

NEWS - BULLETIN

League for Industrial Democracy

Vol. I. No. 5

70 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY

JULY, 1923

THE CAMP TAMIMENT CONFERENCE

The editors of this bulletin who are the Directors of the League for Industrial Democracy must take their readers into their confidence. Strange to say, they do not agree about conference reports. One (call him X) thinks that little in the world is duller reading or less significant than summaries of conference addresses set in cold type after the conference is over and lacking most of the elements which give interest to the conference. The other, Y, believes that those of our members who cannot get to the conference hunger and thirst after the distilled wisdom there extracted from the lips of the speakers. If they cannot get the pure milk of the word at first hand they would like it condensed and canned in the columns of the bulletin. While they argued this serious matter, they got hint of a diary which had been kept of the conference. "Here," cried X, "is the way out of difficulty. Let us print the diary this year and ask our readers what kind of reports they really would like. Most of them won't bother to tell us, but perhaps some of them will." So here is the diary.

An Observer's Diary

Wednesday, June 20

Not many camps show the good taste of Camp Tamiment. The charming little rustic sleeping houses, the mess hall, Maily Hall (auditorium), overlooking the lake, fit into the landscape of lake and trees quite perfectly. It makes one believe that, after all, there may be something in the hope that the labor movement will develop a better sense of beauty than our profit-hunting civilization displays, especially in its summer resorts. All the work at Camp Tamiment, I am told, was planned and supervised by a workman, Alexander Hayman.

But I must get on with my story. As fast as we could, we all got into the lake to cool off. It is a great thing to have it and boats at your door. Some people, however, never will be satisfied. I heard a man say that he thought the camp ought to have applied to the Garland Fund for an appropriation to ice the lake and make it a little cooler. If the first evening's meal is a sample, we will not have to starve to death here. The waiters are friends of the camp and conference and join in with the common life.

The first session went off better than lots of first sessions I have attended. An effort is being made to get us to sing. Song leaflets contain about the best of radical songs and quite a variety of them. It must be said that there is a large field for poets and song writers in the movement. Too often radical songs are nothing in the world but tracts forced into unharmonious marriage with familiar national airs, hymn tunes, and what-not. Nevertheless, we sang. Carroll Hollister plays the piano so well that he manages to keep us together. Mr. Thomas as singing leader is less expert,

but he has a pretty big voice and jollies the crowd. I think it is true that if radicals could learn to sing together better, they might work together better.

Civil Liberty and Academic Freedom

The subject of the first session was "Next Steps in Civil Liberties and Academic Freedom." The first speaker was Robert Morss Lovett, President of the L. I. D. and otherwise famous, as everybody knows. Mr. Lovett made the point that there are five elements in the problem of academic freedom—the trustees, president, faculty, alumni and students. The sins of trustees and presidents have been sufficiently exposed by Mr. Sinclair in his "Goose Step." The stories he tells are true, but he over-simplifies our situation.

"Faculties dominated by men fighting for their own survival afford examples of suppression by means of a community terror and a tyranny of opinion as flagrant as can be found on the part of presidents and trustees. Again, the mass opinion of alumni is almost invariably conservative. I have known cases of presidents, trustees and faculty united in a desire to put an end to some of the rampant abuses of intercollegiate athletics and to raise the intellectual standard of the institution only to be defeated by the alumni. The alumni have become the great financial resource of most colleges. Their leaders are naturally active men of affairs bent on arriving at success, rather than already at the top. The trustees can be reached and influenced; the alumni are too diffused and indifferent. They are the chief menace to liberalism in colleges today.

"One sign, which Mr. Sinclair interprets favorably (and as to this I heartily agree with him), is the developing mind of the student body. We have lately had two instances of forthright independent action by young men of the graduating class. One was the protest of the graduates of Clark University against the administration of President Atwood; the other was the intervention of the graduating class at Amherst in favor of President Meiklejohn."

From the college world, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn turned to the Fascist movement in this country. She gave an encouraging report of the failure of this anti-democratic movement to gain foothold among the Italian population in the United States. The Italian here knows the Fascist movement means the bomb, the dagger and the gun. The real danger is with Americans. Big business here is all too ready to adopt Fascism. Men who are continually talking about Russian violence and lack of democracy extol Mussolini for the same things they condemn in Lenin. Mr. and Mrs. Gary were recently made honorary members of the Fascist organization. An American Fascist society has actually been started. The spirit of Fascism, of course, has been incorporated in the Ku Klux Klan.

Following Miss Flynn, Roger Baldwin, Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, encouraged us by telling us that the outlook for civil liberty is better than it has been

at any time since the beginning of the war. As to the instruments of suppression, there is little likelihood that either the laws or the decisions will be changed. It is more likely that they will fall into disuse. As to the volunteer societies who are out for the forcing of their own brands of law, the chances are that their lives will be short. They do not wield any economic power except in the South, where the Negro would fare about as badly without the Ku Klux Klan. The real fight for civil liberty is bound up with the economic struggle. If we were as near a labor government as England there would be neither the repression which we are forced to fight these days, nor the spectacle of such chaos and weakness among the forces of progress. The ruling class in America will continue to suppress just as long as this disunion lasts. Labor and radical solidarity is the first essential to end suppression. Members of the middle class who see that freedom of expression is the alternative to violence can render positive aid by their service to civil liberty.

The discussion following these addresses was interesting, but not dramatic, and brought out no particularly new facts.

The Youth Movement

Thursday, June 21

Another clear, hot day after a fine night. I slept well, though I was conscious at intervals that I was being soothed to slumber by the drum of big voices discussing, I doubt not, the reconstruction of the universe. Great men apparently need little sleep.

The Thursday morning session was given over to college students. Mr. I. Kornblit, President of the Columbia Socialist Society, presided. He, Mr. Teeple and Mr. Horowitz told in rather optimistic vein of the growth of liberalism in Columbia, the formation of the Columbia forum, largely at the instigation of the Columbia Socialist Society. They were particularly interesting in describing meetings held off the campus because of the ruling of the faculty. Mr. Kornblit told of the success of the Foster meeting. New York papers had mentioned it chiefly in order to report the fact that a volley of eggs had been thrown at the speaker. Mr. Kornblit said only one egg was thrown from the outskirts of the crowd. It was, he said, a good egg and missed its mark! Many people did not know that it had been thrown until the newspapers reported it. Charles Reed and William Bloom told of the activities of Brookwood, which is "not a college, but an educational institution." They described the democracy of Brookwood, they urged the formation of a youth movement inside the labor movement, and warned the intellectuals against going into the labor movement to lead it. Miss Gertrude Knapp reported forward steps at Swarthmore taken largely under the inspiration of the Hartsdale Conference of the National Student Forum. Two conferences between students and members of Philadelphia trade unions have been held, and plans of cooperation in labor education and production of one act plays at labor meetings, etc., were drawn up. I hope the bulletin of the L. I. D. will keep us posted as to progress at Swarthmore.

Mrs. DuBois of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom described the sweep of the anti-war movement among the youth of Europe, and urged that the problems of peace and war be presented to high school students as well as collegians. Prof. Kerlin told of his fight for the right to champion the oppressed and down-trodden, which cost him his position in a Southern college. Prof. Beyer spoke of liberal tendencies in Middle Western colleges. Afterwards, the famous British student and scholar, Patrick Geddes, who has made all knowledge his province, addressed us. He traced the growth of the modern university, which he

called an examination machine, and dwelt especially upon Indian universities in the light of his experience here. Indian students are taught to be docile parrots. The kind of training they receive is admirably described in Tagore's "Parrot's Training." Recently one of the Indian university magazines gave considerable attention to the curriculum demanded some time ago by Barnard students. The wide interest which these articles evoked is one of the hopeful signs, Prof. Geddes said, in the Indian university. He touched briefly on the Gandhi movement and its attempt to form national schools—an attempt so far not conspicuously successful from an educational standpoint.

So far the chairman had been calling on different speakers and general discussion had been long postponed. When at last it was opened, Scott Nearing rushed to the fray with an attack on the students for failing to draw a proper distinction between liberalism and radicalism. He declared that no person could be an avowed radical and continue to teach in the American university. Groups desiring to obtain radical speakers should follow the example of Columbia forum and hold their meetings off the campus. Roger Baldwin followed in somewhat similar vein. He praised the youth movement in Germany as a movement of self-expression which has no parallel here. Miss Kneeland told of the lethargy among students as well as faculties in some of our mid-Western colleges and universities. Sam Friedman said a few words for the Young People's Socialist League and Miss Parks pleaded for spiritual revaluation by the students. In behalf of the students, Miss Gertrude Knapp introduced the resolutions expressing admiration for Dr. Meiklejohn, condemning the action of the Trustees and praising the attitude of the students, especially those seniors who refused to accept their degrees as a protest against Dr. Meiklejohn's forced resignation. Resolutions introduced by Mr. Baldwin were adopted by the Conference condemning President Harding's action in refusing pardon to some political prisoners and in attaching unwarranted conditions to the pardons he granted.

Cooperation

Thursday evening the subject was "Next Steps in Cooperation." Albert F. Coyle, Executive Secretary of the All-American Cooperative Commission and Acting Editor of that remarkable magazine, the *Brotherhood of Engineers' Journal*, presided. The first speaker was David J. Saposs of Brookwood and The Labor Bureau. He spoke on labor banking, which he described in a happy phrase as trade union capitalism. He honestly faced the possibility of certain evils which have resulted in the past from the organization of business for profit. Trade union banks are so organized despite the fact that they have certain cooperative features in the distribution of their excess profits. Mr. Saposs believes the trade union officials may be expected to run banks on more humanitarian lines than business men. They are under official supervision, and they have every incentive to obtain honest and efficient management. Success in the banking field places at the disposal of labor another source of power in giving it a certain amount of control over credit, which is a great source of power in the modern economic world. With this credit it may build up a cooperative movement ably managed and of sufficient proportions to compete against modern aggregations of capital. If in thus supporting labor union banking, unions are not diverted from their fundamental objective as militant economic organizations to protect the immediate interests of labor, Mr. Saposs felt that they would justify themselves.

Cedric Long, Executive Secretary of the Cooperative

League of America, next spoke on consumers' cooperation. His address was a contrast between the success of consumers' cooperation and the failure of producers' cooperation. He pointed out that man is primarily a consumer, that he produces in order to satisfy his wants, that consumers' cooperation on the Rochdale Plan is genuinely democratic and had succeeded to an amazing degree. Not only has producers' cooperation failed almost uniformly in Europe, but it does not eliminate the profit system. Further, Mr. Long maintained, if one believes in production for use it is the users who should control. In the nature of things, housewives, sick, aged and children are users, but not producers in the economic system. Consumers' cooperation makes room for them and their interests, as producers' cooperation cannot. Mr. Coyle replied with an earnest and enthusiastic eulogy on producers' cooperation. There were obstacles in the path of producers' cooperation, especially within the capitalist order, but Mr. Coyle felt they were not unsurmountable. Producers' cooperatives abroad are endeavoring to safeguard themselves against the spirit of selfishness by bringing in trade unions and consumers' cooperatives as investors in their stock. Mr. Coyle's philosophy may be summed up in this sentence: "The worker is primarily a producer, for the great and abiding satisfactions of life come not from filling one's stomach, but from giving fair play to the divine genius of the human brain and hand." As a practical manifestation of this desire, he cited the railway workers' support of the Plumb Plan. He gave figures on the success of cooperation, but scarcely met Mr. Long's figures on producers' cooperatives.

Scott Nearing opened the discussion by endorsing producers' cooperation, which he felt must be the basis of the reorganization of our whole life. Nations are unreal entities in modern economics. Federations of the producers of the world should control the life of the world. These producers' organizations should be self-governed. It is a change in different systems of production rather than consumption, which determines the different types of civilization. To remake the world we must deal with life on the plane of production.

Algernon Lee declared that Mr. Coyle was unscientific in including in producers' cooperation farmers' cooperatives, labor banks, etc., which are not self-governing workshops in which every employee is part owner and manager. He also commented on the inconsistency of some of those who continually cast aspirations on political action and at the same time advocate plans like the Plumb Plan, which cannot be achieved except through political action.

Prof. Horace Kallen gave philosophical and witty support to the thesis that man is first of all a consumer. Mr. Thomas wished that our approach to the problem had been more realistic. What we need to know is what methods are actually dealing with those concrete problems of social maladjustment arising out of our present economic order. Scott Nearing's organization of producers, he felt, was a jump, not a next step. It is all very well to have evangelical fervor for our causes, but we need a closer realistic examination of the working out of various things discussed, from labor banks and cooperatives to the principle of nationalism.

Next Steps in Labor Education

Friday morning the program announced that we were to discuss "Next Steps in Labor Education," and it was in the air that we might hear some rather sharp conflicts of opinion, but the session was most polite and peaceful. Harry Dana made a gracious presiding officer. The discussion was opened by Fannia Cohn, Vice-President, Workers' Educational Bureau and Educational Secretary, Interna-

tional Ladies' Garment Workers. After a graceful tribute to the Rand School, at whose camp we were meeting, Miss Cohn made an earnest appeal for the necessity of workers' education through the unions, meeting the unions on their own grounds, not primarily as radicals or as conservatives, but as workers. "The object of workers' education is to give the workers a new moral and spiritual attitude and a new grasp of social and economic questions. Workers' education should influence the worker to stand with his group and not seek to rise out of it." To be successful, workers' education must be of, by and for the labor movement, although the labor movement can invite sympathetic expression from without to advise it or to conduct classes.

Algernon Lee, the next speaker, declared the Rand School was not an institution working from outside the labor movement, but an integral part of it. He discussed various conceptions of the object of workers' education and declared his own belief that "education for the present struggle is more urgently needed than education for administration after victory is secured." The capitalist system has still much vitality. It is more likely and generally preferable that the workers should triumph over the capitalist within the shell of the present system. They need special training for this struggle. "We can help the workers win power, become better shop chairmen, business agents, trade union organizers, cooperators, etc."

Miss Susan Kingsbury, one of the Directing Committee of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Workers, emphasized the need for sound educational method in workers' education. She dealt chiefly with the German labor education movement which, she said, had given more attention to educational psychology than anywhere else. She spoke in enthusiastic terms of the work done by Prof. Edward A. Weitsch in German Thuringia, the Socialist stronghold, and also the excellent work of Wilhelm Rasmussen of Copenhagen.

Prof. Kallen followed with a critical analysis of workers' education. Like most education, he felt that too much of it fell under one or another of three heads: hokum, bunk, business. Under hokum he placed emotionalism and dogmatism not based on facts. Proletcult, he felt, came under the head of hokum, and makes for illusion. Bunk is to be found in grandiose advertising. The real business of labor education is to provide professional and technical education for trade union workers and leaders. There is a danger that trade unions will exclude from text-books the material which, though necessary to a scientific treatment of a subject, may be objected to by certain trade union interests (e. g., discussion of Catholicism). One safeguard against this is the multiplication of organizations in the labor movement publishing text-books.

The discussion that followed was interesting, but desultory. David Saposs of Brookwood pointed out the impossibility of training young trade union members with the certainty that they would be chosen to executive office; to be an official requires more than technical equipment. Scott Nearing insisted upon the importance of the social sciences and said that the true object of workers' education was the emancipation of the working class and the organization of a new social order. This is no more propaganda than our present education, which is founded on the assumption of the permanence of the present system.

Marie MacDonald, Louis Budenz, Albert Coyle, Dr. Wolfson, Messrs. Teeple, Goldman, Dana and others took part in the discussion. Miss Helen Alfred called attention to the effort of some young women to form a cooperative residence club which she had not had opportunity to announce the

preceding evening. Further information may be had from her at 27 Barrow Street, New York City.

Mrs. DuBois told of the need of the most ordinary sort of equipment for Prof. Weitsch's class in Germany, and at her suggestion the conference decided to send him a letter of greeting together with a collection which Mrs. DuBois took up privately among those who were interested. She made it plain that this was not done with the knowledge, much less at the request, of Prof. Weitsch.

As I left the hall I heard someone say that, while the speeches were interesting, he felt that we would go farther if the discussion were handled on a different plan. Why not consider specifically such questions as: what is the object of workers' education, what method should it employ, what should be its official relation to the labor movement, and the like, asking speakers not to deliver set addresses, but to lead the discussion under the head of these specific questions. I think that idea generally commended itself.

Can War Be Outlawed?

The Friday night session was on "Next Steps Against War." Nellie Seeds Nearing presided and introduced the subject by calling attention to various types of opposition to war. The first speaker was Bishop Paul Jones, Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. He held that war was always an evil; that the individual must stand against it personally and work for its elimination; that it must be opposed on three fronts—spiritual, political and economic. The next step should be consolidation on these fronts, which are now unfortunately divided. Steps are being taken to unite the political and economic fronts through labor parties and otherwise. "Add to that the conscious effort to permeate both politics and industry with the constructive social forces of cooperation and creative good will which release the latent powers of human nature and a solid front against the whole war machine will be presented.

Miss Frances Kellor next presented a clear cut analysis of, and plea for, the outlawry of war by means of the Knox-Levinson plan which Senator Borah recently called to the attention of the Senate. She gave reasons for the failure of the League of Nations to grapple with the war issue, reasons inherent in the constitution of the League. She pointed out certain limits in the constitution of the world court. The court should have full jurisdiction over all international disputes as opposed to domestic issues. Naval and military forces should be limited to those strictly needed for defense. Such a plan would not immediately and miraculously prevent all wars, but it would establish the idea of war as a crime against the human race. Miss Kellor did not feel that war could ever be eliminated by removing its cause. To do so is neither necessary or possible. It is possible to establish law as the antithesis to violence.

Agnes Armington Laidler then sang effectively "Five Souls."

Mr. Thomas argued that the elimination of war required the elimination of its causes. He believed in the outlawry of war only as part of a general campaign against war. The danger of war rises from economic strife operating in a world dominated by a divisive nationalism. It is illustrated by the pressure of our own imperialism in Latin America, the situation in the Far East, the Near Eastern crisis and most immediately by French occupation of the Ruhr. With none of these specific dangers does the League of Nations, world court or even the proposal to outlaw war, deal. Law cannot eliminate war until law is based on justice. The Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scott case was law not justice. It did not avert civil war. Capitalist groups think

it right to exploit other classes. The white race thinks it right to exploit other races; nations each grab for raw materials without regard for others. They are not likely to outlaw war, save as part of a reconstruction program involving a profound change in the organization of society.

There are three possible next steps which would be of value: (1) an increase in the solidarity of labor and the growth of its opposition to international war; (2) an economic conference of the nations, including Germany and Russia, to decide the basis of reparation and of the allied debt, and to reduce armament—a conference whose success would be dependent upon the willingness of the United States to forgive all or part of the European debts due it as part of the price of peace; (3) an unqualified declaration that the power of nations will not be used for collecting private debts in Latin America or in other countries.

The discussion which followed was quite the most general and interesting of the conference. Scott Nearing defined war as any kind of organized destruction. It could only be removed by the ending of exploitation, a step wholly consistent with human nature. Morris Hillquit rather deprecated the effectiveness of the conversion of all the inhabitants of the world, or the proposal for the outlawing of war, but found hope in the opposition of labor to international war (as exemplified in the Socialist Conference at Hamburg), which alone, he felt, had preserved such peace as there was in Europe.

Algernon Lee challenged Miss Kellor's belief that law had gotten rid of duelling and diminished murder. In so far as these things had been done, it was through public opinion growing out of changed conditions which expressed itself in law. Mrs. Richards urged the necessity of educating children against war, and called attention to the terrible influence of history as at present taught in the schools of each nation. Her husband pleaded for the individual to reject war as wholly opposed to all standards of truth and honor. Mr. Morris Friedman sarcastically arraigned the older generation for its part in the last war and its lack of leadership against new war.

Others also took part under the three-minute rule. Miss Kellor was asked many questions and given many opportunities to amplify her theory. George Horowitz moved that the conference endorse the outlawry of war. The motion was tabled. Mr. Thomas probably voiced the opinion of the majority when he said that while under certain circumstances he would favor the Borah resolution for the outlawry of war, he did not propose to endorse it as a sole and sufficient cure for war or repudiate the necessity of dealing with the causes of war. In many points he did not think the plan well thought out; for instance, as to the maintenance of armies for defense. He did not want to appear to be endorsing what may be a good salve as if it were the proper cure for cancer.

Next Steps in Ownership and Control

Saturday: The morning session was given over to "Next Steps in Public Ownership," and Russia was to the fore as the nation which has gone farthest in social experiment. After the singing Mr. Thomas introduced Harry Laidler as chairman and described him as father of the most popular person at the camp. As one who fell under the spell of baby John Laidler, I admit the justice of the description. Dr. Laidler gave a brief opening address on tendencies in public ownership, calling attention to its virtues and faults and some of the tests which ought to be applied to it. I did not take notes, because I understood that the whole matter

would be fully discussed in his pamphlet, "The World Trend Toward Public Ownership," which is now in the press.

Dr. Levine then said in part:

Russia has had two great experiences in public ownership. One was the experience of 1919-20, the other the experience since March, 1921, known as the new economic policy.

The first venture in public ownership was an attempt to socialize everything from A to Z—to organize a completely socialized system. Whether that experiment failed or not depends on the tests one applies. Under that social system, the industries working for the army did fairly well; in fact, well enough to keep the armies in the field well supplied. It failed, however, to serve the needs of the civil population.

Political-mindedness was one of the first causes of that collapse. Socialized industry needs technicians, not politicians; and the training that comes from being in politics, whether orthodox or revolutionary politics, is a dubious preparation for economic work.

The consumers were not educated to cooperate in the new system. If we in the United States were trying to reorganize industry on a basis of production for use, we should immediately run up against the previous prejudices of the consumers. "Production for use," they would say. "Yes, but what is production for use?" As consumers, we want what the bourgeois wants. We might object to standardized clothes, for instance, and want luxuries which cannot be had immediately under a system of production for use. This condition prevailed in Russia. It was one of the causes of the failure of the first public ownership venture.

Correlation of one industry with another was entirely unknown in Russia. The Russians, too, were working under a hallucination as to the efficiency of centralized management. They overdid centralization.

As a result of all this, the first effort in public ownership had to be given up and Russia has started on a new track called the New Economic Policy, which is fundamentally public ownership of key industries—but public ownership, not primarily for use, but for profit. Each industry is supposed to make a profit which goes to the state. The N. E. P. is therefore state capitalism.

There seems to be no doubt that a minimum of financial assistance will make the new policy a success. During the last two years it has been shown that there is no efficiency that capitalism has developed which will not work under this system. From the point of view of the worker, however, it leaves much to be desired. It does not protect the workers entirely from exploitation and abuse.

The peasants have gained their desire in abolishing landlords. Unfortunately, however, they are exploited by small usurious capitalists. Their purchasing power is one-seventh to one-eighth of their pre-war power.

Dr. Levine was followed by Robert W. Dunn, who has been working with the Friends in Russia. He maintained that Russia is now working on her own resources, making slow but steady progress. The realization of Russia's strength is partly responsible for the hostile attitude of Great Britain and the other capitalist powers toward the Soviet Union. There is in Russia a steady gain in production and productivity. There are some 450 state trusts in the larger industries of Russia employing some 1,500,000 workers, 72 per cent. of the total. The tendency of these trusts is to concentrate into fewer and larger units. The trade union movement, he believes, is strong enough to protect workers in their struggle with the bureaucratic and wasteful features of state capitalism.

Unfortunately, other speakers who were to discuss public ownership from the American standpoint had been unable to come. The discussion, therefore, consisted mostly of questions on Russia addressed to Dr. Levine and Mr. Dunn. Their answers emphasized the difficulties in the way of Russian experiment, and pointed out some lessons from that experiment which might be applicable in America. They left, however, a hopeful impression of the Russian situation.

Although the speakers were remarkably well informed, the meeting aroused less general interest than almost any in the

conference, a striking change from conferences three or four years ago, when every road led to Russia. Now that emotional interest has abated, a keen, realistic study of working conditions in Russia had less appeal than it ought to the "intellectuals" of the L. I. D.

The Conference at Work and at Play

Saturday evening was the big night. Maily Hall was crowded. After community singing, which went pretty well in spite of (or was it because of?) the fact that Mr. Thomas had lost his voice in the lake or somewhere. He took the audience into his confidence about the work and prospects of the L. I. D., the desire of the directors for suggestions on future conference programs, and the difficulties found in arranging programs that would meet every need. He then proceeded to the painful task of raising money. The audience made it as painless as possible, and pledges of five and ten dollars came in thick and fast. In all, I believe, nine hundred dollars were raised.

Mr. Thomas then told us that Joseph Schlossberg of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers had been detained at Buffalo by the strike. Max Danish, editor of Justice, the organ of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, had been detained in Brooklyn by the illness of his father. We were, therefore, crippled in the discussion of some phases of the subject, "Next Steps in Workers' Control."

The first speaker was Mr. William Pickens, field secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who spoke on the racial aspect of the organization of workers for power. His humor, his personality and his arguments made him a great favorite with the audience. He did not appeal for benevolence or kindness toward the for-eigner or the Negro citizen.

"Take the Negro workman in our midst; he cannot be neutral; he must be either for labor organization or against it. He is human, terribly human, and will much prefer to be underpaid by the employers than to be starved to death by the labor unions. If the Negro is forced out by the unions, he is forced into the strike-breakers' columns. He has no predisposition to strike-breaking, providing the success of the strike means something to him, and he will be found just as willing as anybody else in the world to get more money for his present labor, or to labor less for his present pay.

Concretely Mr. Pickens suggested that Negro labor officials should be elected or appointed to work together with the white on terms of absolute equality. Colored workers should be allowed to the ranks of organized labor with no shadow of difference. Ten minutes of sympathetic questioning from the floor enabled Mr. Pickens to elaborate something of his position and to increase the favorable impression the audience had formed of him.

Following his address, Mrs. Agnes Armington Laidler sang beautifully a group of Negro spirituals and, as an encore, the Russian Troika.

Afterwards we were addressed by William P. Hapgood, president of the Columbia Conserve Company of Indianapolis, Ind. The plant is controlled entirely by the workers' council, who elect the managers, fix hours, wages, etc. The council is open to all workers who attend regularly. Mr. Hapgood described in some detail the capacity workers had shown to learn from mistakes to work together in making the business successful while at the same time introducing the spirit of service. When he was through he was greeted with a rapid fire of questions, most of which were born of the belief that Mr. Hapgood minimized the importance of the unions or magnified the degree of success of this form of cooperation between employers and employees and its applicability to our most pressing problems. Were the workers organized in

unions? They were not. Was their present control dependent upon the good will of the owners? Fundamentally it was. Did stockholders even now have the final control? No, under the present plan absentee stockholders did not have control. Was it not necessary for the industry still to operate within the usual laws of profit-seeking industries? Yes, but the spirit nevertheless made it a little different. Even though Mr. Hapgood did not make the audience believe that such a plan was the solution for our industrial problems, he at least won admiration for his own idealism, and the success of his experiment seemed to show that workers can be interested in an intelligent control of industry.

Mr. Hapgood scarcely ceased answering questions when there was a noise in the rear. The noise emanated from that prince of good fellows, Rabbi Lewis Browne. (No, I never knew a rabbi was like that.) He demanded the floor. He protested against the conduct of the conference. Mr. Thomas graciously conceded him the floor. He could not very well help himself. And while some dear ladies were still looking astonished at the Rabbi's rudeness the fun began. Local No. 25 (the bond of union was common occupancy of bunk house No. 25) had certain resolutions to offer. First the Rabbi called on Brother Harris. Up rose Mr. Harris, and in most serious voice proposed after various whereases:

"Resolved, that we are unalterably unqualifiedly and unreservedly opposed to each and all and every manner of resolutions, black or white, purple or pink, sacred or obscene, ponderous or piffling, just so long as they are resolutions."

Then the Rabbi with moving and serious eloquence proposed resolution No. 2. This resolution set forth in numerous whereases the importance of the solar system now threatened by capitalism and its unspeakably servile agents, the B. S. & W. and the N. Y. C., rebuked the L. I. D. for its indifference to this monstrous wrong and concluded:

"BE IT RESOLVED, that we of Local 25 herewith go on record as supporting unequivocally and without reserve the solar system as at present constituted with, of course, such changes in the system as may from time to time be found necessary and feasible, and, further,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that copies of these Resolutions be transmitted to the offices of the Universal Heliothermal Corporation, to the Prime Minister of Montenegro, and to the offices of all the locals of the U. M. O. D. and that they be released to the Bushkill correspondent of the Cosmic Press, and printed in *The World*, *Our World*, *The World To-morrow*, *The World the Day After To-morrow*, *The Globe*, *The Sun*, *The Evening Star* and all other journals deemed fit to carry them."

By the time this resolution was read even the most literal among us realized that something amusing was afloat, and we were prepared to laugh and wonder at resolution No. 3. This was introduced by Dr. Bernstein and dealt with the horrible suffering of the people of China, and especially of such famous liberals as Som Dum Goy, Low Hung Chin, One Lung Shy, and Fang Shon An, because the Official Government Kidnappers confiscated vast stores of irreplaceable Chow Mein, Com Quats and Chop Suey. We were all summoned to come to their relief with ships of hassenpfeffer, charlotte russe and bees' knees.

The solar system having been saved, Elmer Rice, the playwright, came to the defense of sex. Having noted a deplorable tendency to "ignore, repudiate, malign, suppress and abolish sex," being persuaded that "human progress depends in a large measure upon the perpetuation of the human race," and being reasonably certain that "without sex the human species would eventually tend to become extinct," we were asked to resolve against the abolition of sex with a final proviso that "any member of this organization found guilty

of violating the spirit of this resolution be expelled and ostracized, even unto the third and fourth generations."

These resolutions were thereupon unanimously adopted by the negative vote of the audience. Mr. Thomas then turned over the chair to Professor Kallen with the suggestion that, while he himself went out to get ready for the show, farce, comic opera, what-not, which everyone knew had been under preparation, the audience might raise a little more money. Professor Kallen took the suggestion seriously and under his exhortation twenty-eight dollars were raised. Since the curtains on the stage were still undrawn, Mr. Pickens took the floor and the stories he told were so irresistible that no one cared whether or not the curtain was ever pulled.

Pirates

But at last the great event was upon us. The stage was fitted like a pirate ship. Aboard it erstwhile grave and reverend citizens were giving us a revelation of their true piratical nature. Among these persons were doctors, lawyers, poets, clergymen—pirates all. This intellectual feast had been prepared by Solon DeLeon, Harry Dana and Nellie Nearing, with musical assistance from Carroll Hollister. It proved what I had been inclined to doubt: that radicals really laugh at themselves. Here was Harry Laidler in a costume, the like of which was never seen on Broadway, taking off the L. I. D.; Norman Thomas impersonating himself as president of the American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund), while other leaders in various radical movements were represented by proxy. But I am moralizing where I ought to be describing the play. Pirates cruising off Cape Codfish hear that Charlie Garland is about to inflict \$1,000,000 on them. In consternation they wonder what to do. Finally they form a fund, The Aquatic Fund for Protecting Suckers, and then divide up in smaller groups to spend the money. These smaller groups told their story in song and dialogue, and some amazing artists were discovered. There was Pasquale in the role of Samuel Bumpers, Nellie Nearing as Elizabeth Gurgling Spring, Marie Macdonald as Coopemup, Rabbi Lewis Browne as Jolly Roger, Sam Friedman as the ferocious Cannibal Lee. There were dances by Katharine Kerlin, Polly Rothrock and Anne Schmidt. Finally in the midst of the general scramble for the fund the chest went overboard. The pirates recovered from their consternation to sing in uproarious harmony: "Yes, We Have No Spondulicks."

From Politics to Poetry

Sunday: Everybody was still feeling happy about Saturday night's fun when we began to gather for the Sunday morning session.

Albert DeSilver, Associate Director of the Civil Liberties Union, presided over the regular meeting, which was given up to the discussion of "Next Steps in Political Action." The first speaker was Mrs. Florence Kelley, general secretary of the National Consumers' League. Mrs. Kelley contended that labor must enter politics if only to save the nation against the tyranny of the Supreme Court, which she denounced for decisions on child labor, minimum wage and other labor laws. Mrs. Kelley contrasted the trade union movement with that in England. We cannot copy England in every particular, but we can give a lot of consideration to the tolerance displayed by the British Labor movement. The nearer we seem to agree the more we seem to squabble. The A. F. of L. must be the leader in a big forward movement united on a few fundamentals.

The next speaker was William H. Johnston, President of the International Association of Machinists and Chairman of

the Conference on Progressive Political Action. He began by telling of his belief in the general principles of socialism, and he added that he had never voted an old party ticket. Ultimately there must be a labor party. He did not believe the right time had come. "The best we can do is to turn our faces toward the Goal of Our Heart's Desire and push forward as rapidly as circumstances will permit." Progressives in every state and congressional district ought to decide on the best method. It was that plan which had brought such success in the last elections. It is possible under our primary laws, with intelligent action for the progressives to capture old party machinery, as, for example, LaFollette controls Wisconsin. Mr. Johnston said that together with this organization must go an intensive campaign of education. "What is the use of forming a party to advocate public ownership and democratic control of railroads and coal mines unless people are educated up to it?" The Old Guard in both parties would hail with joy the news of the fighting Progressives, led by LaFollette and Huddleston, being forced to abandon all effort to control the primaries.

Morris Hillquit joined issue with his friend, Johnston, on these points. First, he felt that the success of progressives in electing more or less liberal-minded men on old party tickets was of comparatively little significance. No one knew how some of these progressives stood or would stand on important issues. Second, he felt the tendency would be to modify the primary laws before the workers could capture the entire machinery of any old party for national use. Third, we would never get anywhere unless we began to build a labor party. He appealed to the experience of the British. What had happened there was far more significant for American purposes than the more or less accidental Russian revolution.

American labor is traveling along the same path as British Labor; its course is being determined by the same forces; eventually it will reach the same conclusions and adopt the same methods. The sooner that realization is brought home to the workers of this country the sooner will the hour of their salvation strike.

Turning to Mr. Johnston, the speaker made an eloquent plea to him to take the opportunity of forming a strong labor party. "Many unions are ready. The farmer-labor Party will take time, but we are ready for the time. What we need is positive cooperative effort." In this connection Mr. Hillquit criticized the "young intellectuals" who sat back to sneer instead of getting into harness and working.

Scott Nearing opened the discussion, contending that there were three snags to the formation of a farmer-labor Party. First, Farmers fear that labor stands for socialization of land. Labor could well afford to explain to the farmers that it does not press this point. Second, lack of harmony between labor leaders and labor organizations endangers confidence. Harmony in the economic field necessarily precedes formation of a political party. Third, bitterness in the radical movement between the Socialist Party and the Workers Party paralyzes action.

The general discussion which followed was animated. B. Charney Vladeck, in a witty speech, dealt with the uncertain allegiance of so-called liberals in the United States elected by labor on the Republican and Democratic tickets. Mr. Glauberman came to the defense of the young generation against Mr. Hillquit's attack, and retorted on the older generation and the Socialist leadership generally for its own lack of courage and idealism. Julius Gerber defended the Socialist Party. Marie Macdonald told about the American Labor Party movement in New York. Mr. and Mrs. Meserole,

Mr. Wolinsky and others spoke on one or another aspect of the subject.

Mr. Hillquit, in replying at the close of the discussion, directed his remarks chiefly to Scott Nearing's argument. "If we must wait for a labor party until all Dr. Nearing's snags had been removed we would wait even longer than Mr. Johnston proposes." He agreed with Mr. Wolinsky's previous statement that the British Labor Party did not secure absolute economic harmony before it got together in the political field. He cited in this connection the breakdown of the Triple Alliance. For his part, he was willing to take into a labor party all workers' groups, no matter how fantastic was their economic and political belief, providing they were serious in cooperating, but when the organ of a group gives over three pages to abuse, and the fourth to a plea of friendship, one becomes suspicious of its sincerity.

Mr. Johnston concluded by saying that he was of the same opinion still. So I imagine was most of the rest of the audience. The discussion showed how general was the interest in a labor party. It showed also how great was the need, at least around New York, for a rebirth of mutual confidence and forgetfulness of past rancors before a general labor party could emerge.

From politics in the morning we ascended to art in the afternoon at the closing session of the conference. Rose Strunsky presided, and gave a sympathetic account of some manifestations of new art movements in Europe. She introduced Clement Wood as the first speaker on "Next Steps in Poetry and Fiction." He gave us an interesting examination of some of the tendencies in American literature. David Levinsky, he said, was the best American novel. American poems stood higher than American novels. He illustrated some of the poetry that he liked, and some that he did not like, by reciting it. To do justice to his vivid, sympathetic criticism of American literature would require an essay.

Elmer Rice, author of "The Adding Machine," believes that the great age of realism, which had its beginning with Ibsen, is coming to an end. It sought to portray life in terms of objective reality, and masters like Shaw, Galsworthy, Hauptmann and Chekov accomplished great things.

The expressionist feels, however, that this method had definite limitations. He feels that external realism cannot reveal entirely the inner meaning of a character or an event. He reaches out not only for the psychological mechanism that motivates conduct—the strange tangle of conscious and unconscious desires, fears, memories, inhibitions—but also for the metaphysical significance of events, their relation to other events and their place in the whole scheme of existence.

To achieve this ambitious end, the expressionist discards plausibility almost entirely. He employs symbols, condensations, graphic gestures. By means of distortions and artificialities, he strives to go beyond a mere cramping, literal transcription of life and to arrive at a more complete expression of its psychological and spiritual depths.

It is impossible to say how far this movement will go or how successful it will be. It is still groping, still in the experimental stage. We have seen only a handful of expressionistic plays: "The Hairy Ape," "From Morn to Midnight," "Roger Bloomer," "The Adding Machine." They have been of unequal merit and their reception has been mixed. We shall see more of these plays. Until we do, we must suspend judgment.

The discussion was opened by Prof. Kallen, who rather took exception to Clement Wood's positiveness in selecting the best. He pointed out how literature was affected by environment, changes of the conditions under which men live together, their insight into their own minds, and suggested reasons why so often literature tends to be an escape from the humdrum, cruel, or inadequate circumstances of man's daily life. I confess that I heard no more, for I had to

pack and say farewell to the camp. Then came supper, the trip down the mountain and at last home.

Things Not On the Program

This daily account of proceedings has left out the comradeship which made the conference. It was a great thing for the camp to have organized and unorganized athletics in the water and on land. The L. I. D. baseball team, captained by Howard Richards, on Saturday afternoon defeated a team of the regular campers, captained by Mr. Bloch, in a good game by score of eight to five. The tennis tournament was won by Clement Wood. Mrs. Mailly organized a hiking trip to Bushkill Falls. Solon DeLeon had his telescope out near the tennis court, and on clear nights showed the mountains of the moon and the rings of Saturn.

This sort of thing, together with the community singing and the Saturday night play and the beauty of the place, created good feeling than which nothing is more necessary in the radical movement, or indeed in human life.

One of the most interesting men at the conference was Prof. Patrick Geddes. In age, although not in spirit, he was one of the oldest of those present, and he shared Baby John Laidler's popularity. Once I remember he rebuked us for our indifference to the things about us, for our tendency to be absorbed in abstractions instead of the concrete. On the grounds one often would see him surrounded by eager listeners talking of everything from Aristotle to Freud, interrupting such discussion to call attention to the curious petal formation of the mountain laurel, or some other interesting botanical fact. He was in his own person a corrective of the tendency to "abstraction as outworn as mediaeval theology."

So the conference had its message from and for men of many types of mind. All in all it gave one ground for confidence in what the L. I. D. is accomplishing, and hope for what it may yet accomplish in American life.

The directors of the L. I. D. wish to thank the Rand School, and particularly Mrs. Mailly, the waiters, Miss Jarvis and Miss Dubrow, who looked after business details, Miss Kimball, who did the publicity work, Agnes Armington Laidler and Carroll Hollister, the musicians, as well as those who took part in speaking and discussing various subjects for their contributions to the success of the Conference.

INTRODUCING OUR NEW FIELD SECRETARY

The L. I. D. is happy to announce the engagement of Paul Blanshard as field secretary. Mr. Blanshard has had remarkable training for work with us. He started right by being born in Ohio. He was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1914, where he made a brilliant record as speaker and student. He did post-graduate work in theology at Harvard, and for a reason was associate pastor at the Maverick Church in East Boston, and afterward pastor of the First Congregational Church in Tampa, Florida. During the war Mr. Blanshard worked in the shipyards of Jersey City. Afterwards he was an organizer of the League to Enforce Peace.

In 1919 he turned definitely to the labor movement. He became organizer of the Amalgamated Textile Workers in Utica, N. Y., where he conducted a fifteen weeks' strike for a shorter day and higher wages. Later he joined the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, working as a tailor in Utica, until he was made organizer for the A. C. W. In the fall of 1920 he became educational director of the Rochester Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a position

which he has filled with remarkable success. He also served as secretary of the Rochester Labor College, an organization which has been supported by the A. F. of L. He has written numerous labor pamphlets and articles on labor education.

Mr. Blanshard is in England this summer completing a book outlining the British labor movement, which Doran will publish next winter. Members of the L. I. D. will remember the very enthusiastic reports we had of his work in debating the open shop in the Middle Western universities under our auspices.

In planning Mr. Blanshard's field schedule for next year the directors of the L. I. D. will welcome help from members of our organization. Any suggestions from you will be appreciated. When Mr. Blanshard comes into your neighborhood he will want your cooperation. Perhaps you even now have ideas as to suitable occasions when he may be used.

In this connection we ask our readers to let any of the directors know the possible opportunities for speaking or organizing. We want to begin this summer to make out schedules for Mr. Blanshard, who will be in the field pretty continuously, speaking especially, but not exclusively, before college groups, and for Mr. Thomas and Dr. Laidler during the more limited time they will be able to give to field work.

In General

A Twin City chapter of the L. I. D. has been formed at St. Paul, Minn. We hope great things from it.

Dr. Laidler's pamphlet, "The World Trend Toward Public Ownership," will be distributed and put on sale early in the autumn. It will be followed shortly by Prof. Harry Ward's discussion of "The Profit Motive." The Labor Bureau and Mr. Thomas are working on a study of the degree to which capitalization represents toll taken from workers and consumers and reinvested in industry rather than sacrifice of investors. Dr. Laidler plans a short pamphlet on "Social Facts," and he and Mr. Thomas a longer pamphlet on "What Is Industrial Democracy?"

Dr. Laidler rests from his labors as chairman of the committee which planned our successful conference. But with him vacation means time to work on another book—a history of socialist theory.

THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

70 Fifth Ave., New York City

Object: "Education for a new social order based on production for use and not for profit."

Officers: Robert Morss Lovett, president; Charles P. Steinmetz, Vida D. Scudder, Evans Clark and James H. Maurer, vice-presidents; Stuart Chase, treasurer; Harry W. Laidler and Norman Thomas, directors.

I wish to join as an.....member of the L. I. D.

Active Member\$3.00
Contributing Member, \$5.00
Sustaining Member, \$25.00
Life Member.....\$100.00
Student Member.....\$1.00

Name.....

Address.....