

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

AUGUST, 1902.

NO. 2.

Wanted; A New Law of Development.

Evolution is no longer a mere tentative hypothesis. One by one, step by step, each division and subdivision of science has contributed its evidence, until now the case is complete and the verdict rendered. While there is still discussion as to the method of evolution, none the less, as a process sufficient to explain all biological phenomena, all differentiations of life into widely diverse species, families, and even kingdoms, evolution is flatly accepted. Likewise has been accepted its law of development: That, in the struggle for existence, the strong and fit and the progeny of the strong and fit have a better opportunity for survival than the weak and less fit and the progeny of the weak and less fit.*

It is in the struggle of the species with other species and against all other hostile forces in the environment, that this law operates; also in the struggle between the individuals of the same species. In this struggle, which is for food and shelter, the weak individuals must obviously win less food and shelter than the strong. Because of this, their hold on life relaxes and they are eliminated forthwith. And for the same reason that they may not win for themselves adequate food and shelter, the weak cannot give to their progeny the chance for survival that the strong do. And thus, since the weak are prone to beget weakness, the species is constantly purged of its inefficient members.

Because of this a premium is placed upon strength, and so long as the struggle for food and shelter obtains, just so long will the average strength of each generation rise. On the other hand, should conditions so change that all, and the progeny of all, the weak as well as the strong, have an equal chance for survival, then, at once, the average strength of each generation will begin to fall. Never yet, however, in animal life, has there been such a state of affairs. Natural selection has always obtained. The

*Benjamin Kidd has well worded this biological law.

strong and their progeny, at the expense of the weak, have always survived. This law of development has operated down all the past upon all life; it so operates to-day, and it is not rash to say that it will continue to operate in the future—at least upon all life existing in a state of nature.

Man, pre-eminent though he is in the animal kingdom and capable of reacting upon and making suitable an unsuitable environment, nevertheless remains the creature of this same law of development. The social selection he is subject to is merely another form of natural selection. True, within certain narrow limits he modifies the struggle for existence and renders less precarious the tenure of life for the weak. The extremely weak, diseased, and inefficient, are housed in hospitals and asylums. The strength of the viciously strong, when inimical to society, is tempered by penal institutions and by the gallows. The shortsighted are provided with spectacles, and the sickly (when they can pay for it) with sanitariums. Pestilential marshes are drained, plagues are checked, and disasters averted. Yet, for all that, the strong and the progeny of the strong survive, and the weak are crushed out. The men, strong of brain, are masters as of yore. They dominate society and gather to themselves the wealth of society. With this wealth they maintain themselves and equip their progeny for the struggle. They build their homes in healthy places, purchase the best fruits, meats, and vegetables the market affords, and buy themselves the ministrations of the most brilliant and learned of the professional classes. The weak man, as of yore, is the servant, the doer of things at the master's beck and call. The weaker and less efficient he is, the poorer is his reward. The weakest work for a living wage (when they can get work), live in unsanitary slums, on vile and insufficient food, at the lowest depths of human degradation. Their grasp on life is indeed precarious, their mortality excessive, their infant death rate appalling.

That some should be born to preferment and others to ignominy in order that the race may progress, is cruel and sad; but none the less they are so born. The weeding out of human souls, some for fatness and smiles, some for leanness and tears, is surely a heartless selective process—as heartless as it is natural. And the human family, for all its wonderful record of adventure and achievement, has not yet succeeded in abolishing this process. That it is incapable of doing this is not to be hazarded. Not only is it capable, but the whole trend of society is in that direction. All the social forces are driving man on to a time when the old selective law will be annulled. There is no escaping it, save by the intervention of catastrophes and cataclysms utterly unthinkable. It is inexorable. It is inexorable because the common man demands it. The twentieth century, the common

man says, is his day; the common man's day, or, rather, the dawning of the common man's day.

Nor can it be denied. The evidence is with him. The previous centuries, and more notably the nineteenth, have marked the rise of the common man. From chattel slavery to serfdom, and from serfdom to what he bitterly terms "wage slavery," he has upreared. Never was he so strong as he is to-day, and never so menacing. He does the work of the world, and he is beginning to know it. The world cannot get along without him, and this also he is beginning to know. All the human knowledge of the past, all the scientific discovery, governmental experiment, and invention of machinery, have tended to his advancement. His standard of living is higher. His common school education would shame princes ten centuries past. His civil and religious liberty make him a free man, and his ballot the peer of his betters. And all this has tended to make him conscious, conscious of himself, conscious of his class. He looks about him and questions that ancient law of development. It is cruel and wrong, he is beginning to declare. It is an anachronism. Let it be abolished. Why should there be one empty belly in all the world, when the work of ten men can feed a hundred? What if my brother be not so strong as I? He has not sinned. Wherefore should he hunger? he and his sinless little ones? Down with the old law. There is food and shelter for all, therefore let all receive food and shelter.

As fast as labor has become conscious, it has organized. The ambition of these class-conscious men is that the movement shall become general, that all labor shall become conscious of itself and its class interests. And the day that witnesses the solidarity of labor, they triumphantly affirm, will be a day when labor dominates the world. This growing consciousness has led to the organization of two movements, both separate and distinct, but both converging toward a common goal—one, the labor movement, known as Trade Unionism; the other, the political movement, known as Socialism. Both are grim and silent forces, unheralded, and virtually unknown by the general public save in moments of stress. The sleeping labor giant receives no notice from the capitalistic press, and when he stirs uneasily, a column of surprise, indignation, and horror suffices.

It is only now and then, after long periods of silence, that the labor movement puts in its claim for notice. All is quiet. The kind old world spins on, and the bourgeois masters clip their coupons in smug complacency. But the grim and silent forces are at work. Suddenly, like a clap of thunder from a clear sky, comes a disruption of industry. From ocean to ocean the wheels of a great chain of railroads cease to run. A quarter of a million miners throw down pick-and shovel and outrage the sun with their pale,

bleached faces. The street railways of a swarming metropolis stand idle, or the rumble of machinery in vast manufactories dies away to shocking silence. There is alarm and panic. Arson and homicide stalk forth. There is a cry in the night, and quick anger and sudden death. Peaceful cities are affrighted by the crack of rifles and the snarl of machine guns, and the hearts of the shuddering are shaken by the roar of dynamite. There is hurrying and skurrying. The wires are kept hot between the center of government and the seat of trouble. The chiefs of state ponder gravely and advise, and governors of States implore. There is assembling of militia and massing of troops, and the streets resound to the tramp of armed men. There are separate and joint conferences between the captains of industry and the captains of labor. And then, finally, all is quiet again, and the memory of it is like the memory of a bad dream.

But these strikes become hegiras, olympiads, things to date from; and common on the lips of men become such phrases as "The Great Dock Strike," "The Great Coal Strike," "The Great Railroad Strike." Never before did labor do these things. After the Great Plague in England labor, finding itself in demand, and innocently obeying the economic law, asked higher wages. But the masters set a maximum wage, restrained workmen from moving about from place to place, refused to tolerate idlers, and by most barbarous legal methods punished those who disobeyed. But labor is accorded greater respect to-day. Such a policy, put into effect in this the first decade of the twentieth century, would sweep the masters from their seats in one mighty crash. And the masters know it and are respectful.

A fair instance of the growing solidarity of labor is afforded by an unimportant strike in San Francisco. The restaurant cooks and waiters were completely unorganized, working at any and all hours for whatever wages they could get. A representative of the American Federation of Labor went among them and organized them. Within a few weeks nearly two thousand men were enrolled, and they had five thousand dollars on deposit. Then they put in their demand for increased wages and shorter hours. Forthwith their employers organized. The demand was denied, and the Cooks' and Waiters' Union walked out.

All organized employers stood back of the restaurant owners, in sympathy with them and willing to aid them if they dared. And at the back of the Cooks' and Waiters' Union stood the organized labor of the city, 40,000 strong. If a business man were caught patronizing an "unfair" restaurant, he was boycotted; if a union man were caught, he was fined heavily by his union. The oyster companies and the slaughter houses made an attempt to refuse to sell oysters and meat to union restaurants. The Butchers and Meat

Cutters, and the Teamsters, in retaliation, refused to work for or to deliver to non-union restaurants. Upon this the oyster companies and slaughter houses backed down and peace reigned. But the Restaurant Bakers in non-union places were ordered out, and the Bakery Wagon Drivers declined to deliver to unfair houses.

Every American Federation of Labor union in the city is prepared to strike, and waits only the word. And behind all, a handful of men, known as the Labor Council, direct the fight. One by one, blow upon blow, they are able to call out the unions—the Laundry Workers, who do the washing; the Hackmen, who haul men to and from restaurants; the Butchers, Meat Cutters, and Teamsters; and the Milkers, Milk Drivers, and Chicken Pickers; and after that, in pure sympathy, the Retail Clerks, the Horse Shoers, the Gas and Electrical Fixture Hangers, the Metal Roofers, the Blacksmiths, the Blacksmiths' Helpers, the Stablemen, the Machinists, the Brewers, the Coast Seamen, the Varnishers and Polishers, the Confectioners, the Upholsterers, the Paper Hangers and Fresco Painters, the Drug Clerks, the Fitters and Helpers, the Metal Workers, the Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, the Assistant Undertakers, the Carriage and Wagon Workers, and so on down the lengthy list of organizations. And over all these trades, over all these thousands of men, is the Labor Council. When it speaks its voice is heard, and when it orders it is obeyed. But it, in turn, is dominated by the National Labor Council, with which it is constantly in touch.

In this wholly unimportant little local strike it is of interest to note the stands taken by the different sides. The legal representative and official mouthpiece of the Employers' Association says: "This organization is formed for defensive purposes, and it may be driven to take offensive steps, and if so, will be strong enough to follow them up. Labor cannot be allowed to dictate to capital and say how business shall be conducted. There is no objection to the formation of unions and trades councils, but membership must not be compulsory. It is repugnant to the American idea of liberty and cannot be tolerated."

On the other hand, the president of the Team Drivers' Union says: "The employers of labor in this city are generally against the trade union movement, and there seems to be a concerted effort on their part to check the progress of organized labor. Such action as has been taken by them in sympathy with the present labor troubles may, if continued, lead to a serious conflict, the outcome of which might be most calamitous for the business and industrial interests of San Francisco."

And the secretary of the United Brewery Workmen: "I regard a sympathetic strike as the last weapon which organized labor should use in its defense. When, however, associations of em

ployers band together to defeat organized labor, or one of its branches, then we should not and will not hesitate ourselves to employ the same instrument in retaliation."

Thus, in a little corner of the world, is exemplified the growing solidarity of labor. The organization of labor has not only kept pace with the organization of industry, but it has gained upon it. In one winter, in the anthracite coal region, \$160,000,000 in mines and \$600,000,000 in transportation and distribution consolidated its ownership and control. And at once, arrayed as solidly on the other side, were the 150,000 anthracite miners. The bituminous mines, however, were not consolidated; yet the 250,000 men employed therein were already combined. And not only that, but they were also combined with the anthracite miners, these 400,000 men being under the control and direction of one supreme labor council. And in this and the other great councils are to be found captains of labor of splendid abilities, who, in understanding of economic and industrial conditions, are undeniably equal to the best of their opponents, the captains of industry.

Just the other day the United States Steel Corporation was organized with total securities issued of \$1,404,000,000. The workers in many of the lesser corporations absorbed, such as the American Tin Plate Company and the Steel Hoop Company, were organized under the Amalgamated Iron, Steel and Tin Workers' Association. But the workers in a number of the corporations absorbed, were not, but proceeded at once to organize. Seven men were discharged for taking part in the forming of an Amalgamated union in one of the mills of the American Sheet Steel Company. Their four hundred fellow workmen immediately walked out, and the great United States Steel Corporation found itself face to face with its bristling 200,000 employees. President Schwab, who receives a salary of a million a year for his wisdom, wisely ordered the seven discharged men back, and an armed truce for a few weeks was established.

The United States is honeycombed with labor organizations. And the big federations which these go to compose aggregate millions of members, and in their various branches handle millions of dollars yearly. And not only this; for the international brotherhoods and unions are forming, and moneys for the aid of strikers pass back and forth across the seas. The Machinists, in their demand for a nine-hour day, affect 500,000 men in the United States, Mexico, and Canada. In England the membership of working class organizations is approximated by Keir Hardie at 2,500,000, with reserve funds of \$18,000,000. There the co-operative movement has a membership of 1,500,000, and every year turns over in distribution more than \$100,000,000. In France, one-eighth of the whole working class is unionized. In Bel-

gium the unions are very rich and powerful, and so able to defy the masters that many of the smaller manufacturers, unable to resist, "are removing their works to other countries where the workmen's organizations are not so potential." And in all other countries, according to the stage of their economic and political development, like figures obtain. And Europe, to-day, confesses that her greatest social problem is the labor problem, and that it is the one most closely engrossing the attention of her statesmen.

The organization of labor is one of the chief acknowledged factors in the retrogression of British trade. The workers have become class conscious as workers have never before. The wrong of one is the wrong of all. They have come to realize, in a short-sighted way, that their masters' interests are not their interests. The harder they work, they believe, the more wealth they create for their masters. Further, the more work they do in one day, the fewer men will be needed to do the work. So the unions place a day's stint upon their members, beyond which they are not permitted to go. In "A Study of Trade Unionism," by Benjamin Taylor, in the "Nineteenth Century" of April, 1898, is furnished some interesting corroborations. The facts here set forth were collected by the Executive Board of the Employers' Federation, the documentary proofs of which are in the hands of the secretaries. In a certain firm the union workmen made eight ammunition boxes a day. Nor could they be persuaded into making more. A young Swiss, who could not speak English, was set to work, and in the first day he made fifty boxes. In the same firm the skilled union hands filed up the outside handles of one machine gun a day. That was their stint. No one was known to ever do more. A non-union filer came into the shop and did twelve a day. A Manchester firm found that to plane a large bed-casting took union workmen 190 hours, and non-union workmen 135 hours. In another instance a man, resigning from his union, day by day did double the amount of work he had done formerly. And to cap it all, an English gentleman, going out to look at a wall being put up for him by union bricklayers, found one of their number with his right arm strapped to his body, doing all the work with his left arm—forsooth, because he was such an energetic fellow that otherwise he would involuntarily lay more bricks than his union permitted.

All England resounds to the cry: "Wake up, England!" But the sulky giant is not stirred. "Let England's trade go to pot," he says, "what have I to lose?" And England is powerless. The capacity of her workmen is represented by 1, in comparison with the $2\frac{1}{4}$ capacity of the American workman. And because of the solidarity of labor and the destructiveness of strikes, British capitalists dare not even strive to emulate the enterprise of American

capitalists. So England watches trade slipping through her fingers and wails unavailingly. As a correspondent writes: "The enormous power of the trade unions hangs, a sullen cloud, over the whole industrial world here, affecting men and masters alike."

The political movement known as Socialism is, perhaps, even less realized by the general public. The great strides it has taken and the portentous front it to-day exhibits are undreamed of; and, fastened though it is to every land, it is given little space by the capitalistic press. For all its plea and passion and warmth, it wells upward like a great cold tidal wave, irresistible, inexorable, engulfing present-day society level by level. By its own preachment it is inexorable. Just as sure as societies have sprung into existence, fulfilled their function, and passed away, just so sure is present society hastening on to its dissolution. This is a transition period—and destined to be a very short one. Barely a century old, capitalism is ripening so rapidly that it can never live to see a second birthday. There is no hope for it, the Socialists say. It is doomed, doomed, doomed.

The cardinal tenet of Socialism is that forbidding doctrine, the materialistic conception of history. Men are not the masters of their souls. They are the puppets of great, blind forces. The lives they live and the deaths they die are compulsory. All social codes are but the reflexes of existing economic conditions, plus certain survivals of past economic conditions. The institutions men build they are compelled to build. Economic laws determine at any given time what these institutions shall be, how long they shall operate, and by what they shall be replaced. And so, through the economic process, the Socialist preaches the ripening of the capitalistic society and the coming of the new co-operative society.

The second great tenet of Socialism, itself a phase of the materialistic conception of history, is the class struggle. In the social struggle for existence, men are forced into classes. "The history of all society thus far is the history of class strife." In existing society the capitalist class exploits the working class, the proletariat. The interests of the exploiter are not the interests of the exploited. "Profits are legitimate," says the one. "Profits are unpaid wages," replies the other, when he has become conscious of his class, "therefore, profits are robbery." The capitalist enforces his profits because he is the legal owner of all the means of production. He is the legal owner, because he controls the political machinery of society. The Socialist sets himself to work to capture the political machinery, so that he may make illegal the capitalist's ownership of the means of production, and make legal his own ownership of the means of production. And it is this struggle, between these two classes, upon which the world has at last entered.

Scientific Socialism is very young. Only yesterday it was in swaddling clothes. But to-day it is a vigorous young giant, well-braced to battle for what it wants, and knowing precisely what it wants. It holds its international conventions, where world-policies are formulated by the representatives of millions of Socialists. In little Belgium there are three-quarters of a million of men who work for the cause; in Germany, 2,500,000; Austria, between 1895 and 1897, raised her Socialist vote from 90,000 to 750,000. France in 1871 had a whole generation of Socialists wiped out, yet in 1885 there were 30,000, and in 1898, 1,000,000. And so in various countries.

Ere the last Spaniard had evacuated Cuba, Socialist groups were forming. And from far Japan, in these first days of the twentieth century, writes one, Tomoyoshi Murai: "The interest of our people on Socialism has been greatly awakened these days, especially among our laboring people on one hand and young students' circle on the other, as much as we can draw an earnest and enthusiastic audience and fill our hall, which holds two thousand. . . . It is gratifying to say that we have a number of fine and well-trained public orators among our leaders of Socialism in Japan. The first speaker to-night is Mr. Kiyoshi Kawakami, editor of one of our city (Tokyo) dailies, a strong, independent, and decidedly socialistic paper, circulated far and wide. Mr. Kawakami is a scholar as well as a popular writer. He is going to speak to-night on the subject, 'The Essence of Socialism—the Fundamental Principles.' The next speaker is Professor Iso Abe, president of our association, whose subject of address is, 'Socialism and the Existing Social System.' The third speaker is Mr. Naoe Kinoshita, the editor of another strong journal of the city. He speaks on the subject, 'How to Realize the Socialist Ideals and Plans.' Next is Mr. Shigeyoshi Sugiyama, a graduate of Hartford Theological Seminary and an advocate of Social Christianity, who is to speak on 'Socialism and Municipal Problems.' And the last speaker is the editor of the 'Labor World,' the foremost leader of the labor union movement in our country, Mr. Sen Katayama, who speaks on the subject, 'The Outlook of Socialism in Europe and America.' These addresses are going to be published in book form and to be distributed among our people to enlighten their minds on the subject."

And in the struggle for the political machinery of society, Socialism is no longer confined to mere propaganda. Italy, Austria, Belgium, England, have Socialist members in their national bodies. Out of the one hundred and thirty-two members of the London County Council, ninety-one are denounced by the conservative element as Socialists. The Emperor of Germany grows anxious and angry at the increasing numbers which are returned to the

Reichstag. In France, many of the large cities, such as Marseilles, are in the hands of the Socialists. A large body of them are in the Chamber of Deputies, and Millerand, Socialist, sits in the cabinet. Of him M. Leroy-Beaulieu says with horror: "M. Millerand is the open enemy of private property, private capital, the resolute advocate of the socialization of production . . . a constant incitement to violence . . . a collectivist, avowed and militant, taking part in the government, dominating the departments of commerce and industry, preparing all the laws and presiding at the passage of all measures which should be submitted to merchants and tradesmen."

In the United States there are already Socialist mayors of towns and members of State legislatures, a vast literature, and single Socialist papers with subscription lists running up into the hundreds of thousands. In 1896, 36,000 votes were cast for the Socialist candidate for president; in 1900, nearly 200,000. And the United States, young as it is, is ripening rapidly, and the Socialists claim, according to the materialistic conception of history, that the United States will be the first country in the world wherein the toilers will capture the political machinery and expropriate the bourgeoisie.

But the Socialist and labor movements have recently entered upon a new phase. There has been a remarkable change in attitude on both sides. For a long time the labor unions refrained from going in for political action. On the other hand, the Socialists claimed that without political action labor was utterly powerless. And because of this there was much ill feeling between them, even open hostilities, and no concerted action. But now the Socialists grant that the labor movement has held up wages and decreased the hours of labor, and the labor unions find that political action is absolutely necessary. To-day both parties have drawn closely together in the common fight. In the United States this friendly feeling grows. The Socialist papers espouse the cause of labor, and the unions have opened their ears once more to the wiles of the Socialists. They are all leavened with Socialist workmen, "boring from within," and many of their leaders have already succumbed to the inevitable. In England, where class consciousness is more developed, the name "Unionism" has been replaced by "The New Unionism," the main object of which is "to capture existing social structures in the interests of the wage earners." There the Socialist, trade union, and other working class organizations are beginning to co-operate in securing the return of representatives to the House of Commons. And in France, where the city councils and mayors of Marseilles and Montea-

les-Mines are Socialistic, thousands of francs were voted for the aid of the unions in the recent great strikes.

For centuries the world has been preparing for the coming of the common man. And the period of preparation virtually past, labor, conscious of itself and its desires, has begun a definite movement toward solidarity. It believes the time is not far distant when the historian will speak not only of the dark ages of feudalism, but also of the dark ages of capitalism. And labor sincerely believes itself justified in this by the terrible indictment it brings against capitalistic society. In the face of its enormous wealth, capitalistic society forfeits its right to existence when it permits wide-spread, bestial poverty. The philosophy of the survival of the fittest does not soothe the class-conscious worker when he learns through his class literature that among the Italian pants-finishers of Chicago* the average weekly wage is \$1.31, and the average number of weeks employed in the year is 27.85. Likewise when he reads:* "Every room in these reeking tenements houses a family or two. In one room a missionary found a man ill with smallpox, his wife just recovering from her confinement, and the children running about half naked and covered with dirt. Here are seven people living in one under-ground kitchen, and a little dead child lying in the same room. Here live a widow and her six children, two of whom are ill with scarlet fever. In another, nine brothers and sisters from twenty-nine years of age downward, live, eat, and sleep together." And likewise, when he reads:** "When one man fifty years old, who has worked all his life, is compelled to beg a little money to bury his dead baby, and another man fifty years old can give ten million dollars to enable his daughter to live in luxury and bolster up a decaying foreign aristocracy, do you see nothing amiss?"

And on the other hand, the class-conscious worker reads the statistics of the wealthy classes, knows what their incomes are, and just how they get them. True, down all the past he has known his own material misery and the material comfort of the dominant classes, and often has this knowledge led him to intemperate acts and unwise rebellion. But to-day, and for the first time, because both society and he have evolved, he is beginning to see a possible way out. His ears are opening to the vast propaganda of Socialism, the passionate gospel of the dispossessed. But it does not inculcate a turning back. The way through is the way out, he understands, and with this in mind he draws up the program.

*From figures presented by Miss Nelle Mason Auteon in the "American Journal of Sociology," and copied extensively by the trade union and socialist press.

**The Bitter Cry of Outcast London."

**An item from the "Social Democratic Herald." Hundreds of these items, culled from current happenings, are published weekly in the papers of the workers.

It is quite simple, this program. Instead of struggling against forces, the plan is to work with forces. Everything is moving in his direction, toward the day when he will take charge. The trust? Ah, no. Unlike the trembling middle-class man and the small capitalist, he sees nothing to be affrighted at. He likes the trust. He exults in the trust, for it is largely doing the task for him. It socializes production; this done, there remains nothing for him to do but socialize distribution, and all is accomplished. The trust? "It organizes industry on an enormous, labor-saving scale, and abolishes childish, wasteful competition." It is a gigantic object lesson, and it preaches his political economy far more potently than he ever possibly could. He points to it, laughing scornfully in the face of the orthodox economists. "You told me this thing could not be,"* he thunders. "Behold! the thing is!"

He sees competition in the realm of production passing away. When the captains of industry have thoroughly organized production, and got everything running smoothly, it will be very easy for him to eliminate the profits by stepping in and having the thing run for himself. And the captain of industry, if he be good, may be given the privilege of continuing the management on a fair salary. The sixty millions of dividends which the Standard Oil Company annually declares will be distributed among the workers. The same with the great United States Steel Corporation. Schwab is a pretty good man. He knows his business. Very good. Let him become Secretary of the Department of Iron and Steel Industry of the United States. But, since the chief executive of a nation of seventy-odd millions works for fifty thousand a year, Secretary Schwab must expect to have his salary cut accordingly. And not only will the workers take to themselves the profits of national and municipal monopolies, but also the hundreds and billions of revenue which the dominant classes to-day draw from rents, and mines, and factories, and all manner of enterprises.

All this would seem very like a dream, even to the worker, if it were not for the fact that like things have been done before. He points triumphantly to the aristocrat of the eighteenth century, who fought, legislated, governed, and dominated society; but who was shorn of power and displaced by the rising bourgeoisie. Ay, the thing was done, he holds. And it shall be done again, but this time it is the proletariat who does the shearing. Sociology has taught him that m-i-g-h-t spells "right." Every society has been ruled by classes, and the classes have ruled by sheer strength, and have been overthrown by sheer strength. The bourgeoisie, because they were the stronger, dragged down the nobility of the sword;

*Karl Marx, the great socialist, worked out the trust development forty years ago, for which he was laughed at by the orthodox economists.

and the proletariat, because it is the strongest of all, can and will drag down the bourgeoisie.

And in that day, for better or worse, the common man becomes the master—for better, he believes. It is his intention to make the sum of human happiness far greater. No man shall work for a bare living wage, which is degradation. Every man will have work to do, and will be paid exceeding well for doing it. There shall be no slum classes, no beggars. Nor shall there be hundreds of thousands of men and women condemned, for economic reasons, to lives of celibacy or sexual infertility. Every man shall be able to marry, to live in healthy, comfortable quarters, and to have all he wants to eat as many times a day as he wishes. There shall no longer be a life and death struggle for food and shelter. The old heartless law of development shall be annulled.

All of which is very good and very fine. And when these things have come to pass, as they inevitably will, what then? Of old, by virtue of their weakness and inefficiency in the struggle for food and shelter, the race was purged of its weak and inefficient members. But this will no longer obtain. Under the new order the weak and the progeny of the weak will have a chance for survival equal to that of the strong and the progeny of the strong. This being so, the premium upon strength will have been withdrawn, and on the face of it the average strength of each generation, instead of continuing to rise, will begin to decline. And if the strength of the race thus begins to decline, is it not plausible that the race will be displaced by other races yet rising in strength under the old law of development?

This, in turn, is nothing new. Time and again, in the struggles of the classes in past societies, it has been exemplified, and it is so exemplified to-day. For the old law, when working for development, after insuring a better chance for survival to the strong, only insured a better chance to the progeny of the strong during that period which lies between conception and full maturity. After maturity, the progeny of the strong had also to enter the struggle and succeed in order to perpetuate the strength. In the genesis of the old French nobility, for instance, the strongest became the founders of the dominant class. This class gradually built up an institution in society, which, especially in its latter days, permitted the weak to survive and to propagate weakness. Consequently, this class grew weaker and weaker. In England, on the contrary, the institution of aristocracy was so different that the younger sons were forced to shift for themselves, "To win to hearth and saddle of their own." Also, there was much intermarriage with the classes lower in the social scale, and with those classes nearer the soil. And in these classes the struggle for food

and shelter was keen, and it is patent that it was the strong ones among them who were chosen for translation into the nobility for breeding purposes. Constantly revived, the English nobility was thus naturally more virile than the French. And in society to-day the progeny of the captains of industry tends to grow weaker and weaker, and are largely preserved by the social institutions which prevent them from being forced into the struggle for food and shelter.

And likewise, when the common man's day will have arrived, the new social institutions of that day will prevent the weeding out of weakness and inefficiency. All, the weak and the strong, will have an equal chance for procreation. And the progeny of all, of the weak as well as the strong, will have an equal chance for survival. This being so, and if no new effective law of development be put into operation, then progress must cease. And not only progress, for there is high probability that deterioration would set in. It is a pregnant problem. What will be the nature of this new and most necessary law of development? Can the common man pause long enough from his undermining labors to answer? Since he is bent upon dragging down the bourgeoisie and reconstructing society, can he so reconstruct that a premium, in some unguessed way or other, will still be laid upon the strong and efficient so that the human type will continue to develop? Can the common man, or the uncommon men who are allied with him, devise such a law? Or have they already devised one? And if so, what is it? The answer rests with the common man. Dare he answer?

Jack London.

The Anthracite Coal Strike.

There is only one issue in the present struggle between the anthracite coal miners and the mine and railroad owners. That issue is the right to organize. There were other issues when the strike began—wages, hours, dockage, weighing, etc., but they have all been subordinated to this one. The coal trust wants to get rid of the union; the miners want to preserve it. No other question will be settled, or will even be considered, until this one is disposed of: The right of the miners to organize—that is, the issue. The mine owners refuse to arbitrate because that will mean recognizing the union. This they will not do, unless forced to it. The miners, having exhausted every other means, say they will compel recognition.

In order to fully understand how much the preservation or the destruction of the miners' union means to both sides, one has to be right on the ground and hear direct testimony. For twelve years, following upon the failure of the Hazleton and Panther Creek Valley strike in 1887, there were practically no unions in the anthracite region. Strikes broke out spasmodically, but were soon crushed. Lattimer became famous through one of these in 1897. The operators had everything their own way, and that way was simply one of extortion and oppression. There are no gentler names for it—and these are too mild. The miners were discouraged, cowed and spiritless. Those among them who tried, secretly or openly, to organize were "spotted" and blacklisted out of the region. I met several such men, who had returned after the strike of 1900. During this time the mine owners were organizing. Untrammelled by any resistance from their employes, they had free scope to fight one another in the market. Inevitably combination resulted. Small owners were wiped out or absorbed, until now the coal trust controls the anthracite output, the transportation facilities and dictates prices to the consumer. There are individual operators, but they are dependent, more or less, upon the trust, and their position makes them even harder task masters than the trust companies.

In 1899 the Vanticoke miners succeeded in organizing, and in winning a strike which lasted five months. Wages were increased, docking regulated, hours reduced and several minor grievances adjusted. This victory awoke the miners of the whole region. A clamor for organization arose from various quarters. President Mitchell answered the cry by sending "Mother" Jones and other organizers into the field. They worked all winter. Every corner of the region was invaded. The capitalists fought them tooth and

nail. At some places the miners themselves, goaded on by their bosses, mobbed and jeered the agitators. There are exciting stories told of those time, but this is not the place to tell them.

Out of those feverish days and nights of dangerous and difficult work came the strike of 1900. Not all the miners responded immediately to the call. Persuasion was required to get some, exhibition of numbers to get others. After six stormy weeks the strike was settled. It was won, whether politics had anything to do with it or not. True, the union was not directly recognized, but it was established. And that was the main point.

From that time, organization spread and strengthened. Every mine in the region has its local and the districts are well organized. Last year, when the mine owners refused to consider the miners' demands, a strike was avoided through the advice of President Mitchell. He counseled peace, told the men they were not ready to strike, the organization was not compact enough and that they lacked resources. They should accept the situation and prepare for decisive action later. The advice was taken. The men continued to organize and they did prepare. And the present strike is the result.

There can be no doubt that the capitalists really wish to destroy the union—just as ardently as the miners desire to preserve it. With many of the miners this desire amounts virtually to a passion. This has to be seen to be understood. It arises from the changed conditions prevailing since 1900. Not that wages, hours or docking have materially changed, although some advantages have been gained. The men acknowledge that the operators are able, in divers ways, to circumvent and evade rules and agreements. But the miners have more liberty than ever before. From one end of the region to the other this is the one thing they harp upon. They have been able to force consideration where before they were treated with contempt. Formerly, if a man complained, he was ignored or insulted. If he complained again, he was told he "could bring his tools out if he didn't like it."

Things have been different during the past two years. There has been more freedom, more independence. Local unions can send a committee to the boss now and have that committee received courteously, at least, where before its members would have been discharged. Petty exactions have been wiped out, irritating grievances remedied. And having tasted a mite of freedom, the miners want more of it. They are determined not to surrender their newly gained privileges without a bitter struggle.

Nevertheless, the existing situation would have been impossible if it had not been for the confidence felt in John Mitchell. Whatever opinion Socialists may hold of his policy, the miners believe in him, radical and conservative alike. And yet Mitchell

opposed the strike. It was declared over his vigorous protests, for Mitchell is extremely cautious and naturally conservative. At the Hazleton convention he spoke at length against the strike, and then, when the resolution was carried, the delegates cheered him until they were hoarse and he shed tears. Those who witnessed it say that no more dramatic scene has occurred in the history of the American labor movement.

In view of this, Mitchell occupies a decidedly interesting position, and we might well ask: What is the secret of his hold upon his people? He was unknown to the anthracite miners four years ago. He seldom goes out among them, remaining entirely in his headquarters. He is very reserved and apparently shuns publicity. His reticence makes him the despair of the reporters, who, nevertheless, respect him highly and consider him one of the ablest public men in America. Every utterance is well weighed, every statement issued carefully considered in company with his colleagues, with whom he is in perfect harmony.

Mitchell's success of two years ago is, of course, largely responsible for his popularity. Still, such a man was necessary at this time. Some one the miners believed in, whom they could trust their interests with. They are loyal to their union, because they believe John Mitchell is loyal to them. They know he is no orator, that he is still young and that necessarily he is surrounded by temptations. But they believe in his honesty, his ability and his intentions, and they feel secure. The only serious criticism I heard of President Mitchell was about the thirty days' armistice proposed by the Civic Federation and accepted by Mitchell and his colleagues. The operators violated an agreement and stocked coal during the thirty days. Even then, Mitchell is not blamed but the Civic Federation is damned and doomed.

The business men of the region are not with the strikers. There are exceptions, here and there, mostly in the smaller towns. In the cities the merchants seem unable to understand the conditions of the miners or the necessity for organization. Apparently, they can imagine no other lot for the miners than that which obtained for years before the union appeared. They only know that then there were no strikes and the men worked steadily. Now business is dead, bills are hard to meet, goods are piled upon the shelf. They want the strike settled in some way. If the miners lose—thank God, it will be all over! If they win—well, the union will still be here, and won't that mean more strikes?

Then the miners' boycott, endorsed and carried on by other workmen, is exceedingly troublesome. Its necessity or meaning is entirely lost to the merchants. They are blind to everything but that their business is interfered with. The question of justice for the miner, good conditions, restriction of docking, shorter

hours, or even higher wages, never illumines their mental horizon. So, encouraged and assisted by the trust emissaries, they join "Citizen's Alliances" which attempt to prosecute boycotters and "disturbers of the peace." These "Alliances" have had strikers arrested and prosecuted upon charges which, at any other time, would be thrown out of court, but they have never moved toward the apprehension of drunken and riotous deputies or the conviction of the coal and iron police who shed the only blood spilled so far in the strike.

Membership in the Alliance is usually kept a secret. Only a few dare reveal themselves in connection therewith, and these few are generally broken down politicians, lawyers or professional men. The merchants keep discreetly in the background, for they know that, won or lost, they will be remembered when the strike is over. So they confine their activities to giving money and attending meetings, which are held in secret. Only to some one whom they believe to be in sympathy with themselves, will they acknowledge their hatred of the union and display their indifference to the miners' grievances.

There is a gubernatorial election in Pennsylvania this year and the politicians have to be careful. So have the papers, for election day is not so far away that the workmen may forget. It happens, therefore, that the politicians are scarce in the strike field, and the papers, with very few exceptions, have done nothing but give advice or scold. The politicians heard of are prolific of schemes how to settle the strike, but they are careful not to be seen too much among the strikers.

The Republican Governor, Mr. Stone, sat up nights when the strike started signing commissions for coal and iron police to serve the companies. When the Republican convention met at Harrisburg, Matt. Quay openly bought up the delegates instructed for Mr. Elkin and had Pennypacker nominated. As Quay had Stone elected Governor, the miners, with their usual guilelessness, turned towards the Democratic party to see whom it would nominate and what it would offer to do for them. They were rewarded by seeing ex-Gov. Pattison nominated through the assistance of Mr. Guffey, Standard Oil magnate, who is the Quay of the Pennsylvania Democracy. Pattison has been hated by the workmen ever since 1892, when he sent the troops to Homestead and broke the famous strike. It was most encouraging to note that this act of Pattison's is vividly remembered by the workmen throughout the State. Both old party conventions gave forth no sign of sympathy for the miners.

To further accentuate the political situation it should be noted that the officeholders, constables, squires, sheriffs, burgesses, judges, on up to Governor, have uniformly displayed only antag-

onism to the strikers. Except in conspicuously rare instances, the trust, in the various localities, has had the powers of government used in its favor. Wherever a man attempted to act with the miners, his efforts have been nullified by the actions of others. Party lines are obliterated to serving the capitalists.

This somewhat lengthy and yet incomplete explanation of the strike situation has been necessary in order that outsiders can understand why the Socialist agitators received such a warm welcome in the strike region. We came with a new message to the strikers and they heard us gladly. Thrown into the position of fighting simply to save the union that had protected them for two years, harassed and antagonized by the business men whom they had formerly believed their friends, deserted and deceived by the politicians who had always proclaimed themselves their champions, misrepresented and discouraged by the papers they had always supported, they were ready to listen to those who came and spoke the truth. In my experience I have never seen men who listened so eagerly and with such unfeigned enthusiasm to the Socialist presentation of the situation as did these strikers.

But the way had been prepared for us. "Mother" Jones had not been through the region for nothing. Everywhere she had left a trail of Socialist books and papers behind her. Few of the officials but had subscribed for a paper, and many of the miners received one she had subscribed for for them. And "Mother" Jones' name is a talisman that opens the hearts of the anthracite miners to any Socialist that comes to educate and not abuse.

Then National Secretary Greenbaum's "strike bulletins," following upon his messages of friendship to the miners' conventions, had also familiarized the name of the Socialist Party. These bulletins were much appreciated and made a good impression.

It did not take long, therefore, for the Socialist agitators to secure a hearing. Nothing could more emphasize the different effect produced by the Socialist Labor Party tactics and those of the Socialist Party than the treatment accorded our representatives. Wherever I went in the region I heard stories of how the S. L. P. agitators had made themselves obnoxious by their attacks upon the union and their efforts to disorganize the men. It sometimes became necessary to explain the difference in the parties to enquirers who classed all Socialists as "union wreckers."

I think the members of the Socialist Party are justified in believing that the presence of their representatives in the field was beneficial to the strike and the miners' union. We preached the necessity of Solidarity and explained the industrial situation so that the miners could not help but become imbued with an increased faith in themselves. They were not slow to acknowledge this, and to show their approval of what we said. It became a

very easy matter to get up a meeting for a Socialist speaker and, in some cases, men were known to walk several miles to hear us. The Socialists presented the case with a force and clearness that went home and made, I am sure, a lasting impression, especially as the situation provided all the necessary features for Socialist arguments of unlimited length.

There was no antagonism to the Socialists exhibited by any of the officials. On the contrary, there was an evident desire to allow us to be heard, and local officials gave us much assistance. Personally I received a letter from President Mitchell introducing me to the locals, which, as representative of the "Worker," was of great help to me. I did not have to use the letter to get up meetings. Just as soon as it was learned I was a Socialist and "all right," meetings were arranged for me. There was no danger of not having anything to do.

Wherever Vail, Spargo, Geiger and Collins had spoken, the same encomiums of their work were heard. We had a clear field, for none of the capitalist party politicians were in sight, and the miners were in the mood for the truth. Collins couldn't begin to organize locals fast enough, and he'll probably never do harder or better work again. Fortunately, we had comrades at Carbondale and Wilkesbarre, who took advantage of every opportunity presented.

Two things are to be regretted. First, that more agitators could not be kept in the field, and second, that more literature and better facilities for handling it could not be provided. I was never more impressed with the necessity of a well-formed, efficiently conducted Socialist organization. The national and State officials of the party did their utmost, but their hands were tied for lack of funds. I am of the opinion that half a dozen good Socialist agitators, speaking different languages, following each other through the region, would do more toward winning the strike than all the money the Socialist Party can give to a strike relief fund.

The demand for literature cannot begin to be filled. The miners are reading and discussing what they read as never before. Such an opportunity to reach a large number of workingmen so receptive and hungry for knowledge will seldom be presented again. As it is, we can feel that not only have we done our utmost to propagate Socialism, but we have also inculcated into the hearts and minds of thousands of workingmen the true spirit of the class struggle and some conception of the prevailing industrial phenomena.

A final word about the strike itself. That the conditions around the mines justify organization goes without saying. Nevertheless, I believe these conditions might have been endured a while longer if tyranny had not been exercised to such an extent.

To be continually insulted and reviled when seeking redress, to be cursed by the boss and subjected to his open contempt, to be ignored by the employer when seeking recognition—this was more than the miners could stand forever. The union has offered them the only medium of expression for their grievances, the only form of protection from the domineering of under bosses and the larger tyranny of the operators they have ever had. The strike is the harvest of years of arbitrary and selfish corporate misrule.

Whatever the outcome may be, the fact that the fight is one to preserve the right to organize should be of encouragement to all Socialists. There is one thing also of which I am morally certain: that, even if the strike be lost, the union will not wholly be destroyed. It has the elements of permanency in it, for men like those to be found in the anthracite region are not conquered by one defeat. The union is there to stay, no matter how this strike may result or who the officers may be. The seed of Solidarity is too deeply planted to be uprooted and destroyed so easily as the mine owners wish. And if the Socialists have only succeeded in planting that seed a little deeper, this alone should recompense us for any money or energy expended during the strike.

William Mailly.

Boston, Mass., July 23, 1902.

Events in Russia.

INTERNATIONAL Socialist Bulletin addressed by the executive committee of the International Socialist Bureau to the Socialistic parties of all countries:

A year ago international Socialism called the attention of the world to the assaults made by Czarism upon science and upon the Russian proletariat.

In spite of the earnest protest of the working class of all nations, in spite of the cries of indignation by the European press called out by this event, despotism still reigns in Russia.

Imprisonment, torture, wholesale slaughter await all those who through their organization or their science are seeking a better social state and are planning the deliverance of the working class.

Recent communications to the Socialist press regarding the bloody repression of May 1, in Russia, are now confirmed by the reports coming from workingmen's organizations, and by others, sent by our comrades, B. Kritschewsky and G. Plekhanoff, Russian delegates to the International Socialist Bureau.

At Wilna, the Cossacks and police agents dispersed the paraders, killed the bearer of the red flag, and made prisoners of thirty-seven workingmen, whom the governor, Von Wahl, ordered to be flogged until they were insensible.

At Kieff, they stripped off the clothes of the young students who were arrested at the close of the demonstrations, and subjected them to the most revolting indignities. Mothers were arrested by wholesale and compelled to give information against their own children.

In the province of Poltava the revolting peasants were taken into the churches, and, after being compelled to hear mass, were flogged until insensible.

In the prisons of Ekaterinoslaw, the political prisoners let themselves die of hunger rather than endure longer the brutal treatment of their guards.

The committee of Ekaterinaslaw of the Social Democratic party of Russia has brought these odious facts to the attention of the public. A "famine revolt" (refusal to take food) has broken out in the prison of Bouterki at Moscow in consequence of the barbarous treatment inflicted upon political prisoners.

At Odessa the paraders have been flogged and the peasants of Kharkoff have been tortured as atrociously as those of Poltava.

The "Bund," or the General Union of Jewish Workers of

Lithuania, of Poland, and of Russia send testimony which completes the record of the proceedings. This is as follows:

"The parade of the 1st of May took place at Wilna as was customary. The police and the Cossacks struck the paraders in the street with their usual ferocity. The bearer of the red flag was abused most ferociously, so that his clothes were cut through and his blood flowed in streams. Some dozens of paraders who were arrested were beaten as they were conducted to police headquarters. But all these savageries were only the prelude to the bloody scenes which were enacted on the next day.

"Already, before the parade, by order of the governor, Von Wahl, bundles of rods had been prepared, soaked in water. On the 2d of May the torture took place in the court of the police commissioner in the presence of a commission of executioners, composed of the governor, Von Wahl; the prefect of police, Nasimoff; the doctor, Michailoff; the commissioners of police, Senitko and Kontchewsky; of Brigadier Martinoff, and the police sergeants, Cybousky and Miloucha. The paraders who had been arrested were called up, one by one. With a cynical irony the governor began by extending a May-day greeting to each prisoner. And here is a surprise for you, he added. "How old are you?" "Forty years." "Give him forty blows." "And you?" "Fifty years." "Give him fifty blows." And so on. One prisoner, more reckless than the others, answered that his age was a million years. They gave him a hundred blows and then, as he had lost consciousness, they brought him to himself by pouring cold water over his head, then made him lie down again to continue the torture.

The doctor was there to determine the number of blows which the tortured man could endure. The governor, Von Wahl, watched that the blows should be given vigorously; if the executioner by chance let fall a blow that was a little too feeble the governor declared that this blow did not count.

"The beating continued until the tortured man lost consciousness; if he proved able to get up on his feet they began again. And to aggravate the shame of the torture they offered the tortured man, after having brought him to consciousness again, a poster on which was found these words: 'Vive le premier mai!' These posters had been distributed the day before the parade by the local committee of the general Union.

"The bearer of the red flag and one other workingman were flogged to death!

"The committee of the 'Bund,' the Socialistic party at Wilna, the Social Democratic party of Poland and of Lithuania, the Labor Committee at Wilna, and the Russian Social Democratic group at Wilna, have put out jointly, with reference to this re-

volting and ignominious torture, 10,000 copies of a proclamation in Russian, in a Jewish jargon, and in Polish, in which it has designated the names of the responsible executioners, and it ends with these words: 'Vengeance shall fall upon each of you and your names shall be accursed forever.'"

The white terror rages in Russia more and more ferociously. The episodes of Wilna are unhappily but one instance a little worse than the others.

International Socialism, profoundly indignant at the atrocities which are daily committed against Russian workers, makes its appeal to public opinion that these abominations be denounced.

Moved with grief, it sends its greeting of solidarity to the Russian workers who, with unexampled heroism, are struggling for their political and economic emancipation.

It is the duty of the Socialist Party of every nation to acquaint people with the abominable wrongs which are being done to the working class of Russia and without delay to raise their protest by such means as they shall think most proper against the Czarism which, in its official discourses, speaks of peace, and which in reality is waging an implacable war against people who demand their right to liberty and to existence.

V. Serwy,
Secretary.

Democracy and Education.

There is no doubt that it has been a wholesome discontent that has produced the progress of the human race. The last two generations of Americans have prided themselves that nowhere did there exist a system of schools that equaled their own. In this they were quite right, for the splendid schools of Germany do not constitute a common school system. With this we have been satisfied, and have failed to recognize that although the only nominal system of common schools in the world is that of the United States, nevertheless we have them only in part; that although the methods of education in some of our schools are good, they are still far from what they should be, and the vast majority of our schools are very poor excuses at the best.

It is commonly believed that our public school system was struck, full-fledged, from the brains of the founders and fathers of the country. In this we are wholly wrong. Our public schools are the result of a long evolution. At most the framers of the Constitution saw no further than that a certain amount of intelligence is necessary for any self-governing people. In its early days the common school system met with fierce opposition. The old question was raised, "Should children be educated at the public expense?" The methods of the dame schools of England had been transplanted to America. Alongside the public schools of New England were founded private schools and academies. To these latter were sent the children of the well-to-do. Gradually the public schools became little more than charity schools, and in 1835 a public school system was still a thing of the future.

About this time Horace Mann, one whose name is familiar to every student of education, was asked to set on foot a move to change this condition of affairs. His struggles with the private schools and academies and the body of citizens themselves were long and severe. Not until 1840 did the State of Massachusetts, the leader in the matter, possess a common school system. Our educational system, therefore, has been the outgrowth of necessity. To presume that it has reached its ideal is absurd. It is at present in a state of revolution.

It is usually supposed that the American people are the most intelligent to be found. Again we are right. Yet the statistics collected by the Commissioner of Education reveal some startling facts. There are to-day in the United States about 22,000,000 children of school age. Of these but 16,000,000 are enrolled in the elementary and secondary schools—that is, the grade and high schools. Nearly 6,000,000 children are receiving practically no

education. Again, of these 16,000,000, but 650,000 ever enter the high school, and but 158,000 ever attend any college, university, or professional school.

Again, the average schooling per individual in the United States is but four school years. We may leave it to any man or woman of intelligence to estimate how much can be accomplished in four years. A knowledge of the three R's constitutes the limit of the education of a large part of the American citizens.

The cause for this condition of things is entirely an economic one. Remembering that there are some individuals who attend school eight, twelve, sixteen—yes, twenty years and more, how is it that this average is so low? There are some children who receive little or no education. These belong to one class, the laboring class. In every large city over and over again the teacher finds the children dropping out of school at 10 and 12 years of age, even in States where compulsory school laws exist. They help to become the bread winners of the family.

In South Carolina, where no compulsory school law exists, they enter the mills at 5 and 6 years. The average length of their lives in the mills is four years. The teachers in the night schools for these little ones say that they do not try to teach them. It is useless. They only endeavor to keep their minds alive by some form of amusement.

In every large city the teacher meets a double difficulty. The children come so poorly clad in winter and with so little food that there is no red blood in their bodies. They cannot be taught. More than this, children of 6 and 8 years are found doing from two to six hours work every day out of school to help keep the family. The same conditions exist in the country. The country boy seldom attends school in the summer after he is 12 years of age, and usually drops out at 14 or 15. The attendance of the girls is little better. This low average is not by any means all due to the ignorant foreign population in the cities, as is often presumed. Nowhere does the average go lower than among the whites of the South.

What, it will be asked, is the cause of all this? Some will answer, It is the fault of individual parents who have not been saving, careful, or temperate enough. A condition found to prevail to such an extent and in one economic class points to other than an individual cause. There is an underlying cause for all this: Economic conditions over which the individuals have been helpless have been the great fundamental reason.

Any examination of any historical period shows that the closest relation has existed between the economic condition of a people or class, and their average intelligence. Man's economic activity began with the procuring of food. Clothing and shelter then be-

came necessary. Thus his wants have multiplied and grown more complex, and constantly he has sought to lessen the amount of his own manual labor necessary to supply these wants. Had he been less ingenious and contented himself with supplying his needs with bare hand labor his advance and cultivation would have been impossible. Tools, domestic animals or other human labor were substituted. As an individual or class gained economic supremacy it happened that two persons, at least, were occupied with mechanical work, so that a third person might enjoy the fortunate condition of not needing to engage in such work. It was the slave labor of Greece that made possible its intellectual supremacy in ancient times. These slaves were the machines, and a vast number of them were requisite for the creation and maintenance of one philosopher. Education was the possession of the aristocracy. It was a disgrace for a free Greek to perform manual labor.

From the earliest times those who possessed certain advantages economically, such as the owning of herds, or lands, or tools, have, on account of this, freed themselves from manual labor and shifted it on to the shoulders of other human beings, and slavery resulted. A leisure class that could devote itself to intellectual culture and scientific advance, who possessed the things with which other men must work, has thus, from the beginning of civilization, stood opposite to a propertyless class that performed the menial labor of the world. Wherever human beings have not been plentiful enough to supply these wants, inventive genius has sought the aid of brute force or inanimate machines. Too often to-day the college professor, the young collegiate, or even the high school graduate looks in contempt at the farm or factory laborer, with dirty, begrimed face, hardened hands and bent form. He never stops to consider that his immaculate shirt front and soft hands are only possible for him because others plow and weave, dig in the mines and cross the sea to provide the wor'd with food, shelter and clothing. We do not in any way claim that the labor of the one is more important than that of the other. Both are alike necessary, and must be done. What we would have is no such complete confining of intellectual work to one part of society and manual labor to another.

As pointed out in a recent United States educational report the keeping of any body of laborers at the lowest point intellectually results in the destruction of their inventive power, and is a menace to any democratic form of government. In Eastern Germany, where cheap labor is plentiful, and the incentive to invent labor-saving machinery has been nil, agriculture is at a low stage of development. Among the western farmers, where laborers are scarce, and devices to lessen the amount of the human part of labor are necessary, there is a far higher average of intelligence, and

the work has, wherever possible, been shifted to domestic animals and machinery.

Now, this represents two tendencies noticeable in society to-day. Where labor is plentiful, and especially among an agricultural people, popular education is underestimated. In the Prussian House of Deputies, where the farm laborers of Galacia were pointed to as the ideal workmen, it was said by members of the land-holding class: "The people of whom one-half can hardly read or write think of nothing save their work and wages. They are the most respectable people in the world." Another said: "I need three oxen for my plow, and if the one behind the plow can call out 'Gee' and 'Whoa' at the right time nothing more is necessary." Again, "No education is necessary for gathering potatoes." Perhaps not, but it is a little hard for the laborer to be classed quite so openly with the brute animal he works with, and by the very class that owes all its superior intelligence to his labor.

In many of the industries it is found that a greater amount of intelligence is an advantage to the employer. In these technical education is favored. Such an education is by no means ideal. It is confined to one narrow line of industry alone, and is calculated not to make broader, more intelligent men, but more valuable workers. More than this, skilled labor has heretofore been well paid. To-day we have a curious phenomenon. The trained engineer, the electrician, the pharmacist and lawyer find that they can obtain no more than the skilled metal- or wood-workers. The labor market is over-crowded. The wages of the technical and professional workers go down accordingly. That technical education should be emphasized at this time is quite as we should expect. The industrial character of the period demands it. It has displaced the purely classical education.

Any examination of education shows at once that it has at all times borne the mark of its time and place. Perhaps nothing will illustrate this better than an example taken from the history of education in Germany. Frederick the Great was the creator of Prussia. He saw that to make his people powerful among the nations of Europe he must have artisans able to provide for the wants of his people at home, as well as soldiers to fight his battles abroad. To train these he founded an industrial school in 1735, and sought to do away with the old quantity education that is characterized by the learning of so many lines and pages and per cent. examinations, Fichte persuaded William III. to send across the mountains to Switzerland and inquire about and learn the methods of Pestalozzi, who was working a revolution in education by bringing the children about him and teaching them from nature. This was done, and the schools of Prussia became the best in the world.

Then came the French Revolution. "The common people have begun to think," said the Prussian rulers together with the other rulers of Europe. We must do away with this quality education that will train them in intelligence, and return to our schools the old method of page learning. Napoleon, born of the French Revolution, swept over Europe, and Prussia came under his power. The question arose as to the cause of their weakness and the remedy. The new minister of education advised a return to the methods of Pestalozzi,—the work from Nature and of investigation. Quality education was returned, and Froebel's kindergartens were opened. In 1848 came another period of unrest, and revolution, and once more the Germans turned to the study of the catechism and all work of investigation was abolished. The schools of Froebel and the Normal of Pestalozzi were closed. It was no less a person than Prince Bismarck who said that an educated working class was a menace to any nation. To any nation founded upon the rule of the few over the many, it is a menace.

It might be well here to give a word of explanation of these terms "quality" and "quantity" education. The first we have already characterized. It is the method that prevails now in our public schools. It consists of the cramming system, the bare gathering of facts. The quality method aims to foster the power of self-activity, of choice. All this will be made clearer by going into details as to the present revolution taking place in education. First of all, this revolution is not a thing of itself apart from all else. It is a part of the great change that is taking place in society. As the form of the industrial institutions upon which all other institutions are founded is passing through a period of transition, so in the fields of literature, art, ethics, science and education there is a correspondingly noticeable change. The social organism moves together as one great whole.

A few examples will best illustrate this change, the two methods of education, and the different objects that the two seek to accomplish. I remember distinctly the way in which I was taught the steam engine. A bare diagram was put before me to represent the different parts. I was told, "This is a steam chest. This a piston rod," and so on. As I saw steam engines working from time to time I was quite helpless in identifying the parts, much less could I have handled one. Exactly the same thing was done in the study of electricity or of any mechanical apparatus. Under the new method it is recognized that it is worse than useless to teach from diagrams, that the child must touch and handle, and make the parts, and put them together if he is to know them.

Take the method of teaching arithmetic. I doubt not if you were to go into the nearest school you would still find them teaching the multiplication and addition tables. The new method teaches

the child addition by the process of actually putting together objects, not abstract figures. It teaches multiplication and the other processes of numbers in the same manner.

The average parent, if asked about the progress his boy of ten has made in reading, will reply, "He reads in the fourth reader." That means nothing to the teacher who has gotten out of the old ruts of text-books. Little does he care what is the number of the reader, whether it be four or forty. Reading words in itself is nothing. What we do wish to know is, how much power that boy has gained in making the thought of the printed page his own.

I think the tendency of the new education is becoming plain. It is to produce men and women of broad and rounded manhood and womanhood, having the power of decision and logical independent thought, not mere repeaters of words, parrot-like following some authority,—men and women, who question, investigate search out the truth and know things not words. It emphasizes the training of the body as well as the mind, and would have an individual developed mentally, morally and physically.

Society to-day suffers from two extremes through its division into economic classes. On the one hand is the so-called cultured scholar, with his knowledge confined to books. His training has all been a kind of brain exercise. On the other hand is the farm and factory laborer, often barely able to read and write and keep his accounts, with all his knowledge confined to the machine. The new education would combine these two, brain and hand culture, and thus destroy our one-sided system of education, and produce complete men and women. Under the present social conditions this is impossible.

There is not alone this one-sidedness in the culture of the two great economic classes, but our industrial system produces a pitiful narrowness in the education,—education being understood in its broadest sense—of the members of the different trades in the laboring class. Outside the little bounds of his own trade the workman knows little or nothing. For example, what does the city born youth know of the processes of plowing, sowing and gathering the grain? Or the farmer, what does he know of the wonderful machinery in the rooms, for example, of a city newspaper, the linotype and the great Hoe presses, or the complex machines of a cotton or woolen factory?

Still further. More and more to-day, especially in times of fierce economic struggle, a technical education is emphasized at the expense of general education in certain trades. This gives us a one-sidedness and narrowness again born of our present system. We have seen people take a child that showed marked talent for music, put it at the piano constantly, neglect any other training, physical or mental, and then wonder why at eighteen or

twenty it made no further progress, and failed to turn out the prodigy they expected. It is plain enough to see why. The child had nothing on which to work, no broad foundation of culture that would enable it to appreciate the good and the beautiful as it grew older.

"Specialize" is the watchword of the day. All well and good. But remember that if you have not first laid a foundation in the form of a good general education your specialist may know all about a certain beetle or trade, but he has no power to grasp or enjoy the other phases of civilization. One writer has well said "Special education, without a general education, is like a house without a foundation."

And now one word as to school discipline. In your school days and mine the ideal schoolroom was, and no doubt to-day, from necessity, still is, the one in which the least noise is heard, where communication is unknown. Our present school organization requires this. The teacher with thirty or fifty children to cram facts into can do nothing else. The new education recognizes that childhood is a time of activity, that to force children to sit six hours in a stupid room is little less than criminal. The new method lays no emphasis on such tomb-like quiet, since the pupil in the model schoolroom is doing things, and learning by doing, not being filled passively, like so many pitchers, with unassimilated matter.

I have gone thus fully into the pedagogical side of the new education, that I might show wherein the present school system will break down, and must be intelligently reconstructed. Also to show that our present system is not the one best fitted for a democratic form of government.

To-day education is used in a woefully narrow sense. It means to the majority of us so many years spent in school or college. Then comes the great "bread and butter problem," the "how to earn a living" question that absorbs the remainder of our lives. One great educator has said: "All of life should be an education." To-day this is impossible. The struggle for existence leaves no time for culture. Yet many of these changes are looked upon as "fads," and if there should come into the average neighborhood a teacher capable of teaching after this method who would, for instance, train the boys and girls in practical chemistry, teach soils, physics, the zoology of insects, and arithmetic by actual objects and measurements, the citizens would be apt to rise up in indignation and put him out, so settled have they become in the old ways.

To-day the knowledge of the world, like the capital of the world, is the monopoly of the few. There is one form of education for the rich, another for the laborer. The laborers believe they are "educated." This is as the ruling class would have it. The

laborers are satisfied, and at the same time kept contented by this "quantity" education, that prevents any free action of their mind. Gradually the ruling class is withdrawing its children from the public schools. Well enough they recognize its defects. The workers are taught, not alone from the lecture platform and through the press, but in the public schools, those things that will best further and maintain the permanency of the present capitalist class.

No form of democracy can long continue where there exists, as there does today, a permanent form of class education. The object of aristocracy has always been the subjugation of the many to the few. Does there exist no aristocracy in the United States to-day? If you do not recognize its existence I shall not undertake to prove it to you. The question of aristocracy has been, how far it is safe to make its laboring class intelligent, and still keep them from thinking for themselves. No monarchy is without class schools. Any feeling of personal rights on the part of the common people is dangerous. They must be prevented from finding the truth.

We all recognize that the industrial changes from 1880 to 1902 have been wonderful. We have seen competition that we, perhaps, began to think was permanent, wellnigh disappear, and monopoly take its place. We must admit that social forms are not lasting; that they are in a constant state of change, and all the signs of the times indicate that the next step in social evolution will see the great producing instruments pass into the hands of the people—collectively owned. Modern inventions have increased the productiveness of human labor a hundred fold. One man with a machine can now do the work of twenty or thirty men in many trades. This great increase of labor-saving machinery should have been the means of releasing a larger and larger part of the population from manual labor and making it possible for them to devote themselves for a part of their time to intellectual work. The menial labor that a multitude of slaves performed if some few were to become philosophers in Greek times, could now be turned over to bands of steel and iron. That this is not done is due to the fact that these machines are privately owned and run for profit. It is the labor-saving machine belonging to the people collectively that will abolish human slavery, free the laborer from constant toil and give him leisure for the culture of his mind.

May Wood Simons.

Socialism and Solidarity.

To inquire whether Socialism and Solidarity have relations between them, and to determine what these relations are,—this is the problem. The question is a delicate one, which may easily enough be answered briefly in the affirmative, but to show the basis for the affirmative answer is not so easy.

In that science, born only yesterday, to which the name of Socialism has been given, everything is still to be created,—method, terminology, data. The figures accumulated by statistics, no matter how laboriously, relate to fugitive facts which can neither be weighed nor measured in the laboratory. The personal equation of error sifts into them to an extent which leads to the most contradictory results. The language of the sociologist fails of scientific precision and each of them forges his own vocabulary. As for the data, they have been realized, to the extent that certain experiments constitute data, in a hostile environment. It is then only the sentiment of truth, the instinct for certainty, the scent of the real path, which are our best guidance in this complex field.

We need first to fix the exact content of the two terms which limit the field that we must survey: First, Socialism. I am one of those who think that Socialism is not, properly speaking, a new doctrine. It is a clearer affirmation of the slow, age-long, universal tendency toward what is better; it is a clearer and more precise expression of the great law of least effort, the only expression which seems established by the multiplicity of the facts which it explains and which it justifies.

To satisfy each day a greater sum of needs with equal effort, or to satisfy with less effort the same or a larger sum of needs, such is certainly the most undeniable social phenomenon. For a long time the law of least effort has been perceived and stated. But in our time it is brought to the eyes of all under forms as wonderful as they are convincing.

The rotary press which pours forth in one hour a torrent of ten, twelve, fifteen, twenty, or thirty thousand papers, folded and counted, while the cylinder press is painfully printing a thousand, and the hand press a hundred, is an admirable symbol of this law.

And the post office, and the railroad, and the steamer! And the electricity which takes the place of gas, carrying light everywhere with brilliant profusion! The invisible word launched across the spaces and caught in its flight like a butterfly on the wing! and the sewing machine, the typewriter, the typesetting machine, the calculating machine, the bicycle and the automobile! One might say that a horde of inventors, like the hordes of barbarians, has

invaded the world and overturned even in its inmost recesses our contemporary life.

Nevertheless, it seems that the effort required from each and every one of the workers has become lamentably multiplied. Every spine has become curved from over-work. Our life carries us away like a whirlwind, and our nerves, scarcely equal to the burdens imposed upon them, are stretched to the breaking point, and the most inconceivable confusion governs the satisfaction of our desires.

Less than ever do these desires seem to be satisfied. They have increased more rapidly than the accelerated means for satisfying them. And the worst of it is that our needs sometimes crowd violently against closed doors of granaries which are creaking under the weight of stored products. The manufacturers complain of stocks which they cannot distribute, and the workers groan and weep because hunger and thirst are strangling them in the garrets of a house in which the lower story is bursting with merchandise and provisions. The contradiction is infamous and would be infernal if the improvement of economic machinery and manual skill must end in exciting new miseries and making the old miseries more intense.

From this contradiction is born the social question, and to this question a response has been given, Socialism.

Nevertheless, ever since it became important to define this response, a thousand doctors have presented themselves and definitions have abounded. Marx, Fourier, Owen, Lassalle, to mention only those who have died, have stated formulas. We recognize integral Socialism, rational Socialism, the Socialism of the platform, State Socialism, communist Socialism, and collectivist Socialism.

Disorder presides over the production, the circulation and the distribution of wealth. Disorder seems to preside also over the hatching of systems and remedies. For one, the social question is a moral one, for another the social question is a question of the stomach; for one it is a political question, for another a question of finance.

But if programs and acts are examined, certain broad lines of argument appear, certain essential ideas come to the surface and we see that one common motive animates the reformers.

The group substituted for the individuals is the thought which inspires all reforms, from the most deadening to the most revolutionary.

To the struggle for life is opposed co-operation for life. Free competition, the pretended mother of harmony, is thenceforth rejected.

Competition has covered our walls with verbose posters, has flooded our houses with lying advertisements, has degraded the press, and has raised adulteration to the position of a world-wide institution. Trusts, combinations and pools have permitted certain millionaires to carve out for themselves empires more vast than those of Tamerlane or Mahomet. In the presence of the barons of finance the barons of feudalism seem like petty pick-pockets. Protectionism and militarism are triumphant; our frontiers bristle with custom houses and threatening fortresses.

Never has the world beheld such a spectacle. The invasions of the Huns and the Normans, the Crusaders and the Mussulmen have been but insignificant skirmishes compared with the gigantic conflict for which the nations have been preparing these thirty years.

After eighteen centuries of Christianity, one century of economic liberty has sufficed to lead up to this work of hate and terror.

Formerly the land covered itself with temples and cathedrals. Henceforth it covers itself with barracks and factories. Hideous and sinister, they rise on the confines of the most exquisite landscapes, among fields where harvests wave as in the fields beyond the mountains, among the torrents and cascades.

And yet these have been the great initiators and through them the better has been born from the worst. They have sifted out the human mass, have fused together the peasants and the city laborers, have brought the common people into the cities and scattered the workers over the fields; they have enlisted men and imposed discipline upon them.

It is due to this mighty army, it is due to this highly developed industry, that the notion of solidarity has penetrated into the most stubborn brains, for without it the work of death and the work of life would be equally impossible of realization; it is the necessary condition of production as well as of destruction.

Inevitably the two concepts, of Solidarity and of Socialism, which grew into consciousness in the thought of the masses at one and the same moment of evolution, were destined to unite and to combine. And it might have been said and has been said that Socialism would be nothing less than solidarity, or that it would not be realized.

Unhappily the idea of Solidarity, like the idea of Socialism, is something impossible to state in a definite formula. The choice of the word intended to designate this idea might indeed raise objections.

Solidarity is a juridical term, and the sense which the jurists have given it has but a distant connection with the sociological

idea that it is called upon to express. To say, in fact, that every debtor for an obligation in solidarity is held alone for the entire debt, apart from his recourse upon his co-debtors, and to say that every creditor for such an obligation has the right to demand for his own profit the entire payment of what is due, apart from the recourse of his co-creditors upon him,—all this explains nothing from the special point of view in which we find ourselves placed. In the social domain no one would require from each of us the execution of the duty imposed upon all, any more than each of us could require from all for his exclusive profit the execution of a duty to be accomplished toward all.

One formula has precisely defined in this regard both the debt with which we are socially charged and the credit to which we are entitled, namely: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Between the notion of solidarity, as it has been formulated by the jurists, and the notion of solidarity as it has been conceived by the teachers of Socialism, there is then a formal contradiction. Where the jurist says all of the debt or all of the credit, the sociologists say: A reduced debt and a relative credit. The notion of social solidarity is manifestly superior to that of juridical solidarity in that it imposes upon a creditor a social debt as a condition of recognizing his social credit. But it is evident that this is not the whole of solidarity as it is stated by the Socialist schools.

The second formula might make it better: "All for one, and one for all." This formula has the advantage of showing the ties which proceed from us to our brothers, as well as the ties which proceed from our brothers to each of us. This formula most emphatically pre-supposes the existence of the group which I indicated as the essential characteristic of all the socialist systems, and it affirms, as I hold, more emphatically still that there is but one human group, and that socially there is but one sole society, humanity.

Nevertheless, the two formulas remain vague and we must turn to deeds and acts in order to grasp fully in what consists solidarity, such as Socialism practises it and demands it. Militant Socialism indeed vehemently sets forth a triple activity, that of the mutual association, the labor union, and the co-operative. Co-operatives, labor unions and mutual associations constitute the regiments of this army and the discipline of this army, and is nothing more or less than Solidarity. No one will contradict me, I think, if I say that this triple activity is in the highest degree social and tending toward Solidarity. I say social intentionally, for

I know the objections that would surely be urged if I were to say Socialist.

With the utmost exactness it would be pointed out to me that the mutual benefit association, the labor union and the co-operative exist and prosper under political forms which are most diverse and that their most imposing successes have been realized without any other ideal than the very realistic and selfish one of satisfying needs which are purely and grossly material.

To all this I agree. I admit it with regret and I must indeed declare that many members of mutual associations, labor unions and co-operatives are attracted to these organizations by nothing less than the pecuniary and personal advantages which they receive from them.

But it is precisely because this is so that it will be to the eternal honor and superiority of Socialism to have affirmed that the triple activity of unions, mutual associations and co-operatives has an educative and suggestive value, that it is merely a mile-stone of the evolution toward a more fraternal organization of human society and that it constitutes the embryonic form of the coming administration of things.

It may be affirmed that it is Socialism under its political form which has discovered and defined the influence toward solidarity exercised by the co-operative, the mutual association, and the union. The Socialist party of Belgium, at least, has affirmed this as well in its declaration of principles as in its economic program. In its declaration of principles it states that the transformation of the capitalistic system into a collectivistic system requires in the moral order the development of altruistic sentiments and the practice of solidarity. In its economic program one and the same paragraph admits the need of recognition of the unions and the reform of the laws regarding mutual relief societies and co-operatives. It would be easy to point out similar declarations in the manifestoes of the Socialist parties of other countries.

It is thus certain that what men of good will have realized in a sporadic fashion Socialism is seeking to co-ordinate in a methodical and organic fashion. By the attraction of its ever increasing mass, by its persistent propaganda in favor of the ideas of altruism and brotherhood, it must inevitably group and it is already grouping within itself the existing organizations into vast federations of a real and conscious solidarity.

It is possible that the word Socialism may be transformed in the course of time into Socialization, and that the word Solidarity may give place to the word Interdependence. It will none the less be true that the aim and end of Socialism will be to realize through all its efforts the maximum of solidarity through the maximum of co-ordination. And we shall see later that the ideal

program of Socialism is nothing but an enlargement and projection into the future of the tendencies now contained in its program of immediate realization.

I have tried to show the origins of the two conceptions, Socialism and Solidarity, which in our time have become conscious, by the effect of a reaction against the abuses and misconceptions of liberty, and I have attempted, however imperfectly, to define these two conceptions. I hope to show still further that if Socialism and Solidarity have been a reaction against liberty, nevertheless they do not lead, as has been erroneously maintained, to the annihilation of liberty.

I said, it is true, that Socialism has for its essential content the substitution of the group for individuals and that Solidarity expresses more especially the mutual subordination of the individuals to each other, the link of creditor to debtor and of debtor to creditor which unites them socially. It might appear that this double union of the group and the link involves hierarchy and authority and is destructive of individual independence.

This view, as I hold, rests on a serious misconception of the proper domain of liberty, as indeed also of equality and of fraternity. Many errors spring from the confusion excited by this celebrated and beautiful republican device. I think, indeed, that the juridical domain is the proper domain of equality, as the economic domain is the proper domain of fraternity, which is nothing but the moral side of Solidarity. Liberty in its turn has for its proper domain the intellectual field.*

In the juridical domain everything is prescription, regulation, order. In the economic domain natural laws impose themselves upon us with an authority that admits of no discussion. We can apply them to our needs, but not evade them. On the contrary, what men have demanded for centuries and justly demanded at the cost of most terrible suffering has been the right to express their opinions by voice or pen, to meet together, to deliberate together in the fullness of their independence. Now this liberty has always been in inverse ratio to the economic power of the ruling class. It is this which the rationalistic Socialists have very happily described as the compressibility of free inquiry.

Under the system of slavery and serfdom the economic power of the head of the family, or of the feudal lord, was almost unlimited. Liberty did not exist, neither for the slave nor for the serf. Under the wage system the ruling class always has at its disposal an exceptional economic power, since liberty of thought

*To avoid any ambiguity it is worth while to observe that if I say the proper domain I do not mean the only domain.

is always restricted and the majority of men in most civilized countries are too often forced into silence or falsity, if they wish to preserve their position and their resources. Too often, also, it is necessary to howl with the wolves. Not until the day when the economic power of the ruling class shall have been reduced to zero will liberty of opinion and of thought be really installed in the world.

The misunderstanding which has produced at once the splendor and the misery of the century just ended has consisted precisely in carrying over the concept of liberty from the intellectual field into the economic. This misunderstanding has tended to stifle the growth of free inquiry, although fortunately to a limited extent, and it has moreover had the effect of perpetrating under the capitalistic form the predatory system of past centuries.

Now to say Socialism and Solidarity means nothing less than the suppression of all economic domination, and consequently, the final liberation of thought. Indeed, on the one hand, the social group such as we have defined it would not be conceivable if it were composed of heterogeneous groups, while, on the other hand, the solidarity realized between the individuals of the social group would not be effective if the action of one alone might counter-balance the action of all or of several.

It is then on the triumph of solidarity, fraternity, and altruism in the economic field that the final triumph of liberty in the intellectual field is conditioned, and we may say the same of the triumph of equality in the juridical field.

As for this triumph of Solidarity, I see no force but Socialism which is capable of assuring it. I know very many of those who hold with the Socialist schools that humanity is marching toward a greater degree of solidarity, but still refuse to align themselves with this extreme opinion, which to many seems subversive. Nevertheless, this conviction of mine seems to follow irresistibly from the Socialist program of immediate realization.

Two fundamental reforms are inscribed upon this program, which are nothing less than the necessary and inevitable extension of the work of the co-operatives and the labor unions, namely, the collective appropriation of property and the social organization of labor.

The appropriation by the commonwealth of natural forces, the soil, instruments of labor and means of production is, in my eyes, nothing less than the hastening of the reform begun by co-operative action. To make all the citizens of the world co-operators in a single co-operative organism, to transform the present predatory society into a co-operative society, such is

certainly the ideal end toward which co-operative action tends. If it were possible to reach this result by mere persuasion and propaganda, Socialism might drop from its program its most essential demand. But who can think seriously of the co-operators even of a single country, with all their efforts, becoming joint owners of all the wealth of that country?*

It would, moreover, be necessary that all the citizens of this country acquiesce in becoming voluntarily members of the national co-operative in order that a really co-operative appropriation be realized through the simple play of present social forces. If co-operation is really that form of the consumption and production of wealth which tends to Solidarity, would it not be absurd to refuse to hasten its final installation? This is the mission assigned to Socialism, and to Socialism alone.

The social organization of labor again is, in turn, nothing but the necessary and inevitable outcome of the action of trade unions. Even now the union has an influence over this organization, since its principal end is to obtain the regulation of wages, of the hours of labor, and the limitation of the selection and enlistment of laborers. Already it often happens that the union manages a school of apprenticeship and a shop for those out of work. But how painfully this labor is accomplished, at the cost of how many strikes and miscalculations! Evidently in a society without employers it will be to the union inevitably by the nature of things that all trade regulation must be referred. Through the fact that it would enroll all the laborers of a given trade, united into an autonomous group, it would become the true employer of this trade, providing for the distribution of labor and the enlistment of the laborers. Solidarity would show itself in such groups not so much, as is now the case, by pecuniary sacrifices made by each of the trade unionists to guarantee the defense of the wages and the leisure hours of his brother laborers, as by the strict payment of the debt of labor imposed upon all according to their abilities and which all will make it a veritable point of honor to discharge completely.

To this question of the social organization of labor is directly linked a reform no less fundamental to which Socialism attaches equal importance. I refer to universal and complete education. The only method of defining what are the aptitudes belonging to each individual and of determining thus what debt he owes to society, the only means of putting him in a situation to discharge this debt and to apply his aptitudes, is evidently to impart to him in the greatest measure possible the knowledge of all fields in

*To speak only of Belgium, I may estimate the wealth accumulated by the co-operators there at about \$400,000. The total wealth of this country is estimated at \$6,000,000,000. This disproportion between the means and the end is manifest enough, especially if we consider that it required twenty years at least for the Belgian co-operators to realize their modest accumulations.

which the activity of men is exercised. On the other hand in a social organization where discussion among citizens on the subject of the satisfaction of their highly diversified needs shall be the permanently established practice, it will be indispensable that this discussion be rapid and practical and that each one take part in the debates with a clear conception of the questions to be solved. Again, greater or less productivity of each individual will be to a great extent conditioned by the greater or less intelligence with which each shall accomplish his task. Now, in a social organization which, conformably to the law of least effort, shall carry division of labor to the maximum, the productivity of each of the laborers will have a particularly important bearing upon the collective result of production. It is especially from this point of view that the solidarity of human efforts will assert itself with a marked intensity.

As for the action of the mutual associations, it also finds its extension and its amplification in compulsory and universal insurance, such as is demanded by the Socialist programs, and its final expression will be in the distribution of the products of labor according to the needs of each one. Compulsory insurance is a mutual benefit association extended to cover all the risks of life and applied to all the citizens from their first conception to their last breath. Limited at present through various laws to special risks, and left by others to private initiative, the mutual benefit association establishes a bond of solidarity only among participants especially threatened by dangers, accidents and diseases, the effects of which it seeks to remedy or alleviate. True human Solidarity will not be realized in this field until all men carry each his part of the disabilities and the sufferings which fall upon their fellow citizens. The burden will thus be wonderfully lightened for those who now carry it by themselves.

Again, the social aspect of hygiene and its close relation to Solidarity will appear more clearly to the eyes of all.

Even now social hygiene becomes obligatory through the perils to which each of us is exposed by reason of the diseases which others may transmit to him. But the necessity of hygiene will be far more completely felt when it comes to bear directly upon the productivity of labor and upon the cost of the insurance charge imposed upon all as well as upon the quota of the necessities which have to be set aside for the benefit of those incapacitated for labor through disease, with a corresponding detriment to the laborers. It is thus with sound forethought that most Socialist programs look forward to profound modifications in the performance of all public service pertaining to the food of children, the housing of families, to sanitary precautions and to the treatment of diseases.

Thus, from whatever point of view we take, Socialism stands for human Solidarity. It is not alone in this demand, but it is alone in proclaiming Solidarity as the directing idea of all its aspirations, in glorifying it in every undertaking, in hailing it as a final liberator, which shall break down all barriers between classes, between races, between nations.

And that is why it is to Socialism that all those are turning whose souls are generous and brotherly, all those who are women and men of good will. Socialism has this singular virtue, of bringing to its cause adherents who have grown more numerous, more enthusiastic, more determined, in spite of the quarrels of schools and of the disputes of persons. It has that virtue of attraction which Christianity once possessed and I think that it owes it to that idea of solidarity, of altruism, of brotherhood to which humanity has been aspiring through all the centuries. And to sum up all my thought, I will say that if Solidarity is the ideal of Socialism, Socialism is the politics of Solidarity.

H. La Fontaine (Trans. by Chas. H. Kerr.)

Concerning the American Labor Union.

Laramie, Wyo., July 14, 1902.

Mr. A. M. Simons, Chicago, Ill. :

Dear Sir and Comrade—Your editorial "Socialism and the Trades Union Movement" in the July International Socialist Review is before me. After careful perusal I think it quite necessary to point out to you that your view upon the question is rather pessimistic, and your ultimatum somewhat unjust to our position.

I venture to say that a majority of the members of the W. L. U. convention came to Denver with the determination to bring about reconciliation between the A. F. of L. and the W. L. U.

During the days of the convention a strike was in progress in Denver between the building trades and their employers, which was utilized by the A. F. of L. for the most aggressive and extraordinary means to injure the organization of the W. L. U. ever invented by man.

While this was going on a committee was speeding to Denver to make a show at an attempt to reconcile the two organizations. It made the poorest attempt at this anyone could ever have seen; showing plainly that it was not their intention to have us with them (as you very properly surmise), at the same time throwing sand into the eyes of the rest of the labor world, quasi proving that they are sincere.

With the contemptible fight in Denver and the more contemptible farce at conciliation, it turned the stomach of mostly all who before had an appetite for the fruit of peace.

We had to do something, however, to offset the work of ingression upon our territory by the repeated aggression of an unscrupulous competitor, hence we entered the broader field of National work with open visor and name. This latter move was also taken by earnest Socialists in the convention for the purpose of forcing the A. F. of L. to a declaration.

From my observation I could readily discern that nearly all the members of the convention saw the utter uselessness of trades unions without politics independent of present political parties and knowing that the A. F. of L. under Mr. Gompers would never depart from the old, worn-out path of trades unionism, unless forced by just such action as we have taken, there was no other way out of the dilemma.

If Mr. Gompers is to remain at the head of the A. F. of L., as is very likely under their form of organization, even if the majority of the members desire a removal, there must be some way

in forcing the issue with them, and our necessary encroachment may force that issue.

On the other hand, if the A. F. of L. declares in favor of independent political action and Socialism, it is a short step for the A. L. U. to get under cover with them. I fear, however, that such a declaration is a great ways off and not in sight with Mr. Gompers as president.

Some of our greatest (western) thinkers have proclaimed the step of the several organizations in Denver you speak about in the above-mentioned article the most far-reaching labor movement in the history of trades unionism, and unless all signs fail you will agree with them after due consideration and the linement of time.

If the A. L. U. continues the aggressive campaign inaugurated since the close of the convention in Denver there is no doubt that it will be a powerful factor, in the west at least, by the next presidential election, when the Socialists will have tickets in every State west of the Mississippi—and elect some of them.

The Socialists in the conventions had many a hard battle and many a sleepless night to win the members over, and their efforts and intentions should receive more general study and consequent appreciation than can be inferred from your article.

Permit me to remain yours sincerely, F. W. Ott.

EDITORIAL

Lines of Division in American Socialism.

We have often pointed out, in these columns and elsewhere, the presence of two divergent tendencies now in process of amalgamation into a real American Socialist movement. Just at the present moment the process of union seems to be arousing a little more friction than is actually necessary.

This friction arises largely from the fact of mutual misunderstandings and hence should yield to intelligent study and discussion. This misunderstanding is the more easily possible because the two phases have such different origins, are so widely separated geographically and are made up of such wholly different individuals. One is located in the West, is quite largely agrarian in its origin, comes almost wholly from economic development, and is peculiarly American in its make-up.

The other is almost wholly Eastern (with the exception of some portions of California), is urban; arrived at its conclusions quite largely through direct ideological propaganda, and is still (though rapidly losing this phase) formed mainly from those born in other countries. None of these characteristics carry either credit or blame to the parties or persons concerned, but are nevertheless facts which must be considered in any adequate comprehension of the problem before the Socialists of this country.

Until very recently the Socialist movement in the United States was almost wholly made up of men who had either gained their knowledge of Socialism in another country, or of those who had been converted to an understanding of an ideological system which these European Socialists had brought with them. Little attention was paid by either of these classes to American economic conditions, but much to Marxian economic theories.

These facts account for the almost complete literary barrenness of the American Socialist movement. While some of the ablest thinkers and writers of the German Socialists were among the founders of the movement in this country, there was not a single book or pamphlet produced during the period in which this element reigned that is to-day mentioned in counting up the permanent and valuable literature of the Socialist movement of the world.

The reason for this was that few of these Socialists thought it worth while to learn anything of American conditions, or to in any way identify themselves with the real forces of social revolt. Placing themselves upon a theoretical and largely dogmatic philosophical Olympus they looked with disdain upon those who were engaged in the real social struggles. But in thus cutting loose from all reality they were dooming themselves to sterility.

When they wrote of American conditions, as they often did in European periodicals, they quite frequently only showed how little they really knew of the life in which they found themselves. They wrote of America as a sort of transplanted England after the Industrial Revolution, or a Germany in the midst of capitalism. Not one of them ever saw any of the great dynamic facts that were building and creating the economic structures of this nation. None of these many Socialist theoreticians have ever noted what was really the most distinctive and important fact in American history, at least from the Socialist point of view. They never comprehended in the slightest degree the tremendous influence upon our whole social life exercised by the continual presence of a frontier within our geographical and governmental boundaries.

Now and then a Socialist writer has seen far enough in this direction to consider the frontier as a "safety valve" and to predict the terrible things that would happen when that "safety valve" was closed. Indeed, the "safety valve" idea has been decidedly overworked, for the fact is, that with irrigation and a host of other new movements, there is not the slightest sign of its disappearance. In this respect we have also sinned in the past by talking this same nonsense, for which we now humbly ask the reader's pardon. What has happened now, however, is that the frontier, as a geographical expression for a great extent of contiguous territory, has disappeared, and this fact is having some important consequences.

But while some Socialists have seen this one phase of the frontier in an exaggerated form, none of them have seemed to think that this fact helped in any way to determine where the forces of social discontent would naturally be located. This was because they had not realized that in this country the element which in other lands was in continuous revolt against social injustice, had here simply moved on to the frontier, and that therefore it would be where that frontier was last located that social discontent would find its first strong united native expression.

The consequence of this blindness to actual facts is that while the theoretical Socialist is prepared for the present increase of Socialist sentiment among the Eastern trade unionists, and will make almost any sort of a concession to secure their allegiance, he cannot see any reason why there should be any Socialist sentiment in the locality where the last great frontier stage was located, and where even the slightest knowledge of economic conditions would have taught him was really the most prolific ground for Socialist propaganda. This position is accentuated by the facts pointed out above that the Eastern Socialist is himself generally an urban factory worker, while the dwellers on the frontier, whatever may have been their previous occupation, are now mainly small farmers.

So it is that there arises a sharp misunderstanding between these two wings of the movement, between the old and the new, the ideological and the materialistic Socialist; for, strange as it may seem, the fellow with the "clearest cut" materialistic philosophy is very apt to have come to his Socialism ideologically, while the Western outcast of capitalism who comes in strict obedience to the working of that philosophy is very apt to give a sentimental and ideological reason for "the

faith that is in him." This fact adds another to the already large number of misunderstandings and contradictions that threaten to multiply and grow until they menace the solidarity of the American Socialist movement.

The frontiersman has always had the utmost contempt for forms and conventionalities of all kinds. He has been sufficiently class-conscious to recognize that in our present society these forms were not created in the interest of his class. He has also had but little use for the wisdom of the books, and in this, too, it is easy to see a blind class-consciousness of the fact that the literature of to-day is not written from the point of view of the producing class. It is easy to push this idea too far and credit the frontiersman with a clearer comprehension of social conditions than he ever dreamed of possessing, and, indeed, it is certain that he seldom saw more than negatively that the institutions and conventions from which he fled were hurtful, and hence declared war on all conventionality and all forms, social, legal or economic. Hence it is that to-day (while most of this spirit has passed away) he does not take kindly to the efforts which are being made to run his very revolt against established institutions into fixed forms, especially when his common sense teaches him that many of those forms were created to meet conditions which will never arise in his experience. This position was brought out with startling vividness when on a recent trip through the Dakotas we saw some of the Socialists there trying to fit their organizations to forms, whose only reason for existence was the threatening proximity of the city labor fakir and ward heeler.

The older Socialist of the cities lays great stress on certain phrases and forms of organization and manners of transacting business, and he uses the knowledge of these phrases and compliance with these forms and mannerisms as tests of the orthodoxy of his Western comrade of the prairies. If the latter does not know these phrases and does not conduct his Socialist propoganda and form his party organization on the lines laid down in the catechism and ritual of the city organization he is a heretic and must be "reorganized." What has made this situation still more aggravating is that these tests have been quite generally applied by those who were not particularly conspicuous for their knowledge of Socialist philosophy. Some comrade, who, because of his ability as an organizer or agitator, had been clothed with a little brief authority has not hesitated to settle off-hand questions of policy and tactics on which the ablest minds of the International Socialist movement have as yet failed to agree.

When the Western farmer, who is in revolt against capitalism, is met with a catechism especially prepared for the factory wage-worker, his confidence in his examiner and would-be teacher is not increased by the discovery that the aforesaid teacher is most ridiculously ignorant of the economic conditions surrounding the man whom he is so willing to teach economic philosophy.

What would the Socialists of Chicago, New York, St. Louis or San Francisco think if some farmer should be sent among them to give instruction on economic subjects and lecture them on their general relation to economic evolution, and it should happen to appear in the course of his lectures that he did not know the purpose of a trade

union, had never seen a factory in operation, and was of the opinion that the chief exploiter of the wage-worker was the pawnbroker and the local landlord. Yet he would be wisdom personified beside some of those who are setting themselves up as judges of the Socialist movement on the Great Plains of America.

Within the last few weeks some of the Socialist papers that are most willing to assist in the "reorganization" process have published articles assuming that the great farm was absorbing the smaller, and that exploitation in the case of the farmer was through mortgages and the growth of a system of tenantry. One such paper declared that the forthcoming census would show a most "startling" tendency towards the disappearance of farm ownership through the growth of mortgages and landlordism, whereas, if the editor had taken the trouble to look at the advance bulletins of that census (which may be had for the asking) he would have discovered that the number of farm owners has actually increased considerably during the last ten years, while the relative increase of mortgaged and tenant farms is so slow that, save in a few exceptional localities, the farmers are in about equal danger from the coming of the next ice age and from conversion into a race of tenant and mortgaged farmers.

Had such writers even understood Marxian economics this would have shown them that under capitalism, exploitation takes place primarily in the process of production, and not through usury and tenantry, both of which forms of exploitation belong essentially to the pre-capitalist stages of society.

But such ignorance of both economic philosophy and facts in no way deters such Socialists from pouring out the vials of their wrath on the "muddled" farmers, while they prate in an almost meaningless manner of classes and class-struggles. Not that these words do not have a very clear and proper meaning in reference to Socialist doctrines and tactics. We have no desire to join those who are seeking for a little cheap notoriety by pretending to reform the Socialist vocabulary and who are going through lexicographical contortions to demonstrate that such words as "revolutionary" and "scientific" do not belong in the Socialist dictionary. But we do wish to insist that when these words are used they should, like all other words, be used intelligently and in their proper place.

The fact is, that there is really much less tendency towards compromise among the farmers who are just now entering the Socialist movement than there is among the trade unionists who are just beginning to see the truth of the Socialist philosophy. The latter have long been accustomed to cringing and crawling before capitalist politicians to beg for legislative favors, and the Socialist platforms formulated by some of those most anxious to "reform" the farmer Socialist reflect this tendency in strings of "immediate demands" made of capitalist governments, all of which demands, by the way, are aimed to improve the condition of the working class while perpetuating wage-slavery. Nothing more could have been said of the most foolish planks in the Populist platform. In our opinion no concessions to capitalism are necessary in either case. But this is "another story" on which it is unnecessary to enter at the present time.

It chanced to be our good fortune during the past month to be pres-

ent at the State convention of the Socialist party of North Dakota, one of the States, by the way, in which the clearness of the Socialism had been objected to by the "reorganizers." Yet during that whole convention there was not even a suggestion of a proposal that involved any compromise with capitalism or the capitalist system. This is something, by the way, whether it be good or bad, that we have never yet seen in any of the many other Socialist conventions that we have attended.

These farmers have learned long ago that they have nothing to expect from capitalist governments. They are now determined on independent political action, with the object of securing collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, and, this may arouse a smile in some of our readers, one of the things of which many of them expressed a fear was that the city wage-working Socialists would sell out or "fuse" with some other party. And it must be said in their defense that their previous experience with the Knights of Labor and similar organizations has not been of a character to insure confidence in this direction.

It must not be thought, however, that all the wrong and ignorance in this dispute is to be found on any one side. If our criticisms appear to be somewhat more severe on the older, city dwelling Socialist, it is partly because he has such a multitude of capable pleaders ready to defend him, while the farmer, on the other hand, has been somewhat unfortunate in those who have taken up his case. Indeed, there has been a tendency in some quarters to exploit this division to secure other factional ends. Those who have found themselves in any way at variance with the policy and tactics of the official powers of the Socialist party have sometimes sought rather to add to this antagonism, hoping thereby to fish out of the troubled waters something in which they were personally interested. Our only purpose in entering into this controversy at all is that some of the mutual misunderstanding and mistrust may be removed, and thus the possibility be created for a stronger and more thoroughly united Socialist movement.

Again, just at the present time, the "reorganizers" chance to be in a position where their real importance is greatly magnified by the official pedestals upon which they stand, which enables them to make much more trouble than the farmers, who, as yet, have little power for good or evil. But the latter are rapidly growing in numbers and influence, and unless something is done to stop the criminally foolish and ignorant attacks that are being made upon them, we may possibly be confronted with a large and energetic split in the Socialist party. Not that this would be fatal to Socialism. Economic progress would continue and social evolution would not stand still. We would be the last to seek to prevent such a split if there really existed any defection from the principles of Socialism by any body of persons within the Socialist party. But, as we have endeavored to show, no such defection from those principles exists among those who are being driven to separate political action, and we can to-day ill-afford the costly delay that such a useless division would entail.

Far be it from us again to object to criticism or controversy. Such things are to be invited and are but signs of healthy growth. But hos-

file criticism, or even personal abuse, is something wholly different from ignorance clothed with official power to correct and discipline.

Indeed, there are many points on which the Socialist of the prairie States needs severe criticism. He is by no means wholly free from that very American characteristic,—self-conceit. He is apt to look down upon technical economics as of no use. He feels himself capable of settling the most intricate problems of economics from the limited knowledge gained through his own personal experience. He has yet to learn that in the wide field of sociology no one man's experience is of sufficient breadth to enable him to draw any valuable conclusions. He has a very pressing need of familiarity with the great classics of Socialism. He generally knows little or nothing of the works of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and the great body of writers and thinkers who have made Socialism a philosophy worthy of the study of the best minds of the world. Did he know these things he would be the better able to show the shallowness of many of the phrase-mongers who are now hurling their paper darts in his direction.

There is an intense need of good, "clear-cut, scientific" Socialist literature in the West, but if it is to be read at all it must be written by some one who knows something of the application of the philosophy of Socialism to American economic conditions, and not consist simply of intellectual gymnastics with Socialist phrases.

Again, the frontiersman is apt to fail to appreciate the importance of national and international organization, or, indeed, of any organization whatsoever. Accustomed to rely upon his own resources he does not at first see the need of wide-spread co-operation, although the history of the last fifty years in America has shown that when once the need of organization is impressed upon him he joins with his fellows with far greater readiness than even the trade unionist of the city.

There are at the present moment two great fields in which Socialist propaganda can reap rich harvests. One of these is the trade union field. Here we have plenty of trained workers. Here the propaganda is in the hands of men who understand every phase of the work, and the results which are being attained are a splendid tribute to the excellent work that is being done in this field.

Another, and equally rich, if not richer, field is to be found in the locality where the frontier has just passed away. Here the producing class—the proletariat—is largely a farming class. These men are ripe for social revolt at the present moment. Indeed, since their individual initiative is much greater than that of the wage-workers, they are going to revolt politically whether the Socialists have the sagacity to work with them or not. But if the Socialist party will see to it that men are sent among them as organizers who will not look upon themselves in the light of divinely appointed censors to correct the errors of those who often are far wiser than their teachers, then there is no reason why we should not lay the ground of a powerful united American Socialist movement.

When once the Western Socialists learn to know something more of the great classics of Socialism and the need of organization, while the Eastern comrades learn something of the facts upon which the philosophy they so glibly repeat is based, the ground will have been laid for a common understanding, and all necessity of a bitter internal fight will have passed away.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

On the March.

Another year of economic and political evolution has passed away. A tiny drop in the sea of eternity, a puny step in the development of the race, it meant 365 days of suffering, oppression, and yearning for millions of proletarians who are struggling for the ideal that is to come.

Economic evolution has greatly increased its speed during the last year. Starting at a snail's pace in the dim past of the prehistoric ages, it has gradually reached a cyclone's swiftness by the help of steam and electricity. The finger of the world's clock, American industry, points to the eleventh hour of capitalism. One man, standing on the American continent, holds the reins of commerce from Hongkong to Hamburg. The East and the West are the gates of his realm in which the sun never sets. Britannia rules the waves, if he permits. The haughty Hohenzollern dares not say him nay. The gloomy Russian despot cannot bid him halt. A stroke of his pen reduces the Chinese wall to crumbling ruins. He is master of the world by the grace of the dollar, and the rulers by the grace of God pay homage to him. He is the incarnation of Mammon's power in general and the crown of American capitalism in particular. He is the manifest destiny that "set Cuba free" to grasp it the more securely, that drove the Boers out of their homes to make them "free" Britons, that opened the door of the Celestial empire for the hell of Western civilization, and that makes terms to the representative of the Almighty in Rome.

Uncle Sam fought hard to break the chains of British bondage, and now the torch of liberty is smoldering beneath the crushing weight of industrial feudalism. He battled still harder to abolish slavery, and now his flag is waving over slaves at home and abroad. He thought he was building the home of the free, and now he finds that he is a back number, a Utopian dreamer, devoid of practical business sense. The Declaration of Independence, of which he was so proud, is suppressed in the shadow of his own flag. The Fourth of July orator stands by the side of the judge who jails women for speaking in defense of their own class. A handful of industrial magnates laugh millions to scorn and starve them into submission. The children of the nation, hardly born, are tied to the car of the Juggernaut of toil and crushed before they have seen the light of reason.

Thousands are starving in Germany, hundred thousands in Russia, millions in India. The wave of prosperity has risen to a giddy height, and in its train follows the inevitable wave of misery, crime and revolt.

Injunctions against labor are falling thicker than hail. Already we are forbidden to think aloud, and as soon as the chemists will have solved the problem of life we may expect an injunction against being born on the land of the corporations. The increase of profits on the one side is accompanied by an appalling number of fatal accidents on the other. A tremendous unemployed problem is slowly preparing, and the first seismic shocks of another commercial crisis are shaking the foundations of bourgeois society.

The reaction of economic conditions in the United States is pressing hard on European industries and agriculture. The billion dollar steel trust followed by a transportation trust embracing the principal transatlantic lines with Morgan at the head is putting the iron, coal and transportation of the world at the mercy of American capitalists. John Bull's plight is a standing joke in the American press. But Germany, Austria and France are in a similar position. The diplomats are demanding an alliance of all European powers against the American invasion. Whatever political benefits the ruling classes may temporarily derive from such an alliance, it would not alter the course of economic development. No matter how the political map is colored, the economic potencies of Europe are not increased one whit. America has irrevocably outclassed the old world. Such demands are only the unconscious admission that the evolution of capitalism has passed beyond the limits of political boundaries, and that a new system of society is required to meet the commercial supremacy of the United States. But neither royalty, nor the aristocratic statesmen, nor the captains of European industry are equal to this emergency. The only element capable of coping with the situation is the international social democracy.

Seen in this light, the claim that the capitalist system could last indefinitely reveals simply that the men who make it judge world conditions from the horizon of their own backyard. Economic and political phenomena of to-day must be viewed in their entirety. In olden times a good diplomatic axiom to follow was: "Cherchez la femme!" To-day it is safer to say: "Cherchez Morgan!" He is the leading political factor as well as the king of capitalism, and the chief agitator for international Socialism.

Thanks to his splendid efforts, socialism is marching to the front. In the United States the unity convention assembled the makers of the future in Indianapolis, a year ago, and sounded the tocsin for a real "American" movement. A few weeks after that the nerveless upholsterers of the passing social order, the Eltweed Pomeroy, Tom L. Johnson, Golden Rule Jones, et al., met in Detroit—*morituri nos salutabant*. The McKinley-Czolgosz incident revealed to the whole country the sharp line of division between socialism and anarchism. The attempt to suppress Wayland's "Appeal to Reason" and Wilshire's "Challenge" failed. Socialism, the "Crying Evil of the Hour," smilingly met its old and familiar enemy, the political organization of the Catholic Church, also on American soil, and welcomed his valuable cooperation. The great strike of the Amalgamated Association against the steel barons gave another object lesson of the futility of economic organization without political aims. The immediate result was the

election of an independent labor candidate in San Francisco, Cal., and Northport, Wash., and a class-conscious campaign in Erie, Pa. The attempt to sidetrack the Chicago labor movement into an independent alley found the Socialists too strong for the labor misleaders. The number of Socialist locals in all parts of the land increased rapidly, a sign of the growing political intelligence. Socialism found its way into the columns of the remotest country papers. The anthracite miners' strike, still raging, is another eloquent proof of our great prosperity being a class prosperity, and found an echo in the class-conscious declarations of the American Labor Union, the Western Federation of Miners, and a number of other labor organizations, that adopted the Socialist platform at their conventions. Porto Rico had its labor troubles as soon as American politicians seized the public power, and found Socialists in their way. Cuba is still too unsettled to permit any social development. In general, the past year stands alone for progress in the history of the labor movement and augurs well for the future. Watch our vote at the next Presidential election!

England is still the land of "pure and simple" in trades unionism. Thanks to the compromising tendencies of the Fabians and the Independent Labor party, the political intelligence of the organized industrial proletariat in the capitalistically most developed country of Europe is still far behind that of the rural population in the semi-feudal States of Southern Europe. Were it not for the Social Democratic Federation, the outlook for Socialism in England would be cheerless. Happily, English capitalism has now reached a stage where it can no longer afford to carry its liberal mask. The American injunction has been imported with the other American products, and helps to dispel the liberal cobwebs from the brains of the trade unionists. There is still hope for them, and the S. D. F. is making headway. So is Socialism in Ireland.

Germany was the first, after England, to feel the pressure of American development, mainly because fraudulent operations at the great banks precipitated a panic. The immense expenses of the army, navy and military operations in China and Africa, added to the difficulties of the situation. An army of unemployed revealed the rottenness of bourgeois prosperity and furnished strength to the fight of the Socialists against the agrarian tariff on foodstuffs. Several secret documents of the imperial government fell into the hands of the Socialists and were used by them to good effect. The Luebeck congress of the German Socialist party showed once more how little sympathy the rank and file has for opportunism, and three million petitions against the tariff laws opened a pleasing prospect for large Socialist gains in the coming elections. The first fruits of their labors have already been gathered by the German comrades in several after-elections to the Reichstag and in numerous municipal elections. The movement has gained ground especially among the farming population of the East and North, the Catholic farmers of the South and the Catholic miners of the Rhine districts.

Austria-Hungary has witnessed a great proletarian awakening. The Socialists have cleared the field for united action by the thorough revision of their program, which gave careful consideration to all the

latest phases of the industrial development and little show to the Bernsteinian creed of an increasing middle class.

In France little progress has been made. The Millerand question proved a serious obstacle to Socialist unity. The opportunist tactics of the ministerialists lamed the revolutionary spirit of their constituency and blurred the sharp class line between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The class-conscious wing of the Socialist party was thus forced to fight not alone the capitalist enemy, but also the Socialist friends. Instead of a united front, the French proletariat exposed a disordered line of battle to the capitalist attack. Under these circumstances it is a wonder that any progress was made at all.

The Belgian comrades had an exciting time. Their fight for universal suffrage reached a dangerous climax. Blood was spilled and the number of brave proletarians who died for their cause was once more increased. The Catholic state proved still too strong for our comrades; but the general strike called by them in support of their demands brought out in strong relief the discipline and political maturity of the Belgian workingmen. Their example deserves emulation, and American workingmen will find food for serious reflection in the idea of a combined strike of the principal American labor unions during a presidential election for the purpose of giving force to their vote for the Socialist party.

The Danish comrades have become "the" party of opposition in Parliament. The liberal party is at the helm of the state, and the Socialists are in undisputed possession of the opposition. With their widespread co-operatives, their well-established press, and the smallness of the territory which they have to conquer, they are in no danger of staying behind on our march to victory. The comrades in Holland are doing their best to keep in line with their neighbors in Belgium and Germany, and even little Luxemburg boasts of some Socialists in public bodies.

The Italian comrades have struck the Hydra of the Camorra a crushing blow and gained a strong foothold among the population of the South of Italy, which had been considered unfit for Socialist agitation. The movement in the North of Italy has marshaled the rural population into a well disciplined corps of class-conscious fighters, who are standing by their colors, although the king is trying to lure them astray by the bait of state Socialism. The waves of Socialism are washing against the walls of the Vatican, and it is doubtful whether the next Pope will remain in the classic land of Papal tradition or move to some more comfortable place. Unless it retires to one of the poles of the earth, ecclesiastical hierarchy, like all other despotism, will soon be crowded off the earth.

The growth of Socialism in the Spanish labor unions is a reflex of the same movement in America. Spain has suffered a great deal from anarchist disturbances, but the Spanish workingmen have learned that trades unions and Socialism are logical complements of the same semi-circle of humanity. While the spoiled boy on the throne vents his divine brutishness in true Caesarian style, even on his own mother, the children of the proletarians are learning the lessons of a nobler and higher manhood in the school of the fight for liberty.

In Switzerland the movement has made remarkable gains during the last year. With the advent of the Gruetli-Bund and the reorganization of the party, surprising victories have been won in the recent cantonal elections. In the Scandinavian peninsula the movement for manhood and female suffrage has resulted in a great improvement of the election laws, which brought immediate Socialist victories in several municipal elections.

Russia is preparing for a grand social upheaval. The academies, the industries and the rural population are permeated with revolutionary sentiment, to which the Socialists are giving an intelligent direction. Even Siberia has its secret Socialist organization. Bulgaria, Servia and Roumania have shown a marked progress in Socialist organization and some gains in parliamentary representation.

Japan has seen its first official suppression of Socialism as a political party. But the propaganda of the ideas continues unabated in speech and writing. The two principal labor unions have adopted the Socialist platform. Australia and New Zealand also have their Socialist parties, and the Argentine Republic has a growing Socialist outpost on the South American continent.

The Socialist movement of the world is firmly established, and its growth cannot be disputed. Nowhere is our progress so palpable and so rapid as in the United States. All indications point to the probability that American Socialism will be the champion who will batter down the walls of capitalism. And a Socialist administration in Washington can dictate its terms to the powers of Europe by force of its economic superiority.

Onward, comrades! The goal is in sight!

1

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union declared for Socialism at its recent convention in New York and elected Peter Schlesinger, a Chicago Socialist, delegate to the A. F. of L. The Patternmakers' League of North America, at its convention in Chicago, adopted a preamble in favor of collective ownerships of the tools of production, and it is probable that James Wilson, the new national president, who is a Socialist, will represent the union at New Orleans. The Iowa State Federation declared for Socialism and the Colorado Federation did likewise, and also voted practical support to the Socialist party. The number of converts who are now coming into the Socialist party, many of whom were prominent in reform parties of the past, is becoming so great that it is impossible to mention them individually. The greatest enthusiasm exists, judging from the party and labor press all over the country, especially in Pennsylvania, Colorado, Montana, Washington and other Western States. The vote in Oregon, where the gain averaged over 200 per cent, is a straw that shows how the wind is blowing. At present tickets are up in about twenty States with more to hear from, and everything points to large increases all along the line.

The struggle between the miners and the operators has developed into a battle of endurance. All attempts to arbitrate the trouble have been coldly turned down by the coal barons, while the miners, after discussing the situation for several days, decided not to order out the bituminous men, but levy assessments on all who are working and send a general call to other trade unions and sympathizers for funds to continue the fight indefinitely. In the anthracite region the agents of the coal magnates and their deputies, coal and iron police and scabs, are making every effort to exasperate the strikers and force them to commit overt acts in order that the Pennsylvania militia may be called out. On the other hand the unionists throughout the district are waging a silent, peaceful contest, and hundreds of them are eagerly studying the doctrines of Socialism, with a view to continuing the strike at the polls until the yoke of capitalism has been finally shaken off. The Socialist party speakers are listened to with marked attention and are welcomed, and it appears that the workers are finally beginning to comprehend the significance of the class struggle. In the West Virginia district the struggle is not one whit less desperate. Seven organizers have been sent to prison for violating an injunction, and Judge Jackson only hesitated to send Mother Jones to jail because of the revulsion of feeling that it would cause throughout the country. The capitalists and politicians have played every scheme to force Mother Jones out

of the State, but she refuses to go, and may yet be imprisoned for her work and devotion to the miners' cause. The national union will require half a million dollars a week to continue the strike, and every Socialist in the land ought to consider it a duty to contribute as liberally as possible, not only advice and sympathy, but dollars, which are most important at this juncture. It is quite likely that the organized workers of Great Britain will come to the rescue with goodly sums, as the writer has received information from Ben Tillett that they would be glad to respond, and President Mitchell has probably already sent a call across the water. All union men feel that a crisis has been reached by organized labor, and they will use all the means within their power to defeat the autocratic capitalists who have monopolized the anthracite coal fields. It is currently reported that the coal kings have appealed for moral and financial aid to all the employers' combines in the country, declaring that if the strikers are allowed to win capitalistic institutions and investments will no longer be safe in the United States. Undoubtedly the present war between labor and capital is the clearest and most marked drawing of class lines that has ever taken place in this country.

Rumors and complaints continue to circulate around labor circles that scores of teamsters and freight handlers who participated in the Chicago strikes are being victimized and blacklisted, and that the capitalists, as is usual in all large affairs of this kind, have broken their agreements. The former strikers are also said to be extremely bitter toward certain officials of the Chicago Federation of Labor, who are accused of having been cowardly and lukewarm all through the strike. They are charged with seeking offices on the Democratic ticket and with deliberately protecting the Harrison ring by throwing a wet blanket over the strike at a critical time, so that the politicians might not be forced to call out the police, and thus lose prestige. Investigations are reported to be in progress, and they may throw light on the matter.

The Newkirk Socialist is another new Oklahoma paper.

The Union Labor Central Club of San Francisco have sent a circular to all unions in the State, requesting them to elect delegates to a convention on Sept. 10 for the purpose of nominating a State Labor ticket, or indorsing one of the regular party tickets. It looks as though there will be merry war from the start.

The brassworkers of Cleveland were injunctioned by Judge Babcock, an enthusiastic Bryan Democrat, during their strike for the nine-hour day, which they won despite all obstacles. Babcock's action has knocked those workingmen speechless who still imagined that some reforms and decent treatment could be secured in the d. o. p.

The Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee is incubating a scheme to form a new national organization, to be composed of city central bodies. This proposition has been discussed for a good many years. The idea is to arrange plans to carry on systematic work in municipalities and aim to secure control of governments through independent political action.

Wisconsin Supreme Court knocked out the law prohibiting employers from discharging workers for being members of a union. Same old song.

The attempt to combine the longshoremen, seamen, tugmen and other workers on and along the lakes is meeting with success. The tugmen are now going into the new amalgamation, which will probably also affiliate with the transport workers of Europe.

Mechanics and laborers are warned not to go to Los Angeles, Cal. An employers' combine in that city is attempting to flood the city with unemployed men, in order to beat down wages and disrupt the unions. Employers' organizations are forming in nearly every city in the country, with the avowed purpose of protecting bosses in whose establishments strikes occur, blacklisting agitators and smashing unions that try to improve the conditions of the workers. The capitalists are no longer denying the fact that a class struggle exists.

On the same day that President Schwab, of the United States Steel Corporation, announced in all the daily papers that his octopus was worth \$1,400,000,000, and would make profits at the rate of \$140,000,000 a year, an item appeared in an obscure corner of the same papers stating that the American Tin Plate Company, a constituent part of the great trust, proposed to reduce the wages of the tin workers 25 per cent. The trust needs the extra 25 per cent to make sure that the profits will be \$140,000,000. The tin workers are well organized and yet they are almost helpless. For years the iron and steel and tin plate workers have been clamoring for high tariff and they are now receiving "protection" with a vengeance. With new machinery and wage reductions confronting them, it is quite likely that the workers will learn that it does not pay to vote the same way as when industry was in its formative period. Many of them are becoming ardent Socialists.

As has been predicted in these columns, Congress adjourned for the summer with the eight-hour, anti-injunction, prison labor and other bills securely stowed away in pigeon holes. As if to heap insult on injury, the politicians of the House came forward at the eleventh hour with a sop in the shape of an arbitration bill. The President is empowered to appoint three members of a commission of five, the capitalists to appoint another, and the laborites the fifth. Of course, Roosevelt would appoint three politicians or "citizens," who would be considered "safe" by the capitalists, so that a 4x1 result could be obtained, a little better than the Hanna's 24x12 scheme. It is needless to say that the union officials and labor press all over the country are denouncing the Washington politicians in heated terms for these latest evidences of "friendliness" toward the workers. But if they stop at mere general condemnation they might as well save themselves worry and trouble. It's votes that count, and to turn down the hypocritical politicians and send another bunch as bad to Washington will do no good. The only way anything will be gained is to elect labor men on the Socialist party ticket. They are class-conscious workers who champion a labor platform and uphold labor principles.

A new machine that not only saves labor, as the term is generally

understood, but almost completely abolishes a whole army of workers, is being installed along the lake ports. The new revolutionizer is a combination of Hullett's clam shell ore hoisting apparatus and the Gayley style of ships. When it was found difficult to hoist ore from the hold of an ordinary vessel, a new form was built—just as the railways are introducing new cars that drop coal and iron ore through the bottom and make shovelers unnecessary. The billion-dollar steel trust has been experimenting for some time at its docks in Conneaut, Ohio, with the new method of unloading device, and President Schwab recently visited that port and pronounced the machinery an unqualified success. A leading representative of a great labor union also visited Conneaut recently for the purpose of looking into the conditions. When about to leave a press correspondent asked him if he thought the new labor saving machinery would injure the laboring man. His reply was quick: "No, we are not afraid of being injured by labor saving machinery, but those clam shell ore hoists are not of that class. They are nothing less than labor abolishing machinery." In this view he spoke near the truth. The clam shells need but two men to operate each machine. They lift twelve tons at each swing and will work out the largest vessel that plies the great lakes in less than two hours. They handle on an average of six vessels a day, doing the work at a cost of below 4 cents per ton, a work that has always cost from 10 to 15 cents a ton by the aid of any of the other machines constructed and hand labor.

In New York the third-rail system is being introduced on the elevated railways, displacing locomotive engineers with motor men, and automatic ticket sellers and ticket takers are being experimented with. The Chicago street railway capitalists are trying a new motive force. An electro-magnet has been invented which is imbedded between the rails. It pulls or backs a car and no brakes are required to stop it, while it is confidently asserted that overhead and underground wires will be done away with. The great saving which the inventor claims is in the amount of electricity required. He says seventy-five amperes will suffice for forty cars, while with the present trolley system seventy-five amperes are required for one car. He says the saving in coal will be more than one-half. It is also claimed that the cars can be run faster than trolley cars because they are always under perfect control. They can never jump the track because there is a down pull as well as a forward pull in the magnets. It is thought that it will be easy to run the cars at one hundred miles an hour with safety. Thus the work of abolishing mechanics and laborers is steadily going forward.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Truth About Socialism. John Collins. Appeal to Reason. Paper, 111 pp. 25 cents.

It hard to find something new to say of all the books that are being sent out at the present time, the object of each of which is to explain Socialism to the beginner. This one is perhaps a little more satisfactory than the majority of such books. It is written in clear, readable English, and those who read it will have a very clear idea of Socialism. There can never be too many such books, even they do all really tell the same story, for the story is one which will well bear repetition.

The Impending Social Revolution, or the Trust Problem Solved. By J. Stitt Wilson. Published by the Social Crusade, Byrne Building, Los Angeles, Cal. Paper, 35 pp. 10 cents.

As an "awakener" to the injustice of present conditions and a powerful short presentation of Socialism, there are few, if any, books yet published equal to this. Its main strength lies in its dramatic presentation of the subject which will hold the reader to the end and then leave a lasting impression upon his mind that will not let him rest until he shall take some effective action. No soldier in the Socialist army can afford to leave this out of his ammunition chest.

Tales from Gorky. Translated by R. Nisbet Bain. Funk & Wagnals. Cloth, 285 pp. \$1.20.

The nine tales comprised in this book comprise some of the strongest work of this great Russian "tramp." They consist, like most of his other writings of tales from the "under world," and some of them are doubtless autobiographical. This is especially probable of "Twenty-six of Us and One Other," and "One Autumn Night." There is a new portrait and a biographical sketch which gives some additional facts concerning this remarkable writer. All of the stories are filled with the bitter philosophy for which Gorky has become famous. It is difficult to describe one of these stories. They are already condensed to the limit. Their flavor, too, is so utterly different from those of any other writer that they must be read to be understood.

In "Chelkash" we have some keen psychological analysis of the effect of the impulse of greed on different human natures. "A Rolling Stone" is perhaps the most complete exposition of what might be termed the "philosophy of vagrancy" that has ever been published. It is tales like these that see to the very heart of things that show the utter superficiality of such writers as Wycoff and "Josiah Flint."

Die Geschichte und Litteratur der deutschen Sozialdemokratie in ihren Hauptzuegen. Von Paul Kampffmeyer. Publishers: Herm. Sydow & Co., Nuernberg, Germany.

This little volume sketches in broad and striking outlines the history and literature of the Socialist movement in Germany. It introduces the student into the fundamental principles of Socialism, enables him to find at a glance the most valuable material stored up in the Socialist literature of Germany on any phase of social progress, and touches in graphic language on the historical events which found expression in that literature. An English translation of this valuable contribution will shortly appear in our Standard Socialist Series.

The Americanization of the World, or the Trend of the Twentieth Century. By W. T. Stead. Horace Markley. 460 pp. \$1.50.

Mr. Stead has caught and described in his remarkably graphic style the tremendous spread of American capitalism. He sees Ireland a center of American influence in the British Empire, South Africa a second edition of the United States, while all of the British colonies are copying American institutions and customs. American heiresses are capturing the European nobility while American capitalists are conquering the markets hitherto considered the peculiar property of Europeans. In spite of its sometimes extravagant rhetoric and occasional bombastic style, which serves to remind one of the "Americanization of literature," the book is remarkably entertaining and suggestive. The author, however, is wholly blind to the great forces within the various nations, which are apt to call a halt to all exploitation, and "Americanization" along with the rest, for, after all, what Mr. Stead calls "Americanism" is nothing more than capitalism carried to its logical conclusion—or, rather, stopped just short of the conclusion, which is—Socialism.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Engels' Origin of the Family.

Some months ago we announced a translation by Ernest Untermann of Frederick Engels' work, entitled "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State." We are glad to say that the printing of the book is now nearly finished, and that we expect to fill orders for it on or about August 25th.

This is a work of immense importance both to students and to those who wish to make converts to Socialism. Most people imagine that private property, as we see it to-day, is something that always has been and always will be. This book gives abundant facts to prove that private property is really something of brief duration as compared with the ages through which the race passed before its appearance. The mass of detail gathered by Lewis H. Morgan in his "Ancient Society" has been used by Engels with full credit and great discrimination. Only the matter of real interest and importance has been retained in the present work, while it is supplemented by Engels' own researches in other fields.

This is one of the few books that no Socialist can afford to leave unread, and it is now for the first time offered to English readers. It is published in the Standard Socialist series, bound in cloth, uniform with Liebknecht's "Memoirs of Marx," Vandervelde's "Collectivism," Simons' "The American Farmer" and Broome's "Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association," and the price, including postage, is 50 cents. To anyone sending \$2.00 before September 1, 1902, we will send the five books by express prepaid.

Socialist Literature for the Striking Coal Miners.

In last month's issue of the International Socialist Review we invited our readers to contribute whatever sums they could to pay for Socialist books and pamphlets to be sent to the striking miners in the anthracite coal fields. Comrade J. Mahlon Barnes, state secretary of the Socialist party of Pennsylvania, has furnished us with addresses of a number of Socialists who are in a position to make the best possible use of all literature sent them, and we have been forwarding leaflets and booklets selected by him to the various addresses as fast

as contributions received have made it possible. Up to the time of going to press we have received the following amounts:

John Saller, McLouth, Kansas.....	\$ 1.40
H. R. Kearns, Arlington, N. J.....	1.00
E. A. Hoagland, Arlington, N. J.....	.50
D. E. C. Duffie, Dover, N. H.....	.40
I. E., Chicago.....	7.00
Thomas Buckman, Marshfield, Oregon.....	.75
Mrs. N. H. B., Chicago.....	.75

Total\$11.40

The article by Comrade Maily in this issue of the Review will make it clear to every reader that there is still urgent need for more literature to be sent to Pennsylvania, and we trust that our readers will respond liberally. As announced in last month's issue, we will send into the State as much literature as the contributions will pay for, when figured at our lowest stockholders' prices.

Have You Read it?

The two great classics of Socialism are Karl Marx's "Capital" and Frederick Engel's "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." "Capital" is expensive to purchase, technical in its language and difficult of comprehension without long and patient study. "Socialism Utopian and Scientific" is equally fundamental and even better fitted to give a general knowledge of the principles of Socialism. It has for many years been recognized by the Socialists of the world as one of the great text books of Socialism. It has been translated into the language of every people who have reached the stage of capitalism. It gives the historic basis of Socialism and traces the philosophy for the phantasies of dreamers to the firm base of scientifically established fact.

So essential has this book come to be to the philosophy of Socialism that its reading is absolutely essential to any one who would really grasp the fundamentals of that philosophy. At the same time it is written in a clear and easily intelligible style. Our edition is the standard translation by Dr. Edward Aveling, and it contains the notable preface by Engel discussing economic determinism or the materialistic conception of history,—a preface of scarcely less importance than the work itself. Price, in cloth, 30 cents; in paper, 10 cents, postpaid.

The Work of Our Co-Operative Publishing House.

The International Socialist Review, as most of its readers know, is owned by a co-operative company consisting of a rapidly increasing number of stockholders (396 as this number of The Review goes to press), most of whom have invested just \$10.00 each. The object of the company is to circulate the literature of CLEAR SOCIALISM IN CLEAR ENGLISH. Not merely the amount, but the quality of the

Socialist literature that is circulated will determine the growth of the movement.

Every dollar of capital invested in our company for the last three years has gone into the publication of just such books, pamphlets and leaflets as the Socialist party needs most urgently. If you want to put ten, a hundred or a thousand dollars where it will help most effectively to bring in the new social order, this is the place. If you want to know how at the same time you will benefit yourself and the local work in which you are interested, write us for particulars. Address

**CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS,
56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.**