In Two Sections Section I

The Intercollegiate Socialist

October-November, 1916 Fifteen Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Harry W. Laidler, Editor — **Caro Lloyd Strobell**, Assistant Editor

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

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

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City

10c. a copy — Subscription, 25c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi
Albion
Amherst
Barnard
Bates
Beloit
Berkeley Divinity
Brown
California
Carnegie Inst. Technology
Chicago
Cincinnati
City College (N. Y.)
Clark
Colorado
Columbia
Dartmouth
E. Tenn. Normal
Emory and Henry
George Washington
Grinnell
Hamline
Harvard
Howard
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Iowa St. College
John Marshall Law
Johns Hopkins
Kansas St. Agr.
LaCrosse (Wis.) Normal
Los Angeles Osteopathic
Mass. Inst. Technology
Miami
Michigan
Middle Tenn. Normal
Minnesota
Nevada
New York
New York Dental
New York Law
North Carolina
North Dakota
Oberlin
Ohio State
Ohio Wesleyan
Pennsylvania
Pittsburgh
Princeton
Radcliffe
Reed
Richmond
Rutgers
Simmons
Simpson
South Carolina
Springfield, Y. M. C. A. Coll.
Syracuse University
Temple
Trinity
Union Theological
Utah
Valparaiso
Vassar
Virginia
Washington
Washington-Jefferson
Washington and Lee
Wisconsin
Yale

The object of the INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY, established September 1905, is "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." All present or former students of colleges interested in Socialism are eligible to active membership in the Society. Non-collegians are eligible to auxiliary membership. The annual dues of the Society are $2, $5 (contributing membership), $25 or more (sustaining membership.) The dues of student members-at-large are $1 a year. Undergraduate Chapters are required to pay 35c. a year per member to the General Society. All members are entitled to receive The Intercollegiate Socialist. Friends may assist in the work of the Society by becoming dues-paying members, by sending contributions, by aiding in the organization and the strengthening of undergraduate and graduate Chapters, by obtaining subscriptions for The Intercollegiate Socialist, by patronizing advertisers, and in various other ways. The Society's Quarterly is 50c. a year, 15c. a copy.

OFFICERS INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

President
J. G. PHELPS STOKES, Yale

1st Vice-President
FLORENCE KELLEY, Cornell

2nd Vice-President
ERNEST POOLE, Princeton

Treasurer
MARY R. SANFORD, Vassar

Secretary
LEROY SCOTT, Indiana

Organizing Secretary
HARRY W. LAIDLER, Wesleyan

Executive Secretary
ALICE K. BOEHME

Executive Committee

EVANS CLARK,	Amherst
ELLEN HAYES	Oberlin
JESSIE W. HUGHAN,	Barnard
NICHOLAS KELLEY,	Harvard
PAUL KENNADAY,	Yale
HARRY W. LAIDLER,	Wesleyan
JULIET S. POYNTZ,	Barnard
I. M. RUBINOW,	Columbia
H. D. SEDGWICK,	Harvard
UPTON SINCLAIR,	C. C. N. Y.
JOHN SPARGO	
HELEN PHELPS STOKES	
CARO LLOYD STROBELL,	Vassar
WM. ENGLISH WALLING,	Chicago
CHAS. ZUEBLIN,	Chicago

Alumni Chapters

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

SECTIONAL COMMITTEE

New England	*Middle West*	*Far West*	*Southern Atlantic*
HAROLD H. CORYELL	GEORGE H. BISHOP	M. LOUISE HUNT	BENTON MACKAYE
VIDA D. SCUDDER	GUSTAVUS LIPPMANN	ESTHER YARNELL	HELEN L. SUMNER

STUDENT COUNCIL

DEVERE ALLEN, Oberlin
LAURA ELIOT, Reed
MADELINE HUNT, Vassar
G. E. CUNNINGHAM, Beloit
A. EPSTEIN, Pittsburg
BROADUS MITCHELL, Johns Hopkins
ROBERT W. DUNN, Yale
AMMON A. HENNACY, Ohio State
HILMAR RAUSCHENBUSCH, Amherst

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

VOL. V OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1916 No. 1

Price of Magazine With this issue of the magazine the subscription price has been raised from the absurdly small sum of 25c. a year to 50c. The reasons for this change are so obvious that it is doubtless unnecessary to state them.

The original price was too small to cover the cost and permit the Society to do effective circularizing. Since the establishment of the periodical the number of pages, including the supplement, has increased threefold. The price of paper has also advanced by leaps and bounds. Q. E. D.

This increased price will not affect the dues of active or auxiliary members or student members-at-large. It will force the Society to make a small advance to members of undergraduate Chapters from 25c. to 35c. a year. The price of individual copies of the magazine will be 15c. instead of 10c.

It is hoped that the members and friends of the Society will assist materially in obtaining new subscriptions and in selling individual copies. The supplements can also be obtained separately at rates advertised in the Quarterly.

I. S. S. Lecturers This year the Society is scheduling a number of lecture trips. John Spargo is planning a three months' trip to the Pacific Coast under the auspices of the Society, from January to April. In going west he will dip into some of the Southern States and return by a more northerly route. Many engagements have already been made and the trip bids fair to be a marked success.

Rose Pastor Stokes will speak in a number of the Southern colleges during November and December. Harry W. Laidler will visit a few of the Pennsylvania colleges in November, the New England colleges in December and the Middle West in the Spring. Dr. John C. Kennedy will also be available for meetings in the West.

The Society would be glad to obtain the names of any who can co-operate in arranging dates for these speakers.

Convention The dates of the next Annual Convention of the I. S. S. are, tentatively, Thursday, Friday and Saturday December 28, 29 and 30. The place is New York City. The program will be described in the next issue of the magazine. It is hoped that as many as possible of the members and friends of the Society may be present at this gathering.

New Publications Among the new publications of the Society are "Study Courses on Socialism," "The Great Lesson of War" by Edwin Schoonmaker and "Why Study Socialism," a pamphlet contributed to by more than fifty economists and writers.

Membership There are hosts of forward looking college men and women and others in this country who ought to be enrolled in the membership of the I. S. S. and who would willingly join if properly approached. May we not ask each member of the Society to do his part to secure at least one new member for the Society during the coming year? Dues, as you know, for active and auxiliary members are $2 a year; for contributing, $5, for sustaining, $25. Present or former students in colleges are eligible to active membership. Non-collegians are eligible for auxiliary membership and possess all privileges except those of voting for members of the Executive Committee. All desirous of obtaining a wider knowledge of Socialism or of helping, by means of our organization, to spread such knowledge are eligible for membership.

I. S. S. Book Store We cordially invite members and friends of the Society to purchase their books through I. S. S. channels. Such purchase will be of mutual assistance to the Society and to the purchaser.

Our Second Summer Conference

By Caro Lloyd.

For the second summer conference, the Society's fairy godmother led it to an idyllic spot, a forest in Maryland.

Because it is so named in old deeds, this stretch of primeval forest is called Sherwood Forest. It is said of Robin Hood in the chronicles that he robbed the rich to give to the poor. He was therefore evidently a social reformer in the rough or perhaps an embryonic I. W. W., and were he flourishing today would probably have come to the I. S. S. gathering to confer under the greenwood trees as to how best to advance a social justice which shall redeem both rich and poor.

Most appropriately the new Sherwood Forest is the scene of a new communal life in the co-operative colony which Mr. Cochran and the Severn Community have established. Its headlands, named from Robin Hood legends, Friar Tuck, Clopston, Thorsby, are dotted with tent cottages grouped on communal land around communal dining halls. Here our delegates were quartered in vacated cottages generously donated. At every turn from porch or wood path we looked through branches of great oaks and pines over the shining waters of Round Bay to far horizons. Thus was the setting in harmony with the mental and ethical outlook which brought us together—an outlook hopeful, truth-seeking, far thrown into the future.

We numbered about one hundred, of all sorts and from distant points. Undergraduate delegates from ten colleges and alumni members bringing the inspiration of their new share in the world's tasks, social workers, including twelve from the Federal Children's Bureau; a librarian from Oregon, a student from Denver, a sculptor from New York, a government official from Panama, professors, writers, lawyers, ministers and Christian Socialists, some in action like Professor Walter Rauschenbusch or dispossessed like Rev. William Johnston of Newark and Rev. Richard Hogue of Baltimore. Here the sister of the late Bishop Spalding of Utah met for the first time the sister of his successor, Bishop Jones. Mary Sanford and Louis Boudin could be seen singing complementary parts in the chorus and our secretary, Mrs. Boehme, played on her typewriter in an improvised I. S. S. office on a porch with a forest background. The veteran figure in the New York labor movement, Edward King, could be seen strolling with Algernon Lee and Senator Henri La Fontaine of Belgium walking with the youthful German, Dr. Mez, a worker with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Such international agreement was not universal, however, as John Spargo was found impersonating the League to Enforce Peace by separating representatives of the Central Powers and the Allies who were fighting with tongues a miniature battle of the Somme. But not even the sensational reporter could deny that as a rule harmony prevailed. Even in the kitchen I heard the good colored helpers, who made for us such delicious dishes, singing in fine chorus. "Nearer, My God, to Thee."

By a wise provision, our afternoons were released for rest and recreation, for swimming and canoeing, for forest walks, tennis and hikes or sails to Annapolis, and in general for those informal conferences which form so important an item. Thus by evening we came refreshed to "Robin Hood's Barn," the Conference hall, the construction of which had been hastened for our sake. Here we gathered at the literature table or sat in a circle around the great log fire or around the piano, where, as the audience gathered, we sang Morris's March or Mrs. Gilman's song, "To Labor."

The assemblage of many nationalities, of many phases of thought, of conservative radical, radical conservative and radical radical, was animated by a splendid spirit, that of close and responsible thinkers bent not so much on self-expression, as on the discovery of "light, more light." Several, indeed,

are known to have changed materially their views under the influence of the speakers. The only regret is that so rich were the programs, so full the equipment of speakers, that there was not sufficient time to draw out the expression of our younger delegates, even with the mornings devoted as they were to a continuation of the evening's discussion.

The leading motive of our program was to offset the menace of militarist preparedness by a consideration of the various avenues of constructive social preparedness. In every branch of this undertaking the radical spirit of the Conference led us onward to the van of the world's best thought and experience to-day.

We opened with the subject of Co-operation when Dr. James P. Warbasse, Helen Sumner and Senator La Fontaine recited the thrilling achievements of the co-operative societies, telling how English co-operators raise raisins in Spain, currants in Greece, olive oil in Africa, tea in India, mine coal from their own mines and sail the sea in their own ships, transacting in their Wholesale Society about four times the business of the United States Steel Corporation. In the sessions on the trade unions, we were called beyond the narrowness of mere craft unionism, the fine achievements of which were enthusiastically summarized by Arthur Holder of the A. F. of L., to the modern inclusiveness of industrial unionism. In the public ownership discussions the repeated call of each expositor was toward an ownership, not autocratic, but democratic. In the treatment of immigration the international point of view was continually advanced instead of the purely national, and the practicability shown of giving justice and help to all races and creeds. In the fine symposium when we treated the problem of defensive warfare with a closeness and thoroughness I believe rare in public discussion, all thinkers stood on high ground, from that of extreme pacifism to the advocacy of non-military defense and even in the endorsement of aggression when necessary to the welfare of humanity, the audience seeming to agree that the development of the international Socialist and labor movement was the only fundamental solution. Among other papers was one by William Montague, professor of psychology at Columbia, leading us to consider the necessity of awaking in the cause of peace the same fascination and devotion aroused by martial tactics.

Our closing session on Sunday was appropriately given to a brilliant exposition by Professor Walter Rauschenbusch and Rev. Richard Hogue of the Socialist appeal to the Christian mind, both pleading eloquently for an extension of the social gospel of Christianity. On Sunday afternoon at an extra session for colonists and visitors, John Spargo told what Socialism is. Of course, it was impossible for many of the Socialists to stay away. "Are you going this afternoon to learn what Socialism is?" I asked Prof. Rauschenbusch. "No," he answered, "I am going to hear what Spargo thinks it is." As we sat there, we could see through the great windows the setting sun of our last conference day glinting its rays across blue sky and through rustling tree tops and on the wings of speeding birds. Clearly, quietly, eloquently came the ringing words of that message of deliverance we can never hear too often. Tears shone in the eyes even of old Socialists. To some of us that hour held the most beautiful and inspiring moments of all.

Just as every day had fortunately been sunny, so were they all replete with mental and spiritual stimulus and the warmth of comradeship. As on the last evening we separated, finding the winding paths to our bungalows by lights ancient and modern, from the eternal stars to the farmer's lantern and the modern flash, it was with a sense of an infinitely enriched fellowship that the we said good night and goodbye.

A wondering child once asked me, "Where is last summer?" We now ask, where is our summer conference. The answer is that it has gone from reality to memory to be revisited in the mind's

eye on dull winter city days and in moments of discouragement. To our hosts of the Severn Community, to our own Committee, our hearty thanks for the week when we were "merry, merry men," aspiring to build a still newer world in this new world Sherwood Forest.

Is Defensive War Justified?

By J. G. Phelps Stokes.*

It is because I am an ardent believer in peace that I believe in the exercise of police power by democratically organized societies throughout their various units, great as well as small. I, of course, know that there are some in the radical movement who view all exercise of force for purposes either of aggression or restraint as an intolerable invasion of the liberty of those against whom the force is exercised. This latter is of course the usual position of the Anarchists as well as of various religious sects. The former adopt it in the belief that liberty must be absolute and untrammeled to be liberty at all. Many of the latter adopt it in the belief (mistaken, I think) that Jesus enjoined it. "Resist not evil," they repeat, "but overcome evil with good."

To the writer, liberty in society means freedom to express oneself and to seek the fulfillment of one's desires by any means not prejudicial to the just interests of others. Liberty does not mean freedom to place in the paths of others obstacles to their just progress, but it does at times require the erecting of effective barriers against such types of unjust progress on the part of some, as would prevent the just progress of others.

If we hold that evil should be overcome with good, we should not be averse to considering what measures may be "good" when used to overcome evil. If a vicious dog attacks a child it may be very good, in every sense of the word, to forcibly seize the dog and remove him. Circumstances might easily arise when the performance of such a forceful act would involve courage of a most commendable kind and morality of even the highest order. If an individual have a homicidal mania or a marked tendency to commit acts of arson or rape it may be very "good" to forcibly restrain him and very bad to stand idly by while he takes the life or wrecks the happiness of another. If one were to witness the commencement of a murderous or other outrageous deed and had the power to prevent its completion, it would be very base to step aside and refuse to interfere, prefering to quietly unburden oneself of a virtuous homily addressed to the aggressor; evidently the murder would be finished before the murderer could be persuaded of the error of his point of view or intention.

It is very good to give a cup of cold water to him who thirsts, or to pour wine and oil (or more modern antiseptics and analgesiacs) upon the wounds of those who lie sore-stricken and wounded by the violent along the highways of life; but very base to acquiesce in the continuance of the aggressive violence that occasions the wounds.

The use of force and the risk of one's life to check the progress of the violent may in appropriate circumstances be the highest virtue. Even He, who said, "Resist not evil," also said, addressing his disciples on one of the most solemn occasions of his life, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one"; and himself used violence successfully on an historic occasion to remove disturbers who insisted upon intruding with the paraphernalia of commerce upon the sanctity of the temple.

Liberty does not mean freedom to intrude forcefully or otherwise upon the

*From address at I. S. S. Summer Conference at Sherwood Forest, Md.

lives or happiness of others; but it does mean, among other things, freedom to pursue the just paths of peace and freedom to erect barriers if need be against the incursions of those who would despoil one of life, happiness or just possessions. If one choose to use one's body as part of such a barrier one has the right to do so. Not only has one the right, but one often has the duty to do so, particularly if being able-bodied, one can thereby afford protection to those who, without such protection, would unjustly suffer grievously. Preeminently is it one's duty to form part of such a barrier where the principles of liberty are at stake, and where one feels that without the barrier even such liberty as mankind has would be jeopardized or overthrown and trampled under the feet of oppressors? Who, believing passionately in democracy, would not give his life gladly, if he felt that by giving it he could best further democracy's cause?

Of course, it is often said that it is better to live for democracy than to die for it; but this is only partially true. Not always can one best advance a cause by living. Jesus, believing intensely in the supreme importance of His message, thought it better that one should die than that a whole people should lack the message that His death would best convey; and innumerable have been those who, inspired by His self-sacrifice, have led richer, purer, nobler and more useful lives than they would otherwise have known. Throughout the ages mankind have revered and drawn helpful inspiration from the memory of those who have died that a cause might live, and have consigned to deepest infamy the memory of those who have forsaken a great cause for life.

It will of course be said that the right to sacrifice one's own life for a cause may be conceded, but not the right to sacrifice the life of another. Here again, partial truth tends to mislead. One seldom has a right to make another fight, but one often has the right to stop another fighting. Liberty is more precious than life, and where a tyrannical government would arbitrarily invade or limit the freedom of a people, the people may rightly, as a last resort, oppose the instruments of death to the invaders or oppressors.

No one has a right to life who denies an equal right to his fellow. To lessen liberty is to lessen life. He who curtails the liberty of the people curtails in similar degree his own right to life. A state or nation that curtails the liberty of a people, preferring its own aggrandizement, forfeits in corresponding degree its right to live. And a nation or a group or an individual that stands idly by watching another nation or group or individual strangle the liberty of others and having power to check the violator does nothing but mumble pious phrases, forfeits correspondingly not merely its own right to life as well as to liberty, but also forfeits correspondingly such right as it may previously have had to the respect of mankind.

He is no good citizen who quietly acquiesces where wrong is done his fellow, and when, being able to help, he does nothing; particularly if being asked to help, he refuses such aid as he is able to give. Doubtless a mere voice of protest will check a wrong at times; but often the wrong advances more rapidly than the voice can follow—sometimes more rapidly than either voice or body can be interposed to stop it; and there are times when nothing can move swiftly enough to check it save the winged messengers of death. Where the wrong is so flagrant as to arouse a whole people to its monstrousness and where it is advancing too rapidly to be stopped by other means, war on the part of the outraged people may be not only right, but essential. And such just and moral war need not be defensive merely. Aggressive war to stop a hideous and a monstrous wrong may be highly moral, and refusal to wage it may be base and ignoble and craven.

Life may be taken and life may be given, but this is not necessarily an

evil. It is very easy to over-estimate the value of mere continuance of living. Many a life would be happier if shorter, and few episodes give greater joy than the giving of life to a cause, and few services are greater than the laying down of life that a just cause may live, and that those that come after may have life more abundantly. I need not attempt to name the multitudes who have given their lives gladly in revolutionary movements aiming at the liberation of men from bondage. The glad giving of a few or of many lives to-day may mean the saving and enrichment of innumerably more lives in years to come, and may even be essential in some instances to the best progress of humanity. And where hundreds or thousands of young men are not merely willing but glad to offer their lives for the preservation of such liberties as mankind has achieved, and for the preservation of ideals and standards of good faith that are dearer even than life, who can wisely seek to dissuade them?

Doubtless some will say that young men are not built to sacrifice themselves for ideals and that unselfishness and devotion to the degree suggested are non-existent or excessively rare. The simplest answer is that people are always slow to believe that motives actuate others which do not actuate themselves. Those who think life better than liberty are fortunately not in the ascendant. Although their ideals of peace may be high, yet they should not forget that such liberty as they enjoy was paid for in advance with the lives of those, their forerunners, who preferred death to oppression, and who gladly gave their lives that the dawn of liberty might be brought nearer—nearer even for those who would rather see liberty overthrown than risk life to preserve it.

It is held by some that the ideal to which we should look forward is that of a vast amorphous social entity, world-wide, and having neither form nor organization nor any parts greater or stronger than the individual man, woman or child, each of whom should be untrammeled, unhampered and uncontrolled. The concept of the family or the state or the nation, as an entity having merit in itself and worthy of preservation, is by such people ridiculed as a bourgeois notion having no proper place in any enlightened philosophy. But the organized Socialist movement of the past half century has never shared this view. Individual Socialists have attacked the prevalent ideals of family and nation, just as individual radicals opposed to the Socialists have done, but the overwhelming preponderance of Socialists the world over, while recognizing the folly of many inherited conventions, yet see in the institution of the family and in the highest cultural organization of the nation the germ centers and culture media in which the life of the individual can best be brought to maturity of growth and happiest fruition. And though defense of the nation has often been decried in Socialist assemblies, yet since the earliest beginnings there has never been in the organized Socialist movement any widely successful opposition to organized defense of one's nation against the incursions of those who would rob it of its independence of action—its freedom to assume such form and functions as its people choose. To be sure, the Socialists have never seen advantage in perpetuating a capitalist state as such; but they usually have seen very great advantage in preserving such of its machinery as can be used in furtherance of the cause of democracy; and in preserving even the capitalist state itself from chaos until it can be conquered from within by the ballot and economic pressure and converted from a capitalist state into a co-operative commonwealth.

As Vandervelde has so wisely pointed out, Internationalism by its very etymology, as well as by its obvious significance, means and requires harmonious inter-relations among nations, and nations must exist as its constituent elements else inter-nationalism cannot be. Nothing is more obvious to the observant traveller than that there are national traits and customs and ideals and ways of doing things that are dear to the respective peoples.

Many of these customs and ideals and ways bring to life most of its joys, and so far as most of them are concerned no good end requires that they be hastily changed or supplanted. Defense of a nation that is making progress toward democracy, as though it were a garden bed in which the flowers of life can best grow, is nearly always approved by Socialists, even though weeds tend at times to overshadow and crowd out the flowers. Just at present, among the Socialists of the United States, a very large proportion and perhaps a majority, appear to take no interest in national defense, and many among them hurl anathemas against those members of the Socialist Party who advocate appropriations for the support of military and naval forces. But those who hurl the anathemas are out of accord with the most widely approved Socialist traditions. Their views even though "advanced" are out of accord with the views of those whom they have always honored as the ablest and wisest among the founders and leaders of the Socialist movement, and out of accord with many expressions relating to the subject adopted as authoritative by National and International Socialist Party Congresses.*

In the immediate present a majority of such American Socialists as have expressed themselves on the subject seem opposed to armaments of every kind, but just as the seeming majority view in the United States to-day was a minority view here yesterday, so a seeming minority view here to-day may not unlikely be again a majority view to-morrow. Notwithstanding the immediate situation in the United States, it would be very easy, did time permit, to multiply readily available evidences that would convince the unbiased that the very great majority of the organized Socialists of the world believe in the propriety of defensive wars, where the liberties of a people are deemed by the people to be at stake; and even in the propriety of aggressive wars where deemed by the people essential to the overthrow of tyranny.

*Mr. Stokes here read a remarkably comprehensive group of quotations from prominent Socialists, including Engels, Marx, the elder Liebknecht, Bebel, Jaures, Guesde, Berger, Hillquit, London, Compere-Morel, Vaillant, and from resolutions passed at various party congresses in proof of this assertion.

Out of Mencius

By Frederick Peterson.

The King began his tower
And measured it and planned,
And the people came together
And builded it by hand.

In multitudes they wandered
Outside the pleasure ground
Where the sleek fat does were lying
And white birds glistened round.

The people died in battle,
Of hunger in the wild;
The King walked in his garden,
The sun looked down and smiled.

The Logic of Pacifism

By Jessie Wallace Hughan.*

There are two kinds of war—first (the unjust and) aggressive war, and second, (the just and) defensive war.

There is hardly a pacifist who does not admit the necessity of defensive war as a last resort. The German Fried and the American Krehbiel unite in repudiating the advocacy of peace at any price and unilateral disarmament.

It has seemed to me that these keen reasoners have here yielded far too much. This necessity of defensive war as a last resort is taken as an axiom even by Norman Angell, who takes nothing else as an axiom. When I asked Mr. Angell after a lecture to explain what risks a nation would occur by one-sided disarmament, he courteously declined to name them.

Yet we are radicals and therefore pledged to examine axioms. Let us take a little while this morning to examine the axiom, Defensive war is necessary as a last resort, and therefore one-sided disarmament is impracticable.

In the first place, what definite things do we have in mind when we talk of defense? What objects may be endangered? Here is a list which I think includes most of the objects, which we mean when we talk of protecting our country, —territory, race and nationality, colonies, policy and empire, honor and prestige, culture and ideals, distinctive institutions, commerce, property, personal liberty, the lives of individuals. There are three questions before us: first, to what extent have modern nations been obliged to defend these things from one another; second, what motives are likely to lead modern powers to attack any of these valued objects in an undefended nation; and third, where a necessity for defense exists, is military or non-military defense the more efficient, whether as first or last resort?

To what extent *have* present day nations been compelled to defend themselves? The map of Europe was practically complete by 1871, with the exception of the Balkans, which are still unfinished in the political geography. We may consider modern international war as dating from that time, including the Franco-Prussian War, which, though itself a part of the older regime, yet is the last war fought between European powers until the present, and so of importance. During this period there have been ten wars between developed or partly developed nations,—the Franco-Prussian, the Balkan of 1878, the Chino-Japanese, the Greco-Turkish, the Spanish-American, the Boer, the Russo-Japanese, the Tripolitan and the last two Balkan. Of these the Balkan of 1878, the Greco-Turkish, the Spanish-American, the Balkan of 1912, and possibly the Boer War, were of the nature of rebellions, and so not to be included in the present inquiry as to international defense. Analyzing the causes of the remaining conflicts, we find that none of these was a matter of attack and defense,—each one may, in fact, be termed aggressively ambitious on both sides.

Bismarck planned for a greater Germany; Napoleon interfered to preserve his own prestige. China and Japan both wanted a third kingdom, Korea. The Rhodes and Kruger factions each longed for preponderance in South Africa. Both Japan and Russia had aggressive plans in Korea and Manchuria. The Balkan States quarreled over dismembered Turkey. With the exception of the Spanish-American War, where we ourselves played the part of aggressor in the Philippines, and of the Tripolitan War, when Italy expanded into an atrophied portion of the Turkish Empire, there is no element of attack and defense at all, unless it is the defense of *an aggressive foreign policy*,—two dogs quarreling over a bone which neither has a right to possess. The burden of proof, therefore, is upon those who maintain that defense by war is likely to be required in the future when it has not been so in the immediate past.

The reply is of course a ready one. It is not actual war, say the defenders, but potential war, that protects our country. It is very well to talk of dogs

*Address at I. S. S. Summer Conference at Sherwood Forest, Md.

quarreling over a bone, but who wants to be the defenseless bone, Korea or Tripoli or Somaliland?

Now in maintaining the uselessness of defensive war, I am speaking solely of war on the part of an industrially developed nation, such as the United States. If I were a citizen of Somaliland I would not be using these arguments, but probably advising defense against Britain—with most suicidal effect. But let us bear in mind that we are neither Koreans nor Zulus, not bones, but dogs, and the distinction is a fundamental one.

Let us suppose for the sake of argument an absolutely undefended industrial nation, unprotected by league of peace, international police or any means not now available. What would happen? It is clear that its safety would depend almost entirely upon the motives for and the deterrents against aggression on the part of other nations. Considering the four most important of the values which we signify by the words our country, would foreign powers proceed to deprive such a people of land, liberty, property and life?

Since the last three could be affected but little unless the first were captured, let us inquire the fate of life, liberty and property on the supposition of a conquered land, and then consider the likelihood of such a conquest of territory in itself. "The possession of wealth by a defenseless nation," says Hudson Maxim, "is a standing *casus belli* to other nations, and always there has been the nation standing ready to attack and plunder any other nation when there was likely to be sufficient profit in the enterprise to pay for the trouble." I need not remind you also of the lurid details of The Battle-Cry of Peace regarding life and liberty. Yet what are the facts?

The Hague Conventions were signed in 1907 by all the powers, and embody at least the official attitude of these powers toward the life, liberty and property of the conquered.

These conventions are but scraps of paper, it may be said. What is the evidence as to whether they are adhered to in conquered territory? This evidence is not easy to find. We all know that there are lies on both sides, and that life, liberty and property are far from inviolate anywhere, in New York, for instance. It is obvious that occurrences during hostilities do not concern us, and atrocities attendant upon the conquest of Belgium or East Prussia throw no light whatever upon our suppositious case where the point is that there is no defense and therefore no war.

Luxembourg is perhaps the best instance we have of an undefended territory, but as details except from German sources are practically non-existent we are obliged to rule these out as possibly partisan. The present condition of Belgium is of significance, however, and for a longer range, that of Alsace-Lorraine, as the last important transfer of developed territory from one European country to another. We note that in 1874, three years after the war, the deputies of Alsace and Lorraine were admitted to the Reichstag and that according to the *Statesmen's Year Book* their number of deputies was greater than that of Baden, a German state of larger population and area.

Among the various pro-German and pro-Ally contradictions as to occupied Belgium, I have been glad to find a little account written by a Belgian in an English magazine, the *British Review*, telling of conditions from the point of view of neither Germany nor Ally but an enthusiast for Belgian communal government, showing the lack of violence to the conquered and the power of moral suasion.*

*Pierre Maes, writing in the summer of 1915 on Municipal Resistance in Belgium in the *British Review* (vol. II, p. 404), tells us that the Germans in no respect changed the order of things existing before the war, but *followed the Hague conventions.* The Teuton, "in spite of all his efforts, has not succeeded in reducing the inhabitants to submission" (p. 203) and the "moral force counterbalances the action of the new governors." No violence is done to the rights of the conquered, although the Germans are *trying* to lay the country under regular requisitions and drain it of all its resources both public and private.

The budget of the city of Ghent for the

Conquest is not agreeable. I am not advocating the conquest of the United States by anybody. Here are the Hague Conventions, however, and here is some first-hand testimony that to me rings truer than that of Hudson Maxim as to life, liberty and property, even in a country still involved in war. And we must remember that in our hypothetical case there *is* no war, but an unresisted occupation. What is the likelihood of such an occupation, however? It is to defend the territory of the Unted States that Norman Angell, Meyer London and the Socialist majority are willing to tolerate a modified militarism. The British nation objects to being "wiped off the map of Europe," said Mr. Balfour apropos of the Agadir crisis, and it is the fear of such a geographical catastrophe that supports every army in the world. Walter Lippmann assures us of safety to our land. "Few informed people," he says, "imagine for a moment that any nation of the world contemplates seizing or holding our own territory. If we get into trouble it will be over some place like Mexico or Haiti or the Philippines, or the Panama Canal or Manchuria or Hawaii."

Mr. Usher and Norman Angell have voiced like opinions.

It is not, moreover, for military reasons that the United States need fear no foreign conqueror. Suppose the complete absence of army, navy and international police, I have no fear that any nation would steal our territory, for the simple reason that it would be of no economc use to them.

We are all familiar with the Socialist explanation of modern wars as a struggle for foreign markets in order to dispose of the surplus products of capitalism. Norman Angell, by what appears at first to be a contradiction of Socialist theory, proves, by reasoning also familiar to this audience, that trade does not follow the flag and that conquest is of no economc value to the victor. Many have been the attacks upon Mr. Angell, the most scientific of them, that of Mr. Jones, establishing as its chief point that Angell has ignored the possibility of protective tariffs. Hobson, however, supplements the argument of Angell by showing that even a tariff does not make Imperialism profitable or exclude free trade nations from the whole benefit of new markets. Mr. Angell's theory seems, accordingly, to have stood the test of criticism; yet we need not therefore give up our Socialist contention. The nations are clearly struggling for the unclaimed world. Why?

In the first place, as Angell assures us, it is not for their real advantage that nations strive, but for what they think is their advantage. In the second place—and here is where I wish to show that the Unted States is not a bone, but a dog in the world contest—the rivalry is at present entirely for a new variety of market that was unknown in the last generation. Ever since the fall of mercantilism with the American Revoluton, the enlightened powers have given over the attempt to exploit civilized territory as a market for home produce. England and Germany know that free trade is the only economic advantage to be gained by conquering the United States.

---

year 1914-15 is given. Out of an expenditure of about 33,000,000 francs 15,000,000 went for military requisitions, the loss for the year being something over 3,000,000 francs. The one tax that the Belgian writer denominates a blot on the budget is that on the houses of absentees deliberately imposed by the Germans in order to bring about their return. Among the items of the budget we notice an advance of 800,000 francs to the Vooruit co-operative, repairs to dwelling houses, etc.

He praises in detail the great communal independence of the Belgian cities from time immemorial, where the burgomaster is never the mere agent of the governmnt. Now they are "obliged to admit the collaboration of the German authorities." "They knew their duties and their rights, and they could, relying strongly upon the Hague conventions, discuss point after point with the invader, who saw that he was obliged to keep his place, to share their views, and even to help on their task." He tells of the successful grappling of the communal administrations with a heavy task,—the feeding, with the aid of the United States and Spain, of the whole of Belgium. "Not a day passes without some deputy or other having a bone to pick with a commandant who is anxious to impede the exercise of his tutelary function; but nothing can withstand the murmur of a starving population, of which the *moral resistance* is of exemplary dignity. The importance of the local authorities in our country has completely baffled the Germans."

The type of market that Angell fails to emphasize, however, and that the Socialists are right in making the bone of contention in modern war, is the market of an undeveloped country. Mr. Boudin has explained to us how the industrial nations have changed their index of prosperity from textiles to iron and steel, from consumers' goods to producers! We are willing to import our small wares from the East if we can build them the machines and the railroads by which to produce them, exploit their undeveloped raw materials and turn into coolie labor their ignorant people. It is as a field for the investment of capital that the powers desire new territory.

Now the developed nations are already saturated with capital. By this I do not mean that money is free or that there are no openings for profitable enterprise. We are familiar with the principle, however, that as capital accumulates in a society, the marginal units are forced into less and less productive uses, these units determine the general rate and normal interest falls. For generations the capital of England has sought foreign investment. Hobson tells us that "in 1893 the British capital invested abroad represented about 15 per cent. of the total wealth of the United Kingdom; nearly one-half of this capital was in the form of loans to foreign and colonial governments; of the rest a large proportion was invested in railways, banks, telegraphs and other public services, owned, controlled or vitally affected by governments, while most of the remainder was placed in lands and mines or in industries directly dependent on land values."

Here we have the motive at the bottom of the scramble for new lands. The developed nations, that is, the capitalist ring who control them, want undeveloped territory in which they may obtain concessions, invest capital and enjoy, under the ægis of their government, an abnormally high interest. Now the United States is an exploiting country, not an unexploited one, and therefore, even if absolutely unprotected, cannot play the role of China, Korea or Africa. Could Germany or Japan enrich itself by loaning money to our government, opening up our lands and mines or building Pacific railroads? We are saturated with capital and therefore to a conqueror of less value than ruined Mesopotamia. Our country is safe.

Our colonies can be taken from us, however. Yes, quite true. Yet we might profitably make a present of the Philippines to the first customer in view of their twenty millions expense every year and trade profit of only two and a half million—and Hobson has proved conclusively that this absence of profit is characteristic of Imperialism rather than exceptional.

I must spend my remaining minute in just touching upon the second great cause of aggression, which is not economc, but psychological; namely, fear. While the international wars from 1871 to 1914 were caused almost solely by the struggle for undeveloped lands, the present catastrophe was brought about, as far as most of us can estimate the cause at present, by something quite different—in the background, of course, the contest for world exploitation, but in the foreground fear alone, the fear of the tremendous armaments with which each nation expected to terrify the others into peace. The undeveloped country, Korea or Mesopotamia, may be in danger from economic greed. The developed country is in danger from one cause alone, the fear of it aroused in other nations.

Alsace and Lorraine were the last annexation of developed territory, and the reason, according to the Cambridge History, was fear of France, a well-founded fear, it seems, for Emile Bourgeois tells us that France immediately established an army, "with hope of revenge." Professor Stowell has collected for us the excuses of the various nations in 1914, as found in the many-colored state papers—every one an excuse of fear—Austria fearing Servia, Russia fearing Austria, Germany fearing Russia, and so on, in a vicious circle.

There is but one way in which the United States can render itself unable to be feared, and that is by permanent repudiation of all war, offensive or

defensive. "Unpreparedness" alone will not do it; democratic control alone will not do it. We have all seen how the people of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, with a few Socialists to boot, with a totally inadequate army and navy according to their own statements, were yet saved by good luck alone from war with Germany and Mexico. Some of us can even "remember the Maine." The same thing may happen again, and if the next time the foreign foe happens to be less occupied than last year we can hardly expect him to refrain from anticipating our attack and thus ushering in a defensive war. Mobilitis, as Professor Stowell calls it, is the most serious cause of war.

Several times I have mentioned leagues of peace as unnecessary to the safety of an unarmed nation. To avoid misunderstanding let me say that I have the deepest respect for all such plans, always provided they yield nothing to preparedness or militarism. The nations must of course demand and achieve the proper machinery for world government as soon as they are ready to forego the advantages of force. It will be of tremendous value for brilliant minds to work out these plans as far as possible in the present. Much injustice and confusion would undoubtedly have been saved to our country if the American colonies had been able to work out the rough outlines of the Federal Constitution before 1776. But, if they had delayed the signing of the Declaration of Independence until the Constitution should be perfected, I regret to say that it might have been still unsigned.

May I repeat, therefore, an industrially developed nation brings no profit to a conquering power, and governments are already acting on this principle. An unarmed nation need not be feared and therefore need not be attacked. Absolute safety from anything is impossible in this imperfect world, yet I believe that an unarmed United States would be the safest nation that has yet existed.

The Conference Speakers

Reported by HARRY W. LAIDLER

Scholarly addresses, keen criticisms, passionate searchings for truth, and, withal, a genuine spirit of fellowship were the outstanding features at the various sessions of the Summer Conference.

The subject chosen for discussion—"Social Preparedness, National and International"—was the most vital before the country. Perhaps the greatest diversity of opinion among the delegates was witnessed during the discussion of international social preparedness. The question of the justifiability of defensive warfare was productive of the most varied views.

DEFENSIVE WARFARE

Four principal speakers stated their position on this question at the Saturday evening and Sunday morning sessions. J. G. Phelps Stokes argued his belief in wars "where the liberties of a people are deemed by the people to be at stake," and of even aggressive wars "where deemed by the people essential to the overthrow of tyranny." Dr. Jessie W. Hughan took the extreme pacifist position against all international wars. William English Walling, while declaring that Socialists do not favor any original declaration of war, asserted that, when a war is on, the Socialist is bound to favor that side whose success will advance the interest of internationalism. Dr. George W. Nasmyth declared that the Socialists, by affirming their willingness to join in a war of defense, would place too great a weapon in the hands of the ruling class, inasmuch as it is possible for almost any ruling class to convince its people, at the outbreak of a war, that the war is defensive as far as its country is concerned. He felt, however, that it would be difficult to avoid wars until leagues of peace were

established to which the nations might turn in times of crises.

The addresses of Miss Hughan and Mr. Stokes appear elsewhere in this issue.

War and Internationalism

In arguing that Socialists—after war is declared—should throw their support on the side of the country whose success would advance the cause of internationalism and democracy, Mr. Walling gave a survey of the peace demands of the minority Socialist groups in the various nations and declared that the war would go on even if these minority groups were in charge of affairs. The peace terms suggested by the pacifist group in the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain, and of the minority group of the French Socialists, would be impossible of realization, he asserted, without the defeat of Germany. The only hope of shortening the present war or of avoiding the necessity of future international conflicts was in a revolution in Germany. Such revolution, however, according even to the radical German Socialists, would not materialize until several years after the war.

"Moreover, the German internationalists themselves take a position that leads, not towards an early revolution and internationalism but towards a strengthening of nationalism and a prolongation of the present war. For they oppose any surrender of German, Austrian or Turkish provinces even if the population of such provinces prefers to live under some other government. In fact, I do not believe a single German Socialist leader, not even Liebknecht, has ever confessed that there is such an international question as that of Alsace-Lorraine—and if he did his voice would be drowned by the voices even of the German minority. Yet the neutral Socialist Conference held at the Hague on August 1st has just demanded a consultation, which means a compromise, on this question. What this compromise would be is not clear. But one thing is certain. Some parts of Alsace-Lorraine are German and some are French. Strassburg and the Rhine districts were German even in Goethe's time, when France owned Alsace. Metz and the western parts of Lorraine are French to-day. But Metz is the most important point of Lorraine strategically and near it are situated the most valuable iron mines of Europe. Even the most radical of German labor unionists, Hue of the coal miners, has said that Germany must not relinquish these mines. And the German people will not relinquish Metz until millions more of them are slaughtered."

Defining the Socialist position toward war, Mr. Walling continued:

"Socialists do not believe in any war *merely* because it is defensive. For example, suppose that the Czar had started to butcher the whole Jewish population, or a large part of it, as the Turks did in Armenia. If then Russia had been attacked on this ground by other more advanced nations, would that attack have justified the Russian Socialists in *defending* the Czarism? On the contrary, Russian Socialism as well as that of all other countries would have gained by Russian defeat. This was why Karl Marx desired a war between Russia and Europe—leaving aside the question as to which side would be the nominal aggressor as being of secondary importance. The sole consideration was that internationalism would gain by a war that resulted in Russian defeat.

"The question as to who caused a particular war is so difficult as to be almost insoluble in any case. The important question for the whole world—including the nations not involved—is: Whose success will bring the greater progress towards internationalism? In a war between Russia and the United States, for example, practically all the Socialists of the world, including nearly all those of Russia, would desire American success and do everything in their power to bring it about. And by success, I mean, of course, such a success as Germany had over France in 1870, or Europe over Napoleon in 1815. In neither case was France 'crushed,' but in both cases she was most decidedly beaten, and from a military standpoint humiliated (i. e., her army was humiliated), so that no intelligent Frenchman could fail to see that she was beaten. It is such a defeat—*decisive but not crushing*—that Bebel said in his Memoirs (only six years ago) was desirable for a people politically unfree like those of the semi-absolute monarchism of present-day Germany. Conversely, it is desirable that France should have a reasonably decisive victory not because she is on the defensive, but because she is France, a *politically* free country, a democratic republic, the result of two successful revolutions—in both of which the working-class played an important part and got at least a minor share of the benefits—including the practical annihilation of the land-owning nobility and the clergy as political powers.

"Internationalists then do not favor any original declaration of war. Nor do they in every instance support national defense after war has already been declared. But when war has been declared they favor the victory of the democratic as against the autocratic government, on the ground that bourgeois political democracy represents a great step in economic progress and a great step towards internationalism when

compared with aristocratic or even plutocratic monarchism, where existing forms of parliamentary government are a farce. In a word, the world's Socialists do not count the two and a half centuries of English, American and French progress towards political liberty and political democracy—won by the sacrifice of seas of blood—as so much time lost, simply because we still have a long way to go before we reach Socialism. On the contrary, they count the gain so precious that it is worth any sacrifice whatever in blood or money to prevent these forces from receiving a set-back in 1917 at the hands of the identical reactionary powers they overthrew in 1648, 1776, 1789 and 1848. The political struggles of these countries were hailed by the democrats of the whole world, and especially all Socialists and internationalists, as the land-marks of human progress—*until the outbreak of the present war. And after this war is over, when they have beaten their enemies once more, their prestige will be greater than ever.*"

Dr. Nasmyth, the last speaker, said in part:

"The problem of defensive warfare is complicated by the fact that the people of a nation can always be deluded into believing that even a war of aggression is a war of national defense.

"In Germany I passed through the city of Cleve on the third of August and saw the troops being mobilized, as they thought, to repel the invasion of the Russian Tartars and Cossacks. The soldiers were told that the Russians were coming in to destroy their homes and to kill their women and children. On the sides of the freight cars in which they were embarking they chalked "Nach Petersburg" and all similar inscriptions, because they believed that they were starting for the Russian front, but instead they were sent over the boundary into Belgium and practically all of them were wiped out when they went up to the forts of Liege in close formation.

"In the same way the peasants of the Polish plains, the Tyrolese mountaineers, the French weavers of Lyons, the farmers in the vineyards of the German Main and the workers in the shipyards of the Clyde all were told that this was a war of defense, that their country had been the victim of an unprovoked attack and that they must rally to the support of their flag and their nation. These facts must be taken into consideration when we are discussing the problems of justifying war for defense only.

"We can see the same thing in our own Mexican crisis. In Cleveland, durduring the crisis, the chief of police declared that he would arrest anyone who criticised the policy of the American government. The difficulty of getting at the truth was shown during the Mexican War and the Spanish-American War. It has recently been discovered that prior to the declaration of war in 1898, our cabinet had in its possession a message from Spain to the effect that she would grant anything that this country demanded."

Dr. Nasmyth then turned to the question of the effects of non-resistance compared with those of resistance. He spoke of Finland as an example of a non-resistant country now bent on directing a campaign against alcohol and illiteracy, and asked whether it would have been a sane policy for the statesmen of that country to have suggested resistance. He continued:

"The first argument for resistance is that of preserving the name of and saving one's own country. If, however, we really want to save our country, the way is not to resist. Whoever wants to be a martyr, let him resist. The second argument for plunging into war is that of saving other countries, but we don't even accomplish that. Belgium went to war to save France, England to save Belgium, France to free Alsace-Lorraine, Italy to save Trieste from the continued rule of Austria, Japan to save England and incidentally to obtain the German possessions in China, etc. The countries, however, are not saved, but are destroyed in the process."

In answering the question as to whether Armenia was better off for failing to resist the Turks, Dr. Nasmyth said that the persecution of the Armenians was the result of religious fanaticism which should have ceased to exist a couple of hundred years ago. He declared that "the sick old man of Europe" had been given a new lease of life in 1878 by the action of Lord Beaconsfield in tearing up the treaty of San Stephano and forcing the powers to accept the Balkans back under the yoke of Turkey. "For England," he declared, "wished a powerful Turkey which would prevent Russia from controlling the Dardanelles and would keep India secure for England."

"Mr. Stokes has made a most idealistic appeal. The non-resistants were formerly the idealists and were appealing to the high moral principles. That is all changed now. The advocates of non-resistance, after a refusal to justify war on economic grounds, are trying to pin the minds of the people down to the facts of the case and the advocates of preparedness are going back to high moral principles. One fallacy, however, runs through the argument of those advocating war. They suffer from unilateral aberration. They make no reference whatever to the killing of people, but

see only a laying down of their own lives. We are willing to lay down our own lives for a great ideal. The thing which I, and most of you, are not willing to do is to kill other men. Mr. Stokes has appealed to the example of Jesus. He was glad to lay down his life, but he was not willing to go out and kill another man.

"Mr. Walling is willing to justify war if the end is liable to be a victory for democracy. We have to go a little deeper into morality and say that the results of using wrong means are the abolition of democracy and the militarization of all Europe. We have to come to a morality which will know that the means themselves must be able to stand the test. When we ask in war, 'Who wins?' I am reminded of a reply given by a newsboy who was asked who was going to win the present European conflict. He replied, 'Who won the San Francisco earthquake?'"

Dr. Nasmyth then went into the discussion of the League of Peace to which nations could turn in time of international conflict, and declared his belief that it was one of the great instruments against war.

Sunday Morning Session

The discussion of the justifiability of defensive warfare was continued on Sunday morning. Mr. Spargo spoke of the danger of overvaluating mere continuance of existence, and said that life was worth while only if it contained valuable ends. If he had any preference he would prefer in the future to be born in the Belgian heritage than in the Luxembourg. When a determination in a people to resist oppression is destroyed it is a sad day for a nation. It may become a duty of an enlightened people to raise a sufficient force to crush the reigning class in another nation and to liberate those who suffer.

Louis Boudin said that the speeches of the pacifists had almost converted him to the belief that non-resistance was a good paying proposition from the point of view of the nation which wished to protect its skin.

"However," he declared, "I am opposed to pacifism because I believe that progress is made by struggle, and those nations have made progress that have struggled, internally and externally, and the countries that have had no violent struggles have not progressed.

"I do not believe in the principle of defending *your* country. If you start out with that principle you will find the members of the proletariat fighting each other. The principle of the League to Enforce Peace appeals to me. It tries to organize humanity so that all of humanity will come to the defense of any oppressed nation. It says it is not your duty to defend your country, but any country that is attacked. This induces a higher than a nationalist principle."

Mr. Boudin stated that often pacifists make the mistake of having in mind the suffering while war lasts and thus want to find a means of stopping it, but that the worst thing about war is its results when "peace breaks out."

"Hatred and the results of conquests are the pernicious things. Whenever one nation dominates another, the national struggle obscures the class struggle. As I am opposed to conquests, I must be in favor of defense, but not defense that would make a nation defend his country, but that would involve the duty of defending any country when attacked and when there is a chance of conquering it."

Dr. Mez, taking the pacifist position, declared that the opposing side failed to realize the irrelevancy of physical force in the accomplishment of permanent results. He said that it was not consistent for the Socialists to vote against armament for twenty years and then to support the war after war was declared and rejoice in the fact that the nation had such strong armaments upon which to rely. He continued:

"The anti-militarist should say, 'I have opposed all of your war. You have not taken my advice. War is broken out. Let things go smash. The system I have opposed has done it.' To say that we will take part in defensive war, or in war for democracy doesn't get the working-class anywhere. The more two countries fight with each other the less one finds of internationalism."

Dr. Hughan referred to the fact that England, in its endeavor to fight the struggles of democracy, was becoming militaristic itself; that it had 2,000 men under military guards for refusing to serve against their fellow men, and was persecuting many in a frightful manner.

"Does not the Pacifist believe that during a labor struggle it is right for unionists to bring pressure to bear on a scab to join a union?" asked Mr. Spargo.

"It is one thing," replied Dr. Nasmyth, "to do this and another for a government to force its citizens to kill their fellows.

"Boudin says that progress comes from struggle and that is where I and the Darwinians disagree with him. The Medes,

the Persians, the Greeks and the people of Roman Empire all were warlike people. They that take the sword shall perish by the sword, and the nations that have not taken the sword are the ones that have survived. The next century will probably be the century of China and India, the nations that have taken religion as something to be lived by."

League of Peace

A portion of Saturday morning, following the paper of Professor Montague, was devoted to the discussion of the League of Peace. Senator La Fontaine, author of "The Great Solution," and winner of a Nobel Peace Prize, gave a short sketch of the progress toward international courts, and said, among other things:

"In 1898 the Czar sent an invitation to 26 nations to come together to discuss peace. The main discussion then centered around the rules of war.

"In 1899 a proposal was made to organize a system of compulsory arbitration whereby the states should be obligated to bring before the court those disputes involving treaties or generally accepted principles. Germany alone opposed. In diplomatic conventions when there is not unanimity, no agreement can be reached. In 1907, a similar proposal was made by Great Britain, the United States and France, and supported by a big majority at the Hague. Germany again opposed, supported by Roumania and Greece, and the question was again dropped."

Senator La Fontaine declared that the only equitable representation in the League would be the principle of equality of states. Economic and military forces of the combined nations could be used against a recalcitrant nation. Mail, telegraph, railroads, shipping from without a nation could be cut off. The beginning of an international organization may be found in the 400 international associations existing before the war, of which the postal union is the most comprehensive.

John Spargo, Louis Boudin, William English Walling and others supported the League on the ground that it provided machinery to which the nations could turn in time of international crises. Professor Rauschenbusch declared that he did not believe that the plans of the members of the League to Enforce Peace would guarantee the rights of small nations if the few powerful nations had the power to enforce their demands. The League might, he thought, prevent war, but the big nations would accomplish their purposes by peaceful aggression, such as England used in obtaining control over Persia. He continued:

"I fear that the pacifists and neutrals will be buncoed by such a league, and that this will defeat the pacifist proposals. If those in back of such a league had the same idealism as Dr. Nasmyth, then we could feel safe. But this is not the case. A league would be likely to give a powerful economic weapon to those manipulating the machine. It could also provide machinery that might be used in crushing a revolution."

In reply to this suggestion Mr. Boudin asked:

"Is not the state an engine of power in the hands of one class? Is that any reason for abolishing the state and going back to private warfare? Then there will be the struggle of the masses to get hold of that engine. Progress will certainly follow."

Dr. Nasmyth acknowledged that certain bills of rights should accompany the formation of such a league. He said:

"The independence of small countries should be guaranteed. Countries should not be allowed to interfere with the internal affairs of other lands. The necessity for such a bill of rights indicates that radicals, instead of leaving the formulation of plans to conservatives, should help to formulate plans which will be truly democratic. The League, while not perfect, is a step in the right direction. It substitutes police regulation for war; it does not try to establish a *status quo*. If, as a nation, you want to go to war, you can do so, it says. Only before you go to war, you shall submit the controversy to the decision of the world. A period of delay of at least one year will be given in which it can be determined who is the aggressor. The aggressor would be the nation who refuses to submit its case to arbitration. On the other hand, if it does work, we will be infinitely better off and my reason for believing that it will work is that it is founded on self-interest. You can depend on treaties being kept when it is for the interest of nations to keep them. The capitalistic groups have nothing to gain by war by aggression. They have income taxes up to 34% in England, and it is being predicted that they will go up to 75%.

"Under the League it would be considered as insane to offer resistance as it is now considered insane to resist a policeman. Non-resistance will then become a practical plan for international action. I believe that the United States should take a bold stand for such a plan."

IMMIGRATION

Friday evening was divided between three unusually valuable talks on immigration and the class struggle in Europe.

Professor Jacob Hollander of Johns Hopkins opposed a policy of restricted immigration as far as immigration from European countries was concerned, although declaring that the question of Asiatic immigration was not an immediate political issue. He cited it as his belief that the United States had not as yet reached the stage when the free admission of competent immigrants wisely distributed would fail to result in increased economic well-being and in wholesome culture and spiritual growth. He did not, however, take the view of some economists that that which was advantageous for the world at large would necessarily be advantageous for the particular country, and felt that many cases might arise in which immigration might result in lowering the standard of living in a particular country, while bettering conditions in the world as a whole.

John Spargo, the second speaker on immigration, said in part:

"I am profoundly convinced that we cannot treat the Japanese with contempt, exclude them as 'undesirables' by special legislation, without incurring a bitter racial hatred whose natural fruitage is war.

"Exclusive laws directed against the orient will, I believe, make inevitable a bitter war between the occident and the orient, beginning, perhaps, as a trade war and culminating in armed conflict. At all events, those Socialists who are in favor of Asiatic exclusion had better favor extensive military and naval preparation, for we shall need it if we are going to provoke the hatred of the Asiatic peoples. I do not take the position that there should be no restriction upon immigration; that we ought to admit without any question all who choose to come to this country. I do not think a nation should be expected to admit more immigrants than it can assimilate, that is to say, provide work and decent living conditions for, any more than a man is expected to take into his home more people than he can care for. It is quite compatible with Socialist ethics, it seems to me, to say that we can only assimilate so and so many persons next year in this country. But it is not compatible with Socialist ethics, it seems to me, to make our limitations the excuse for excluding the people of any race, creed, or color, as such. Whatever conditions are laid down to cover the admission of immigrants ought to be applied to all races, all creeds, and all nations. Whatever standards are imposed, whether of physical or mental efficiency, or of character, should be imposed upon all.

"But if we admit that immigration does tend to lower wages, etc., there is no sufficient reason for believing that exclusion is the remedy. Competition of cheap goods made thousands of miles away has the same effect on the standard of living of workers as competition of laborers at the factory gate. If the protection of the standard of living makes it necessary for us to exclude cheap labor, it must equally impose upon us the necessity of supporting protective tariffs. Exclusion of the Japanese because they lower the standard of living would compel us consistently to exclude laborers from southern Europe. They are far more numerous.

"The true Socialist remedy is not the exclusion of that race, but the development of an enlightened policy by the political and economic organizations of the working class in this country to the end of securely establishing the standard of living and making it immune against all forms of competition, while preserving the open door which internationalism demands.

"Nor have we given the Japanese an opportunity to prove whether they are able to become good citizens or good comrades in the working class cause. Labor has denied them membership in its organizations. And yet we have noted the heroic efforts of Socialists in China in the recent great revolution in that country."

Mr. Spargo declared that the two chief arguments for the restriction of immigration from Japan were that such immigration lowers the standard of living already established by the working class of America, and that Japanese cannot be assimilated.

In reply to the first argument Mr. Spargo stated that wages are not lower in the states which have the greatest immigration, nor are they higher in those having the least. The contrary condition is practically universal. Labor organizations do not flourish best in the states and cities most free from immigration.

In dealing with the argument that the Japanese were not assimilable, Mr. Spargo said that the same argument was formerly brought against permitting the Irish, the Italians, Slavs, and Finns to enter the country. Fifteen years ago the Labor Department of Minnesota stated that the Finns could not be assimilated. It has been shown that the Anglo-Saxons and the North American

Indians mix with quite admirable results. We have no biological evidence that Japanese are non-assimilable.

Mr. Spargo also touched upon the question of immigration after the war, and inclined to the view that immigration from Europe is likely to fall off, as the "wastage of human material during the war will give a new value to healthy children and adults, with the result that the governments of Europe will take steps to restrict emigration, and that the work of reconstruction will absorb all the available labor supply for years to come. If this condition obtains, Mexico and Japan will be looked to for immigrants.

Regarding the Socialist stand on immigration, Mr. Spargo cited the resolutions in the Stuttgart Congress of the International in 1907, which declared that restriction of immigration was a useless method of dealing with the subject, and proposed that the organized workmen in the various countries protect their standard of living by urging the prohibition of the importation of immigrants under contracts to work for lower wages, etc.; by urging legislation shortening the working day, fixing the minimum wage, establishing proper housing conditions, etc. The Congress also indicated the duty of the labor unions to act against restriction and exclusion, and to welcome the alien into union membership. It urged that the unions in the country from which the worker emigrated help to enlighten the workers regarding the true conditions prevailing in the countries of immigration.

The Socialist Party of the United States in the 1910 Congress went on record against the exclusion of any immigrants on account of race and nationality, and elected a new committee on immigration to consider the subject further.

Mr. Spargo referred to the attitude of the American trade unions in recommending restriction, and urged that the Socialists should not lower their ideals for opportunistic advantage. "If in general we co-operate with the unions in their struggles, we must not co-operate with them in policies which are contrary to the Socialist principles," he declared.

"I would have the party and the economic organizations address themselves to the task of organizing the immigrant workers as fast as they arrive with a view to their complete and rapid assimilation into the general civic life of the country, and into the organized struggle of the proletariat. Finally, I would have the Socialist International, when it shall have been reorganized, address itself to the task of educating the workers in those lands from which the great streams of emigration flow, and organizing them, so that when they reach their new homes they will be ready to take their places in the organized political and economic struggle. Thus the Socialist International would become an active and important factor in the international Socialist movement, and not merely the agency for arranging international congresses. It seems to me that through the International Socialist Bureau we could circulate information, concerning labor conditions here, in those countries from which we draw our immigrants. We could send back as missionaries to their native lands comrades who have lived long enough in this country to have caught its spirit and learned enough about its problems to enable them to present to their fellow countrymen the truth about this much-fabled land."

Mr. Boudin, in arguing likewise in favor of unrestricted immigration, declared that wages had not been reduced by immigration, nor was the course of emigration primarily from thickly to sparcely settled countries.

"The immigrant is likely to adopt the standard of living of the country to which he immigrates. This adoption, however, is dependent to a large extent on the facility with which he becomes assimilated, which, in turn, depends greatly on the welcome accorded him by his adopted nation."

The Class Struggle After the War

That the present war, by forcing the evolution of capitalism in Europe and making the proletariat of Europe more militant, was bound to lead to an intensification of the class struggle, was the belief of Algernon Lee. He said in part:

"The war is accelerating the development of capitalism in at least four ways. It is taking the peasant out of the old ruts of rural economy and turning him into a user of modern machinery. It is bringing him into closer touch with the modern world. As a result he will be much less an obstacle to progress in the future than he has been in the past.

"The war is setting the women to work by the millions in office, mill and factory,

and subjecting them to the same conditions as formerly operated upon the men folk. They can never go back to the old life. The wholesale killing and crippling of men will force many of them to continue after the war as bread winners.

"The war is forcing an exceptionally rapid development of industrial technique. Along with this goes the system of speeding. Alertness, adaptability, quickness of motion are becoming more valuable than physical strength and specialized knowledge. The working class is becoming more homogeneous. The so-called aristocracy of labor will occupy a different place after than before the war.

"Furthermore, the rapid industrial changes are squeezing out the smaller firms, and leading to a marked concentration of capital.

"It is true that the class struggle during the war has been obscured by the censorship, martial law, the postponement of elections, and the voluntary action of the unions themselves, while the small amount of unemployment in Great Britain is preventing its too open manifestation. However, this is but a temporary condition.

"The workers—at least those in England—have no enthusiasm for the war and little loyalty for the government. They have a suspicion that the English upper class diplomacy since 1904 has had its part in bringing on the war. Their trade union standards have been lowered under the administration of the Munitions Act. Under the Defense of the Realm Act they have been bullied and threatened. They have seen a Conscription Act jammed through by a Coalition Ministry with the most stupid disregard for justice. Men known to be suffering from active tuberculosis have been declared physically fit and sent to the front. Others, with a 'pull,' have escaped. Dockers and longshoremen have been conscripted, while wharves have been choked with goods and farms have been swept bare of farm laborers on the eve of the harvest. Retail prices have risen thirty, forty, fifty per cent. When the soldiers return from the front, despite the need for reconstructing the industries, there is likely to be severe unemployment. The employers will be keen to keep the advantages they have wrested from the workers during the war.

"When the workers return it is argued that they will have acquired a new self-esteem, a new capacity for self-assertion. They have acquired some right to England's destinies. Having faced enemy soldiers, they will not be very much afraid of British policemen.

"On the other hand it is argued that their emotional and physical effort during the war will have exhausted their vitality. However, those who lay most stress on this exhaustion declared that it will only postpone the outbreak of proletarian revolt."

In conclusion, Mr. Lee declared that the moderate wing of the Labor Party had pretty well fallen down in the crisis, and had been bullied or cajoled to give away the workers' case. He believed that the first election after the war might possibly sweep the I. L. P. (the Socialist branch of the Labor Party) out of Parliament, but that it would come back stronger than ever, and less impeded by the weight of non-Socialist colleagues. As for the trade unions, the war will have helped them in the direction of industrial unionism.

The morning prior to Mr. Lee's address — Friday — a discussion participated in by natives of a half dozen countries was devoted to the effect of the war on the workers of Europe. Senator La Fontaine declared that as far as Belgium was concerned, he believed that after the war universal suffrage, including woman suffrage, would be granted to the workers, and that the Socialist representation would greatly increase. Following the outbreak of the war, he affirmed, the Socialists conducted a great deal of valuable propaganda in the trenches and for the first time reached the middle class.

John Spargo spoke of the confidence that had been placed in the Socialists of various countries who had been asked, since the outbreak of the war, because of their larger experience, efficiency and social vision, to take charge of large administrative works.

Miss N. Young of England vividly described the exceedingly low wages given to the women workers in the factories since war declaration and the continual smashing of trade union standards.

Dr. Kotinsky dealt with the marked development of voluntary co-operative bodies of Russia since the beginning of the war.

The question of military "preparedness" was dealt with by Professor W. P. Montague, whose paper will appear in another number, and by Mrs. Agnes D. Warbasse, the chairman of several of the meetings. Mrs. Warbasse said in part:

"Preparedness to the average person

to-day means huge naval armaments and military equipment and training, with all the mental and physical qualities which enable one nation to overpower another—in other words, the rule of might.

"I believe that the future progress of mankind is to be sought by developing through all means in our power those measures which will tend to eliminate the economic causes of war and by working for 'the day' when international justice, international co-operation, international solidarity shall prevail.

"Does it not seem as clear to you all as it does to me that the society we are interested in—that the humanity we love—has nothing to gain and everything to lose by militarism, which exalts physical strength and bravery over moral courage, the principle of force over the power of the mind, which depresses the individual and raises the state supreme, exalting obedience and discipline above initiative and originality? It subordinates the people to material consideration, developing a military caste, which is bound to impose its peculiar ideals on the people. Its standards become more and more sordid and utilitarian and the interest in pure truth, in thought, in art, in human and social betterment inevitably declines."

National Social Preparedness

While the international problems occupied the center of attention in the latter part of the week, the early portion of the Conference was devoted with enthusiasm to such national problems as public ownership, co-operation, trade unionism.

The object of these meetings was to concentrate attention on the need of social reconstruction in this country. Much of the material which furnished the basis of discussion was, however, gleaned from the experience of Europe. Especially true was this in the case of public ownership and co-operation.

Next Steps in Public Ownership

The astonishing sweep toward governmental ownership in the world was portrayed by Harry W. Laidler. Mr. Laidler declared that the present was giving a considerable impetus to collectivism. He said:

"Germany has, since the war, taken a very considerable charge of the food supply and has increased its public services to such an extent that perhaps 55% of the German people obtain their living from the government. England has taken control of the railways, monopolized the sugar trade, requisitioned the meat supply of New Zealand, greatly developed its state insurance policy, voted millions for the construction of houses, increased its hold on canals, coal supply, shipping and agriculture, and restricted the price of food. Similar advances have been made in other countries. However, it is not to be assumed that all of this collectivism will remain after war is over."

In describing the trend toward public ownership, Dr. Laidler continued:

"About $50,000,000,000 is now invested in industries conducted by various governments. The persons employed directly in public work number between 10,000,000 and 12,000,000, and the wages paid aggregate between $2,000,000,000 and $2,500,000,000. In the railroad industry, of the total railway mileage of the world, one-half is owned and worked entirely by various governments. Out of nearly 70 countries, large or small, there are 50 in which government administration prevails. The United States and the United Kingdom are the only large countries with little or no public transportation. The government of Great Britain, since the war, has at least temporarily taken charge of its railways. In 1913, 171 cities of Great Britain owned their own municipal tramways and 132 in Germany. In banking, the Post Master General, in charge of the Postal Savings Banks, in most of the great nations, is by far the most extensive banker in the community on account of the postal savings banks. Two thousand municipalities own their own gas plants throughout the world.

"Cities are going extensively into the construction of municipal houses, Paris having appropriated, before the war, $40,000,000 for housing construction. In health, land improvement, education and recreation, insurance, agriculture and forestry, mining and other industries, there has been, during the last generation, a marvelous growth in public ownership. Much of this public ownership is bureaucratically run. The future will probably see a very rapid extension in such ownership and the democratization of its management, and such collectivism and democracy will inevitably lead to Socialism."

Benjamin C. Marsh dealt chiefly with the nationalization of railroads, and contended that "fundamentalists" should see to it that the railroads were not paid exorbitant prices, when socialization occurred. He said:

"We should take over all natural monopolies and have complete government ownership of all transit and municipal ownership of all public utilities.

"We should refuse to pay a single dollar to any railroad corporation or to anyone who owns any natural monopolies for any value which that individual has not cre-

ated. Of course, it will be said that we intend to confiscate. If we do not take the railroads over at the value which the owners have given to them, if we pay them a falsely capitalized value, then we are going to confiscate throughout all time the earnings of the workers of this country, for we have to take from the working people in order to pay those who have not created values."

Mr. Marsh contended that the railroads will succeed in "putting over" their proposals unless we wake up; that the Supreme Court of the United States upholds their position, but that Secretary Lane of Agriculture and the Massachusetts Railway Commission have, on the other hand, held that the railways are not entitled to this increase in land values.

He expressed his belief as well that the threatened railroad strike had hastened the nationalization of railroads in this country by at least ten years.

Algernon Lee, who had recently returned from Europe, declared that the significance of the collectivist sweep in Europe should not be overestimated from the Socialist standpoint. All extension of governmental activity was not Socialistic—as could be seen in the case of the increase in the army and navy.

Panama Canal

The collectivism in the Panama Canal was vividly described by Frederick Swanson, for many years an engineer in the Zone. He said:

"Panama is an example of State Socialism. It is not, however, democratic Socialism. The government has provided houses, commissary stores, entertainment. The Panama railroad is considered a government-owned railroad. Stores are operated by the Panama railroad in almost every town that has any permanent residents. At present it is amusing to find the Panama Association of Commerce (merchants), protesting against the liberal use of commissary privileges by the residents while at the same time the members of the Association of Commerce themselves are purchasing two-thirds of their supplies from the government, because of their superior quality and inexpensiveness.

"Bachelor or family apartments are supposed to be furnished to all employes. Sometimes there are three or four hundred people on the waiting list. The houses are furnished free. The total wages are the salary paid plus commissary privileges. The average machinist's wage is 66c. an hour. In a good many ways work is attractive. Ford has been characterized as a paternal despot. That might be said of the Panama Canal Zone."

Mr. Swanson concluded by telling of the growth of unionism in the Canal Zone.

The Co-operative Movement

The first session of the Conference on Tuesday evening opened with a discussion of the subject of co-operation.

Dr. James P. Warbasse, president of the Co-operative League of America, told of the growth of this democratic economic movement and the philosophy underlying it. He said in part:

"Co-operation is as old as life. The modern form of the co-operative movement began in England in 1844. From the little society in Toad Lane, three quarters of a century ago, down to the present day there has been no abatement or period of reaction. The development of the movement has gone on from country to country and from continent to continent.

In Great Britain the membership of the co-operatives has doubled itself every decade for the past seventy years, until now the 1,500 consumers' societies have 3,000,000 members. This means that one-fourth of the families in the United Kingdom are embraced in this movement. Last year these societies distributed $700,000,000 worth of goods. They returned to their members $85,000,000 in surplus. They own $300,000,000 worth of property. They have $50,000,000 invested in homes, built for their members. This is the growth from the $140 capital of the pioneers in 1844. The three employes have now increased to 150,000. From that time until 1914 these societies had distributed $13,000,000,000 worth of commodities.

"The printing and book publishing business amounts to $1,000,000. The largest tea warehouse in the United Kingdom is that of the Co-operators, where 25,000,000 pounds of tea yearly are distributed from their own tea lands in Ceylon. Olive oil from their own groves in Africa is transported to England to be used in making soap in their own factories. These are the largest in the country, producing 800 tons of soap per week. The flour mills of the Co-operators at Manchester, which turn out 35 tons of flour every hour for their 15,000,000 consumers, make them the largest flour millers in the Kingdom, and the largest purchasers of Canadian wheat in the world.

"Their own ships sail the seas. They produce coal from their own mines, and every agricultural product from their own vast lands. They raise currants in Greece and raisins in Spain for their jam

and plum-puddings, made in the canning works at Crumpsall and Silvertown.

"For thirty years they have made their own watches in their watch industry at Coventry. Last year their shoe factories produced 3,000,000 pairs of shoes, which is more than half as much again as the total output of all the other shoe factories in Great Britain.

"They touch every industry. More than 1,000,000 of their members are covered by their wholesale system of life insurance. In 1915 they paid 15,000 death claims. They appropriate over $500,000 yearly to education. Large sums are given for hospitals, strike benefits, famine, fire, earthquake and every conceivable disaster.

"As large as the British movement is, there are more members of co-operative consumers' societies and more co-operative stores in Germany, France and Italy than in the whole of the United Kingdom of Great Britain. The rate of increase in the growth of the continental movement is faster, and its social activities even more diversified.

"Co-operative banking is represented by 65,000 co-operative credit unions, with a membership of 15,000,000, doing an annual business of $7,000,000,000. The British wholesale does a yearly banking business of $800,000,000.

"This is an international movement. The wholesale societies of at least seven countries now exchange products with one another. The International Co-operative Alliance represents seventeen countries.

"The Co-operative movement is teaching people to do things for themselves without asking or accepting aid from the State. It is teaching the workers how to administer the affairs of society on every scale. It is raising up from the ranks of labor men who are capable of conducting large affairs."

Dr. Warbasse then dealt with producers' co-operatives, declaring that the results thus far obtained had been pitifully small. He described the development of state collectivism, which was running parallel with co-operation, and which was becoming more democratic with the progress of society, and declared that ultimately these co-operatives and collectivist movements "were destined to meet and fuse into the Co-operative Commonwealth." To fuse these movements, he believed, was the task of ideal Socialism.

Dr. Helen L. Sumner also reviewed the development of the co-operative movement in Great Britain, and then touched upon the development of agricultural and other forms of co-operation. She predicted a very considerable advance in co-operation after the war. She said in part:

"The form of co-operation which has probably had the most rapid and extensive growth within the past few years is agricultural co-operation. In Switzerland farmers have co-operated in practically every activity of rural life. Little Denmark is covered with a fine network of co-operative societies, binding together for common advantage the agricultural and dairy interests of the country. Germany is not far behind. Ireland has become famous as a center of agricultural co-operation, and within the past fifteen years agricultural co-operative societies have sprung up like mushrooms in England under the stimulus of the Agricultural Organization Society. Before the war agricultural co-operative societies were revitalizing agricultural and rural life in France, and the movement had even extended to Siberia and India.

"The four chief branches of agricultural co-operation are for purchase, for sale, for insurance, and for credit. And the advantages of co-operation among farmers in these four directions, not only to the individual farmers, but to the countries which have encouraged this development, are beyond question. Co-operation, indeed, is enabling the small farmer in Europe to approach in his methods of doing business toward the modern methods which have revolutionized industry.

"Co-operative credit has had its greatest growth in Germany, but in many other countries banking and insurance are carried on by co-operative societies.

"In housing, too, co-operation has found a fruitful field of endeavor. The big Hamburg society 'Production' which grew out of the great dock strike of 1896 to 1897 and which when the war broke out had some 50,000 members, has built several large and handsome apartment houses, each supplied with a playground and gymnastic apparatus and each adorned with little porches from which trail the bright-colored flowers characteristic of the most attractive sections of all German cities. And in England the most important housing development of recent years, and one which has attracted much attention in this country—the Garden City—owes its existence to a co-operative movement.

"The war has, of course, placed a heavy strain upon co-operative societies as upon every other form of peaceful enterprise. In Belgium, of course, the co-operative movement has suffered severely, as also in Northern France where, in the districts which have been overrun by the Germans, one-fourth of the French co-operatives are located. But except for the devastation wrought directly by battling armies, the co-operative movement has stood up well under the shock of war. In Great Britain, indeed, in the early days of food panic, the

action of the co-operative societies, wholesale and retail, in refusing to raise prices steadied the trade of the whole nation. Though information is very meager as to conditions in Germany we hear that the co-operative societies, by keeping down prices, have so won the consideration of the public authorities that workers in certain branches of the public service, who have always before been forbidden membership in such societies, are now permitted to join. In both Germany and England, too, we hear of increased sales and unusually rapid growth in membership. All the evidence, indeed, seems to point to the superior stability of co-operative over private enterprise in time of economic and social disaster. And the general opinion among those in touch with the movement is that co-operation will emerge stronger than ever from the war, and that, in the efforts at self-protection put forward by the working people when the war is over and the bills begin to come in, it is certain to grow by leaps and bounds."

Senator La Fontaine explained the success of co-operation in Belgium, declaring that co-operation had been an aid there to art and music as well as in material commodities. The movement, he maintained, had developed men and women capable of conducting great economic and industrial business. An insidious form of co-operation, he believed, was that undertaken by sellers of different commodities for the purpose of extorting high prices from the consumer. This form of co-operation which has already developed considerably in the United States might put great obstacles in the way of genuine co-operative endeavor.

On the following morning, Wednesday, which was given over to the continuation of the evening's discussion, John Spargo declared that a far greater amount of co-operation existed in this country than we had any idea of. He cited co-operative stores of the Slavs in Scranton and Yonkers; of the Italians in Barre, Vt.; the co-operative fire insurance and workmen's sick and death benefit companies; the production of Socialist newspapers, etc., and dealt especially with the work of the Finns. In Fitchburg, Mass., he declared, there are three Finnish co-operative stores which control practically 100 per cent. of the Finnish trade.

"They buy their coal wholesale, dry goods, groceries and shoes, have their own printing plant, print their own daily newspaper and several other newspapers by contract in Finnish and English. They arrange with authors and publish their books and throughout the country are raising funds to build in nearly every community co-operative Finnish headquarters, a social hall, approaching the folk houses of their native land. They have established a national college, which is really a college of very high standard, in Smithfield, Minn. That great movement of the people's university is financed out of the co-operative movement."

Mr. Spargo believed that the co-operative movement would first develop in this country along somewhat nationalistic lines—the Finns building up stores which particularly catered to their peculiar needs; the Germans, Italians and other nationalities aiding in co-operative enterprise controlled entirely by them—and that gradually there would be a federation of these nationalistic enterprises.

Scott H. Perky, who has just returned from a visit among the co-operatives of the Illinois miners, declared that he found many in which were represented various nationalities, and that he believed that economic advantage could be depended on to bring together men and women of various nationalities in one co-operative group. Arthur H. Holder also dealt with his experience with co-operative stores in this country.

Discussion of Trade Unionism

At the sessions devoted to Trade Unionism Wednesday evening and Thursday morning, Mr. Arthur E. Holder, legislative agent of the American Federation of Labor, was the principal speaker. Mr. Holder told of the heroic struggles of organized labor to gain a foothold in this country, traced the development of industry, which necessitated the development of a strong labor movement, mentioned the activities of the A. F. of L. in behalf of social and economic legislation, of education, child labor legislation, public grounds and parks, the securing of the secret ballot, direct legislation, postal savings banks, free speech, etc., and declared that the prime purpose of the union was to see how best to distribute equitably the

wealth of the workers socially produced. He continued:

Through the militant efforts of the trade unions twenty-four (24) states enacted laws requiring guards on dangerous machinery, and twenty-seven (27) states require ample ventilation and sanitation in factories.

Thirty-one (31) states have nine inspection laws with authorized inspectors.

Fourteen (14) states have enacted laws regulating the hours of adult male labor to be worked in and around mines.

Twenty-six (26) states have enacted special laws regulating the work of women and children in and around mines.

Eighteen (18) states have enacted special child labor mining laws.

Twenty-seven (27) states enforce sanitary and sufficient toilet rooms for the sexes in industry.

Thirty-nine (39) states provide factory inspectors to enforce observance of health and safety laws.

Thirty-four (34) states require fire escapes on factories and public buildings.

Forty-six (46) states have adopted an age limit for working children. Thirty-six (36) prohibit night work by children and forty-four (44) have fixed a maximum number of hours as a working-week for children.

Thirteen (13) states have boiler inspection laws and seventeen (17) officially inspect bakery shops.

Forty-six (46) states have enacted mechanics' lien laws to protect the wages of all the workers.

Thirty-seven (37) states have established bureaus of labor, which serve as the clearing houses for industrial information, and are the centralized influence for advancing better state factory laws.

Twenty-six (26) states have automatic coupler and automatic brake laws which have been the means of saving thousands of lives on railroads.

Following the example of the Federal Government thirty-eight (38) states have enacted eight-hour laws for public employes and on public works, which enable 1,500,000 federal and state employes to enjoy a normal workday in harmony with 2,000,000 industrial toilers who obtained it by the economic power of the trade union.

Thirty-two (32) states and the Federal Congress have enacted automatic workmen's compensation laws for the benefit of working people injured in industry. All these compensation laws have been written since 1908 through the efforts of the organized trade unionists.

Thirty-seven (37) states and the United States have passed employers' liability laws.

Mr. Holder ended by giving a list of the concrete labor measures which the unions have forced through by their agitation in Congress from 1906 to the present day.

Following the presentation of Mr. Holder, there was vigorous discussion regarding some of the policies of the A. F. of L. Mr. Spargo held that this organization, while performing an immensely valuable work, had neglected to a considerable extent the organization of the unskilled, and that many of its component parts had raised its initiation fees to such a height that it was impossible for many workers to join.

Mr. Louis B. Boudin, in commenting upon the so-called victory of the eight-hour law, said that the Adamson Law was not an eight-hour law at all, but primarily a bill which increased the wages of the railway workers. Rose Pastor Stokes declared that the trade unions had failed to co-operate as much as was desirable; that the A. F. of L. had not encouraged industrial unionism, which was necessary for the highest form of concerted action, and spoke of the valuable work of the Industrial Workers of the World in arousing a militant spirit among the neglected unskilled workers.

In reply to Mrs. Stokes' defense of the I. W. W., Mr. Spargo declared that he felt that this organization, forming a separate group, had retarded rather than strengthened industrial unionism in the labor movement in the United States. Mr. Holder hotly retorted to the reflections made on the A. F. of L., declaring that it had spent tens of thousands of dollars in endeavoring to organize the unskilled, but that the unskilled had, in many cases, refused to join with their fellows; that it was developing industrial unionism as rapidly as was practicable, but that it saw immense difficulties in the way of industrial organization and that the leaders of the A. F. of L., however advanced they were on the subject, were not able to superimpose their views on the membership at large. Concerning the I. W. W. he declared that its chief value was as a bug-a-boo to the employing class. Employers often conceded demands to the A. F. of L. if they felt that a refusal would lead to the coming in of the I. W. W.

In conclusion he called the attention

of the audience to the fact that the vast number of workers in the constituent organizations of the A. F. of L. had had very few opportunities for education and that they were prone to mistakes but that in spite of that they were performing a splendid service for humanity.

The discussion of the latter part of Thursday morning centered around the relative value of industrial vs. political organization, Dr. James P. Warbasse taking the view that very few labor measures could be expected unless there was pressure of strong economic organizations back of them.

Mr. Stokes cited child labor legislation as an exception to this statement and Mr. Spargo and others emphasized the importance of political as well as industrial activity in forcing radical enactments.

Ethical Phases

The last two sessions of the conference—Sunday afternoon and evening—were devoted respectively to an exposition of Socialism by John Spargo and to a discussion of "The Socialist Appeal to the Christian Mind" by Rev. Richard W. Hogue and Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch. Mr. Spargo gave his usually lucid and eloquent explanation of the fundamentals of Socialism. A summary of Prof. Rauschenbusch's exceedingly suggestive and scholarly appeal will appear in a later issue.

Rev. Richard W. Hogue, who resigned his pastorate in a prominent Episcopal Church in Baltimore on account of pressure brought by conservative members, said in part:

"The modern pulpit is not to interpret past ages and condemn the sins of the dead. Jesus, the divine Teacher, did not do that for His day and we are true neither to His example nor to His authority, if we do so.

"The Socialist appeal bids us recognize that it is absurd and futile to preach the individualistic application of the Golden Rule and send men back to practice it under a system which makes it impossible to do so without at the same time seeking to bring the teachings of Christ in touch with that system.

"The church is false and inconsistent, which is concerned over the sufferings of one little child, while at the same time it is deaf to the cries of the multitudes of children bowed down in ignorance, adversity, poverty and toil. If it be well that we offend not one of these little ones, then it were far better not to permit the civilization in which we live, as far as we can influence it, to offend great masses of them; that church is blind which does not see what every sociological student knows, that there is a tremendous and fundamental struggle going on between classes of men. Without the message of brotherhood infused into the heart of the struggle, the forces of unrest may gain the day but lose the way; justice may win her righteous cause, but it will be a victory born of a hatred and bred by a violence whose bitter fruits will be the heritage of our children's children.

"The Church does not hesitate to enter the province of the secular in order to secure her own property rights. The Church is constantly dealing with economic problems which affect the support of her ministry and the maintenance of her institutions. If she does these things for herself and her own interests and is unwilling to do as much for human welfare she stands openly convicted of utter selfishness. How much more earnestly and valiantly must she contend when human life is unjustly overtaxed: when even little children in multitudes are robbed of their birthright of health and happiness and liberty!

"If we were to follow the path our Master made our hearts will surge with a mighty sorrow over the sight of the Jerusalem of to-day that does not know its King; that serves lesser gods for greater profits; that replaces the sign of the cross with the dollar mark; that gives more to recreation than to religion, more to self-indulgence than to human service, more to current fashions than to the eternal Christ!"

An Effective Membership Campaign at Vassar

GERTRUDE H. FOLKS,
President Vassar Chapter I.S.S., 1915-16.

Established in the Spring of 1915, the Vassar Chapter of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society made its first real campaign for membership in the Fall of 1916. In an effort to bring the contemplated work of the club before the whole college, leaflets were sent to every student, member of the faculty and officer of the college, emphasizing the non-partisan character of the organization, outlining the study course for the year and enclosing a membership blank to be filled out and returned with the dues for the year to the treasurer of the club. The clerical work was done by students who volunteered their services, the only expense to the club being the printing of the leaflets and blanks.

In addition to this, the Chapter also followed the usual custom of Vassar clubs in securing membership—canvassing being prohibited, all the clubs of the college unite in arranging a "pay-day," at which time representatives of each club are stationed in the dormitories to receive membership dues from the residents of that hall. "Pay-day" was held about a month after the distribution of the membership blanks and about twenty new members joined at that time. In all, the club had 98 members—approximately the same number that had joined when the club was first started in the Spring. Though at first sight this does not seem to denote an increase in membership, it was a hopeful sign. For in the Fall not only are the numbers reduced by the graduation of the seniors, the class among which the greatest interest is shown, but also the Freshman enrollment is necessarily small, "Socialism" to a large number carrying no meaning whatever except popular prejudice; while in the Spring, after a year of college work, with the new interests and thought stimulus which it brings to many, there is a greater response from the Freshman Class. To have as great a number in the Fall as in the Spring, in spite of the loss of the Seniors, showed, therefore, an increase in interest among the upper classes.

Another desirable feature in a membership campaign, which Vassar was unable to carry out this year, is to have separate blanks for former members. Instead of sending them the regular cards stating that they desire to join the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, assume that they are still members and send merely a statement of the annual dues. Failure to respond would of course mean lapse of membership, but psychologically it seems to be easier to renew membership in an organization than to join anew every year.

The policy of having all the activities of the club open to the entire college tends to bring in new members from time to time during the year, as interest in the work of the club develops.

Book Reviews

THE SOCIALISM OF TODAY. A Sourcebook of the Present Position and Recent Development of the Socialist and Labor Parties in All Countries, Consisting Mainly of Original Documents. Edited by William English Walling, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Jessie Wallace Hughan, Harry W. Laidler and other members of a Committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. N. Y.: Holt. $1.60.

The compilation of an extensive collection of documentary source-material illustrative of the international Socialist movement at the present critical stage of its development has been widely recognized as a pressing need. The volume edited by a committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and published by Henry Holt and Company is an admirable contribution to that end. A surprisingly varied and almost uniformly useful collection of documents, dealing with numerous phases of Socialist thought and action, is presented to the

student in a perfectly impartial manner and practically without comment.

The first section of the book presents in the form of resolutions and other official declarations a brief history of the Second International, as it is called; that is, of the international Socialist movement since the first of the post-Marxian series of international congresses, that of 1889, which was held at Paris. The citations are principally from the authoritative volume by Jean Longuet, grandson of Karl Marx. As a summary it is of the utmost value to the student.

The second section of the work, consisting of ten chapters, is given up to documents which illustrate the history and development of the national Socialist movements in the leading countries. Statistics of membership and political strength, the platforms and principal declarations of principles and policies, summaries of the most important controversies and problems which have arisen in recent years, together provide admirably comprehensive pictures of the movement in many lands. As one reviews the material gathered together in this section the principal feeling is one of profound astonishment at the tremendous complexity of the movement.

The third and fourth sections deal in a similar manner with Socialism in the Americas and in the British Empire, respectively. A brief section is given to Socialism in China, but there is no account of the much more important Japanese movement. The material about Chinese Socialism as yet available is rather meagre, and it is not strange that this section should be inferior to other sections in interest and importance.

The second half of the book, which is even more interesting and valuable than the first, deals with the attitude of the numerous Socialist parties and parliamentary groups toward various social problems. Here the student will find a vast array of information concerning the Socialist policy toward Trade Unionism, Direct Action, Unemployment, Militarism, Immigration, Equal Suffrage, Sabotage, Government Ownership, Protective Tariffs, Compulsory Arbitration of Labor Disputes, Co-operation and many other matters of vital importance. Of course, it cannot be said that the book absolutely covers each of these subjects in its relation to Socialism; that would require many volumes. It can be said with confidence that upon each of the topics treated the material is fairly comprehensive, generally well and impartially selected and calculated to illumine the subject.

The source-book is a credit to its editors and to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. More than that, it is an indispensable volume for the well-equipped library.

JOHN SPARGO.

The American Labor Year Book, 1916, by Department of Labor Research, Rand School of Social Science. N. Y.: Rand School, 50 cents.

Of marked interest to the student of the labor and Socialist movements is the appearance of this first American Labor Year Book.

As a ready reference book for those who wish to gain a knowledge of the important facts of the labor world, this publication is practically indispensable. It is divided into six parts. Part I deals with the labor movement in the United States, its development, its present status and its problems; Part II, with labor and the law; Part III, with the Socialist movement in the United States. Among the real contributions found in this section are the reports of actual accomplishments of Socialist legislators and administrators in this country. There is scarcely any branch of the movement which fails to receive careful consideration. In Part IV an attempt has been made to obtain the very latest news from all Socialist movements abroad. The war has naturally interfered somewhat with this attempt, but a very considerable amount of recent information has been obtained. Part V is confined to the study of social and economic conditions in this country and Part VI, to the relation of government and politics.

Mr. Trachtenberg, the editor, has succeeded in bringing together experts from many lines. In the discussion on social and economic conditions, for instance, Dr. Helen L. Sumner gives a remarkably comprehensive survey of woman and child labor

in this country and an analysis of infant mortality. Professor Scott Nearing deals with wages and the standard of living. Dr. I. M. Rubinow takes up the question of social insurance, and John P. Frey, Cheves West Perky, Benjamin C. Gruenberg, Edward F. Brown, William English Walling, Randolph Bourne, John Collier and others have contributed articles along the lines of their specialties. In the section on politics and government, the names of Frederic C. Howe, William Leavitt Stoddard, Carl D. Thompson, Max S. Schoenberg, Clarence G. Hoag and William M. Leiserson appear in the list of writers. Part III on the American Socialist movement is edited by Jessie W. Hughan; the International movement, by Ludwig Lore and Algernon Lee, while Florence Kelley, Frank Macdonald, S. John Block, George M. Price, Harry W. Laidler, Chester M. Wright, Benjamin Glassberg and many others deal with the labor movement.

There are naturally a number of omissions. There is no article, for instance, portraying the extent of unemployment in the United States, nor of wealth concentration. A complete Socialist platform is not to be seen in the book. Many of these lacks, however, may be explained by the necessity to eliminate 200 pages of material at the last moment on account of the cost. However, all in all, the editor and contributors are to be heartily congratulated on this scholarly piece of work which should do much to enlighten organized labor, Socialists and social reformers generally concerning the important movements and problems of American life. It is to be hoped that the expectations of the editor and publishers of making this an annual in reality may be realized.

The publication of this book is particularly gratifying to the I. S. S., since it was made possible only through the initiative and untiring efforts of the former president of the Yale Chapter of the I. S. S.—Alex. L. Trachtenberg, the editor.

HARRY W. LAIDLER.

THE NEXT STEP IN DEMOCRACY. By R. W. Sellars. N. Y.: Macmillan. $1.50.

In this book Professor Sellars, a philosopher, considers Socialism from the standpoint of justice. He sees the new order arising not from inevitable economic developments and bitter class struggles, but from the increasing force which ethical standards command.

Economists have lately realized that wealth and welfare are not synonymous terms. An article may have a high money value, yet be socially harmful—witness patent-medicine plants and whiskey distilleries. An increase in economic "wealth" moreover may be at the same time a decrease in human welfare. Fifty per cent. of the cotton crop may net a greater money price than would the whole, but in this event half the people must go underclad. Did the 117 per cent. increase in land values from 1900 to 1910 mean a corresponding increase in national well-being? Is the production of goods justified if in so doing the population is enfeebled? Men like Ruskin and Sismondi long beat in vain at the doors of classical political economy with these and similar questions.

Professor Sellars agrees with that group of thinkers like Davenport, Small, Hobson and, above all, Veblen, who hold that under the profit system wealth can be predatory as well as productive, and that it is distributed neither in accordance with the principle of productivity nor with that of need. Socialism is then, in his eyes, a movement in the direction of greater justice and consequently ethically desirable.

The teachings of Darwin and Spencer that evolution is a slow and long-drawn-out process has convinced Professor Sellars that progress must necessarily be so. Such a belief is inevitably dangerous. To regard progress as automatic and inevitably slow is to cause only lethargic and half-hearted attempts at reform. There are mutations in the field of human society as well as in other forms of organic life. Conscious evolution can indeed move as fast as the human mind can progress.

There is a fine spirit of humanitarianism in the closing passages when Professor Sellars bids us "reach out helping

hands to those who are struggling upward so wearily and against such odds." Ardent preachers of the class struggle should ponder over such statements. They might realize that aid may come from the upper class itself and that the road to social justice does not lie through class hate.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

College Notes

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL Chapter reports that, as last year, every member of the school is a member of the I. S. S. Chapter. W. B. Spafford is this year's chairman and Henry H. Daniels, the secretary.

The first meeting of the YALE Chapter for the coming year took place on Monday evening, October 22nd. The subject, "What Party Should a Collegian Support in This Campaign?" was treated by Harry W. Laidler. A representative group of officers were elected in the Spring as follows: Robt. W. Dunn, president; Benjamin V. Brewster, vice-president; Frank E. Gilson, Jr., treasurer; Eugene A. Krauss, secretary;. A. S. Johnson, J. M Voreys, R. B. Menapace, E. W. Bourne, R. P. Coffmann and Karl W. Llewellyn members of the Executive Committee.

Rose Pastor Stokes addressed a large gathering on the subject of Socialism on July 13th at the summer session at DARTMOUTH.

David Brunswick, 1918, is this year's president of the HARVARD Socialist Club. Boris Stern is secretary. The club is planning a series of public meetings as well as more intensive gatherings.

Harry W. Laidler spoke on Socialism at the MASSACHUSETTS AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE during the summer at the regular weekly assembly.

The officers of the AMHERST Chapter for the coming year are: Morris A. Copeland, president, and George Benneyan, secretary.

Elizabeth Brandeis has been elected president of the RADCLIFFE Socialist Study Club for 1916-17.

Arthur W. Calhoun and H. Sturgis are the president and vice-president of the CLARK UNIVERSITY group.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES

A strong Chapter was organized in ADELPHI COLLEGE this last Spring with Theresa Wolfson and Rosalind Kohn as chairman and secretary respectively. Dr. Jessie W. Hughan spoke on October 23rd on "What is Socialism?" and Dr. Harry W. Laidler is scheduled to address the group November 6th on "The Practicability of Socialism."

Next year's officers in the flourishing VASSAR Chapter are: Madeline Hunt, president, and Mary Hayden, secretary. The Chapter is planning some definite social activity as a group in the vicinity of Poughkeepsie.

Mr. Fitzgerald, organizer of the street railway employees' association of New York, addressed several hundred members and friends of the COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY Chapter early in October, giving the men's side of the street car strike. Morris Hillquit, Walter Lippmann and others are scheduled for later meetings in the year. The officers for the coming year are Albert B. Seadler, president; Phyllis Perlman, vice-president; Morris R. Werner, secretary; Milton Weinhandler, treasurer.

Rose Pastor Stokes addressed a large gathering at the CORNELL SUMMER SCHOOL on "What Socialists Want and Why They Want It." Gustave Gerber promises a strong Chapter in Cornell this year.

At the first meeting of the C. C. N. Y. Chapter, M. Appelbaum spoke on the Humanitarian Cult. Morris Hillquit and several other speakers have promised to address the group during the year. A debate is being planned on "Single Tax vs. Socialism." J. Liebstein is the secretary.

This year's officers of the BARNARD Chapter are Evelyn Salzman, 1917, president; Frances Fineman, 1919, secretary-treasurer; Ruth Budinoff, 1918, member of the Executive Committee. At the meeting of October 20th, Harry W. Laidler told of the activities of the I. S. S. Miss Salzman, the president, during the summer prepared a splendid report for the Society on "Health Activities in the United States" which will be published later.

The following have been selected officers of the NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF COMMERCE Chapter for the year 1916-17: Miss E. Berkowitz, president; Miss D. Powers, secretary.

An I. S. S. study Chapter is in the course of formation at GOUCHER COLLEGE, Baltimore. Ida Glatt, 1917, is the moving spirit.

On account of the lack of space due to the length of the Convention report, the printing of the interesting articles submitted by the faculty and students of the UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA for a U. of Penn. Supplement will have to be delayed until the next issue. E. Ralph Cheyney, president of the University of Pennsylvania Chapter, will complete his course in the University of Wisconsin. I. Caplan is secretary and N. I. Hourwich treasurer.

The officers of the CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY Chapter for the ensuing year are: Adolph H. Schutz, president; Harry Alpern, vice-president; Carl C. M. Greimer, secretary and treasurer.

Several of the officers of the Chapter for this year at the UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURG have left for other institutions—President Bolotin for Columbia and Isabel Porter for another Pennsylvania college. The new officers are: G. F. Piazza, president; I. A. Mazer, vice-president; W. Malyn, treasurer; J. J. Paglin, secretary.

Edward Frazier is the secretary at HOWARD this season.

MIDDLE WEST

Scott Nearing addressed the students of OBERLIN under the auspices of the Oberlin Chapter of the I. S. S. on October 13th. Devere Allen, the chairman, reports unusually good prospects.

A special I. S. S. edition of the students' weekly, "The Racquet," was issued at LA CROSSE NORMAL COLLEGE, La Crosse, Wisconsin, in May of this year. The issue contained a group picture of the members of I. S. S. Chapter, articles concerning the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and the La Crosse Chapter, excerpts from the writings of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Frances E. Willard, Helen Keller, Prof. E. R. A. Seligman and others, and special articles by Professors Sherwood, Sanford, Nurse, Messrs. Moore, Wells, Miss Minnie and others. The number was a particularly attractive one. The idea should be copied in other schools. The officers elected for the ensuing year are Adolph Eberding, president; Paul Schmidt, first vice-president; Earl F. Tainter, secretary-treasurer. George A. Connor, one of the most active of the Chapter members last year, will unfortunately not return to the college this season. In reporting the activities of the past season, Secretary Tainter emphasizes the social feature: "We have given several parties and gone on picnics and 'hikes' and find in so doing we have aroused considerable interest not only among our members but also among other students as well," he declared.

The Chapter at the UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN is likely to have its best year this season, according to David Weiss, the secretary.

The final meetings of the year at OHIO STATE were addressed by Robert Minor and William Francis Barnard. Ammon A. Hennacy, the secretary, has been instrumental in starting a students' book exchange.

VALPARAISO Chapter, as usual, has promptly sent in dues for many new members. Secretary Swartfager declares that the year looks particularly promising.

The last speaker of the UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN Chapter for the year was Prof. Hobbs, who spoke on "Preparedness." Shelby Ogden reports the beginning of the year's work there.

I. Lubin, formerly of Clark College, is now at the UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI. He is planning to organize a group for the study of Socialism in that institution.

The UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS Chapter which has a score of undergraduate and a similar number of faculty members, has already held a number of interesting meetings. The Chapter is planning a supplement to *The Intercollegiate Socialist* in the near future. An editorial in a recent issue of the student paper urged the students to support the club. The officers are: Miss A. Gregory, president; Harry Amsterdam, vice-president; Karl Epstein, secretary-treasurer.

BELOIT Chapter, the William Morris Club, reports a good beginning. Gerald E. Cunninghaus, William F. Huffmann, and Claude Habberstad are the principal officers.

PACIFIC COAST

The plan for interesting the students of REED COLLEGE in the work of the I. S. S., suggested by Miss Clara Eliot, is of marked interest. Miss Eliot writes as follows: "My plan is to call attention to our organization and its purpose by circulating a questionnaire on the subject of Socialism. I ought to get answers from most of our student body. By securing the class, major subject, and sex of each person answering, some interesting correlations could be made. My object would be so to frame the questions as to compel a realization of how indefinite and heterogeneous are the conceptions of Socialism which most of us hold. Secondly I should want to bring out the pressing need for definite and consistent opinions on the subject; in other words, to lift the problem out of the merely academic plane and relate it more closely to life, to voting, party connection or other expression of social creed. I find it hard to frame questions which will bring home this point. It ought to be possible to start by a question a train of thought which would lead to this realization, instead of trying to impose it from without by lectures and essays. The questionnaire would at least gain considerable attention for the problem, and serve to introduce the Intercollegiate Socialist Society to interested students."

At the Reed College Chapter meetings for the Spring, Prof. Coleman dealt with the ideals and achievements of the Fabian Society and James P. Thompson, with Industrial Unionism. Clara Eliot is secretary and A. B. Clark president this year.

SOUTH

C. E. Wolf is planning the organization of an I. S. S. Chapter at the VIRGINIA EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

At the UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA the officers elected last Spring are: Jack McNaughton, president, and Hicklin Yates, secretary.

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

"What Party Should a Radical Support in This Campaign?" was the subject under discussion at the October 13th meeting of the NEW YORK Alumni Chapter. The question resolved itself into a discussion of the relative practicability of a radical lending his support to Mr. Wilson or the Socialist movement. Benjamin C. Marsh and Winter Russell espoused the Wilson cause and Dr. Jessie W. Hughan, Felix Grendon and Evans Clark the Socialist part. Further meetings of the year will be: November 2nd—"Does Universal Military Training Educate?"; the middle of November—"The Class Struggle in Europe After the War"; December 7—"What Should Be the Foreign Policy of the United States?";

January 8—"What Kind of League of Peace Should a Radical Support?" The officers of the New York Chapter for the year are: President, Herman Kobbé, Columbia; first vice-president, Juliet S. Poyntz, Barnard; second vice-president, Alexander Trachtenberg, Yale; secretary, Randolph Bourne, Columbia; treasurer, Alice K. Boehme; delegate to the Executive Committee, Scott H. Perky, Cornell; advisory members, Dr. T. Boehme, Cheves Perky, Harry W. Laidler.

An Alumni Chapter is in the course of formation in BALTIMORE.

The president of the SCHENECTADY Economics Club, Alumni Chapter of the I. S. S., this year is Campbell Macmillan; secretary, Dr. Bradley H. Kirschberg.

Upton Sinclair and George E. O'Dell were among the speakers before the LOS ANGELES Alumni Chapter in the Spring. Carolyn L. Patch, last year's secretary, is now in New York.

George E. O'Dell gave an excellent talk before the CENTRAL CALIFORNIA Alumni Chapter in May. Miss Charlotte Kett is the recently elected secretary. The year promises marked activity.

Miss Harriet L. Jones, the efficient secretary of the WILKES-BARRE Alumni Chapter has, unfortunately for the Chapter, left the city to take charge of Oldfields School. Harry W. Laidler will speak in Wilkes-Barre on November 12th.

M. Louise Hunt, secretary of the PORTLAND, Oregon, Chapter, and Mr. and Mrs. F. V. Anderson are spending the year in New York. The officers of the PORTLAND ALUMNI for the year are: Professor A. E. Wood, chairman; Vera M. Divon, secretary. The Chapter is planning to co-operate with the General Society in investigating the extent of social legislation on the Pacific Coast.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of The Intercollegiate Socialist, published bi-monthly, excepting June, July, August, September, at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1916.

State of New York,
County of New York.

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

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

2. That the owners are: Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Membership approximately 2,000. The principal officers are: President, J. G. Phelps Stokes, 88 Grove St., N. Y. C.; 1st Vice-President, Florence Kelley, 289 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.; 2nd Vice-President, Ernest Poole, 130 E. 67th St., N. Y. C.; Treasurer, Mary R. Sanford, 90 Grove St., N. Y. C.

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

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

Alice Kuebler Boehme.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 23rd day of March, 1916.

John Martin, Notary Public,
Bronx County, No. 7.

Certificate filed in New York County, No. 125; New York County Register's No. 7185. (My commission expires March 30, 1917.)

The I. S. S. Book Store

Purchase your books from the

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

(Add 10 Cents for Postage to Price Mentioned)

A POPULAR TWENTY-FIVE CENT LIBRARY

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

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

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

STANDARD 50c. LIBRARY

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

The American Labor Year Book, 1916. By the Department of Labor Research of the Rand School of Social Science. Gives innumerable statistics regarding the Socialist and labor movements here and abroad and expert analysis of social conditions.

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

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

Socialism. By John Spargo. This book gives a clear exposition of the theoretical phases of Socialism, an analysis of the present system of industry and a rough outline of the Co-operative Commonwealth. It is used frequently as a textbook.

Christianity and the Social Crisis. By Walter Rauschenbusch. A powerful presentation of the anti-social and anti-ethical present-day society and a vigorous call of Christians to social justice.

Social Forces in American History. By A. M. Simons. Just what the title of the book suggests—a skilful portrayal of the operation of the big economic and social forces in the making of real history.

Socialism As It Is. By William English Walling. A critical analysis of the position of the Socialist movement throughout the world on the land question, labor, social reform, compulsory arbitration and other problems. At attempt to understand the movement by its acts.

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

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

TEN-CENT CLASSICS

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

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

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

A CHOICE GROUP OF SOCIALIST BOOKS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Syndicalism in France. By Dr. Louis Levine. 1.50 (paper), $2.00 (cloth). Generally considered the most scholarly and impartial presentation of the subject in English.

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

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

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

The Collectivist State in the Making. By Emil Davies. $2.00. The most comprehensive attempt thus far made to show the tendencies toward governmental activity in industry in the various countries of the world. A startling disclosure of the drift away from individualism toward collectivism.

Boycotts and the Labor Struggle. $2.00. By Dr. Harry W. Laidler. An analysis not only of the economic and legal aspects of boycotts, but also of the entire labor struggle in America, with its blacklists, "spy" systems, etc. The law of conspiracy in state and nation is elaborately set forth.

The Cry for Justice. An anthology of Social Protest. Edited by Upton Sinclair. $2.00. A remarkable collection of burning messages in prose and poetry that have kindled the fires of social protest throughout the ages.

History of Socialism. By Thomas Kirkup. Revised by Edward Pease. $2.00. The standard history of this movement from the days of Utopian Socialism to the outbreak of the European War.

Socialism: A Critical Analysis. By Prof. O. D. Skelton. $1.00. Probably the most scholarly attempt to refute Socialism thus far made.