



CLARENCE S. DARROW



PROF. JOHN C. KENNEDY

*The*  
Darrow-Kennedy  
Debate

on

*“Will Socialism Save  
the World?”*

# “Will Socialism Save the World?”

*Affirmative:*

Professor John C. Kennedy

Alderman 27th Ward

*Negative:*

Mr. Clarence S. Darrow

---

Mr. Arthur M. Lewis

*Chairman*

---

at the

GARRICK THEATRE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS,

JANUARY 26, 1919.

Maclasky & Maclasky, Court Reporters

Chicago.

JOHN F. HIGGINS, PRINTER  
376-380 WEST MONROE ST.



# “Will Socialism Save the World?”

---

Mr. Arthur M. Lewis, permanent lecturer of the Society, read the question and introduced the debaters.

## PROFESSOR KENNEDY'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. Kennedy said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Darrow, Comrades and Friends:

Every student of history must be impressed by the fact that the law of life is a law of change. No form of industry, no social organization, no form of government, no philosophy, no science or no religion can be considered to be fixed and final. The law of life is a law of growth and development. Therefore, when I attempt to prove today that Socialism will save the world, I do not pretend to prove that I can offer or anybody else can offer here and now a solution for all the social problems that may arise some time in the far distant future. All that anybody can hope to do in any given age or period is to offer a solution for the problems which present themselves in that period, and to leave the door open for development in the future.

So the question which we are debating today really comes down to this: Does Social Democracy offer a solution for the social problems of our age? If it does, that is all anybody who claims to be an evolutionist can ask.

Now, what are the problems, and what are the great questions with which we are confronted at the present time? We are all familiar with the fact that during the past seventy-five or hundred years in nearly every civilized country there has been a remarkable concentration of wealth and power in the hands of comparatively few individuals. That concentration has been cumulative. Every year has seen it getting greater, and more oppressive to the mass of the people, and just as this power and wealth and prestige is concentrated more and more in the hands of a few, there is a wider and wider mass of people who are in comparative poverty and insecurity and insignificance. They are dependent for all the main interests of life upon these few who are getting a firmer grip upon the entire situation. That is the real social problem of our time, this problem of the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few, leaving the rest in comparative poverty and dependence.

Connected with this problem are a number of other secondary problems, which would be solved if you solve the main problem. For example, we have the world over, a

class struggle, or a series of class struggles. It seems to become more and more one class struggle, a class struggle between those who possess most of the wealth and a organized army of wage earners.

Nobody can look upon that struggle with any great degree of satisfaction. No matter which particular class he may happen to find himself in he must recognize the bitterness, the hatred, and the misery which comes out of this terrific class struggle which is raging all over the world.

Then, in connection with this class struggle we find that the ruling class, conscious of the fact that it is a minority, utilizes every possible means to hold the majority in subjection. It realizes that in our present day and generation brute force alone will not suffice; that if it depends entirely upon the army, upon brutality, upon the policeman's club, and the soldier's bayonet, that the ruling class cannot long retain its power. Therefore, it must resort to a program of mis-education, of misrepresentation, a program to develop, in the minds of the masses of the people, false ideas regarding their own situation in life, and the situation of the working class.

In other words, they must corrupt the press, the pulpit, the schools and all other agencies of public information, and of social control. They must corrupt these instrumentalities in order to use them to hold the masses of the people in subjection. Now, that is part and parcel of this capitalistic system which prevails in all the leading countries of the world at the present time.

We have not only the class war, but we have the war between the various nations. Now, that in itself, of course, would be a sufficient subject for a debate—whether or not capitalism is the chief cause of modern wars, commercial competition for markets, and so on. In my opinion, that is the fundamental cause of modern wars; and if that cause could be removed we would remove the chief agency making for war between nations at the present time. These are some of the great social evils with which the peoples of the world are confronted, and I do not need to enumerate a number which will occur to all of you, of minor importance, which are nevertheless grounded in the same situation, and have the same fundamental cause.

I am not going to take the time here in this debate, because I think Mr. Darrow will admit the facts—to prove that there is a tremendous amount of poverty throughout the world—needless poverty; not poverty that arises out of the incapacity of the human race to get from the soil and to get from the natural resources sufficient food and cloth-

ing and shelter, and other means of satisfying the wants of humanity; it is not a poverty based upon our inability to cope with the forces of Nature. If that were true, if we lacked the necessary skill and intelligence to get from the earth the things that we need, we would have to accept the situation and say "That kind of poverty is inevitable," but every intelligent person knows that we have such a mastery over the forces of Nature that all of the necessities of life can be produced in abundance for every human being on the face of the earth. There can be no question about that.

So the problem to be solved is not a problem of the mastery of the forces of Nature; not a problem of the production of more wealth. That is not the problem with which we are confronted. The problem is one of distributing the goods which we are easily able to produce; to get a just and equitable system of distributing among the mass of the people the wealth which their labor really creates.

Now, I say I do not believe it is necessary to give any statistics as to the amount of poverty. Nor is it necessary to give any elaborate statistics on the reverse side of the picture, the concentration of wealth and power. I recall a few years ago, Senator LaFollette presented to the United States Senate a very elaborate statement demonstrating that seventy men controlled all of the important industries, and what you might call the strategic points in our social and industrial system. He enumerated the men, and showed which industries they controlled through interlocking directorates; how, through the control of insurance companies, banks and corporations of various kinds, they dominated the railroads, and the telegraph and telephone industries, the mining industries, the big trusts, such as the steel trust, and copper trust, coal trust, beef trust and so on. He showed how they had gotten control of the water power and all other natural resources, so that they really were in position to dominate the entire economic life of the nation.

I do not think anybody who is familiar with modern industrial development will deny that or attempt to deny this tremendous concentration of power and wealth. It has gone on more rapidly during the past four years than ever before in the history of the United States. I am informed, for example, that Swift & Company last year made profits of forty-seven million dollars. Clear profit. One corporation, forty-seven million dollars. The Federal Trade Commission reported that in 1917 the Packers of Chicago cleared something over one hundred and forty million dollars—Clear profit. And so, such information as we have been able to

DARROW-KENNEDY DEBATE.

t on the profits of the great corporations of the country during the last four years, demonstrates conclusively that the wealth of this country is far more concentrated today than it was five or ten years ago; and the process goes on with ever increasing rapidity. The more wealth one group gets, the more it is able to get, the more it is able to drive its competitors to the wall, and to get control of the necessary basis for any industry to be built upon.

Now, what are we going to do as a people? Are we simply going to say, "This is inevitable, and it must go on in this way," that nothing can be done about it; it has been ordained by God that some shall be rich and the rest shall be poor; that some shall rule and the others be slaves? Is that the way we are to face the situation? Must we accept it as some law of Providence, or is not this a matter that is subject to human control? Is this not a matter which can be met and faced as other problems are met and faced?

You know very well that during the Middle Ages when certain men of science came forward with remedies for various diseases, or with solutions for various problems they were met by this argument from some of the high church authorities, "It will not do to interfere with the laws of God, with the acts of God. If anybody is sick, why it is the will of God that he should be sick. Don't try to cure him. If we have any sort of a calamity, if we have a flood, for example, it is the will of God we should have a flood. Don't try to control the flow of the river and to stop the flood, because it is the will of God that these people shall be wiped out." That is the way they regarded a great many problems in the Middle Ages.

So too, today, we find certain people saying, when we are confronted by these economic and social problems, "Nothing can be done about it; it is a part of the law of Nature that it should be so. People are what they are. They can't be otherwise. Mr. Armour is at the head of the Beef Trust because he is Mr. Armour. The others are working for him because they happen to be a lot of Poles and Lithuanians and so forth, that do not have the executive ability, do not have the natural talent that Mr. Armour happens to have." And so they will argue that there is no use, you can't do anything about it.

Now, the Socialists look at the matter from a scientific standpoint. We believe that these problems, such as the problem of concentration of wealth, the problem of poverty, the problem of class warfare, the problem of corruption of agencies of public information and education—all of these

problems can be solved, and will be solved. We see the forces already developing; see the forces at work in society which are bound to bring about a transformation; and we feel that it is the mission of the Socialist party and the Socialist movement to work in harmony with these forces which are going to transform this capitalistic system; to organize the forces, to unify the forces, to direct these forces so that the transformation will be brought about in the most systematic, orderly and effective way possible. That is the mission of the Socialist movement; not to build something out of a situation which we imagine; not to create something out of our own imaginations as an ideal, a Utopia, or social republic, but simply to work in harmony with the forces which are developing in the present society and which are leading straight to Social Democracy.

Now, what are these forces? It is a fact that in order to protect and promote their own interests the capitalists must prepare for their own downfall. It is a fact that the capitalists must organize their workers. They must develop a spirit of solidarity among their workers. They must develop a collective efficiency among the workers in their establishments. They must bring about a certain degree of technical education among their workers, because if they don't the workers of some other capitalist will be so far superior that the capitalist who fails to bring about these results will lose in the world competition.

So this rivalry among the capitalist industries of the world compels the capitalist system to bring about a degree of education and organization among the workers which fit the workers not only to serve capitalism well but also when the day comes to serve themselves well.

That is inherent in the system of industrial development. It is a part of it. The capitalists bring about the situation not because they want to, but because they must. They can't help themselves, that's all there is to it. It is inherent in the line of industrial and social evolution.

Now, when you have a group of workers in any industrial establishment—let's call it the Western Electric Works, or a packing house, or the International Harvester Company's plant, or any other industrial establishment—when you have that group of workers from the humblest laborer up to the most skilled engineer in the whole plant—when you have them dovetailed together, working together as one splendid organization, taking the raw materials and passing them through their hands and having them come out as a finished product, it is inevitable that that group of workers sooner



or later will say, "Why doesn't that product belong to us after we have created it? How does it happen that after we have taken the raw material and taken it from its initial stages right on to the point where it is delivered to the consumer—how does it happen that we, the producers, in the end are not the owners?" How does that happen? And it is inevitable that sooner or later there will develop in the minds of the masses of the workers the conviction that the wealth which they create belongs to them and belongs to nobody else.

Now, I am not going into any dialectical argument over the precise relationship between labor and capital—the function of labor and capital in the productive process, and so forth. I am simply dealing with a psychological fact, that the workers in the mines, on the railroads, in the mills, in the factories, in the stores, wherever they are occupied, dealing with the various goods and services that are needed by humanity—they inevitably must come to the conclusion that they are the producing class; they are the useful class; they are the creative class; they are the ones who make everything that is worth while, and therefore they should have everything that is worth while.

Now, some people disagree with that argument, but you won't be able to convince these workers that they are wrong.

And that spirit is developing; and it means that we are getting the world over a class conscious working class, with certain definite aims and objects, not any longer content to accept poverty as inevitable; not any longer content to accept insecurity and unemployment as inevitable; not any longer willing to live in shacks and shanties while some people are living in palaces. Step by step the organization and movement is developing to transform this social system so that the working class will be the ruling class. That is the important thing.

Now, that grows out of this economic situation. It does not come about because I say it ought to come about; and it won't stop coming about because Clarence Darrow or somebody else might say it should not come about. It develops out of the conditions of activity and life of the masses of the workers. That is where it comes from. Comes out of the actual life experiences and struggles of the masses of the workers. That is where this conviction comes from, that the working class is the useful class, and that it must be the ruling class.

Now, you may say, "Well, who are they going to rule, and what are they going to rule." Well, the peculiar fea-

ture about the present situation in world history is this: That whereas in previous periods when a certain class desired to get power and did get power, it almost invariably was in a position to rule some other class that was under it; as, for example, if the capitalist class overthrew the feudal lords, the capitalist class was still in a position to rule and exploit the working class, today when the working class comes into power there is no class under the working class. There is some class on top, but no class under it.

So that when the working class comes into power the only thing it can do to the plutocracy and the men of wealth, and those that have been living on unearned incomes, is to say, "We will give you a job, but you can work just like the rest of us, on the same basis, with the same opportunities." In other words, unify the whole human race into one class who will all be workers, who will all have leisure, who will all participate justly in the wealth that is created, who will all have an opportunity to get a good education, who will all have an opportunity to get some pleasure in their work; who will all share alike in the good things of the world.

Now, that is the respect in which the mission of the working class differs entirely from the mission of other classes which have overthrown the ruling class above them. The mission of the working class is to free not only itself, but in so doing to free all humanity.

And it must do it in order to do a good job; in order to satisfy its own demands; in order to solve its own problems, it must grant equal rights to all. There can be no question about that.

So, therefore, let's set it down as the first point in the solution of the social problems with which we are confronted—the first plank, you might say, in the program of the Social Democracy, the workers shall rule society. Over against that you would say, or have as a program that the parasites should rule society—those who do not work. You see, there are only two classes—those who do work and those who do not.

Now, I say that the workers should rule society, and I wonder whether Mr. Darrow will say that the parasites should rule. You will have to accept one form or the other of that dilemma, because there are only the two classes, the workers and the shirkers.

It is a fundamental doctrine of modern Socialism the world over that the working class shall rule. A better word perhaps than the word "rule," would be the word "administer;" because the word rule implies that you are ruling some

object class, exploiting some subject class; and that is not the idea of Socialism. The idea of Socialism is a co-operative administration of the social and industrial system—a collectivist administration, not an administration to exploit any element in society, but an administration to protect the rights of all alike.

So let's lay that down as the first proposition. The second proposition as a means of solving these social problems is that the working class shall use its power to get possession of all the social tools of production, and all the natural resources upon which humanity depends for its existence and happiness.

Now, mark my words: I say all the social tools of production. It does not imply, for example, that if you have a spade and want to spade up your back yard that you must have collective ownership and operation and management of that spade. That does not happen to be a social tool of modern industry at all. So I might go on and give you illustration after illustration where the personal ownership, private, personal ownership of certain tools and certain instrumentalities in no way jeopardize the welfare and happiness of one's fellow men—in no way enables the owner to tyrannize over his fellow men, or to exploit his fellow men; and that kind of property the Socialists are perfectly willing to leave under private ownership and private control; all kinds of property which in no way leads to robbery, which in no way leads to tyranny. The Socialists are perfectly willing to leave all those forms of private property in the hands of their personal owners, if it will do those personal owners any good.

The significant thing is the social control, the collective control of the social tools of production, those which enable a small group, the group of capitalistic owners, to take from those who are employed in the industry a large percentage of what they produce; of those industries which enable the capitalists to say whether the workers shall work, or whether they shall be unemployed. Those industries and resources which give the capitalists the strategic control of the whole social system; those are the ones which must be socialized; which must be owned collectively, and managed democratically. So let's put that down as the second plank in the socialist platform, the second point in our argument is "collective ownership and democratic management and administration of the social tools of production and the natural resources upon which the mass of the people depend for their existence and happiness." That is a part of the Socialist

program, but we do not stop there. This is what you might call the mechanical part of the program. It is a means to an end. What Socialists are after, if I understand the Socialist movement correctly, is this: It is liberty. That is what the Socialist movement wants. It is freedom. We do not want collective ownership because it is collective ownership. We want collective ownership because it is the best means we know of to escape the tyranny of capitalism. That is the reason we want collective ownership. We are confronted with a certain situation, and that is the way out.

We have to choose between private monopoly or public monopoly; between capitalist rule or working class administration. We have to make a choice. We are in an actual situation in a real world, and the Socialist puts forward this program of collective ownership as a solution of these problems of private monopoly and private control of the industries of the nation and of the world.

Now, collective ownership would be of no use if it did not secure a more just distribution of wealth; if it did not give the mass of the people, the workers, a better opportunity for self-expression, for self-realization, a better opportunity to live, in other words. If collective ownership and democratic management of industry would not lead to those results, if it did not mean more liberty, and more life for the mass of the people, the program would not be worth the paper it would be written on.

So, let's bear in mind what the real end is, and not put the emphasis so much on the mechanics of it. Let's see what the object is, and realizing that, we can say that in addition to the program of collective ownership and operation, we must have a very highly organized and developed system of education in order to get the results we are after; an education that will start with the children, the small children. Teach them a little bit different sort of doctrines from what they are taught in some schools at the present time. When you start out with the children and say, "What you should do is to become a captain of industry, get rich; get rich honestly, if you can, but get rich, because the rich people are the great people; they are the models"; if, directly or indirectly, we teach such doctrines as those to the children, we kill the spirit of co-operation; we kill the spirit of social solidarity; we kill the spirit of brotherhood, and promote the spirit of competition, a disastrous competition, for the human race.

So you have to start with the children to instill the ideals of brotherhood and of co-operation, of social service, if you are going to make this system amount to what it should amount to. And that is not all. When it comes to the choice

occupations, which is one of the greatest problems with which every boy and girl is confronted, what assistance does the average child get today in the choice of an occupation? What consideration is given to the problem? The schools are just beginning to deal with that problem—sort of nibbling at it—but after all every boy and every girl should be given a broad knowledge of the various processes by which the goods we need are created, and by which the services we need are rendered; and the talents and capacities of that child should be so directed that the child will in all probability get to some occupation which will be congenial and satisfactory, and lead to a high degree of happiness.

Not only in the selection of occupations, and in the direction and in the training for occupations can a great deal to be done by our school system, but there are many industries and many occupations that ought to be abolished entirely; they are run today simply because there is a profit in it. Some of these occupations, and some of these industries where men and women are employed could be so transformed by the introduction of machinery that they would cease to be unwholesome, that the work would cease to be so deadly monotonous as it may be under present conditions. But, mark you this, as long as it is more profitable to hire human beings under unfavorable economic conditions instead of displacing these human beings by machinery or other instrumentalities in production, the capitalists will continue that form of production and keep the human beings at work there instead of utilizing the machinery; but when the workers are controlling the situation their ideal will not be the production of profit, their ideal will not be the exploitation of their fellow men; their ideal will be just as much to get satisfaction out of their work, as it will be to produce wealth. And that is something that has been missed entirely by the capitalist system.

As a matter of fact, it is probable that more happiness can be gotten out of one's work if the work is congenial, than out of the product of the work, out of the wealth that is created by the work. But the capitalist system, run as it is for profit, run as it so often is, under very unpleasant conditions for the worker, makes work slavery; takes all the joy out of work, all the happiness out of work, so that the only aim of the worker is to get shorter hours, and get higher pay, to get away from it as much as possible.

So, let's put these three things together: The rule of society, the administration of social and industrial affairs by the working class, the control of the industries and natural resources through collective ownership and democratic management and a system of education designed to make every

boy and every girl a free citizen, not a slave, but a free citizen, entitled to all the opportunities that any other citizen is entitled to. Let's have those three fundamentals of a new social order, and in my opinion we can go forward and solve practically all of these problems with which we are now confronted. We can solve the problem of the unjust distribution of wealth, with its concentration of wealth in the hands of the few, and poverty among the many. We can solve the problem of the class war, because the antagonistic classes will cease to exist as separate classes.

We can solve the problem of the corruption of the press; the corruption of the political machinery; the corruption of our educational system, because there will be no ruling class here to do the corrupting; and we can solve the problem of world war because we will eliminate conflict for world markets.

#### MR. DARROW'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. Darrow said: Mr. Lewis' eagerness for debates has got Brother Kennedy and myself into trouble.

I am glad to say that I practically agree with most of what Mr. Kennedy has said. I am so honest about my debates that I never permit myself to be driven into opposing something I believe in or advocating something I don't believe in. On Sunday, at least, I try to be honest.

Now, I shall not spend my time trying to prove that Socialism on the whole is not a scientifically correct theory; and certainly I shall not try to prove that our present society is right. I would not undertake to say that any society on earth ever could be right. I certainly would not claim that this is not a world of change. The only trouble is it does not change fast enough. You may not get your money's worth today, as far as a debate is concerned, but if we come out so that I agree with Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Kennedy agrees with me, why, perhaps it is just as well. Anyhow, I have no ambition to win, and I am quite sure he has not. I am not anxious to make any quarrel with theoretical Socialism. Of course, practical Socialism might be different, because that involves Socialists. But as to the theory of Socialism, I am rather inclined to think that it is logical, and perhaps will come if the world does not get cold too soon. I came here this afternoon to debate a question, as to whether Socialism would save the world.

Now, I do not want to take any advantage of a narrow interpretation of a question; although I did tell my brother that if he wanted to change it—to whether anything would

the world—I would debate that. Or, if he wanted to make it still broader and say, is the world worth saving, I would debate that.

So I am going to debate the question myself, whether he is or not, whether Socialism will save the world.

Now, I thought I would open my part of the Sunday service by reading a little poem, which somewhat illustrates my view of saving the world.

### FIXING THE OLD THING RIGHT.

Said Adam unto Seth, his son,  
 "My boy, my life is nearly done;  
 I am the first man ever made,  
 And yet a failure, I'm afraid.  
 And you, my boy, must bring to men  
 Your father's Eden back again.  
 You must correct our great mistake,  
 Our foolish blunder with the snake.  
 The world has wandered from the light;  
 Go in and fix the old thing right."

Said Seth to Enos, his first born,  
 "My boy, your life is in its morn;  
 You've scarcely passed from boyhood's stage,  
 You're but four hundred years of age.  
 I've struggled on through hopes and fears,  
 And lived about five hundred years;  
 And now I feel that there can be  
 But a few centuries more for me. ,  
 I've tried my prettiest since birth  
 To steer and regulate the earth;  
 But all of Nature's plan, I fear,  
 Is pretty badly out of gear.  
 So, while I travel toward the night,  
 Go in and fix the old thing right."

Said Enos unto Cainan, "Lad,  
 I fear the world is growing bad.  
 But when I see before me spread  
 Your large development of head,  
 And know you deem all wisdom shut  
 And focussed in your occiput.  
 I feel that here is one at last  
 Who should redeem the wretched past;  
 And so I say, take up the fight,  
 Go in and fix the old thing right."

Said Cainan to Mahalaleel,  
"The envious years upon me steal,  
And now I feel as old and dried,  
As Father Enos when he died.  
Though I possessed, as father said,  
A large development of head,  
The world would 'haw' when I said 'gee',  
And 'gee' when I said 'haw'. Ah, me!  
I've tried for these nine hundred years,  
To drive this balky yoke of steers;  
And now I pass the goad to you,  
To do the best that you can do,  
And when old Cainan fades from sight,  
Go in and fix the old thing right."

Mahalaleel to Jared said,  
"My son, 'tis time that I were dead;  
And in this view of mine, I guess,  
You, too, have come to acquiesce.  
The world has reached a sorry plight;  
Go in and fix the old thing right."

So Jared, when his life was done,  
The same to Enoch talked, his son.  
And Enoch, like a faithful pa,  
The same to young Methuselah,  
Who near a thousand years of strife,  
Mourned o'er the brevity of life,  
And said to Lamech, "Life is short,  
And very little I have wrought,  
Though I might make the world sublime,  
And perfect, if I had the time,  
But in my life's contracted span  
I have but merely just began;  
No earthly power my life can save,  
I seek my premature grave.  
My son, take up the unfinished fight;  
Go in and fix the old thing right."

Soon Lamech left the world to Noah,  
Just as his fathers had before.  
And then the Flood came on to rout,  
And drown the whole Creation out;  
Though all had tried with main and might,  
They failed to fix the old thing right.



But when a man is born today,  
 He starts out in the good old way,  
 And bravely works from dawn till night,  
 To try to fix the old thing right.  
 The same old lightning in the blood  
 That thrilled men's hearts before the Flood,  
 Drive all men to the endless fight,  
 To try and fix the old thing right.  
 And though the clouds of doubt draw nigh,  
 And shut the sun from out the sky,  
 And though life marches through the gloom  
 To music of the steps of doom,  
 A voice comes from the darkness far,  
 And smites the cloud-wrack like a star,  
 And makes its thunder-blackness bright,  
 Go in and fix the old thing right."

Not only have all the world through all the ages been trying to fix the old thing right, but every kind of receipt that could be conjured up by the ingenuity of man has been tried to fix the old thing right; and still it is not right. It is never right because of the inherent things in life, and in the universe, especially the inherent nature of man, which will leave man trying right, no matter what it is.

We have had all kinds of receipts since the world began, all kinds of prophets. We have had Karl Marx and Henry George, and Billy Sunday, and Billy Bryan, and Lydia Cham. We have had Kaiser Bill, and all the rest of the world, and Trotsky. I could choose my audience and get any one of those names cheered, all of them fixing the old thing right, according to their own way of looking at it.

We have had all the schemes that men could devise. We have had Buddhism, Mormonism and Catholicism, and Socialism.

We have had Christian Science, and Free Silver; we have had Peruna; Cod Liver Oil; every old thing known to man. I really have not the time and I confess I have not even the knowledge to discuss the relative merits of all of these things that have interested fragments of the human race. Most of the human race have lived and died in utter unconsciousness of most of these theories. They have grabbed at and clung to the one closest at hand, and of course, clung to it like a death, never thinking that it could be wrong.

There may be and no doubt is, a species or a part of the world in all of them; even Peruna, which I understand contains some alcohol.

Whether any of them have the whole truth or not depends upon the breadth or the narrowness of the intellect that is studying them. To a very narrow intellect each one of them has the whole truth of the universe. If the intellect is broader, it would take two or more, and so on, according to the outlook of the mind.

Now, if I might discuss Socialism after confessing a substantial belief in it, with some reservation—I will point out some of its weaknesses—I would say that the ordinary Socialist—the ordinary Socialist; I do not mean Karl Marx, or Mr. Kennedy, or Trotsky—I mean the one, the one out of the million of the fellows who used to vote the Socialist ticket in the United States. I mean the ordinary one; they lay too great emphasis upon bread and butter, and they have taken their particular dope as containing the whole meaning of life; whereas, there are more things in the world than bread and butter, and a man must labor under some delusion if he thinks that he can live by bread alone. He can't, even if he throws in beefsteak. To the ordinary Socialist, as shown by all of his talk, and by all of his writing, the one great evil in the world is the lack of a practically equal distribution of property; or, at least, if property was fairly divided the world would be saved; and then we would all be happy.

Well, now, it is hard to make some people happy. I was not even happy when my friend, Mr. Lewis, here suggested that I might live many more years to discuss and debate. I thought that was about the most unpleasant thing he could say about me. It is very hard to make some people happy, and it is very easy to make others happy. If I could be happy on such a dream as that, then I would try to go to sleep and pray that nobody would ever waken me.

Now, let's see what Socialism really is. To me, Socialism is a theory of political action, and economics. To you, Socialism is a religion, just a pure unadulterated dope. Now, let's see if I can prove it so that everybody will understand it excepting the Socialists. If I can I am satisfied.

Most all the Socialists I ever knew believe that this is a universe of law. They do not believe in a personal God, or any other, and I am not disputing on that question. Of course they have certain patron saints, among whom is Karl Marx; and that does not bother me. They are materialists. They believe that when a man is dead he is dead all over.

Of course there is a certain sect which call themselves Christian Socialists, but I never saw any of them. I never saw any Socialist who could be a Christian, or any Christian who could be a Socialist. Because either dope is enough to fill

anybody. If a man is drunk on whisky he does not need morphine. If he has morphine he does not need whisky.

The great mass of Socialists are materialists. The great mass of them are possessed of considerable intellect. I am not joking now. Of course I am not comparing you with myself, but I am comparing you with the common herd. And that is the reason I say you are intellectual.

You believe in the co-operative commonwealth; in a world where everything shall belong to everybody and nothing belongs to anybody; and I don't object to that. Of course this is rather a short definition of Socialism, which perhaps my friend could quibble over, but I am just putting it short. I believe he did say that they would save out a spade, but what a Socialist would do with a spade I can't imagine.

Anyhow you believe in the co-operative commonwealth, where the product of every man will be dumped into the common pot, and each fellow draw out according to the amount of work he has done, or according to his needs.

Well, I shall not quarrel over that. I can imagine a state of society where a man's best title to property would be that he needed it, and as all of the laws in reference to property are purely arbitrary, why, perhaps that would be as good as any. But I will state this, that no intelligent Socialist believes that any such state of society will come in the next ten generations. I am speaking of intelligent Socialists.

You believe in a state of society, as Brother Kennedy put it, where the lowest class—and I am quoting him because he says nothing can be beneath it; he is not speaking intellectually or morally, but he is speaking of their relation—where the lowest strata of society will control the upper, and where all of us intellectuals will have to go to work, or starve.

Well, I am willing to take a chance on that. I am willing to starve. I don't agree with Mr. Kennedy that when we have Socialism work will be play, because when work is play, then it is not work. The distinguishing thing about work is that you do not want to do it. And when some sort of condition of psychology, or Socialism, makes it just as much fun to saw wood as to play golf, then sawing wood will no longer be work; but so far as we can see work will always be work, and I don't want it.

Now, let me follow up what I meant to prove to you people who are not Socialists. This blissful state that Mr. Kennedy talks about will not come in the next thousand years.

A Voice: Doesn't matter.

Mr. Darrow: Well, if my friends think it won't be a thousand years, we will cut it down to a hundred. I don't

think any of you are crazy enough to believe that this state is coming inside of a hundred years; but if you will cut it down again, I take it, the average of you here are thirty years old, maybe thirty-five, possibly forty; and as long as you have a pleasant dream, why you may live longer than the ordinary person. We will say you live to be ninety. Anyway, it won't come while you are living, and when you are dead, you are dead.

So there isn't any one here who is going, physically and in the flesh, to participate in the co-operative commonwealth. That is for future generations—assuming it is coming—and you are dead; you know nothing about it. You won't even know that it is not coming.

Now, so far as Socialism affects your life today, it is because it is a dream, an idealism, a religion, nothing else. Why, I have known Socialists—some of them I see around me today—fathers in Israel, good fellows, they haven't been awake since I knew them. They never will awaken. They will die in their sleep. I don't object to it. I am glad of it. That is a fine way to die, and it is a bully good way to live. I don't object to it. But what I do say is this: that they are living upon an ideal; they are living upon a theory; they are living upon a dream; they are living upon a religion; they are taking dope. It has no relation to actual, physical life. It is purely to them imaginary, and yet you are living on it now, and life perhaps is mostly an ideal. You are living on it, and you are dreaming of it, and wherever there is any human being who can live his life and get pleasure out of the dream that some day Socialism and justice will rule on the earth, I say all right, go to it.

Practical Socialism is not a political theory; it is a religious doctrine. You are living upon religious dogma, just the same as the Christian Scientists are living on religious dogma. You are living on a narrow, sectarian doctrine, just as the Methodist is living on a narrow, sectarian doctrine; and when you look at a man with that far-off, dreamy look, and say, "Are you a Socialist?" it is just exactly the same as the liquid stare of the Salvation Army lassie, who looks into your eyes and says, "Do you love Jesus?"

Now, I am not quarreling with it. All I can say for myself is, that dope does not work on me. It is not enough. There are too many things in heaven and in earth—especially in the earth—for me to get fat over the thought that a thousand years from now the co-operative commonwealth will come. It is pure dope, so far as it affects the present-day life of any Socialist, and if you can live on it, well and good. It

may cure the Socialists, but it won't cure the world. It may save those who take it; but suppose the Socialists came into power and would pass a law that it should be taken by the Christian Scientist, do you think it would save them? Or take the agnostics, or different people who are awake, do you suppose if you would pass a law to that effect it would cure them, or save them? No. It will save those who can take it, and who can live on it, and that is all.

Let's see about this saving the world. Now, I am willing to concede for the sake of the argument, so my friend won't have too hard a job, that some time far in the future the world may evolve a state of society where everybody's highest good will be to see to the general good; and where he will be willing to dump in his earnings and take pot luck with the rest; and, broadly speaking, that is a very good definition of Socialism; although some of you may not say I understand it. Perhaps I don't; but I am willing to concede that some time that will come; and, of course, I am willing to concede that it would be a higher state of society than the present catch-as-catch-can state of society that we live in now. Take all of that; but are we to be happy then? Is it the unequal distribution of wealth that is the greatest evil in the world? Is that the greatest question that can fill your mind? Is it the highest idealism that some time there will be an equal distribution of wealth? I think not.

Now, everybody knows himself better than he does anybody else. At least he ought to. He might try not to, but he ought to. So, I will take myself for an example, and assume that the rest of you are the same way—which you are not. For thirty years I suppose I have had more money out of this crazy patch-work system than I could have had out of a co-operative commonwealth. I would have been behind if I had dumped my earnings—or rather my gettings. I want to convince you that I am a real Socialist. I would have been behind if I had dumped these into the common mass, and taken out my per capita share; and yet I have always been more or less a Socialist. The capitalists say I have been more; the Socialists say I have been less. So I have been more or less. But I have always been willing to dump them in; at least, I have said so. It was so far away I didn't see any great danger. And I have had probably two or three times as much money and as much food, clothes, to say nothing about other things, as I would have been able to get had I taken pot luck with the rest. And yet, I have not been happy.

Now, what's the matter? Why haven't I been happy? Why, I have had more than I could possibly get under the co-

operative commonwealth. I have had plenty to eat. One thing that made me unhappy sometimes was too much to eat. I have had plenty to eat. I have had plenty of clothes to wear; I have had a good house and I have been able to have some luxuries that I could not have had under the co-operative commonwealth, and still I am not happy. In fact, I am not sure that I am any happier than I was when I had very much less; and that is not due to age, because age does not make me less happy. In fact, it makes me more reconciled, because I know I won't have to stick around so long.

The reason I am not perfectly happy is because the bread and butter question is not the whole of life. In fact, when we get that settled, we think it is no part of life. I still am able to have debts. While I can get money I can buy gold bricks with it, and fool it away. I am still able to look around and find people that are better off than I am and to want something else; and then the real things in life that worry me, I have not touched at all, and money cannot reach them. They are these simple things which lurk in the human mind more than the body; they are the everlasting questions which, after all, affect men more than anything else.

You Socialists are here today to talk about Socialism. If there was somebody in the next block that could show the people by an absolute demonstration that they were going to live forever, nobody would be interested in Socialism for a single moment.

Those eternal problems of life and death are so much bigger than all the economic problems that nobody would think of the economic problems if there was any solution for them; and so, if you people are going to take dope, and can choose your dope, choose religious dope, it is bigger, it will go farther, because Socialism at the best can only affect a very short time, whereas religious dope can affect eternity.

Of course I have been happy at moments; I have had my—not my lucid intervals—but my illucid intervals when I was happy. If my lucid intervals only would not come back, I would be happy all the time; but they keep coming back.

There are a lot of things that annoy me. There are the misfortunes of others. Now, you Socialists say, "Well, if we had Socialism they would not have misfortunes." Oh, yes, they would. They would have cancers, and I would rather be as poor as the average working man—who, by the way, is not a Socialist—he is just a working man. You people are just kidding yourselves into believing that you work. You are Socialists. I would rather be as poor as the average working man than to have a cancer, or tuberculosis, or any of the

physical troubles which are the common lot of common men; and yet, when I look around me, I see that from the nature of things nobody can be happy very long, and I could not be happy even if I lived in Mrs. Potter Palmer's house. By the way, she is dead now, although she lived in a good house. I am not specially mentioning her name, but the house occurred to me.

Of course one thinks that these material things in life are the things that count; but they do not count. About as soon as a man gets everything fixed up and builds himself a fine, new house, the first great function he attends there is his own funeral.

My troubles in this world have never had any connection with food, except I have had too much of it. It might here and there give me the gout; and you poor people are lucky because you don't have the gout. They are the miseries and troubles inherent in life that Socialism can't cure. They are the everlasting annoyances that are present all the time.

The newspapers. Why, Brother Kennedy says that when we get Socialism we will have honest newspapers. Will it do all that? What faith a Socialist has!

The mosquitoes bother me. The reformers. The gossips; all kinds of fool people that look after other people's business; and they will have more time when we get Socialism, for then they won't have anything else to do.

Then there are those people who are my pet aversion, the Prohibitionists. They bother me. And that kind of people never stop. Why, just the other day when I saw that the prohibition amendment had carried in the United States, I said to myself, "Well, all right, I am glad of it; we will get rid of the Prohibitionists." Then I picked up the papers the next day, and I found they had started on a crusade to make the world dry. I found we had got Prohibition, and I looked in the paper and found we still had the damn prohibitionists.

So what are you going to do about it? Nothing. You know happiness is a mental condition. To quote Karl Marx, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." Any kind of dope that will work on you will save the world for you. It saves it by its effect on you, that is all. It can't be saved by external medicine, or internal medicine. You can only do it by some delusion or hallucination, which takes possession of you, and by which you live; and whether it is Christian Science, or Single Tax, or Theosophy, or Free Silver, or Socialism, it all accomplishes the same result.

## PROFESSOR KENNEDY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Kennedy said: The poem which Mr. Darrow read to us at the beginning of his speech seemed to me to be quite appropriate to his speech. It might have been entitled, "Reminiscences of Some Old Men About to Die".

Now, if anybody accuses the Socialist movement of being youthful, of being full of hope, and spirit and vigor, we plead guilty. We are not dead; not about to die; we are not looking at things from the standpoint of one who is facing the grave. Are we?

We are looking at matters from the standpoint of those who wish and intend to build, and to build something worth while. Whether or not the entire job will be done in our lifetime is something we cannot settle; but there are some people who think the job is going to be done a whole lot sooner than Mr. Darrow thinks it is going to be done. For example, the gentlemen around the Peace Table over in Europe seem to be worried lest something will happen in the near future.

Now, they are not saying that Socialism may come in a thousand years and we do not need to worry about it now. That is not the attitude that the premiers, the capitalists and the "powers" are taking. They say, "We have got to look out, or the Socialists will get us now, and we will have to move promptly and cleverly." And that is the thought, according to all press dispatches that is uppermost in their minds, how to stave off Socialism; how to keep it down, how to prevent the Socialistic movement from getting control of all the countries and all the industries right now, not ten years from now, or twenty years from now, but right now, throughout Europe. In other words, it is not an academic sort of a game of golf or checkers with the working class at all. It is a vital struggle for a chance to live. That is what Socialism means to the mass of the workers, and they are not going to wait a thousand years for it, either.

The working class are struggling for power in order that they and their children may live; and they have not had a chance to live in the past, and they know it, and no amount of argument is going to convince them that it makes very little difference whether they take Christian Science or whether they take Socialism. They know what it means. (e.)

The miners in Great Britain know the difference between the five and six hour day down in the mine and a ten or twelve or fourteen hour day down in the mines. They know the difference. Clarence Darrow may say it is all the same to the miner whether he is putting in ten or fourteen hours a day



in the mine. The miner does not think that way. Four or five hours work a day makes a difference to him.

These men know why they want to get control of those industries. They know how their hours of labor have been prolonged. They know how they have been ground down. They know how they have been driven about like a lot of slaves and cattle. They know these things, and it is not a purely academic question with them as to whether it will be continued. They know it is vital and essential to their welfare and their happiness that they have a chance to live their lives in a different way from what they have been living them in the past; and to do that they must have power—they must have industrial power, economic power.

Some people may say, "Why, the Socialistic movement is materialistic!" Sure. Of course it is materialistic; materialistic in this sense, that you must have some food to eat, and you must have some clothes to wear, and you must have a house to live in before you can begin talking about astronomy, and philosophy, and poetry, and so on.

We are told that there are two millions of unemployed in this country now, and perhaps there will be more than that. Do you think they will be especially interested in attending lectures on philosophy, or attending concerts, or looking at statuary, when they do not know where the next meal is coming from? Not at all. What they want is to solve that economic problem first, then they can enjoy the lecture, then they can enjoy the concert; then they can philosophize; then they can deal with those playthings of life, but first of all they must have the economic foundation. And that is where the working class show their hard common sense. That is the proposition. It is simply plain common sense, horse sense. That is the first problem that Clarence Darrow solves, his economic problem. And he has got common sense enough to do that.

So when one accuses us Socialists of being materialists, I plead guilty in that sense of the word; yes. You must first of all get the plain necessities of life before you can meet with any freedom of mind, any security at all. But that is not the aim and end of Socialism.

Every Socialist knows that that is just the beginning, you might say, of life; the first step toward a social life where everybody will have the opportunity to philosophize, to study history and science, to enjoy poetry and literature, to travel, and try to solve the problems of the spirit. Yes, every Socialist wants to that, and there is going to be a higher form of life probably in the future when we have solved these eco-

conomic questions, which vex us so much now; there will be a possibility of dealing with some of these other problems. But first of all, let us get the economic questions out of the way, and that is the reason, and the only reason that the economic question is so much in the foreground in Socialist philosophy.

Mr. Darrow says that work is always going to be work, but William Morris demonstrated that work might be a quite different thing from what it is under capitalism, and nobody knows that better than Clarence Darrow. He knows that a large part of the world's work can be done under entirely different conditions from what that work is done under now; and the man who attempts to put a limit to the degree in which work may be pleasureable is very unwise, for we have demonstrations every day of new methods of accomplishing certain objects which eliminate the drudgery, and make work pleasureable and enjoyable. We must give opportunity for creative expression; an opportunity to show one's personality in what one is doing. That is a thing the worker does not have under Capitalism at all. That is one of the non-materialistic aims which will be realized in a Socialist form of society.

Mr. Darrow seems to think that when one points out that every problem will not be solved under Socialism, that therefore one has made a valid argument against Socialism. My contention is that if we solve the most pressing problems of our time that is enough for Socialism.

It is as if we were debating the question of whether it would be possible to eliminate a certain disease—let's say; such as the question of whether anti-toxin would prevent diphtheria—and it is demonstrated by experiment and experience that a certain kind of anti-toxin would prevent diphtheria. Mr. Darrow would then say, "Well, what's the use of using it, you're going to die anyhow."

Now, he reminds us that a great many poor people have tuberculosis. That is true. It is called the "poor man's disease." Why is it that the poor people have it so much more than the rich? Ask any person who has any knowledge on the subject. He will tell you, "Lack of sunshine; lack of good food; lack of proper industrial conditions." In other words, the lack of the necessities of life. I do not mean by that merely food, but the right sort of air and life and living conditions, is more than anything else responsible for the white plague. And the best cure for tuberculosis, the best remedy, is good housing conditions, good working conditions, plenty of good food, and so on; and any good physician will tell you so.

That is another reason why we need to solve that economic problem, to get rid of some of these diseases which have their basis very largely in poverty, or in extreme riches.

Now, when you get beyond a certain point in wealth, you reach a point where they begin to get the gout and so on. Too much wealth in some ways is just as bad as too little, and society rots at both ends; rots from extreme poverty and rots from extreme wealth. To eliminate those extremes is one of the aims and objects of Socialism.

It is rather hard, in some ways, to answer Mr. Darrow's arguments. That is, they are kind of elusive. You try to put your finger on them, and they are not there.

But the substance of his position seems to be this: It is impossible to make life worth living anyhow, therefore Socialism can't do it. The trouble with Life is that it is Life; the problems remain unsolved.

It is a fundamental difference in our attitudes toward life that divides us. Mr. Darrow seems to think that one would get happiness through reaching a sort of a final Utopia, in which everything would be just so; where all the problems would be solved; where all the mosquitoes would be dead. Where there would be nothing to vex us, nothing to bother us, nothing to worry us; everything just right.

Now, we Socialists do not look at life that way at all. While we want to get rid of the evils of capitalism just as fast as we can, and while we want to solve problems just as fast as we can, one after another, yet we are not looking forward to any stage or any condition where there will be no more problems, nothing to overcome, because life would not be worth living, when there is nothing more to be done.

To lie around in luxury, is not the aim or ambition of any Socialist. All we want is a chance to live under wholesome conditions, and to meet the problems of the day as they arise, whether they are intellectual problems or physical problems; and such is life, in my opinion, may and probably will be very enjoyable. We have enough examples of it in the community about us: the people who are getting along very nicely, and getting a great deal out of life; those who are in moderate circumstances; they are not pessimists; they are not cynics. If you ask them, they say life is very good for them; they have no complaint, so far as they are personally concerned; they are getting along very well. There are a great many such people. The thing that bears them down in most cases more than anything else is that they see so much misery, so much poverty around about them. They see so many people who can't enjoy these things, who are not in a position to get any-

thing out of life, and it makes it very difficult for them, even though they are in better circumstances; even though their problem of existence is largely solved, it makes it difficult for them in many cases to get enjoyment from what they have.

Now, let's solve the problem of poverty, so that nobody will need worry about the condition of his fellow man; so that we will all have an opportunity to share in the good things of life. Let's solve it that way, and then one's happiness will not be purchased at the happiness of his brother; we will all be sharing in the good things of life.

In conclusion, again I want to put emphasis upon the practical side of the Socialist movement; It is not a mere theory; it is not a vision, or a religion, as Mr. Darrow has said; although there is that element in it: but it is an everyday struggle, and everyday fight for better conditions of living. The Socialist movement is not only working toward a final goal, but has its virility and its power through the struggle the mass of the workers for better conditions now. It is threatening the power of Capitalism; it is gaining every day new concessions, and new advantages for the working class. Why do the capitalists grant these concessions? Why do they grant three or four hours in this case, and higher wages in that case, and safeguard the workers here and there? It is to keep down the rising tide of discontent.

So that when Mr. Darrow tells you that Socialism is not coming until the dim and distant future, and that it will do you no good personally, so far as Socialism is concerned, to be working for this goal, I say we are not only working for that final goal, but by the fight we are making for Socialism we are bringing pressure upon the ruling power, the plutocratic power, to better things here every day; and whether they like it or not, they have to do it. If they don't do it, it means revolution much sooner, a complete overturning of the system, and nobody knows that better than the capitalists themselves.

If Mr. Darrow thinks it is a dim and distant dream, the capitalists of the world do not think so. They think it is a very immediate proposition, and they are dealing with it as an immediate proposition.

So we have the situation: An ever-increasing number in the ranks of the Socialist movement, looking forward to an early realization of their dreams, and the Capitalist class in fear and trembling lest those dreams be realized all too soon for them.

That is where the two great contending parties stand. That is how they look upon the situation. Who is better to judge, the workers and the capitalists who are in the thick of

the struggle, or Mr. Darrow, who is standing on the side lines, and says it is coming only in the dim and distant future? Don't worry about it; the ones who are in the thick of the struggle realize which way the tide is going. They realize how near the victory is for the Socialists; and my belief is, although thereby I put myself in the category of "unintelligent" Socialists—my belief is that this generation is going to see Socialism in most of the great countries of the world.

### MR. DARROW'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Darrow said: I think Brother Kennedy and the audience have demonstrated that my statement that Socialism was a dope is true, because the more utterly unreasonable a statement, the wilder you applaud.

Is Socialism in its organized form coming in this day and generation?

Now, there are a lot of you who honestly think so. I would not object if it did. But to say that it can is to deny all human history, and all that man can learn of science, and of life. The human race cannot be made over in a generation.

The rich men, if intelligent—and most of them are not—they are not afraid of any immediate Socialism in the world; they are not afraid of a general state of anarchy and disorder, such as is sweeping over the world today. Now I don't stand with them on that question. I am neutral. Anything is better than peace. They were just as afraid of the French Revolution. Socialism was not born out of the Revolution. Something better no doubt came out of it, but the dream of Socialism, no.

Why, you could not get a Socialist government that could stand together twenty-four hours. Now, you ask me who could understand this question better, a capitalist who was a part of it, or the working man who was a part of it, or I, who am looking on? I tell you I, and you Socialists don't seem to know that you could not get a Socialist government that would hang together. Every blooming one of you is an orator, and a boss, and you would not be satisfied to let anybody else have anything to do with it. Not for a minute. It is like the French Revolution. When I read the story the thing that impressed me was not that they cut off the heads of the noblemen, but they wound up the job by cutting off each other's heads.

Change does not come that way. It may be an element in it, but you put a brand new party, Socialism, down on the earth, according to program, and it would last just about as

long as a snowball—no longer. It takes men, women, ideas—and those are of slow development and slow change, and slow growth; and they don't come out of theories, and political orators.

I am not saying that Socialism has done no good, or is not doing good. I think it has and is. I will not quarrel about that for a moment. I am glad to see it do good. I am not one who says that it is not better to feed a hungry man than to let him starve. It is. I like to see the hours of labor shortened; although Socialism may or may not have had much to do with it. I like to see wages increased. I like to see a man cured of a corn even though he may still have a bunion. Why not? That is not the proposition at all.

Socialism may have had much to do, and doubtless has had much to do with the general feeling that there should be more equality in life and the conditions of living; and in raising wages, and in shortening hours; but that it will save the world! Do any of you believe it? If you do you are Socialists for fair.

Mr. Kennedy practically confesses that you can't expect anything like that out of it. He tells you that it is not that you want peace in the world. It is not that you want the world to be contented and happy, because the struggle, after all, is the real thing. Well, is it? If the struggle to get Socialism is the real thing, then, what do you want of Socialism? Why, of course, you don't. Mr. Kennedy is absolutely right.

Why, he understands something about psychology and life, even though he is a Socialist. The Prohibitionist is not interested in getting rid of rum. He is interested in Prohibition; and when you get rid of rum his job is gone, and he has got to find another. He is not gone, the more pity. The Socialist is not interested in getting Socialism. He is interested in Socialism, and if you get it, then what is he going to do? Sit down and rest? Eat too much, and drink too much? Or study astronomy? Well, if any of you have a call for astronomy, you better not wait for the co-operative commonwealth, but go at it now.

You have taken up Socialism just as the Christian Scientists have taken up Christian Science and just as I have pessimism. To be doing something, that is all.

Do you think if you got Socialism there would not be the same craving, the same dissatisfaction, the same eternal groping out toward the strange and the unknown? Why, it is an intellectual diversion, that is all it is. So far as this generation is concerned it can't be anything else; and when it comes you will be out of a job—if it ever does come.

What I object to in Socialism is placing it so out of all relation to life. The ordinary Socialists think there is no other question on earth, except being fed; and the most of them are fairly well fed at that. It is out of every relation to everything that makes up life. Is Mr. Kennedy right when he says that you cannot understand poetry, or astronomy, or philosophy unless you settle the economic question? No. If you can make everybody fat and comfortable, probably the poets and the philosophers will disappear.

If a man has it in him to love the things that give emotion and vision and breadth to the human mind, he will do it, and he won't wait until the co-operative commonwealth comes along before he does it. He will do it now. The trouble with Socialism, or one of the great troubles is not that it is not right, but that fundamentally it is a bread and butter specific, which is meant to cover the whole range of life, when it is a small part of human life.

I am not objecting to it on the ground of its materialism. I am a materialist in the sense of the word that you are. But what I do say is that any man's head that is good enough to understand Socialism and enjoy it, ought to be good enough to find ten thousand fancies, and ten thousand dreams, and ten thousand emotions to fit his brain, and yet you take the one, and we have all the rest as well.

I criticize it as I criticize anything else that is sectarian and narrow; and it is sectarian and narrow.

We have been told that the real reason for Socialism is that it stands for liberty. Well, the Republicans say that is what the Republican party stands for; and the Democrats say that is what the Democratic party stands for; and the Republicans and the Democrats and the Socialists are equally right about it. How many of you people who know the practical workings of social philosophy, and social life, and party Socialism—how many of you think you would have any more liberty under Socialism than you would under Republicanism?

Why, they are the most priest-ridden bunch of politicians in America. The party says deliberately that no man can do anything except vote for every name on the ticket, or you will call a court-martial and drum him out of the party—and that is liberty.

Well, now, you are just like everybody else. You stand for anything that is done in the name of your creed. Anything that is done under the name of your creed is good. Socialist human nature is not any different from any other human nature. It is just human nature—to be arbitrary, to be cock sure, to

think that everybody else is wrong, and to run over everybody else's rights, that is all. Just the same thing.

When a party speaks, whether it is the Methodist Church, the people who made the Westminster Catechism, or the Socialist Convention in St. Louis, then anybody else who disagrees with them is dangerous, or a traitor, or a fool. Any doubt of it? You know there isn't.

Now, it is just the same whatever the party is, whatever the religion is, whatever the kind of dope. What I object to is not that its economic philosophy is wrong; not that it does no good in the world, and is not doing good in the world; not that we ought not to have more of it, but because it has placed this part of its creed out of all relation to human life; because it has made of itself a creed; because it has made its votaries narrow and priest-ridden; because it has taken one truth out of the universe and closed the eyes of its members to all the countless truths, to all the countless duties, and to the countless emotions in the world on account of its being a priestly, narrow, religious sect. That is where I think they are wrong.

#### PROFESSOR KENNEDY'S THIRD SPEECH.

Mr. Kennedy said: I think you will all appreciate that it would be impossible at this stage of the debate to enter into a discussion of the tactics and methods of the Socialist party, and the reasons therefor. There probably are good reasons for some of these rules and regulations that Mr. Darrow feels are limitations upon liberty. However, I am not going to try to discuss that now.

The only point that I do want to touch upon is that referred to in connection with Socialism being a bread and butter question. I thought that I had already covered that pretty well, but Mr. Darrow still seems to think that the only thing any Socialist is concerned with is the bread and butter question.

Now, as a practical movement, I know from what I have seen in this country and in other countries that the Socialist party has probably done more to awaken the interest of the working class in literature, in history, in science, in art, and in all the interests of the spirit than any other movement the world has ever seen. That is a fact.

That is not limited to any one country. I have traveled some in the various European countries. I have attended the lectures of various Socialists; I have gone to what they call their People's Houses, where they have exhibitions of art; where they have concerts given by their singing societies, and



by their orchestras. I remember in Belgium, in one Maison du Peuple, which is the home of the Socialists, they were maintaining one of the greatest sculptors of Belgium, supporting him and exhibiting his works there, making it possible for him to go on and do his work.

The same thing has been done in other countries where the Socialists are supporting the various lecturers, and maintaining libraries, filled with books and works of art. That is a fact. That is not a theory. Wherever one goes, wherever there is a group of Socialists, you will find they are attempting to promote this work of education. I might ask is there a better example of that than this Lewis Workers' University right here?

You all know that Mr. Lewis came here as a Socialist lecturer, and from the time he started up on the North Side of the city until the present day he has not confined the activities of this organization simply to the bread and butter question, as you know very well, but has attempted to touch upon all the main interests of life.

Now, what has been done here has been done the world over. I know it to be a fact. So Mr. Darrow is simply mistaken in his statement, that is all. I think when he reflects upon it, he will be glad that he is mistaken; because after all, he wants the movement to be as broad as it can be.

Our debate today has not really been an out and out debate upon Socialism, and anti-Socialism, or Socialism versus Capitalism. It seems to me Mr. Darrow, as he said at the outset, has simply pointed out what seemed to him to be certain limitations on the Socialist movement. Well, doubtless the movement does have limitations, for no movement of millions of people can be expected to be perfect. Think of where it came from. It has come from the workers, ground down by Capitalism. That is where the Socialist movement has come from. Sprung out of the masses, who have not had an opportunity for fine university educations, and who have not had an opportunity to develop all sides of life; and out of that very movement they are developing a higher civilization than Capitalism has ever put forth.

So, recognizing and admitting all the limitations of the Socialist movement, recognizing all its shortcomings, all I can say is that the best argument for its future success and its future service is what the Socialist movement has already done for the world.