the Armistice a very definite struggle took place in France between the Minoritaires and the Majoritaires. The French Socialist Congress placed the Longuet Minoritaires definitely in command. The resolution of this faction, which was passed by a vote of 1,528 as against one of 1,212 for the Majoritaires' resolution, stated that the Party, while supporting national defense, renewed its adherence to the Internationale, rejected all collaboration with the bourgeois class, and demanded the calling of an international Socialist conference. It went on to declare that "the party should set itself against any government that continues to oppose the meeting of the Internationale and against any government entering into negotiations with the Conservatives or welcoming an

Imperialistic program, setting aside acceptable peace proposals, or attacking the working class and its organizations." The party conferred a mandate upon its elected representatives to act against these demonstrations to Conservative policies both in the country and outside of it, by employing according to circumstances, all the means in their power, including the refusal to vote credits. It condemned the operations begun in Russia and Siberia and demanded for all peoples the right to govern themselves.

The Congress also approved the reply made by Mr. Lansing in the name of the President to the German Chancellor's note, noting with satisfaction the first employment of direct and open diplomacy, declaring that the door was thus opened between the belligerents for a just peace. It approved the diplomatic and military guarantees demanded by the President for an Armistice.

M. Marcel Cachin, Centrist, was elected editor of the official organ of the French Party, "L'Humanité," in place of M. Renauld, the former editor. The Congress also criticised vigorously the attitude of M. Thomas and others concerning the Doumergue documents, and the attitude of some of the leaders of the Party concerning the secret negotiations of Prince Sixtus. It furthermore passed a resolution confirming its fidelity to the national defense, but placing its attachment to the Internationale on the same footing.

THE UNITED STATES

Immediately after the election, the Socialist Party began a membership campaign and is now endeavoring to raise the membership of 85,000 to that of 300,000 by January 1, 1920. It declares that the question of reconstruction would be the issue of the Presidential campaign of 1920 and believes that before that time the Republican and Democratic Parties and their statesmen will be hopelessly discredited.

In November, prior to the signing of the Armistice, the Party issued a manifesto declaring as follows:

"We demand that in the coming peace the principle of self-determination of peoples be asserted to the fullest degree, with the right of all subject peoples and races of both the Central and Allied Powers to determine the conditions of their own existence.

"We demand that the peoples of Russia have complete freedom to solve their internal problems and that the integrity of Russian territory, as well as that of Finland, the Baltic provinces, Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine and other border provinces, be preserved.

"We demand that the present preliminary and all subsequent peace negotiations be conducted with the strictest observance of the principle of open covenants of peace, arrived at publicly.

"We demand that duly accredited representatives of subject peoples and of the economic and political organizations of the working class in all countries, participate in the final peace conference.

"We demand that passports be granted representatives of Labor and Socialist groups to attend International Conferences for the exchange of opinions between the labor groups of the belligerent and neutral nations.

"We demand that this government refuse to consider any proposal for economic war after war."

The Independent Labor Party

On November 17, at a regular meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, an Independent Labor Party for Illinois and the United States was launched, partly as a result of the refusal of the City Council of Chicago to ratify members of organized labor for the Chicago School Board. A resolution in favor of such a party was unanimously adopted by the thousand delegates present. A newspaper was also suggested. With one Socialist delegate requesting to be recorded as not voting, a platform was adopted known as Labor's Fourteen Points and was afterwards submitted to and almost unanimously adopted by the Illinois State Federation of Labor on December 2.

The platform demanded:

- (1) Unqualified right of collective bargaining.
- (2) "Democratic control of industry and commerce for the general good of those who work with hand and brain, and the elimination of autocratic domination of the forces of production or distribution either by selfish interests or bureaucratic agents of government."
- (3) An eight-hour day and a living wage.
- (4) The abolition of unemployment through the stabilization of industry and the establishment of government work during periods of depression, on housing, reforestation, reclamation of desert and swamp, etc.
- (5) Complete equality of men and women in government and industry.
- (6) The abolition of profiteering by the development of co-operation, the elimination of parasitical employment, etc.
- (7) Democratization of education in public schools and universities through the participation of labor and the organized teachers in the determination of methods, policies and programs.
- (8) Continuation after the war of soldiers' and sailors' insurance and the establishment of government insurance against accident and for all insurable forms of property.
- (9) Inheritance, income and land value taxes to pay the war debt and for government expenses.
- (10) Public ownership and operation of railways, steamships, stockyards, telephone, telegraphs and other public utilities and the nationalization and development of natural resources, water power and unused land, with the repatriation of large farms to the end that returned soldiers and sailors and dislocated war workers may find an opportunity for independent livelihood.
- (11) Complete restoration of free-

speech, free press and free assemblage; removal of all war-time restrictions on the exchange of ideas, liberation of political prisoners, who championed the rights of labor or patriotically insisted on constitutional rights. (12) Labor representation in all departments of government. (13) Labor representation at the peace conference. (14) A league of workers of all nations supplementing the league of nations pledged and organized to enforce the destruction of autocracy, militarism and economic imperialism throughout the world and to bring about worldwide disarmament and open diplomacy to the end that there shall be no more kings and no more wars.

Seymour Stedman, Socialist leader in Chicago, in commenting on the new party, declared that it seemed to him the height of folly for the Socialist Party to take any attitude which could be interpreted as hostile to this newly proposed party. If the party failed, the Socialists would then be open to the charge of undermining the political expression of the workers and would increase the hostility which had too long existed.

"For these reasons," he declared, "I believe the Labor Party should be encouraged and a most cordial relationship should exist between the two parties. The two organizations will at this time no doubt meet with some difficulty. If they should be running as rivals, it must be on such friendly terms as to make it plain that we realize that in a short time differences may be adjusted and the workers in their various parties may be united into one solid aggressive political movement. No matter who has sown the seed, the workers in the end will reap together, or they will never reap at all."

Non-Partisan League

"Returns already in from the seven states in which the Non-Partisan League took part in contests for seats in the legislature on November 5," observes the "Non-Partisan Leader," "show that over 100 lawmakers have been elected by the farmers, outside of North Dakota." In North Dakota, "the League has not only re-elected its house majority, but has captured for the first time the state senate." Congressman John M. Baer was also re-elected.

In Minnesota, where the Minnesota State Federation of Labor decided to cooperate with the League, the combined farmer-labor forces have elected at least 15 state senators and 36 house members. The League, in the rural districts, returned 11 senators and 26 house members, and organized labor in Minneapolis and St. Paul returned 4 senators and 10 house members, all pledged to the farmer-labor program. The vote for the Non-Partisan candidate for governor of Minnesota was 111,948, as compared with 166,515 for the successful candidate, Burnquist, and 76,793 for the Democratic candidate.

In South Dakota, the League elected 14 legislative candidates; in Colorado, 2 state senators and 2 state representatives; in

Montana, 16 members of the lower house and 4 of the upper; in Idaho, 6 senators, 10 representatives; in Nebraska, 7 members of the lower house and a number of sympathizers. Two years ago, the League had elected no candidate outside of North Dakota.

The Social Democratic League.

The Social Democratic League met in New York City in November. Those present elected the following officers: Charles Edward Russell, Chairman; William English Walling, Secretary; J. G. Phelps Stokes, Treasurer. Mr. John Spargo, who returned shortly afterwards from his mission abroad and was formerly chairman of the League, is no longer connected with it in an official capacity. The League has published a reconstruction program and has sent one or two delegations to Washington and elsewhere.

College Notes

With the prospect of the return of students from the camps to campus, and the demilitarization of the curricula, we may look forward to a greater activity in the colleges than the Society has ever enjoyed. As was to be expected, the Chapters at the colleges for women have suffered least from war conditions.

New England Colleges

"A flourishing study class" is in progress at RADCLIFFE, according to the report of the secretary, Mary Peabody. The Chapter has sent dues of \$8.75 and reports meetings led by Mr. Laski and W. Harris Crook. An enthusiastic Chapter of twenty students is forming at SIMMONS with Martha Anderson as the moving spirit. Florence Sargent, an instructor, hopes to attend the I. S. S. Convention. A small but active discussion group is in progress at WELLESLEY with Ruth G. Porter, secretary.

Middle Atlantic States

Despite unfavorable conditions, the CORNELL Chapter has been able to hold several meetings this year. The secretary, William Schack, reports that with a return to normal conditions next term, the Chapter will organize formally and begin vigorous activities.

Chapters at COLUMBIA and C. C. N. Y. are reorganizing. HUNTER reports an excellent study group, with an attendance of seventy at the first meeting. Bertha Wallerstein, president of the BARNARD Chapter, writes: "Matters are clearing up somewhat at Barnard. The Dean addressed us on November 20 on 'Women in Reconstruction Time,' and Prof. James Harvey Robinson will speak in December on 'The Relation of "Education" to Social Progress.' We are starting a study group which is going to study the British Labor program and compare it with the American Socialist Party and the A. F. of L."

The VASSAR Chapter reports a membership of 22 and "an active club with competent

officers." "Because of the war," writes Jeanette Regensburg, secretary, "we had combined with the Consumers' League and Suffrage Club, thereby giving up separate meetings. Now we intend to resume individual meetings at which members of the faculty and students shall speak on pertinent topics. We are trying now to procure Mr. Ratcliffe for next month, and Mr. Arthur Gleason is coming March 11." The ADELPHI College group is also holding regular and successful meetings.

Middle West

The Secretary of the OBERLIN Chapter reports three meetings on "Various Aspects of Socialism," on the "League of Nations" and the "Need for Democracy in Art." A course in Socialism is being planned. "Each member is required to read at least three books on the topic for discussion under penalty of a ten-cent fine." The leader prepares a paper, each member in turn being leader. Outside speakers are to be invited from Cleveland.

From the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Josephine Newell, Secretary, reports: "A number of students and one or two members of the faculty are ready to form an active Chapter as soon as a suitable meeting place can be obtained." In the meantime a study group is meeting at a private house. "I feel very strongly, and there are others here that agree with me, that now is the time for Socialism to be presented fairly and frequently to the students at Illinois."

Alumni Chapters

Organization of Alumni Chapters is being considered at Berkeley and Fresno, California. The Chicago Fabian Society, which is informally connected with the I. S. S., is holding successful meetings. Its program reports Clarence Darrow as speaker on the "League of Nations" for the November meeting and Charles Zueblin on "World Reorganization" for December. The meetings are preceded by "cakes, coffee and conversation at 7 o'clock; 15 cents."

The New York Alumni Chapter held a dinner on November 26 on "American Journalism and the Approaching Conflict." Among the speakers were Oswald Villard, Paul M. Kellogg, Ellis O. Jones, Randolph Bourne, Royal Davis and Norman Thomas, Harry W. Laidler, chairman.

The Saturday Camaraderies are meeting with great success. Among the programs have been James Weldon Johnson on "Reconstruction and the Negro," Prof. Benoy Sarker on "Reconstruction in the Persian Gulf," Victor David Soskise on "Kerensky the Man" and Albert Rhys Williams on "The Intelligentsia and the Russian Revolution," Louise Adams Grant, chairman. At the meeting on journalism and that on Russia many had to be turned away for lack of space.

The World Tomorrow

announces the offer of

A PRIZE OF \$500

for an original essay on

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ITS PRACTICABILITY AND ITS NEED

*For full particulars send 12 cents
for a copy of the current issue
of "THE WORLD TOMORROW,"
118 East 28th St., New York City*

Wisconsin

David Weiss of the Wisconsin Chapter writes:

"Prospects for the coming year look as if the Social Science Club, the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Socialist Society, will have its most successful year in the history of the Chapter, as at no time has so much interest been shown at the University of Wisconsin. Many students, who formerly would not listen to us, are more than friendly to our literature.

"We have held two meetings this year. Owing to the influenza epidemic, which had banned all public meetings and prohibited large classes from meeting for almost a month, and the organization for the S. A. T. C., we did not get started until about three weeks ago.

"Our first meeting was addressed by Prof. E. A. Ross, who spoke on 'Reconstruction after the War.' This was our largest meeting in four years and more than 250 attended. About eight new members joined the society after the meeting. The second meeting was a discussional one on the desirability of Compulsory Military Training."

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP,
MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,
required by the Act of Congress of August 24,
1912, of The Intercollegiate Socialist, publish-

ed quarterly at New York, N. Y., for Oct., 1918.

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 Avenue, 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 Avenue, New York City. Membership approximately 1,600. The principal officers are: Acting President, Florence Kelley, 289 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.; Vice-President, Vida D. Scudder, Wellesley, Mass.; 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 stocks, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by her.

Alice Kuebler Boehme.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of Sept., 1918.

Walter C. Campbell, Notary Public,
Westchester County. Certificate filed in New York County. Register's No. 10081, in New York County, No. 50. My commission expires March 30, 1920.

The LIBERATOR

A Journal of Revolutionary Progress.

"As a literary magazine it is of the highest standard. As an expression of advanced ideas and radical thought, it resembles the 'Masses' which had no peer; it is free from vacillating liberalism. Its program is socialism—clear-cut, and well defined, and I hope that it will survive to the day of the Liberation—'when the red cock crows'."

"Being a public school teacher, the rut I am in has a depth all its own. The Liberator always lifts me out of it to a belief that life is rich and worth while and adventuresome."

Published monthly by The Liberator Publishing Co., 34 Union Sq., New York.

Special offer good only until January 15, 1919.

The Liberator for 6 mos.
(price is \$1.50 a year, after
Jan. 15, 1919, \$2.00)

"Six Red Months in Russia"
by Louise Bryant, 299 pp.
just out! Price alone, \$2.00.

Together for \$2.50

GIFT BOOKS

Purchase for your friends from *Intercollegiate Socialist Society*, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Send price cited plus 15 Cents for postage.

RUSSIA

<i>The Red Heart of Russia.</i> Bessie Beatty.....	\$2.00	<i>The Dark People.</i> Ernest Poole.....	1.50
<i>Six Red Months in Russia.</i> Louise Bryant.....	2.00	<i>Unchained Russia.</i> Chas. Edward Russell.....	1.50
<i>Russia in Upheaval.</i> Edw. A. Ross.....	2.50	<i>The Soul of the Russian Revolution.</i> Moissaye Olgin	2.75

PROBLEMS OF READJUSTMENT

<i>Political Ideals.</i> Bertrand Russell.....	1.00	<i>Self Government in Industry.</i> G. D. H. Cole....	1.75
<i>The Future Belongs to the People, Edited and Translated by S. Zimand, With an Introduction by Walter E. Weyl.</i> Karl Liebknecht..	1.25	<i>The Creative Impulse in Industry.</i> Helen Marot	1.50
<i>The Aims of Labor.</i> Arthur Henderson.....	1.00	<i>Democracy After the War.</i> John A. Hobson.....	2.00
<i>Inside the British Isles.</i> Arthur Gleason.....	1.50	<i>Essays in War Time.</i> Havelock Ellis.....	1.75
<i>Fair Play for the Workers.</i> Percy Stickney Grant	1.60	<i>Stakes of the War.</i> Lothrop Stoddard.....	2.50
<i>Cooperation.</i> Emerson P. Harris.....	2.00	<i>The End of the War.</i> Walter E. Weyl.....	2.00
		<i>The Structure of a Lasting Peace.</i> H. M. Kallen	1.25
		<i>The League of Nations.</i> H. M. Brailsford.....	1.75
		<i>A Peoples' Part in Peace.</i> Ordway Tead.....	1.25

SOCIAL NOVELS AND ESSAYS

<i>Jean and Peter.</i> H. G. Wells.....	1.75	<i>The Profits of Religion.</i> Upton Sinclair.....	1.25
<i>Pell, the Conqueror.</i> M. A. Nix.....	4.00	<i>A Chance to Live.</i> Zoe Beckley.....	1.60
<i>King Coal.</i> Upton Sinclair.....	1.50	<i>The Message to the Middle Class.</i> Seymour De- ming	50
<i>The Harbor.</i> Ernest Poole.....	1.50	<i>Drift and Mastery.</i> Walter Lippmann.....	1.50
<i>Christianizing the Social Order.</i> Walter Rau- schenbusch	1.50	<i>Justice and Liberty.</i> G. Lowes Dickinson.....	1.20
<i>Religion for Today.</i> John Haynes Holmes.....	1.50	<i>Ireland.</i> Frances Hackett.....	2.00

SOCIALISM

<i>New Worlds for Old.</i> H. G. Wells.....	1.50	<i>Socialism in Theory and Practice.</i> Morris Hill- quit	1.50
<i>Socialism and Character.</i> Vida D. Scudder.....	1.75	<i>Socialists at Work.</i> Robert Hunter.....	1.50
<i>Americanized Socialism.</i> James Mackaye.....	1.25	<i>The Socialist Movement.</i> J. Ramsay Mac- donald	50
<i>History of Socialism.</i> Thomas Kirkup.....	1.50	<i>The Socialism of Today.</i> Walling, Hughan, Stokes and Laidler	1.75
<i>Social Democracy Explained.</i> John Spargo.....	1.50		
<i>Facts of Socialism.</i> Jessie W. Hughan (Paper)..	.25		