

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

---

---

Vol. I

AUGUST, 1900

No. 2

---

---

## CHICAGO LOCKOUT.

---

A striking picture of American social and economic organization is presented in the present situation within the building trades of Chicago. The strong tendency of the social evolution in America has been a pronounced individualism. To leave to each individual or to each organization of individuals to direct its own affairs untrammelled by any regard for the interests of other organisms has been the first axiom of our philosophy. In spite, however, of this conscious avowal, the conditions of our economic and industrial growth have forced many of these warring individual interests into harmonious co-operation. The fierceness of the individual competition has necessitated co-operation. But this co-operation has been forced upon us in spite of our avowed intention to fight our battles on individual grounds.

Chicago has now for nearly six months been suffering from an acute labor controversy. Two organizations have opposed each other with bitter animosity. Thousands of employers have deplored their idle capital and tens of thousands of laborers have idly walked the streets. Families and dependents have suffered and starved. Hosts of small shopkeepers have anxiously watched their growing credit accounts, trade in general has been disturbed. Buildings in all states of construction have been left unfinished—those whose skeletons awe the wondering passer-by, those on the architects' plans, and those in the minds of the willing owner. Industries dependent upon new shop accommodations must wait better opportunities and either take their labor force away from Chicago or compel it to swell the army of unemployed. All classes have suffered. But here are two parties that are unable to adjust their differences. Because of this inability of the two principal parties, the dependent industries, the powerless public, must suffer without being allowed to send representatives to the settlement or having their voices heard, although they also are parties in the effects of the struggle. But our social philosophy

compels us to leave the original contestants alone and bear our own discomforts as patiently as we may.

There is, however, an advantage in this attitude of laissez-faire. The past shows that the progressive steps of evolution have been taken under this struggle between social or economic classes. The retardation in the social development of Continental Europe is due to the forcible interference of the government to suppress any serious difference between the industrial factors. This interference may have given industrial peace; but this peace is only equivalent to social stagnation, because the life-impulse of the working classes to rise to an equal opportunity and development to the other classes has been stifled by the intolerant attitude of the powers above. In the United States the rapidity of our industrial and social development is largely due to the wide latitude the various classes have had for the settlement of their differences. In the industrial sphere this method is very expensive, but let us have it until experience has taught us a better way to remove the causes of friction.

New Zealand has taken a step ahead of us in its insistence upon compulsory arbitration of all labor disputes, but there the working classes have gained such an influence in the government that they know their interests will receive fair treatment by the Arbitration Board.

On the other hand, the necessities created by material development baffle our philosophical preconceptions. Men are forced to co-operate. Not long ago the formation of labor unions was universally decried as destructive of individual liberty, and we still hear the echoes of the cry. Now, not only the laborers in individual trades unite, but unions engaged in the same industry affiliate into central organizations. The Building Trades Council of Chicago embraces every trade and occupation that has anything to do with the erection of a building. Delegates from the various unions meet in a central council. This council elects an Executive Board, which, with the Board of Business Agents, administers the affairs of the Council. All important questions are referred back through the delegates to the various unions for suggestion or ratification. But the tendency to co-operation does not end here. Many of the important unions of Chicago are branches of national organization, as the Carpenters and Joiners, Plumbers, etc.

The Building Trades Council of Chicago is only one of similar councils existing in almost every large city of the United States, with whom it is more or less closely affiliated. In the same manner the laborers engaged in manufacturing the materials of which a building is composed have organized their unions into a central council, the Building Material Council, and these two coun-

cils in the past years have very closely allied their interests. If we, then, remember that the Building Trades Council is also a part of the American Federation of Labor, with whom nearly all organized labor is affiliated, we may have a conception of the tremendous strength that may be concentrated into that organization, which for the time being is attacked by the employing capitalists. It is, of course, true that these affiliations of such large bodies cannot assert as formidable a strength in an actual conflict as the appearance of number would indicate, because labor has not yet been educated up to the highest sense of solidarity or conception of its power; but any one who is at all familiar with the inside operations of these bodies knows the readiness with which labor has responded to appeals for financial help. It is only the contributions of funds from unions all over the country that has sustained the locked-out men in Chicago in their struggle. The relation between the Building Material Council and the Building Trades Council (during the time past) in refusing to handle material not bearing the proper label, or striking for a manufacturer that helped an unfair contractor, has assisted both these councils to attain their present importance in the labor market.

It is very significant of how much more recent date any organization of the employers have been brought about. Lacking the incentive of an ever present struggle for mere existence, the employers have been satisfied with the power that capital itself gives. But competition among employers will bring about organization just as resistlessly as competition among the men. We have the same relentless formation of trusts among the building contractors of Chicago as is characteristic of all other industry: Consolidation of related interests, eliminative waste and unnecessary factors.

Organizations of contractors of the same line of business have existed for years, as the Chicago Masons' & Builders' Association, Master Plumbers' Association, Chicago Painters' Association, etc. Some of these organizations have strengthened effectually their memberships by making corresponding labor organizations agree not to work for contractors outside the organization. They have also made stipulations with the dealers in supply whereby a member of the organization has received a rebate in the purchase of materials, which an outsider could not secure. But still the field was too crowded. Chicago is filled with small contractors whose capital or connections will not allow them to take large contracts but who compensate themselves by the numerous smaller jobs. These smaller men have as a rule kept themselves outside of all organizations, partly because they have lacked time to take in a broad view of business policy, as they must do their

own superintendency, partly because they prefer to pick up any job they can find, untrammelled by agreements either with unions or their own association. A contractor who had closely followed the whole movement stated that in 1899 fully 70 per cent of the work done in Chicago had been done by men outside the contractors' organizations. The profits that are divided among a number of men would give handsome incomes to a few contractors if these others could be eliminated, and still not bring any detriment to the trade as a whole. Seeing how the whole tendency in our industrial development is to give the control and direction of production into a few hands, it is impossible to believe that this tendency should not reflect itself in the minds of one most daring and enterprising contractor.

But any central organization was not affected until the spring of 1899, when the Building Contractors' Council came into existence, although its real activity did not show itself until fall. Vigorous measures were employed to induce the independent contractors to fall into line, the most effective being the difficulty of the independent contractor to secure materials unless he could prove a good standing with his association. In all this struggle the material dealers have proven themselves the staunchest friends of the Contractors' Council. An abundance of testimony goes to show that they have used every kind of recrimination against independent contractors, even absolutely refusing to sell to men who persisted in employing union labor. Even in their ranks the superiority of the large manufacturer over the small shows itself. By collusion with the stronger contractors, a few of the dealers and manufacturers of materials could force the weaker men to the wall and have the whole field to themselves. The dealings of the Central Supply Association, both in regard to the fixing of prices and in the matter of free competition, presents the most interesting study to any student of Political Economy. After the fight was on, no man who employed union labor could buy building material; or, if he succeeded at all, by being in every way harassed by those who aspired to the monopoly of this trade.

A very important factor in building is, of course, the architect. The blessings of unionism were clearly perceived by the architects when they formed the Chicago Architects' Business Association, which association they strengthened by inducing the state legislature to pass a State License Law for architects. Early in the struggle they passed resolutions sympathetic to the contractors and pledging their efforts to prevent outside contractors from taking contracts already held by members of the Contractors' Council.

Before going into an analysis of the lockout itself, it is necessary to bear another circumstance in mind. After the trade de-

pression in '96-'97 the prices of materials began to rise. A rise in prices will not generally prevent industrial activity, as it may only be a sign of advancing prosperity, but the phenomenal advance during '99 of from 100 to 300 per cent. in the cost of material could scarcely find a corresponding willingness in prospective builders. In the nature of things, such an enormous increase could not be expected to continue forever, and the action of some of the noted captains of industry in closing mills and otherwise reducing production, while figures were at this profitable level, were only a sure indication that prices had already reached the top-notch and were expected to start upon the declining plane. If one also follows the price quotations in the reputable trade journals, one will find that the climax had been reached in the end of March or beginning of April. It is only reasonable to suppose that if conditions favored a suspension of building operations while the reign of excessive prices lasted and building could be resumed when the market was more favorable to profitable buying, that this suspension would be hailed with eagerness. It is impossible to reject this element in our attempt to understand the present situation.

It is only to be expected that a great deal of friction must have existed between two bodies of such strength as the labor unions and master associations possessed. Harmonious relations between employer and employes, with interests so conflicting, can only be found where one of the parties is too weak to assert itself. Usually labor has to adapt itself to the conditions stipulated by the employer, but the building trades have succeeded in representing their demands in the agreements with the contractors. This they have succeeded in doing through the solidarity attained by the central council. Many of the individual unions have always been very strong because they have enrolled in their numbers every available workingman. Others, especially the laborers and more unskilled men, would never have been able to stand alone. But behind every individual agreement stood the combined force of the Building Trades' Council, and that compelled the contractor to give terms which he would not have done if he had only single unions to deal with. The Building Trades' Council simply usurped the power of capitalism. If a Rockefeller fights a small recalcitrant dealer with the combined force of his immense capital, that is business. But if the Building Trades employ the same tactics in self-defense, it is overturning of society. It is not to be expected that the Building Trades' Council would always use this power with the utmost discretion and discernment. Errors have often been committed. The quarrel between different unions as to jurisdiction over a certain class of work ought not to interrupt the work

of other unions. The refusal to handle labor-saving machinery can easily be understood as an attempt to protect present workers. But the introduction of this machinery is a pill, however hard, that the workingman under present conditions must swallow, for the benefit that the saving gives to society as a whole. Mistakes of judgment over petty controversies between contractor and men have been the cause of stagnation of work. We are so accustomed to the overbearing treatment of men by employers that we accept that as the order of nature. When the men are able to turn the tables, even one who has not the least to do with the matter cries out in indignation. On the other side, actions of the contractors which the unions have considered a breach of existing contracts have caused added friction and disturbance of work. The great misfortune throughout this whole matter has been the lack of a mediation board before which these grievances could be adjusted. Against any infringement on their rights the men have retaliated by a strike. Inasmuch as an attack on one union means an attack on all, work has been suspended many times, not only by the union originally involved, but by all unions on that same building, and at times on other buildings as well. This, of course, has been very harassing, not only to the first contractor, but to all contractors and owners who themselves may have had nothing to do with the original grievance. The Building Trades' Council had an effective means by which to settle all grievances, and it is not to be wondered at that the laboring men, with the sense of past silently-endured sufferings, should use this weapon effectively, and even at times unreasonably. The solidarity of resistance in labor brought about solidarity of suffering among the contractors.

When, therefore, the Building Contractors' Council considered themselves strong enough to fight the consolidated strength of the unions, it did not await the expiration of existing agreements, but precipitated the struggle by a general lockout, Feb. 5, 1900.

The bones of contention are briefly stated in the following resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Building Contractors' Council, held Nov. 17, 1900: That the trades represented in the Building Contractors' Council shall not recognize,

- 1st. Any limitation as to the amount of work a man shall perform during his working day.
- 2d. Any restriction in the use of machinery.
- 3d. The right of any person to interfere with the workman during hours.
- 4th. The sympathetic strike.

5th. Restriction in the use of manufactured material, except prison made.

6th. The right of the unions to prohibit the employment of apprentices.

All of these counts, except the fourth, are of minor importance and have been used mostly for oratorical effect. All of them—except the fourth—have been considered by the unions. In regard to the second, the explanation has been given that of the 33 trades affiliated with the Building Trades' Council only one—the stonecutters—have ever objected to the use of machinery. The reason, as explained by themselves, is that out of 75 cut-stone contractors in the city only about 15 have machinery. These 15 want to crush the other 60 out of existence.

The fourth count is the real bone of contention. It is restated in a circular of the contractors, dated April 30, 1900: "That the agreement shall only become operative when the union withdraws from the Building Trades' Council and agrees not to become affiliated with any organization of a like character during the life of the agreement."

The sympathetic strike is the *raison d'être* of the Building Trades Council. It has been the means of either punishing the contractor or to compel him to conform to the will of the unions. Sometimes the punishment has taken the form of a fine, with the threat of a strike if the money is not forthcoming. The agent of the Building Trades Council is the Business Agent of the union. The personality of this agent has also been made a factor in the struggle. The contractors have been vehement in their denunciations of the Business Agent, or Walking Delegate. The very relation between employer and employe makes it necessary that the representative of the latter should be a *persona non grata* to the former, especially if he is able to back up his demands. There is no doubt that the business agent has, in many instances, been lacking in those personal qualities of patience and adroitness that smooth the relations between business men. The stories of bribe-giving and bribe-taking that have been occasionally mentioned are just as disgraceful to the one party as to the other.

The demand for the abolition of the Building Trades Council has been persistent with the contractors. They have gone so far in their hostility against the opposing council that they have even refused to treat directly with it. In their eyes it has been "unreliable and unworthy." Any attempt of reconciliation or arbitration made by any third party has been constantly rejected, unless it could first guarantee the extinction of this hated body. The attempt by unprejudiced third parties to secure evidence in

regard to the merits or demerits of the controversy has been met with no response. Either an entire submission to their conditions, including the abolition of a central organization or the cessation of all work, has been the consistent position of the Building Contractors' Council.

How far the men have shown their willingness to meet the contractors is shown by the propositions of the union men in the recent attempt of arbitration by Mr. Gompers. At the national conference of the American Federation of Labor President Gompers and Vice-President Thomas I. Kidd were delegated to investigate and try to bring about a conciliation of the struggle. In their conference with the committee of contractors they were authorized to submit a proposition in which the demands of the contractors were conceded with the following modifications:\*

That employers shall be at liberty to employ and discharge whomsoever they see fit; that the employer shall have the right to employ whomsoever he pleases, provided the union of the trade is unable to furnish men, but all men shall receive the full wages agreed upon in their trade. •

"Explanation: The unions do not think it fair or just to them that after years of effort spent in organizing, contributing liberally of their money and energy in the meantime, that some one who, if he has not been decidedly antagonistic to them, has at least been passive, should be allowed equal rights to share the fruits of what they have secured. While they recognize the God-given right of earning a living which belongs to every man, they claim that under existing conditions it is as essential to have a trade union in the industrial field as to have a code of morals or a code of laws governing a people, and while some men do not like the existence of the law, they are bound to observe it in the interests of the greatest number.

"That the rate of wages shall be subject to arbitration when agreements cannot be reached between parties.

"That agreements shall cover a period of not less than three years.

"That an arbitration clause to provide for the adjustment of possible difficulties in the future be made a part of this agreement.

"That no by-laws or rules conflicting with the agreement shall be enforced or passed by association or union except by mutual consent, during the life of the agreement.

That no central body with which either party to this agreement may be affiliated shall have the power to in any way abrogate, change or annul any agreements entered into by the parties

---

\*Chicago Record, July 27.

to this agreement. That central bodies shall exist not for the purpose of making, but for the purpose of maintaining agreements entered into by the unions or associations forming its component parts; and if the existing central bodies contain anything in their constitution or by-laws conflicting with this they shall be amended in conformity with this agreement.

"All matters governing employment, wages, trade, the interpretation of working rules, etc., shall be considered matters to be settled by arbitration."

It would seem that no employer had any rights whatever to dictate over any organization of employes that exists only for defense and self-preservation, unless he is determined to absolutely domineer over all the actions of his employe. Still the contractors refused absolutely to have anything to do with any proposition that did not carry with it the withdrawal of the unions from the Building Trades Council.

One charge that has been made repeatedly against the Building Trades Council is that some of its members and leaders have used their influence over the men to secure offices in the city hall. As a correlate to this the city administration has been accused of undue leniency towards the unions, that the administration in order to secure the votes of the union men has overlooked violations of the law and refused to come to the assistance of the contractors in as liberal a manner as desired to protect non-union men. The same objection has always been made against elective officers, that they are amenable to influence of the most potent electors. Sometimes it is an inspector who does not dare to enforce the factory laws, or the fire escape ordinance, whereby scores of people are brought to untimely deaths because of the pull that the capitalist has. That a permanent organization of laboring people can exert an influence over the administration only indicates what power it may wield when properly directed. That delegates to the Building Trades Council hold city jobs means that they use the influence they have in their unions for self-promotion. What malign effect that may have upon other organizations than their own is difficult to see. They cannot be blamed for influencing the city government in favor of their own organization. A leader whose popularity in his own union has gained him an administrative or legislative position must be condemned if he dissipates his opportunities in alliances with parties that exist and are maintained at the expense of and detriment to the laboring class. The Building Trades Council is an excellent school where native talent and ability can be developed and utilized. It is indeed a pity that this talent shall be consumed in the service of a political machinery of whatever name that feeds upon labor, but whose only return to labor are vague

promises. When the labor unions wake up to combine their strength in voting for candidates of their own party that will do their bidding as surely as the party of the employers now do theirs, there will be no necessity for any such strikes and lock-outs as now so frequently convulse the industrial body. Until that time the contractors ought to tolerate that the larger body is satisfied with the sops that an indulgent administration deigns to give.

The attitude of the general public has been very instructive. The combined moneyed interests, like the bankers and real estate dealers, showed early and clearly their sympathies. In response to a circular letter sent out by the Contractors' Council a document indorsing the action taken by the contractors was signed by more than a score of the most prominent business men and bankers in Chicago. A man whose former service as comptroller of the currency has opened for him a high position in Chicago, throws the weight of that position in favor of the contractors in a lengthy argument about the rights of employers to fix contracts. At a dinner of the Real Estate Board a member even went so far as to suggest, after having denounced the mayor for his non-committal attitude: "What is the use of monkeying with the politicians in the question? These fellows don't care what we say. The only way out of it is simply to tell them you can't put up a building and that you won't try. That's it. Starve it out! It's the only, only, only way."

A reverend doctor who preaches in a fashionable church on the West Side put the case thus: "God has said to man, 'Thou shalt labor.' The walking delegate says, 'Thou shalt not labor.' Who will win?" Here the contractor even receives divine sanction. The newspapers of Chicago who faithfully reflect the minds of the moneyed classes with few exceptions have been unsparing in their denunciations of the Building Trades Council. Inspired by the able press committee of the Building Contractors' Council, they were in the first months of the year frantic in exposing the shortcomings of the unions. As will happen in all strikes, acts of indiscretion and violence were committed, in which the papers saw violent threats of riot and mob rule and even demanded the calling out of the militia. But as time went on and the contractors were unable to secure scab-labor, things quieted down and the tone of the press also calmed. One paper has seen in the persistent refusal of the contractors to arbitrate a reason to lay part of the blame upon their shoulders. A new paper started for campaign purposes adopted at the beginning an opposite policy, denouncing at once the Building

---

\*Chicago Record, May 18.

Contractors' Council and the Republican party as the oppressors of the poor and enemies to labor.

This unanimous animosity of the leisure classes towards labor organizations can not always be taken as individual hostility. It is rather the outcome of defective information and a reflection of class feeling. The reasoning faculty of the public is formed by social conditions and the sympathies of the unit is directed by class-distinctions. If the appearance of the case makes the class judgment plausible the individual does not hesitate to adopt it.

Let us impartially review the philosophy of the situation. The owner supplies the funds to build a house. The architect draws the plans and makes the specifications. Materials can be bought on the market. The laborers perform the work. For protection of the laborers unions have grown up. The history of the past has sufficiently vindicated their existence as desirable and necessary. Even the contractors have been careful to state that they wage no war upon the unions, they would lose all public sympathy if they did. In unionism has been the only strength of the laborer. If it is right for one set of men to combine for mutual advantage, it is certainly right for them to unite with another set. The strength of the industrial unions has increased immensely by the organization into a central body. The aim and purpose of the Building Trades' Council is a right and laudable one: that of self protection. There is a great difference between the organization of unions and that of capital,—the first protects men, lives, human happiness, the latter only things. There is a great similarity—both give effectiveness. As yet we have seen no limits to the growing organization of the latter, although many view it with apprehension as infringing upon human welfare. Why may we not expect that organizations whose sole aim is the welfare of the laborer should not grow in effectiveness? Why should not a bricklayer combine with a carpenter? Why should a plumber be excluded? Have not all laborers common interests that they need to guard unitedly? No doubt we will see in the future all labor organizations unite in common purpose and action, and who needs to fear the day? In power there is always a temptation to abuse, and the present conflict may have been averted, if the Building Trades Council had not overestimated its strength in enforcing existing contracts and made timely concessions. Whether the ultimate results would have been better is impossible to say.

And here comes the office of the contractor. His business is to correlate the capital of the owner with the labor of the men. It is his business to see that the adjustment of capital and labor is smooth and precise. He is the lubricator in the house building machinery. He is not the capitalist, has in many instances no

capital, as that is forthcoming from the owner as the work proceeds. He does nothing of the work, especially if he has large contracts, as the superintendence and skilled work is done by men paid for that purpose. His only office is to see that the work is done in the time stipulated. If he fails in this he fails in his office. All the friction that has existed in the past is only an indication of his inability to fill his office in the industrial process. The efficient railroad manager prevents strikes on his road by judicious actions. The efficient contractor will not run counter to his working rules or violate agreements with his men. And right here is the insecurity and difficulty in the contractor's position. He performs no essential part in the labor, but his position is only a pecuniary one. As in the clothing trade, the contractor or sweater, as he is called, has been found profitable to retain by the manufacturer, because he is more efficient than the latter to produce cheap labor. The contractor has to live by both the laborer and owner, and when the laborers are able to demand high wages, as they do in Chicago, the contractor must find room in which to turn. There are too many contractors in Chicago for the profits. The weaker ones need to be weeded out by long inactivity, during which their capital is consumed. The chief safeguard of the labor unions, the central body, must be broken down, and the unions handled singly. Add to that a season of depression, which must inevitably come, and the men will be willing to work for more reasonable wages. This is the programme of the contractors who expect to survive in the struggle for existence, and our popular inertia and fondness of clinging to established modes of industry assist the programme.

Lately some owners have continued their building with architects dealing directly with representatives of the men, and the experiment would be continued by others if the conspiracy between the architects, material dealers, and contractors did not bar the way. As it is, the men suffer, the public suffers, but we vindicate our policy of non-interference, that allows a few men to clog the wheels of industry, only because they will not allow thousands of other people to exercise a liberty which they themselves enjoy.

*S. V. Lindholm.*

## THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ITALY.

---

Italy is passing through the most critical period of its history after the revolution which gave it its unity and its constitution. Through this revolution the most active party of the bourgeoisie, aided by the working people, relieved us of foreign rulers, broke the temporal power of the pope, gave itself a representative constitutional government, to the end of winning, through suffrage, free meetings and a free press, the political administration and the control of public affairs, but socially it did not finish the work of the French revolution. That is to say that even today in Southern Italy we enjoy certain delights of the feudal systems, so that one may well say that the working class is caught between two evils, those which are derived from a capitalist system as yet imperfect, and those which remain to us from the ancient systems not yet entirely disappeared.

The revolution accomplished, our patriots of the bourgeoisie threw themselves upon the now unified Italian state, to cut their piece out of the rich cake. And the communal portion, the goods in mortmain in possession of the church, were confiscated and sold for almost nothing to the new men; the huge insanity of our parvenus makes Italy enter into the concert of European powers and into the triple alliance which brings us the heavy burdens of a war budget exceeding the resources of the country, and we even have to undertake colonial adventure in Africa to fill the pockets of the dealers in supplies, of the financiers, of the greedy politicians. The defeat of Adowa delivered us forever from Crispi and his gang, but there remains to us a budget very heavy and always with a surplus of passivity and a system of taxation which hampers every new activity in manufacturing and agriculture. Every milliard of net income is weighted down with a 24 per cent tax. Even the working class is over-taxed, if one considers that salt pays 15 cents per pound, and as for our intellectual level, we have still 42 per cent of illiterates.

Meanwhile the working class, which had gained very little, still received very slender wages (the women who rebelled in the rice fields near Bologne earned 14 cents per day for twelve hours with their legs in the water and their backs in the sun) while the price of wheat was increased by the import duties to \$1.10 and even to \$1.80 a bushel. So the working class detached themselves from the "patriots" and began to follow a policy of their own, adopting the socialist doctrines and opposing themselves to the whole class of the bourgeoisie. The attempts on the part of the bourgeois government to crush the socialist party and the labor

movement are continual. As bread riots are frequent in the south, the government and the ruling class take advantage of them to accuse the socialists and overwhelm them with volleys of musketry and centuries of prison. Molinella, Caltavutuvo, Partinico, etc., are bloody examples of the Calvary of the Italian proletariat, and Volterra and Pallanga are the Spielbergs of the new martyrs of the liberty and the emancipation of the working class. But the socialist party always springs up more alive, stronger and fuller of fight than ever, and especially in the north, where the industrial and economic movement is more advanced and civilization more diffused, it wins the sympathy of even a part of the little bourgeoisie, crushed under the weight of taxes and weary of a too costly administration, which obstructs all progress, every useful effort. The conservative class increases its attempts to stifle the movement of the workmen, which has already shown itself in a good number of cities and parliamentary seats captured by the socialists and republicans, and in a series of strikes for higher wages and shorter hours. Profiting by a recent revolt of starvation provoked by the high cost of bread in the south, which excited a certain agitation in the most populous centers of Florence, Milan, Pavia, etc., in May, 1898, the conservatives demand a state of siege, volleys, war bureaus. Results, certain citizens stretched out on the pavements and certain others in cells.

Strong in these exploits the conservative bourgeoisie who stand for Italy superannuates, retrograde, denying the conquests of the Revolution which had served to put them in control, wish to suppress the liberty of the press, of meetings, of unions and strikes, and they even would like to limit the right of suffrage, because these means assist a new class, that of the workers, to become strong, and to put forth its own word in the administration of public affairs.

The government, which for a number of years has merely expressed the will of the chamber, but which is chosen by the king at his pleasure independently of the parliament, from his generals and senators, of whom the incumbent president-general Pelloux is a type,—this government, in order to stifle the socialist propaganda, proposes two political measures which are real restrictions of the liberties sanctioned by the statute, the compact sworn between the people and the king by the plebiscites.

To the measures of the reactionary mass and its government is opposed the Extreme Left, represented by the socialists, the republicans and the radicals. Many victories have been obtained with the amnesty decreed by the people and bestowed upon those condemned by military tribunals but acquitted by the popular juries and by the investigations of the press, and of the popular parties united in the defense of liberty. By parliamentary ob-

struction the discussion of reactionary measures has been prevented.

Unable to triumph legally, the government closes the Chamber and assumes to give authority to its leaders by a royal decree. But the Supreme Court of Cassation decides against it, and it then presents its measures anew in the Chamber. And the obstruction begins again. Unable to conquer, the majority then conceives the idea of gagging the Extreme Left in the parliament and proposes to adopt on short notice by showing of hands a new code of parliamentary law called the Guillotine, which gives the President such powers to nullify the will of the minority, that the rule ought justly to be disregarded.

The struggle is becoming more bitter, and this time, even the constitutional liberal Left with its leaders, Zanardelli and Giolitti, is making common cause with the Extreme Left and is opposing any violation of the statute.

Many incidents show the ignoble spirit of Colombo, the President of the Chamber, and his party, and the noble spirit of the party of the Extreme Left, which in this struggle wins the support of the strongest and noblest minds of our country, such as D'Annunzio the poet-novelist, Pantaleoni the economist and Lombroso the sociologist.

Finally the government, once more unable to get the active support of parliament in its illegal acts, dissolves the Chamber and appeals to the voters by asking the country to solve this question, Whether the minority has the right to obstruct the parliamentary work of the majority?

The Extreme Left and the liberal Left answer by putting the question in these terms, Whether the majority has the right to undo that which the Italian people have conquered, the statute and its liberties, and whether it has the right to slaughter the minority once for all by depriving it by a new rule of the legal means of opposing any reactionary reform or any economic measure profitable to the conservative ruling class. And the country replied by doubling the socialist group, which from 16 reaches the number of 32 representatives in the Chamber, by increasing the republican group from 24 to 27, the radical group from 24 to 32, and the whole Extreme Left from 64 to 94 seats. And more significant still, the country relieves Milan, the moral capital of Italy, from all its reactionaries, and among them that Colombo who was the infamous President of the Chamber in its last sessions.

And there is everywhere an awakening of new energy among the working people and the small bourgeoisie, who range themselves on the side of the popular parties, and who demand the end of this outworn monarchical regime, of this foolish, reactionary bourgeoisie, which finds its adherents and its support only in

the impoverished and backward south, patient under oppressive taxes and enforced labor, where servility and corruption are still magnificent instruments of domination and victories for the masters of the hour. But even in the south these elections have shown something of an awakening, in spite of the violence and the corruption exercised, and three socialist deputies have been elected: one at Naples and two in Sicily. The beginning of the work of purification and renewal of the political character of these proletarians accomplished with much courage by the socialists has given magnificent results. The start is made, and more will follow.

In the north whole provinces are conquered by the socialist and anti-monarchical propaganda. The socialists who ten years ago counted only 3 delegates now count 32, have polled more than 170,000 votes, are represented in 372 towns, and possess a daily newspaper, "Avanti" (Forward), a bi-monthly review edited by Turati: "Critica Sociale" (Social Critic), and 52 weekly newspapers.

But the more strength the organized proletariat acquires, so much the more obstinacy and bitterness does the conservative class put into its opposition. It is thus that the conflict is on between the new Italy, which includes labor, intelligence, and a part of the capitalists of the more civilized and modernized bourgeoisie of the north, and the old Italy, which includes the wheel horses of politics, the clans of the south, the largest cotton manufacturers, the ship builders, the landlords, the king and the army, this conflict is far from ending. The struggle will be great in proportion to the foolish obstinacy of the parties of reaction, but whether it be long or short, whether with or without bloodshed,—I can not prophesy, but following the experience of the past it should be easy to foresee,—the final result is not to be feared; it will mark the triumph of the new Italy.

And the socialist party, having acquired the right of existence which at present is every day contested, will be able to continue its way along the lines of the class struggle, to finish its word of emancipation for the workers, whence for the moment it has been forced to suspend to procure for itself anew the oxygen of liberty. Nevertheless the struggle continues most beautifully.

*Alessandro Schiavi.*

## THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

---

The present movement is not a favorable one for the working-class movement in this country, or for a review of its progress and prospects. The whole nation, with a few honorable exceptions, is suffering from a bad attack of jingo madness. So far as it has any organic existence, or any articulate collective voice, the working-class is against the war. But that does not alter the fact that the great bulk of the working people, as of every other class, has gone rabidly jingo. The best known men in the working-class movement have pronounced against the war, but they have, most of them, been rather backward in doing so, and so in the main their opposition has been ineffectual, and at the present time the rank and file could not be counted upon to back their leaders in an attitude of opposition to the prevailing jingoism. Had these leaders come out boldly twelve months ago it is more than likely that the war might have been prevented. We of the Social-Democratic Federation did what we could, and we received the support of one or two members of Parliament, but the majority of the labor members stood aloof, just at the time when their services in the cause of peace would have been most valuable. The difficulty seems to be that among these men there is a tendency to separate what they call "labor questions" from general politics; and so they appeared to regard the war as a matter upon which "from a labor point of view," they were not called upon to express an opinion. That idea has been fatal to any useful purpose their opinion might have served. For it cannot, I think, be denied that the war has done incalculable mischief, even so far as domestic and "labor" questions are concerned, quite apart from the wider issues of the rights and wrongs of the conflict itself.

At the beginning of the present session of Parliament the ministry were good enough to inform us, in the "Queen's Speech," that the present time was "not propitious for social legislation." The moral was obvious, if only the workers had taken the trouble to notice it. You cannot have your cake and eat it too; and the money which has been spent on lyddite shells, dum-dum bullets, and other warlike trifles for the delectation of the Boers is not available for providing old age pensions, better dwellings, or an improved system of education for the British people. It is always to the interest of the master class to divert the attention of the workers from their own affairs by stirring up foreign strife, and in this case they seem to have done it with unqualified success. The miserable slum-dweller does not know that he is miserable, does not know that his dwelling is a slum and not a palace so long

as he feels assured that "Bobs" is smashing "old Kroojer," and he can sing "Gawd Save the Queen" and "Rule Britannia." It is of much more importance to him that the British should be successful in defeating the Boers in South Africa than that he should be successful in getting better conditions of life for himself at home, and it does not matter in the least that he and his wife and children starve so long as "Gawd" in his goodness will save the Queen. And yet it is said that working people are selfish! The one thing these facts demonstrate is that it is impossible to detach labor questions from general politics, and that our masters are quite aware of this fact even if labor leaders are not.

Thus, then, thanks to the ignorance of the workers, their lack of organization and their readiness to be misled by the specious pretexts of patriotism, added to the inaptitude and apathy of their leaders, jingoism is rampant and any progressive movement among them has been almost brought to a standstill. We are within a few months of a general election. There is a very widespread impression that it will take place almost immediately, and in any case it cannot be delayed for more than a few months. The Tories, now in office, are all powerful, and, whenever the election takes place, they will, there is little doubt, be returned with an increased majority. The Liberal party has resolved itself into its elements, a mere collection of incoherent and incongruous atoms. There was precious little life in it before, but this war has smashed it completely, as many of the best known Liberals are quite as jingo as any of the Tories. So far as the official opposition, the Liberal party, is concerned, therefore, the government will have it all its own way at the election, let it come when it may, and apart from the Liberal party there is no opposition at all, that is no opposition strong enough to make a show in the House of Commons. We of the S. D. F. have several candidates in the field, and there are some prospects of success at least in certain of the constituencies. The Independent Labor Party, too, is putting forward candidates in a number of places, but at most the two combined, even if successful beyond all hopes, will do no more than constitute the nucleus of a party or group in the House of Commons.

Early in the present month a conference was held representative of the Socialist organizations and the trade unions, and to which the co-operative societies were invited, to form a combination to secure the better representation of labor in Parliament. A committee has been appointed by the conference consisting of members of the trade unions, the S. D. F. and I. L. P. and the Fabian Society. The aim of the committee is to secure the co-operation of these various sections for the support of any candidate any one of them may put forward. Some of our friends are very sanguine about this committee, and anticipate great results from its efforts. I fear, however, that not very much will come of

it. The organizations represented on the committee number some two hundred thousand members, and if all these members were like some—active, class conscious Socialists—the committee would be a power to be reckoned with. But the bulk of the members of the trades unions are nothing of the kind. Although many of their officials and most active men are Socialists, and although the Trade Union Congress passes Socialist resolutions every year, the majority of the rank and file of the trade unions are Liberals or Tories or nothing at all. We hear a great deal about the trade union movement, but really there is no such “movement.” There are strong, well organized, well equipped, wealthy trade unions, but they do not constitute a movement. As a political force they practically have no existence. Even in those few cases where a trade union sends a member to the House of Commons, he goes as the representative of that section, that trade, not as a representative of the working-class as a whole, to voice its aspirations and ideas, but simply to safeguard the trade interests of a section, and perfectly free to be as reactionary as he likes on any other matter. Under the circumstances, it is encouraging that the labor members are as good as they are, but the circumstance does not give such ground for hoping great things from a committee depending so largely upon a trade union backing. Such a backing will only be useful and reliable when it becomes Socialist, and it is encouraging to know that in spite of all the reactionary influences at work, Socialism is steadily making progress in the ranks of the trade unions. But until they really are Socialist, to attempt to combine them into one party with the Socialist organizations, pure and simple, is at best a doubtful experiment. It is one thing to endeavor to escape from the reproach of being a mere sect, and to try to form a representative working-class party, it is another thing to attempt to combine in such a party bodies whose ideas are dissimilar, whose aspirations are not the same, and who are not agreed on general principles. The most that can be hoped from such a combination, it seems to me, is that it will provide against the various sections fighting each other, which has in the past been a cause of considerable ill-feeling and some scandal.

It may be gathered from the foregoing that the immediate political outlook for the working-class movement here is not particularly bright. It must not, therefore, be thought, however, that the movement is out of heart, or that we see any reason to be gloomy or cast down. All the time, in spite of drawbacks and discouragements we keep pegging away and we also have the satisfaction of seeing the movement make steady progress. Every day sees us take a step forward, and if the steps are not the strides we should like to take, “slow and sure” is a good motto. It is better to make haste slowly than too fast or to make no progress at all.

*H. Quelch.*

## SOCIALISM AND THE INTELLECTUALS.

**Note by the Translator.**—This address, although delivered in France and called out by recent developments there, is most timely and important for us in America. Here also the socialist movement has grown to the point where the brain workers are joining it, and it rests with themselves to say whether they shall be a mighty help or a petty hindrance. If they spend their strength in trying to change the character of the movement by making it "broad" enough to take in all amiable exploiters, if they build up factional organizations to preach socialism with the class struggle left out,—then they will waste their labor, they will make themselves ridiculous, they will delay the progress of socialism a little, not very much. But if they realize that the laborers of the international socialist movement have a firm grasp on the most important scientific truths ever discovered, and if they will frankly join the movement as comrades, not as self-appointed leaders, their training and ability will be of the utmost service in dealing with the serious problems that attend the break-up of capitalism and the building of the social order of the future.

C. H. K.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT PARIS MARCH 23, 1900, AT A MEETING CALLED BY THE GROUP OF COLLECTIVIST STUDENTS ATTACHED TO THE PARTI OUVRIER FRANCAIS, BY PAUL LAFARGUE. TRANSLATED BY CHARLES H. KERR.

Ladies and Gentlemen:—I am happy to deliver this address under the presidency of Vaillant, because it is a pledge of the close and lasting union between our two organizations, and because Vaillant is one of the intellectuals of the socialist party; he is acknowledged to be the most learned of French socialists and perhaps of European socialists, now that Marx, Engels and Lavroff are no longer with us.

The group of collectivist students which has organized this conference, has been led to choose this subject, because French socialism has just passed through a crisis which is not exactly one of growth, though such it has been called, but which has been caused by the arrival of a certain number of bourgeois intellectuals within the ranks of the party. It is therefore interesting to examine the situation of the intellectuals in capitalized society, their historic role since the revolution of 1789, and the manner in which the bourgeoisie has kept the promise it made them when it was struggling against the aristocracy.

The eighteenth century was the century of reason—everything, religion, philosophy, science, politics, privileges of classes, of the state, of municipalities, was submitted to its pitiless criticism. Never in history had there been such a fermentation of ideas and such a revolutionary preparation of men's minds. Mirabeau, who himself played a great role in the ideological agitation, might well say in the national assembly: "We have no time to think, but happily, we have a supply of ideas." All that was needed was to realize them. Capitalism, to reward the intellectuals who had labored with so much enthusiasm for the coming of the revolution, promised them honors and favors; in-

telligence and wisdom, as well as virtue should be the sole privileges of the society it was founding upon the ruins of the old order. Promises cost it little; it announced to all men that it brought them joy and happiness, with liberty, equality and fraternity, which, although eternal principles, were now born for the first time. Its social world was to be so new that even before the Republic was proclaimed, Camille Desmoulins demanded that they begin a new era which should date from the taking of the Bastille.

I need not teach you what application capitalism has made of these eternal principles which by way of cynical raillery, she carves on the lintels of her prisons, her penitentiaries, her barracks and her halls of state.\* I will only remind you that savage and barbarous tribes, uncorrupted by civilization, living under the regime of common property, without inscribing anywhere these eternal principles, without ever formulating them, practice them in a manner more perfect than ever was dreamed of by the capitalists who discovered them in 1789.

It did not take long to determine the value of the promises of capitalism; the very day it opened its political shop, it commenced proceedings in bankruptcy. The constituent assembly, which formulated the rights of man and of the citizen and proclaimed equality before the law, discussed and voted, in 1790, an electoral act which established inequality before the law; no one was to be a voter but the "active citizen" paying in money a direct tax equal to three days' labor, and no one was to be eligible to office but the citizen paying a direct tax of a "silver mark," about 55 francs. "But under the law of the silver mark," clamored Loustalot, Desmoulins and the intellectualists without real estate, "Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose 'Social Contract' is the bible of the revolution, would be capable neither of voting nor of holding office." The electoral law deprived so many citizens of political rights, that in the municipal elections of 1795, at Paris, a city which counted about half a million inhabitants, there were but 12,000 voters, Bailly was chosen mayor by 10,000 votes.

If the eternal principles were not new, it is also true that the flattering promises made by the intellectuals had already begun to be realized before the advent of capitalism to power. The church, which is a theoretic democracy, opens her bosom to all. That they may enter, all lay aside their titles and privileges, and all can aspire to the highest positions; popes have risen from the lower ranks of society. Sixtus Fifth had in his youth tended swine. The church of the middle ages jealously attracted to herself the thinkers and men of learning, although she respected the wishes of those who wished to remain laymen, but extended

\*Ever since the French Revolution the law has required the words "Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite" to be placed over the door of every public building in France.—Translator.

over them her protection and her favors; she allowed them all boldness of thought, on the single condition of keeping up the appearance of faith, and never leaving her enclosure to lavish themselves upon the vulgar. Thus Copernicus might write and dedicate to the pope his "treatise on the revolution of the celestial bodies," in which, contrary to the teaching of the Bible, he proves that the earth turns around the sun. But Copernicus was a canon at Frannbourg and he wrote in Latin. When a century later Galileo, who was not identified with the clergy and who on the contrary sought the protection of the secular authorities, professed publicly, at Venice and Florence, the theories of Copernicus, the Vatican stretched out its terrible hand over him and forced the illustrious old man to deny his scientific belief. Even after the crisis of Protestantism, the church preserved its liberality toward the scientists who belonged to it. Mersenne, a monk of the order of the Minimes, one of the great geometers of the seventeenth century, a precursor and friend of Descartes, corresponded freely with Hobbes, the father of modern materialism; the notes of the French edition of "De Cive" contain fragments of this correspondence.

The church, in keeping up this liberal conduct, may have been animated by a disinterested love of pure science, but what chiefly concerned her was the interest of her dominancy; she wished to monopolize the intellectuals and science, just as in the old theocratic Egypt the priests had done to whom the Greek thinkers resorted in search of the first elements of science and philosophy.

It would be insulting capitalism to attribute to it a disinterested love of science, which from its point of view has no reason for existence except on the sole condition of utilizing natural forces to the enhancement of its wealth. It cares nothing for pure speculation and it is by way of self-defence that it allows its scientists to devote their mental energy to theoretic researches instead of exhausting it on practical applications. This contempt for pure speculation is shown under a philosophic form in the positivism of Auguste Comte, who embodies so well the narrowness of the groveling spirit of capitalism.

But if science apart from its industrial applications does not interest the bourgeoisie their solicitude for the intellectuals takes on none of the forms which we saw in that of the church, and nowhere is their indifference to them better shown than in the relative position of material property and of intellectual property before the law.

Material property, whatever its origin, is by capitalist law a thing eternal; it is forever assured to its possessor; it is handed down from father to son to the end of the centuries, and no civil or political power may lay upon it a sacrilegious hand. We have lately seen a characteristic example of this inviolability of material property.

The keeper of the signal station at Durban transmitted to the Boers heliographic dispatches informing them regarding the ships which entered the harbor, the men, the horses and the munitions of war which they transported. His treason brought him 125,000 francs, which, like an intelligent capitalist, he deposited in the bank. The English military authorities seized the traitor, condemned him and shot him, but they respected his property so honorably acquired, and his widow and son are now its legitimate possessors. The law, apart from certain variations, being the same in all capitalist countries, things go on in France as in England. No authority could lay hand on the property of Bazaine, nor make De Lesseps, Cottu and their families disgorge the millions artfully extracted from the "lambs" on Panama canal stock.

This legal sanctity of property is a new thing, in France it dates from the revolution of 1789. The old regime, which had small respect for this sort of property, authorized the confiscation of the property of those legally condemned, and the abolition of confiscation is one of the first reforms demanded in the petitions of Paris and several provincial cities to the states general. Capitalism, by forbidding the confiscation of property obtained by fraudulent and infamous means, proclaims that the source of its fortune is quite as fraudulent and infamous as that of criminals and traitors.

Capitalist law has none of these amenities for intellectual property. Literary and artistic property such as the law protects at all has but a precarious life, limited to the life of the author and a certain time after his death—fifty years according to the latest legislation; that time passed, it lapses into common property; for example, beginning with March of this year, any publisher has the right to bring out for his own profit the works of Balzac, the genius of romantic literature.

Literary property, though a matter of interest to publishers, who are certainly few in number, brings no benefit to the mass of the capitalist class, but not so with property in inventions which is of prime importance to all the manufacturing and mercantile capitalists. Consequently over it the law extends no protection. The inventor, if he wishes to defend his intellectual property against capitalist pirates, must begin by buying that right, taking out a patent, which he must renew every year; on the day he misses a payment, his intellectual property becomes the lawful prey of the robbers of capitalism. Even if he pays, he can secure that right only for a time; in France, fourteen years. And during these few years, not long enough generally to get his invention fully introduced into practical industry, it is he, the inventor, who at his own expense has to set in motion the machinery of the law against the capitalist pirates who rob him.

The trade-mark, which is a capitalistic property that never required any intellectual effort, is on the contrary indefinitely protected by law like material property.

It is with reluctance that the capitalist class has granted the inventor the right of defending his intellectual property, for by virtue of its position as the ruling class it regards itself as entitled to the fruits of intellectual labor as well as of manual labor; just as the feudal lord asserted his right of possession over the property of his serfs. The history of the inventions of our century is the monstrous story of their spoliation by the capitalists; it is a long and melancholy roll of martyrs. The inventor, by the very fact of his genius, is condemned with his family to ruin and suffering.

It is not only inventions requiring long and laborious study, heavy outlay for their completion and long time for their introduction, that plunge the inventor into the inferno of poverty; this is equally true of inventions that are most simple, most immediately applicable and most fertile in rich results. I will mention but one example: there lately died at Paris in extreme poverty a man whose invention saves millions of francs a year to the railroads and mining companies; he had discovered a way to utilize the mountains of coal dust that encumbered the neighborhood of wharfs and mines by converting it into "briquettes," such as are today in common use for fuel.

The capitalist bourgeoisie, the most revolutionary class that ever oppressed human societies, cannot increase its wealth without continuously revolutionizing the means of production, continuously incorporating into its industrial equipment new applications of mechanics, chemistry and physics. Its thirst for inventions is so insatiable that it creates factories for inventions. Certain American capitalists united in constructing for Edison at Menlo Park the most wonderful laboratory in the world, and in putting at his disposal trained scientists, chosen workmen, and the ordinary materials necessary to make and keep on making inventions which the capitalists patent, exploit or sell. Edison, who is himself a shrewd business man, has taken care to secure for himself a part of the benefits brought by the Menlo Park inventions.

But not all inventors are able like Edison to dictate terms to the capitalists who equip invention factories. The Thompson-Houston Company at Paris and Siemens at London and Berlin,\* in connection with their plants for turning out electrical machinery, have laboratories where ingenious men are kept busy

\*It is a well-known fact that in the American establishments of these and similar companies each workman before receiving employment must sign papers transferring to the corporation the title to all inventions made by him while in its service.—Translator.

searching out new applications of electricity. At Frankfort the manufactory of aniline dyes, the largest in the world, where anti-pyrine, that mineral quinine, was discovered, keeps on its pay roll more than a hundred chemists to discover new products in the prolific waters of coal-tar. Each discovery is at once patented by the house, which, by way of encouragement, gives a reward to the inventor.

We may up to a certain point regard all factories and workshops as laboratories for inventions, since a considerable number of improvements in machinery have been devised by workmen in the course of their work. The inventor having no money to patent and apply his discovery, the employer takes out the patent in his own name, and in accordance with the spirit of capitalist justice, it is he who reaps all the benefit. When the government takes it into its head to reward talent, it is the employer who receives the decoration; the inventive workman, who is not an intellectual, continues to revolve like the other machines under the black and greasy number which distinguishes him, and as in this capitalist world he must be content with little, he consoles himself for his poverty by the reflection that his invention is bringing wealth and honor to his employer.

The capitalist class, which to increase its wealth is in pressing need of inventions, is in even more imperative need of intellectuals to supervise their application and to direct its industrial machinery. The capitalists, before they equipped invention factories, had organized factories to turn out intellectuals. Dollfus, Scherer-Kestner and other employees of Alsace, the most intelligent, most philanthropic and consequently the heaviest exploiters in France before the war, had founded with their spare pennies at Mulhouse, schools of design, of chemistry and of physics, where the brightest children of their workmen were instructed gratis, in order that they might always have at hand and at a reasonable figure the intellectual capacities required for carrying on their industries. Twenty years ago the directors of the Mulhouse school persuaded the municipal council of Paris to establish the city school of chemistry and physics. At the beginning, whether it is still the case I do not know, the pupils were recruited in the common schools, they received a higher education, gratis, a dinner at noon at the school, and 50 francs a month to indemnify the parents for the loss from the fact that their sons were not in the workshop.

On the platform of the constituent assembly of 1790 the Marquis of Foucault could declare that to be a laborer it was not necessary to know how to read and write. The necessities of industrial production compel the capitalist of today to speak in language altogether different; his economic interests and not his

love of humanity and of science force him to encourage and to develop both elementary and higher education.

But the slave merchants of ancient Rome were, by the same title, patrons of education. To the more intelligent of their human merchandise they gave instruction in medicine, philosophy, Greek literature, music, etc. The education of the slave enhanced his market value. The slave who was an expert cook brought a better figure than the slave doctor, philosopher or literator. In our days it is still so; the big capitalists pay their chief cooks better than the state pays the professors of liberal arts, even though they be members of the institute. But contrary to the practice of the Roman slave merchants, our capitalist class lavishes instruction only in order to depress the selling price of intellectual capacity.

Jaures in his preface to the Socialist History of France says that "the intellectual Bourgeoisie, offended by a brutal and commercial society and disenchanted with the bourgeois power, is rallying to the support of socialism." Unfortunately nothing could be less exact. This transformation of the intellectual faculties into merchandise, which ought to have filled the intellectuals with wrath and indignation, leaves them indifferent. Never would the free citizen of the ancient republics of Athens and Rome have submitted to such degradation. The free man who sells his work, says Cicero, lowers himself to the rank of the slaves. Socrates and Plato were indignant against the Sophists who required pay for their philosophic teaching, for to Socrates and Plato thought was too noble a thing to be bought and sold like carrots and shoes. Even the French clergy of 1789 resented as a mortal insult the proposition to pay a salary for worship. But our intellectuals are accustoming themselves to such degradation.

Spurred on by the mercantile passion, they are never better satisfied with themselves or with society than when they succeed in selling their intellectual merchandise at a good price; they have even come to the point of making its selling price the measure of its value. Zola, who is one of the most distinguished representatives of literary intellectualism, estimates the artistic value of a novel by the number of editions sold. To sell their intellectual merchandise has become in them such an all-absorbing principle that if one speaks to them of socialism, before they inquire into its theories, they ask whether in the socialistic society intellectual labor will be paid for and whether it will be rewarded equally with manual labor.

Imbeciles! they have eyes but they see not that it is the capitalist bourgeoisie which establishes that degrading equality; and to increase its wealth degrades intellectual labor to the point of paying it at a lower rate than manual labor.

We should have to put off the triumph of socialism not to the year 2000 but to the end of the world if we had to wait upon the delicate, shrinking and impressionable hesitancy of the intellectuals. The history of the century is at hand to teach us just how much we have a right to expect from these gentlemen.

Since 1789 governments of the most diverse and opposed character have succeeded each other in France; and always, without hesitation the intellectuals have hastened to offer their devoted services. I am not merely speaking of those two-for-a-cent intellectuals who litter up the newspapers, the parliaments and the economic associations; but I mean the scientists, the university professors, the members of the Institute; the higher they raise their heads, the lower they bow the knee.

Princes of science, who ought to have conversed on equal terms with kings and emperors, have marketed their glory to buy offices and favors from ephemeral ministers. Cuvier, one of the mightiest geniuses of the modern era, whom the revolution took from the household of a nobleman to make of him at 25 years one of the museum professors, Cuvier took the oath of allegiance and served with fidelity the Republic, Napoleon, Louis XVIII, Charles X and Louis Philippe, the last of whom created him a peer of France to reward him for his career of servility.

To devote one's self to all governments without distinction is not enough. Pasteur placed his glorious name at the service of the financiers, who placed him in the administrative council of the Credit Foncier, side by side with Jules Simon, with dukes and counts, with senators, deputies and ex-ministers, in order to entrap the "lambs." When De Lesseps was equipping his colossal swindle of the Panama canal, he enrolled the intellectuals of the Institute, of the French Academy, of literature, of the clergy, of all the circles of higher life.

It is not in the circle of the intellectuals, degraded by centuries of capitalist oppression, that we must seek examples of civic courage and moral dignity. They have not even the sense of professional class-consciousness. At the time of the Dreyfus affair, a certain minister bounced, as if he had been a mere prison guard, one of the professors of chemistry in the Polytechnic school who had had the rare courage to give public expression to his opinion. When in a factory the employer dismisses a workman in too arbitrary a fashion, his comrades grumble, and sometimes quit work, even though misery and hunger await them in the street.

All his colleagues in the Polytechnic school bowed their heads in silence; each one crouched in self-regarding fear, and what is still more characteristic, not a single partisan of Dreyfus in the Society of the Rights of Man or in the ranks of the press raised a voice to remind them of the idea of professional solidarity. The intellectuals who on all occasions display their transcendental

ethics, have still a long road to travel before they reach the moral plane of the working class and of the socialist party.

The scientists have not only sold themselves to the governments and the financier; they have also sold science itself to the capitalist-bourgeoisie. When in the eighteenth century there was need to prepare the minds of men for revolution, by sapping the ideologic foundations of aristocratic society, then science fulfilled its sublime mission of freedom; it was revolutionary; it furiously attacked Christianity and the intuitional philosophy. But when the victorious bourgeoisie decided to base its new power on religion, it commanded its socialists, its philosophers and its men of letters to raise up what they had overthrown; they responded to the need with enthusiasm. They reconstructed what they had demolished; they proved by scientific, sentimental and romantic argument the existence of God the father, of Jesus the son and of Mary the virgin mother. I do not believe history offers a spectacle equal to that presented in the first years of the nineteenth century by the philosophers, the scientists and the literary men, who from revolutionaries and materialists suddenly transformed themselves into reactionaries, intuitionalists and Catholics.

This backward movement still continues; when Darwin published his *Origin of Species*, which took away from God his robe of creator in the organic world, as Franklin had despoiled him of his thunderbolt, we saw the scientists, big and little, university professors and members of the Institute, enrolling themselves under the orders of Flourens, who for his own part had at least his eighty years for an excuse, that they might demolish the Darwinian theory, which was displeasing to the government and hurtful to religious beliefs. The intellectuals exhibited that painful spectacle in the fatherland of Lanark and of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, the creators of the evolution theory, which Darwin completed and defended against criticism.

Today, now that the clerical anxiety is somewhat appeased, the scientists venture to profess the evolution theory, which they never opposed without a protest from their scientific conscience, but they turn it against socialism so as to keep in the good graces of the capitalists. Herbert Spencer, Haeckel and the greatest men in the school of Darwinism demonstrate that the classification of individuals into rich and poor, idlers and laborers, capitalists and wage-earners, is the necessary result of the inevitable laws of nature, instead of being the fulfillment of the law and the justice of God. Natural selection, they say, which has differentiated the organs of the human body, has forever fixed the ranks and the functions of the social body. They have, through servility, even lost the logical spirit. They are indignant against Aristotle because he, being unable to conceive of the abolition of

slavery, declared that the slave was marked off by nature; but they fail to see that they are saying something equally monstrous when they affirm that natural selection assigns to each one his place in society.

Thus it is no longer God or religion which lead the workers to wretchedness,—it is science. Never was there an intellectual bankruptcy more fraudulent.

M. Brunetieres, one of those intellectuals who do not feel their degradation and who joyfully fulfill their servile task, was right when he proclaimed the failure of science. He does not suspect how colossal this bankruptcy is.

Science, the great emancipator, which has tamed the powers of nature, and might in so doing have freed man from toil so that he could develop freely his faculties of mind and body; science, become the slave of capital, has done nothing but supply means for capitalists to increase their wealth, and to intensify their exploitation of the working class. Its most wonderful applications to industrial technique have brought to the children, the women and the men of the working class nothing but overwork and misery!

The middle-class revolutionary party of 1789 cried out in horror and indignation against the lords, who through the long summer nights compelled their servants to beat the ponds near their castles in order to keep the frogs from croaking. What would they say if they saw what we see? Improvements in lighting date from the capitalist period. At the end of the last century Argant and Carcel invented the lamp with a double current of air, at the beginning of this Chevreul invented the stearic candle, then gas was discovered, then petroleum, then the electric light, turning night into day. What benefits have these scientific improvements in lighting brought to the workers? They have enabled employers to impose night work upon millions of proletarians, no longer in the midsummer nights and in the balmy air of the fields, but through nights of summer and winter in the poisonous air of the workshops and factories. The industrial applications of mechanics and chemistry have transformed the happy and stimulating work of the artisan into a torture which exhausts and kills the proletarian.

When Science subdued the forces of nature to the service of man, ought she not to have given leisure to the workers that they might develop themselves physically and intellectually; ought she not to have changed the "vale of tears" into a dwelling place of peace and joy? I ask you, has not Science failed in her mission of emancipation?

The obtuse capitalist himself is conscious of this failure; so he directs his economists and his other intellectual domestics to prove to the working class that it has never been so happy and that its lot goes on improving.

The economists, considering that to deserve the good graces of the capitalists it was not enough to falsify economic facts, are suppressing economic science, which is becoming dangerous for the domination of capital. Since Adam Smith and Ricardo they limit themselves to sifting over the same errors regarding value, regarding the productivity of the predatory and idle capitalist, to compiling facts and arranging statistics which guide the capitalists in their speculations; but they dare not draw conclusions and build systems with the materials that they have accumulated. When Ricardo wrote, the phenomena of modern production were beginning their evolution, their communist tendencies could not be perceived, one could then study them without taking sides and could build up a science without fear of wounding the interests of capital. But now that they have arrived at their full development and show clearly their communal tendencies, the economists put out their own eyes that they may not see, and they wage war against the principles established by Ricardo, which after having served as a basis for the old bourgeois economy, have become the points of departure of the Marxian economy. To take a whack at the socialist theories and put themselves at the service of the financiers, like barkers and fakirs of their bogus goods, are the intellectual functions of the economists. Latterly the owners of silver mines have enlisted them to sing the praises of bimetallism, while Cecil Rhodes, Barnato, Beil, Robbers & Company called them in to boom the Transvaal gold mines.

The intellectuals of art and literature, like the jesters of the old feudal courts, are the entertainers of the class which pays them. To satisfy the tastes of the capitalists and beguile their leisure,—this is their whole artistic aim. The men of letters are so well broken to this servile duty that they do not understand the spirit of Moliere, their great ancestor, all the while that they adore the letter of his works. Moliere is the writer most written about in France; learned men have devoted themselves to gathering up the scattered fragments of his erratic and careless youth, to fixing the date and the hour of the representations of his comedies; if they had unearthed an authentic piece of excrement from him they would have set it in gold and would kiss it devotedly, but the spirit of Moliere escapes them. You have read, as I have, many critical analyses of his dramas. Did you ever find one of them which brought out in clear light the role of this militant playwright, who more than a century before Beaumarchais and before the revolution, at Versailles, in the very court of the great monarch, thrust at the nobility of the court and of the provinces, attacked the church before which Descartes and the rest trembled, hurled his jests at Aristotle, the unquestioned authority of La Sorbonne, that secular church; who ridiculed the Pyrrhonism which the neo-Kantians of our own days oppose to the materialist

philosophy of Marxian socialism, but which then was the weapon of the Catholics, of Pascal, of Huet, the bishop of Avranches, to strike and to overthrow human reason, with its impudent desire of reaching knowledge by its own strength. Pitiful, wretched reason, clamored these Kantians before Kant, you can know nothing without the aid of faith! Moliere is unique in European literature, you must go back to the epoch of imperial Athens to find his counterpart in Aristophanes.

If the bourgeois critics timidly and unintelligently mention this side of Moliere, there is another of which their ignorance is complete. Moliere was the man of his class, the champion of the bourgeois class. Like the socialists who say to the workers, "Break with the liberal bourgeoisie, which deceives you when it does not slaughter you;" he cried to the Georges Dandins and to the "bourgeois noblemen," "Avoid the nobles like pests; they deceive you, mock you and rob you."

The great capitalist bourgeoisie does not choose to work, either with its hands or its brain; it chooses merely to drink, to eat, to practice lewdness and to look dignified in its beastly and cumbersome luxury; it does not even deign to occupy itself with politics; men like Rothschild, De Lesseps, Vanderbilt, Carnegie, Rockefeller, do not run for office; they find it more economical to buy the officers than the voters, and more convenient to put their clerks into the ministries than to take part in parliamentary struggles. The big capitalists interest themselves only in the operations of the stock exchange, which afford the delights of gambling; they dignify these by the pompous name of "speculations,"—a word formerly reserved for the highest processes of philosophical or mathematical thought. The capitalists are replacing themselves in the supervision and management of the great industrial and commercial enterprises by intellectuals, who carry them on, and usually are well paid for doing so. These intellectuals of industry and politics, the privileged portion of the wage class, imagine that they are an integral part of the capitalist class, while they are only its servants; on every occasion they take up its defense against the working class, which finds in them its worst enemies.

Intellectuals of this description can never be led into socialism; their interests are too closely bound to the capitalist class for them to detach themselves and turn against it. But below these favored few there is a swarming and famishing throng of intellectuals whose lot grows worse in proportion to the increase of their numbers. These intellectuals belong to socialism. They ought to be already in our ranks. It ought to be true that their education would have given them intelligence to deal with social problems, but it is this very education which obstructs their hearing and keeps them away from socialism. They think their

education confers on them a social privilege, that it will permit them to get through the world by themselves, each making his own way in life by crowding his neighbor or standing on the shoulders of everyone else. They imagine that their poverty is transitory and that they only need a stroke of good luck to transform them into capitalists. Education, they think, is the lucky number in the social lottery, and it will bring them the grand prize. They do not perceive that this ticket given them by the capitalist class is fixed, that labor, whether manual or intellectual, has no chance to do more than earn its daily pittance, that it has nothing to hope for but to be exploited, and that the more capitalism goes on developing, the more do the chances of an individual raising himself out of his class go on diminishing.

And while they build castles in Spain, capital crushes them, as it has crushed the little merchants and the little manufacturers, who thought they, too, with free credit and a little luck, might become first-class capitalists, whose names should be written in the Great Book of the Public Debt.

The intellectuals, in all that has to do with the understanding of the social movement, do not rise above the intellectual level of those little bourgeois who scoffed so fiercely at the bunglers of 1830, who, after being ruined and merged in the proletariat, none the less continue to detest socialism; to such a degree were their heads perverted by the religion of property. The intellectuals, whose brains are stuffed with all the prejudices of the bourgeois class, are inferior to those little bourgeois of 1830 and 1848 who at least knew the smell of gunpowder; they have not their spirit of combativeness, they are true imbeciles,—if we restore to this word its original Latin meaning of unsuited for war. Without resistance they endure rebuffs and wrongs and they do not think of uniting, of organizing themselves to defend their interests and give battle to capital on the economic field.

The intellectual proletariat as we know it is a recent growth, it has especially developed in the last forty years. When after the amnesty of the condemned of the Commune, we began again the socialist propaganda, believing that it would be easy to draw the intellectuals into the movement we took up our dwelling in their cultured Latin quarter, Guesde taking his residence in the Rue de la Pitie, Vaillant in the Rue Monge, and I in the Boulevard de Port Royal. We became acquainted with hundreds of young men, students of law, of medicines, of the sciences, but you can count on your fingers those whom we brought into the socialist camp. Our ideas attracted them one day, but the next day the wind blew from another quarter and turned their heads.

An honorable merchant of Bordeaux, a prominent member of the municipal council, said in the time of the empire to my father, who was disturbed over my socialism:

"Friend Lafargue, you must let youth take its course; I was a socialist when I studied at Paris, I was connected with the secret societies and I took part in the movement for demanding of Louis Philippe the pardon of Barbes." The young men of our age turn quickly, let them get back to their homes and they develop prominent abdomens and become reactionaries.

We welcomed joyfully the entrance of Jaures into socialism; we thought that the new form which he brought to our propaganda would make it penetrate into circles that we had not been able to touch. He has in fact made a decided impression on the university circle, and we owe it in part to him that the meetings of the normal school have ideas regarding the social movement which are a little less absurd and formless than those with which their learning and intelligence have hitherto been contented. Lately, joining forces with the radical politicians who had lost their working-class following, they have invaded the socialist party. Their souls overflow with the purest intentions; if their peaceful habits prevents them from throwing themselves into the conflict, and if their lofty culture forbids them to take their place in the ranks of the comrades, they nevertheless condescend to instruct us in ethics, to polish off our ignorance, to teach us, to impart to us such bits of science as we may be able to digest, and to direct us; they modestly offer themselves to us as leaders and schoolmasters.

These intellectuals who for years have had it for their duty to wear out trousers on the benches of the university that they might become experts on exercises, polishers of phrases, philosophers or doctors, imagine one can improvise himself into a master of the socialist theory by attending one lecture or by the careless reading of one pamphlet. Naturalists who had felt the need of painful research to learn the habits of mollusks or of the polyps who live in a community on the coral banks, think that they know enough to regulate human societies, and that by keeping their stand on the first steps of the ascending ladder of animal life they can the better discern the human ideal. The philosophers, the moralists, the historians and the politicians have aims equally lofty; they bring an abundant supply of ideas and a new method of action to replace the imperfect theory and tactics which in all capitalist countries have served to build up socialist parties strong in numbers, unity and discipline.

The class struggle is out of fashion, declare these professors of socialism. Can a line of demarcation be drawn between classes? Do not the working people have savings bank accounts of \$20, \$40 and \$100, bringing them 50 cents, \$1.50 and \$3.00 of interest yearly? Is it not true that the directors and managers of mines, railroads and financial houses are wage-workers, having their functions and duties in the enterprises which they manage for the

account of capitalists? The argument is unanswerable, but by the same token there is no vegetable kingdom nor animal kingdom because we can not separate them "with an ax," as it were, for the reason that at their points of contact, vegetables and animals merge into each other. There is no longer any day or any night because the sun does not appear on the horizon at the same moment all over the earth, and because it is day at the antipodes while it is night here.

The concentration of capital? A worn-out tune of 1850. The corporations by their stocks and bonds parcel out property and distribute it among all the citizens. How blinded we were by our sectarianism when we thought that this new form of property, essentially capitalistic, was enabling the financiers to plunge their thieving hands into the smallest purses, to extract the least pieces of silver.

The poverty of the working class! But it is diminishing and soon will disappear through the constant increase of wages, while interest on money is constantly diminishing; some fine day it will descend to zero and the bourgeois will be overjoyed to offer their beloved capital on the altar of socialism. Tomorrow or next day the capitalist will be forced to work, is the prediction of Mr. Waldeck-Rousseau. And there are intellectuals whose condition grows worse in proportion as capitalism develops, who are stultified by the utterances of the employers to a point where they affirm that the position of wage-workers is improving, and there are intellectuals who assume to possess some knowledge of political economy, who affirm that interest on money is rapidly diminishing. Could these reformers of socialism perchance be ignorant that Adam Smith calculated at the end of the eighteenth century that 3 per cent was the normal interest of capital running no risk, and that the financiers of our own epoch consider that it is still around 3 per cent that the interest rate must fluctuate. If a few years ago this rate seemed to fall below  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, it has risen today above 3 per cent. Capital is merchandise, like intellectual capacities and carrots; as such it is subject to the fluctuations of supply and demand. It was then more offered than demanded, whereas since the development of the industrial plant of Russia, since the opening of China to European exploitation, etc., the over supply of capital has been absorbed and its price rises with its scarcity. But the intellectuals have too many trifles to think of and too many harmonious phrases to balance for giving any thought to economic phenomena. They take at face value the artful fabrications of the capitalists, and repeat with pious conviction the old litanies of the orthodox economic church: "There are no classes, wealth is coming to be distributed more and more equitably, the workers are growing richer and those living on incomes are growing

poorer, and the capitalist society is the best of all possible societies; these truths shine forth like suns and none but partisans and mystics can deny them."

These intellectuals propose to modify the tactics as well as the theories of the socialist party; they wish to impose upon it a new method of action. It must no longer strive to conquer the public powers by a great struggle, legal or revolutionary as need may be, but let itself be conquered by every ministry of a republican coalition; it is no longer to oppose the socialist party to all the bourgeois parties; what is needed is to put it at the service of the liberal party; we must no longer organize it for the class struggle, but keep it ready for all the compromises of politicians. And to further the triumph of the new method of action, they propose to disorganize the socialist party, to break up its old systems and to demolish the organizations which for twenty years have labored to give the workers a sense of their class interests and to group them in a party of economic and political struggle.

But the intellectuals will have their trouble for nothing; thus far they have only succeeded in drawing closer the ties uniting the socialists of the different organizations, and in covering themselves with ridicule.

The intellectuals ought to have been the first of all the various groups to revolt against capitalist society, in which they occupy a subordinate position so little in keeping with their hopes and their talents, but they do not even understand it; they have such a confused idea of it that Auguste Comte, Renan, and others more or less distinguished have cherished the dream of reviving for their benefit an aristocracy copied after the model of the Chinese mandarin system. Such an idea is a reflection of past ages in their heads, for nothing is in more absolute opposition with the modern social movement than such pretensions. The intellectuals in previous states of society formed a world outside and above that of production, having charge only of education, of the direction of religious worship, and of the political administration.

The mechanic industry of these societies combine in the same producer, manual labor and intellectual labor; it was for example the same cabinetmaker who designed and worked out the piece of furniture, who bought its first material and who even undertook its sale. Capitalist production has divorced two functions which once were indissolubly united; on the one side it puts the manual workers, who become more and more servants of the machine, and on the other the intellectual workers, engineers, chemists, managers, etc. But these two categories of workers, however different and contrary they may be in their education and habits, are welded together, to the point that a capitalist industry can not be carried on without manual laborers any more than without intellectual wage-workers.

United in production, united under the yoke of capitalist exploitation, united they should be also in revolt against the common enemy. The intellectuals, if they understood their own real interests, would come in crowds to socialism, not through philanthropy, not through pity for the miseries of the workers, not through affectation and snobbery, but to save themselves, to assure the future welfare of their wives and children, to fulfill their duty to their class. They ought to be ashamed at being left behind in the social battle by their comrades in the manual category. They have many things to teach them, but they have still much to learn from them; the working men have a practical sense superior to theirs, and have given proof of an instinctive intuition of the communist tendencies of modern capitalism which is lacking to the intellectuals, who have only been able by a conscious mental effort to arrive at this conception. If only they had understood their own interests, they would long since have turned against the the capitalist class the education which it has generously distributed in order better to exploit them; they would have utilized their intellectual capacities, which are enriching their masters, as so many improved weapons to fight capitalism and to conquer the freedom of their class, the wage-working class.

Capitalist production, which has overthrown the old conditions of life and of work, has elaborated new forms, which already can be discerned without supernatural vision, but which to the intellectuals remain sealed under seven seals. One of the leading lights of intellectualism, M. Durkheim, in his book, "The Division of Labor," which made some noise in university circles, can not conceive of society except on the social pattern of ancient Egypt, each laborer remaining, his life through, penned up in one single trade. However, unless one is so unfortunate as to be affected by the hopeless near-sightedness of the normal school, one can not help seeing that the machine is suppressing trades, one after the other, in a way to let only one survive, that of the machinist, and that when it has finished its revolutionary work which the socialists will complete by revolutionizing capitalist society, the producer of the communist society will plow and sow with the machine today, will spin, will turn wood or polish steel tomorrow, and will exercise in turn all the trades to the greater profit of his health and his intelligence.

The industrial applications of mechanics, chemistry and physics, which, monopolized by capital, oppress the worker, will, when they shall be common property, emancipate man and give him leisure and liberty.

Mechanical production, which under capitalist direction can only buffet the worker back and forth from periods of over-work to periods of enforced idleness, will when developed and regulated by a communist administration, require from the producer to

provide for the normal needs of society, only a maximum day of two or three hours in the workshop, and when this time of necessary social labor is fulfilled he will be able to enjoy freely the physical and intellectual pleasures of life.

The artist then will paint, will sing, will dance, the writer will write, the musician will compose operas, the philosopher will build systems, the chemist will analyze substances not to gain money, to receive a salary, but to deserve applause, to win laurel wreaths, like the conquerors at the Olympic games, but to satisfy their artistic and scientific passion; one does not drink a glass of champagne or kiss the woman he loves for the benefit of the gallery. The artist and the scientist may then repeat the enthusiastic words of Kepler, that hero of science: "The elector of Saxony with all his wealth can not equal the pleasure I have felt in composing the *Mysterium Cosmographicum*."

Will not the intellectuals end by hearing the voice of the socialist calling them to the rescue, to emancipate science and art from the capitalist yoke, to liberate thought from the slavery of commercialism?

## DANGEROUS QUESTIONS.

---

The capitalist parties and press of the United States, like those of all other countries, find their principal function in diverting the exploited workers from all questions which might attract their attention to the irreconcilable conflict existing between them and their exploiters, and which might lead to their emancipation. But economic development is more powerful than political caucuses and platform makers, and that development has this year forced to the front a series of questions that touch the very foundation of the capitalistic social organization. The attempts made either to entirely avoid these subjects or to discuss and disagree about them without touching these basic positions is almost ludicrous.

### TRUSTS.

Trusts are the logical result of the competitive system operating under a regime of private property, and to discuss them without touching those institutions is to play Hamlet with Hamlet left out. Both parties attempted this impossible feat. They sought to advocate "regulation" within existing social organization. But this was so simple, easy and harmless that both parties claimed it as their method of settling the problem. The Republican party, which is controlled, owned, dominated, officered and financed by the great trust magnates, was nevertheless willing to go further in the application of this "remedy" than its opponent, and proposed a constitutional amendment to give Congress greater power to deal with these obnoxious creations. The Democratic party, however, still continued to pose as the particular friend of those who had been hit by the trusts. Its speakers and writers claimed to be filled with a deep and undying hatred of all things in any way connected with these terrible objects. Judge of their discomfiture when it was discovered that the leaders and officers of Tammany Hall, without whose support no Democratic party could hope to win, were the owners of the great New York Ice Trust, and that the whole strength of that organization and the Democratic administration of New York city was being used to secure special favors from the municipality for the trust.

Then when the Kansas City convention met it interrupted its denunciation of the trusts long enough to decide a contested seat in favor of Senator Clark of Montana, one of the principal owners and managers of the Copper Trust, and who had just been expelled from the United States Senate for having been awkward enough to get caught in bribing his way into that notorious millionaires' club. Rumor has it that his way into the aforesaid Dem-

ocratic convention was smoothed by a two million dollar donation to the campaign fund; but, however, that may be, enough had happened to show that the "trust issue" was a decidedly dangerous thing to handle, and so it was relegated to a back seat by both parties.

#### THE NEGRO QUESTION.

Another question to be avoided by all capitalist parties is the treatment of the negroes in the Southern states. Space does not here permit to show how, by the entrance of northern factories into the "black belt" upon the one hand and the importation of negroes by Northern employers to crush labor unions upon the other, the "negro question" has become simply a part of the "labor problem," so that his old friends (?) the Republican party are no longer interested in his welfare, but, on the contrary, have a very active interest in keeping him, in common with the whole laboring class, from seeking his own interests at the ballot box. Thus it is that the Democratic party is left unmolested in its violation of that bulwark of capitalism, the United States Constitution, and permitted to work its will upon the helpless blacks. This permits the Democratic party to pose before the country as the particular exponent of the idea that "All governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and to flood the country with literature demanding that the Filipinos, Cubans, and Porto Ricans be given the full and unrestricted ballot, while at the same time they are enacting and rigorously enforcing laws completely disenfranchising a majority of the voters throughout the Southern states of the union. Worse yet, while this same Democratic party is convulsed with "thrills of horror" over the wrongs that are committed upon the inhabitants of some far-off Pacific islands they are lending encouragement and protection to the burning and torturing of uncondemned and untried negroes by furious mobs of white Democratic voters.

#### GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION.

Notwithstanding the fact that the legislative bodies are completely in the control of the capitalist class it is not always possible for these bodies to foresee all emergencies that might arise and anticipate all desires of their masters. So it has been found much more effective in time of strike to have a judge declare that whatever the employers desired was law and to enjoin the laborers from violating this "made to order" legislation. With this plan also it was possible to punish the objecting employees for contempt without the troublesome formality of a jury trial. So flagrant have these acts become that even the most stupid of the workers have been aroused and there has been a general protest

against "government by injunction." The Democratic party, not recognizing that this procedure was an essential part of our present class governed social organization, attempted to use this discontent as an issue. But within the last few months two of the most famous injunctions that have ever been issued were sent out by Democratic judges,—Judge Hook, of Kansas City, coming to the rescue of the street car owners at the time of a recent strike with a blanket injunction forbidding the workers from doing almost everything but eating, and even assisting their employers in curtailing that privilege, while another Democratic judge in Augusta, Georgia, made it a crime for the laborers of that city to boycott a "rat" paper. It is needless to say that neither of these judges have been disavowed or even criticised by the party to which they owe allegiance.

#### THE BULL PEN.

Here is the hottest and most dangerous subject of all for any supporter of capitalism to touch. Here is a subject that neither Republican nor Democrat dare mention. Notwithstanding that outrages were perpetrated such as even despotic Russia would hesitate to attempt; notwithstanding that men were shut up in a living hell for months, without trial or even accusation and were tortured into madness and shot for insane ravings; notwithstanding that up to the present time the infamous "permit system" still remains in force, which forbids a man from even asking for work unless he has signed an agreement not to belong to a union, still not a word of protest can be raised by either party. The reason is easy to see. One is as deep in the mud as the other in the mire. While it was McKinley who sent the negro troops to commit the outrages, yet they were sent at the request of the Democratic-Populist governor, Steunenburg, who was the most active agent in carrying out the whole transaction and who has within the last few weeks declared that he was proud of the part he acted. So it was that the Democratic party of Ohio very promptly turned down Congressman Lentz, who attempted to attract public attention to the matter, and the Democratic representatives in Congress voted solidly with the Republicans against printing for public circulation the results of the investigation into the affair by the Congressional committee.

#### ANTI-EXPANSION.

All of these subjects having been discovered to be "too hot" for use as issues by parties standing on the capitalist position, the Democrats solved the problem by declaring "anti-militarism and anti-expansion" to be the great "issues." The Republicans

promptly accepted this position and "pointed with pride" to the fact that through expansion they had been able to get rid of all that the workers produced and trusted to being able to make them believe that the greatest blessing laborers could enjoy was to be kept steadily at work creating wealth for export, from which they would be allowed to retain enough to enable them to keep on working. But just as everything seemed thus happily settled the Chinese trouble arose and all the forces of capitalism were demanded to arouse the proper pitch of "patriotism." The stake was too great to admit of any division in the ranks of the ruling class. It would never do to let a little thing like a presidential "issue" endanger the chance of getting a slice of China. So the ridiculous spectacle is presented of this same Democratic party standing on an anti-expansion platform and howling for war with China. It really looks as if the pace of economic development were getting too swift for modern capitalist politicians and as if something would have to be done.

## THE KINGDOM OF COMPETITION.

---

The Kingdom of Competition is like unto a man that was a Newsdealer. He findeth ten street arabs, and sayeth unto them:

“Go to, Why caper ye up and down the gutter all the day long? Harken now and hear what I shall say unto thee. Stand ye here in a row by this curbstone, and I will straightway place one thousand papers on the curbstone which lieth over against you, and it shall come to pass that when all things are in readiness I will pucker up my lips and will make a shrill whistle unto you, and when ye shall hear the sound thereof ye shall all with one accord speedily cross over and take unto yourselves as many papers as ye can lay hold of, and behold, for every two papers ye sell ye shall receive one-half of one penny. If ye be diligent and crafty ye shall presently become millionaires and all men shall reverence you and call you blessed.”

Then when he had made an end of speaking, he did place the papers on the curbstone according to all that he had said. After the which he looked steadfastly upon them and puckering up the lips of his mouth he made a shrill whistle therewith. And it came to pass that when the street arabs heard the sound thereof that with one accord they began to pass hastily over to the other side. Now, because some were lesser than their fellows and not so mighty, they were beaten down and trampled into the mire and filth of the highway so that they came not near the papers at all. When the swift and the strong came to the curbstone they strove mightily one with another. Each laid hold of the same papers and because of their confusion the papers were rent so that they were no more of use to any man. Then he who was mightiest of all took with him five-score papers that were not rent and went his way and sold them.

And it came to pass than when he was returning unto the Newsdealer to pay unto him that which he had won for him that he might receive his recompense, behold, one who had been trampled into the mire and the filth of the highway laid wait for him and by strategy took from him one half of all that he possessed. Then he who had sold the papers came unto the Newsdealer saying:

“Behold, I was diligent and crafty, selling five-score papers I took with me. But even now as I was returning hither, was I taken in ambush and robbed of all I possessed. I pray thee, therefore, pay me the pennies that thou hast promised me and give me more papers to sell that I hunger not, thirst not, nor go naked.”

But the Newsdealer mocked him, saying:

"Ha, Ha, Go up, thou street urchin. Thou art a thief. I bade thee be crafty, but willed not that thou shouldst rob me."

Then he cast him into a dungeon and kept him there until he looked no more like one who might be trusted.

Again, the Kingdom of Competition is like unto a Sea in which dwelt one great shark and many little fishes.

Among the little fishes were some wiser than their brethren.

These lifted up their voices and gave counsel to the many, saying unto them:

"We are many, but we daily grow more lean. We strive day and night, one with another, and by our strife prove that no one loveth his brother. Behold, how fat the shark groweth. He spreadeth his fins and his tail over the sea so that there is no longer any room for fishes except before his face. All the hours of the day his gluttonous eyes are upon us, and those who go nigh unto him are swallowed by him. Our beauty fadeth, for the sea is slimy with the venom he hath spued into it. Look well to this matter. There lieth beyond us a day's journey, a sea, wherein no shark may dwell. Let us go hither that we may live in unity each striving for the other's glory and for his good. Then shall our beauty fill the sea with its radiance and the waters shall be sweet and pure."

Many who heard were glad and would have done according to all that was said to them; but the shark, who had grown very fearful lest they should do even as their brethren had counseled, lifted up his voice and spake:

"Harken not unto those busy-bodies, for they are defamers, speaking evil of dignitaries. They assail the powers ordained by the maker of all things to rule over you. They are defilers of the sea and the destroyers of your tranquility. Be wise, strive diligently to come near to my person, for he that comes nighest unto me shall be like unto me. It shall be well with him. He shall cease from troubling, for he shall be down with me and we shall be one."

Then one thought moved the great company of little fishes, and they pushed each other with head and shoulders, striving to come near to the person of the great shark. And it came to pass that when many were come very near to him, he opened wide his mouth with a great laugh and swallowed them. And great strife and confusion prevailed in the sea, for those that were nearest to the shark might not go from him because they that were behind did thrust them nearer to him.

So he waxed exceeding gross for many days, and then it came to pass that a mighty Sword-fish smote him so that he died.

Again the Kingdom of Competition is like unto a game of play which is surnamed Rugby. They that be strong do make a heap

of them that are weak. Then with much joy they do leap upon their backs. They pull the hairs of their heads, they bite their ears with their teeth and they smite them with their fists and with their feet, shouting with a loud voice:

“O, Competition, live forever, for thou art the incentive to noble deeds.”

O, ye Sons of Men, get ye knowledge, get ye wisdom. Drive before you every vision of the dreamers and sing, sing, sing:

“Glory, Glory, Glory be to Competition.”

*Walter A. Ratcliffe.*

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

### Monopolies and Trusts, Dr. R. T. Ely, Macmillan & Co.

Although it is nowhere stated as a thesis the whole aim and object of this book seems to be an attempt to disprove the socialist position that competition tends to concentration and monopoly. Aside from one chapter which is given up to a discussion of "The Law of Monopoly Price," and which announces as a "new law of monopoly charge" that "The greater the intensity of customary use, the higher the general average of economic well-being; and the more readily wealth is generally expended, the higher the monopoly charge which will yield the largest net returns," which after all is only a cumbersome and academic way of saying that the higher the standard of life the greater the room for exploitation, nearly the entire book is an argument for the thesis stated above. No one who reads this book can but feel how far removed Dr. Ely is from the time when he was a representative of the most advanced economic thought in this country. Then he was on the offensive against the fossilized Manchesterism of Laughlin and Sumner; today he is on the defensive against the advancing socialist thought. The reason for this is that notwithstanding Dr. Ely's exhaustive studies of socialism he has always insisted upon ignoring its fundamental position, that of the class struggle. He has always insisted upon considering it as a scheme of administration.

His whole position rests upon differences which he alleges exist between industries, enabling them to be divided into two classes, in only one of which the law of concentration of industry exists. He holds that aside from a few special industries, such as railways, telegraphs, telephones, gas, water works, etc., which he designates as "natural monopolies," competition is destined to continue. It is rather strange that one who is usually so careful of his terms should continue to employ a word at once misleading and meaningless. The word "nature" is one that has long been a refuge for quibblers and every social student knows what valiant service it has done the cause of confusion under the phrase of "natural rights." Nor does Dr. Ely in any way remove this confusion by his attempted explanation. He says (p. 43): "The term natural is here used in its well-understood and customary sense, to indicate something external to man's mind. A natural monopoly is one which, so far from giving expression to the will of society, grows up apart from man's will as expressed socially, and frequently in direct opposition to his will and de-

sire thus expressed." But there is nothing more sure than that the foundation of his so-called "natural monopolies" is in exact accord with the "will and desire" of the dominant class in our present society and are an outgrowth of the social organization which they support.

A rather ridiculous example of the existence of this very confusion in the mind of the author himself is seen on page 62, where he is trying to account for the fact that the ownership of street railways in different cities is being concentrated into the hands of a few individuals. Instead of taking the very obvious and reasonable explanation, which, however, is not in accord with his theory, that this is owing to the greater economy of unified management, he says: "It does not seem that there is any natural tendency that would lead to the ownership of all the street railways in the country by one combination of men. But . . . they must invest their money in some way and they naturally turn to street railways elsewhere."

When on pages 77-80 he attempts a classification of monopolies his whole distinction breaks down, and whenever he comes to a point where his actual question at issue must be discussed he simply dodges one side and takes refuge in *ex cathedra* statements. He finally makes a classification including "local monopolies," "social monopolies," and in general so broad as to make it easily possible in the future to get any industry that may be monopolized in under it and thus maintain the classification. This is followed by page after page of general indefinite arguments against the idea of monopoly existing outside this imaginary fence. It almost seems as if it were sought by this example of the cumulative method of arguing gone mad to so bewilder the reader that he will have at least a general impression that the fence is still intact. When this same method is applied to his arguments they fall flat. Take the series of statements that appear on p. 162 et seq. He attempts to explain away the fact of greater economy through large purchases by saying that "bargains may be picked up in a small way as well as in a large way." But he should know that for the large buyer it is not a case of chance "picking up," but of an absolute knowledge and choice of a great number of bargains entirely unknown to the smaller dealer. The statement that the purchaser on a large scale may by such purchasing raise the market price of the article bought is simply foolish, and is something of which so careful a writer as Dr. Ely should be ashamed. He knows full well that his illustration of purchases of land has no connection with the subject under discussion and can only serve to confuse, while in commercial purchases, which are supposed to be under discussion, the large buyer does not increase the total demand, but simply takes what

a large number of small buyers would have otherwise have purchased. Moreover the large buyer has a choice as to whether he shall buy in large or small quantities at a time, and has a much better opportunity to know when and where to buy the entire output advantageously than the small buyer. The whole argument abounds in mere "ipse dixit" statements that really involve the whole point at issue, as for example where he says concerning purchasing on a large scale (p. 162), "one sooner or later reaches the point of maximum effectiveness," or (p. 165), where he says concerning the growth of industry, "a point of maximum efficiency is sooner or later reached." At other times he betrays an ignorance of economic phenomena that in one with his great knowledge of detail is almost inexcusable. For example, concerning the relative stability of large and small companies, he says (p. 166), "many a small producer went through the crisis of 1893 with perfect safety; many a large company became bankrupt." But the fact is that of the failures in the five years, 1893-7, 87 per cent were of firms with less than \$5,000 capital, while only .24 of one per cent were for over \$50,000, which fact proves the exact reverse of what Dr. Ely would have us believe.

Another example of this same inexcusable ignorance, only this time it is of economic analysis rather than statistical facts, is seen where he gravely gives as an example of the new fixed charges that are supposed to appear with increased size that "a superintendent that can be had for fifteen hundred dollars a year has to give way to one who can command \$10,000, \$15,000 or even more. The bookkeeping has to be reorganized and made more expensive; new buildings must be constructed . . . spotters and private detectives employed." Does it never occur to the writer that the firm that makes these "expensive" changes has it in its power to choose between so doing and starting another small, and according to Dr. Ely, a more economical business? If they adopted another system of bookkeeping it was because so doing enabled them to keep better control of their business than the little firm. If they employed spotters it was to stop thefts that the smaller business could not afford to protect themselves against.

What Dr. Ely has really done is to mistake a historical stage for a social condition. The socialist has always recognized that the process of concentration proceeds faster in some industries than in others. The crystallization has various centers around which the industrial molecules gather. These centers are what Dr. Ely calls "natural monopolies." Already he is forced to admit that the process has spread to allied industries which he designates as "dependent monopolies," but he seems to think (to change the figure) that the disease can be isolated and the capital-

ist system preserved intact. The impression is left (p. 142) that if his position regarding the existence of natural monopolies could be maintained it would constitute a refutation of the socialist philosophy. Nothing could be further from the truth. The concentration of industry is simply a corollary to the main socialist argument, and is offered to show the administrative advantages of a socialist organization of industry. It is also pointed out as one of the things that will force a transformation of industry. But it will do this, not simply by the formation of unbearable monopolies, but by the accentuation of the class lines causing a revolt of the producing classes long before the monopoly point is reached in even a majority of industries. Here, as elsewhere, the fact that Dr. Ely ignorantly or intentionally ignores the philosophy of the class struggle, leads him into false positions. The thesis of the book is, so far as socialism is concerned, unimportant if true, and is certainly not proven if admitted to be important.

**A Country Without Strikes, Henry Demarest Lloyd, Doubleday, Page & Co.**

This is a study of compulsory arbitration at work in New Zealand, but like all of Mr. Lloyd's books is written by one who is first of all an advocate, then a reporter and lastly a student. If the book is read by one who is already well grounded in economic philosophy he will find much valuable information and suggestive facts. But for one who is not able to separate the wheat from the chaff the book is distinctly misleading and injurious. Fortunately he makes a warning blunder in his first chapter which should put the cautious reader on his guard for the rest of the journey. He here talks about "social experiments" and "social inventors," which is enough to testify to the incapacity of the writer to correctly interpret social phenomena. Then if one reads closely he will see that in spite of himself the author has succeeded in picturing much that is wholly undesirable. He admits that the aim of the Court of Arbitration has been "to preserve as nearly as possible the conditions in which it found the trade." But this of all things is what labor does not want. Its whole struggle, even within existing social organization, is to keep pace with the advancing industrial development. It wants no judges who "shall hold their destiny in his hands" (p. 86) nor any state that is powerful enough to force "the workingmen to go to work on terms unsatisfactory to them." The whole system as outlined by Mr. Lloyd, even taking his most favorable interpretation is an economic slavery, that while it offers a present livelihood of a trifle higher character than in older countries (although there is

no proof that it is higher than in other countries with similar undeveloped society) it is a complete deadener on all ideas of social revolt by the workers and a guarantee of future slavery. The intelligent socialist will find in Mr. Lloyd's book some strong reasons for opposing the New Zealand system.

"Socialists in French Municipalities," Chas. H. Kerr & Co. Pamphlet, 32 p., in "Pocket Library of Socialism." We have heard much of what the English municipalities were doing, but few people are aware that only across the Channel in France very much more work is being done. This is the first time that any account of this work has been put in English, and this pamphlet should receive a wide circulation.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

---

[This department is edited by Max S. Hayes.]

At the quarterly meeting of the American Federation of Labor Executive Council, in Denver, last month, negotiations were begun with a view of amalgamating the American Federation of Labor with the Western Federation of Labor. The latter body is composed of a number of strong national, state and local organizations, including the strong Western Federation of Miners, which union made the heroic fight in the Coeur d'Alenes, Idaho, where over 400 miners were imprisoned in a bull-pen and subjected to the most barbarous and inhuman treatment by the joint orders of the Republican national administration, the Democratic-Populistic state government and the Standard Oil trust. The Western Federation of Labor is a progressive organization. At its national convention, in May, the Federation declared, among other things, that "we believe that the wage system should be abolished and the production of labor be distributed under the co-operative plan," and "we regard public ownership and operation of the means of production and distribution as the logical solution of the industrial problem, and respectfully urge all working people to give the subject the thoughtful consideration its importance deserves." The Federation also called upon organized labor everywhere to study the economic and political questions in union rooms and to strike at the ballot box for industrial freedom. If the amalgamation is perfected it will mean a powerful union of unions in this country, and the infusion of still more progressive blood in the organized labor forces.

Strikes are on in nearly every industrial center of the country. Next in importance to great struggles in the building trades in Chicago and the street railway business of St Louis is the bitter fight between the cigarmakers of New York and their bosses. Several months ago half a dozen of the large firms combined and locked out their journeymen to prevent them from aiding the strikers of the Kerbs, Wertheim & Schiffer Co., a notorious concern which paid starvation wages to its employes who manufactured cigars for the jobbing trade. Policemen's clubs and injunctions have not deterred the men, women and children locked out, and they have stood out as a unit for months. Nearly \$70,000 has been collected and paid to the unorganized strikers,

the unionists drawing regular strike benefits.—Nearly a hundred thousand molders in Cleveland have locked horns with the bosses, who also have a national organization. The employers are attempting to reduce wages 10 cents a day throughout the district and Cleveland is the battle-ground. The strongest molders' union in the country is in that city, and much will depend on this fight.—There are other strikes on of minor importance in many places.

The work at American Federation of Labor headquarters is piling up to such an extent that the report of charters issued for May has only been issued recently. There were 119 charters granted to local unions, seven to city central bodies, and one to a state branch in that month. These charters do not include new unions formed in organized trades, the national bodies of which charter locals direct. The printers average nearly ten charters a month, the carpenters, machinists, painters and other crafts following close behind. The work of organization this year is unprecedented, as is made manifest not only in new unions organized, but in the steady increase in membership of the unions in existence, and the Louisville convention of the Federation is destined to become a national parliament, greater and more representative than any similar meeting this year, excepting only the conventions of the two dominant political parties.

Last year the Canadian Trades Council, which is a similar body to the A. F. of L., declared for independent political action. This position was taken because its legislative committee reported that it was impossible to secure the passage of labor bills in parliament or provincial legislatures or even municipal bodies. The council committee having the resolution for independent politics in charge was composed of old party men, who reported adversely, but the delegates arose almost as one man and proclaimed their political independence. As a result, the trade unionists of Canada are working with the Socialists to secure a voice in legislative bodies. In British Columbia three more labor men have been elected to Parliament, and the capitalistic newspapers and politicians have become panic-stricken. They admit that candidates who stand on the most socialistic platform are the most to be feared.

Fully 250,000 workers have been out of employment during the past month in the iron and steel, tin plate, glass, textile, boot and shoe and kindred industries. The cause is given as "dullness of trade" and wage adjustments. The iron, steel and tin plate workers will go back into the mills, when they secure sufficient orders to start, at about the same rates they received in the past

year—though many of the men are dissatisfied, claiming that trusts have increased the price of the necessities of life. The glass workers will receive slight concessions, as there is a fight on between the trust and the independents, each bidding for the skilled men, the trust having gone so far as to issue stock (watered?) to the workers. The textile workers will consider themselves lucky if they secure last year's scale, the bosses having stated that when the mills were closed that it was either that or a reduction. The boot and shoe workers will hardly suffer a reduction, as they are quite thoroughly organized and will not submit to a cut.

North Carolina is now preparing to follow in the footsteps of several of the other Southern states and disfranchise the negro voters. The Democrats of that state, under the leadership of Charles B. Aycock, the candidate for governor, have been conducting a "red shirt" campaign, which has depended for its enthusiasm upon references to the Ku Klux outrages that followed the civil war. An amendment to the constitution is proposed which will disfranchise one hundred thousand negro voters. It is significant that while such laws have been enacted by the Democrats throughout the South, there has been no attempt by the Republicans to enforce the penalty for such action which the United States constitution provides. Did the Republicans so desire they could largely cut down the Democratic strength in Congress and also deprive them of a number of electoral votes. But they would far rather see the Democrats in power than lose this chance of depriving a large portion of the laboring population of the right of suffrage.

It is worthy of record that the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor is a progressive body. At its recent convention in Sheboygan, the Federation declared, by a vote of 45 to 9, for "the collective ownership by the people of the means of production and distribution. By this is meant that when an industry becomes centralized so as to assume the form of a trust or monopoly, and hence a menace to the best interests of the people, such industry should be assumed by the government. This is true protection to the weak, those least represented in legislation." The unions are steadily moving forward despite the chicanery of enemies within and without.

The progressive labor press of America is highly pleased at the outcome of the recent elections in France, Belgium, Italy and Austria, where in every instance the Socialists won new victories, increasing their general vote as well as membership in legislative bodies. These triumphs in Europe are having the effect of at-

tracting the attention of American working people, and as a result nearly every labor and reform paper in the country is printing an increasing amount of matter regarding Socialism, which is being studied with more interest than ever before. Of course, the capitalistic press intentionally suppresses this highly important European news, but it becomes known for all that.

The Socialist Labor party and the Social Democratic party have united and placed tickets in the field in the following states: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, Washington, California, Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, Michigan and Kentucky. Union will probably be perfected and tickets nominated in several more states this month. Many active Populists and independent voters of a progressive character are joining the new movement, as are also trade unionists in the industrial centers.

A silly story has been sent broadcast by the Democratic party managers. It is to the effect that Eugene V. Debs will withdraw on October 1 as the Social Democratic candidate for president. Mr. Debs sent out a denial, but it has been generally suppressed by Republican as well as Democratic organs. The season when the campaign liar secures his spoil has arrived.

The printers of Augusta, Ga., just when they believed they had their strike won against a daily paper, were injunctioned by the courts, and now their fight is becoming hopeless.

The boycott against the New York Sun is still on. It is charged that J. Pierpont Morgan, the railway magnate, and John D. Rockefeller are standing behind the Sun, and that they are willing to supply money indefinitely to defeat the printers in this fight.

A Massachusetts court has decided that machines in the textile industry may be run at night, and thus another "labor law" that cost the workers much time and money to secure its enactment has been knocked into a cocked hat, unless some higher court steps in and protects enslaved and worn-out women and children by reversing the decision, which will hardly be the case.

A late report from St. Louis is to the effect that the employers of that city are displaying their class interests openly by threatening to discharge their workers for refusing to ride on boycotted street cars. The same trick was resorted to in Cleveland a year ago. It gradually became effective. Yet a whole lot of people continue to prate that "the interests of capital and labor are identical."

American trade unionists are disposed to say mean things about Senator Hawley, and all because, they allege, he "held up" the eight-hour bill in the Senate. Mr. Hawley, during political campaigns, boasts of "having been a workingman himself once"—a printer, by the way—and, therefore, possesses all the requirements of the politician who is "the workingman's friend" in season and out.

The striking laundry workers of Dayton, O., have been injunctioned by the courts at the request of the Manufacturers' Association of that city.—There is more talk of forming a national union of laundry workers.

New York bakers are compelled to strike to secure the enforcement of the state ten-hour law for their craft. As usual the lawless capitalists have no use for labor legislation, and "anarchy reigns," so far as they are concerned.

The crucible steel trust, with \$50,000,000 capital, has been swung into line with the 400 and odd other capitalistic combines that are now in existence in the United States. Nearly everything in the iron and steel business is now trustified, and already the chief promoters are talking of forming a trust of trusts, which is the highest point the capitalistic system can reach. Then what? Socialism?

In Colorado the State Federation of Labor nominated a state ticket of trade unionists several months ago. The politicians became frightened, pulled wires, and a few days ago the ticket was withdrawn by a close vote. The minority, however, is in rebellion, declaring that it will not be coerced by the old party politicians, and that the ticket originally nominated will stand.

The American Federation of Labor has decided to levy an assessment of 2 cents a member to aid the New York cigarmakers. The sum of \$15,000 will be realized.

After several years of fighting, the two national unions of painters have finally amalgamated. The new organization, it is stated, will start out with a membership of about 25,000.

The Labor League is the name of a new secret organization that has started in and is spreading through Georgia. Only wage-workers are eligible as members.

Iowa Socialists convene Oct. 10 to nominate a ticket.

Nothing appears to have come of the widely-heralded Ruskin

Hall movement in this country. A month ago Messrs. Bowerman and Sexton came over from London to start a "labor college," and it was stated that they carried with them \$20,000 with which to begin operations. They were to have addressed the unionists in the principal cities, but after speaking in a few places they quietly departed for home. The \$20,000 is now said to have been "only pledged" by a Mr. Vrooman, who gained some notoriety in this country a few years ago with his labor church, co-operative colonies, political fusion, capitalistic reform and other schemes.

The trade unionists and socialists of Holland have just combined. The former have heretofore largely supported the anarchistic propaganda and abstained from voting, but now 24 national bodies, in convention assembled, have declared in favor of supporting the Social Democratic party.

The trust movement continues to make headway in England. The latest octopus given birth to is a large electrical combine of 57 companies.

The highest court in New South Wales, Australia, has decided that employers must give preference to union workmen. The Employers' Federation threatens to appeal the case to the Privy Council in England, but it is thought unlikely that such a step will be taken. In Australia workingmen have cultivated the habit of taking independent political action. In America the majority of workers are satisfied to be party slaves, and for that reason they are economic slaves as well and find that employers give non-unionists preference.

The trade unionists and Socialists of England are declaring in conventions and by resolution that they are opposed to the government carrying on military operations in the Transvaal or China. The Hon. John Morley and a portion of the Liberal-Radical party seems to side with them, the former stating in a speech at Oxford that, as between militarism and socialism he would choose the latter.

The Socialists and laborites of the Argentine Republic, South America, held a national convention last month. They report a gratifying increase of membership in the organizations, a good financial condition, and steady spread of socialist doctrine.

Once more the German government has notified the railway employes that if they are caught talking socialism or handling literature bearing on the subject they will be discharged. The

government owns the railways, and this is a sample of capitalistic state socialism that the opportunists and step-at-a-time reformers, who sneer at "class-consciousness," will do well to consider.

In Thuringen and in Waldenburg, Germany, the Social Democrats were triumphant in bye-elections for members of Parliament. In Muhlhausen they lost.

Just before adjourning, the Socialists hammered a bill through the French Chamber of Deputies providing for compulsory arbitration.

In San Domingo, in the West Indies, the trade unionists and Socialists are forming a Labor party.

# EDITORIAL

---

## THE CHINESE SITUATION.

Events during the past month in relation to matters in the Orient have served to emphasize one point very distinctly, and that is the absolute ignorance that prevails regarding the facts. There is scarcely any possible combination of the factors engaged that has not been telegraphed as actually existing and contradictory and conflicting statements have followed one another in close succession. This is a fact which it will be well to bear in mind through the long series of events upon which we are just entering. Whatever else is true it is practically certain that the average press dispatches will be false and the diplomatic ones still more so.

The great capitalist nations of the world are engaged in what promises to be the most bold faced plundering expedition of the age, and they will have the greatest of incentives to conceal their actions from the laborers who must do the fighting for them. If they were able to do this so skillfully at the time of the Commune, when Paris teemed with newspaper correspondents and every mail could bring the truth to the outer world, how much easier it will be in China, cut off by almost impossible barriers of language, distance and customs from those who are to be deceived. The censorship of Manila will be nothing in comparison with the one that will cover all points of communication with the seat of trouble in the Orient.

Hence if we are to arrive at the facts it must be largely through deduction as to the interests involved and the ends sought. An example of the way in which these interests are at present distorting news is seen in the reports of the massacre of the legations and foreigners. It is of the greatest importance to the capitalist nations to arouse resentment against China. It is not simply the old story of blackening a character before striking its possessor although that motive undoubtedly plays its part. But more important than this is the need of arousing the "patriotic" spirit at home which will provide with readiness the necessary funds and volunteers. So it is that while the very fact of the massacre is very much in doubt many of the daily papers have been filled with long details of the punishments and tortures inflicted by the Chinese, not a few of which accounts have been richly illustrated with photographs and drawings, apparently

“made on the spot,” and it is a sad commentary on the intelligence of the American reader that these tactics seem not to be met with the slightest disapproval, or to throw the least doubt upon the credibility of the press as a means of gathering and disseminating news.

The more that comes to be known of the trouble within China itself the more the socialist philosophy of society is justified. It was pointed out by Li Hung Chang some time ago that one of the reasons why China did not wish Western civilization was because she did not wish the labor problem that accompanied that civilization. . . But whether she wished it or not that civilization has come and with it the “labor problem.” This was most startlingly set forth in an article published in the Chicago Tribune by Li Teschung, former superintendent of the Secret Cabinet in Peking. The article is such a remarkable statement of the situation and complete justification of the socialist philosophy that it is here given almost entire:

“The labor question—or, perhaps, more precisely expressed, the socialistic question—is at the bottom of China’s troubles. An imperial investigation into the causes of the present unlawful uprisings will show that.

“Three years ago the Tien Tsin-Peking railway line was opened; for the last twelvemonth or longer it has been in active operation, while smaller auxiliary or branch roads have sprung into existence at intervals of from thirty to forty days all along. And as the railway net spread and as new connections by rail are constantly made, the labor market becomes daily more demoralized—that is, opportunities for work grow less and less.

“Traffic between the coast and the metropolis, and especially between the commercial centers Tien Tsin and Peking, is enormous—hundreds of thousands of people lived by it from time immemorial. They found their daily bread on the land and waterways as carters, carriers, forwarders, and helpers, generally. The horse owner, drayman, or expressman, the caravan leader, driver, camel, donkey, and mule attendant; the shipowner, boatman, sailor—all made a modest but assured living along the road, as their fathers had done before them. They had the stock, the custom, the experience. They were good for this business and for no other. Then there were the inn and boarding-house keepers supported by the passing crowd and dependent upon it; the wagonmakers, sailmakers, saddlers and feed merchants, The bus, carryall, and livery stable people likewise transported passengers. The number of officials alone who go to Peking half a dozen times or oftener per year reaches into the thousands, and the masses of candidates for government positions going to the capital for their examination are ten times greater.

"And as the signal for the first train from Taku to Tien Tsin-Pekin was given all these individuals, merchants, owners of draft animals and of other means of transportation; all these drivers, eating-house keepers, these workmen and helpers, lost their means of livelihood—lost it without hope of retrieving their fortune in stock or other work

"The branch roads robbed another class of poorly paid but contented people of their only chance for keeping body and soul together. The branch roads wiped out the coal carrier—the poor devil who on his own or his donkey's back transported black diamonds to the consumer, often covering hundreds of miles, plodding patiently for a trifle. European and American journals have often made fun of this antediluvian way of carrying coal, as they called it, but it suited the people who lived by it well enough.

"The unemployed—at least the chronic unemployed—were unknown in China before the arrival of the steam engine and freight car, but for the last twelve or fifteen months the territory between the Gulf of Pechili, Changting-Pu, and Peking has been overrun with them.

"And the disfranchised men have not been in good humor—hungry people generally are not. Still, they might have continued to suffer patiently—for at bottom the Chinaman loves peace and is capable of much endurance—if it had not been for the militant class of must-be-idlers. For the railway hurt the professional private police, also known as Boxers, no less than the industrial and laboring classes already mentioned.

"In the country the Boxers would probably pass under the name of athletes—that's what they really are—strong men drilled in the use of arms, who sell their prowess to those in quest of protection. In ante-railway days if a man of any consequence went traveling he hired a couple of Boxers to save him from molestation by beggars and sneak thieves and to protect him against footpads and robbers. No caravan started 'cross country save under the conduct of Boxers; a transport of ready money or valuables without the attendance of Boxers was never dreamt of. Women and children moved from town to country under the strong arm of Boxers; even the government and the mandarins employed them continuously in one capacity or another.

"But with the advent of the railway system the occupation of private policemen or bodyguards became obsolete. Those who use the steam cars need no special protectors, and money transports are quicker and safer by rail than in the midst of any army of Boxers bristling with crossbows, spears, or even rifles.

"While the poor, half-starved and meek Chinese laborer might never have summoned up courage enough to seek redress for the

grievous wrong heaped upon him by the hated innovation, it was but natural for the athletic Boxer, drilled to earn his living by fisticuffs, to raise the hand of revolt. Born to live by his prowess, he uses violence to win back, if possible, the bread of which he is deprived. His argument is against law and order; society would be doomed if it were permitted to prevail; yet from the Boxers' standpoint its psychological and physiological soundness cannot be denied.

"Thus the original dispute between wage earners and monopoly broadened into a full-fledged social question with a political lining.

"To sum up: Fear of starvation roused the anger of the Chinese populace against a useful innovation; the bread question grew into a political grievance and culminated in the hatred of foreigners and in open revolt against the government, for the Manchu dynasty is as foreign to the country in Chinese eyes as if it were Prussian or Anglo-Saxon.

"These are the facts; they show conclusively that the present troubles were caused by unhappy social conditions over which the government had no control and which absolutely lacked political motive. That the original bread riot or economic movement developed into a political movement—that is no reason why its origin should be obscured and its motive doubted.

"The real why and wherefore of the uprising is moreover made plain by the fact that the rioters are not content with attacking foreigners. Their lust for vengeance strikes their own countrymen as well. And here another aspect of the labor situation comes into view: The foreigners, when hiring Chinese labor, prefer to employ converts."

It is becoming more evident every day that in tackling the Chinese puzzle capitalism finds itself in the presence of the greatest problem that has yet been put before it. Whether in its present almost decrepit state it will be able to solve it or not, even to its own satisfaction, is something that is worrying many of its ablest defenders. What shall be done with China after the troops have marched to Peking? How will the outlying provinces be "civilized?" How shall they be policed and exploited? If the policy of the "open door" is maintained who shall be "door tender?" If China is to be divided up how are the pieces to be apportioned? These are questions that it will puzzle the diplomats and politicians of capitalism to answer, and that unless they do answer may easily prove that last jar that will complete the downfall of our present social system.

# FOREIGN HAPPENINGS

---

## UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN BELGIUM

The two most important events in the socialist world, news of which has reached America since our last issue, is the struggle for universal suffrage in Belgium and the amalgamation of the socialist parties in Holland. Regarding the first of these, "La Peuple," the Belgian socialist daily, gives an outline of the successive steps that will be taken to secure the desired end. In the first place, there is a series of public meetings and general agitation through the press and by means of pamphlets, etc. Then the various municipalities in the control of the socialists will send in memorials demanding the reform. Next the trades unions and co-operatives will proceed along the same lines. On the meeting of the Chamber of Deputies a great mass meeting was held, followed by interpellations by the socialist deputies in the Chamber. This is to be followed by an attempt to introduce and carry the bill. If defeated, the agitation will be increased, and a campaign of obstruction pursued in the Chamber. As a last resort preparations are being made to call a universal strike, such as gained them the limited suffrage they now have, and which is, with the vast resources at the disposal of the co-operatives, sure to be successful. At the present time there is a system of plural voting in operation, which in the majority of cases works greatly to the advantage of the capitalist parties. The following proclamation has been issued by the Parti Ouvrier and is published, with the accompanying comment, in a late issue of La Peuple:

"Comrades! The reign of falsehood must disappear. It is already condemned by the public conscience. It belongs to you to give it the finishing stroke. We count upon your energy and upon your steadfastness, as you may count upon ours. From this time in every town of the country let the clarions of our propaganda resound. In every industrial center let our comrades busy themselves with strengthening the unions, those battalions of the militant socialists. And the day when the Parti Ouvrier shall give the signal of assault, the day when your deputies shall engage in the final battles, we have the assurance that the formidable movement which last year succeeded in blocking the progress of reaction will reappear more resistless than ever to break the last resistance of the party of fraud, and to open wide the doors of the parliament to UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE."

A most important phase of this movement is seen in the inclusion of women in the demand for universal suffrage. This was opposed by a few of the socialists on the ground of the ignorance that still exists among the Belgian women, and which is so great as to almost pass belief on the part of American readers. Only a very small per cent. can either read or write, while almost none have any interest in or knowledge of any public questions. It was pointed out that the granting of the franchise to women, while they are still so completely under clerical domination, might easily mean a temporary setback to socialism. But none of these things deterred the Belgian comrades in their determination to stand by their principles. Deputy Vander Velde showed that all the objections offered to conferring the suffrage upon women had been urged by the Liberals against giving the same right to laborers. It was also shown that on many points woman was peculiarly a sufferer under the capitalist system and would prove a valuable ally of socialism when once her allegiance had been secured.

As always happens when the socialists attempt to take a decisive step, the Liberals, who have been making great protestations of their friendship for the workers and their desire for reform, are now found hand in hand with the clericals, prepared to block the movement for universal suffrage. The socialists have boldly announced that they propose to have their right to vote at once, and declare that they will proceed by gradual but rapid steps from agitation to parliamentary action and obstruction, and after these have failed recourse will be had to the universal strike, and as a last final resource, street riots. Those who know how all these methods were used in this same regular succession and with increasing power in gaining the present restricted suffrage will realize what it means by the present program. It means certain victory.

#### HOLLAND

Concerning the movement in Holland, we take the following also from *La Peuple*:

At the recent conference of the Socialist party of Holland, held at Amsterdam, resolutions were passed declaring the necessity of the action of the militant proletariat on both the economic and political ground, and declaring that the organizations for these purposes constituted the two indispensable weapons with which to carry on the class struggle.

After a long and moderate discussion, it was decided that the *Socialistenbond*, the old socialist organization, having expelled from its ranks the anarchists and followers of *Domela Nieuwenhuis*, and which has for its organ the weekly paper, "*Recht voor*

Alien," should dissolve itself and merge itself in the Social-Demokritische Arbeiderparty, and accept as their organ the daily paper of the latter organization as the official party organ. The common organization now has three deputies in the legislative chamber, Troelstra, Van Kol, and Schaper. The unanimous adoption of this resolution by the 43 delegates at the convention is complete confirmation of the union now existing in the socialist movement of the Netherlands, which will mean increased strength against the two equally dangerous enemies—capitalism and anarchy.

#### ANARCHY AND SOCIALISM

The shooting of King Humbert, of Italy, has let loose all the capitalist press in wholesale denunciation of all those who oppose the existing social order. Although there has not as yet been the slightest evidence to show that the act was anything more than that of a half-crazed fanatic acting on his own responsibility, and while anyone who wishes might easily know that the socialists have ever been the deadly opponents of the anarchists, still there have been plenty of papers ready to demand more stringent agitation against the socialists in America because the anarchists of Patterson, New Jersey, were acquainted with a crazy fool who shot an Italian king. This is the story that has repeated itself over and over again in the history of the social revolution. The "reds" have always been the "dearest foes" of capitalism. The capitalists class care nothing for the lives of a few of their puppets who may occupy positions of prominence in the governments of the world. They know, if the anarchists do not, that it is even easier to get new kings and emperors who will do their bidding than it is to find scabs to take the place of striking workers. But they also know that the steady, quiet, resistless advance of socialism is numbering the days of exploitation and that unless that advance is checked labor will soon achieve its freedom and exploiters must perforce become producers. Hence they seek for every opportunity to repress the socialist movement. But the socialist refuses to fall into their trap. He realizes the hopelessness of open resistance with all the powers of government in the hands of his opponent. So he fights within the legal bounds that capitalism has itself prescribed, and conforms in every way to the demands of the society he is opposing. But if he will not himself commit crimes he must be punished vicariously. So he is accused of the crimes of his opponents, the anarchists, and punished for that. This has long been the practice in Europe and recent events have shown that we may expect the same thing here. The assassination of King Humbert is

being used as an argument for the suppression of socialist meetings on the streets of Chicago. The most absurd stories have been circulated about the happenings at such meetings and the police have shown an unwonted activity in annoying the socialist speakers. But such tactics react upon their perpetrators and educate faster than the socialist speakers they suppress.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

We regret to be compelled to announce that sickness made it impossible for Mr. E. V. Debs to prepare the article on the "Outlook for Socialism in the United States," which had been announced for this number. However, he has promised that it will be ready in time for the September number. The next number will also have an article by Mr. Job Harriman, the socialist candidate for vice-president, on "A Comparison of the Democratic and Republican Platforms in the Present Campaign." These two articles alone will make this number one that will be desired by every socialist. Besides these, there will be an article by Robert Rives LaMonte on "The Essentials of Scientific Socialism," which is one of the best statements of the fundamental principles of socialism ever put forth. Articles have also been promised by Prof. I. Hourwich and Rev. H. S. Vail, while several communications are expected from European socialists. Taken altogether the September number promises to be far ahead of any socialist publication yet issued in the English language. Arrangements have already been made for future numbers, which insure that the present high standard will be constantly improved upon as time passes.

The article in this number by Paul Lafargue will be reprinted in pamphlet form for sale separately. The opportunity will then be taken to make several changes which were sent by the author too late for correction in this issue.