The Intercollegiate Socialist

Towards Democracy in Reconstruction
By Arthur Gleason

Randolph Bourne
By Florence Kelley
By James Oppenheim

Jessie Ashley
By Freda Kirchwey

Political Prisoners in the United States
By Norman Thomas

The British Elections
By Felix Grendon

French Socialism and the Peace
By Norman Hapgood

The Soviet State of Russia
By C. Kuntz

Karl Liebknecht
By S. Zimand

The Farmers of the Northwest
By A. B. Gilbert

The Tenth Annual Convention, I. S. S.
Summaries of addresses by Albert Rhys Williams, Norman Thomas, Ludwig Lore, Arturo Giovannitti, Evans Clark, Louis B. Boudin, Harry Dana, Scott Nearing, Horace M. Kallen, Rose Schneiderman, James P. Warbasse, Harry W. Laidler.

Discussion in World Socialism
By Ordway Tead and Jessie W. Hughan

College Notes

February-March, 1919 **Fifteen Cents**

The Intercollegiate Socialist

VOL. VII. February-March, 1919 No. 3

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

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.

NOTICES:—(1) As this issue goes to press, arrangements have been made to hold a dinner for discussing the advisability of changing this magazine into a monthly. (2) The next conference of the Society will be held from June 24th to June 30th. The location of the Conference will be Highland, on the Hudson.

Toward Democracy in Reconstruction

By Arthur Gleason

In a time of change, certain master ideas ride a population and carry it far. Prince Kropotkin has said:

"There are moments in the life of mankind when certain general ideas prepared by a slow evolution of the mind get hold with an unprecedented clearness of the great masses of man. Such a moment takes place now."

The danger is that one shall write cautiously and seek to translate revolutionary force into terms of moderate social reform. The balanced and temperate statement of the coming reconstruction will not suffice to render the radical alteration which British labor demands. One feels that something prophetic is needed.

From the ground up the remaking must be done. Europe is in ruins and cannot be tinkered. A restoration of the old society with its institutions just as they stood before the war is clearly impossible. That which has got into the mind of the people is that conscious control of life is possible.

Self-Government in Industry

The modern industrial movement in Western Europe, the movement of the organized workers in trade unions, concerns itself with the organization of producers. Its area is the day's work. It claims that the producer must control production. This means workers' control of industry: self-government in industry. It begins with wages and hours, but it goes on to a share in management. It expresses itself afresh in wartime England in the shop stewards' committees, the spread of industrial unionism, the Triple Alliance, and the joint boards. Its extreme statement (which will not find acceptance in Great Britain) is French and Italian syndicalism, which would brush aside the State and conceivably might end in a tyranny of the strongest trade union, or in an anarchy of contending trades.

The modern political movement of labor in Western Europe concerns itself with the organization of voters. It functions through parliaments, and local councils and boards. It deals primarily with man, the consumer, rather than with man, the producer. It therefore is a territorial geographical association (instead of a workshop association). The members of the association live together. (In the industrial association they work together.) The political movement concerns itself with nationalization of the means of production, the division of the national product and the distribution of wealth. Its extreme statement (which will not find acceptance in Great Britain) is German state socialism which conceivably might stifle freedom in centralized organization.

Advocates of State and Guild Activity

The British labor movement, driven on by the industrial and the political impulse, alike, tends toward "ownership by the state and management by the worker." These are the two master ideas of our time in the world of labor. For the political impulse toward collectivism, the Labor Party is the custodian. Arthur Henderson is the leader of this and Sidney Webb is one of the interpreters, who not only gave constructive statesmanship to the formulation of labor's foreign policies, but with Snowden—at the opposite pole on the war issue—helped to fashion its proposals for radical fiscal changes. But in the domestic field, while the reconstruction plan of the Labor Party is detailed and specific in its outline of legislative minimums as protection against industrial abuses, it is all but bare of reference to the structure of industrial self-defense and self-government, shop by shop, district by district, and trade by trade, to the same end.

Sidney Webb is, in truth, making a last stand fight for the classic interpretation of industrial democracy, where the political state was to be sovereign, owning and conducting the forces of production, and where the unions were to be juniors in the presence of the bearded scientific experts. He tries to soft-pedal the new impulse toward workers' control in which the main drive is that labor is not to be a subordinate, but a partner.

On the other hand, organized labor has come to appreciate the value to itself of scientific method as the result of the tribunals set up by the war. In these too often the workers found that they knew only the facts of their own shops or districts and turned increasingly to such authorities as Webb for the wider view.

For the industrial impulse toward producers' control in industry, there is at present no one custodian. In its local manifestations, the shop stewards are its fore-runners, and in the words of one of the leading labor executives of England—himself a member of a government tribunal—if a John the Baptist rose up among them they would sweep England. In its national manifestation, Robert Smillie (of the miners) and J. H. Thomas (of the railwaymen) and other industrial unionists are its leaders. A. R. Orage, S. G. Hobson, G. D. H. Cole and others are its intellectual interpreters. These last have no direct immediate "following" of votes, but their ideas are helping to swing the labor movement more and more to the "left." They aim at a trade union congress (or, in their vocabulary, a National Guild Congress) which will be executive and legislative for man, the producer, while Parliament will execute and legislate for man, the consumer. The state which they foresee will be a machinery half industrial, half political.

Political and Industrial Wings Necessary

The political movement is ill-advised in under-estimating this industrial movement in its newest manifestation. Arthur Henderson has never fully understood what David Kirkwood and the Clyde Workers' Committee were seeking to do. Some of the advocates of workers' control have an equal distrust of political methods for achieving their aims. This distrust is at times revealed in the writings of Cole and S. G. Hobson, for example. The first labor member of Parliament failed to achieve the large things hoped for and the experience of the rank and file with labor members in the government was disillusioning.

It is probable that the success of British labor in its two-fold movement will be dependent on the adjustment of both impulses to a new and common resultant, just as the organizing faculty of the British people has built up an Empire, while with their ingrained love of personal freedom they have kept fast hold of local self-government. It is in the interplay of these two impulses that we have evidence that British labor is drawing on collectivism, but individualism as well, in endeavoring to strike a new balance between social control and liberty.

Conscription of Wealth

Thus, in the political field, an outstanding lesson of the war to the British worker is that life has been conscripted by the state; therefore, property can be conscripted by the state. He believes that property is an instrument of the common welfare. The Labor Party believes that taxation of incomes and profits will not yield enough to free the country from its oppressive war debt, and that any attempt to tax food or the other necessities of life will be unjust and ruinous to the masses of the people. It, therefore, demands that an equitable system of conscription of wealth shall be put into operation, with exemption for fortunes below $5,000, and a graduated scale of rates for larger totals. But the Labor Party would do more than put the accumulations of past generations into the pot along with the lives and liberties of this. It proposes to extend the wartime taxation of incomes, profits, and inheritances and to apply them in the name of the nation to the purposes of peace as they were applied in the name of the nation to the purposes of the war. It affirms that the land of the nation should belong to the nation, and therefore it calls for the public absorption of the unearned increment of land values. It believes that the day is ending for political parties dominated by the owners of land and capital.

As the economic structure of our time is defined by legislation and administration, British labor desires to play its part in the formulation of legislation and in the responsibilities of administration. There has been an immense increase during the war of industrial discipline under state control. If the state is to become the master, then the workers are determined to exercise a share of con-

trol of the state. "The cause of unrest," said a trade union official in Birmingham, "is that we are trying to fight a great war and at the same time to preserve our individual liberties."

Socialization of Industry

And while the British Labor Party would, on the basis of wartime experience, devote the natural surplus to the social welfare, retain the railways and other forms of common service in public hand, and expand the control and ownership of mines and raw materials, it would be a rash prophet who would assume that it would not leave wide areas for voluntary enterprise. Rather it aims at increased industrial initiative by freeing old stores of wealth and untapped sources of energy to the community. It still employs the verbiage of old days in its manifestoes, for it has not yet created a language to fit its new conceptions. It was one of the jokes of the June conference of the Labor Party, which adopted the reconstruction plan, that Sidney Webb, who has spent his life in arguing for the socialization of wealth, pleaded on the floor of the convention for the minting of a new term; but his efforts were swept under by the votes of trade unionists who preferred the old socialist phrases to unwonted ones for the things they were groping towards.

The End of Unemployment

Similarly, the Labor Party holds that it is the duty of government to find suitable work for all, on penalty, failing this, of providing maintenance for the workers. It has little patience with the notion that it is the fear of starvation that makes the world go round; rather that it is premature work, overwork, undernourishment, unemployment that slackens its production. But this does not mean that it favors a lethargic communism. The wartime organization of Britain's man power makes it believe that it is entirely possible to find work for all; the wartime leap forward in productivity makes it believe that this is not only possible but that an altogether new level of output and general prosperity can come into being. And not the least basis of its faith rests in the belief that if men feel that they are working merely for their week's wages and the profits of private employers, one of the greatest motivations of all is neglected. When men worked in wartime England for the nation's cause, they put their backs into it.

Bureaucracy vs. Individual Liberty

Underneath it all, British labor is determined to shake off bureaucratic interference and regimentation which the war has revealed as contrary to the fundamental instinct for individual liberty. Labor will continue to oppose a rigid state socialism with this devolution of function. Direct sovereignty over their own lives is the genius of the workers' control movement which parallels and tempers the political movement. It is a movement for status—for increasing, not decreasing, the muster of self-dependent Englishmen.

It is not attempting to take over factories, and put them into the hands of the workers, like the Russian soviets. It is going ahead one step at a time, administering first workshop conditions, then sharing in the management of the factory process. It is not trying to extemporize executive experience over night. It acts inside its area of competence, but the change it is effecting in the organization of industry is fundamental. Just as, politically, British labor does not make a wholesale conscription of property, but nevertheless, plans to nationalize the agricultural land, the mines and railways, to conscript accumulated wealth on a graduated scale, and to tax income and profits, so industrially, British labor does not set out to take over the entire industrial process at one stroke. Rather, it is a challenge to the old conception which left autocratic power in the hands of one factor in production—the owner of private capital. It is a decisive step toward industrial self-government. It will find expression in no one formula, but will manifest itself experimentally in a hundred different forms whether under public or private ownership. It is, nonetheless, a decisive step toward the integration of economic self-government by shops, districts and industries, that will fairly parallel the form of civil government from town to nation.

Representation of Consumers

Here the political labor movement will come in as a tempering force, with its emphasis on the consumers' or national stake in industrial negotiations and arbitrations. Under the government's Production Committee, the tribunals include the employers, labor leaders and the public. This is a divergence from old trade union practice when the case was threshed out jointly by employes and employers alone. Thus, under the old scheme there was nothing to prevent the entrepreneurs and the unions from rigging the public. In ship building plants, for example, the employers might yield to the demand of workers for increase in pay and tack it straightway onto the sale price. In wartime, this was of immediate national concern. It threw open the whole question of how far the industry could stand by economies and lessened profits, the wage increase without price increase, and how far one given craft could by its monopoly position gouge the whole public.

A World View.

The newer communal view is taking hold of the newer leadership in the union movement, and can be counted on to carry throughout the labor world, as against the older narrower craft view. It has manifested itself in concern for all the workers in other industries, purchasers of their product, and for all the workers of the world. The new communal idea in labor policy asserts itself not only in the settlement of labor issues, but in the proposals for the nationalization of basic industries and common services. Characteristic of it were the resolutions adopted by the British Labor Party in its wartime conferences, repudiating the Paris agreement. Lloyd George did not meet labor's point of view in his statement of December, 1917, as it would have meant a break with dominant elements in the war cabinet. But neither did he support the Paris agreement in his statement of war aims. He omitted it in deference to the prevalent labor sentiment, which saw that the struggle in the international field must be to make democracy victor over privilege. Accordingly, labor called for democratic control over raw materials. It called for an international control over those weak and exploitable territories which are the stakes of secret diplomacy. It demanded that there should be no more dumping on the markets of the world of goods, produced by sweated labor. But it took its stand against divisive grade alliances, boycotts and the perpetuation in an economic war after the war of the forces that had let the world in for this one.

With the monopolistic craft type of mind tends to go the support of the two party system of trade government (employers and employes), the support of a protective tariff wall behind which they can jointly put up the prices of product and the wages of the craft to the detriment of the rest of the body of workers; the support of schemes for trade harness and economic isolation of competing nations. Its adherents among British trade unionists lend themselves to what J. A. Hobson calls Prussian-Australianism—a "khaki" party of imperialism, protective tariffs, colonial exploitation and state-aided industries, high wages and polematistic schemes for labor. Henceforth, says Mr. Hughes of Australia, the workman must labor at the plough, "with his sword strapped to the handle."

But British labor sees a different future from that. In international policy, it steadfastly insisted on its principle of democratic appeal to the common people of the enemy. It formulated that appeal and laid it before the workers of the hostile countries. In building its international program, labor worked out a new organization. Efforts had been made to create a Trade Union Inter-Allied Conference. They failed. Efforts were also made to create a Socialist Inter-Allied Conference. They, too, failed. Finally, cohesion was found by uniting the forces of the trade unions and the Socialists in the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference. It is in thus harmonizing the two active principles at work in the labor movement that British organizers display their leadership.

Above the Nation

The leaders of Britain have held their people united through four years of war.

A nation waging a defensive warfare on its own soil, instinctively reacts as a unit against the invader. So France has had little question of the issues of the war. And the military power of Germany, drunk on victory and conquest of enemy territory, bound its people to a single purpose. But England's task was more difficult. Uninvaded and without victories, she held united. Labor leadership deserves much of the credit for this long-enduring unity. The workers were the backers of the war and the forerunners of peace.

They freed themselves from the vague internationalism of alien groups which tended to disregard the deep instinct of nationality, and at the same time they refused to permit the passions of war to divert them from their constructive program for an international order. They never blurred the issues of the struggle against Prussian aggression. But they were equally determined that military victory should not be used for territorial aggrandizement and the perpetuation of hate. It is the merit of the British and Inter-Allied workers that during war they reached out beyond the war to the fellowship of free peoples.

It was to this effect and in this even tone of justice that Inter-Allied labor spoke to the nations of the world, and, in so speaking, assured the common people of the enemy that they would not exchange one oppression for another if they overthrew their autocratic government.

J. W. Ogden, chairman of the Derby Trade Union Congress, said:

"Let us lift our minds above the clouds of doubt, suspicion, and dissension that have blurred our vision and warped our judgment, and in the higher, clearer and purer atmosphere we shall discern the true goal of our aspirations and ambitions. The industrial Canaan towards which we have wended so long and so laboriously, world brotherhood, may seem farther away today than ever. In spite of that I shall still look towards it as the salvation of the work, and the only hope of the workers."

The New Spirit

The British labor movement is an organic growth, which, like everything else in wartime England, has gone through in four years what would ordinarily have required twenty years. In principles and procedure it is entirely at variance with the Bolsheviki movement in Russia. The war has differentiated it from continental socialism. The spokesmen and programs of British labor do not voice class hatred. Labor is developing something different from the old-time trade unionism (with its concentration on wages and hours) and the old-time class-conscious socialism —broader than the one, freer than the other, typically English in its inconsistencies.

What baffled some American visitors in British labor is what baffles the elderly in the life of Europe today; the variety and wealth of creative impulse, the hearty dissent from custom and tradition, and the zest for challenging the very origins of belief, and for shaking the foundations of venerable institutions.

It is an experimental attitude toward life. The spirit of all this quest is so springy and buoyant and impudent that the forces of reaction have hardly had time to mobilize. An elan is being recaptured, lost for one hundred and fifty years of industrialism.

British labor cannot be charted off into tidy little thought forms. It is a living, growing, and moving thing. Its vitality spills over into many activities. To the observer it seems as unwieldly and top-heavy and split up as the British Commonwealth of which it is an ever-growing part. But under crisis it reveals the same inner cohesion as the British Commonwealth has revealed under the strain of war. A community of spirit holds British labor together. Back of its machinery of action there is a profound belief. It is a belief in the worth of the individual person. And this belief leads to the desire for founding a society of equals, a human brotherhood, where the common man will be at home.

Randolph Bourne*

By FLORENCE KELLEY

Of all the costs of war the direst is the loss of the torch bearers. Our poor old human race, throughout all the years of its history, has destroyed the flower of its youth. It has thus dimmed its sight and dulled its ears to that new truth without which it could not fully live, and this is doubtless a prime cause of the tragic slowness of its upward progress. For the eyes of youth seek the sunrise, it is in young minds that the entrance of strange, new thoughts causes least pain. When the fire of a new idea blazes, they it is who eagerly light the torch and carry it hither and yonder, knowing no rest.

Through all the past old men have sent their sons to death, insanely thinking this sacrifice their own,—and glorious! And now, once more, a priceless flaming torch has been extinguished.

"Write on and, after the war, we can print your work," said timid publishers and quaking editorial boards, shivering under the espionage law. But for him there is no "after the war." For, after the armistice, with the coming of the anniversary when the Christian world acclaims Peace on Earth, Good Will to Men, pneumonia took Randolph Bourne among its millions. The cruel enforced silence of his last year has become the silence of eternity. His pen is still. His torch lies dull upon the ground. Tears and burning rage and lasting grief are vain. The loss is loss forever. America is a poorer land forevermore because Randolph Bourne is dead.

Of his scant thirty years, his last should have yielded the richest gains for our nation—so generously endowed with everything but thought, so poor in beauty of literary form. Burdened from the cradle as almost no one is burdened, that gallant spirit, accepting Nature's challenge, became himself a living challenge. Randolph Bourne was no propagandist, no apostle of creed or party. He was a critic endowed with subtle discernment of the inner meaning of his time and his contemporaries. Fear, stupidity, shams, reaction in minds and teachings which we thought modern, the penetrating rays of that torch revealed for what they are. His was no lambent flame; it flared and scorched.

Rarely gifted, his musician's ear heard the music of English words. We Americans who write on economic and social subjects (worst of all the pedagogs!) seem doomed by some strange curse to write jargon. But Bourne, by the singular charm of his art, led his readers to follow his argument however repugnant to them the content might be. It was an art admirably mature, still aglow with the daring energy of youth, sadly destined never to come to full fruition. Readers of *The Atlantic* thrill at the recollection of Bourne's challenge to "The Older Generation." His "War and the Intellectuals," in the Seven Arts, by the sheer beauty of its English compelled a reading.

Bourne's writings, so appealing in their promise, now never to be fulfilled, should be instantly collected. They will be at once his finest memorial and the sternest rebuke, because unconscious, to the men who once were radicals and now march safely in the rear ranks of academic reaction, who, (because of their fears?) saddened those gloomy closing months.

Our country has glorified the bravery of the soldiers, picked for their physical qualities, for the courage that is common to wild beasts and to men. Bourne's was rare spiritual courage, valiant, unswerving. Stoically he endured the physically intolerable, and gaily sought adventure in the world of intellect, his weapon the most poignant pen our century has disclosed.

---

*Editor's Note: Mr. Bourne was a member of the I. S. S. since his student days at Columbia. When the war broke out, he was planning to attend the informal international conference of university Socialists scheduled for Vienna for August 21, 1914. He has been a frequent reviewer for THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST and was at one time secretary of the N. Y. Alumni Chapter. Mr. Bourne died suddenly of pneumonia on December 22, 1918.

RANDOLPH BOURNE

DIED DECEMBER 22, 1918

From the Dial

1

We wind wreaths of holly
For Randolph Bourne,
We hang bitter-sweet for remembrance;
We make a song of wind in pines. . .
Wind in pines
Is winter's song, anthem of death,
And winter's child
Is gathered in the green hemlock arms
And sung to rest. . .
Sung to rest . . .
Waif of the storm
And world-bruised wanderer . . .
Sung to rest. . .
Sung to rest in our living hearts,
We receive him,
Winding our wreaths of holly
For Randolph Bourne.

2

Winter lasts long
And Death is our midnight sun
Rayless and red. . .
Peoples are dying, and the world
Crumbles grayly. . .
Autumn of civilization,
Gorgeous with fruit,
Dissolves in storm. . .
And we,
Our dead about us,
Know the great darkening of the sun
And the frozen months,
Sounding our hemlock anthem,
Hanging our bitter-sweet. . .
We walk in ruined woods
And among graves:
Earth is a burying ground. . .
Nations go down, and dreams
And myths of peoples
And the forlorn hopes
Make one burial. . .
And we
Came from the darkness, never to see
A Shakespeare's England,
A Sophocles' Athens,
But to live in the world's latter days,
In the great Age of Death,
Sons of Doomsday. . .
He also came,
And walked this crooked world,
Its image.

3

In him the world's winter,
Ruined boughs and disheveled cornfields,
And the hunchback rocks
Gray on the hills,
Passed down our streets. . .
Passed and is gone; and for him and the dying world
Our dirge sounds. . .

4

Yet suddenly the wind catches up with glory
Our anthem, and peals wild hope,
Blowing of scattered bugles . .
And the wind cries: Look,
Pierce to the soul of the cripple
Where, immortal,
The spirit of youth goes on,
Which dies never, but shall be
The green and the garland of the Spring.
And the wind cries: Down
To the dissolution of the grave
The crippled body of the world must go
And die utterly,
That the seed may take April's rain
And bring Earth's blooming back.

5

Bitter-sweet, and a northwest wind
To sing his requiem,
Who was
Our Age,
And who becomes
An imperishable symbol of our ongoing,
For in himself
He rose above his body and came among us
Prophetic of the race,
The great hater
Of the dark human deformity
Which is our dying world,
The great lover
Of the spirit of youth
Which is our future's seed. . .
In forced blooming, we saw
Glimpses of awaited Spring.

6

And so, lifting our eyes, we hang
Bitter-sweet for remembrance
Of Randolph Bourne.
And winter's child
Is gathered in the green hemlock arms
And sung to rest. . .
Sung to rest in our living hearts;
We receive the rejected,
Weaving a wreath of triumph
For Randolph Bourne.

JAMES OPPENHEIM.

Jessie Ashley

By FREDA KIRCHWEY

The death of Jessie Ashley on Monday, Januaary 20, 1919, took from the Executive Committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society one of its ablest and most valued members, and from the labor movement as a whole a valiant, uncompromising worker. This is a time when the world can ill afford to lose people of the hardy fibre of Jessie Ashley. She combined keenness and vital mental power with an unflinching honesty that drove her from a position of comfortable intellectual security to the very heart and depth of the working class movement. A classmate at the New York University Law School has recalled that Jessie Ashley graduated and started to practise law with the only half-whimsical determination of becoming another Joseph Choate. Her antecedents, her surroundings, her associates, all were such as to lead her along safe and quiet paths of intellectual and social life. But the power that made her study law when few women entered the legal profession also made her venture unafraid into the ways her own clear vision pointed out.

In the summer of 1907, animated by a spirit of intellectual adventure, she began to study Socialism. When she saw where her study must lead, she still went straight ahead. She joined the Socialist Party and ever since has been a constant and active member. Even when later on she developed a distrust of political action, her devotion to every effort in the right direction and her unflinching respect for other honest opinions held her in the Party ranks. She worked with the I. W. W. in strikes and out of them. She taught a course for women at the New York University Law School, and joined in the successful fight for woman suffrage and the fight, still unwon, for legal birth control. Wherever there was a movement designed to help the oppressed and disfranchised, politically or socially or industrially, that movement belonged to Jessie Ashley by right of valiant sympathy and participation. Her life is a challenge and a summons to the men and women of her time; a summons to comradeship and effort well voiced by John Galsworthy in his poem, "Errantry."

Come, let us lay a crazy lance in rest
And tilt at windmills under a wild sky;
For who would live so petty and unblest
That dare not tilt at something ere he die
Rather than, screened by safe majority,
Preserve his little life to little ends
And never raise a rebel battle-cry.

The Executive Committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, in its sorrow at losing so fine a friend, can only express its gratitude at having had the privilege of knowing Jessie Ashley and sharing some part of the vigor and inspiration of her life.

Resolution of the Executive Committee, I. S. S.

The Executive Committee of the I. S. S., at its February meeting, passed the following resolution regarding the death of Miss Jessie Ashley:

Whereas, suddenly in the days of her greatest usefulness, death has taken from us Jessie Ashley, and

Whereas, for long years with a rare union of legal acumen and fearless spiritual adventure, she gave her powers to the cause of human emancipation, and, in so doing aimed not to impose her will but to further the progress of each avenue of approach to that great end, and

Whereas, the dearest cause to her was Socialism and among the many organizations which she furthered was the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, to whose support she generously contributed and on whose executive committee she served for two terms and up to her last day. Therefore, be it

Resolved: That we, the members of the Executive Committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society hereby bear our tribute of sincere appreciation and gratitude and convey to her family, comrades and friends our deep sense of the loss which we share with them.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
The Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

Political Prisoners in the United States

By Norman Thomas

Americans who heretofore have either not known what a political prisoner was or have associated him with Russia now have a singular opportunity to study his problem in the United States. There are, at the present time, approximately 500 prisoners in Fort Leavenworth Disciplinary Barracks who have refused military conscription. These are usually called conscientious objectors, and the grounds for their objection are many and various. There are at least 1,000 men and women, perhaps 2,000 (and the number is steadily increasing although the war is really over), in various prisons throughout the country, who were convicted under the Espionage Act or corresponding State laws, not because they were German spies or had any communication with Germany or made violent attack of any sort upon our government; but for the expression of opinion which judge and jury decided impaired the national morale or obstructed the course of the war.

The alleged justification for imprisoning such political offenders is that in time of emergency they seriously distract the popular mind and make the common task more difficult. Not only do they not take what the majority feels is their share in the struggle, but they are an added weight upon a nation in arms. On the other hand believers in freedom argue that progress depends upon the heretic and the dissenter, that truth arises out of discussion, and that just because the war is a great emergency it is necessary that we should know the truth, that if we desire war to make for justice, we should not turn it into an instrument of coercion at home. Life for free men is intolerable if the state is to claim their very souls to use at its pleasure.

Comparison of Sentences

Into the merits of this dispute I shall not now go. Both sides will unite in the conviction that if the emergency is passed it is cruel folly to treat the political offender more harshly than most criminals. This is precisely what is being done in America. The average sentence for conscientious objectors runs from ten to thirty years. At Camp Funston, from which many of the objectors have been sentenced, two soldiers guilty of bigamy were, I am reliably informed, recently sentenced to two years. Mrs. Stokes was sentenced for ten years for charging that the government was for the profiteers, and a captain in the United States army guilty of fraud in the rain coat scandals was sentenced to one year. No European government has begun to impose such sentences upon its political offenders guilty of far more serious offenses against the will of the state. Moreover, political prisoners in European countries are given a special status. The editor of *Avanti,* confined in an Italian prison, is still able to write frequent editorials for his paper. In America men and women of this type are drenched in the physical and moral filth of our shamefully conducted penal institutions. Until very recently in the Fort Leavenworth military prison conscientious objectors have been confined in dark, vermin-ridden solitary cells for indefinite periods, fed every alternate two weeks on bread and water, manacled to the bars of the cell nine hours a day, forbidden to read, write or talk. In addition, guards imposed brutalities of their own devising upon these defenceless men. Manacling was finally abolished, not only for conscientious objectors but for all prisoners as a direct result of a sympathetic strike in prison inaugurated by conscientious objectors who deliberately refused to work in order to share the sufferings of their brethren whose consciences forbade them to obey military orders in a military prison, and who in consequence had been subjected to this form of torture. Still more recently, owing to public protests, conscientious objectors at Leavenworth have been taken out of the solitary cells. The Board of Inquiry, consisting of Judge Mack and Dean Stone, has interviewed most of the objectors and it is understood that some of them whose original conviction was technically incorrect or involved glaring injustice, are to be discharged; but there still remain a class of political prisoners

confined in military prisons out of which have come hideous tales of the torture of men in the name of the great god Discipline.

Social Radicals Hardest Hit

Less is known of the conditions in the various prisons where offenders against the Espionage act are confined, but some grim stories have been told of their sufferings. It is particularly important to bear in mind that political prisoners under the Espionage Act, in nearly every case, are social radicals. Whether as a result of deliberate or instinctive action, the Espionage Act has been used far more effectively as a weapon in the class struggle than in the national war which has ended. The recent conviction of Morris Zucker, in Brooklyn; of the Socialists in Chicago; and of the I. W. W. "silent defenders" in Sacramento proves the Espionage law is still in full power as a club to silence the radical.

One need not be a Socialist or a radical of any sort to recognize that the story of political prisoners in the United States is a record of national humiliation and gross injustice. If we allow these ferocious sentences to be served out we shall sow for ourselves the winds out of which we ourselves or our children after us will reap the whirlwind. Every consideration of expediency, of true patriotism, of social progress, of justice, demands the immediate repeal of the Espionage Act and a general amnesty for political and industrial prisoners.

The British Elections

By Felix Grendon

Seldom has a national election upset fewer calculations. Lloyd George and the Coalition won hands down, the Labor Party increased its Parliamentary strength from 38 members to 65, Sinn Fein swept Catholic Ireland, and the Asquith dissenters were snowed under. These results, almost in their actual proportions, were predicted in too many quarters to take any student of British politics by surprise.

Clearly, the outcome gives Lloyd George a popular mandate to conduct the interests of Great Britain through the closing scenes of the great war. The man who has been in the saddle during the final months of warfare is not to be unseated before the end of the Peace Conference. Considering human nature as we find it, what is more natural? People will not swop horses while crossing a stream, even if the only road on the other side leads to the city of destruction.

A Peace Conference Mandate

Does the vote mean more than this? Turn first to the figures. The Coalition members of the House number about 400 more than the largest party opposed and exactly 235 more than the combined opposition.* Observe also that the Prime Minister's lieutenants are Milner, Curzon, and Arthur Balfour, men who stand for pretty much the same Junker social scheme that is championed by Taft, Senator Lodge, and Elihu Root. Does the huge Coalition majority mean, then, what it seems on its face to mean? Does it mean that the British people endorse the program of the Junkers and spurn the program of Bob Smillie, Arthur Henderson, Bernard Shaw, and the Inter-Allied Labor Conference?

The best answer to this question is, that extremely few political students think so, even in the coalition camp. Truth to tell, not many people doubt that English domestic affairs are ripe for the

---

*Estimates of the majority, varying according to the political complexion of the estimator, range from a little over 250 to a little over 400. The *New Statesman* says: "The *Times'* notion of the Coalition majority is 262, and it appears a fair one. Adopting it, one arrives at the result that 5,091,520 electors voted Coalition, and 4,598,486 electors voted anti-Coalition. The average Coalition M.P. represents 10,000 electors, the average anti-Coalition M.P. 20,000 electors. Thus, proportionately, the Coalitionists have achieved nearly twice the representation of anti-Coalitionists. Which somehow recalls the eccentricities of the Prussian franchise."

day when Labor and the Thinkers are to strip for the most determined sort of action against Capital and the Peers. But hardly any one supposes that Lloyd George will be in office on that day. When Sainte Beuve was asked whether he believed Louis Napoleon's government would last, the candid Frenchman replied: "Sir, I am paid to believe it." But even those who are paid to believe that Lloyd George's government will last make no bones of their unbelief. And they betray their want of faith not merely in the view that the winner may hope to develop staying powers, but in the theory that the electors, when they returned Lloyd George, endorsed his policies. Thus the London *Saturday Review,* a supporter of the Coalition, gives the whole show away: "The great leap into universal suffrage may do no harm this time—*the new electors were* not ready. But next time!"

There can be no doubt that, in committing England to a general election, as soon as Germany's collapse was assured, Lloyd George played the political game with his usual giddy cunning. But, in the campaign itself, this quality deserted him. That he would get a mandate to steer British interests through the Peace Conference was a foregone conclusion. But the Prime Minister wanted a mandate that should cover much more than this. He wanted a mandate, above all things, that should entrust his government with all the problems of the period of reconstruction.

Now it is probable that he could have had the Peace Conference though he had promised nothing, and that he could *not* have had the Reconstruction period unless he had promised everything. But what did he actually do? He promised everything for the Conference and nothing for Reconstruction. He blew hot on the fire of international hatred and cold on the corpse of domestic reform. Consider the first part of his program. He offered to hang the Kaiser, to make the Germans pay to the last red cent, to get the soldiers home like lightning, and to give the returned warriors a square deal. In short, when it came to the foreign settlement, he fortified his voice by eating fire, and used the robustious tongue of the circus barker. But notice how, when it came to the domestic settlement, he softened his voice by eating chalk and used the candied tongue of the wolf that beguiled the Seven Little Kids.

Reconstruction and the Campaign

For, as regards the social problems after the war, he offered nothing but piffling generalities. It was only too clear that he meant to take the craft along on the old lines without a thought of reefing down unless the political outlook forboded a tornado. True, he spoke glibly of "reconstruction." In fact, he talked *reconstruction* until he had "tortured one poor word ten thousand ways." But the long and the short of it was that, whatever else it might mean, Lloyd George's reconstruction did *not* mean the only thing it should have meant, and that was the abdication of private monopoly, the death of privilege, and the annihilation of social slavery.

Even this is not the full story of the Coalition victory. Such was the cheapness of their appeal to patriotism, and the emptiness of their program for reconstruction, that all decent people were heartily disgusted. Barely fifty per cent of those who came to register returned to vote, and the apathy of the electors who went to the polls, coupled with the indifference of those who stayed away, was by long odds the most exciting phenomenon in the whole campaign. It was such a staggering phenomenon that it has kept all but the most fanatic even of the Coalition newspapers from hugging the illusion that the New Government can long survive the end of the Peace Conference at Versailles.

The Labor Party's New Rôle

One fact stands out bold and clear. The Labor Party, the only party to come before the nation with a program of drastic social reconstitution, has almost doubled its membership in Parliament, and has added immeasurably to its prestige both at home and abroad. To this sequel, a historic departure in the House points the moral. As the minority group with the greatest unity of purpose and with the most radical platform of dissent, the Laborites have taken the official place of the party in Opposition.

Who can foresee what this departure portends? For the first time since Roundhead faced Cavalier in the House of Commons, the line-up represents two sharply-divided and irreconcilable forces — no mere battledore and shuttle-cock between Tory despot and Whig slaver as in the past two hundred and fifty years. The presence of the Labor leaders in the Opposition front benches means a recognition of the fact that in the midst of every modern country there are two nations, between whom is a great gulf fixed. It involves an advertisement of the grim truth that the one nation has means, leisure, opportunity, power, while the other has poverty, drudgery, restriction, slavery. Mr. Lloyd George appeals to his countrymen for unity; he calls for a new comradeship of the masses and the classes, meaning a continued pliancy of the one and a prolonged lease of despotism for the other. By contrast the Labor Party demands the only workable kind of unity, a unity based on a complete extermination of the parasites and a full recognition of the economic and moral claims of the workers by hand and by brain.

Meanwhile the Coalition marks time, and Lloyd George affects a seasoned air of triumph. Not at all daunted by the menacing reports from Germany and Russia, he can see nothing below the placid surface of the election but a reassuring calm. Picture him in this interesting rôle. He looks with gorgeous complacency into Britain's industrial volcano, and, like the American tourist who peered into the crater of Vesuvius, he declares that "there is nothing in it."

The Alternative

But his followers are daily giving evidence of more and more uneasiness, a feeling reflected in the growing petulance of their press. They have stopped alternately jeering at the new opposition and stroking its fur the right way. For the Labor Party is asking the question of the hour in a voice that will not be denied. Is England to witness a social and economic development comparable to the deep and far-reaching changes in Continental Europe, or not? Labor has served notice that it is ready to give this question a constitutional answer in the affirmative and to conduct the English Government through the sequel. There are signs that all but the die-hard Junkers are soberly considering this answer. They are considering it without rapture. But they are considering it. Meanwhile, it is becoming clearer every day that the only alternative answer is—Bolshevism.

French Socialism and the Peace

By Norman Hapgood

There has been a great deal in the newspapers lately about the French socialist parties. Whenever I read these newspaper articles, my mind dwells partly on the parliamentary groups, but far more on the masses of French people. In some respects I think the parliamentary socialist groups represent large masses, and in other respects I should think a very small fraction of the French people. No one can have failed to notice, for example, that the strongest expressions of cordiality to Woodrow Wilson's views of the need of a League of Nations came, during his visit to France, from the socialists. Some of the extremely orthodox and theoretical American socialists have opposed the League of Nations on the ground that it would be a league of bourgeois nations and would, therefore, strengthen the bourgeoisie.

The League of Nations

It is of interest to notice that both wings of the Socialist Party in France are equally strong for a league. Both wings have existed long enough and borne responsibility enough to be able to do what is necessary to any kind of government of such a complex thing as a large aggregation of human beings. They are able really to see the significance of their formula, and at the same time the

complexity of the conditions to which it must be applied, in greater or less degree according to the opportunities. Karl Marx said that one real step in advance was worth all the doctrine in the world. It sometimes seems to me that my friend Max Eastman and other American socialists do not always realize the wisdom of Marx's observation, or the importance of using their economic bible as an inspiration and orientation instead of as a rigid dogma to be followed line by line and letter by letter in any and every circumstance. The passion of the French socialists for a League of Nations has been a passion for general human progress, spiritually, intellectually and materially.

I spent seven months of 1917 in France, and was also there in 1915, and I did what I always do—sought to get at the views of the average man and woman. It is always easy for a person representing any journalistic organ of importance to get the opinions of the governing class. Those opinions are pushed at one at every turn. The real problem is to be able to complete one's view by getting the outlook of the large elements in the community that have no spokesman. The French are talkative people, and if one sympathizes with them and takes every opportunity to converse in railway trains, on trams, in cafés, or in the army, it is not more difficult certainly than it would be in our own country to get a line on them.

The Question of Alsace-Lorraine

When I was in France, the ordinary soldier and the ordinary peasant and laboring person, whether man or woman, certainly agreed with the Russian slogan of no indemnities and no annexations. The populace even carried these principles so far as to apply them to Alsace-Lorraine. The upper class had its doctrine neatly worked out about why Alsace-Lorraine should be taken back absolutely and by force. The masses were afraid of such a reconquest because they believed that it would create the same problem turned the other way around. That is to say, the Germans in Alsace-Lorraine would be dissatisfied, and you would have another breeding ground of trouble. That was before the complete collapse of Germany, and it is possible that French peasant opinion has been changed by victory. As we know, German opinion was very liberal in July, 1917, at the time of the famous Reichstag Resolutions. Brest-Litovsk came along at a time of brilliant military accomplishments, and there was not liberalism enough in Germany of an effective kind to make much headway against the army chiefs. It is easily conceivable that the same psychology may be applied to France, and that the Entente victories may have changed the French peasant's point of view. I hardly think so, however, for the French peasant is not a newspaper-fed animal. He is a person who talks and sings and thinks in his own group, and his ideas are pretty firmly rooted.

As to the extent to which orthodox socialism has grown or decreased among the peasants or laboring people in France during the war, there is no way of adequately finding out, since there have been no elections. I did not run into much of it, but that may have been partly because I am not interested in orthodox socialism, or in anything else that is orthodox, and am extremely interested in general attitudes which take account of the complexities of life; that is to say, which mingle judgment and instinct with theory.

It is understood of course generally in this country among thinking people that the French parliamentary socialists do not represent socialism in France as broadly as the British Labor Party represents the whole social trend in England, because there has never been an amalgamation of the big syndicalist bodies with the parliamentary socialists, whereas in England the Labor Party represents all, except a few small groups, that believe in economic radicalism, whatever form it takes.

Majority and Minority Socialists

The recent overthrow in the control of the Socialist Party in France is the natural result of victory. Nothing is harder than to defend by force an invaded nation and yet keep untainted one's universal or international principles. The emphasis must go either to the immediate

object of self-defense with the probability of warping one's permanent beliefs, or on one's permanent beliefs with the danger of lessening the efficiency of defense. During that part of the war, therefore, when France was groggy under the German assaults, it was quite natural that the group represented by Renaudel and Thomas should keep the control because they were the group whose first proposition was that action to thwart the German forcible intention was the duty of all men. It was equally natural that when Germany ceased to be a menace, the control of the party should swing to the Longuet group, since they were the group that had always taken a more passionate interest in the ultimate doctrine that they had in the immediate consideration, and since it was obvious to the fair-minded that after the collapse of Germany the great danger to the increase of liberty throughout the whole country no longer came from Germany but from the triumphant powers.

Whoever will notice the first use that the Longuet group made of their victory will realize, I think, the balance and wisdom that exist in the party in France. Their first important practical step was to capture the control and editorship of their great organ, *L'Humanité*. Whom did they put in charge of the paper, with almost unlimited control for the time being of its policy? Not one of their own left-enders, but perhaps the finest mind in the party—a man highly endowed with intellectual brilliancy and distinction, but also with that sense of measure that is necessary to the successful use of power. Cachin is called a man of the center, and the Renaudel group was astounded and tactically upset when the Longuet group chose him to represent them in their official journal. It is of extremely good omen, however, for the progress of the parliamentary Socialist Party in France to have as its spokesman a man who while he has an admirable record in insisting on movement and ultimate principle, has also a healthy skepticism about attempting to get along without patience and acceptance of the slowness of evolution.

Effect of Anti-Wilson Peace

As to the immediate future of the socialist power, it seems to me to depend on two things. It is possible that socialist governments will be experimented with in several countries, including France. What is a practical certainty, however, is that, if the governments that dictate the peace at Versailles give to the world an imperialistic, anti-Wilson peace, the existing governments in several countries will be thrown out violently, and probably more sudden experiments in socialism will be undertaken than will succeed, and we shall see a series of vibrations back and forth.

It is very difficult for an American who had not been abroad a good deal during the war to realize the enormous power of the President in Europe. Through these bitter years he has come to represent to the European masses the idea that they might get away from the old bureaucratic leadership. While our prosperous and comfortable armchair-patriots were jeering at his notes, the masses of Europe were coming, through those notes, to look to him as one who might lead them out of the wilderness. I will risk one prophecy with absolute confidence; if the governments of France, Italy and England refuse to make peace on President Wilson's general terms and to form a League of Nations in his general spirit, and if he wishes to challenge their action and come home without signing, the government of Italy will be overthrown in a very few weeks, perhaps even in a few days, and would probably be followed by a socialist government; and the same thing would happen in France and England more slowly, but still within a very short time. The only possible outlook for an orderly and fairly quick return to normal comfort in France, as elsewhere, is in courageous liberalism.

The Soviet State of Russia

By C. Kuntz

Why is Russia a puzzle? Active knowledge, the foundation of human attitude and activities, is acquired by a process of assimilation. An observer confronted with a new phenomenon is at first prone to interpret it, to know it in terms of that stock of knowledge which at the time being he calls his own. Now, the elements of knowledge that touch upon the workings of the state and that are to form the base of this assimilative process, are inculcated into the individual at an age and under circumstances that render uncertain in later years the proper assimilation of further knowledge of events springing from the dynamic nature of the state. The smatterings of mechanics and mathematics the layman has managed to save from the ruins of his school education will hardly entitle him to sit in judgment over phenomena falling under the jurisdiction of celestial mechanics; in fact he professes no knowledge and hence no definite attitude in this domain. Not so, however, in matters social and political. As a political animal man lives and acts politically and socially, whence he naturally claims as his birthright political and social attitudes and activities. But for this very reason he not infrequently is made to feel the more keenly the sting of disappointment when finding himself betrayed by his inadequate preparedness in these matters.

The March and November Revolutions

On the school bench the potential citizen is taught that government is an axiom, "an indefinable," that there are so many kinds of government and that the government of his country, whether divinely preordained or otherwise established, is the last word of civics. Accordingly, all political events historically enacted anywhere on the globe the full-fledged citizen can mentally assimilate, know, in terms of this primitive stock of knowledge. It was thus but natural that the first Russian revolution, in March, 1917, was at once identified, understood and even "welcomed" by the outside world. Why, it was a revolution of the people (whatever this word may denote) against the survival of a mediaeval form of government. But what has happened in Russia since November, 1917? Something that hardly dovetails with the citizen's knowledge stock of civics, something that can hardly be assimilated, and the citizen anxious to know is puzzled.

This is one of the facts that, outside of Russia, have favored the formation of an atmosphere wherein misinterpretation of Russia, intentional and unintentional alike, has been bred and spread broadcast for assimilation to the citizen thirsty for knowledge. A further no less potent factor that has contributed toward the creation of this atmosphere is the total bankruptcy of what is known as sociology or social science. At a time when the whole body of mankind is being pried open, when social vivisection is going on on a gigantic scale, the so-called social sciences stand by pitifully impotent even to diagnose the situation. So it has come to pass that even the educated, the intellectual citizen, feels suspended in the air of idle speculation in face of this grandiose spectacle of history.

Unpuzzling the Puzzle

The foregoing considerations not only account for the lamentable misinterpretations of what is going on in Russia as well as in the world arena generally, but at once suggest that a *revision* of the traditional knowledge equipment is a necessary prerequiiste to a right understanding of these phenomena. Some fourteen months have now gone by since in Russia there has been established, in spite of difficulties apparently insurmountable, a certain state-form under which the Russian people try to arrange their affairs as best they can. This state-form has thus far not been recognized as a government by any outside country. Why? Obviously government *is* "a definable," but is left undefined for reasons extra-scientific. The work of revision must therefore be directed upon this concept.

Concept of State as Static Force

The supposedly unchallenged conception of government is that, whatever its

structure, functionally it is here to "keep order," thus implying that the state is or would, if left alone, be in disorder. Stated scientifically it all means this: The life of the state manifests itself as a struggle of socially dynamic forces running in various and not infrequently opposite directions. Government or the political state is the *static* force that seeks to hold in equilibrium this bustling life of the state which, like life itself, is spasmodically revolutionary. Moreover, the political state is by implication, as a static conserving power, identified with those dominant factors of the state whose existence is a function of the *status quo,* and *vice versa:* the modern state as a category appears but as a political state. Indeed, it is this fusion of the two essentially distinct notions of state and political state (or government) that causes confusion in the discussion of politico-sociological matters. Revision warns against this fusion.

The State as a Palliative

Furthermore, in practice the functional activities of government are to *solve* problems growing out of the complex nature of the state. To mention some of these problems: The labor problem, the land problem, the race or nationality problem. These are some of the fundamental problems. Then there are problems of a derivative character, such as those attaching to commerce, finance, foreign policy. Now, how does a government solve problems? The fact of the matter is that it never solves them; it indeed, a state problem being the expression of conflicting social forces, can be shifted, mitigated, but can never be solved. Witness the evolution or the enactment of a law (and what is a political law but an *attempt* at solving some problem?) to find this statement fully corroborated. Again, the final solution of the basal state problems is tantamount to a final dissolution of the political state. Whence, whenever a problem or complex of problems imperatively demands a final solution, history steps in and solves it by revolution, i. e., removes, does away with the very problem. For it must be remembered that a solution of a special problem means the removal of all the conditions creating it. The only solution of the problem of slavery was and always will be the abolition of it. The only solution of the war problem is the abolition of all the conditions that make war necessary.

This is just what history has been staging in Russia. The Czaristic government had for ages so managed the state affairs as to erect a Babel-tower of problems. By organized force it had pieced together a huge empire out of most diverse elements, thus giving rise to a gigantic race problem; it had stimulated the development of an oligarchic landlordism on the one hand and of a pauperized peasantry on the other, thus giving birth to an imperative land problem; relatively backward in the development of domestic capitalism, it catered to foreign capital with the result of involving the state in the world war out of which it could no longer extricate itself (when to go on with it, it was no longer capable), thus creating a burning war-and-peace problem. Add to all this the labor problem, this problem of problems, and it becomes clear that the Russian revolution came as though by special invitation.

The Failure of Political Solutions

The first Provisional government (Lvove-Milukove) was short lived, if not still-born, for it attacked the problems "politically;" it even intended to offer the throne unmoved from under N. to M., woefully blind as it was to the fact that all the forces vitally concerned in the satisfactory solution of the overripe problems were in full swing. Moreover, the Coalition government (Kerensky-Tereschenko) fared no better than its predecessor, for, as its name suggests, it sought to straddle the problems, to satisfy both the wolf and the lamb. But this political procedure was unhistorical, nay anti-historical; the Russian people had already been spontaneously organized in Soviets, in groups having a common interest and reaching a mutual understanding through common councils. These Soviets actually typified the fundamental problems; they were the Soviets of soldiers, workers and peasants clamoring for the final solution of the war-and-peace problem, of the labor problem and of the land problem.

The Soviet State and Bolshevism

Manifestly, the Soviet state is in a sense the elemental creation of history. Two historic factors determinant of this new state formation, of this new order, are at present clearly discernible. One of them is negative, viz., no other state form of the political types hitherto known could possibly solve the aforesaid problems in accordance with the biddings of history, i. e., in accordance with the demands of the given evolutionary stage. The other factor is positive, viz., the Soviet state seems to be the medium chosen by history for the realization of those ideals which formed but the veneer of the now tottering civilization, the ideals of Liberty, Equality and Brotherhood and of all that flows therefrom. These two factors, the further development of which can not be pursued here, furnish the key to the Russian situation. The negative factor explains the failure of the old order under whatever political guise to assert itself by civil war and foreign aid; the positive factor unmistakably indicates the lines along which the new order, the Soviet state is moving.

The Abolition of Inequality

It is the work of the Soviet state to put concrete content into the empty phrase of the passing civilization, "All men are free and equal," by eradicating the causes of social inequality. Indeed, from this axiom, as well it might be termed, all the functioning of the Soviet-state may be deduced. In a state of equal beings there can be no social problems. All its problems are merely tasks born of its struggle with nature, they are *natural* problems solved by sheer work. . . . A war-and-peace problem? On its very birthday the Soviet declared itself at peace with all the world because at home its main endeavor was to abolish the conditions that necessitate war. As a historical creation the Soviet is conscious, as it were, that no peace congress of the old type, no league of nations dwelling within the old order, can ever establish permanent peace. Like a Constituent Assembly, a peace congress consists of unequal constituents; neither the one nor the other has ever *solved* the problems confronting it. The one as well as the other is therefore unhistorical. Indeed, even the statesmen of the old order, forced as they are by the historic movement into inconsistency, decry secret diplomacy and exalt a "people's peace."

Again, in solving once for all the fundamental problems by proclaiming as absolute the right of all nations and nationalities to self-determination, by returning the land to its tiller, by restoring to labor its full product, in a word by removing social inequality together with its shadow exploitation of man by man—the Soviet state of Russia prepares the ground at home for a permanent peace. For it must be borne in mind that external war is in a considerable degree a function of a state system whose heart is social inequality.

Applied Communism

Now, the method pursued by history in moulding the new state formation in Russia is universally known by the name of Bolshevism. New phenomena naturally call for new names. But what is Bolshevism in terms of something familiar? After what has been said, the Soviet state may be defined as the self-assertion of the state, implying the negation of the political state, and the way this self-assertion is being brought about, that is, Bolshevism, may be defined as *applied communism*. For the Soviet seeks to achieve the ultimate solution of the basal problems by *communalizing* (as distinguished from state *socializing*) the production and distribution of wealth. As all this work of history is indeed surprisingly new, we find also adherents of socialism, both theoretical and political, unable to assimilate it all, so that they either busy themselves with searching in the books of their old masters for the exact date when Russia will be ripe for socialism, or, by the inertia of their social position, hold back the wheel of history, thus aiding the reactionary forces.

The Need for Thought-Revision

"After the war the world will be a better and freer place to live in." This is the confession of bankruptcy made by the old order through the lips of its advocates. It is an admission that the world is changing for the better. But this change now taking place in Russia is mov-

ing with an impetus so characteristic of a revolutionary epoch and in a form so thoroughly novel that the human mind, poorly equipped withal, is overwhelmed. The only way for the serious minded to follow is: Stop, think and revise. Revise your politics, revise your economics, revise your ethics, revise the whole ideology of the declining civilization, then revise your very conscience. Such revision may open up before you a charming vision of the dawn of a new civilization rising in Russia in the form of the Soviet state wherein many of the ideals cherished by humanity and heretofore deemed so remote and even doubtful of realization are to become reality through applied communism.

Karl Liebknecht

By S. ZIMAND.

The great fight of Karl Liebknecht was the fight for international Socialism. Liebknecht was bred on the doctrine of Socialism from his early childhood and worked for it until the last moment of his life. For nearly thirty years he fought for his ideal in public life. At an age when most of his countrymen spent their time in the beer halls, we find Karl Liebknecht organizing the youth against militarism. Later on we see him in the courts of law doing work for the poor people of Berlin. From 1902 to 1918, he was a member of the local, state and national parliaments.

Tall, dark, courteous, with delightful manners and sparkling wit, he won the affection of all who came into personal touch with him. There was nothing mean or petty in his character. His political opponents all agreed on that. When he was recently liberated from prison they admitted that "in spite of his very strong opposition to the party from which he separated himself, he never used any of the methods of fighting which too often have been indulged in by others. He always despised such methods. This is the reason why he has so many friends among those who do not hold his political doctrines. They feel for him a sincere sympathy, even though their ways and views must needs be separated."

Though not himself a literary man, Liebknecht was imbued with the culture of his age. He was interested in art, music and literature and often used to express to me his regret at having little time to hear and see the beautiful creations of art. He knew several languages —French, English, Dutch, Flemish and Russian, learning Russian while in prison in 1907. His education was broadened by travels in Europe and America. He loved life with all the passion of a great nature, but the misery of the poor affected him so deeply that he felt impelled to spend every ounce of his energy in hastening the dawn of the new day. With each year his devotion became more intense. In 1907, he went triumphantly to prison for his cause. Out of prison with unabated courage and zeal he hastened from one parliament to the other fighting for a new life for the people whom he loved with such immeasurable devotion.

In this war his is the great figure that blazes "with the beauty and strength of his courage." I shall always remember that glorious day, December 2, 1914, when Karl Liebknecht stood up in the Reichstag and challenging not only his whole party, but what seemed to be the entire nation, handed in an explanation as to why he would vote against the War Budget. "As a protest against the war," he said, "against those who direct it, against the capitalist purposes for which it is being used, against plans for annexation, against the violation of the neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg, against unlimited rule of martial law, against the total oblivion of social and political duties of which the government classes are still guilty, I vote against the war credits demanded." From that time, day by day and year after year, he kept up the fight until finally they could silence and defeat him only by sending him to prison. Condemned even by his

own party for his anti-war stand, Liebknecht did not falter. He sent a message to the Socialists of England; he made a vehement attack upon the government in defense of his fellow worker, Rosa Luxemburg, he visited Belgium and kept up his constant policy of questioning the government at sessions of the Reichstag and in the Prussian Assembly.

"The ideal classical education lies in the spirit of independence and humanity," he exclaimed on March 15, 1916, in the Prussian Assembly and addressing himself to this reactionary Parliament he added: "Your ideal of classical education is the ideal of the bayonet, of the bombshell, of poison gas, of grenades which are hurled down on peaceful cities, and the ideal of submarine warfare."

Thus he fought on unflinching, until in 1916, his great May day address again brought him imprisonment. I can see now in my mind's eye the tall, dark figure raising his hands to the crowd on that memorable day, and saying as he ended his speech: "Do not shout for me, shout rather, 'We will have peace—now!'" Released from prison he was found again working ceaselessly, fearlessly to bring about the dawn of the new world. At last brought to bay in a short and intense fight, he was killed by the hands of his own people, the people for whom he had lived and fought the great fight. A bitter fate was this. But his work will be carried on, and his great struggle for humanity be remembered long after some of the present rulers of Germany are forgotten.

The Farmers in the Northwest

By A. B. Gilbert

The Nonpartisan League movement of the Northwest is at least one answer, perhaps the only answer to that old question in American politics: What can a people do when the politicians of both old parties refuse to carry out their expressed will? On nearly all such occasions our supposedly proud people have submitted to what looked like inevitable domination of the special interests, but the people of North Dakota offer a shining exception. After many years of toleration of such politics which passes among the superficial for leadership and statesmanship, the North Dakota farmers became thoroughly mad.

Under the leadership of Mr. A. C. Townley, these farmers, in February, 1915, began to organize for political action. In a little over a year they had sufficient strength to capture the nominations on the strongest old party ticket, the Republican party, and at the regular elections in the fall their victory was even more astonishing. Lynn J. Frazier, the candidate for governor, received 87,665 votes, as against a total of 22,966 cast for his two opponents. The organized farmers secured all the state offices, except that of state treasurer, eighty-one out of a hundred and thirteen members of the lower house, eighteen out of the twenty-five members elected to the senate, and the three judges of the supreme court. In July, 1916, the League farmers elected their first congressman, John M. Baer, a man who had contributed greatly to the farmers' success by his powerful cartoons.

The 1918 Elections

These very astonishing results led to an immediate demand for the League method in other states where the farmers were exploited about as much as they were in North Dakota. And the North Dakota farmers, on the other hand, saw the need of pushing out into other states, because the enemy they had organized to fight was not confined in North Dakota, but rather could draw support from organized special privilege throughout the nation. Consequently, not long after the North Dakota victory in the fall of 1916, the Nonpartisan League was organizing in thirteen other states, with the fight centering in the rock-ribbed special privilege state of Minnesota. By the time of the fall elections in 1918, or, in other words, in less than two years, the League had secured over 200,000 members who

had contributed $16.00 each for their two years' dues, a rather surprising testimonial to the desire of the western farmers for political and economic freedom. Campaigns were waged in seven of the thirteen states, and in all of these states important results were accomplished. In North Dakota there was another clean sweep, and this time the League farmers defeated the hold-over senators who had prevented the enactment of the farmers' program, secured all three congressmen and ten important amendments to the constitution were passed, which, among other things, allow the state to exempt improvements and personal property from taxation and to engage in practically any kind of industry. North Dakota thus becomes the most important political laboratory in the United States, and its history in the next two years will be of great importance to all those interested in seeing a development of socialization here, or better, real civilization.

In Minnesota the League and labor elected thirty-six legislators, one state officer (the clerk of the supreme court), and one congressman. In South Dakota, where the League candidates ran on an independent ticket, about fifteen legislators were elected, and the League stands as the second party in the state. The same is true in Idaho, where the League candidates ran on the Democratic ticket. There also the two United States senators endorsed by the League, Borah and Nugent, were elected. In Montana, Nebraska and Colorado the League secured important representation in the legislature. While in none of the states outside of North Dakota does the League have enough legislators to control legislation, it has enough in each one to put the League program squarely before the legislators and thus secure most important fighting material for the 1920 campaign. These legislatures, of course, will turn down the League program, and the farmers will see more clearly than before the issue between themselves and special privilege.

A Word to the Impatient

Many socialists who have followed the League more or less closely may be somewhat impatient at its limited program and the fact that it does not establish any entirely independent party; at least such views are commonly heard. It should be remembered, however, that the most essential feature about the League, and one not usually thought of as being in its program, is the organization of farmers by themselves and alliance with the more progressive labor elements. This meets by far the greatest of all problems in intelligent political action by the farmer. For once well organized all else is comparatively easy. The farmers are free to adopt whatever specific program the times may call for, and for the first time they can vote intelligently in their own interests. Again, for all practical purposes the Nonpartisan League and labor allied with it are as independent of the old parties as the British Labor Party or the Socialist Party. The farmers have run candidates on old party tickets, not by the usual compromise, but by forcing the special privilege candidates out. In North Dakota especially these tactics have proved to be a most valuable kind of opportunism. The fact that the League is the Republican Party there in no way changes or endangers the League's purpose, while at the same time it deprives the special interests of a powerful political weapon.

The Future

In the immediate future the great work of the League will be to get as many farmers in the thirteen states in which it is operating, organized before 1920. And practically every circumstance guarantees success in this direction. Our federal and state governments, dominated by the special interests, have made no plans for reconstruction and the "new day" promised the toilers, and these interests will continue their exploitation on a larger scale than ever. On the other hand, the League program carried out in North Dakota in the present session of the legislature will be a powerful object lesson as to what can be done. In 1918 the League had, as has been said, 200,000 members, and it polled in all the states a little over 600,000 votes. In 1920 it ought to have 600,000 members, and poll three times as many votes.

There is one other point that ought not to go unmentioned, because it is a remarkable tribute, in a way, to the

thousands of devoted men and women who for the last generation have been devoting their energy to ushering in a new day for the working classes. Thanks to their efforts, as well as to the exploitation of our special interests, comparatively few of the western farmers have to be converted to the League program. The problem of the League organizer rather is to convince the farmer that the League offers the method of putting this program into effect in the near future.*

* The following is the 1918 Platform of the Nonpartisan League in Minnesota:

1. Exemption of farm improvements from taxation.
2. Tonnage tax on ore production.
3. Rural credit banks operated at cost.
4. State terminal elevators, warehouses, flour mills, stockyards, packing houses and cold storage plants.
5. State hail insurance.
6. A more equitable system of state inspection and grading of grain.
7. Equal taxation of property of railroads, mines, telegraph, telephone, electric light and power companies, and all public utility corporations, as compared with that of other property owners.
8. State-owned and operated pulp and paper mills to furnish print paper at cost.
9. A soldiers' moratorium law to protect our soldiers at the front from suffering financial loss while in the service of their country, to continue six months after the war.
10. To the full extent of every resource of the state, individual and collective, within the power of this organization to control, every member of this organization and every candidate endorsed pledges his support to the war policies announced by President Wilson and to the prosecution of the war until a democratic victory is achieved.

We pledge our candidates one and all to the carrying out of the foregoing as fast as sound and safe progress will permit.

We also indorse the following legislative program as of especial value to labor:

1. State insurance.
2. State free employment bureau.
3. State old age pensions.
4. State eight-hour law, except in agricultural pursuits.

We extend the hand of fellowship to organized labor. We welcome cooperation with labor, and pledge our candidates to the faithful service of the interests of the workers on the farms, the railroads, the shops, the mines and the forests.

As measures calculated to further the interest of our nation in the war, and for the more equitable financing of the war we urge:

1. That congress enact legislation which will enable the President to carry out his price-fixing program to prevent extortionate profits.
2. Legislation by which the government may purchase and distribute necessaries at cost through the parcels post.
3. Legislation increasing the tax on large incomes and excess profits, to continue until all the costs of the war are paid.
4. A tax on all unused land.
5. Legislation looking to the assistance and encouragement of agriculture as the basic industry upon which the welfare of our people and the winning of the war depend.
6. That all plants manufacturing munitions be operated by the government. Profit-making in munitions of war is repugnant to every American citizen.
7. That all industries in which industrial disturbance occurs which cannot be settled by federal mediation be taken over and operated by the government.
8. We further urge that the farmers and workers keep up their splendid effort at increased production and conservation of food supplies, and universal support of the Liberty loans and all of the war activities calculated to aid our boys at war. Patriotism demands service of all according to their capacity.

For the first time in history farmers and workers strike hands in full cooperation for the welfare of all the people of the state. Shoulder to shoulder, we stand for the welfare of all and the protection of the rights of our sons and brothers at the front. Let our victory over the forces of disloyalty and reaction at home be as great as their victory over the forces of autocracy abroad.

We'll stick.

Notes on the Tenth Annual Convention, I. S. S.

From the standpoint of sustained interest and enthusiasm, the Tenth Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society was undoubtedly the most successful ever held under the Society's auspices. The undergraduate representation, on account of the war, was necessarily smaller than in previous years, although the attendance of college alumni and others was considerably greater than at any previous convention.

Most important of all the gatherings was the Annual Dinner of the Society held at the Aldine Club, on Friday evening, December 27. Nearly 600 college men and women and others were present on this occasion to listen to the discussion of "Socialism—A Growing World

Power." The masterly addresses of Norman Hapgood on "The Socialist Movement in France" and of Arthur Gleason on "The British Labor Movement" appear elsewhere in this issue.

Williams on Russia

Albert Rhys Williams, who dealt with Russia, called attention to the difficulties under which the Soviets were working and urged those present to be patient of their mistakes. He said:

"We must remember that prior to the revolution hundreds of years of the rule of Czars had kept the people browbeaten, poor and oppressed. Three years and seven months of war had bled the country white. Three and a half millions Russians had been killed, 4,000,000 wounded; there were 350,000 war orphans and 200,000 deaf, dumb and blind. The Russians lost more than Belgium, France, Italy and America combined. The railways were broken down, the mines had been flooded, the food and fuel were nearly gone. The Czechs, supported by the Japanese, French, British and Americans, cut off their grain supply from Siberia. The Germans and Austrians cut off their food supply from the Ukraine. Twelve million soldiers were suddenly demobilized. America has only 4,000,000 soldiers, and yet we expect to take a year before they are all home from France and demobilized. The Bolsheviki were sabotaged by the old officials and deserted by the upper classes, boycotted by the Allies and nearly guillotined by the Germans."

Opposed to Intervention

Mr. Williams spoke of the obstacles in the way of constructive work, when a nation has to defend itself on four fronts. He declared that conditions, in spite of obstacles, have been improving in the factories and that great attention is being given to the development of education. Workingmen's reading circles, theatres, etc., are being organized throughout the country, and the hunger of the inhabitants for reading of all kinds is remarkable. In dealing with the ideals of the Russians, he declared that one of their slogans was, "No man shall have cake until all men have bread." As for Allied military intervention, Mr. Williams felt that it was a great mistake. He declared:

"Intervention thus far has overturned the government of the Soviets in Siberia, which rested on the peasants and workers, and in its stead gave support to the Omsk Government, which is a government of the Cossack generals, monarchists and landlords and a few old social revolutionists. It has brought anarchy and hunger to great masses of workmen and peasants. The Soviet at Vladivostok was established without killing a single human being; but to overthrow the Soviets for 150 miles thousands of peasants and workers were killed and wounded, all the battleships, hospitals and warehouses around Vladivostok were filled with these victims of intervention. It has cut off the great cities of Moscow and Petrograd from the grain supplied of Siberia. It is turning the natural love of the Russians for America into hatred for her."

Mr. Williams concluded by declaring that, by taking our troops out of Russia, we would be helping to make Russia safe for democracy, Europe safe for democracy, and the world safe for democracy.

The American Movement

Mr. Norman Thomas in dealing with "The American Socialist Movement" declared that it was not half so popular to be a radical at home as to be a radical abroad. In describing the two dominant parties, he declared that they stood essentially for the same thing. While the Democratic Party provides a liberal leadership, he asserted, we cannot forget that President Wilson, many of whose ideals are applauded by the labor parties of Russia and England, is also the leader of the party of the Southern Bourbons, the leader of the party of Gregory and Burleson. Mr. Thomas vigorously criticised the lack of freedom of speech and press during wartime in America, spoke of the absence of labor representation in our Congress, and lamented the fact that in the trade union movement, attention was centered almost entirely on wages and hours, while little thought was given to the problem of democratic management. "The reason for the backwardness of labor," he declared, "is not far to seek. America is a comparatively new country. The ranks of labor are divided by race and color and we do little of fundamental thinking in this country. With the development of the unskilled worker, with the decrease of free land, a new social consciousness is developing."

Mr. Thomas spoke of the elements that, he believed, would make up the new socialistic movement, including, on the left wing, the I. W. W. and, on the right wing, the Nonpartisan League and the new labor parties which have definite class bases. The Socialist Party in this

country, he maintained, had ever emphasized democratic management of industry as an antidote to bureaucracy and had always fought for freedom of speech and press and for the development of human personality. "In this country we have seen the failure of liberalism and progressivism. Witness the failure of our liberals to protest against the suppression of civil liberties, to raise their voices against intervention in Russia or to fight for fundamental reconstruction. More and more it is becoming a choice with the thinking intellectual between alliance with the forces of conservatism or of socialism."

The Parties of Germany

Ludwig Lore, editor of the *New York Volkzeitung,* analyzed the demands of the various parties in Germany. Both the Independent Socialist and the Spartacus groups, he declared, had at first worked together—as opposed to the Majority Socialists—for the immediate installation of Socialism, favored the Soviet form of government, and opposed the calling of the National Assembly. The Independent Socialists later agreed to the calling of the Assembly, but urged that it be postponed for a few months to permit of a number of fundamental changes in the social structure. Finally, however, feeling that the Allied powers would be more likely to recognize Germany at the peace conference if a government was installed through the calling of the Assembly, the Independents left the Spartacus group, and entered their candidates in the fight for the Assembly. They, however, resigned from the provisional government which they left to the Majority Socialists. The Spartacus group continued its agitation for a Soviet form of government and a dictatorship of the proletariat and refused to have anything to do with the National Assembly campaign.

Italian Socialism

Arturo Giovannitti, the last speaker, described the anti-war stand of the Italian Socialists, the refusal on the part of a half hundred of the Socialist parliamentarians to vote for the war budget and the expulsion from the Party of those who had participated in the war. He declared that the retreat of the Austrians in 1918 occurred just a year following the retreat of the Italians and that, on the former occasion, everything had been prepared both on the Italian and Austrian lines for a joint strike of the soldiers. However, he asserted, shock German troops had the night before the proposed strike been substituted for the Austrian troops in the Austrian lines and when the Italian troops laid down their arms they were confronted with the aggressive shock troops of the Kaiser. He declared that the Socialist movement of Italy aimed at an entirely new society and was opposed to a reconstruction that was merely a palliate.

Mrs. Florence Kelley, presiding, spoke of the suffrage amendment and called attention to the fact that Senator Wadsworth of New York, although instructed by the Legislature to vote for the measure, refused to do so, and by his single vote was holding it up.

A League of Nations

The second big public meeting of the Convention was that held on Saturday night at the People's House. Every seat in the auditorium was taken and an overflow meeting had to be arranged in one of the other rooms of the building. Widely diverse points of view regarding the League of Nations were presented by the five speakers present. Horace M. Kallen, author of "The League of Nations, Today and Tomorrow," Louis B. Boudin, the well known Socialist and lawyer, and Harry Dana declared that the Socialists should support a liberal league, while Evans Clark and Scott Nearing took the position that Socialists should be indifferent to the kind of League that the world was about to secure.

Evans Clark, the first speaker, told of the increasing disturbances in governmental machinery not only in Russia, but in England, France and Italy. He quoted Gertrude Atherton as declaring that "this is the age of the autocracy of the republic," and declared that when we see republics waging a war against the Russian proletariat, suppressing civil liberties and deciding the fate of hundreds of women if not millions behind closed doors, we realize something of the significance

of Mrs. Atherton's statement. He continued:

"There are two kinds of Leagues of Nations. The League we shall not get is the League of the well-meaning liberal professional folk: the League of H. G. Wells and H. L. Brailsford, the League of Herbert Croly, and Lincoln Colcord and John R. Commons. This is the League that has been born in this country by the rather surprising union of the League to Enforce Peace and the League of Free Nations Association, aided and abetted by the New Republic and the liberal organs of public opinion. In England it is represented by the League of Nations Union, an amalgamation of the League of Nations Society and the League of Free Nations Association. The League of Nations we shall not get is the league that points straight, as Mr. Wells puts it, to a pooling of empires, . . . to a world control of shipping and of the world distribution of staples, to restraint upon tariff wars and indeed to a general control of international trade. It is the League that proposes to limit the sovereignty of nations, to control their military and naval forces either as to their size or administration, or to dictate in any way the policy of their several foreign offices. It is the League that would admit Germany and Austria to membership in the Association.

"The League we shall get is quite different. It has been eloquently described, and not without a touch of humor by Mr. Field, Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune;* and it is the League the United States Senate will support:

"'The Senate is almost unanimously opposed to any interference with the Monroe Doctrine by a League of Nations, to any international army or navy, to any permanent world court or tribunal, and to any disarmament plan which permits minor nations to decide to what strength the American army and navy shall be limited. Otherwise it is not ill-disposed to the idea.

"The league we shall get is the league which Winston Churchill described but a few days ago: 'I am a hopeful and sincere advocate of a League of Nations, but the League of Nations cannot be a substitute for the supremacy of the British fleet.'"

Mr. Clark believed that while the catchwords and slogans of the liberals will be adopted, the substance of their demands will be ignored. He affirmed that the interests of the dominant group in every nation except Germany and Russia demand unrestricted competition in trade and commerce, the opening up of all the markets of the world and only such restrictions as will facilitate the common desire for financial and commercial return, and that the league of nations that will be created will be consistent with these ideals. He continued: "We should clearly understand that Bolshevist Russia is, and that Bolshevist Germany will be, as undesirable in such a league as the Germany and Russia of the Hohenzollerns and Romanoffs."

Mr. Clark concluded by quoting the memorandum of the Jugoslav Socialists to the Stockholm Peace Conference, in which they declared that "the international must be transformed into a higher legislative and executive of the proletariat of the world so as to enable it to act in the interest of world-peace."

"Here is the great contribution to the present confusion of thought—an international Soviet. We, the workers of the world, do not oppose world organization, we do not oppose world government. We look, however, with suspicion and mistrust at a League of Business Men's Republics. We know who will control it and in whose interests it will be dictated. We know who dominates each of the Allied 'democracies,' and we know that the whole cannot be greater than its parts. We must have a world organization of our own—we, the great majority. We shall build up our International, and, like the Russian Soviets growing up within and beneath the existing form of government, the old may be some day cast aside and the workers of the world will have a world-government of their own—a League of Free Peoples, not only in rhetoric, but in fact."

Should Support League

Louis B. Boudin took exception to the contentions of Mr. Clark and declared that in his opinion Socialists should not be indifferent to a League of Nations, but should try to take part in the formation of such a league and later to get control of it. The doctrine that workers should not participate in the League, he declared, was the same as the anarchist doctrine that the workers should not take any part in capitalist politics. Even if the co-operative commonwealth were not presented to the workers on a silver platter, they should vote for immediate advances and take advantage of them.

Mr. Boudin asserted that nationalism had been the greatest obstruction to the working class international and he believed that an international organization, by breaking down the nationalistic ideology, would take from the masters the most powerful argument that they are now using to induce the workers to participate in nationalistic struggles. The

speaker further declared that Karl Marx as well as the Socialist parties throughout the world had for years favored a League of Nations, and he believed that, with additional international security, workers would have a greater opportunity to concentrate upon the effective waging of the class struggle than at present.

Inevitability of League

Dr. Nearing, the next speaker, briefly described the former leagues of nations, particularly the Holy Alliance, organized in 1815, which became an instrument of reaction. He mentioned President Wilson's statement in the latter's inaugural address of March 5, 1917: "The community of interest and of power upon which peace must henceforth depend imposes upon each nation the duty of seeing to it that all influences proceeding from its own citizens meant to encourage or assist revolution in other states should be sternly and effectually suppressed and prevented." Dr. Nearing continued:

"This paragraph means that the individual nations joining a League of Nations must see to it that henceforth the world shall have no Switzerland nor any other asylum, so that Lloyd George may make good his threat to the leaders of the Bolshevik Government that they would find no asylum left on the face of the earth.

"The League of Nations is called into being by economic and social forces over which idealists who are thinking of a league of free peoples have absolutely no control. The fact that the League of Nations is receiving the endorsement of most of the tory statesmen of Europe should open the eyes of the people to the realities of the situation.

"What are these realities?

"During the past few years the production and distribution of wealth has been placed upon an international basis. American corporations have plants in Europe, Asia and South America. English, German and French companies have established connections on all five of the continents. At the same time investment has been put on a world basis. The stock and bonds of American and English industries are held by investors in all the great countries of the world.

"This economic community of interest must logically find its expression in some political community of interest since political institutions are built upon economic foundations. The League of Nations is the logical political expression of international capitalism just as the bourgeois state is the logical political expression of national capitalism.

"The League of Nations would have come as a matter of course. Its coming has been hastened by the war and by the menace of Bolshevism. The Russian Revolution is to the capitalist world what the French Revolution was to feudal Europe. Russia, Austria and Prussia united in the Holy Alliance against political democracy. England, United States, France, Italy and Japan will unite in a Holy Alliance against industrial democracy.

"These nations have already taken the first step in that direction. They have joined forces and invaded an ally without even the pretense of a declaration of war.

"The League of Nations will come—inevitably. Economic causes have created it. The necessities of international capitalism demand it. The League of Nations will come at the behest and under the control of the most reactionary forces in the capitalist world. It will be a league of bankers, diplomats, manufacturers and traders. Its function will be the preservation of capitalist society with all of its monstrous iniquities. Its power will be exercised through an international police force—an international constabulary—organized and preserved to suppress revolutions. The League of Nations will endure as long as the bankers and traders of England and the United States will stand together. When they divide as they ultimately must divide, there will be two leagues of nations and a world war that will eclipse in horror that which has just ended. Until that time comes the League of Nations will make the world a safe abiding place for capitalism by crushing out every vestige of militant democracy."

Workers' Stake in League

Horace M. Kallen, the following speaker, declared that the difference between him and Mr. Nearing was that the latter was essentially religious, while he was not. No one but a religious person, he declared, could be indifferent to an instrument which would bring such definite advantages to workers as would the League of Nations. To ignore those advantages and dream only of what is to come later is to repeat the error of that theologian who, in his dream of heaven, is blinded to the facts of this earth. Dr. Kallen dwelt eloquently on the advantages accruing to the workers through the elimination of war, as a result of the development of the League. Nor did he believe it probable that, with the present strength of the proletarian movement in Europe, a League of Nations could be used, even though its founders wished it to be used, for the purpose of crushing revolutionary movements.

Dr. Harry Dana, the concluding

speaker, also looked upon the League as a step forward and urged Socialists, who had been fifty years ahead of President Wilson in advocating a new international order, not to allow President Wilson now to get ahead of them.

Harry W. Laidler, in introducing the speakers, remarked that it sometimes appeared that the conservative trustees in American universities were actively engaged in proletarian propaganda, for, by making it easy for such brilliant instructors as Harry Dana, Scott Nearing, Horace M. Kallen and Evans Clark to leave the quiet atmosphere of college life and enter actively into the struggle for industrial democracy, they were distinctly contributing to the strength of the movement toward a new social order.

Socialism and the Collegian

The first meeting of the convention was held at Miss Stokes' studio, 90 Grove Street, New York City, on Friday afternoon. Mrs. Florence Kelley, who presided, paid a beautiful tribute to Randolph Bourne, for years an active member of the Society. The secretary read a paper dealing with the progress toward industrial democracy during the year.

Jessie W. Hughan, author of "American Socialism and the Present Day," gave a keen analysis of the Socialist movement in this country. She said:

"In these days of remaking the world there is a trumpet call to service for every collegian, and unless the I. S. S. can help its members to function devotedly and efficiently in the great reconstruction its convention will be for naught.

"In the tremendous international problems waiting to be solved we Socialists have need for action rather than investigation, for the world is not yet ready to act upon the conclusions which have formed the commonplace of radicals for three years. We proudly point to the Socialist Party manifesto of December 31st, 1914, as embodying the most significant of the "fourteen points" of January, 1918.

"The national subject of overwhelming importance is that of the socialization of industry, already proceeding so far as to delight the collectivists and terrify the individualitsts. The Socialists here offer the only solution,—neither bureaucracy nor industrial anarchy, but industrial democracy. The Socialist Party, moreover, has stood for the principle of industrial unionism since 1912, and since 1914 has fought for the Anglo-Saxon principles of free speech and free conscience as against state control.

"It is in the solution of its own internal tactics that the Socialist Party needs the help of the young and trained radical. The social revolution is already thundering through the world. The only question is, How will it come? Will it come, as in Germany, through a tyrannical state socialism yielding to efficiency? Will it come, as in Russia, through violence, through a dictatorship of the proletariat, with the inevitable counter-revolution and the red and white terror? Or will it come through a steady political movement, a union of manual and mental workers, a political and industrial democracy rather than a state socialism, a movement without violence or counter-revolution or dictatorship of anyone, which scorns victory till it shall rest upon the will of the majority? Such a revolution may be hoped for in the United States, if the young radicals of this generation devote their splendid energies to the steady upbuilding of the political Socialist movement in our country."

Rose Schneiderman, president of the Woman's Trade Union League of New York, told of the formation of labor parties in forty-five centers of population in the United States and, in explaining how the collegian could function in the trade union movement, asserted that he must enter the movement in the spirit of service, prepared to undertake any task assigned to him, and not with the idea of leadership.

The Co-operative Movement

Dr. James P. Warbasse told of the recent growth of co-operation in this country, stating that, whereas, a few years ago there were about 700 stores in the United States, now there are some 2,000. He mentioned the recent organization of an American wholesale and the marked interest of trade unions in co-operative enterprises.

Secretary Laidler read a paper dealing with the development toward industrial democracy during the year. The social revolution in Russia in November, 1917, and the German revolution in the fall of 1918, he believed, had increased the influence of the workers of the world in the political and social life of Europe to a far greater extent than any other events in history.

In America, of chief note in the co-operative movement was the amalgamation of the five wholesale into an American wholesale; in the trade union movement, the recent formation of the labor parties and in the radical farmer's move-

ment, the growth of the Non-Partisan League in several of the states of the Northwest. The Socialist party, despite persecutions, had held its own, and was stronger than in 1916, although it did not keep its 1917 gains. The Social Democratic League, with its 1,100 members, was continuing its propaganda. The National party ran campaigns in about a half dozen states, although its success was not conspicuous. The recent development of liberal periodicals was distinctly encouraging. The suppression of free speech and press was one of the most discouraging of recent developments.

Reports of Delegates

Reports of delegates were given and chapter problems were discussed on Saturday morning at Miss Stokes' studio. Margaret Garrison of Radcliffe declared that the Radcliffe chapter now contained 35 members and was co-operating with the Radical Club in securing speakers for the college. A series of small study meetings were being held with W. Harris Crook and Harold Laski as leaders. As a whole, the Chapter was meeting with no opposition and was a stimulating force in the college life.

Martha Anderson of Simmons, president of the recently organized Simmons Chapter, declared that 23 members of the college body had just signed up and were now grappling with the I. S. S. Study Course. The college had recently purchased a score or more of volumes on Socialism and allied problems. The president of the I. S. S. Chapter was also secretary of the Civic League and this League had secured Arthur Gleason, George W. Nasmyth and others as speakers during the Fall.

Elizabeth Zachery of the Oberlin Chapter also maintained that the Chapter in her college was meeting with no opposition and was holding interesting discussion meetings. The subject of "Russia," and the "League of Nations" and "Socialism and Art" had already been discussed. The chapter was securing speakers from Cleveland. The members were charged 10c. for failure to attend any of the regular meetings.

Bertha Wallerstein of Barnard declared that the Barnard group had had some serious obstacles to overcome during the last year, but that it had held several successful meetings in the fall addressed by Dean Gildersleeve on "Women in Industry," Professor James Harvey Robinson on "Education," and other speakers.

William Schack of Cornell reported that last year the leadership of the Chapter had been too entirely Marxian and that this year an endeavor had been made to make the discussions more varied and broader in their nature. A number of professors were interested in the work, and the meetings had been more successful this year than for several years past. The Chapter, instead of following any particular study course, took up the vital problems of the day.

Carol Bristol reported for the Adelphi Chapter and told of the success attending the discussion meetings where Hillquit's "Socialism Summed Up" was used as a basis, and of the meeting on "Reconstruction Programs of Parties" led by the Secretary of the Society.

The C. C. N. Y. Chapter, according to Mr. Cohen, is about to reorganize. The separation of the students into the Twenty-third Street branch and the up-town buildings and the development of the war activities had prevented college meetings. One meeting, however, had been arranged on "Labor and Reconstruction" with Dr. Edwards as speaker.

Columbia was represented by Alfred Sachs, who told of the plans for future gatherings and of the success of the meetings last spring. Mr. Hollister, represented Amherst, thought that the field there for a vital Chapter was a fertile one. William Foster told of the difficulties at Howard on account of war activities, influenza, etc.

Discussion of Chapter Problems

A number of the students took part in the discussion of Chapter Problems. Miss Garrison felt that the Society should strive to supply the students with information that would be of immediate value to them in their college work. There was a general demand for sectional committees of students in colleges in the neighborhood of large cities and arrangements were made for the reorganization of sectional groups in New York and elsewhere.

Devere Allen, formerly president of the Oberlin Chapter and secretary of the Young Democracy, told of the manner in which the I. S. S. literature had helped him during his undergraduate days and urged enthusiastic support of the work of the Society.

Most of the delegates seemed to agree that it should be the effort of the Chapters to reach as many students as possible with more public meetings rather than to concentrate solely on small intensive study gatherings. The latter, however, should not be ignored. Dr. Laidler submitted a report of the activities of the Society during the past year together with suggestions regarding future work. He said in part as follows:

Activities of the Society

"During the Spring of 1918, the Society continued to send lecturers to the colleges and hundreds of lectures were given by individuals before the various chapters. The most extensive trip was that of the secretary to the colleges of the Middle West. During this trip he spoke before economics, sociology and other classes at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Oberlin, Ohio State, Ohio Wesleyan, Hamline and the Universities of Missouri,

Minnesota, Michigan and Pittsburgh. In a trip among the New England colleges, he spoke at Yale, Harvard, Mt. Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Clark, Tufts and Simmons.

"The Society has continued the publication of its quarterly magazine which it hopes to develop into a monthly; is now issuing a pamphlet by Bertram Benedict on "Public Ownership of Express Companies;" has prepared a revised Study Course and Booklist on Socialism and Allied Subjects and is developing other literature on the various phases of industrial democracy.

"In May several hundred copies of 'Why Freedom Matters,' by Norman Angell, were mailed to undergraduates, but, in November, the Society received notice from the Postmaster that these copies had been declared non-mailable and had been disposed of as such. The April-May issue of the Intercollegiate Socialist was also held for nearly two weeks by the post office, but was finally released. Otherwise there has been little interference with the Society's publications.

"In the fall a successful conference was held on 'Reconstruction After the War' at the Delaware Water Gap. Among the speakers at the Conference were Richard Roberts, S. Nuorteva, Robert J. Wheeler, Ordway Tead, C. G. Hoag, Ellen Hayes, James P. Warbasse, Florence Kelley, Percy Dearmer, Louis B. Boudin, Morris Cohen, Evans Clark, Jessie Hughan, Benton Mackaye, Wm. P. Montague, Norman Thomas, George W. Nasmyth and Madeline Doty.

"At the beginning of the college year, the draft turned most of the colleges in the country into military training camps. The attention of the students was so absorbed in military duties that practically all outside gatherings were suspended. The signing of the armistice, however, has brought renewed interest in the work of the Society. This is evidenced all along the line. A few years ago, the study of Socialism was looked upon by most college students as of merely academic interest. At present, however, no student can claim to be intelligently informed concerning world events unless he has a sympathetic understanding of the Socialist movement. The work of the Society was furthermore never more imperative than at the present moment.

Advice to Chapters

"Each Chapter should immediately begin a membership drive, should organize teams for that purpose, putting aside two or three weeks for the drive and giving to its successful conclusion the best energies of its members. They should do their best to secure outside speakers and at their study meetings should devote part of their time to the philosophy of Socialism and part to the practical achievements and tactics of the ever growing movements in Europe and America. They should always bear in mind that the Society is a study and not a political propaganda organization and should try to bring within the Chapters students of all political and economic creeds.

"Miss Hughan's Facts of Socialism, written especially for the I. S. S., and obtained in a 25c. paper edition; Hillquit's Socialism Summed Up, published in the 10c. paper edition; Marx and Engels' Communist Manifesto; Engels' Socialism—Utopian and Scientific; Kautsky's Class Struggle; Ramsay Macdonald's Socialist Movement and Spargo's Elements of Socialism are to be recommended as a basis for discussion. The Chapter should also try to keep in touch with current events through such dailies as The New York *Call*, the Milwaukee *Leader*, and the *Christian Science Monitor;* such quarterlies as *The Intercollegiate Socialist;* such bi-monthlies as the *Class Struggle;* such monthlies as the *Liberator, Forward, Upton Sinclair's, World Tomorrow,* the *Arbitrator* and the *Co-operator;* such weeklies as *The Nation*—particularly with its international section,—the *New Republic, The Survey, The British New Statesman,* etc. Pamphlets constantly published by the Rand School, the I. S. S. and Socialist publishing houses also give worth while interpretations of events in the labor world. Literature on various phases of the social problem may be obtained from the Socialist Party, 803 W. Madison St., Chicago; the Co-operative League of America, 2 West 13th St., New York City; the Public Ownership League of America, Unity Building, Chicago, Ill.; the Civil Liberties Bureau, 41 Union Square, New York City; the Social Democratic League, 277 Broadway, etc.

"There are also many new phases of Socialism which are constantly coming up for discussion and to which the student should devote much thought, such, for instance, as the relation of the Labor Party to the Socialist movement, the problem of state sovereignty, the machinery for obtaining democracy and efficiency in industry. Care should be taken in all discussion meetings to concentrate on the most vital points at issue and much thought should be given beforehand to the question on which discussion should be focussed.

"Never were the opportunities in the I. S. S. Chapters for usefulness greater than at present time. Never were the responsibilities for effective service in this work greater. Collegians interested in social problems are going to be confronted in the days to come with vast social responsibilities, and there is no college agency better equipped than is the I. S. S. Chapter to afford the needed training."

The Saturday Camaraderie

Saturday afternoon, the New York Alumni Chapter gave a reception to the delegates in the Civic Club at its regular Camaraderie. Algernon Lee, head of the Socialist group in the Board of Aldermen, conducted the Question Box Session, and dealt with such widely varied problems as the difference between the German parties, the questions of incentive and of political corruption, and the desirability of a labor party in the United States. Platoni Drakoules, for years an active Socialist mem-

ber of Parliament in Greece, told of the Socialist movement in that country and declared that the spirit of Socialism was akin to the Hellenic spirit. The Convention, all told, was pronounced the most vital and interesting ever held under the Society's auspices.

Among the delegates present were Carol Bristol, Victoria Hess, Sarah Cohen, Rose Genodman, and Theresa Shulkin of Adelphi; Carroll Hollister, of Amherst; H. Rivkin and Bertha Wallerstein, of Barnard; Wm. Spoffard, of Berkeley; Alfred H. Sachs, L. and H. Raymond, Benjamin Ginsburg, of Columbia; Alex Klein and Vincent Mannino, of C. C. N. Y.; William Schack and Marie Syrkin, of Cornell; S. Chovenson, of Delaware College; William H. Foster, of Howard University; Louise Ross, Vita Weinstein, and Anna Rappaport, of Hunter College; Mr. Schacter, of N. Y. U.; Elizabeth Zachery, of Oberlin; Anne Fowler, of Ohio Wesleyan; Margaret Garrison, Eleanor Mack, Margaret Lawson, Marion Svencenski and Vera Mikol, of Radcliffe; Martha Anderson, of Simmons; Ruth Porter and Janet Mack, of Wellesley. Numerous delegates attended the public sessions, but no record was made of their names.

H. W. L.

GUILDS FOR AMERICA

A Communication by ORDWAY TEAD

Miss Hughan's generous and understanding approach to the American uses of the guild idea* makes easy the effort further to clarify one or two of the points which she raises. I understand her to approve of an ultimately unified sovereignty (power of control and command) in the hands of the consumer. She objects to Mr. Cole's endeavor deliberately to create a plural sovereignty by dividing control and responsibility because she sees the danger of a "deadlock." What, it seems to me, she gives too little weight to are Mr. Cole's reasons for wanting to escape from the practical difficulties which are created by the application to actual affairs of the theory of unitary sovereignty.

IMPLICATIONS OF UNITARY SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Cole comes at his problem from two angles which when they converge become significant in their practical suggestion. He wants to render it impossible for the One Supreme Sovereignty to lord it over the individual as it now can. Belief in absolutism of sovereignty had led to numberless practices which oppose and set at naught the rightful claims of the individual for a reasonable degree of self-determination, for a generous opportunity *to realize personality as a prime end in life.* I have not space to indicate all the actual consequences of this view in political affairs. But our refusal to let a citizen sue the government, our disinclination to have governments enter into collective contracts with labor unions, our indisposition to concede that government employees have the right to strike—all are practical expressions of an absolutist theory, of politics and of life. Absolute sovereignty results, in other words, in action which is inimical to the rightful claims of human personality for its chance at expression and growth.

ORGANIZATION BY FUNCTION

The other leading idea which Mr. Cole expounds with admirable clarity is the principle of organization by function; by which he means simply that organizations which are to have control over a given field of activity must be composed of those who have an interest in the proper conduct of that activity and who by reason of their participation know whereof they speak in helping to make determining decisions. The Webbs have said the same thing as it relates to the world of labor organization in remarking that it is the consumer's function to decide what is to be produced and how much; it is the producer's function to decide how it is to be produced and to a large extent under what conditions. If this is sound, it remains as a joint function to determine the price and the relative amounts of the total income from production to go to the several parties.

The concrete suggestion which this approach leads to is for strong producing organizations—national guilds—to assume the full function of the producer. Combined into a council of guilds these bodies would comprise in fact the industrial parliament of a nation. But there remain, also, just as clearly as they exist at this moment, the civic functions in which people are interested not

* See *Guildsmen and American Socialism* by Jessie W. Hughan in THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST for December-January, 1918-1919.

by virtue of economic relations so much as because of geographic relations. These civic functions include education, protection from law breakers, public health, recreation. The machinery to control these activties is properly the existing political machinery so modified as to get all the interested parties involved in the making of all important decisions.

Plural Sovereignty and Human Personality

It is the acceptance of the idea of functional organization that involves *ipso facto,* acceptance of the idea of plural sovereignty. *That body decides finally on an issue which includes all parties at interest in and informed concerning that issue.* This does indeed create the possibility of a deadlock. It is in the sharp clash of issues which such deadlock creates, says Mr. Cole,—it is in the education of the public opinion of the various parties at interest with the possibility of an ultimate disappearance of the *impasse* which that involves, it is in the inability of one authority temporarily to impose its will absolutely,—that the personality of all individuals concerned gets its chance. A federalism of economic and civic controls means a dissipation of absolutism and an assurance of humanism. A deadlock is always possible; and according to the view which I share, it is well that it should be so.

But, it will be said, somebody has to decide on issues in order to get action. Responsibility may of course be decentralized; but it cannot be diffused. That is true; the difficulty partly lies in a confusion of ideas. Delegation of authority is not incompatible with unified and coherent organization. To have the last word concerning any particular problem finally in one man or one committee's hands, is not the same as having the last word about all problems in one group's hands. And it is the latter which political socialism finally comes to. Authority, the new political theory is saying, arises not out of the fact of accidental association; it arises out of the fact of purposive association for the performance of a function by those who, because they are performing it, derive the authority to do what is necessary to perform it.

Socialists and Trade Unionists

The other point which entails actual differences in policy is more largely a matter of emphasis. Because the guildsmen seek functional control, because they know that responsibility can only be successfully assumed as there is competence on the part of those who assume it, because they know that a capacity for exercising control comes only with experience, they are peculiarly interested in developing all the potentialities of the trade union movement.

In this country socialists approve of trade unions. But I have never felt that they are specially interested in helping labor to remove the disabilities, legal and social, which stand in the way of the full exercise of rights of organization and increasing joint control. Nor have they been at special pains to translate their message into terms which interest the trade unionist. Undoubtedly the fault of this is not wholly the socialists'. But it is true that the unions have not been made aware of the major socialist indictment of the existing production system in terms that have a vivid appeal. The unions would, I believe, understand the proposition that the operation of industry for profit involves a progressively larger share of the income from industry going to owners rather than workers. While wages increase gradually, the wealth out of which investment is made and surpluses amassed and reinvested and amassed again increases in almost geometric proportion. Under the wage system, labor can never substantially increase its relative share from the income of industry. This is axiomatic to the readers of this magazine. But are the elementary economic facts of our industrial arrangements being made plain by socialist propagandists—being stated in a way that the trade unionist will have to see? Have they been made plain in a way that shows to socialist and trade unionist alike how and where they have a basis of common action? After all, organized labor's reluctance to enter politics as a working man's party is not wholly the result of inertia. There is the very real danger that organized labor will get drawn away from its major job of creating a democratic government

within industry. Admittedly the socialists have advocated democratic control of industry. But the guildsmen have begun to show, as I believe no others have, how control can be democratized without jeopardizing efficiency and initiative.

This is, I say, largely a question of emphasis. American socialism must deliberately center its own thinking upon *the problem of organized labor's increasing control of industry, rather than the government's increasing control of industry,* if it wishes really to catch the full and wise significance of the guild idea.

I have no desire to magnify minor differences. But I do believe that at least on these two points the issues are sufficiently distinct and far-reaching to warrant a continuance of friendly controversy.

A REPLY TO ORDWAY TEAD

By Jessie Wallace Hughan

Mr. Tead and myself are so far agreed regarding the compatibility of the guild idea and American Socialism that our differences must needs be chiefly academic. A practical point indeed is his suggestion of a more vivid appeal to the trade unionist in Socialist propaganda. His own paragraph on the subject is a valuable foretaste of the enrichment that will come to our movement by the incorporation of the guildsmen's contributions.

The issue between us is mainly concerning Mr. Cole's "endeavor deliberately to create a plural sovereignty by dividing control and responsibility." His first motive in so doing is "to render it impossible for the One Supreme Sovereignty to lord it over the individual as it now can."

Dual Organization and Personality

I agree thoroughly with Mr. Tead in his demand for self-determination on the part of the individual, with the denial of the absolute sovereignty of the government. To me, however, the question is, What will be able to bring this freedom? If dual organization *per se* could bring it, would not the Constitution of the United States, with its elaborate Legislative, Executive and Judicial, have brought it long ago? If the guild electorate is to be co-extensive with that of the political state, there seems to be no essential difference between Mr. Cole's dual and our own triple system; if it is not co-extensive, then a portion of the population must thereby be partially disfranchised. If a dual government had existed in the United States during the past year, would the American in his economic capacity have proved more friendly to civil liberties and the conscientious objector than he has proved in his political capacity? Decentralization, the devices of political democracy, the capacity for passive resistance to unjust law—these seem to me better safeguards than a dual government against the evils of absolute sovereignty.

Organization by Function

Mr. Cole's second principle is that of "organization by function," a thoroughly sound principle when confined to the decision as to how and under what conditions articles are to be produced. Mr. Tead points out also that there exists a large field of civic matters which are properly under the control of the territorial organization. His somewhat surprising conclusion, however, is that the acceptance of the idea of functional organization "involves, *ipso facto,* acceptance of the idea of plural sovereignty." A deadlock may ensue, he declares, but it is in this deadlock, with the necessity for education which it brings, that the individual personality gets its chance. "In what way?" may I ask. When our Supreme Court and Congress clash, as over the income tax, for example, it is not easy to see the advantage of the individual personality in the years of delay.

The most real difference between Mr. Tead and myself is with regard to the supremacy of the productive function as such. Authority, he says, "arises not out of the fact of accidental association; it arises out of the fact of purposive association for the performance of a function by those who, because they are performing it, derive the authority to do what is necessary to perform it."

This authority indeed exists within the

function itself, yet that function must be controlled by something higher, in the organism by the nervous system, in society by the consumer—that is, by the people in their geographical relation. There sometimes exists what I might venture to term the fallacy of the expert mind—the mind which has centered so successfully upon efficiency of production that it sometimes forgets that the one excuse for being of efficiency, or of production itself, is to serve the will of the consumer. Productive groups, however well they may perform their functions, lose all their authority when the function itself is superseded, as the whale's hind legs quietly atrophied when the organism took to the water. "The purposive association for the performance of a function" is often the last group which should be consulted upon the supreme issues affecting it. Ignoring the authority of the purposive association of brewers, the "accidentally associated" people of the United States have decided to abolish it, function and all; and many of us hope to see a few years hence a similar abolition of the function of war, not by the military experts, but by the ultimate consumers. Higher than function is the choice between functions.

The Final Arbiter

Even with Mr. Tead there seems to linger a conception of the State Socialism of Bismarck rather than the Socialist Party of America. Otherwise it is hard to understand his allusion to having "the last word about all problems in one group's hands—which political socialism finally comes to." What is this oligarchic group in the American Socialist ideal? The people of the democracy, the mental and manual workers! And is this group more dangerous in its territorial than in its productive capacity?

Mr. Tead finally urges American Socialism to center its thinking "upon the problem of organized labor's increasing control of industry rather than the government's increasing control of industry." I venture to say in reply that this very centering has been going on so vigorously since 1912 that industrial control now forms a staple of thought and effort in the Socialist party, while collectivism as such sometimes finds difficulty in securing a hearing. Instead of an exclusive emphasis upon either of these great principles, some of us would urge American Socialism to entrust the securing of one to the unions and the securing of the other to state capitalism, while it directs its own forces to the control of the government by the working-class, the establishment of a political and industrial democracy.

College Notes

In the Convention Notes the recent work of the Chapters in a number of the colleges was mentioned and will not be repeated here. As the magazine goes to press, Dr. Harry Dana, a member of the Executive Committee, reports that the Harvard Chapter has just been reorganized with membership of forty. V. A. Kramer has been elected president and David Anopolsky secretary. George Roewer addressed the Chapter at its organization meeting on some of the recent social developments of importance.

The Society has just received a letter from Silik Polayes of Yale relative to the reviving of the Chapter there. "With the discharge of the S. A. T. C. from the institution," he declares, "it is surprising how ready Yale is to benefit by the existence of a radical organization. With competent speakers, we could do a great deal in real constructive work, for even at Yale the field for agitation is broad. We have a good number of supporters to commence with and once started, I think we could increase easily in membership."

Berkeley Divinity School has recently sent dues for its entire student membership. Prof. W. P. Ladd has just been installed dean of the college and has issued an installation address filled with the social message.

Ruth G. Porter of Wellesley reports this year an active discussion group at that college.

The students at Vassar are planning to hold a large public meeting on February 10, with Albert Rhys Williams as the principal speaker. Mary Cover is chairman of the Chapter. The secretary, Jeannette Regensburg, declared that during the war they had combined with the Consumers League and the Suffrage Club, thereby giving up separate meetings. "Now we intend to resume individual metings at which members of the faculty and students shall speak on pertinent topics."

The Cornell Chapter is constantly increasing its membership. Joseph Goldberg is secretary-treasurer and William Schack president.

At Hunter College, Albert Rhys Williams spoke on Russia to a large group of students, in January.

E. O'Neill Kane, Jr., formerly of Oberlin,

is now endeavoring to reorganize a Chapter at PRINCETON.

A letter has recently been received regarding a possible organization at BROOKLYN POLYTECHNIC.

Alfred H. Sachs of the COLUMBIA Chapter reports a successful reorganization meeting and is planning a series of big meetings in the Spring.

Continued reports of activity are being received from David Weiss of the WISCONSIN Chapter. "Interest," he declares, "is more widespread today than it has been for the past four years. The change in the name of our Society from the Socialist Group to the Social Science Club seems to have worked advantageously. We had a splendid meeting in January, at which we listened to an address on 'Bolshevism and the Soviet Government.' On January 27, or the week following, we will have Mayor Dan Hoan address the Society."

Lottie M. Odell of HAMLINE University reports that the group will reorganize at the beginning of the new year.

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

The Fabian Club of Chicago has held some very successful meetings, including one on "Amnesty for Political Prisoners," at which Ernest R. Reichman spoke. The Club has recently issued a 16-page pamphlet, "A Peace Conference Handbook," a review of the Problems of the Coming Peace Conference, full of valuable suggestions.

On February 10, a dinner to discuss "The Socialist Review" is planned at the Bon Roy Hotel, 92nd Street and Madison Avenue. The speakers are John Haynes Holmes, Harry A. Overstreet, Bruno Lasker, Chas. W. Ervin, Florence Kelley. Evans Clark will take part informally in the discussion. Harry W. Laidler will preside.

The New York Alumni Chapter is meeting with marked success. A very informative meeting was held on January 23, at the Church of the Ascension, on the subject, "Is There a Campaign Against Labor?" The Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the International Waiters' Affiliation, the Marine Workers and U. S. Labor Department were represented respectively by J. Schlossberg, Leon Lostar, Vincent Gilroy and George W. Coleman.

The Saturday Camaraderies are particularly interesting. Among the programs arranged by the Chapter's secretary, Louise Adams Grout, and the Committee have been: Rev. Richard Roberts on "The British Elections"; Juliet Stuart Poyntz on "A New Plan for Democratic Education"; George W. Kirchwey on "The Job and the Man"; John Coughlin on "The Man and the Job"; Elias Lieberman and Capt. William A. Maher on "In the Trenches of Labor," and Nahum I. Stone on "Industrial Democracy and Efficiency in the Shop."