

"No Annexation Amendment"

(Continued from page one.)

later—for no annexation and no indemnity. The difference which occurred between Millukoff and the Workmen's Council a week ago brought to light the fact that there are other secret treaties in existence than the one that was exposed by Trepoff at the beginning of last December; but these Millukoff refused to disclose. They cannot much longer be kept secret, now that the workmen have taken their part in the responsible government of Russia.

Asset to German Militarists.

The old Allied Note was the child of undemocratic diplomacy, and it has had the most disastrous results. I have no doubt that it is in a measure responsible for the very unfortunate speech that was delivered by the German Chancellor yesterday. It stiffened Germany. It increased the power of the militarist class in Germany. I think the greatest mistake our Government has made has been that they have not deliberately pursued the policy of dividing the two sections in Germany—of alienating the democracy and the militarist class. Instead of doing that they have cemented the alliance of the two in what they have believed to be a war of national defence. Nothing has been done more towards that end than the unfortunate Allied Note of January last. I candidly admit the force to the statement that a war which was entered upon without any idea of territorial aims may so develop that it is necessary if its objects are to be attained that there shall be a readjustment of territory; but the Allied Note was a great deal more than that. The Allied Note was imperialism and conquest naked and unashamed. It was not restitution and security. It was conquest and domination. We all admit that.

The Minister of Blockade (Lord R. Cecil): Where do you find that?

Mr. Snowden: In every line of it—in its proposal to dismember the Austrian Empire. Surely I need not quote what is within the knowledge of every hon. member of this House. "Territorial readjustments which will be necessary after the war." We are informed that President Wilson has refused to enter into the compact of the Allies.

Lord R. Cecil dissented.

Mr. Snowden: Refused to enter into the pact of London—then the news papers have been misinformed. Has he entered into it?

Lord R. Cecil: No question has been raised about it.

Mr. Snowden: I am quite sure that what the Russian Provisional Government means is that no country shall continue after the war to hold by the sword what it has gained by the sword during this war, and that no territory shall be transferred to any Government except by the will of the people who are transferred. That brings us up against the statement that we will make no peace with Germany because the word of Germany cannot be trusted. Were we to accept that, then we might abandon ourselves to despair. There is nothing but war before the world. I cannot accept that.

German Will to Peace.

I believe that there is proportionately as strong an anti-militarist sentiment, as strong a desire for peace, as strong a desire to establish some kind of system which will avoid future wars in Germany as in any other country that you can think of. Herr Scheidemann said yesterday in the Reichstag that 99 per cent. of the people of Germany were looking to the establishment of universal peace. I do not

know if the right hon. gentlemen opposite approve of the idea of a League of Nations. There was a remarkable meeting held in London two days ago to discuss this question. You cannot have a League of Nations which does not include the Central Powers, because a League of Nations which did not include them would be a League of Nations against them, and you can never have a League of Nations except upon very stable conditions. The possibility of a useful League of Nations after the war will depend upon the terms of settlement that we are going to have, and that we contemplate, will be the kind of settlement which the democracies of the belligerent nations are going to have.

A People's Peace.

Make no mistake about it, it will be a people's peace. This war is not going to be settled as other wars have been, by Statesmen whose incompetence or criminality made the war. This war is not going to be settled in the secret chambers of diplomacy; it is going to be settled by the democracies of the different countries. This war is going to sweep away for ever, in the settlement of the war, all those old methods employed in secret diplomacy, capital using diplomacy, which have been responsible for wars in the past.

Now part of the Russian Government have sent an invitation to all the Socialist parties in the world to meet them soon in International Conference. This is an event of the greatest significance.

The Parliament of Man.

This conference will be the embryo of the parliament of man.

If the British Government be wise, if the Governments of the Allied Powers are wise, they will accept this invitation to the Workmen's Council as a heaven-sent means of extricating themselves from the awful position in which they are now placed. It is the only way in which the war can be settled. It is not for me to say what the decisions of this conference will be, but I think I could state them with a tolerable degree of accuracy. In the first place this conference will be international. Delegates who attend that conference will be men who have developed what the noble lord the member for Oxford University described so eloquently last Monday at the League of Nations meeting as the higher morality which considers its obligations to humanity greater than its loyalty to any one country. That would be the governing spirit of the International Conference. While, as to policy, its policy will be to secure such readjustments of territory as will remove one cause of war, namely, resentment at being subjected to an anti-racial rule.

Its Probable Decisions.

I do not say, and nobody can say for a moment, that it would be easy to re-draw the map of Europe and to make race and Government area coterminous. It will be a very difficult problem, but if there be the spirit to do it it can be done.

Another decision to which this conference will come will be this: I am sure that it will announce a policy which will try to remove as far as possible financial and commercial competition as a cause tending to produce war.

Free Traders All.

There are many causes of war—the ambitions of ruling dynasties or of militarist classes, race, religion; but in these modern times the most fruitful cause of war is commercial competition, the desire for new markets, the use of foreign policy and diplomacy as a means of aiding interested financial

groups in the different nations. Without universal free trade, I am afraid, this will always remain an invitation to and a possible cause of friction between nations. The Conference will speak with one voice upon that question. They will speak unanimously in favor of free trade and the open door for the commerce of nations.

That Conference will repudiate the old doctrine of the balance of power, which the late Primé Minister so truly described as a precarious contrivance, and for leagues of nations against leagues of nations it will substitute a league of nations, and, as has been pointed out by a German Socialist, it will advocate the establishment of international arbitration for the settlement of all disputes. And the Conference will also declare for the abolition of the method of secret diplomacy. It is a monstrous thing that the people of the country should be committed to war, and should be driven into war and have to sacrifice their lives because of commitments made by governments of which they were previously altogether unaware. National diplomacy will have to be free and open in the future. Parliaments will represent the people and will have to ratify agreements before agreements can have effect. There is one other matter about which we have heard very little during the war. We heard a good deal about it in the months preceding the war owing to the disgraceful disclosures which were made—namely, financial interests in the manufacture of armaments. We shall have to remove that altogether.

The Only Way to End the War.

Now, roughly speaking, this is the kind of peace that we want. It is the kind of peace which those of us who have had to bear the charge of being unpatriotic have been waiting for. This is the kind of peace Russia wants, and the kind of peace that the people of every country of the world are longing for. The Government have had many opportunities in the past of bringing this war to an end. I am afraid there are few signs of greater wisdom on their part. There appears to be no evidence that they are using other means than the brutal weapon of slaughter to achieve their ends. That way will never bring peace. It is only by the exercise of reason and common sense that peace will be achieved. The awful lists of casualties now appearing every day in the newspapers indicate something of the terrible anguish and suffering now being endured, and it is because of that and because I believe there is now a hopeful opportunity of bringing this war to an end in such a way as will realize the objects for which we entered it that I do pray that the Government will not reject this present opportunity but that they will put themselves into line with the new democracy of Russia, which expresses the longing and the hope of the democracies the whole world over.

—Labor Leader.

(Continued in next issue.)

A REPLY TO MR. DOUGLAS

We take the opportunity of making the following insertion (by a voice from the fog), written in reply to criticism of The New Socialism, by H. A. Russell, contained in the columns of the Square Deal of May, 1917. We do not stand as sponsor for all that "A Voice From the Fog" says on this matter, but we are very much of his opinion in regard to what he has to say with reference to Mr. Douglas mystifying abstractions, viz., Justice, equity, righteousness, etc. These are meaningless terms separated from the laborer receiving the full "Social value of his labor."—Ed.

What Mr. Douglas Says:

In discussing the methods whereby

we may judge of the correctness of any proposal for social betterment, amongst others, this author give the following:

"That it involves no artificial or arbitrary adjustment of work or wages. That it preserves the fullest liberty to the individual. That it ensures to each the full value of his labor and equal opportunity; and finally, that it appeals to every sense of justice and fairness."

To all these tests we fully and heartily agree. When he appeals to justice and fairness we can without reservation utter a cordial Amen. But when, on the next page, he makes the assertion "That the realization of the ideal of justice can be accomplished only by the overthrow of the capitalist system," then at once he rushes into a fog. That word "capitalist" gives no assistance to the investigation of social adjustments. We might as well say "wealthism" or "commodityism" or "goodism" as to say "capitalism" or "capitalist system." A capitalist system we are going to have under any condition, the only difference between systems that is of any importance to examine is a just capitalism or an unjust capitalism. So long as our socialist friends stick to their unmeaning terms and do not use plain English, they will mislead themselves and others. Let them stick to the words justice, equity, righteousness and brotherhood, and then they will be walking in the light.

To the Editor:

Dear Sir,—The long-anticipated by me, came to hand in your issue this month, to wit, An esteemed "Single Taxer" who is perhaps unconsciously influenced by the drunken condition of flourishing capitalism, thought it opportune to criticize a book by Mr. H. A. Russell, "The New Socialism"; and it seems to me, that in the effort there is a timely exhibition of the logic of popular political economy, which, at this time when capitalism is so intensifying that even its immaculate potency seems to the ordinary mind, mild. It seems to me of more moment to your readers than to be confined to the opinions of Mr. Russell and Mr. Douglas. Though desiring not at this time a controversial comparison of "Single Tax" and "Socialism," yet the assertive and corrective attitude adopted by Mr. Douglas needs some attention. For it seems to me either pure bluff, or a display of ignorance regarding the nature of "Capital." If the former, I do not understand it from Mr. Douglas; if the later, it is what I would expect from "The anthropist" dealing with iniquities of our social system. Therefore, I would, as a voice from the fog, ask Mr. Douglas if he is as positive that "Single Tax" would afford the largest possible equality, as that we shall have Capitalism in any system. He says the word "Capital" affords no assistance in investigating social adjustment; but would he be equally as positive that the word "Holy Ghost" affords no assistance to adjust the conduct and conditions of sinners, or, would a good or bad "Holy Ghost" be the only important consideration to adjust personal iniquities?—like a good or bad capitalism to adjust social iniquities.

It is possible for the anthropists walking in the light to see "the cat," yet see no connection in the terms "Holy Ghost" and "Capital," but that does not prevent a Socialist in the fog seeing much similitude in these two mediums of purposeful trinities in concept, in composition, in function, for stripped of their aliases and the many complex forms they incarnate they appear in all their purposeful essentials two phases of one evil; both are historical products of human selfishness. The first parading in ecclesiastical verbiage such as righteousness, authority, humility, and other platitudes to

(Continued on Page 5).