The Intercollegiate Socialist

What Should be the Terms "When Peace Breaks Out?"

A Symposium by

Randolph S. Bourne
Howard Brubaker
Ellis O. Jones
Upton Sinclair
John Spargo
Rose Pastor Stokes
William English Walling
James P. Warbasse
Charles Zueblin and Others

Peace and Internationalism

By Walter E. Weyl

Other Articles and Reviews

By Caro Lloyd, H. A. Overstreet, Jessie W. Hughan, Ordway Tead, Louise Adams Grout, Bertram Benedict, Gilbert P. Marsden, J. Liebstein and Harry W. Laidler.

October-November, 1917 Fifteen Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

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

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

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

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City

15c. a copy — Subscription, 50c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi	E. Tenn. Normal	Missouri	Rutgers
Albion	Grinnell	Nevada	Simpson
Amherst	Hamline	New York	South Carolina
Barnard	Harvard	North Carolina	Springfield, Y. M. C. A. Coll.
Beloit	Howard	Oberlin	Syracuse University
Berkeley Divinity	Illinois	Ohio State	Temple
Brooklyn Law	Indiana	Ohio Wesleyan	Union Theological
Carnegie Inst. Technology	Iowa St. College	Pennsylvania	Valparaiso
Chicago	John Marshall Law	Pennsylvania State	Vassar
Cincinnati	Kansas St. Agr.	Pittsburgh	Virginia
City College (N. Y.)	LaCrosse (Wis.) Normal	Princeton	Washington
Clark	Los Angeles Osteopathic	Purdue	Washington-Jefferson
Columbia	Mass. Inst. Technology	Radcliffe	Wisconsin
Cornell	Michigan	Reed	Yale
Dartmouth	Middle Tenn. Normal	Richmond	

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

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

VOL. VI OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1917 No. 1

The "Researcher"

Several years ago the I. S. S. established an informal Research Bureau. Through the generosity of one of the Society's members, the Bureau was enabled to publish each year two or more supplements to THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST. The admirable studies, "Municipal Ownership in the United States," by Evans Clark; "Co-operation in the United States," by Cheves West Perky; "Who Gets America's Wealth?" and "New Income and Inheritance Taxes for the United States," by Wm. English Walling, have already been published in this series and others are in course of preparation. At the suggestion of this Bureau, furthermore, the valuable compilations, "The Socialists and the War," edited by Walling, "The Socialism of To-day," by Walling, Hughan, Stokes, Laidler, and "State Socialism—Pro and Con," by Walling and Laidler, have been prepared and published. The Bureau has also stimulated, indirectly, a number of other investigations.

During this period, however, it has been without a director, and has therefore been unable to fulfill its possibilities. This summer a generous donor, interested in scholarly research of a fundamental economic nature, has made it possible to secure the services of such a director. The Society has been fortunate in obtaining for that position Mr. Ordway Tead. Mr. Tead is a graduate of Amherst, 1912, and while an undergraduate was editor-in-chief of the Amherst Monthly, and active in I. S. S. work. Since graduation he has served as head of the Men's Residence, South End House, Boston; as Secretary of the Massachusetts Committee on Unemployment, and as a member of the firm of Valentine, Tead and Gregg, engaged in the unique venture of industrial counseling. He has also contributed to various economic and popular periodicals. For the last few years he has made a special study of labor representation in industry. His intimate knowledge of some of the most perplexing of industrial problems, his wide social vision, his scholarship and his genuine enthusiasm guarantee work of a high character. Under his direction, the Bureau should become a force of no small constructive value in the economic life of the nation.

The Bureau hopes in every way to cooperate with existing agencies and will avoid all possible duplication. This is especially true in its relations with the Labor Research Bureau of the Rand School of Social Science, which is doing such admirable work under the efficient leadership of Alexander Trachtenberg. The Director will be glad to obtain the names of all who might be in a position to assist in investigation work. Inasmuch as there will arise certain expenses in the conduct of the Bureau not as yet provided for, the Society will also appreciate assistance along these lines.

The Coming Year

Something of the wonderful spirit prevailing at the I. S. S. Conference at Bellport, L. I., is forcefully portrayed by Caro Lloyd in an accompanying article. A full account of the Conference will be given in the next issue of the Magazine. If the enthusiasm displayed by all attending this remarkable Conference is in any way indicative of the promise of the year's work in I. S. S. circles, the college year just beginning will be indeed a successful and inspiring one.

The Society is not unmindful of the fact that the ranks of the colleges have been depleted by the war, and that many of the active members of the I. S. S. have not returned to their Alma Maters. However, there are still approximately 200,000 college students who should be reached by the Society's message. The activities of the Socialist movement in Europe, the trend toward collectivism since the beginning of the war, the agitation for conscription of wealth, the rapidly rising cost of living, the relation of war in general to the economic struggle, have, furthermore, made college undergraduates and alumni more interested than ever be-

fore in the teachings of Socialism and the Socialist movement.

This increased interest should be reflected in the steady progress of I. S. S. Chapters, and will be so reflected if these Chapters act consistently with the aims of the Society.

In an endeavor to follow these aims members of the Society should ever keep in mind that the I. S. S. is an organization for the study and discussion of Socialism. It is not an anti or pro-militarist, anti or pro-war, anti or pro-conscription organization. The Society as such includes within its ranks men and women of widely varying views on Socialism and war, and each Chapter should make a special effort to bring into its membership all who are sincerely desirous of obtaining a better grasp of the problems of industrial democracy, no matter what their political or economic creed.

The Society can perform no more important task in the present crisis than provide a forum in which various social problems of fundamental importance, brought into prominence by the war, are thrashed out in a constructive and scholarly manner.

Besides studying the essentials of the Socialist philosophy, the following topics, discussed at the Autumn Conference of the I. S. S., might be considered at informal discussion meetings and open lectures: "The Trend Toward State Socialism: Its Significance," "The Significance of the Russian Revolution," "Conscription of Wealth," "American Democracy and the Negro," "What Terms of Peace Should a Radical Propose?" "Socialist and Labor Representation at the Peace Settlement," "Labor in Public and Private Industry as Affected by the War," "Universal Service in Peace and War," "Freedom of Speech, Press and Conscience."

And let us, in all of these discussions, seek the truth, give every side a fair chance to be heard, taboo acrimonious personal attacks and make the meetings of the Chapters the most thought-stimulating, the most vital intellectual endeavors in American life.

The Christmas Convention Every member and friend of the Society, on reading this paragraph, should make an irrevocable decision to attend the Ninth Annual Convention of the I. S. S., to be held in New York City December 27, 28 and 29, 1917. This year the big dinner will be held on the first night of the Convention, December 27, rather than at its conclusion as heretofore.

The Society is planning to make this gathering the greatest conference of students interested in Socialism and fundamental social problems ever held in the country. More etxensive notice will appear in the next issue of the Magazine. In the meanwhile, remember the dates.

Peace Terms Every genuine democrat and internationalist should now be giving his best thought to the consideration of terms of a just and lasting peace; should stimulate discussion of such terms in every organization to which he may belong; should aid in so mobilizing the democratic forces in this country that they may be able to function effectively in the peace settlement. Socialists and radicals generally can immediately see to it that the most thoughtful contributions on various phases of the peace problem are presented for consideration to those appointed by the president to consider this problem. The I. S. S. will be glad to assist in the collection of such data, and in bringing it to the attention of the proper authorities.

Free Discussion As this Quarterly goes to press, the suppression of the Socialist and the radical press because of their criticism of certain governmental policies and the throttling of free speech in university hall and in the community at large has become a fact of grave concern to every lover of freedom.

When will it be realized that suppression of minority opinion is, from the standpoint of sane majority action, the most disastrous course that a nation can pursue?

Our Week in Bellport

By Caro Lloyd

For its third summer conference, the I. S. S. sailed into the harbor of old Bellport, L. I., and there dropped anchor on September 18. Winds were soft and a warm sun was sparkling on Great South Bay. Taking shelter at the two inns, The Goldthwaite and The Lloyd, we were welcomed by our friends and comrades, Darwin and Katherine Meserole, and from that time on found ourselves surrounded by their gracious and sympathetic hospitality. With a few exceptions, the summer guests had gone, so we were virtually safe in surmising that whomever we met on porch or corridor was some particular brand of radical and that it was safe to waive formal social preliminaries and tell him at once our plan for the disposal of Alsace-Lorraine or why we considered that Gibraltar and Panama should be internationalized.

The inns stand a shady lane apart, each secluded by hedges and trees from the village, so that old Bellport as well seemed for a time an I. S. S. possession. Interwoven with all our memories is the shining view of the bay with its faint line of grass-covered sand dunes on the horizon, a sky that only for one brief interval ceased to be blue, the occasional whirr of aeroplanes and the ever-present fleet of sail boats. When we looked out in the morning, the little boats lay still on the steely water, here and there a lazy sail just being unfurled, or in the warm afternoon their white wings were seen bearing them noiselessly, swiftly, here and there, or at near midnight when we parted hurling back a final anti-war argument to our retreating opponent, they lay peacefully sleeping at anchor, under the crescent moon and the glistening stars.

That mere incidental, known as food, was obtained at the Goldthwaite. Here the discussions were so earnest and incessant, that it was difficult for the waitresses to get a word in edgewise. Very hard was it to interrupt Norman Angell's discussion of what we should do "when peace breaks out" with "veal croquettes and baked weak fish," or to eject into John Spargo's indictment of the Stockholm Conference the words "stewed prunes and sliced bananas." The social potentiality of the paper napkin was here successfully demonstrated. Its use enabled us to move from table to table and thus get in touch with many groups.

Our sessions were held in the big room at the Lloyd. As one stepped into that room for the first time it was to feel a sheltered sense of peace and beauty; its harmony of color in lounges, chairs, chintzes, its vases of zinnias and asters, the great chimney with its log fire and from the long windows the inspiring view far off to seaward made it a congenial background. Above all there hovered over it the memory of one for whom it was named, Henry Demarest Lloyd, whose spirit as that of a noble truth-seeker was invoked by Mrs. Meserole in her beautiful opening of the first session.

No one, I believe, who attended from beginning to end will ever lose the inspiration of the six days. We were meeting in the whirl of a great world crisis, and this added intensity to our deliberations; we met in private, hence freedom, intimacy, closeness of discussion prevailed. We opened with the singing of labor songs and on all sides one saw men and women of conservative mien joining heart and soul in "Shall you complain who feed the world, who clothe the world?" or "To arms, to arms, ye brave." In fact, there was to be found a comprehending radicalism among non-socialists which led one to surmise that radicalism is "moving up one" all along the line.

When at first several stated speakers failed to appear, from our ranks arose such excellent substitutes that some of us wondered whether when our real speakers did turn up, we could maintain our present high standards. Speakers as well as audiences were composed of all kinds, majority as well as minority Socialists, reformers, proletarians and so-called parasites, all with varying views; yet in all the twelve main sessions and the several short sessions which we inserted, so intense was our interest, barely

one antagonistic word was spoken. This occurred, in spite of the fact, which I may now whisper, that certain of us considered it not an impossibility that we might even be visited by federal agents. The closeness of thought, the freedom of speech, the tolerance, the deep sense of individual responsibility toward a solution of our social tragedy, the varied viewpoints and the splendid equipment of every speaker, all are woven into the fiber of a life-long memory.

Pervading the whole assemblage was a brave protest against what is "rotten in Denmark" and a high plane of concern for the common good. This note of democracy was woven like a shimmering thread through all the wonderfully stimulating sessions on Freedom of Speech, Press and Conscience, on Conscription of Wealth, on Public Control of Food, on Universal Service, on the Trend Toward State Socialism, and the Peace Proposals Radicals Should Advocate. To fit the crisis, our deliberations possessed an international range. In the session on the Negro, Dr. Du Bois eloquently, though somewhat gloomily, portrayed the condition of the race. This was lightened by James W. Johnston's analysis of their ethnological contribution in joy of temperament, in art and music. The problems of India were brilliantly surveyed by Lajpat Rai, and Russia was presented in four lights by an extreme Socialist, plain Socialist, conservative Socialist and co-operator, or as it was described, by the poet, the optimist, the pessimist, and the realist. In the memorable session on Socialist Representation at the Peace Settlement, we heard from internationalists of England in Norman Angell, of Belgium in Senator La Fontaine, of America in Algernon Lee. No one could fail to testify to the supreme worth of all our meetings.

We were enlivened now and then by informal moments of personal revelation, when radicals confessed to conservatism, and conservatives let on that they were really radical; when Boudin declared that he would "rather be right than logical," when Rose Pastor Stokes passionately offered to lay down her life, if need be, to ensure German democracy; when Crystal Eastman, looking like a Holbein portrait, took issue with President Wilson "in her simple, feminine way" and hit several nails on the head; while Prof. Overstreet replying exercised, as he said, "the gentle art possessed by the male of side-stepping the main issue." Our personal references, however, were never "cross references," and the greatest friendliness prevailed.

The main sessions always broke up into small group sessions which were to be found everywhere. Walter Weyl said he had not been there three-quarters of an hour before he had heard three groups of pacifists each denying pacifism to the other.

But we were not without lucid intervals of rest and frivolity for in the afternoons we laid aside heavy problems. We had a smoke and a book on a grassy bank or sandy bluff. We took the motor boat to the bathing beach, or played tennis, or napped, or walked, or motored to Shinnecock Hills or the Hamptons. On Sunday evening, our last session, we gathered more intimately around the log fire and had an experience meeting, telling "How I became a Socialist."

On Monday, alas, all was over and we reluctantly separated, to return to office, to class room, or studio, the suffragist to the picket line, the draft resister to his struggle, all immeasurably enriched. As the member from the Western Electric Company expressed it, he was going back "re-charged."

Well ballasted by new facts, under the white sails of idealism, blown by fresh breezes of inspiration, the conference on the 24th sailed out of the harbor of old Bellport, out again to the open sea where the Ship of State lies tossing in the world storm.

What the Terms "When Peace Breaks Out?"

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON PEACE PROPOSALS

Edited by H. W. LAIDLER

A few weeks ago President Wilson appointed Colonel House to gather and collate various peace proposals, with a view of placing at the disposal of the American representatives at the peace conference the most mature thought on this mooted problem.

It was for the purpose of "doing its bit" toward the intelligent discussion of the many questions of overshadowing importance which must be settled at the peace table that the I. S. S., some weeks before President Wilson's appointments, submitted the following questions to its members:

(1) *Time for Peace Conference.* Under what circumstances do you think that the Allied governments should actively work for a peace conference?

(2) *Annexations and Indemnities.* (a) Do you favor the formula, "no punitive indemnities and no forcible annexations," as a basis for peace terms, or the formula, "no indemnities and no annexations"? (b) What changes of territory, if any, do you believe that any of the countries engaged should seek at the peace conference? (Do you, for instance, favor Italy's aims in regard to Trieste, Fiume, the Trentino, etc.; England's desire to retain the German colonies; France's desire to secure the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine?) (c) Would you be in favor of prolonging the war in order to ensure indemnities, punitive or otherwise, or annexations by any of the countries involved? (d) Would you favor a plebiscite for any of the disputed territories? Briefly state reasons for your opinion on these subjects.

(3) *International Agreements.* (a) What provision should be made by the peace conference in regard to disarmament? (b) International organization? (c) The internationalization of straits and highways? (d) The exploitation of undeveloped countries

Somewhat more than a hundred members responded and the answers indicated a wide diversity of opinion on all of the questions asked. A few of the more representative answers are herewith printed in whole or in large part as separate articles—these are followed by a general summary. It is to be regretted that space will not permit us to publish all the significant statements received.

CHARLES ZUEBLIN

The Allies should work for peace when there is assurance that a peace compact will be signed by a democratic German government.

Believing absolutely in no punitive indemnities and no forcible annexations, I still regard these demands as a hopeless basis of permanent peace. Territorial boundaries are quite secondary. The questions to be decided are: Freedom of the seas, freedom of trade, and some loose federal organization which will respect the sovereignty of all responsible nations and the neutrality of others. All peace proposals of a negative nature are futile, undemocratic and unworthy, and only keep pacifists in their deserved disrepute. If the pacifists are to count at all, their proposals must be positive.

ELLIS O. JONES

A drive should be made for peace at the earliest possible moment, not later than the day after to-morrow.

I favor the formula of "no punitive indemnities and no forcible annexations." All questions of disputed territories, colonies, etc., should be left to a plebiscite of the inhabitants thereof. All land should be ruled by the people who inhabit it. Anything else is absurd. I am not in favor of prolonging the war for any purpose except the destruction of militarism. Let all those who want to be shot hurry up and get it over with, leaving those who want to live to do so in peace.

The peace conference should provide for complete disarmament if possible. Forts and custom houses should be done away with entirely. Straits and highways should be internationalized. The exploitation of undeveloped countries is a big subject, because all countries are undeveloped. All undeveloped countries should be developed with regard to the best interests of those who do the developing, avoiding systems of slavery,

special privilege and other forms of social injustice which have been the cause of so much misery, friction, and one-sided industrial development. The principle of co-operation must continue to supplant the principle of competition if we are to continue to progress toward a better economic arrangement in all countries.

WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

The Allies should actively work for peace when the German people have overthrown the Kaiser as the Russians overthrew the Czar, or when every German knows that the Kaiser's armies are decisively beaten.

I am with President Wilson against superficial formulas.

I favor such territorial changes as will be decided upon by the democratic nations after the defeat or overthrow of Kaiserism.

If a democracy "favors" a policy, it cannot be willing to wait until the Kaiser gives his consent. With such servility there would not be a democracy on earth to-day.

All the Entente Powers are agreed that there shall be an international organization and as much disarmament as practicable—depending on the degree to which Kaiserism is defeated.

HOWARD BRUBAKER

To me, no time is too soon for a peace conference.

I believe in the formula "no punitive indemnities and no forcible annexations." This keeps the way open to leave the fate of disputed territories to the will of their populations. The war should not be prolonged one day over the purely financial issue of indemnities.

I believe that the peace conference should provide for disarmament except for a small force of international character, for use in emergencies endangering world peace. I believe in an internationalization strong enough to maintain an open door policy in the backward countries.

I do not believe in the policy of refusing to deal with the Prussian dynasty. We left it to the Russians to throw off their own incubus.

I am strongly opposed to inter-allied trade agreements after the war tending to hedge in the Central Powers. This is the surest way to endanger the future peace.

If there is no basis now for a peace conference with the enemy, I should favor a peace conference of the allies and the neutrals laying down broad principles upon which we would be willing to make peace. The influence of Russia and America ought to be for democracy and tolerance in such a conference. I believe it entirely possible that Germany would accept its finding without being beaten—it might even throw off its form of government in order to do so.

JOHN SPARGO

When the enemy governments, individually or together, are ready to admit defeat and withdraw from the territory they have conquered in the war, the Allies, in my opinion, should work actively for peace.

Frankly, my observation leads me to the conclusion that the people who say that there must be "no indemnities and no annexations" and those who qualify the phrase by inserting "punitive" before indemnities and "forcible" before annexations mean the same thing. They are all anxious that Germany shall not be required to make such reparation as is possible to Belgium and Serbia. This I regard as immoral. So long as we have the power to fight, I would not favor ending the war upon any terms which did not provide for the payment of substantial compensation to Belgium.

I believe firmly in certain territorial readjustments. It is immaterial to me whether you call them "annexations" or not. In fact, the term annexation means the appropriation by force by one power or by a group of powers of territory belonging to some other power or powers. It does not properly include the freeing of territory from a conqueror and giving it its independence. I believe that the future of the Trentino should be determined by its inhabitants. I believe that Alsace and Lorraine should be restored to France. In my judgment it is not possible to have a just plebiscite in these provinces to determine their future. I do not understand that *England* claims

or desires the German colonies in Africa. *The war upon Germany in Africa has not been waged by England, but by the United States of South Africa.* These free states have raised the armies, sacrificed the lives and raised the money to carry on the war. It can be depended on that they will determine the future status of the German colonies—*not England.* The British Empire has passed out of existence. In its place there is a great commonwealth of free peoples. I believe that Poland should be reconstructed as an independent nation, taking from Germany, Austria and Russia the portions of Poland held by them. These are by no means all of the territorial readjustments which I believe desirable, but are sufficient to illustrate my point of view.

Yes, I would wage the war indefinitely to secure some ends—e.g., Complete restoration of Belgian independence and reparation by Germany to include (1) A substantial fine for the violation of Belgium's neutrality; (2) payment for damage done to the territory and the loss of property; (3) compensation for the loss of life; (4) *complete reimbursement of all the fines and requisitions levied upon Belgian citizens and cities.*

On the question of international agreements, I have written an exhaustive article and am unable to reply to them satisfactorily in the limited space available here. I believe in progressive disarmament, if it is universal. I do not believe that democratic nations should disarm while undemocratic nations keep armed. I believe in a league of nations with some international power to enforce peace. I believe that the internationalization of straits and other strategic waterways is desirable if universal; not otherwise. I can easily conceive of discriminatory internationalization. The exploitation of undeveloped countries should be carried on under international supervision, with adequate provision for the protection and development of the inhabitants of such countries, and with absolute equality to all nations in trade opportunities.

RANDOLPH S. BOURNE

I believe that a peace conference called by the Allies at any time during the last eight months, or during the indefinite future, will be able to make a settlement as advantageous to world-democracy as any settlement made after complete exhaustion or even a military decision over Germany. From the point-of-view of probable terms, it is immaterial under what circumstances a peace conference is worked for, as long as it is immediately obtained and hostilities ended. No possible gain for capitalist "democracy" or defence against Prussian "autocracy" can compensate for the evil of the prolongation of the war. Any other theory springs from the metaphysics of prestige; not from common-sense.

"No punitive indemnities and no forcible annexations" is a much better formula than "no indemnities and no annexations." Belgium should certainly be indemnified, but in some way that provides a fund for social reconstruction. France might waive indemnity if the French-speaking parts of Lorraine were surrendered. The indemnification of Servia and Poland might depend on the status worked out for them at the settlement.

No changes of territory ought to take place except those that involved the restoration of a population clearly homogeneous and " irredentist." This would exclude most of the claims of France and Italy.

I am not in favor of prolonging the war to ensure any of these results, because I believe they are as likely to be secured now as at any time.

All disputed territories should be restored only after an honest plebiscite.

The peace conference will not be a peace conference unless it agrees on disarmament as an expression of the world's disillusionment with the use of military force.

International organization should be *functional* rather than *political,* i.e., it should not seek a federation of states such as is proposed by the League to Enforce Peace, but co-operative control of services, such as food supplies, shipping, finance, raw materials for industry, along the lines now being worked out by the allied nations. This co-operation must be world-wide, however, not dis-

criminatory against the Central Powers. A sharp distinction should be drawn between the internal administrative functions of a country and the external competitive functions. The latter should be abolished as obsolete and obstructive. Nations are only artificial units. No genuine international relations exist. Relations between nations as units are traditional, unreal, correlated to no actual cultural or economic relationship. Not only secret diplomacy but all the diplomatic game, of which war is only an incident, must be abolished if we are to have peace. The ideal is an "anarchist communism" of nations rather than a strong centralized federalism.

Free trade in colonies, and the centralization of straits and highways would be essential to any co-operative control of functions. An international commission (not of diplomats or statesmen or politicians) but of scientific managers could then direct the exploitation of undeveloped countries in the interest of the countries themselves, as well as the exploiting nations.

ROSE PASTOR STOKES

The Allied governments should, in my opinion, actively work for a peace conference, only in the event of the complete defeat by the Allies of the Hohenzollerns—or their defeat by the German people themselves.

I favor discussing the questions of annexations and indemnities when the Allied nations and the German nation are ready, after the defeat of the Hohenzollerns, to discuss them.

I believe a pooling of the nation's armed forces into an international police force and national disarmament is certain when the Kaiser is defeated and that then the internationalization of straits and waterways would be democratized and properly guarded.

If an international tax were levied for the purpose of creating a fund to aid the undeveloped countries to develop their own democracies, political and industrial, the results would be ideal, I believe. But this, I conceive, may not be done except by nations themselves much farther on the way toward social and industrial democracy than the nations of the world are at present.

JAMES PETER WARBASSE

The allied governments *should* be working for a peace conference *now.*

I favor *no* annexations and *no* indemnities. The introduction of the consideration of indemnities in terms of peace represents the entering wedge of a series of demands on both sides which have no end. Suppose that the Allies insist that the payment of indemnity to Belgium shall constitute one of the conditions of peace, what effect will such a stipulation have on the course of events?

From the military standpoint the Central Powers are the dominant side in the war. But there are two forces at work in Germany and Austria, as there are also in the Allied countries; there is the force of the government which has military victory as its goal, and there is the force of public sentiment which has peace as its goal. The first wants the war continued until victory is secured, the second wants peace as soon as possible. These are two antagonistic forces. If the Allies hope for military victory and hope to demand a large money indemnity for Belgium, the effect of the demand would be to cause the Central Governments to fight in order to avoid this payment. The demand prolongs the war. As the Central Powers believe in the justice of their cause most ardently, they have never given reason to assume that they would consent to yield such indemnity. Assuming that they would continue to fight rather than pay, where is the end? If ultimately it were possible to defeat the Central Powers, by the time such a military defeat could be brought about the bankruptcy would be so extreme that the possibility of the payment of indemnity would be a doubtful matter. But suppose that the Allies insist in that remote contingency upon the payment, how would it be paid? It could be done by Belgium imposing taxation upon the defeated nations. But already these nations are burdened with taxation beyond their endurance. If it were physically impossible to pay, then Belgium would be required to confiscate German territory. But how would that shifting of geographical boundaries provide capital

or indemnity? And would Belgium profit by squeezing taxes out of Belgian subjects which she could not squeeze out of Germans?

Still, suppose that it were possible, without Belgian annexation of German territory, to compel the German people each year to pay tribute to Belgium, the conditions of life in Germany after the war with the burden of taxation would become so onerous that the laborer could scarcely live. Emigration from Germany would develop as a natural result, and Germans would flow into those countries whose living conditions were better; it might be to Belgium, Russia, or France. The time has long since passed when the people of any country can be compelled to remain there, like slaves denied the age-old privilege of migration.

In the event of indemnity being imposed upon Germany, it would not be upon the Germany which prosecuted the war and invaded Belgium, but upon a new government, occupying the same soil, but which by force of revolution, as an enemy of the old Germany, had conquered and destroyed it. The new and revolutionary Republican Government, which will occupy Germany after the war, will have been created by the enemies of the German autocracy. Had the German autocracy had the power it would have destroyed the makers of the new government just as it destroyed the enemy Belgians. It would be upon this new government in Central Europe that the burden of Belgian indemnity would fall—this new government which is the enemy of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs.

The people who issued the orders for the invasion of Belgium will not pay the indemnity. If it is paid at all it will be by the taxes imposed upon the children of working people who are as innocent as are the children of Belgium. Unborn generations will bear the burden. If the terms of peace are left to diplomats, ministers and warriors, peace is far off and its permanence doubtful. This war should be ended by the people of the belligerent countries, organizing and bringing such pressure upon their governments that the ending of the war and the terms of peace emanate from the people.

The longer the war continues with the United States as a belligerent the more deeply will we become involved in European politics, diplomacy, and intrigue; the more will we have imposed upon us the vicious complications of war, such as the destruction of free speech, free press and peaceful assemblage, and the breaking down of standards of labor and living; the greater will the burden of taxation become; and the more lives will be destroyed.

No change of territory should result from the war excepting that which the people themselves desire.

The peace conference which defines the terms of peace should be a peoples' conference and not a diplomats' conference. The world should be done with diplomats by the end of the war. Disarmament should be demanded. A permanent international council of the peoples should be instituted: The waterways of the world should be made free. So-called undeveloped countries should be protected from exploitation by the international council of the peoples.

UPTON SINCLAIR

As to peace conditions, I should say that the first condition should be the democratization of the governments of Germany and Austria. This, of course, means an uprising of the German and Austrian people. In order to make this uprising easier, the Allies should immediately state what terms they would be prepared to grant to self-governing Germany and Austria. I do not believe that any nation should gain territory from this war. All territories legitimately under dispute, such as Poland, Armenia, Trieste and Alsace-Lorraine, should be made independent under international guarantee. There should be a league of nations to police the world and to force the decisions of a world court.

The Answers Summarized

FAVOR A PEACE CONFERENCE

Sixty-nine—a majority of those replying—believe that a drive for peace should be made by the Allies under the present circumstances. Various reasons for this attitude are given. That of Professor William Ellery Leonard is typical. He says:

"The Allies should at once work actively for peace. Peace talk is in the air. The Pope has spoken. Socialists of the different belligerent countries have tried to get together. The President of the U. S. on Jan. 22 anticipated the ideas of millions over the world. There are honest peace tendencies in the Central Powers, as indicated by the attitude of the Reichstag. The world is come to an *impasse*. Neither side can overwhelm the other, and if either side ever expected to conquer the control of Europe, each has now realized that the other side cannot. The slaughter can only go on by the belligerents creating the myth of moral ideals as their justification, and the myth must be exploded—the myth that Germany has the key to civilization, and, above all, the myth that all righteousness and salvation of the human race is in the hands of the Allies and that Germany is a monster outside all appeals to Reason or Good Faith. One need not be anti-American to say this—an American citizen has a right to continue the use of common-sense, even in war time."

Lawrence Todd believes that a statement by this country that it is ready to close the struggle and that it counts on the people of Germany and Austria to carry out in concert with other nations a program of world-wide disarmament and democratization of political and economic institutions, "will move the German people faster than will our military toward the goal of democracy we proclaim."

Others contend that "it is a weak peace which is the result only of military advantage or enemy collapse."

NOW NOT THE TIME FOR PEACE

A very considerable number (45) believe that no drive for peace should be made until certain preliminary conditions are satisfied. Upton Sinclair, H. D. Sedgwick, Charles Zueblin and seven others are of the opinion that peace negotiations should not be entered upon until German democracy is attained, or military autocracy dethroned. This forcing of democracy on Germany is a necessary preliminary to Socialism, according to Mr. Ladoff, inasmuch as "Socialism can and will be built on the foundation of bourgeois democracy. It cannot be built on feudal soil."

Six believe with Professor Hayes that peace conferences should be taboo until the Central Powers or their autocratic governments have been decisively beaten. Prior to a peace conference, in the belief of seven, democracy should be attained or the Hohenzollerns should be defeated. Two favor withdrawal of the German armies from foreign soil before peace negotiations are entered upon; two present the alternative of withdrawal or democratization; one desires withdrawal and admission of defeat; three believe that a peace conference should be entered upon when permanent peace is reasonably to be expected and three, when Germany offers an opportunity for a conference.

Other conditions are as follows: when "the Allies are *sure*, dead sure of Germany"; after the German government *offers* restitution, reparation and a democratic form of internal government"; when the Allies can meet the Central Powers on anything like equal terms; when Germany definitely states her willingness to evacuate all occupied territories and indemnify Belgium; when the principles for which the Allies are fighting are triumphant. Mr. Kobbe suggests that it is not a question as to when the Allies *should* seek peace, but when they *will*, and he believes that this will be only in case of a military disaster or a threatened revolution. Professor Cockerell favors a continuous unofficial conference. He says in part, as follows:

"I believe that the Allies should work actively for peace whenever they can feel that the general purposes for which they are fighting can be attained. I have long been, and still am in favor of a continuous *unofficial* conference for the purpose of formulating demands and ideals, with the general object of unifying the demands of the peoples (rather than the governments) of the belligerent countries. I am convinced that the real purposes and wishes of the *masses* in the different countries are not sufficiently diverse to demand warfare for their settlement, and that a large

part of apparent diversity is due to erroneous information on the one hand, and lack of clear thinking on the other. This is really putting it very mildly. Now, to return to the original question: when *can* the governments feel confidence, etc.? Surely when, and only when, they know the opinions of the people they are dealing with and know that whatever is done will be approved, and will not represent the tricky bargaining of a small group of government officials and politicians. From this point of view, the importance of public discussion cannot be overestimated."

INDEMNITIES AND ANNEXATIONS

A majority of those answering (58), including H. D. Sedgwick, Charles Zueblin, Vida D. Scudder, Randolph Bourne, Ellis O. Jones and Jessie W. Hughan, favor the formula "no punitive indemnities and no forcible annexations."

"An opposite policy," declares Mr. Edgerton, "would confirm the German people, if defeated, in their belief in the iron ring, and would sow new seeds of hate and revenge." Professor Dana believes that "certain changes in national boundaries and certain funds for rehabilitation may be necessary (unless peace is to mean the *status quo ante* and stagnation), but these annexations and indemnities should be arranged from time to time by an international parliament and should not be punitive or forcible; that is, they should not be punishment for military defeat nor reward for military victory." Two others suggest that all the large nations should help in the restoration of Belgium.

Twenty-five, including Dr. James P. Warbasse, Mary W. Ovington, Mr. and Mrs. Darwin J. Meserole, George W. Downing and Frank C. Doan, favor the more radical formula of "no indemnities and no annexations."

Among the reasons advanced for this position are that all indemnities are punitive; that they are irritants for future wars and that they could not be divided among the various nations without friction. The acceptance of this formula, Mr. Mead declares, would be a recognition that no nation was exclusively responsible for the war. Dr. Calhoun believes that no indemnity should be given to a nation participating in the war of her own accord. Laurence Todd urges that all nations contribute toward a common fund to be used in restoration enterprises. Another suggests that "what is left of Germany's army should help in restoring Belgium and Northern France."

Several (13) refuse to give their consent to either formula, either on the ground that they are uncertain of their stand; that discussion is useless, and should be left to the conference; or that formulas are doubtful in their application.

Professor Cockerell favors reparation to Belgium—as do many who agree with the first formula—and is opposed to "annexations of any sort unless it can be shown, in a manner satisfactory to an international court of trained men, that the proposed changes are for the good of the peoples concerned."

The most stringent indemnity suggested by a member was that advocated by Mr. Winston, who believes that all damage done to Belgium, Servia, France, Roumania and the rest should be replaced, stone for stone, using therefore (a) all private means of the aristocracy and the bureaucratic class beyond enough, possibly, to provide for a small pension, in addition to some contributions by Germany as a nation; and (b) the forced physical labor of all the German leaders responsible for specific acts of cruelty. This he does not look upon as a punishment. Germany would suffer even then less than the countries she overran; and in her extremity would be compelled to establish public ownership.

Seven others specifically urge reparation in one form or another, one only advocating indemnities as a punishment. One is of the opinion that any indemnity will be punitive in its effect.

PLEBISCITE.

Eighty-two of those answering favor a plebiscite in one or more of the countries in dispute to determine whether or not territories should be transferred. Of this number, 56 specifically state that they oppose any prolongation of the war in order to ensure indemnities or annexations. Nine agree to a plebiscite, without declaring whether or not, in their

opinion, the war should be prolonged for territorial ends or indemnification.

A number specify the kind of plebiscite approved by them. Mr. Mead believes that the voting "should be carried out under international control, free from interference by any power directly concerned, and probably some time after the war, so as to allow some, at least, of the war-hate and prejudice to die." Some advocate a plebiscite only in the case of Alsace-Lorraine, while others favor it for all territories in dispute, even including Poland, Finland, Palestine, Ireland and the Philippines. Still others would confine it to European territories, leaving Asiatic and African colonies to an international tribunal.

Dr. Calhoun is of the opinion that a vote of the people should be taken only in case that an international commission should decide that a territory belongs *economically* in a different national unit than that to which it at present is attached. Dr. N. I. Stone, on the other hand, favors it "only when the question of *nationality* is in doubt and where an absolutely fair and honest count without pressure upon the voters could be assured."

Seven of those replying are skeptical regarding the value of any plebiscite in deciding questions of national boundaries. Thus Professor Hayes states that "it is only too probable that the people would vote under fear of revenge from the Central Powers." "A plebiscite which gave New York City to Germany or Russia would be intolerable," declares Donald S. Tucker. "In no part of the world are the inhabitants of strategic localities the only ones concerned."

Bertram Benedict also doubts "the advisability of allowing an element inside of a country to break away if it so desires. Our Civil War is eloquent testimony to the impossibility of breaking up a country by means of a plebiscite. If the theory is applied to districts forcibly annexed, how far back will one go?"

Instead of such a method, Mr. Zilboorg suggests that the question of transfer of territory should be made by an international court after conference with scholars and social workers in disputed territories.

Fifty-six, as has been said, favor a plebiscite and, at the same time, oppose the prolongation of war for purpose of indemnities and annexations. In addition to these, eleven—not agreeing to a plebiscite—feel that the war should not be continued in order to obtain exchange of money or territory. Of these, however, three definitely urge the continuance of war "until the present military Junker class in Germany is overthrown by the mass of the German people."

"The only justification for prolonging the war," Rev. James L. Smiley, on the other hand asserts, "is the prospect of abolishing capitalism."

TERRITORIAL READJUSTMENTS.

Many, as has been stated, believe that all changes of territories should be left to a plebiscite. N. I. Stone is of the opinion that only those changes should be made that "strictly comport with the principle of independence and self-government of nations, such as returning Italian provinces of Austria to Italy, Bosnia and Herzegovina to Serbia, Transylvania to Roumania, etc.

Miss Sampter would give independence not only to all nations independent before the war, but to *all* nationalities desiring it — presumably expressing themselves through plebiscites—including Poland, Finland, Ireland and Palestine. The independence of Servia, Montenegro and Roumania, according to Miss Garbutt, should also be guaranteed.

That the rights of small nations, black, as well as white, should be protected at the peace conference is, as well, the belief of Oscar Leonard.

"I favor," declares Mr. Leonard, "the recognition of the rights of small nations, Ireland as much as Alsace-Lorraine. I want Palestine to be returned to the Jews and Egypt to the Egyptians, Armenia to the Armenians and the unexploited African lands to their own people. I want the white man to get off the back of the black man, just as much as I want the capitalist to get off the back of the workers."

The Balkan question, according to Mr. Winston, will be solved only when the monarchies are abolished in favor of re-

publics. Armenia and other subject provinces of Turkey should be freed from their yoke; Bohemia should have its independence, if it so desired, or should be privileged to remain a part of a democratic Austria. In dealing with India, Mr. Winston is of the opinion that "there is little question that approaching federalization will put the different parts of the British Empire on an equality."

Dr. John R. Haynes gives the interesting suggestion that "the Balkan peoples should temporarily assume the status existing before the war and that later their boundaries should be fixed by an international court, it being understood that the racial lines should be observed as far as possible." He is as well of the belief that "the three Polands shall become one nation independent, or more than one independent nation as the people shall decide," and that Germany's conquered territories should not be returned. Should the retention of the last named prevent a treaty of peace, however, it should be waived for the sake of peace.

The internationalization of Constantinople and the formation of an independent federation of Balkan States are advocated by Miss Shearman. Convinced of the truth of stories of cruelty practiced by Germans on the inhabitants of the German colonies prior to the war, Mrs. Parks urges that these colonies be not returned to Germany. Others suggest administration by an international tribunal. As for the German colony in China, Mr. Edgerton suggests that it be given back to China with compensation to Germany for money expended there in permanent improvement. The far-off and little-considered island of Papua, according to Miss Spruance, should be kept under the control of Australia.

World administration is advocated by Professor Calhoun for all colonies incapable of self-government. Professor Cockerell contends that such colonies be administered by "boards representing the several countries and friendly to the legitimate commerce of all."

It is absolutely essential to future peace, according to Mr. Mead, that all nations—as a result of territorial readjustments—should be assured free access to markets and raw materials and undeveloped countries. He declares:

"If this latter were done, diplomats would not be blinded by greed in considering the interests of the dependent and oppressed nationalities. For example, Germany would probably be glad to get rid of her obstreperous Alsatians, if assured that German manufacturers would receive from the coal and iron mines of northern France the supplies they need. And in every case where there is a real and legitimate demand among the people of an area for a change of rulers, or for freedom from rulers, it would be possible to gratify it."

The importance to future world peace of free access to the sea is emphasized by Mrs. Kitchelt, who believes that all nations should reasonably ask such access. Professor Cockerell contends that Italy should not be permitted to block up Austria's passage to the Adriatic, and Miss Sisler is of the opinion that Italy should be allowed to obtain only that territory which is clearly Italian.

Miss Jessie W. Hughan believes that "as Italy entered the war largely in order to gain territory, any such gain on her part would act as an incentive to similar action on the part of other nations." No matter what may be the justice of her claims to territory, therefore, she believes "that none should be assigned to her as a consequence of this war."

While asserting that such changes of territory as are demanded by France and Italy should be refused, Mr. Benedict would favor a *quid pro quo* policy if France and Italy would otherwise prolong the war for months or years rather than yield. Morocco, French Congo, Tunis, etc., might be exchanged, under such a policy, for European territory.

H. D. Sedgwick favors many of the claims of France, Italy and England. He says:

"I am in favor of giving back Alsace-Lorraine to France, for I think not only the territory in question but the whole corporate body from which it was torn has a right to be heard on the question of union or divorce. Italia Irredenta

should go to Italy—I believe it to be Italian. In the interest of South Africa, I would not give the German colonies back to Germany."

Extensive readjustments are suggested by J. F. Twombly and John R. Swanton.

Mr. Twombly states as follows:

"Give the people in each district the chance to determine their own government: Lorraine would probably decide for France; Alsace for Germany. Trentino would probably vote for Italy. Trieste, too; but here the question of economics, etc., comes in: it would hardly do to leave Austria without a port. The reorganization of Austria-Hungary: the formation of a large, federal Balkans-Danubian State, including Bulgaria, enlarged Roumania, enlarged Servia, decreased Hungary, changed Bohemia, and perhaps Austria, is the only reasonable and permanent solution. It would probably be better for Austria proper (provinces of upper and lower Austria, Styria, and Tyrol) to join the German Empire. If such a state had been organized a few years ago, there would have been no war. It is necessary politically, racially and economically. Whether anything practical can be done about it is doubtful. This is perhaps the most difficult thing in the way of peace."

Mr. Swanton's suggestions are still more elaborate:

"Changes in territory should certainly be made and so made as to satisfy the desires of the bulk of the people occupying said territory. Of course this can not be stated with precision by any one person, but it would seem to involve (1) the determination of the boundary between France and Germany by means of a plebiscite in which expropriated Alsatians intending to return to their old homes should have a voice; (2) the return of Danish Holstein to Denmark; (3) the annexation by Italy of all the Italian speaking portion of the Trentino and the Adriatic coast as far at least as C. Promontore; (4) the reestablishment of the Polish state to include German and Austrian as well as Russian Poland; (5) the unification of the Lithuanian speaking countries; (6) the erection of an independent state to include the Czechs and Slovaks; (7) the annexation of all Jugoslav territories to Servia or else the partition of that territory between Servia and a new south Slavic state; (8) the addition of the Rumanian speaking portions of Austria, Hungary, and Russia to the present Rumanian kingdom; (9) the unification of the Ruthenians either as an independent state or as an autonomous part of Russia; (10) the establishment of boundary lines between Bulgaria and Servia and Bulgaria and Rumania in accordance with the nature and wishes of the populations concerned; (11) annexation to Greece of the coast lands of western Asia Minor and southern Thrace; (12) the determination of the status of Albania through a commission consulting the wishes of the people themselves; (13) the reduction of Turkey to Turkey in Europe and western Asia Minor; (14) the erection of an independent Armenian state; (15) self-government—under the protection of the great powers if necessary—for Syria, Mesopotamia, and Kurdistan; (16) and I might add an independent Finland, if Finland so desires, and an autonomous government for Ireland. It is of course understood that Belgium is to be restored. This will, it seems to me, constitute a very fair beginning toward a permanent peace."

Perhaps the most aggressive Allied terms are enunciated by Mr. Davey, who feels that the Central Powers should be dismembered so that their possible combined strength would fail to make them a world menace.

DISARMAMENT.

Practically all who answer favor total or partial disarmament. Twenty-one urge immediate total disarmament. Three others state that the breaking up of this system should be accomplished as rapidly as possible. Nine favor gradual decrease, Laurence Todd specifying that it be complete in ten years. Mr. Winston suggests that the professional soldiers be gradually turned into "an engineering force for the construction and operation of public works."

Twenty-four urge that a force be retained as an international police force. "The idea of complete disarmament," declares Miss Burnham, "would be too staggering to the nations at this time. . . . Therefore let us internationalize our armies, as we are already doing our science, and to some extent commerce."

Miss Burd believes that "armaments should be reduced to such a size that their combined strength would be sufficient to keep the peace of the world until such times as all people are so developed that they are voluntarily represented in the international group and the principle of arbitration is firmly established."

That armies should be limited perhaps to 1 per cent. of the population, and expenditures on all armaments to a certain specified amount of money per soldier, is the contention of N. I. Stone. This limitation should be accompanied by a provision for organization of an international army, composed of the national armies, as provided above, and subject to orders of an international authority

sitting at The Hague. The international army, he suggests, should be used against any government violating the provisions as to armaments or guilty of aggression against other nations.

Five advocate the continuance merely of a small national police force against internal or external disturbers, piracy, etc.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Of the eighty-seven answering this particular question, all favor an international organization. They call it variously a world federation, a league of nations, a league to enforce peace, an international tribunal, an international commission, a council of delegates, a parliament or arbitration board. Three believe that nations should be equally represented in such tribunals regardless of size. Two favor representation according to population. Mr. Sedgwick suggests a tribunal with two houses, one selected on the basis of population, the other, representing each state, on some other basis than that of mere numbers.

Mr. Mead suggests a two fold representation, one on the basis of classes, and the second chosen from the membership of the various national legislative bodies. His scheme is unique. "To avoid the use of a bi-cameral body," he declares, "a dual system of voting in the council could be used, each representative voting in proportion to the population of the country on certain classes of questions, and having only a single vote on certain others." He favors an international executive authority chosen by the council and a judicial tribunal. Nine advocate an organization similar to that of the United States government.

The enforcement of the decisions of such an international organization, according to several members, should be left to an international judiciary. The use of economic force, including the boycott, is urged by six members. Still others advocate the use of both economic and political force. Several as well bespeak enforcement of decrees by military forces. Mr. Macmillan would have the international police increase "until they reach a strength corresponding to about half the sum of all the national forces, but no more, so that even if captured by a *coup d'etat* for some autocracy they could not enforce their will on a majority of the independent nations."

Donald Tucker suggests that "perhaps the best way to create such an international organization would be first to create an international debt of such enormous size that all over the world there would be men who had perfectly good corrupt motives for keeping the international organization alive and growing. It is particularly important that all these men be more interested, financially at least, in the international state than in their national government. Only an assumption of war debts and indemnities can do this. Hamilton's share in forming our federal government is worthy of study in this connection."

To forestall the necessity of using force, Miss Burnham suggests, among other things, a commission to study the causes of war. Her suggestions are as follows:

"(1) An international organization, including some sort of tribunal or court before which nations (including small nations) can lodge complaints and plead their causes, should be initiated. (2) Some permanent congress or senate, including representatives of every nation, and also of the "backward countries," whether nationally conscious or not, should be arranged for. It should have advisory power, the right to suggest measures to the various nations. In time it might acquire an international legislative function. (3) Some scheme like that of the League to Enforce Peace should be instituted. (4) And a commission, (broadly international in membership) should study the methods of dealing with those causes; this commission to report at intervals to whatever body is formed that is most internationally influential and authoritative."

Mr. Raymund believes that the League to Enforce Peace idea is a false one, as it places too much emphasis on the military; that the weapon of the league of nations must be an economic one, and "of course, this means an international marine, with all that that implies."

Various special plans are endorsed by several correspondents. Vida Scudder favors the plan of the Union for Democratic Control. Swanson favors Tennyson's Dream and Hugo's World Federa-

tion of Civilized Nations. Evelyn Hughan suggests an international commission plan as outlined by Walter Lippmann in "Stakes of Diplomacy." Perlzwig endorses an international congress along lines suggested by Norman Angell in the *New Republic*. Edgerton advocates Brailsford plan in "War of Steel and Gold." (6th edition, 1916). Price recommends "subsidized inter-change schools, colleges, universities, and travel made compulsory and possible."

Certain of those answering (8) believe that these various international leagues are merely temporary, that, for any lasting solution, fundamental economic changes must be accomplished. In these groups are several (7) who declare that settlement can only come when all nations are socialistic or proletarian in government.

That such a commission should be representative of various elements in the population, is the belief of George E. O'Dell. He says:

"A permanent commission in each country with periodical assemblings in the European and American capitals, to draw up legislation for acceptance by agreement of countries participating regarding matters of international concern; the commission to consist of representatives of the professions, of business, manufacture, and labor. Courts of law, an adequate police being out of the question, are a farce. And courts of appeal in dispute with a six months' postponement of fighting or preparaton for fighting are worse than farcial. What is needed is a permanent confrontation in times of peace of leading citizens of all countries liable to dispute, with the object of promoting mutual understanding as to problems, needs, etc. This can at least, by the very fact that it pretends to no authority other than the continual appeal to good will and good judgment, acquire some respect. But a "court" in any pretense of the ordinary sense, not only has never existed, but probably never can. No government in its secret heart has any respect for Hague Courts."

Dr. John R. Haynes believes in an international army and navy which "should be manned and officered by representatives of all nations." He continues:

"The mingling of all nations in a single regiment in itself would tend to bring about kindly international feelings that would aid in making war impossible. The fact that most or all members of the military bodies maintained in Germany were foreigners, would not be resented by the German people if the military units maintained in England and Russia were likewise composed of men foreign to those countries. Or, if desired, the bulk of the international army and navy might be kept in very small countries, like Holland or Belgium, where their presence would not result in any jealousy on the part of the great powers."

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF STRAITS AND HIGHWAYS

Well nigh unanimous is the feeling that the straits and highways of the world should be internationalized (74 approving). Only one, Mr. George O'Dell, believes that this is impossible except as a matter of good will. Dr. Frank C. Doan is of the opinion that peoples "could place no confidence in any agreements by capitalistic chancellories," while Campbell Macmillan believes that "until international organization has developed and earned the confidence of all nations, the British Empire should retain relative supremacy at sea during good behavior, which would be interpreted to include adherence to free trade."

Several specify with Sidney A. Reeve, that "the question of internationalization should be left to world government as one of its first tasks." Mr. Raymund suggests that the removal of fortifications from such waterways as Panama, Suez and the Dardanelles would have the effect of internationalizing them. Among the waterways and highways which should be internationalized are mentioned Gibraltar, Kiel, Dover, Panama, Bosporus, the Suez and the Bagdad Road. Mr. Hough would place in the care of international organizations all seas, straits, *aerial channels* and overland railways.

Mrs. Hazlett believes that, with internationalization, "new democratic standards must take the place of class profit interests."

THE EXPLOITATION OF UNDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

That some international commission should be appointed for the purpose of supervising the exploitation (in the sense of development) of undeveloped coun-

tries, is the consensus of opinion of those answering. Just how such a commission should be constituted, and what powers it should possess are touched on by but few. One contends that power be given to the Hague Tribunal; another, to a committee of the League of Nations. Mr. O'Dell insists that such a commission contain representatives of the subject races.

All concessions in such countries, Mr. Sedgwick declares, should be granted by this international tribunal. Mr. Raymond argues that "no concessions should be granted to individuals and corporations, but only to nations as such; this would avoid complications and would definitely fix responsibility at all times." Many agree that the first object of such a commission should be the development of the country and the betterment of the inhabitants, not private gain. Miss Burnham believes that "some check on private cupidity and harshness should be provided for" and "that there should be a recognized obligation of any nation which secures a colony to maintain a *good public school system there.*" "Education of the inhabitants—primarily industrial education," agrees Dr. Calhoun, "should be the basis, and output should be a secondary consideration."

The end in view of such a commission, according to Mr. Chase, is that "private and national exploitation shall forever cease." Others believe that the commission should seek to develop in the inhabitants an ability to govern themselves, and that, when this is accomplished, the self-governing nation should be admitted into the league of nations.

Professor Ogburn urges the stabilization of the governments of backward nations.

In dealing with a number of problems bound to arise in connection with the development of backward nations, Herman Kobbé says:

> "Open the doors of all the territories to world trade, but on a basis of fair exchange; establish legal equality and personal protection for natives and immigrants or settlers, if necessary, by the use of the international police force; safeguard undeveloped communities against absentee landlordism; withdraw protection from profit-seeking entrepreneurs; and let the civilized states introduce schools, sewage systems and sewing machines as part of a world policy to abolish inequalities of economic development."

A compromise position on the internationalization of exploitation is taken by Mr. Macmillan, who believes that development should be conducted by individual nations, but under the general supervision of an international judiciary.

Taking the word "exploitation" not as "development" but as the securing of surplus value from labor, a number of those answering declare that efforts should be made to prohibit such exploitation in undeveloped countries. Mr. Reeve, on the other hand, urges that "protection against exploitation begins at home. So long as natives must buy goods made here, from the same source as ourselves, can they possibly be protected against exploitation until we are so protected?" Several urge that no nation should be called on to safeguard capital invested in undeveloped lands. Several believe that free trade and an open door policy throughout the world will solve the economic problem. Nine urge the abolition of private ownership as an immediate solution. Mr. Swanson of Panama advocates that there be "international or national activity similar to the constitution of the Panama Canal. Such would tend toward economy and make more equitable distribution of losses and gains."

Peace and Internationalism

By Dr. Walter E. Weyl*

Author of "American World Policies"

To an internationalist no peace proposals can be satisfactory unless they promote democracy and the bases of a permanent understanding between the nations. We are fighting against Militarism, not against German militarism alone. We are fighting a political system and a state of mind that ranges one nation against another, that breeds mutual suspicion, that robs peoples of their security and their right to develop. Our immediate enemy is the Imperial German Government, which is maintained in power by the interests and traditions of the Junkers and of the big industrialists of the Rhine and which is impressed upon a German population, docile, overdisciplined and over-anxious. Our ultimate enemy is the spirit of monopoly, conquest, and national aggression.

The peace terms which we seek turn therefore not primarily on questions of boundaries but on questions of international organization. Frontier questions are important but national security and peace without fear are infinitely more important. We cannot accept a peace which is based on the spirit of conquest, greed or revenge. We are not fighting to dismember or to weaken Empires, to load crushing indemnities on the victims of the war or to humiliate or needlessly injure the enemy. The test of peace terms is whether or not they promote internationalism. We cannot permit Germany to keep her conquests, nor should we assist our own Allies to sow the seeds of future wars by holding alien territories. In this sense we are fighting not only against but also *for* Germany, Austria and Bulgaria. For if we achieve the purposes we have in mind, these nations will find a greater security in the strengthening of international law, in the repression of conquest and in the creation of a League of Nations than they possibly could obtain in a trembling Balance of Power, in which the safety of each nation is hazarded by every secret move on the diplomatic chessboard.

It is easy to work out new maps of Europe and invite the nations at the council table to realize them in the terms of peace. We can lightly incorporate Alsace-Lorraine in France, or establish it as an independent country, or permit the German part of it to become an autonomous German state or leave the whole question to a plébiscite of the Alsatians and Lorrainers. We can resurrect the Poland of 1772 or of 1793. We can give Bosnia to Servia, Transylvania to Roumania, Istria and Dalmatia to Italy, and we can redistribute Macedonia, divide Asia Minor among worthy Powers and let the German colonies go to whoever holds them. There are literally thousands of possible variations of this plan. What is more difficult, however, is to evolve any plan in advance that will meet with the acceptance of the interested Powers. The essential point, moreover, is only touched by these territorial re-arrangements; the real problem lies deeper. It lies in new forms of international cooperation and in the growth of an international spirit. Our immediate task therefore is to establish general formulae for peace, which will be accepted by a sufficient number of people in each nation to make negotiations possible.

The following are suggested as a framework within which the negotiations of peace can proceed.

(1) The peace should not be a peace of conquest, a mere victory of the strong over the weak, an exploitation of the weak by the strong.

(2) It should not be a peace of revenge or greed, a punitive peace, nor a peace giving to the victors whatever they can collect from the vanquished.

(3) It should not be a log-rolling peace, a peace of give and take, like the peace manufactured in Vienna in 1815 or in Berlin in 1878.

(4) The peace should signally establish beyond possibility of doubt the valid-

*Abstract of an address delivered at the Autumn Conference of the I. S. S.

ity and sanction of international agreements, such as the treaty of 1839 guaranteeing Belgian neutrality.

(5) The peace should take a long step forward in recognizing the right to autonomy or even to independence of subject nationalities.

(6) The peace should promote the economic security of nations by means of the extension of the principle of the open door, of equal economic rights in old colonies and new, by the establishment of economic rights of way over territory belonging to foreign nations, by the freedom of the sea, by the denunciation of aggressive or selfish economic leagues, by the promotion of direct or indirect forms of mutual insurance against war and aggressions likely to lead to war. The peace should provide a Permanent International Machinery for the adjustment of economic difficulties between the nations.

(7) The peace should provide for a League of Nations, representing if possible the democratic elements in each nation. Such a League should establish machinery for the arbitration of justiciable disputes and for mediation in cases non-justiciable, as well as for a progressive disarmament by land and sea. The League should have behind it the entire economic and military resources of the signatory Powers.

Not all this can with certainty be accomplished in the peace negotiations which will conclude this war, but no peace should be considered satisfactory which does not aim in the direction of such internationalism, and any peace must be rejected which is based on the old principle of punishing the weak and debilitating the vanquished; thus creating conditions which are directly opposed to the growth of internationalism.

The I. S. S. Research Bureau

By Ordway Tead

The war has made vivid, as no other force could, the value and necessity of forethought, plan and method in the reorganization of social life. The same sort of analysis and proposal that we are studying to secure in international relations is essential to industrial relations and for the same reasons. In both fields there are conflicting interests to be recognized and adjusted, and in consequence questions of policy and method arise which require a type of thoughtful planning as yet all too rare.

The scientific method of study has revolutionized our hopes of the power of thought over human conduct. To know what has been done under known conditions, to plan in the light of that knowledge experimental forms of actions for trial, to observe the success of such trials—by this process we can travel far in formulating practical, helpful proposals for the reorganization of economic institutions. The kernel of this process is honesty and accuracy. The measure of its success is the degree of candor and dispassionateness with which it is employed. Especially in research into problems of economic reconstruction we can afford to be critical of every hypothesis. Only with this complete liberality in the exercise of criticism, will our work gain a hearing, and only so will it stand under the scrutiny of all comers. The successful research organization of our day is conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all facts will receive frank acknowledgment and competent evaluation.

The I. S. S. is fortunate to be able to undertake at this time research which conforms to the requirements of scientific inquiry. We have in this undertaking an opportunity to consider in detail and impartially the enormous problems of reorganizing our industrial life and of writing a democratic constitution for the government of industry. This is a task meriting the best brains the country has. It is the task of the hour. It is undertaken by us seriously and humbly, not because new ideas and sound methods

can proceed full-grown from any one group, but because the task must at least be attempted.

The work of the Research Bureau will begin with one or possibly two major lines of inquiry. Positive decision as to what these should be is not easy. The results of the extension of governmental activity in war time afford one attractive topic. In all probability we shall consider the success of the increase of Federal control over some one type of enterprise, such as railroading—drawing any possible lessons as to the way in which benefits of centralized control would be preserved under government ownership and operation.

The effort will be to publish, probably in book form for general sale, the results of our studies as they are completed, and special attention will be paid to getting publicity for our results. This will be the more important because our investigations will be in fields where the conclusions, if valid, should be worked into the structure and policy of industrial government with approximate immediacy.

In addition, we will attempt to popularize and give publicity to economic writings which come to hand, particularly those from radical groups in Europe. To stimulate in our own universities and in active groups of thoughtful people more and better research on specific industrial problems will be a further effort. There is much thought that can be rendered productive and vital by being directed; and the suggestion to students and organizations of subjects of inquiry which are immediately relevant should help to bring this thinking to earth and to grips with real situations.

We are taking a double view of our problem. We can help to formulate constructive measures which will contribute definitely to immediate reorganization at one point after another. And we should also do what is possible to stimulate sympathy for and insight into the dynamic democratic forces of our era. Without this broad undercurrent of enlightenment respecting changes that impend, the process of reformation will be stupidly delayed or abortively hastened. Either result would be a calamity, since sound progress is gauged not by the position of the scouts reconnoitering in advance but by the proximity of the rear guard. Everything that can be done to render intelligible the attitudes and aspirations of labor groups will be of no little importance in the days when Labor steps forward to claim its voice in the control of national and international destinies.

We bespeak the cooperation of our members in this work. Successful research is not to-day carried on in isolation. We shall require constant and outspoken suggestion and criticism. We have at hand a new chance to help in creating the influences and the administrative machinery which will determine the structure of a happier commonwealth. In initiating the task we are not unmindful of its magnitude, nor of our own limitations. In those two facts lies the stimulus to maximum endeavor.

A Year of Growth

By J. Liebstein, 1918
President I. S. S. Chapter, C. C. N. Y.

The first year or two in the life of the Socialist Study Chapter at City College, New York, was indeed a faltering one. For nearly a year, the College Board of Trustees was undecided as to whether or not it would accept our constitution, finally agreeing to its acceptance on condition that we adopt a name which did not contain the word Socialist.

We made the best of this condition, decided to have our life legalized, and called ourselves the Social Problems Club. Inasmuch as giant intellects had spent so many valuable months in considering our Society, we felt that it must be because of the great importance of the subject with which we dealt. We therefore decided to give the Chapter much

of our energy, and to work, work *all the time.*

We first aimed to win the active support of all the sympathetic forces of the college and to neutralize the hostility of our opponents. A series of splendid public meetings on live questions in relation to Socialism was arranged. The largest lecture hall in the College was chosen as our regular meeting place and an extensive advertising campaign was initiated. Mr. Reuben Ross led the Publicity Committee, which consisted of some of the best artists of the College—a few of the attractive posters turned out by our artists were displayed at the last convention of the I. S. S.

Our plans worked out just as we desired. Our average public meeting drew no less than four hundred. In the collegiate year 1916-17 we were addressed by Misha Applebaum, Gardner L. Harding, Florence Kelley, Senator Henri La Fontaine, John J. Dillon, Commissioner of the Foods and Markets of the City of New York, and Morris Hillquit. Mr. Hillquit has the distinction of addressing the largest meeting ever arranged in the College by students. There were about 800 inside the Chemistry Lecture Theater, while a considerably larger number outside were seeking admission. Some seats had as many as three or four occupants and hundreds stood on the tables.

These very successful meetings have given us a rather conspicuous place on the map of City College. The leading members of the faculty, as well as the entire student body, highly appreciate our work. Our membership has been greatly increased, and the outlook for the future is bright.

In addition to the big monthly lectures, faculty members are asked to give their views on Socialism before our Society. These meetings are held every two weeks, and, although the time assigned them is designated as "Lunch Period," yet they draw an average audience of two hundred. It should not be assumed that our work is all of a passive nature. There is an active phase which receives much attention from us. We have numerous discussions on Socialism, led by members of our Society. These, held during the dinner hour, are also very well attended. The discussions are lively and their participants are many. In adding up the total attendance at our public lecture, faculty meetings, and discussion gatherings of the collegiate year 1916-17, we find that from three to four thousand were present.

However, the word "work" does not haunt us continually. We have social gatherings during the Christmas and Spring vacations. These have grown to be particularly popular. At our December, 1916, soiree there were almost a hundred present. Among the guests were Edwin Markham, who recited some of his sparkling gems; George E. O'Dell, Dr. Laidler and a number of our professors. All had a most enjoyable time, for food, drinks, smokes, songs, talks and fun there were galore. In April, 1917, we had a Spring festival. There were more than 125 present. Members of the Adelphi, Barnard, Columbia and other local Chapters were guests. The intellectual treat was provided by the poet Louis Untermeyer, Florence Kelley, Alexander Trachtenberg, as well as our College poet "Yip" Hochberg, who had distinguished himself at the soiree. Lemonade, cakes and ice cream came to the rescue at the appropriate time.

We hope that Dame Fortune will continue to smile on us. We realize that we are beset by ever-menacing dangers. But we hope not to falter and to measure up to every occasion that may arise. Our program for the new collegiate year is both more extensive and intensive than last year's. A glorious goal, barred by severe, but nevertheless surmountable difficulties is before us! And we shall succeed!

The Saturday Camaraderie

By Louise Adams Grout, Chairman

The Saturday afternoons of February, March and April, 1917, were marked by a unique activity of the New York Alumni Chapter which proved so popular that it is recommended to other Chapters as a method of accomplishing many ends at once. It was known as the "Saturday Camaraderie."

The pleasant rooms of the New York Civic Club were engaged and invitations sent to all Chapter members to come with friends for a social hour and informal discussion on matters of Socialist interest.

Members of the Civic Club were also welcomed and many distinguished comrades and liberals from remote cities and countries were encouraged to drop in when passing through the city; to contribute to the discussion, and to add a variety to the group calculated to keep it continuously interesting. These groups were largely represented.

There were gathered as well a fringe of cautious inquirers into the general subject of Socialism, bent on discovering if all Socialists were really pro-German or what might be the difference, if any, between the I. S. S. and the I. W. W. Belligerent pacifists were there and mild-mannered militarists.

The crisis of America's entrance into the war gave ample material for many-sided controversy, and representatives of England, Germany, India, Ireland and Roumania gave color—at times even a pardonable choler—to the arguments.

After an hour of sociability over the teacups, there was always a twenty-minute address from some person of note and then an hour's discussion of the subject from the floor. Chair room, floor room, standing room and adjacent hall room were hardly large enough for the audience and the closing moments came all too soon for the expression of protests against or approval of the speaker's point of view.

Among the speakers whom the Chapter heard and quizzed were Lajpat Rai, the Indian nationalist; Joseph McCabe, the biographer of Shaw; Charles Zueblin, Charles Levermore, Edwin Markham, Professor Ellen Hayes and many others.

These meetings will be continued during the coming season, and it is hoped that all members of the National I. S. S. will share our Camaraderie when in New York.

The rapid march of history may be relied upon to provide many topics upon which Socialists will feel deeply and hold conflicting convictions. He who thinks only in ante-bellum terms will find himself armed with nothing better than a bow and arrow equipment for the struggle ahead, and we need to forge new weapons for new wars against old privilege.

Moreover, it is necessary for us, in these days when old boundaries are breaking down and new alignments being formed, not only to understand each other's point of view, but to experience the personal contact which is made possible by these gatherings.

"How I hate that opposition Senator!" said a member of Congress. "Do you know him?" asked his friend.

"Of course not, or I couldn't hate him," was the answer.

Let us leave no door open to hate.

Review of Books

STATE SOCIALISM: PRO AND CON. Edited by William English Walling and Harry W. Laidler. With a chapter on Municipal Socialism by Evans Clark. 649 pp. N. Y.: Holt. $2.00.

It became the custom among American socialists and even near-socialists several years ago to be very superior about State Socialism. "Oh, yes, of course," we said, "State Socialism—interesting, you know—very; but really not *Socialism*—oh, no, not at all! Bismarck and all that—New Zealand too—just capitalistic collectivism—nothing more." It was a little unfortunate, because, feeling ourselves so infinitely more holy in our economic devotion than the varied assortment of liberals and progressives the world over who were willing to use the existing machinery of a plutocratic state to accomplish some betterment of conditions, we gathered ourselves unto ourselves and esoterically sulked in our tents. And it was the more unfortunate because here at our very doors, or at doors not very far removed, demonstrations were being made, daily and hourly, of the most important contention we had ever made in support of a Socialist society. The capitalist had said to us in his folly: "There can be no successful enterprise save as it has in it and under it and over it and around it the stimulus of private profit." And we had answered him, in the wrath of our wisdom, that there could be. Only, being not yet possessors of the earth and the machinery thereof, we couldn't prove it. So he had us.

Now—a little belatedly—come to our hands six hundred and forty-nine pages of solidly written proof, proof not of the endlessly argumentative kind, but of the crisply fact and figure kind. We are given to see, the world over, how enterprises organized and directed by the collectivity and returning profits only to the collectivity, are not only as successful, but in many cases far more successful than enterprises organized and directed by private individuals and returning profits to private individuals. Upon their most fundamental contention, therefore, socialists may now write their Q. E. D.

Socialism, let us hope, has passed the stage of perfervid declamation and entered the far more hopeful stage of concrete experimentation. The trouble one finds with the older Socialism is that it was so ecstatically lost in admiration of its perfect economic interpretation that it had no stomach for the wearisome trials and failures, the adaptations and compromises involved in constructive social engineering. A review, such as this volume gives, of the bewildering complexity of enterprises that have enlisted the intelligence of governments, will serve as the best antidote for the eloquent generalizing that is so much in evidence among Socialists and that does so much discredit to the Socialist movement.

But it will do more. To the non-Socialist reader who reads carefully through the tight-packed but fascinating pages which detail the modern movements in the collective organization of finance, agriculture, transportation and communication, commerce and industry, mining, public health, recreation, food supply, housing and so on, it must bring the conviction expressed in the first line of the preface that the "tendency toward collectivism is probably the most portentous movement of the 20th century."

"The book," say the editors, "is in no sense a brief for State Socialism." And strictly speaking, this is true. And yet one cannot help feeling, as the authenticated facts are rolled up, that the editors see in this tendency toward State Socialism not only the most "portentous" but the most encouraging movement of the 20th century—the movement, in short, which is to lead strongly to that essential democracy of industry which is the true goal of the Socialist. "The more a government engages in industrial activities," says the Fabian Research Bureau, "as contrasted with functions merely of police and national defence, the more essentially democratic does the administration tend to become." This would seem to be a justifiable conclusion reached by the study of the facts detailed in the present volume.

In a brief review it is impossible to enter into any adequate discussion of the contents of this important volume. One

would like to say much in emphasis of the illuminating chapter on finance, with its steady pointing to the social monopolization of banking and the elimination of interest; of the various types of extra-governmental government (as in the German Chambers of Agriculture), prefiguring industrial as over against the political parliaments of the present; of the effects of State Socialism in nationalism and internationalism, etc. But reviewers are under the autocratic rule of the blue pencil.

We may simply say therefore in conclusion that Messrs. Walling, Laidler and Evans Clark have, in this volume, published a source book of information, which no social thinker, Socialist or non-Socialist, can well afford to ignore. Besides, in clear arrangement and indexing, the book is a joy to handle!

H. A. OVERSTREET.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF PEACE AND THE TERMS OF ITS PERPETUATION. By Thorstein Veblen. N. Y.: Macmillan. $1.50.

One reads Veblen always for the sheer intellectual joy of reading him. When once you are familiar with his vocabulary, with his heavy irony, with his destructive conceptions that take our modern society so neatly and stand it on its head, you read every new book of his with increased pleasure and understanding. It is like nothing you have read before. Here, you say, is a totally original mind. The words, the intellectual slant, remind you of nothing, refer you to nothing but themselves. Veblen's mind is the most original, perhaps the only original mind in America. And it is an intensely socialistic mind. Veblen's thought does nothing but eat corrosively into the ideals, the activities, the attitudes, of capitalistic society. It riddles all the efficiencies, all the nobilities, all the decencies even, upon which our ruling class has built up its station in the world. Business enterprise, the family, the Church, higher education, the gentleman, the patriot, the military establishment—he leaves them all stripped of any human value, except to provide irony for the beholder. One cannot be intellectually honest and retain respect for existing institutions or reputable types of mind after a careful reading of Veblen. He is more dangerous than all the other revolutionary and radical writers put together. For his weapon is a tough-fibred, irresistible ridicule, which twines itself into every corner of your mind and gives it a permanently anti-capitalistic and anti-magical direction. Irresistibly intellectual argument, saturated with irony—this is what makes Veblen potentially the most revolutionary intellect at work in America to-day.

When he turns it on to the nature of peace, he is as irresistible as ever. He judges the situation by his old standards of the machine-process, Live-and-Let-Live, conspicuous waste. The terms upon which peace can be perpetuated are the same terms upon which magical thinking, economic waste, intolerance, social caste, autocracy, can be destroyed. Peace is possible through no halfway measures. The League of Nations which destroys the Imperial power must itself be thoroughly democratized. The national establishments which exist to guard competitive national policy must themselves follow the dynastic State into oblivion. Trade, shipping, colonial possessions, even citizenship itself, must be neutralized. Economic and social castes must give way to the ungraded commonwealth. Unless the more pacific and more democratic nations are themselves made true social democracies, it is scarcely material to the common man whether the world-subjugation contemplated by the Imperial power of Germany is prevented or not. Veblen is certainly the first writer to examine candidly and comprehensively the advantages of a peace with submission, a "peace without honor." Taking the example of China, he finds much to recommend this method as a means of keeping intact the national culture. But he doubts the Western temper. If the West will not accept the Pax Germanica, it must then destroy the dynastic State, for there is no alternative between submission and conquest. In this work of destroying the dynastic State, he is sure that America must aid, otherwise it will be defenceless. This argument derives largely from his conviction that the modern war-technique makes the offensive invincible and extends indefinitely the range of its ef-

fective power. This seems to be the one weakness in the argument. For certainly the trench deadlock, the immunity of Ostend and Zeebrugge, the failure at the Dardanelles, seem to prove exactly the reverse, namely, that both on land and sea it is the defensive in modern warfare that is incomparably stronger, and that coast defences are practically impregnable against the assault of an offensive launched from across the sea. At least this argument is just as plausible as Veblen's, and, if it is, his argument for the League of Nations is seriously affected. For if America is not defenceless, then she has a chance to begin at once to put into effect that "peace by collusive neglect" of the old theories of international relations which Veblen urges as the ultimate solution. He says, "An institution grown mischievous by obsolescence need not be replaced by a substitute." Yet he ignores the fact that the American entrance has meant the revival for us of a host of obsolescent attitudes, techniques, institutions, which will make just so much harder any peace by collusive neglect of the existing apparatus of international rights, pretensions, discriminations, covenants and provisos. He does not see that the militaristic destruction of Imperial power may indefinitely delay that socialistic peace for which he argues. He gives too little credence, perhaps, to the democratic ferment in Germany, to the possibility of the substitution in the German mind of the matter-of-fact view of things for the traditional outlook based on feudal allegiance.

If you read Veblen closely, however, you see that his subtle mind meets most of these contingencies. He is not engaged so much in an examination of immediate possibilities and programs as in a discovery of the ultimate terms of a peaceful world-order. As he brings his arguments to a head in his last chapter on the destruction of caste and the price-system, you cannot but feel that he has the broadest-reaching Socialist vision of any mind of his time.

RANDOLPH BOURNE.

THE GREAT SOLUTION. By Henri La Fontaine. Boston: World Peace Foundation.

The Great Solution is written by a Belgian Senator, Professor of International Law, and recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. The author therefore speaks with authority when he combines into a body of doctrine the various reforms that have been proposed in international relations. This body he names the Magnissima Charta of the Society of States.

Careful regulations, embodying the results of the Hague Peace Conferences, are given for the Conference of States, the Judiciary Organization, and the International Administration. Most valuable of all is the chapter on the Rights and Duties of States, including such practical suggestions for world peace as the collective exploitation of the globe and the abolition of offensive and defensive alliances.

It is easy indeed to see points of contention in the charter which might defer its adoption to a time not far short of the millennium. When would even the United States, for example, consent to give up its protective tariff, put an end to race exclusion, and submit to a condition of equality with Hayti and Monaco? Would not the principle of equality of states, moreover, perfect as it is ideally, be something of an incentive to the fomenting of secessions, as the United States is said to have assisted the secession of Panama?

To the radical pacifist the suggestion comes once more—"Must we wait till the new order is perfectly devised before we cast off the old? Is it necessary to complete the Constitution before signing the Declaration of Independence?" Let us applaud the professors of international law in their helpful work, but meanwhile the war against war need not be halted.

Finally may we render thanks to Senator La Fontaine for the example he has given us of magnanimity and clearness of vision in the midst of a mad world? Though himself an exile of a country whose wrongs make our own little quarrels sink into insignificance, yet we cannot find in his pages a word of hatred, a trace of narrow nationalism, or any turn-

ing aside from the position that our common enemy is no group of men but the arch-enemy War.

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

THE RESTORATION OF TRADE UNION CONDITIONS. By Sidney Webb. N. Y.: B. W. Huebsch. 50 cents.

The title of Mr. Webb's latest book is a misnomer, both because of the disproportionate amount of space devoted to discussing why the British Government's pledges to the unions cannot be kept and because in the two final chapters the author is less concerned with a restoration of trade union conditions than with an attempt to find for the organized labor movement a more secure basis in policy and a surer foothold in practice than it has previously enjoyed. The inaccuracy is the more serious because a restoration of all trade union terms and conditions in English industrial life is positively repugnant to Mr. Webb. He sees, a little way at least, toward a wiser *rapprochement*. It results that his title gives a suggestion which his meager treatment of the vitally necessary steps toward industrial rehabilitation does not sufficiently counteract.

In this lies the only serious shortcoming of an eminently readable and rapid summary of the influence of the Munitions Act upon trade union affairs. But it is a shortcoming which Mr. Webb must soon make good if his apostleship of the labor movement is to carry over into the next decade with the unchallenged security which has marked it in the past quarter century.

The case as I see it but as it is *not* presented may be briefly stated thus: British employers and statesmen want output after the war. Trade unions have historic objections to productivity, which can be removed only when they have guarantees that they will share in its benefits. Political leaders must choose between an endless fight with conservative unions and a working understanding with increasingly progressive unions, which can be secured if unions are given a voice in controlling industry. Labor's attitude after the war can therefore be somewhat governed by the action of those in power—if they can be brought to see the alternatives.

Mr. Webb intends to present a case which will compel the attention of statesmen. But he neglects to stress the one point which will catch the eye of those preoccupied dignitaries. He should have said explicitly and with amplification: Grant industrial constitutions under which labor can be represented in the consideration of production problems and labor's interests will awaken. Only on such an accredited basis will labor feel confident that it has sufficient protection for the standards it has striven to build up.

The successful labor organizations of the future will be the responsible body of efficient workers, the "guild," which will exercise a positive influence in the affairs of actual manufacture. It is this simple truth which the new prophet of labor will rise to expound.

The wisdom of stressing the argument which will find favor with a known audience is patent, yet it has been ignored in this book—and its wider usefulness will therefore suffer. This is regrettable because all that Mr. Webb has to say must be listened to and acted upon if industrial anarchy after the war is to be kept at a minimum.

Bewildered American students in search of hints as to "what we can do for the labor movement" can profitably ponder this simply written volume, the little brother to the Webbs' more substantial work on "Industrial Democracy" which no serious student of economic reform can afford to leave unread.

ORDWAY TEAD.

THE MENACE OF PEACE. By George D. Herron. N. Y.: Kennerly. $1.00.

In this little book, Mr. Herron sets out very forcefully and eloquently to prove that Germany's military ambitions must be thwarted, and that accordingly any peace negotiated previously to her complete overthrow will be unqualifiedly vicious. And in spite of constant evidences of a religious emotionalism (he calls those agitating for peace at the present time "Satanic seducers of the soul of the world!") and in spite of a tendency toward superficial overstatements, he makes out a strong case against Germany. Nor is he quite partisan; indeed,

depicts the Thing in Europe as an issue, not of black against white, but rather of brown against gray. For instance, Mr. Herron admits the German contributions in the past to the idealism of the world; the German leadership in eradicating slums, in protecting the proletariat against exploitation, in making educational advantages general; the hypocrisies of England and her maltreatment of Ireland and India; and the treachery of Italy.

But on the whole Mr. Herron nevertheless makes good his position that the principles dominating the German government represent an anti-social trend in modern civilization. Even though the struggle must appear to some of us as insignificant in comparison with the Russian Revolution and with a struggle in which the workingmen of all countries would unite to gain their share of the happiness of the world, and even though some of us think that the benefits of political democracy are puny in comparison with the benefits of social democracy, which does not seem to us to be at stake in the present war, yet the average reader will incline to agree with Mr. Herron that the ideals represented by the Allies are higher and nobler than the ideals represented by Germany.

But just when the reader is prepared to be shown that the ideals of Germany can be overthrown only and best by armed force and that such overthrow is more than worth the death and the mutilation of millions of the best stock in Occidental civilization, he is astounded to perceive that Mr. Herron simply takes that fact for granted. Absolutely without discussion, Mr. Herron states as axiomatic the doctrine that evil must be resisted with evil—the doctrine at complete variance with the doctrines of that Jesus whose teachings Mr. Herron lauds on almost every page of his book. Mr. Herron announces fervidly that "the doctrine that might makes right is the archlie of history"; and then imperturbedly assumes that the only method by which the Allies can prove the righteousness of their cause and the sinfulness of Germany's cause is by the ability of the Allies to conquer Germany's cause by the use of might!

Now, it may be that the autocratic repressions which have so far characterized our attempt to make the world safe for democracy by the use of might are necessary, even desirable, insofar as no other methods will suffice to thwart the power of Prussianism. But since the resort to force as arbiter is more characteristic of autocracy than of democracy, the burden of proof must fall upon the shoulders of those who maintain that in the present struggle autocracy can be made to yield to democracy only by the employment of the choice weapon of autocracy. And since in maintaining that position, Mr. Herron relies merely upon statement and not upon proof, his book must regretfully be regarded as a series of links not connected into a chain, not as argument, but only as unsupported assertion, very interesting, very eloquent, but nevertheless unsupported.

BERTRAM BENEDICT.

WILL HE COME BACK? A Comic Interlude. By Felix Grendon. New York: The New Review Publishing Co.

In its highest form the comic spirit is nothing less than moral passion destroying old established morals. In the intense light of this passion, habits of thinking and acting that have grown obsolete, but have not been exchanged for superior habits, excite our ridicule. And this is an important step in advance, for what can survive the ridicule of mankind? Habits like men may be jibed out of existence. When all the world laughs derisively at officials like Kaisers, Prime Ministers, and Presidents, or at habits like drunkenness and dinner parties, such persons or habits are politically and socially doomed.

This comic spirit is at the bottom of Mr. Grendon's farcical play. It takes hold of certain phases of the marriage question and lights up a few of the absurdities that arise when human nature comes in conflict with an institution which, having outlived its usefulness, has thereby acquired a dangerous power to hamper the progress of life.

Clearly, the flippant pleasantries and pungent ironies of *Will He Come Back?* barely hide the author's aim to make us think. The situations, full of dramatic

force, join the startling and the natural in a manner that reminds us of Henri Becque. There are effective stage bits for the groundlings, a little mystification for the highbrows, and lots of delightfully frank conversation for those whose instincts are quick and sound. This conversation is of a kind rarely heard on the stage. When the characters open their lips they do so to express not "the lies they tell one another to conceal what they have done, but the truths they tell one another when they must face what they have done, without concealment or excuse." GILBERT P. MARSDEN.

HENRY FORD'S OWN STORY. As Told to Rose Wilder Lane. Forest Hills, N. Y. Ellis O. Jones, 1917. $1.00 net.

This is the story of a man alive with the spirit of the new social conscience, one of those lean, keen, witful Americans, similar in type to the late "Golden-Rule Jones." The tale is refreshingly told, and is a short cut to a picture of Henry Ford as direct and skilful as the man himself. It depicts his tireless energy moving straight as an arrow to its goal, from the days when the boy melted old wagon tires in his father's shop to make things with, on to his rigging up of a steam farm wagon at sixteen, and to his final conquest of the gasoline motor engine and his marvellous factory organization.

All through the narrative there runs like a shimmering gold thread, his life's motive. A shrewd head and a good heart have kept him true to his creed: "Do the thing that is best for everybody, and it will be best for you in the end." If good millionaires could save the profit system, Henry Ford's type would do it. Although he has not consciously joined those who are working toward a co-operative commonwealth, he is imbued with their spirit.

"The whole system is wrong," he says. "People have the wrong idea of money. They think it is valuable in itself. They try to get all they can, and they've built up a system where one man has too much and another not enough. As long as that system is working, there does not seem to be any way to even things up. But I've made up my mind to do what I can."

The story leaves him at the climax of his business career and at the beginning of his fight for peace. To his colleagues in the latter work, his present station is a mystery. Some day a second story of Ford may be even more interesting than the present very readable volume.

C. L.

THE WAR IN EASTERN EUROPE. Described by John Reed. Pictured by Boardman Robinson, N. Y. Scribner's. 1916. $1.50.

John Reed went to the European battle grounds for the second time in April, 1915. In a three-months' flying trip, he and Boardman Robinson expected to see marvellous changes in the map of the war. As a matter of fact, they arrived almost everywhere during a comparative lull in hostilities. Making an adventurous flight through Serbia, Russia, to Constantinople and "the burning Balkans," they reached Salonika only to find "nothing doing," neither war nor rumors of war! They took ship to Italy, and home. Of course, unknown to them at that moment the French and English troops had only six hours sail to reach Salonika and German and Austrian armies were invading Serbia.

"As I look back on it all," writes John Reed, "it seems to me that the most important thing to know about the war is how the different peoples live; their environment, tradition, and the revealing things they do and say. . . . And in this book Robinson and I have simply tried to give our impressions of human beings as we found them. . . ."

The result is a fascinating series of rapid, informal sketches, side lights on the war which often flash the whole conflict into view. The color which is absent from Robinson's strong illustrations is all in the writer's words. He uses his pen like a brush and words like pigments. With no pretense at learning, the narrative in a few words here and there gives us vistas of racial origins and history, and bits of folk lore and song. In the library of war books, this vivid human portrayal of heart-sick Europe will hold a distinct place.

C. L.

Books Received

King Coal. By Upton Sinclair. N. Y.: Macmillan. $1.50.

His Family. By Ernest Poole. N. Y.: Macmillan. $1.35.

Municipal Ownership. By Carl D. Thompson. N. Y.: Huebsch. 50c.

Jean Jaures. By Margaret Pease. N. Y.: Huebsch. $1.00.

Crimes of Charity. By Konrad Bercovice. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf. $1.50.

Your Part in Poverty. By George Lansbury. N. Y.: Huebsch. $1.00.

The Christian Ministry and Social Problems. By Chas. D. Williams. N. Y.: Macmillan. $1.00.

Human Wisps (Six One-Act Plays). By Anna Wolfrom. Boston: Sherman, French French & Co. $1.00.

Studies in Democracy. By Julia H. Gulliver. N. Y.: Putnam. $1.00.

Syndicalism. By J. Ramsay MacDonald. Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co. 50c.

The Labor Movement. By Harry F. Ward. N. Y.: Sturgis and Walton. $1.25.

Is God Good? By L. W. Keplinger. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. $1.50.

The Christianity of Christ. By Ernest Schneider. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. $1.20.

An Old Wine in a New Bottle. By N. O. Ruggles. Boston: Richard G. Badger. 50c.

College Notes

As this issue goes to press within a few days after the opening of the college year, the Society has thus far few reports concerning Chapter activities. The COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK Chapter held in late September a most successful meeting on "The Russian Revolution," addressed by A. J. Sack, Director of the Russian Information Bureau. Over 500 were in attendance. On October 11, Dr. I. M. Rubinow delivered a lecture on "Social Health Insurance and State Socialism." It is expected that the Russian Ambassador will address the December meeting. J. Liebstein is president and William Winestein secretary of this most flourishing organization.

David Weiss, of WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY, reports that the season there is likely to be the best ever enjoyed by the Socialist Club.

Beatrice Jones, President of the RADCLIFFE Chapter; Adele Franklin, of BARNARD; Mary E. Cover, of VASSAR; Robert W. Dunn, of YALE; Olive Reddick, of OHIO WESLEYAN, and Grace Poole, of Syracuse, are among the most active spirits in their respective Chapters. B. Elconin, of DETROIT COLLEGE OF LAW, reports that a Chapter is in process of formation at that institution.

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, 1917.

State of New York,
County of New York.

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

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

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

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

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

Alice Kuebler Boehme.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of March, 1917.

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

Certificate filed in New York County, No. 374; New York County Register's No. 8317. (My commission expires March 30, 1918.)

TEN-CENT CLASSICS

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

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

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

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

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

A CHOICE GROUP OF BOOKS ON THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT

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

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

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

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

Fabian Essays. By Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, etc. $1.25. A brilliant series of essays, dealing with the development of

capitalism and the promise of Socialism, written from the viewpoint of the unorthodox Fabian Society school of thought.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Harbor. By Ernest Poole. $1.35. "The first novel of the New Democracy."

His Family. By Ernest Poole. $1.50. A brilliant story of New York family life as affected by the modern forces in our great cities.

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.