

MAR 4 1916

The

Intercollegiate Socialist

Labor Day



Peace and Socialism

SYMPOSIUM

BY

Senator Henri La Fontaine, Chas. Zueblin
Charlotte Perkins Gilman

Proceedings Labor Day Conference, I. S. S.

OTHER CONTRIBUTORS:

John Spargo

Helen L. Sumner

Prof. Herbert A. Miller

Caro Lloyd Stobell

Hortense Flexner

Paul H. Douglas

Harry W. Laidler



October-November, 1915



Ten Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Harry W. Laidler, 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

10c. a copy

Subscription, 25c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi	Columbia	Miami	Radcliffe
Alberta (Can.)	Cornell	Michigan	Simmons
Albion	Denison	Minnesota	So. California
American International	Fargo Agricultural	Montana	Springfield, Y. M. C. A. Coll.
Amherst	Florida	New York	Syracuse University
Barnard	George Washington	New York Law	Temple
Bates	Hamilton	North Dakota	Union Theological
Bowdoin	Hamline	Northwestern	Utah
Brown	Harvard	Oberlin	Vassar
California	Howard	Ohio Northern	Vassar
Carnegie Inst. Technology	Illinois	Ohio State	Washington
Chicago	Indiana	Ohio Wesleyan	Wesleyan
Cincinnati	John Marshall Law	Oregon Agricultural	Western Reserve
City College (N. Y.)	LaCrosse (Wis.) Normal	Pennsylvania	Williams
Clark	Los Angeles Osteopathic	Penn. State	Wisconsin
Colgate	Mass. Agricultural	Pittsburgh	Yale
Colorado	Mass. Inst. Technology	Princeton	

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. Undergraduate Chapters are required to pay 25c. 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 Bi-monthly is 25c. a year, 10c. a copy, 15 copies for \$1.

OFFICERS INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

<i>President</i>	
J. G. PHELPS STOKES,	Yale
<i>1st Vice-President</i>	
Mrs. FLORENCE KELLEY,	Cornell
<i>2nd Vice-President</i>	
ERNEST POOLE,	Princeton
<i>Treasurer</i>	
Miss MARY R. SANFORD,	Vassar
<i>Secretary</i>	
LEROY SCOTT,	Indiana
<i>Organizing Secretary</i>	
HARRY W. LAIDLER,	Wesleyan
<i>Executive Secretary</i>	
Mrs. ALICE K. BOEHME	

Executive Committee

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,	Bowdoin
Miss JESSIE W. HUGHAN,	Barnard
NICHOLAS KELLEY,	Harvard
PAUL KENNADAY,	Yale
HARRY W. LAIDLER,	Wesleyan
ALGERNON LEE,	Minnesota
Miss JULIET S. POYNTZ,	Barnard
I. M. RUBINOW,	Columbia
Prof. VIDA D. SCUDDER,	Smith
H. D. SEDGWICK,	Harvard
UPTON SINCLAIR,	C. C. N. Y.
Miss HELEN PHELPS STOKES	
Mrs. CARO LLOYD STROBELL,	Vassar
WM. ENGLISH WALLING,	Chicago
CHAS. ZUEBLIN,	Chicago

Alumni Chapters

Berkeley
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cleveland
Fresno
Los Angeles
New York
Philadelphia
Portland, Ore.
St. Louis
Schenectady
Seattle
Springfield
Washington
Wilkes-Barre

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

VOL. IV

OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1915

No. 1

Prof. Nearing and Free Speech

Since the days when Professor E. A. Ross was forced to resign from Leland Stanford University because of alleged economic heresy, no dismissal from college faculty has raised more vigorous protest than has that of Professor Scott Nearing from the University of Pennsylvania.

Nine years ago Dr. Nearing entered this quasi-public university as instructor in economics of the Wharton School of Finance. His magnetic personality, his ability to popularize abstruse economic truths, his indefatigable industry, his broad democratic sympathies, his fearlessness, his idealism soon made him one of the most successful teachers at that institution. Four hundred students at times crowded his courses.

Had Dr. Nearing confined his activity to the class room, all would have gone well. This, however, he refused to do. He wrote for the public press. He published magazine articles. He prepared books—eight of them in eight years—four on the subject of the distribution of wealth, the most dangerous subject that a professor can tackle. He, moreover, reached, in these books, some fundamental conclusions. He declared, for one thing, that a worker should receive all that he earns! He contended as a corollary: "He who is not willing to enter the workshop of life shall receive but the barest subsistence which will hold life intact!"

Young Nearing also went on the public platform. He spoke against child labor, when child labor was rampant in Pennsylvania. He defended workers on strike. He denounced corruption in Philadelphia's public utility corporations. He hit at special privilege wherever it raised its head.

The modern university does not consist, as did the Socratic schools of Greece or the French and German universities of the middle ages, of an inspired teacher, a host of eager-minded students and an attic or public square for lecture room. It consists of great buildings, expensive laboratories, an army of instructors. It needs money, plenty of it. Sometimes it needs it so badly that it is willing to sell its soul.

The University of Pennsylvania, with land and equipment valued at \$20,000,000, is one of these great educational factories. The University obtains \$1,000,000 from the state each year and tens of thousands from private contributors.

The modern university, if it is to obtain great contributions so necessary to its life, must curry favor with the moneyed men of the community. No better way of attaining that end has been devised than by placing these financial leaders on the board of trustees. "Trustees are chosen in nine cases out of ten," declared Professor Henry Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation, "for financial reasons only."

Whether or not these reasons operated extensively in the selection of the board of trustees of the U. of P., it is impossible to say. If financial prowess had, however, been the characteristic most sought in board members at this institution, happier choices could scarcely have been made. On this board appears, for instance, the senior partner of J. P. Morgan & Co. and one of the chief forces in the local transit company; the president of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad; representatives of the United Gas Improvement Company, the Girard Trust Company, the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, the

HXL
WII
v. A
(RECAP)

MAY - 6 1920

434215

American Sugar Refining Company and a host of other corporations. In fact a careful scrutiny of the financial connections of the 24 trustees on the board discloses the fact that no less than 95 presidencies, vice-presidencies and directorships of large corporations are distributed among them.

It is but natural, therefore, that the disquisitions of Professor Nearing on poverty, unearned income, corruption, should disturb the equanimity of these leaders of finance, many of whom were obtaining large profits from the special privileges which Dr. Nearing constantly attacked.

The result was well nigh inevitable. Dr. Nearing became a marked man. For eight years he was refused advancement from instructorship, despite the fact that the average instructor who makes good is raised to the position of assistant professor within four or five years; despite the fact that Nearing was more widely and favorably known than were the vast majority of the full-fledged university professors; despite the fact that his promotion was continually urged by the members of his department, his name twice appearing at the head of the list. For six years his salary, a small one, remained the same.

In 1914 an investigation was conducted into the economic teachings of professors of the Wharton School of Finance. The investigating committee, however, found that the professors under suspicion, of whom Nearing was the most prominent, were teaching the very things that Joseph Wharton, the founder of the school, made a condition for the continuance of the endowment—the immorality and inexpediency of unearned incomes, the iniquity of public corruption. The investigation stopped. The following fall Nearing was promoted to the position of assistant professor, but with no increase in salary!

This year a further investigation

was made. Following the inquiry, Thomas S. Gates, chairman of the Wharton School Committee, president of the Philadelphia Trust Company, in rendering his report, bemoaned the alleged effort of some of the teaching staff to arouse class prejudice, opposed "the use of the fair name of the University as a point of vantage for utterances foreign to the scheme of teaching and ideals in education" and called for the discharge of any professor violating the university traditions. Every one realized that Chairman Gates' strictures were directed against Nearing.

The report created a furore. Students held great protest meetings, passing vigorous resolutions in favor of free speech. Then followed a number of months in which nothing happened. In the Spring, the faculty submitted to the Board of Trustees a list of professors recommended for reappointment. Nearing's name, of course, was on the list. The faculty received no intimation that the recommendation would not be favorably considered. His retention seemed, therefore, a foregone conclusion.

Then came commencement, June 16th, and the speech of Professor Felix Emanuel Shelling, declaring that it would be "intolerable in this land of freedom" to allow to professors "anything else than that full freedom which we grant to all men." The day after, when most of the students and professors had gone on their vacation and when practically all college positions for next year were taken, Professor Nearing was notified of his discharge. Not a single word of explanation was given—not one.

The trustees, when asked the cause of their action, refused to take the public into their confidence. In October of this year, however, Dr. J. William White, a trustee not present at the meeting at which Nearing was dismissed,

stated that "on numerous occasions" Dr. Nearing presented views which were construed as "fanatic" and "extravagant" before "lay audiences" that were "quite unfit to appreciate or digest them." He made other accusations tending to discredit Dr. Nearing as a well-poised professor, which, however, the professor subsequently disproved. Statements by members of the staff indicated that Nearing was a popular professor, an esteemed faculty associate, a man whose influence over the students was of the best. By the process of elimination, the only reason for Dr. Nearing's discharge was to be found in his attacks on certain big "interests" represented directly or indirectly in the Board of Trustees. The Board is still receiving protests from all over the country against the dismissal, and, with the opening of the college year, those protests are becoming ever greater.

Coming, as did this event, practically simultaneously with the dismissal of Professor James H. Brewster from the University of Colorado; of George Clarke Cox from Dartmouth; of Arthur W. Calhoun from Maryville College; of Benjamin W. Van Riper from Boston University; of Dean Price from deanship of the Agricultural Department of Ohio State; of Dr. Edmund T. Dana from the University of Minnesota—practically all without one word of explanation, without any opportunity to obtain a hearing—the question of academic freedom looms up as one of the most important presented to thinking men and women.

The question before us is this: Are the universities to become mere centers for the propagation of traditional truths, or are they to be free forums wherein scholars with a vision may have an opportunity, alongside their more conventional brothers, to point out that vision to developing youth?

"It is by no means beyond the power of the state," declared Friedrich Dahlmann in 1845, himself a victim of academic repression, "to transform the former seats of

free culture into mere workshops, but the blow aimed at the sciences will not hurt them, for they are not unfamiliar with the wanderer's life, as much as it would hurt the youths of the state. It is by no means beyond the power of the state to compel these youths to attend such universities, but it has not the power to prevent them from despising institutions which contradict all the academic traditions and ideals esteemed in our literature. . . . For the places to which a noble ambition once led men to the highest culture would then hold merely the hod-carriers of science."

If college professors are to retain their self-respect; if the youth of the land is to receive his rightful heritage; if the nation is to be served by college men and women equipped with a genuine knowledge of its manifold problems, university professors must be free to express their honest convictions, even though these convictions dig deep into special privilege.

Each of us can aid in obtaining this university ideal. Professors can help by banding together for the purpose of resisting, with might and main, every infringement of their rights; by persistently demanding a greater measure of democracy in the management of the university; by refusing to "scab" on fellow members of the "black-coated proletariat."

Students can aid by regarding as the greatest gift to the University, not imposing buildings or expensive apparatus, but rather professors of scholarship, of vision, of ideals, of courage; by protesting with unmistakable voice against any invasion of their heritage. The community at large can give its aid by supporting those who conscientiously voice their convictions, even though those convictions disturb some old accepted truth; by battling, in season and out of season, for every social measure which will free the university from the grip of the money lords, which will make it a center of intellectual endeavor controlled by the people, in the interest of the people. H. W. L.

Socialism and War

By Senator Henri La Fontaine*

The most striking fact about Socialism and war was obviously the powerlessness of Socialism in 1914 to prevent the frightful catastrophe. No less striking was the fact that nearly all the Socialists agreed to participate in the defense of their respective countries.

In Italy and Great Britain, it is true, some Socialist groups have criticized their governments. In Germany a number of women and men have dared to protest against the war. The large majority of the Socialists, however, without hesitation, have supported their government.

And yet, to be loyal and just, it must be conceded that the German Socialists, in the historic session of the Reichstag on the 4th of August, 1914, declared that it was for the purpose of defending the fatherland against Russia that they agreed to support the imperial government. It may also be said that they opposed in advance all conquest by Germany. We must add, however, that they did not protest against the violation of the neutrality of Luxemburg and Belgium, which was cynically acknowledged by the Chancellor of the Empire and stormily cheered by the Reichstag, nor have they protested against this action up to the present time. They have furthermore voted in favor of the new military credit, only seventeen abstaining and two opposing, even though the main foe, against whom Teutonic hatred has been directed, is not autocratic Russia, but democratic Great Britain.

All the other Socialists in the belligerent countries supported their gov-

ernment, stating that they entered the struggle in order to defend democracy, to secure international justice and to crush militarism.

These various Socialist pronouncements give us ground for hope that, when the war is over, the Socialists, not alone in the allied countries, but also in the neutral lands, will unite and advocate this minimum program: democracy, international justice, anti-militarism, and that a great number of the Socialists of Germany and Austria-Hungary—it is useless to speak about the Turkish Socialists—will rally to this program.

Such a program, however, expressed by words as vague as democracy, international justice, anti-militarism, is inadequate. Behind these terms there are institutions to create and institutions to suppress, traditions and prejudices to overthrow and new laws to make. Certain of these laws and these institutions should be accepted everywhere and supported throughout the world with unanimity by all those who profess to be Socialists.

There is no doubt that international Socialism has been too often pleased with mere words. Socialism has had no constructive tendencies. To maintain an apparent unity it has been satisfied, as diplomacy nearly always is, with elastic formulas. Too often it has consented to subordinate the realization of its program to national or local circumstances. If Socialism is desirous of dominating the world, its first duty is to accept a rigid discipline and to frame a definite program which should be supported everywhere with an unyielding obstinacy.

When Bebel, for instance, declared that he would defend his country if it were attacked, voting, however, at the same time against excessive arma-

* Senator La Fontaine is Socialist Senator of Belgium, President of the International Peace Bureau, the winner in 1913 of the Nobel Peace Prize.

ments, he implicitly acknowledged the necessity of armies and opposed a mere verbal hindrance to militarist politics. Shall we, in this matter, adopt similar political tactics and allow American democracy, in following out the program of preparedness, to yield in its turn to excessive militarism?

Socialists ought to have a categorical and clear opinion concerning the problems before the world. They ought to know what meaning is to be given to democracy, to international justice, to anti-militarism.

Regarding democracy. Does it mean that the franchise is given to each woman and man? That the people are permitted to decide all questions of public interest by referendum or by initiative? That parliaments have the controlling power over their governments? Does democracy consist in the elimination of occult diplomacy and of professional diplomats and the placing of the relations between states under the control of Parliaments? Is democracy the general adoption by all peoples of a republican regimen?

What about international justice? Does it consist only in the creation of a Supreme World Court and of an International Court of Conciliation? Does it not also carry with it the solemn recognition of the right of the peoples freely to dispose of themselves as well as the obligation to enforce, by a collective coercion, the international judiciary decisions and the independence of states? Does it not as well imply the right of each man to enjoy everywhere all over the world a complete freedom of speech, of thought, of action, of motion? Does it not also mean respect for the rights of backward peoples and the vouchsafing of aid to these people in transforming their civilization through modern education?

Finally, does it not involve free

trade and the removal of all tariffs which enable a few wealthy citizens to grow ever richer at the expense of other peoples as well as of their own fellow citizens?

What about anti-militarism? Does it consist in the disbandment of all armies and navies? In the opening of all straits and channels and the blowing up of all fortresses and armories? In an embargo on all exportations of guns, rifles and ammunition? Does it mean the inauguration of a system of militia to supercede standing armies? Is it the organization of an international police force? Does it mean a people armed and a professional commandery discharged? Does it mean that training will be local, and that the barracks will be surrendered to social purposes?

To all these questions and hundreds of others, Socialists should have definitely formulated answers and should stand by them as one man. But one question, for many Socialists, predominates over all others: If, in fact, the Socialists should agree upon the remedies which should be forced upon the diplomats entrusted with the making of a lasting peace, will the triumph of Socialism be surer and nearer?

Socialism means more than the reduction or the end of wars. But the reduction or the end of wars, the suppression of the most flagrant wrongs inflicted on peoples and of the secular hatreds between them, will mold a world more favorable to Socialist propaganda. For it will be less easy then for rulers to divert the attention of the masses from the struggle of the classes by the manipulation of events of a sensational character in international politics.

It is obvious on the other hand that those who took advantage of the circumstances preceding the great war will try to profit by the new state of things brought on with the aid of the

Socialists. This will only be a greater reason for Socialists to remain tightly united and to oppose with eagerness those attempts. No clear-minded Socialist could suppose that, after the war, all struggle for him would be over and that the opponents of Socialism would disarm at once. It would be no less stupid to decide, because we were unable to reach our goal at once, that free play should be allowed to our opponents and that nothing should be done to limit their power.

My conclusion is, therefore, that the Socialists of the neutral countries and, as largely as possible, those of the belligerent ones, should try to agree upon what effort they are willing to make when the hour strikes for peace. In my opinion the best known Socialists and, namely, the members of the International Socialist Bureau, should be present when the representatives of the states meet and discuss terms of peace.

In close relation with the men and women members of other organizations, who certainly will gather in the city designated for the diplomatic conference, they should exert a continuous and collective pressure. Perhaps it would be necessary and highly impressive to call an International Socialist Congress, as it would be needful to call an Interparliamentary Conference, a Universal Peace Congress, an Interunionist Conference, an International Students' Congress, an Interdenominational Congress, an International Women's Congress, an International Congress of Chambers of Commerce, and to appeal to jurists, to teachers, to scientists, to artists, to bankers, to shipowners, to all those whom the great war has hurt and wronged and injured and aggrieved! Socialists, if they refrained from acting, would let pass the most striking opportunity that they have ever had to prove the overwhelming power of their principles and their ideals.

World Federation and Peace

By CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN.

In trying to substitute ideals of Peace for those of War, we find the word peace too negative. "War" means action, the doing of a great many things, the whole complicated and strenuous work of fighting.

Peace means "not fighting"—"not doing things"; it does not offer to the imagination Achievement.

We must offer not only these negative ideals of "not fighting," but positive ones of the great work of World Federation, which alone can guarantee Peace: the active work of forming that great Union.

Such a World Federation is already somewhat established through our numerous international functions and associations. The business of the

world is now very largely international: finance, art, science, invention, religion,—all our highest social processes are now world processes.

The earliest basis of association was the tie of common blood; next, the tie of a common land; third comes the tie of a common social process: the organizations of an art, an industry, a business, involving members of distinct racial stocks and of separate countries.

The true sociological basis of World Peace is the establishment of a Federated Government, based, not on a common blood nor a common land, but on our common interests and their world-processes.

Throughout history we find that in any given period the general ideas of a

people are always far behind their degree of social advancement. Conditions change faster than ideas, because our young people are educated in the oldest traditions, emotions and prejudices.

To-day, in our swift and sweeping changes, we develop new social ties, new conditions and obligations, far faster than we consciously recognize them. We are now, in reality, evolved to where World Federation would in all ways benefit us; but our ideas and emotional reactions are still those of the national, and, in some cases, even of the tribal period.

In order to promote World Peace, we must promote that form of organized union which alone can ensure it. This is to be done along two lines: first, the necessary education, both of adults and children, which will ignore old quarrels and hatreds, and deliberately emphasize the mutual interests and benefits of the people of the earth.

For children this requires a re-writing of history, in which the main teaching shall be of human progress, with full recognition of the steadily increasing obligation each nation owes to the others; with the record of wars given a most secondary place; their miserable bases of anger, greediness and pride clearly shown, and their glaring injury to the civilization of the time always indicated.

The element of heroism and devotion should be strongly treated in describing those men and women to whose invention, discoveries and services we owe our real advance.

By cutting off from the child's mind the old tradition of military glory and planting instead the new tradition of

world-service through creative activities, we shall make the kind of people who will be able and willing to unite. For adults the necessary education involves not only new knowledge, but the stern labor of personally resisting one's own traditions and instincts.

In political action we should begin at once our "Peace Department," with its "Secretary of Peace," or whatever we choose to call it;—"Department of International Relations" would be more definite. We should begin action at once, calling International Conferences to discuss measures for the maintenance and improvement of such mutual relations; and, as rapidly as possible, institute some form of World Federation.

This idea, in a varying degree, is now being urged by almost all the thinkers and workers for World Peace. Its first form will doubtless be a mere Court or Tribunal, like that already instituted at the Hague, with the addition of an International Force to carry out the decrees of the Court.

Such an International Police, both military and naval—especially the latter, as the sea is the real world connection wherein all our interests should be recognized and defended—, seems the first practical step in the establishment of World Peace.

The only force more potent than the strongest nation is that of all the other nations. Through that force we will maintain World Peace, and in that peace rapidly develop the world ties, and the new world people, making peace a recognized necessity, and relegating war to the status of cannibalism.

Special attention should be called to the change of address of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society from 41 Union Square, to Rooms 412-13, EDUCATIONAL BUILDING, 70 FIFTH AVENUE, (Corner 13th St.), N. Y. City. Tel., Chelsea 3877.

Permanent Peace

By CHARLES ZUEBLIN

Permanent peace can come within the range of possibility only by clearing the ground of utopian proposals. To brand a peace measure as utopian is not to call it absurd, only impracticable. No such impracticable utopists have appeared in our time as the men who expect to settle anything by war. This utopian device prevails momentarily over the others merely by the use of force. It disposes of treaties as paper, dismisses The Hague as tissue, and treats the organizations of Christianity as confetti. Such results ought to discourage a proposal of further utopian suggestions. If disarmament is recommended, what can we offer the nations of Europe? Continental countries think they must maintain armies; maritime countries, navies. We have made no such preparation as they have, and cannot. We have over 20,000 miles of coast line to protect, eight times that of England, twenty-five times that of France. Our transportation facilities are purely accidental. The methods of the future, as revealed by the use of flying machines, in the present war, may menace even the interior. The body politic is suffering from inability to digest the sons of Mars, but it is not to be cured by sweets.

Scientific proposals are needed to induce permanent peace. When war is upon us, we spend incredible millions and endure unheard-of suffering. The chief torture demanded of us to forestall these calamities is fearless thought. We must move toward free trade. While protectionist sentiment has been steadily growing in Great Britain, the Southern States and other free trade territory, war makes free trade imperative. Protective and revenue tariffs are the proposals of children playing with bombs. We must meet each nation cordially and generously, with reciprocal tariffs and reciprocal patents. We must

substitute a merchant marine for a navy. We shall go neither unarmed nor carrying concealed deadly weapons. We shall not talk about peace and prepare for war. We shall make peace profitable.

America must revise its attitude toward immigration. We can only admit people as fast as we can assimilate them, but there must be no discriminations against European or Asiatic immigrants. We can admit freely Asiatics as well as Europeans up to the numbers we can assimilate in any year, if our native labor is protected by law and organization, so that no aliens are employed while natives are unemployed and immigrants are compelled to accept the American standard of living. We must face frankly the question of the density of population. China, Japan, and Germany are all overcrowded. The United States can hold hundreds of millions more with comfort and profit. It is chimerical to try to monopolize this land for the handful of people in it, while other nations are overcrowded. The only correctives for density of population are emigration and a rising standard of living. The congested nations must have an outlet. The standard of all nations will rise as the working people get their share of production.

The United States must develop a solidarity now lacking. No matter how insuperable the obstacles seem, economic justice must be done to the negro; unions must be recognized and encouraged; home rule for each community must prevent a conflict of local, state, and national legislation; and all transportation and communication must be socialized. A unified nation is impossible with railways, express, telephone and telegraph in private hands.

America must recognize that militarism cannot be abolished by prayer or fasting, but only by a reasonable counter

proposal. America must have a working army. Every girl, as well as every boy, should be a conscript to public service. A year of each young life should be given to public works. This will incidentally inculcate a sound patriotism harmonious with universal, as well as national, well-being. It will take care of the surplus labor that makes a fringe of poverty choking the life of each community. It will furnish an opportunity for vocational training in which the

young people can experiment in life and the nation select its soldiers, engineers, nurses and social workers.

The United States can carry the olive branch to other countries only as it proves its sincerity. It already enjoys a great prestige because of its relations to Canada, Mexico and Cuba. It can come into similar friendly relations with the world by proving that conquest is futile, solidarity feasible and permeation scientific.

Patriotism

By HORTENSE FLEXNER

Perish the man-made bounds—the measured lines
That bar earth's kindred children race from race,
Holding their starvelings in their strait confines,
Breeds of small prisoners bereft of space,
Whose souls, as sightless fishes in dark pools,
Lie well content, nor sense what strange lure gleams
On wide horizons, in the wind that cools

Day's burning heart—men who wear chains for dreams!
Shall they not know that home is all of earth,
And love of country but a little flame
Fanned in a cage? Children of common birth,
Must they then train the guns, die in their shame,
Nor meet in kinship, till they fall—made free
And one, in Death's too still democracy?

Nationalism and Socialism

By HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER, Ph. D.,
Professor of Sociology, Oberlin College

The rational principles of Socialism are not going to be overthrown by the European war, but internationalism will have to wait on the fulfilment of the demands of nationalism. Sentiment is just as much a fact and a force in individuals and in society as reason. Patriotism or national feeling is an emotion which cannot be eliminated until it can find another emotion to take its place. Whether that time will ever come is a question to which the signs of the times offer no answer.

Group consciousness seems to express itself more easily in harmony with tradition, than with economic advantage. In fact, the more the group is oppressed, the more vigorously it fights for freedom. Cultural oppression arouses the strongest opposition. This takes the form of religious and linguistic antagonisms. These are the symbols around which the group rallies, and it is beginning to be obvious that these two forms of social expression must have won the privilege of being entirely free before

internationalism can make much progress. The Home Rule struggle in Ireland is the best known illustration of this principle, but it is as common as the existence of a subject people. Poland, in its subjection to Germany and Russia, made a religion of its nationalism symbolized by devotion to language and religion. Austria is composed of half a dozen groups whose life purpose is to establish their own language in opposition to the German of the official government. This struggle is the greatest thing in the world to them, and if Socialism tends to break down the barriers which nationalism sets up, it must take a back seat until national freedom is secured.

The Jews, who have contributed more to Socialism than any other single group

from Marx to Hillquit, are likely to be diverted for the same reason. Zionism is a movement to hang together until genuine national self-respect is created, and the Jew is free. In other words group consciousness will dominate until discrimination disappears.

Nationalism is not necessarily antagonistic to Socialism, but it is more primary and will work out its freedom first. Then Socialism can work its internationalist program. Socialism is patient, but it must be more patient. Its problems are not solely economic but quite as much psychological. The coming society must have an adjustment of the complex forces of human nature, and one of the most elemental is the group consciousness which we call nationalism.

Our Labor Day Conference

By Caro Lloyd Stobell

This fall marked a new milestone in the history of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, namely, the holding of its first summer conference. An array of pilgrims, about one hundred, as varied and as typical as those on Chaucer's famous pilgrimage, journeyed from all points to meet at the old Whittier Inn in Hampton, N. H. Socialists, social workers, divinity students, farmers, ministers, workmen and teachers came from a strong personal sense of responsibility toward the problems which confront the human race to-day. The same spirit animated them which made Thomas Paine exclaim in 1776: "We must think as we have never thought before. The crisis of our civilization is upon us. Which way shall we turn?"

No setting could have been more beautiful than the old village. It stands in restful isolation. The world comes in on the trolley at one end and goes out at the other, leaving it undisturbed, its white houses nestled un-

der great elms, its home gardens ripening in the sun, its four white spires testifying to its Puritan ancestry. Even our scores of members did not seem to awaken any curiosity, although the Town Hall was cordially opened for our morning and evening sessions, and one of the pastors omitted his evening service in order to attend our meeting.

We seemed, indeed, to be interpreted in terms of religion. I asked my rather naive landlady about us and she said she had understood that Socialism was a new kind of religion and that we were like the Quakers.

Our afternoon sessions were held at the Whittier Guest House, where, like the Attic philosophers, we communed in the grove. Through all the setting there was appropriately present the reminiscence of the poet Whittier, the first to protest against chattel slavery and the consistent opponent of war. On Sunday morning we attended the Quaker meeting house where he wor-

shipped; and here the spirit moved several Socialists to speak and the voluntary service was one of our most impressive experiences.

As we left, I overheard one of our Russian members say to an American Anglican minister that it had been her first religious meeting. He was so amazed that he asked her three times over what she said.

This episode is mentioned as typical of the highly interesting informal conferences which were always happening; as when John Spargo would gather a ring of young students in the grove at luncheon, or Prof. Hayes and Dr. Rubinow munched corn and talked the eternal verities at the clambake, or as we wandered through the garden where Whittier spent his last days.

Everybody seemed to be somebody important, and as we were all tagged with named labels we quickly came to know who's who and to get at each other's special message. Sidis, the prodigy, came to visit us, and Ellen Starr, from Hull House. Workmen came from Haverhill, and delegates left the Episcopalian convention at Byfield to visit us. There also was Frank Sanborn, the present "Sage of Concord," whose ancestor founded the village, and who rebuked us for daring to suppose that said ancestor or Hampton or even New Hampshire had left us anything to solve.

We had sessions devoted to the ideals and tactics of modern Socialism, on the ethics of Socialism, on unemployment, and three on peace and war.

The thinking of the conference was constructive, an intense and eager desire to find a way out being its prevailing note. It was evident—as who can doubt after the report of the Industrial Relations Commission—that the burden of exposing our social rottenness can now be largely left to the system itself, as it "smelleth to

heaven." The hours are now striking for constructive suggestions.

It is a wholesome sign that the only kicking for which the Socialists found time was over their own shortcomings. Vida Scudder in her talk on the ethics of Socialism warned them against recognizing only economic forces and ignoring the eternities, pleaded for a union of Socialism and Christianity, which started a refreshing discussion between Christian Socialists and agnostics. Florence Kelley and Dr. Rubinow and Juliet Poyntz in the valuable session on unemployment scored our failure to do effective work on this task immediately ours.

The sessions on War and Peace were packed full of interest and value. Prof. Ellen Hayes discussed the causal relation between Socialism and permanent peace. Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan advocated the pacifist policy of non-resistance, and William English Walling told of the internationalism of finance which was making for peace.

Prof. Charles Zueblin, while holding that non-resistance was the only policy which had ever worked, set forth Prof. Wm. James' plan of an army of peace. Dr. George W. Nasmyth, director of the World Peace Foundation, said that he looked to America to lay the basis of the world's peace and to the Socialist party to use its leadership. He set forth the plans of the various groups working for world peace, notably the Fabian plan. The conference was infinitely enriched by two addresses from Senator La Fontaine, of Belgium, and by the clear-cut thinking of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, calling for a campaign of education in internationalism to hasten the day when we shall sing, "Our world, 'tis of thee," and in the meantime the maintaining of world peace by an international mutual defense force.

Shall we ever forget Anna Strunsky Walling as she arose and made her impassioned plea for Socialism? As she stood there in her flowing white dress, her eyes flashing, her body swaying in her emotion, she seemed a personification of the social revolution. For a moment many of us felt as if we were in a scene parallel to those of the French revolution. As through the other speeches we had seen growing the intellectual framework of the coming Inter-Nation, in her we felt pulsating the overpowering passion of revolt, of love, of hope, of courage which will bring it to life.

Thus we came to the end of the conference, and as we parted, after the final frolic of a clambake on the beach, we felt that although there still remained some unsolved problems for the world at large we, at least, were immeasurably enriched by the experience. The swift play of mind upon mind, the sharp differences of opinion, and under all the current of spiritual comradeship had been inspiring.

So distinct was its success that the conference bids fair to come again and to prove one of those hardy perennials which make glad the gardens of our experience.—New York Call.

Jottings from the Conference Notebook

It would indeed be difficult to obtain a portrayal of the wonderful spirit prevailing at the Labor Day Conference more true to life than that contained in the foregoing article by Caro Lloyd Strobell. An eager searching after truth, an impatience of dogma and empty phrase and an overwhelming desire to build rather than to destroy characterized every session of the Conference.

Especially noticeable was the constructive spirit in the discussion of the methods of obtaining peace.

Senator La Fontaine on the World Court

Senator Henri La Fontaine, the oldest Socialist senator of Belgium, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and president of the International Peace Bureau, led in the discussion of this vital problem—and none better equipped for this task could have been secured. The senator, who has made a special study, during many years past, of the organization of an international court, emphasized the importance of such a court as an instrument for peace, and urged that the Socialists of the world take a leading part in working out methods of procedure. He also contended that it was the duty

of the Socialist movement to send its best representatives to the city where the diplomats of Europe gather to decide on measures of peace, and to bring the greatest possible pressure to bear upon them to incorporate in treaties terms which would make peace permanent. In elaborating his plan for an international court, Senator La Fontaine declared that the greatest problem was that of giving due representation to the smaller nations, so that their interests would be properly safeguarded.

"I am in favor," he declared, "of an international court of justice and of a council of conciliation, the former to have jurisdiction over justiciable disputes and the latter, over non-justiciable disputes.

"The present court of arbitration cannot settle economic differences, such as those arising over tariffs. It has no power to hear disputes between one state and citizens of another state or to change treaties. The Hague Conference has already agreed on the principle of such a court. The nations, however, have thus far been unable to decide on the method of selecting judges. At the 1910 Hague conference, Germany, with the support of Turkey, Greece and Roumania, opposed the plan submitted, and as no agreement could be made at these conferences, except with unanimous consent, nothing was done."

Senator La Fontaine believed that in selecting the judges for the court, each of the forty-six states should nominate fifteen judges, five of whom should reside in other countries. He also contended that the voting power of the small states should be the same as that of the larger ones. This scheme of selection, he believed, would ensure proper representation to the smaller states, while the larger ones, which, for the most part, possess the best known students of international law, would be virtually certain of their due share of representatives. He stated that most serious students of international jurisprudence develop an international consciousness — an ability to abstract themselves from their nationalistic environment. Each nation could be depended on to vote for the most impartial of the statesmen of other nations, he believed, and the calibre of the court would therefore be likely to be of a high order.

The Senator also emphasized the astonishing growth of international organizations immediately before the war, and said that, in his opinion, if the war had been delayed for five years, these associations would have been strong enough permanently to have prevented a European conflagration.

"The middle and professional classes of Europe, as well as the working class, were becoming year by year ever more vigorous in their demands for peace," he declared. "At the 1910 convention of the International Peace Bureau, 132 peace organizations were represented and in 1912, 176. If the congress proposed for San Francisco this year had materialized, representatives from over 200 peace societies would probably have been present. There are at present in existence more than 400 international organizations of various sorts, including scores of federations among the public departments of European governments. The International Postal Union and the International Agricultural Bureau include in their ranks practically every advanced nation in the world. The Frankfort Congress proposed by the Free Masons for August 15, 1914, for the purpose of discussing the autonomy of Alsace-Lorraine, was

of the utmost significance. Five thousand delegates from Germany, France and elsewhere had, before the war, promised to be present at this Conference. The recent growth of such organizations and particularly of the Socialist movement was no doubt one of the reasons why certain European militarists were anxious for war at the present time."

The Senator spoke as well of the importance of free trade and liberal immigration laws in bringing about peace and warned the American people against that kind of militarism which has been imposed upon Europe, declaring that if the Socialists remained silent, the United States also might be victimized.

Asked what he thought would be the effect of the war on Socialism, he said:

"The Socialists of Europe are to-day preaching Socialism in the trenches and are gaining many adherents. I believe that when the war is over, Socialism will be stronger than ever before."

Charlotte Perkins Gilman seconded Senator La Fontaine's suggestion of a world court in a remarkably lucid statement, excerpts of which appear elsewhere in the magazine. She also dwelt on the necessity of reconstructing our methods of teaching.

John Spargo declared that it was his belief that a league to enforce peace was a dangerous possibility for the proletariat of the world.

"If the capitalists remain in control of the various countries," he asked, "will not the force at the disposal of the united nations, organized for the purpose of enforcing their decrees, be available for the crushing of any social uprising that may assume the importance of a social revolution? What is wrong is the uneven economic development, and we will have friction so long as that exists. The one remedy is class solidarity. We should make that ever stronger and should also hold ourselves in readiness to start a vigorous campaign for disarmament."

Rose Pastor Stokes, who acted as chairman of the meeting, also suggested this danger. Senator La Fontaine declared that he believed that an international court could depend upon economic boycotts and other economic pressure to

enforce its decrees, and that it would not be necessary for it to organize an international police force.

"While there will undoubtedly be defects in such a court, as there are defects in every other human institution," he added, "its advantages will be far greater than its evils. If the Socialists, moreover, take an active part in formulating plans for the international organization, the interest of the proletariat will be properly looked after."

Mrs. Gilman denied that such an international court would be permitted to interfere with the internal affairs of any country. Miss Mary Ovington expressed a fear that the court might lead to a combination of the white races for the purpose of dominating over the negro and yellow races. This danger, Senator La Fontaine admitted, but thought it could be warded against. The efficacy of a citizens' army in safeguarding democracy in these days of machine guns was also vigorously discussed.

Peace and Democratic Self-Assertion

In the second Conference on "Socialism and Peace," held Sunday evening in Hampton Town Hall, Professor Ellen Hayes of Wellesley College emphasized the necessity of self-recognition, self-assertion and self-guidance on the part of the masses of people, if permanent peace, even under Socialism, was to be obtained. Dr. Jessie W. Hughan and William English Walling also spoke. Harry W. Laidler presided.

Miss Hayes asked whether, when we consider the fundamental causes everywhere at work defeating the birth of political democracy, there is any ground for hope that these same causes will not as effectively deaden industrial democracy and make internationalization illusory and unsound.

"It would afford," she declared, "something very simple and definite to work for if it could be established that membership in the Socialist Party and the reading of Socialist literature made a person free in his mind; but from the mental habits of a lifetime, the prevailing modes of thought and the customary viewpoint of one's so-

cial environment, escape is not so easy, and back of one's own day and generation are the folk-ideas and folk-behavior which have grown with the growth of the race: the faith in the great man; the humility before the rich man; the reverence for position and authority; the thralldom to the group-superstition called patriotism. Acceptance of the creed of social democracy cannot suddenly set these forces at naught. It is fairly probable that the average convert has only exchanged one master for another. The taint of servility is still in his blood, he is eager to 'get behind' somebody of note and leadership without inquiring strictly about the principles which that leader is himself behind. . . .

"I am convinced that the question of world peace turns ultimately on the capacity of the masses for self-recognition, self-assertion, self-guidance. When the Socialist movement throughout the world means a majority of men and women who refuse to be satisfied with a pseudo-democracy, when it has at last learned that to be well born is a common right and to be well bred a common need—which is to say that human life shall not be cheap or mean—when the pretensions of rulers and the sophistries of politicians are only history stories, there will be peace."

Miss Hayes spoke about the difficulty at present of developing in the masses the idea of independence of opinion when even in the universities, the avowed educational policy of which is to train the youth to habits of open-mindedness and mental self-reliance, "young people are equipped only with highly-endorsed, perfectly conventional beliefs and opinions, while docility ranks 100 as a student's virtue."

"No form of government, no system of economics," concluded Prof. Hayes, "will put an end to wars. Forms and systems do not save. The source of world peace must be looked for in a sounder average mental integrity, a sounder and more widespread ethical life controlling organizations and institutions. This spiritual civilization cannot be thwarted any more than it can be created by tribunals, treaties and international agreements. It is the ultimate content of Socialism and its coming is guaranteed by evolution of itself."

"Peace at Any Price"

Dr. Jessie W. Hughan, the second speaker, expressed the belief that the

time had come for Socialists to take a definite stand against all international wars, defensive as well as aggressive, and to refuse to enlist in such wars.

"There are three possible attitudes toward the war," she said. "We can approve of aggressive warfare, as Bernhardt seemingly does. We can give our approval only to wars waged under certain circumstances, such as wars of defense or wars against militarism. We can fight against all wars. The supporters of aggressive warfare are rare. Wars against militarism are ineffective. For militarism does not reside in any one nation intrinsically nor can it be crushed nor inflicted from without. If we grant that its destruction is possible from without, this can be done only by a greater militarism. Would it pay?"

"To be willing to wage a war of defense is always a disastrous policy, (1) because the war party makes every war a defensive war to the workers; (2) because even a genuine war usually becomes an offensive war and vice versa in the course of campaigns; (3) because defense is no longer practicable by means of war. A war in defense of land is not practicable. We do not own land anyway. A war in defense of institutions is not practicable, for these institutions depend on industrial development and cannot be permanently checked by force. A war in defense of homes and families is futile, as one can see in the case of East Prussia, Belgium and the German coast. Modern methods of warfare moreover will make an adequate defense impossible. Accordingly an unconditional hostility to war is the only rational policy unless, like Bernhardt, we approve of war."

Miss Hughan contended that the Socialist Party, therefore, should instruct its congressman against voting for war or war appropriations; that it demand immediate disarmament of the United States and unconditional arbitration, and that it insert an anti-enlistment clause in its membership pledge. Miss Hughan's contentions gave rise to a lively discussion. John Spargo declared that should the German Socialists after the war rise against their government in order to secure further political rights, there is little doubt that the Russian bureaucracy would support the German government in trying to crush the proletariat. Un-

der these conditions would it not be justifiable for American citizens to rush to the aid of the proletariat, even at the point of the bayonet?

W. Harris Crook vigorously defended Miss Hughan's peace proposal, declaring that economic boycotts, if properly used, would be sufficient to bring any recalcitrant nation to its knees, without a resort to arms.

The Internationalization of Production and Peace

The two most hopeful movements tending to eliminate war, according to William English Walling, were those of democracy and of the internationalism of industry. The world, he declared, could most confidently rely on the latter movement to abolish warfare.

"The working people in no country favor war," Walling said. "The majority of the capitalist class and of the middle class are probably opposed to war. The majority, however, are in favor of the causes which lead to war. They do not wish to make the tremendous economic concessions which must be made if a conflict is to be averted. The economic nationalism of the mass of people is one of the big causes of war. In the United States it is very easy to stir up people against the Japanese, for instance, on account of economic competition. The Panama Canal should be neutralized, but we note that the American people are opposed to making the sacrifice. Otto Bauer, the Socialist leader of Austria, declares that one of the great evils of capitalism is that the economic interest, not only of the capitalist class, but also of the working class, conflicts at present. It is necessary for us then to find a way in which people of various countries will have common economic interests.

"To be against war means nothing if we favor our nation whenever it has an economic conflict with another nation. Norman Angell is an international pacifist. William Jennings Bryan is a national pacifist. In declaring that the American people should never abate one iota of sovereignty, Mr. Bryan uttered a more warlike sentiment than Roosevelt has uttered in the last twenty years. Some of the British Socialists, in emphasizing the importance of the British Empire, are taking the same nationalist pacifist view.

"While democracy is advancing, the internationalism of industry is growing more rapidly. War will be prevented by this internationalism of production. Nations are being drawn together more and more by bonds of common ownership. British capitalists have invested a billion dollars abroad; France, half a billion. The United States is being drawn into the circle. Germany, up to the present time, however, has occupied its capital largely at home."

Mr. Walling expressed his fear that the plan for an international court suggested by Senator La Fontaine might interfere with the process of the internationalism of production.

"If Montenegro, Belgium and other small nations were given an equal vote with the large powers in such a court," he declared, "they would probably try to use their combined power to protect their special privilege. Turkey, for instance, would urge that the straits of Dardanelles remain inviolate, although these straits should be free to the various nations. Italy would insist that Austria be held up through the Italian control of Trieste. Austria would thus be prevented from obtaining proper access to the sea. Germany ought to have free use of the mouth of the Rhine, but this would undoubtedly be opposed by some of the smaller states. Australia wishes to have a white Australia, even though it be empty.

"On the other hand, the plan of representation suggested by the Fabian Society, whereby all the eight great nations would be given equal representation, would leave everything in the hands of these large powers. The United States would have only the same vote as Italy or Japan, and many incongruous results would follow. The fight over the distribution of votes in an international court is insoluble. Ceaseless bickerings would follow, which it would be possible to settle only by force. The internationalization of production, therefore, is the tendency which gives reason for the greatest hope. This internationalism will solve the question of war and peace long before a democracy is democratic enough to have a real voice."

The Fabian Peace Plan

The third and last session of the Conference which considered the question of war, was held in the Town Hall, Hampton, Monday morning. Charles Zueblin and Dr. George W. Nasmyth were the principal speakers. Prof. Zueblin, an

excerpt of whose address is printed elsewhere, urged the establishment of a working army, of free trade and of a different immigration policy as elements in a peace program.

A description of the Fabian plan for a world court—the most extensive plan thus far devised—was ably set forth by Dr. George W. Nasmyth of the World Peace Foundation.

"The plan," he declared, "recognizes the need (1) for an international high court to judge justiciable cases; (2) a council of conciliation to interpret treaties, to decide boundary disputes and to hear cases of individuals against states, etc.; and (3) measures for enforcing the decrees of the court. The Fabian plan is distinctly a great nation plan. Under it each of the eight great nations will be represented by one judge, while the seven remaining judges will be apportioned among all of the smaller nations. This differs from the Hague plan, which proposes that each nation nominate three judges, those securing the majority of votes being declared elected—the others being placed on the second ballot. It is also at variance with the plan of our own state department suggested during the last administration. The latter proposal was that the world be divided into the South American, Asiatic, North American and European Sectional Courts. Any case not decided by the Sectional Court agreeably to the disputants, was to be taken, according to this scheme, to the international council. It is as well sharply differentiated from the Interparliamentary Union plan elaborated by Senator La Fontaine.

"The Fabian plan depends upon economic boycotts to enforce the decrees of the court, and suggests twelve ways to bring economic pressure to bear, among them the placing of embargoes on ships of nations, the passing of non-intercourse acts, the seizing of debts and the placing of the moneys obtained at the disposal of the International Council and, finally, the cutting off of food-stuffs."

Anna Strunsky Walling pleaded eloquently for the coming of that spirit of internationalism and brotherhood which would make it impossible for comrades in the International to take the lives of their fellow-beings.

Senator La Fontaine, Mrs. Gilman,

Mr. Walling, Karl Karsten and others also took part in the discussion.

Mr. Walling opposed the Socialist referendum which would forbid the United States to supply ammunition to the Allies.

Mr. Karsten, president of the Inter-collegiate Anti-Militarist League, who had made an investigation of the attitude of those present toward war, declared that the average age of the men present who were against war of every kind was 26; of those favoring, under some conditions, war and preparation for war, 44. J. G. Phelps Stokes presided.

Unemployment

The second big concrete problem discussed at the Conference was that on unemployment. Mrs. Florence Kelley, secretary of the National Consumers' League, and member of the Mayor's New York Committee on Unemployment; Juliet S. Poyntz, who has made a special study of this problem in the United States and England; Mrs. Geo. S. Frank, of a New York volunteer committee on unemployment, and Dr. I. M. Rubinow, author of "Social Insurance," threw much light on this subject.

The speakers contended that while the disorganization of the present system was largely responsible for unemployment, much could be done even now to ameliorate conditions. The Socialists, they asserted, should take a leading part in this work.

Mrs. Florence Kelley dealt especially with the manner in which a reduction of hours on the part of those already employed would relieve the unemployed situation.

"In New York City," she said, "we find such franchise corporations as the elevated railroads employing ticket choppers seven days a week, twelve hours a day, and compelling these employes to pay for substitutes during legal holidays. Laws should be passed preventing such corporations from working their help unreasonable

hours. Such laws would automatically lead to the employment of many now without work."

If Socialists were but vigilant enough, they could also see to it that the laws regarding hours of labor were so worded that they could not be easily evaded, Mrs. Kelley declared. She pointed out that in Connecticut, where a law was passed prohibiting night work for women later than 10 P. M., but saying nothing about the time at which female employes would be permitted to begin work in the morning, the Winchester and other companies employed girls from 6 to 10 at night, gave two hours for lunch and recreation, and started their machinery again at 12:01 A. M.

There were certain hopeful signs, however, Mrs. Kelley felt, such as the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court declaring constitutional California's eight-hour day for women.

She vigorously denounced the attitude of employers, among them one of the largest in the United States who, she declared, welcomed the large reserve army of the unemployed, on the ground that its existence induced employes to work the harder, for fear lest their places be taken by the many out of work.

Mrs. Kelley urged that Socialists help free the workers from the uncertainty of unemployment so that the latter might have leisure to think and to plan for social reconstruction.

Dr. I. M. Rubinow advocated as remedial measures a more even distribution of work, the strengthening of trade union activity, the establishment of the minimum wage and of public employment bureaus, the organization of industrial education, the adjustment of public work to the condition of the labor market and unemployment insurance. In dealing with public ownership he declared that if it did nothing more than to stabilize the labor market, it would be well worth while.

Juliet S. Poyntz was of the opinion that the big cause of unemployment was

the disorganization in the labor market under the present capitalistic system.

"The average fluctuation in the demand for labor in Massachusetts last year," she said, "is 30 per cent. Each employer wishes to keep a large reserve army so as to obtain cheap labor. Mr. W. H. Beveridge, the English authority on unemployment, acknowledges that the evil is due chiefly to bad organization of industry and labor under competitive conditions, and that the solution is to be found in a genuine organization of the whole of industry such as a co-operative system would bring about."

She urged Socialists not only to study the problem, but to speak and write for the organized and unorganized working class and to get them to demand a solution for themselves. Mrs. George S. Frank presided and told of the inadequate way in which the problem was being tackled in New York and of the tragedy of the whole situation.

Socialism and Ethics

A particularly stimulating address on "The Ethics of Socialism" was given by Professor Vida D. Scudder of Wellesley College, author of "Socialism and Character," at the Sunday afternoon session. Professor Scudder urged Socialists to reconstruct their old shibboleths in the light of present-day conditions.

"There is a tendency to repeat old formulas unchanged and unmodified," Professor Scudder declared. "If this tendency is not checked, it will leave the Socialist camp as doctrinaire as the camp of religion. We must open up the Socialist windows to the clear light of heaven. The economic interpretation of history is one of the greatest contributions of Socialist thought to the history of economics. It contains a deep, vital and essential truth. It, however, does not explain everything.

"War is a tremendous destroyer of formulas. It is obvious that the economic cause was not the only cause which produced this present war. There were many other forces at work. Mazzini used to say that Republicanism was more sacred than Socialism, because the passion for Republicanism was based on an abstract idea and that for Socialism on economic interests. I used to believe that this statement was the statement of an ideologist but

there is something substantial in it. The Socialist must duly consider racial psychology and the forces of purely spiritual passion.

"We must frankly face the fact that Socialism has failed in the present crisis. It, of course, is not a single failure. There is something humorous in hearing those who formerly accused Socialists of violence now scolding Socialists for not keeping the peace. It shows, however, that while opposing Socialism, they still believed that it was the one great constructive force. Religion also has failed and it has been on the job as an international force for thousands of years. We find on the one hand organized religion trying to keep men and women in relation with eternity. It has been one of the mightiest constructive and destructive forces in the history of the world, the most powerful force in the individual consciousness of thousands of men and women; a force which has been at work recreating humanity and the relations of humanity to eternal life.

"On the other hand, we find Socialism often repudiating all interest in the eternal; developing, however, noble watchwords of its own, splendid, fine bonds of brotherhood, of equality of opportunity. Religion, ignoring the problems of time, has failed, and in the present war we see it working at cross purposes—Mohammedans, Catholics, Protestants and Jews fighting against their brother Mohammedans, Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The church has been devoting itself to its old stupid work wringing its hands in supplication, not contributing one iota to constructive ideas, doing naught but consoling the victims of wrong conditions. This condition has pertained because organized religion has not paid attention to the great problems of our present day. The Socialists, on the other hand, have allowed a misguided zeal to take possession of them. What is needed is a union of religion and Socialism.

"Religion is ready. It is recognizing more and more that it must effect the temporal relations of men. After the French Revolution such prophets as Wordsworth felt that the greatest wisdom that came out of the revolutionary period taught only that man should enter into the quietness of his closet, where he would hear the eternal voice. This now has changed.

"What is the greatest need of the Socialists after the war? Socialism includes the most intelligent minds in Europe to-day. It is necessary that they form a program, but Socialism needs something deeper. It needs purification of character, and unless it draws its inspiration from

deeper wells, I do not think that it will be any more than a doctrinaire movement. I long to have it recognize the silent influx from eternity, the forces generated from above as well as from below. I want a richer, freer, more pliable Socialism. We neither want this Socialism to revert to Utopianism nor to cold intellectualism. It should present a synthesis of scientific interpretation and spiritual forces. We need to socialize self-restraint and charity, a charity which comes from genuine sympathy and constructive imagination. We should be a little less suspicious of one another, little less worldly. Each world, the religious and the social, needs what the other can give. If we, in the Socialist movement, do not recognize this, I am afraid that we are going to become mechanical. We have got to put the spirit of the living into the new Socialist psychology."

John Spargo declared that in his belief Socialism, despite its shortcomings, was the greatest spiritual force in the world. He contended that only through equality of opportunity can we gain any real individualism. As the beauty of the rose, he asserted, is dependent upon the sturdiness of the gnarled roots in the soil, so the development of the spiritual life of the mass of the people is dependent upon the soundness of the economic system.

"He is the more truly spiritual worker," said Mr. Spargo, "who, instead of always speaking of the eternal, consecrates his strength to the cultivation of the soil in which a decent spiritual life may be developed."

Mr. Spargo declared that while he was in sympathy with those who wished to discard formulas, he realized that it was not easy to throw them aside and retain the spirit.

Interesting clashes of opinion were heard in the discussion participated in by Mrs. Florence Kelley, Florence Converse, Margaret Sherman, W. F. Cochran, Dr. I. M. Rubinow and others. Mr. Cochran declared that we must not forget that there was a moral determination as well as an economic determinism. Dr. Rubinow warned those present that the economic interpretation of history ap-

plied to great mass movements and was never intended to cover all individual actions of individual men. He also emphasized the necessity of discriminating between ethics and religion. Mary Ovington presided.

Socialist Tactics and Ideals

Of keen interest also was the illuminating discussion on the "Ideals and Tactics of Socialism," at the Saturday evening meeting in the Town Hall, led by James Mackaye, author of "Economy of Happiness," and John Spargo.

James Mackaye contended that the Socialists and the Socialists alone were proposing a social system consistent with the highest American ideals. Socialism should therefore be explained far more than at present in the light of American traditions and idealism.

"During the Revolutionary days," asserted Mr. Mackaye, "the American people demonstrated their belief that the people should rule over the things that concern them. The political structure of the nation, they felt, did concern them. They therefore revolted against King George to gain control of that structure. Socialists contend with the fathers of the country that the people should rule over those things which concern them. They go a step further. They declare that the industrial life of the nation concerns the people. They therefore propose public ownership of the industrial life as the only means of obtaining for the mass of the people control of their own industrial affairs. The reformers who propose regulation instead of ownership are simply contending that the people 'butt in on plutocracy.' They are taking the attitude of the Tories before the Revolutionary War, who advocated that the people do some ruling, but that they share the reins of government with European autocracy.

"The second great ideal of the American people was enunciated during the Civil War, when the American people abolished slavery—the principle that no man shall live off the labor of others. Lincoln declared that slavery exists wherever one toils and earns bread, and another eats it. He said that certain forms of slavery will continue for many years. The Socialist carries to its logical conclusion the principle established by those who abolished slavery, fighting, as he does, against the

present industrial system in which large masses of people toil and work and earn bread, while others eat the fruits thereof. Capitalism combines the essential qualities of monarchy and slavery. It differs from slavery in that it is efficient, while slavery was inefficient. It often seems to be conferring a benefit, whereas it is actually working an injury.

"It should be the tactics of the Socialists to reveal the true relation between monarchy, slavery and capitalism. If Socialists expounded Socialism as Lincoln expounded his principles, all of the powers of capitalism could not withstand our propaganda. The social reformer of to-day who is engaged in patching up the present system is like the compromiser of the antebellum period, who attempted to patch up the system of slavery, who ignored Lincoln's statement that a house divided against itself cannot stand and who, after patching the patches for forty years, finally muddled into war. What are our Sherman anti-trust laws, our pure food laws but unsatisfactory patch-work. Under Socialism, for the first time in the history of civilization, will we have a consistent democracy, a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Mr. Spargo declared that the ideal of Socialism was to establish a great industrial democracy, where equality of opportunity pertained. He believed that society was now making tremendous strides toward collective ownership and that the war was hastening these strides. Capitalism was more and more leaving such great projects as the construction of the Panama Canal, the development of hygiene, etc., to the collectivity. He asserted, however, that that sort of collectivism was not Socialism; that Socialists desire a collectivism shot through and through with the passion of democracy.

In dealing with Socialism and the educated man, Mr. Spargo declared that the backbone of the movement for Socialism, he believed, must always be the proletariat. The movement, however, has always a welcome place for those of other groups of society who come to it with single mind, placing upon its altar the gifts they have at their disposal.

"Never a man or woman came to the

Socialist movement clean in mind, offering gifts of education and inspiration, and been rejected," he said.

Mr. Spargo also spoke against the tendency of Socialists to talk Socialism in terms which conveyed no meaning to the ordinary man, and said that we should interpret Socialism to others in terms of their human experience.

In conclusion, he prophesied that Socialism would grow rapidly after the war.

"Out of the hell of Mars, out of the bloody mist of war," he declared, "will come the Socialist movement chastened, less arrogant, less dogmatic than before, disciplined and awakened. It must face many practical problems, and I hope that it will have the courage not to temporize."

Following the talks of the speakers there was a lively discussion on the question of Socialist education of the young. Many contended that the Socialists should refuse to follow the practice of some churches which sought to inculcate dogmas in the mind of children before they were old enough to understand the real meaning.

Each meeting gave rise to innumerable private discussions on hotel veranda and during long walks through the country side. So valuable was the conference in clarifying thought, in revising old creeds, in promoting genuine fellowship, in inspiring those present in their battle for a democratic brotherhood, that each and all at its close urged that an I. S. S. summer reunion become a yearly institution. This will no doubt be the case.

The Conference Committee wishes to take this opportunity again to express its deep appreciation of the fine co-operation given by the brilliant group of speakers and others who helped to make the conference a success. Special thanks are due to Louise Adams Grout, Eleanor Wood and Miss Gove.

HARRY W. LAIDLER.

Review of Books

THE SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR.
By William English Walling. N. Y.: Holt. 500 pp. \$1.50.

William English Walling has collected and arranged a notable list of documents. From out the mouths of Socialist leaders, and from the columns of the party press, he has clearly and comprehensively presented the attitude of Socialists toward war and toward the war.

After an analysis of his vast mass of material, it becomes evident that, when war came, it was despite the efforts of the Socialists. In all countries they had fought militarism and navalism and had struggled even to the last to prevent the foreign policies of the powers from reaching their logical conclusion.

The war came. Bebel in 1907 had declared that it was an easy matter to determine whether a war was offensive or defensive. The Socialists did not find it so. German bureaucrats asserted that they were defending themselves against Russian autocracy, to do which they were compelled to wage war on democratic France. The German Socialists, overpowered by the nationalistic sentiment of the country, acquiesced and took up arms. But their Belgian and French comrades could not understand such a paradox. They found it somewhat trying to have the road to St. Petersburg lie through Paris, not to mention Brussels. They came to the defense of their countries.

As a consequence, International Socialism broke down. Socialists with rare exceptions became nationalists. Party leaders entered the French and Belgian cabinets; the German majority vigorously supported the Kaiser. Some like the I. L. P. in England, the Russian party, and Liebknecht either passively or actively opposed the war,

but they were lone voices crying in the wilderness of arrogant yet bewildered nationalism.

The first shock of combat passed. Teuton and Allies, both entrenched, hung in a deadlock for months. War budgets rose to the billions, casualties were reckoned in millions. People slowly realized that peace must come in time. Socialists began to see that they were to have another chance. They had failed to prevent the war, but they might influence the terms of peace.

What were these terms of peace to be? Some, like Hyndman in England and Südekum in Germany, had been carried so far from their socialistic moorings that they could think only of the humiliation with which their antagonists must be visited. Others maintained that such a peace would be no less aggressive than an offensive war itself. They therefore insisted that when peace came no nation should be unduly humiliated and none should suffer territorial amputation. Mr. Walling deserves credit for having discerned as far back as April that there was a very large section of the German party which would oppose any seizure of foreign soil. This movement, led by Liebknecht, Kautsky and Bernstein, in the event of a German victory, may play a considerable part in the determination of peace terms. The Socialists of all countries are still united in their demands for the democratization of foreign relations, gradual disarmament, with an increase of international arbitration.

We are not, however, so much interested in what the Socialists have done in this war, as in what they will do in the future, and on this topic Mr. Walling's book furnishes many interesting hints. From many scattered passages, we can piece out the two conflicting socialistic theories. Should Socialism be nationalistic or international?

The view upheld by Adler and Bauer and carried out by the German majority is that the interests of the toilers of one country may be opposed to those of another; that German day laborers may profit by the destruction of Sheffield works, from which their English comrades get their bread and beer; that California farmhands and Japanese coolies may have antagonistic interests.

True enough, yet their interests are hardly so hostile that war would benefit them in the long run. The loss of men and the tax burden would enormously offset any disparity. Besides, even if war did pay one group of workers temporarily, what is that compared to the welfare of the whole movement for all time? If Socialism as an ideal has stood for anything, it has stood for the unselfish devotion of all lesser groups to the common good of the oppressed of all nations. Rob it of this, and you strip it of its prime motive power.

The Socialists in future should oppose war—not merely be content with struggling to abolish capitalism. They must try to alter the bad psychology that produces war, as well as abolish an unjust economic system. One cannot wait for the other. The attack must be carried on both sides at once.

To this end, it becomes a question as to whether Socialists should not advocate an inter-nation similar to that which the League of Peace is favoring. The previous tactics of refusing to vote war credits is at best an act of negative morality; the general strike, regarded as a "myth" even in times of peace, is a frail reed to lean upon to prevent a future war; the distinction between an offensive and defensive war has broken down. The Socialists consequently must assume a more vigorous and definite attitude.

A hopeful measure is the one proposed by Hervé before the war that Socialists should refuse to participate in any war, whether alleged to be defensive or not. The international character of

the Socialist party would insure some safety in this resolve, for the workers of one country would not then have reason to fear their fellows of another. The danger in this proposal is of course that the country least democratically developed might overcome a country where the non-resistant Socialists were strong. But it must be remembered that Russia would be the only country to fear in this contingency, and Russia will be crippled for some time. Besides there is here a dormant spirit of revolt which awaits merely an opportunity to burst into flame.

This whole question of war-participation is now being brought to our attention not only by the I. L. P. in England but also by the Anti-Enlistment League in this country. Is not outright non-resistance perhaps the one way out?

Bulky as this review is, it has not begun to do justice to all the points in Mr. Walling's book. Clear, impartial and scholarly, this book interestingly presents the whole panorama of Socialism as it touches upon war. It may in closing be of interest to the members of the Society to note that the book was begun at the suggestion of the I. S. S.

PAUL HOWARD DOUGLAS.

LABOR POLITICS. By **R o b e r t Hunter.** Chicago: Socialist Party. 25 cents.

This book contains a history and analysis of the political activities of the American Federation of Labor, and an argument in favor of "two working-class movements, one devoting all its energies to the building up of the economic organizations of the working class, the other devoting all its attention to developing the political power of the working class." The text, however, hardly justifies the title, for though the introduction begins by recounting a victory of labor in politics that took place over eighty years ago, this is not a history of labor in politics or even a discussion of the political labor movement of to-day,

but is merely a history and discussion of politics in the American Federation of Labor. Nevertheless, it is well to recognize the fact that, as Mr. Hunter points out, the existence of a great, democratic public school system in the United States is in large part due to the Working Men's Party of 1829 to 1832—the only strong, independent political movement of the working class which ever existed in this country before the rise of the Socialist Party.

It may seem that Mr. Hunter attributes too great power to a single individual when he states that "an independent labor party would have developed out of the American trade unions had not Mr. Gompers blocked the way." Mr. Gompers, he says, was "powerful enough to overcome all opposition, and his own will has almost invariably prevailed." But he fails to explain *why* Mr. Gompers has been so powerful in a democratically self-governed organization. Is it not possible, at least, that the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor has made Mr. Gompers powerful by its approval of his politics, and that the rank and file is therefore more responsible than is Mr. Gompers for the avoidance of independent political action which has characterized the American Federation of Labor?

Yet this book is a powerful and on the whole a sound argument in favor of the dual organization of the working class—in the economic field and in the political field—of such organization as exists and has demonstrated its efficiency in practically all European countries. As Mr. Hunter says:

"Curiously enough, the tactics and methods used by Trade Unionists to battle with the employer on the industrial field are identical with those used by the Socialists to battle with the masters of society on the political field. As the Trade Unionist seeks to organize all the workers engaged in the industries of the nation, so the Socialist seeks to organize all the workers who vote in the nation. As the Trade Unionist seeks to unite men into one body so that they shall be able to strike together and thus to

enforce their demands, so the Socialist seeks to unite men into one body so that they may be able to vote together and thus control the political life of the nation. The need of the Trade Unionist is an all-extensive Trade Unionism. The need of the Socialist is an all-extensive political unionism. The one pleads for unity in the trade and industry; the other urges unity in politics. Both should exist supplementary or complementary to each other, in order that men might battle both as toilers in the shops and as citizens in the nation, for the complete emancipation of Labor from the tyranny of capitalism."

HELEN L. SUMNER, Ph. D.

SOCIALISM AS THE SOCIOLOGICAL IDEAL: A BROADER BASIS FOR SOCIALISM. By Floyd J. Melvin, Ph.D. N. Y.: Sturgis and Walton. \$1.25.

Dr. Melvin's book is in one respect at least a very notable achievement. He has interpreted Socialism and presented the case for it very thoroughly, without any compromise of essentials, in a manner that is absolutely original and unique. He relies neither upon the arguments of Marx and his followers nor upon those of the State Socialists. He does not take as his basis the Marxian theory of historical materialism and argue for Socialism from the standpoint of the materialistic conception of history, which, by the way, he tentatively accepts. Nor does he follow the Fabians in presenting data to show the possibilities of collectivism. He takes his stand upon the principles of modern sociology and argues with great force that these justify the Socialist programme.

Those forces at work in society which the sociologist recognizes as the most valuable, in that they are making most efficiently for the realization of his conception of ideal society, are making Socialism inevitable. For, from the sociological viewpoint, "Socialism is the social system which seeks by means of the social control of heredity and environment to direct the further progress of civilization in accordance with the ideals arising

through social self-consciousness." This social control is impossible except through a democratic organization. The Socialist movement, or, rather, the movement toward Socialism, is part of the democratic movement and is irresistible.

Dr. Melvin lays great stress upon the spiritual forces which are making for Socialism. And the class-consciousness of the proletariat is essentially a spiritual force, or, as he says, "the lever with which the spiritual forces enumerated will endeavor to materialize their yearning for social justice."

Altogether the book is a very useful addition to our literature, despite the fact that the needlessly difficult and turgid style of the author will inevitably restrict its circulation and influence.

John Spargo.

POSSIBLE SUBJECTS FOR MASTERS' THESES OR PH.D. DISSERTATIONS

[The Society would be glad to be kept informed concerning theses and dissertations on these and allied subjects.]

SOCIALIST THEORY.

Socialism and the Elimination of Competitive Wastes.
Possible Methods of Socializing Industry.
A Study of Incentives under Competitive and Cooperative Industry.
The Law of Value under a Socialist Commonwealth.
Probable Methods of Assignment under Socialism.
The Economic Interpretation of History and Socialism.
Determination of Income under Socialism.
Forces Making for Socialism.
The Class Struggle and Socialism. (To What Extent Is There a Class Struggle in America in the Marxian Sense?)

SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

Accomplishments of Socialist Movement Here and Abroad (or in Any One Section).
Programs of Socialist Parties in Regard to Municipality, Farm, Factory, etc.
Ethical Forces and Socialism.
Socialism and Peace.
Socialism and War.
Socialism and Internationalism.

COLLECTIVISM.

Tendencies toward Collectivism in the World.
Government Ownership of Railroads, Telegraphs or Telephones.
State Socialism in the Public School.
History of the Post Office (Initiative, Conditions of Labor, etc.)
State Socialism in the Building of the Panama Canal.
Socialization of the Mines.
Cooperation—Voluntary Cooperation Abroad and in the United States of America (or in Any Country).

MUNICIPAL PROBLEMS.

Tendencies in America toward the Improvement of City Government.
A Study of Relative Advantages of Municipal and Private Ownership in Gas, Electric Light and Trolley Systems in American Cities.
Commission Form of Government and Democracy.

SOCIAL REFORMS.

Government Regulation versus Government Ownership of the Trusts.
The Accomplishments of Regulation in the Case of Banks, Railroads, etc.
The Net Results of the Operations of Public Utility Commissions of Various States.
The Extent and Success of Profit Sharing in the United States of America.
Social Progress and Industrial Development in the United States of America. (Is Social Progress Keeping Pace with Industrial Development?)
A Study of the Methods Adopted Here and Abroad in the Solution of the Unemployed Problem.

PRESENT INDUSTRIAL TENDENCIES.

Concentration of Control and Ownership in Industry in the United States.
Tendencies toward Concentration, if Any, in Agriculture.
Tendencies toward Concentration in the Retail Stores of the Country—Emergence of the Chain Stores.
Is the Middle Class Disappearing?
Tendencies toward Democratic Control in the Industries of the Nation.
Economies of Trust Production over Large Scale Production.
The Effect of the Application of the Efficiency System on Production and Labor Conditions.
Substitute for a Money Incentive Now Operating in Industry.
Increase in Cost of Living in the United States Since 1900.
Function of Capitalist in Present-Day Industry.

POLITICAL DEMOCRACY.

- Initiative, Referendum and Recall on Pacific Coast, in New Zealand, etc.
 Proportional Representation—Reasons for and Against.
 Abolition of United States Senate—Reasons for and Against.
 Supreme Court of the United States and Power to Declare Laws Unconstitutional. (Should Such Power Be Continued?)
 Veto Power of President. (Should It Be Abolished?)
 A Study of Effects of Woman Suffrage on Social Progress.
 The Suffrage in Theory and Practice: A Study of the Variation in the Votes Cast in Presidential and Congressional Elections, 1876 to 1914, in Comparison with the Increase of the Number of Citizens of Voting Age and Sex.

LABOR PROBLEMS.

- Social Advantages of Trade Unionism in the United States.
 Advantages and Disadvantages of Industrial versus the Craft Form of Organization.
 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Minimum Wage for Men and Women in the United States.
 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Eight-Hour Day for Men and Women.
 Advantages and Disadvantages of Compulsory Arbitration.
 History of the Protocol in the Shirt and Cloak Industries.
 Labor in Politics.

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS.

- Restriction of Immigration and Social Progress.
 Economic Factors and the Present War.
 Tendencies toward Internationalism. (Economic and Racial Factors.)

POSSIBLE SUBJECTS FOR COLLEGE DEBATES.

- Resolved:* That a Constitutional Amendment Favoring Woman Suffrage Is Desirable.
Resolved: That the Initiative, Referendum and Recall Should Be Instituted in the State or Federal Government.
Resolved: That the Strengthening of the Army and Navy Is the Best Way of Ensuring Peace.
Resolved: That the Public Ownership and Democratic Administration of the Principal Industries of the Country Is More Desirable Than the Present System.
Resolved: That Government Ownership Is the Best Solution of the Trust Problem.
Resolved: That the United States Government Should Own and Operate Its Armament Industry, Its Merchant Marine, Inter-

state Railroads, Telegraphs, Telephones, or Mines.

- Resolved:* That the Express Business of the Country Should Be Nationalized, and Managed in Cooperation with the Post Office Department.
Resolved: That a Minimum Wage Should Be Federally Established for Women (or for Men and Women) in the United States.
Resolved: That the Federal (or State) Government Should Inaugurate a System of Social Insurance Against Sickness, Accident, Old Age, and Unemployment (or Any of These).
Resolved: That Cities with a Population of Over 100,000 in the United States Should Municipalize the Gas, Electric Light, or Street Car Systems.
Resolved: That Compulsory Arbitration in Labor Disputes Is Socially Desirable.
Resolved: That the Municipalities, the States and the Federal Government Should Establish New Public Works in Order to Assist in the Solution of the Unemployed Problem.
Resolved: That the System of Proportional Representation Should Be Adopted in Our Municipal, State and National Elections.
Resolved: That the Supreme Court of the United States Should Be Deprived of Its Power to Declare Laws Unconstitutional.
Resolved: That the Senate of the United States Should Be Abolished.
Resolved: That the United States Take the Necessary Steps for Immediate Disarmament and Arbitration of All International Disputes Without Waiting for Concerted Action by the Powers.
Resolved: That as a Means of Diminishing the Incentive to War Without Depriving the Nations of Means of Defense, the Federal Government Should Undertake the Construction of All Naval Vessels and Equipment and the Manufacture of All Arms and Munitions of War for Its Own Use and Should Prohibit the Private Construction and Manufacture of Such Vessels, Equipment, Arms, or Munitions in the United States for Sale to Any Foreign Power.
Resolved: That Labor Organizations Are Justified in Seeking to Establish the Principle of the Closed or Union Shops, Subject to Such Provisions as Shall Assure to Every Workman the Right to Become a Member of a Labor Organization.
Resolved: That the Legal Limitation of the Workday by State or Federal Action Is Desirable as a Means of Distributing Opportunities for Employment and Diminishing the Evil of Involuntary Employment.
Resolved: That Secondary and Compound Boycotts in Labor Disputes Not Involving Threats of Violence Should Be Legalized.

POSSIBLE SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION IN I. S. S. CHAPTERS.

- Would Socialism Lead to an Increase or a Diminution of Graft?
 Would Socialism Stifle the Incentive?
 Will Socialism Be Possible Without Definite Checks on Increase of Population?
 What Methods for Obtaining Democratic Control Would Be Desirable Under Government Ownership?
 To What Extent Is Autocratic Management of Industry Necessary to Bring About Efficiency?
 What Constitutional Changes Are Necessary to Bring into Being a Socialistic State?
 What Is the Relation of Socialism to Syndicalism?
 Will the Working-Class or the So-Called Middle Class Prove a More Effective Agency in Bringing About Socialism?
 Will Social Reform Help or Hinder the Growth of Socialism?
 What Are the Possible Methods to Be Employed in Socializing Industry and Their Relative Desirability?
 What Would Be a Good Form of Currency Under a Socialist State?
 In What Sense, if at All, Is the Theory of Increasing Misery a Correct One? (To What Extent Is It Necessary to the Socialist Philosophy?)
 Is it Possible to Relate to Each Other and, if so, How, the Economic Interpretation of History, the Class Struggle, and the Theory of Surplus Value?
 Is Socialism Inevitable? If so, Why?
 To What Extent Should the Theory of the Economic Interpretation of History, as Enunciated by Marx, Be Modified?
 Is the Theory of Surplus Value a Necessary Part of the Socialist Philosophy?
 To What Extent, if at All, Should the Tactics of the American Socialist Party Be Changed to Suit American Conditions?
 To What Extent Is Socialism Gaining Headway in the Trade Union Movement?
 Can International Peace Be Assured Under Capitalism?
 What Has Been the Effect of the Supreme Court Decision upon the Standard Oil Company? Upon the Northern Securities Company?
 To What Extent Is Unemployment an Inevitable Concomitant of the Present System?
 Are the Causes of the Present War Chiefly Economic, Political, Militaristic, Racial, or Philosophical?
 What Are Some of the Advantages and Disadvantages of a World Court?
 To What Extent Is a Healthy Nationalism a Prerequisite to a Healthy Internationalism?
 To What Extent Would the Increase of the

Army and Navy in America Help or Injure Peace?

- What Should Be the Attitude of the United States Toward Mexico?
 Is the Middle Class Disappearing?
 To What Extent Is Vocational Training an Advantage to the Working Class?
 Are Socialism and Religion Necessarily Antagonistic?
 Ought a Socialist to Enlist in the Army or Navy?
 Ought a Socialist to Support a Defensive War?
 Would it Be Expedient for the Socialist Party to Advocate Immediate Disarmament on the Part of the United States?
 Is Violence Ever Expedient in Labor Disputes?
 To What Extent Is it Advisable for Socialists to Become Identified with Outside Reform Movements?
 To What Extent Is it Advisable for Socialists to Become Identified with Extreme Social or Philosophical Radicalism?

I. S. S. ACTIVITIES

Every member and friend of the I. S. S. is urged to obtain subscriptions to the Quarterly, and thereby to help make this magazine a power in the educational world. The December-January number of the periodical will deal largely with the question of collective ownership. John Moody, editor of Moody's Manual, author of "The Truth About the Trust," etc., will give an illuminating article on "Public Ownership of Railroads." Dr. Jessie W. Hughan will deal with "Collectivism Under Socialism." There also will be an article setting forth some of the findings of the Fabian Society as a result of their remarkable investigation on world-wide collectivism of the present day. The next number will also contain reviews of Scott Nearing's important contribution on "Income," of Dr. King's "The Distribution of Income," of Dr. Howe's "Socialized Germany" and of Sinclair's worth-while anthology on "The Cry for Justice," which reviews, it was hoped, would be ready for this issue.

The Society is happy to announce that John Spargo will speak under its auspices in the colleges of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois from November first to the middle of December. This trip promises to be one of the most fruitful ever arranged by the Society. All in these states who can assist in scheduling Mr. Spargo are asked to communicate with the Society. Plans are under way for a Southern Ohio Conference in Cincinnati for November 26th or 27th, when Mr. Spargo will be in that city, and for a

middle Western Conference in Chicago, December 4th.

Harry W. Laidler, organizing secretary, is also being scheduled among the colleges of Iowa and Illinois during November and December.

On September 12, 1915, the Society passed its tenth year of successful endeavor. The New York Alumni Chapter celebrated the event with a dinner given on October 6th at the Rand School. Members and friends of the Society throughout the country are urged to show their appreciation of I. S. S. work, during the ten years of its activity, by obtaining for it as many new members as possible. Here's to a doubling of our membership during the coming year!

All who possibly can should reserve Christmas week for the I. S. S. Convention to be held in New York City. The dates will probably be Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, December 28, 29, 30, 1915. The program will be an intellectual treat.

The Research Committee of the I. S. S. has been active during the summer, and hopes this fall to prepare pamphlets on "Co-operation in the United States" and on "Municipal and Federal Collectivism." Cheves W. Perky, Martha Casamajor, Robt. W. Dunn, James A. Hamilton, Arthur E. L. Nelson, Dorothy Bird, Paul Otis, Felix Grendon, Harry W. Laidler and others have been assisting in the work. Mr. Laidler will be pleased to obtain the names of others who can give some time to research work during the next few months.

Paul H. Douglas, Bowdoin, 1913, last year's president of the Columbia Chapter, I. S. S., and member of the I. S. S. Executive Committee, has been selected chairman of the New England Committee of the Society, to take the place of Ordway Tead. Mr. Tead has been compelled to resign as chairman of this Committee on account of his duties as secretary of the Massachusetts Unemployment Committee, but has retained his membership on the N. E. Committee. The Society wishes to express its appreciation of the excellent work of Mr. Tead during the past year, and bespeaks the continued co-operation of all with the N. E. Committee.

Louise Adams Grout, director of the Boston School of Social Science, who managed the I. S. S. Labor Day Conference so efficiently, has also been added to the Committee. Walter Hinkle, last year's organizer of the N. E. Committee, will continue his good work among the colleges.

The New York Alumni Chapter is prepar-

ing this year its usually interesting program, as follows:

October 20th: "New York State Constitution."

November 4th: "The Class Struggle," a discussion between Dr. I. M. Rubinow and Sidney A. Reeve.

December 2nd: "Utopian Socialism—My Conception of a Co-operative Commonwealth," Jesse W. Hughan, Walter Lippmann, William English Walling.

December 16th: "The New Economics and Socialism," Prof. Scott Nearing (probably).

January 16th: "The New Philosophy and Socialism," Prof. Harry A. Overstreet.

January or February, John Spargo.

March 3rd: "The Collegian and Socialism," Morris Hillquit.

April 6th: "Co-operation" (speakers to be announced later).

A number of other meetings will be arranged during the year. The officers for the year are: Rufus J. Trimble, president; Juliet S. Poyntz, 1st V. P.; Scott H. Perky, 2nd V. P.; Caro Lloyd Strobell; secretary; Alice K. Boehme, treasurer; Felix Grendon, delegate to I. S. S. Executive Committee.

The New York City student members of academic and professional colleges have just organized a Committee for the purpose of assisting the Organizing Secretary in reaching every such institution in the city. Philip Wittenberg and Joseph Glass are the chairman and secretary of the committee respectively. Monthly luncheons with prominent speakers are being arranged, the first to be held October 30. The co-operation of all of the schools with this committee is urged.

John Spargo spoke this summer at the Dartmouth Summer School before a large audience on the question of "Socialism and War" and received an enthusiastic reception.

While it is impossible, on account of lack of space in this issue of the quarterly, to give information concerning this season's programs of the various I. S. S. Chapters, from reports already received, the I. S. S. feels that prospects for the coming year are brighter than ever before.

As this issue goes to press, the death of J. Keir Hardie, veteran Socialist of England, is noted with sorrow. The next to the last meeting addressed by Hardie in this country was held in Carnegie Hall under the auspices of the I. S. S. This meeting, Mr. Hardie afterwards declared, loomed up in his mind as the most pleasant experience of his American trip. His interest in the Society was a sincere one. Next to Jaurès, Hardie for the last decade had been the most ardent of the

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

anti-war leaders in the Socialist International. His death at this time is a source of deep regret to workers throughout the world. To thousands who came into direct contact with this lover of men, his loss is a great personal bereavement.

Among those attending the Labor Day Conference were: Wilfred Balch, Carl Beck, A. C. Binder, Marion Boughton, Louise Brown, Abbie Farwell Brown, Louise F. Caldwell, Helen D. Chamberlain, William F. Cochran, J. L. Cohen, Charles F. Collett, Florence Converse, Earl F. Cook, D. W. Cotter, W. Harris Crook, Edmund T. Dana, H. W. L. Dana, Hollowell Davis, Helena Dudley, Horace Fort, Mr. and Mrs. George S. Frank, Laura Garrett, George S. Gilman, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Mr. and Mrs. Felix Grendon, Louise Adams Grout, Ellen Hayes, Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Heller, Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Henry, Grace Horne, Eugene Hough, Mr. and Mrs. Everett Jones, Jessie W. Hughan, Evelyn Hughan, K. G. Karsten, George Keefe, Florence Kelley, Prof. H. W. Ladd, Miss Ladd, Senator and Mme. Henri La Fontaine, Harry W. Laidler, Mrs. M. P. Libbey, Ethel Lorenz, Mr. and Mrs. James Mackaye, Mary Mason, Rev. Grover G. Mills, J. R. Minevitch, Jane Moore, Dr. George Nasmyth, Mary W. Ovington, Mr. and Mrs. Scott H. Perky, Juliet S. Poyntz, Sidney Reeve, Rev. Alson Robinson, Mr. and Mrs. G. E. Roewer, Jr., Dr. I. M. Rubinow, Prof. Vida D. Scudder, Miss Shadd, Wm. James Sidis, Mr. Skelding, John Spargo, R. B. Spicer, Edith Spruance, Ellen Gates Starr, Clara G. Stillman, Mr. and Mrs. J. G. Phelps Stokes, Mrs. Eugene Stowell, Helen L. Sumner, Ellen Usher, Mr. and Mrs. William English Walling, Alma Wiesner, Miss Westcott, Leonie Baker, Eleanor Wood, Mr. and Mrs. Alex Wright, Lily D. Wright, Prof. Chas. Zueblin, Frank Sanborn, Miss Gove, Rev. Mr. Prescott.

NOTE FROM HELEN KELLER

Dear Mr. Laidler:

I wish I could accept the invitation of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society for Labor Day. I should indeed be happy to join my comrades on such an occasion. But alas, I am not free yet to make engagements of this sort. Mrs. Macy and I are still lecturing, and we shall be busy all the autumn. We have a date for Indiana on August the 25th and we do not know in what part of the country we shall be Labor Day. But I am waiting and working, hoping that in a year or so I may have the chance, the voice and the equipment

to speak my message for humanity. May the work of the Society continue to grow. May it be among the great forces that shall transform the bondage, the misery, the cruelty of past ages into the glorious freedom, strength and brotherhood of all men.

With cordial greetings, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HELEN KELLER.

Wrentham, Massachusetts,

June sixteenth.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION ETC., OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST, published bi-monthly, excepting June, July, August, September, at New York, N. Y., required by the Act of August 24, 1912. Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 41 Union Sq., New York City. Managing Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 41 Union Sq., New York City. Business Manager, A. K. Boehme, 41 Union Sq., New York City. Publisher, Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 41 Union Sq., New York City. Owners: Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 41 Union Sq., N. Y. City. Membership approximately 2,000. The principal officers are: President, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Stamford, Conn.; 1st Vice-President, Florence Kelly, 6 E. 39th St., N. Y. C.; 2nd Vice-President, Ernest Poole, 130 E. 67th St., N. Y. C.; Treasurer, Morris Hillquit, 30 Church St., N. Y. C.; Secretary, Leroy Scott, 84 Grove St., N. Y. C.

There are no known bondholders, mortgagees or other security holders.

Alice Kuebler Boehme.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 16th day of March, 1915.

Franklin H. Brown,

Notary Public,

Kings County, No. 245.

Certificate filed in N. Y. County.

(My commission expires March 30, 1915.)

"Poverty is as Unnecessary as Malaria or Yellow Fever."

In his "ESSAYS IN SOCIAL JUSTICE" Professor Carver presents a cure for poverty. There is much keen thought in his diagnosis of the disease and his remedy reaches the source of the trouble.

Svo. Cloth. 429 pp. \$2.00 net

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

34 University Hall

Cambridge, Mass.