

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. I

APRIL, 1901

No. 10

Trades Unions and Socialism

THE modern proletarian movement has two kinds of antagonists: one, the straightforward but brutal antagonists, propose to suppress and to crush it by force. This kind has already experienced so many defeats, its method has proved itself to be so abortive, that it is losing to-day, with the thinking and discerning capitalists themselves—at least for the time being—ever more of its credit. All the better does the other kind prosper that says: “Divide and rule,” which, since forcible means do not avail, seeks to weaken the proletarian movement by splitting it. These opponents to the rule of the proletariat pose as its friends; they are not brutal but “ethical,” and for this reason they are all the more dangerous. They artfully try to represent different proletarian organizations as being antagonistic; they appear as advocates of sections of the proletarian movement, in order to propagate distrust and even hatred against the entire movement. Some of these precious friends of labor avail themselves of national distinctions to incite workingmen against workingmen, others turn religious distinctions to the same account. However, the most intelligent and eminent among their number try to create discord between the trades union and the Social Democratic movement. These people always have in mind the example afforded by England. While on the continent of Europe the Social Democracy pushes ahead irresistibly and victoriously, in spite of special arbitrary legislation and of proscriptions, in spite of June butcheries and of bloody May weeks, the Chartist movement in England came to naught about the time when the trades unions were recovering ground, and so it happened that nowhere does the capitalist class wield to-day the political power more supreme than

in England, the country possessing the most efficient, the most numerous, the best organized, as well as the freest and most independent working class in the trades union movement. No wonder that this example should excite the envy of all wide-awake capitalist politicians and national economists on the continent of Europe and that their ardent efforts should be directed towards filling the reigning classes as well as the proletarians with enthusiasm for that English pattern.

It stands to reason that one nation can and should learn from others, as it can thereby save a great deal of costly experience. However, to learn from somebody does not mean simply to imitate that person slavishly, but to profit by his experience and knowledge so as to make a sensible and free use of them. If there is a trades union to be organized effectively, it is indispensable to consult the English pattern. Of this nobody was earlier convinced than Marx, who already in 1847 called attention to the English pattern of trades unions; and if the trades union movement in Germany and in Austria has developed so quickly, this is due, above all, to the "International" and to the Social Democracy, both of them influenced most powerfully by Marx's teachings.

But if we have to determine the relation between trades unionism and Social Democracy, between trade and class organization, between economic and political struggles, in that case we can learn from the English nation only how that relation should *not* be.

Never has this become more evident than just at present, when in consequence of the collapse of the liberal party even the *pretence* of a political influence on the part of the English working class has disappeared and when English trades unionism is anxiously striving to promote the formation of a new independent workingmen's party, in which endeavor it finds itself, however, most hampered by the instincts it itself has fostered, the instincts of trade egotism and of disregard of all efforts towards a more remote and higher aim. The present stage of the English trades union movement is the least suitable one to make its previously existing relation to politics appear in an ideal light.

It has often been remarked that the trades union movement, where it does not go hand in hand with an independent political movement, i. e., where it is not saturated with socialist thought, acquires somewhat the character of the by-gone guilds.

It has also frequently been pointed out that this guild-like character shows itself first of all in that the workingmen organized in trades unions form and constitute, similar to the old-time journeymen organized in guilds, an aristocracy of labor, which isolates itself from the unorganized workingmen,

which raises itself above them, which pushes them down the deeper into the social mire, the quicker it elevates itself. Where, however, the trades union movement is at work in the closest intellectual contact with the political movement of an independent labor party, there the trades unionists come to be the chosen champions of the entire proletariat, there they improve, along with their own condition, that of their class. The increase of duties, resulting therefrom, is compensated by having the economic and political basis of their achievements rendered more solid than that of the achievements of a labor aristocracy. The more such an aristocracy of labor leaves the unskilled, unprotected, unorganized parts of the proletariat to shift economically for themselves, the more these come to be the breeding centers of scabs who stab organized labor in the back on every occasion and thus paralyze every decided action. On the other hand the workingmen organized in trades unions cannot constitute for themselves alone a political party, but always only one part, and indeed often a powerful one, of such a party. If they leave the unorganized workingmen to their own political resources instead of uniting with them in one political party, then the former must become the tail of a capitalist party that pretends to be friendly to the workingmen, but which, no matter how it tries to protect the interests of its proletarian voters, can never muster the necessary courage in face of capitalism and is doomed to fail the sooner, the more the proletarian character of its followers clashes with its own capitalist notions—just as is manifested to us by the fate of the Liberal party in England.

Then again, of course, England also shows us how much the success of the Social Democracy stands in need of the foundation afforded by a powerful trades union movement. Though, as the writer of this article has been assured by people that have been Chartists themselves, there was a closer connection between Chartism and trades unionism than modern historians of trades unionism suppose, it is a fact that the time when Chartism flourished was one of depression for trades unions; Chartism had no strong and steady economic organizations to fall back upon, and that explains much of the unsteadiness and precariousness of its development.

Modern English socialism, however, placed itself in its beginnings in pretty strong opposition to the trades union movement; a stand that may be easily explained, considering the former conservative character of the trades unions; but which, nevertheless, was wrong and of no advantage to the English Social Democracy. But in the course of time the trades unionists have lost more and more their antipathies to socialism, and, vice versa, the socialists have ever more been losing their an-

tipathies to trades unionism, so we find at an ever-increasing rate the same people at work in both camps, and therefore we may expect that slowly but surely a relation between the two movements will be established similar to the one that has always existed with us in the labor movement of Austria and Germany.

In view of all this we have not the slightest reason to look for outside patterns regarding the relation between trades unions and Social Democracy. The isolation of the trades unions from the balance of the proletariat has not only the injurious effect of splitting and weakening the latter, but it also curtails its chances of development.

We have compared the isolated trades unions to the journeymen's organizations of old,—the guilds. What has become of the latter. They have disappeared along with the system of guilds without the least share on their part in surmounting this system. Their prosperity was linked most intimately with that of the masters of the guilds; the downfall of the latter meant that of the former. The same fate is menacing the isolated trade union; it can only prosper if the capitalist system of production at home continues to progress. Its progress is very closely bound up with constant and swift enlargement of the capitalist sphere of power and exploitation. As soon as the industrial capital of a country has once reached the limit of its ability to expand briskly, then the time of decline sets in for the isolated trades unions. Such a decline manifests itself the same as with the journeymen's associations of by-gone times, not in the decrease of their membership, but in that of their ability and desire to struggle. Instead of at the expense of their exploiters they rather try in partnership with them to sustain and to improve their economic condition by monopolistic isolation of their trade and by increased fleecing of the people at large.

Particularly in England, the industrial capital of which has already in many lines reached the limit of rapid expansion, we see signs of such reactionary tendencies, e. g., with its textile workers who not only frequently vote for the conservatives, but who are also reactionary in an economic sense, who rave about bimetalism and child labor, etc.

In the most striking manner, however, the reactionary tendency of some isolated trades unions of England discloses itself in the trade alliances, which since 1890 have appeared now in one and then in another trade. These alliances are based upon agreements between a trades union and a combine of manufacturers, whereby the manufacturers agree to only employ members of the trade unions and these on their part pledge themselves to only work for the manufacturers

belonging to the combine, i. e., only for those manufacturers that sell their products at the higher prices decided upon by the combine. In this way all competition against the combine will be rendered impossible. These trade alliances, which are praised by our bourgeois friends of labor as the commencement of harmony between capital and labor, propose therefore nothing less than to induce the workingmen to share in the scheme of the combines to raise prices and to exploit the public. They are expected to assist the manufacturers in fleecing the community and to receive in return a part of the booty. In this manner it is not any more the capitalist but the community that would become the enemy of the workingman, or rather of the aristocracy of labor, which has turned from an exploited person into an exploiter.

However, the innate incongruities between capital and labor are so great that we know of no trade alliance of any duration. These incongruities are frequently so great as to nip the endeavors towards the realization of a trade alliance in the bud. This is very fortunate for social development, for, could the trade alliances exist and grow, they would inflict incalculable harm. Consider, for example, the consequences, should the scheme to start a trade alliance in the coal-mining industry, as has been attempted, succeed and should the coal miners be turned into accomplices of the policy of the combine, into promoters of a coal famine—a maneuver particularly tempting under the sliding scale of wages. The entire balance of the workingmen would be compelled to declare war not only against the coal barons but as well against the coal miners! And what a prospect, if other orders of workingmen in important lines of industry followed suit; if in place of the struggle between capital and labor, we should witness the struggle between different monopolies in which workingmen in the pay of their organized masters would enter the field against their fellow workingmen!

Any independent labor movement would be impossible, and the labor aristocracy organized in trades unions would be chained most tightly to the capitalist class and forced on by its own interest to help the advancement of capitalist politics at home and abroad.

Of course we will not come to that pass, for the reason already stated, that, where the combines are the strongest there the antagonism against the workingmen is also the greatest; and also for the reason that the bourgeois friends of labor will never succeed in isolating the trades unions from the rest of the proletarian movement, or to keep up such isolation where it now exists. But, in consideration of the present raving about trade alliances, it is not amiss to picture a state in which they

should prevail. Entirely different from these reactionary and futile attempts on the part of isolated unions to improve the economic condition of their members in countries already approaching stagnation of capitalist production, must be the endeavors of such trades unions as go hand in hand with a strong and class-conscious Social Democracy.

The more the development of capitalist commodity-production stagnates or free competition is crowded out by combines and trusts, the more a class-conscious labor movement will try not to impart by reactionary experiments a new artificial life to some lines of production; but it will endeavor to further economic development by replacing capitalist production for sale by socialist production for use. When, for instance, the coal miners, where they exclusively rely upon their trades union organization, place their hope upon a trade alliance with the coal barons, they will there, where they support the Social Democracy, strive for an increase of political power of the proletariat for its effective use for workingmen's protective laws, and finally for the expropriation of the mines.

To-day already production for the commonwealth in the shape of production for state and community becomes a factor of steadily growing economic importance. To-day it is no longer the textile industry but the iron industry upon which the entire economic prosperity of a nation depends. If the latter prospers, new life pulsates through the entire social body; if it stagnates we have general depression. The iron industry, however, is again to a large extent dependent upon state and communal politics; state and street railroads, canalizations, army and navy orders, etc., exert a perceptible influence upon economic conditions. Modern states certainly exert this influence largely in idly wasting the means at hand, especially for militarism; they develop production, they employ the productive powers, but at the same time they permit civilization to be stunted; yes, in some countries like Italy, Russia and Austria militarism leads not only to a waste of products, but also of productive powers, and consequently to a shrinkage of production.

The more capitalism passes over from free competition to monopoly, the greater the number of its industrial branches that have become unable to develop adequately, the more the influence of state and community on the character and extent of production increases, the more necessary it will be for every class to gain influence on state and community, the more fatal will be the isolation of trade unions that prevents the proletariat from depending and promoting its interests effectively, the more indispensable it will be that the trades unionists are inspired with socialist discernment and socialist enthusiasm;

the more necessary, on the other hand, that the Social Democracy should be able to rely upon a numerous army of organized trades unionists, on which rest the deepest and firmest roots of its power.

The trades unions will not disappear along with the capitalist mode of production like the journeymen's organizations vanished with the guilds. On the contrary, they will constitute the most energetic factors in surmounting the present mode of production and they will be the pillars on which the edifice of the socialist commonwealth will be erected.

K. Kautsky.

(Translated by E. Dietzgen.)



Education and Socialism



It will be the aim of this paper to outline some of the features of our present educational system, the revolutionary tendency that is now pervading it, and finally the changes that socialism would bring, for in no department of social activity shall we see a greater or more vital revolution than in the methods and object of education.

To state exactly the object of education both the sociological and the biological side must be taken into consideration. That the social phase of education has been largely ignored in the past may be seen from the following definitions taken from the older writers.

Plato says, "The purpose of education is to give to the body and to the soul all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable."

Kant defines education as "the development in man of all the perfections which his nature permits."

With John Stuart Mill "education includes whatever we do for ourselves, and whatever is done for us by others for the express purpose of bringing us nearer to the perfection of our nature."

Herbert Spencer briefly states that "Education is the preparation for complete living."

Rousseau contents himself with the following indefinite generality: "Education is the art of bringing up children and of forming men."

In Horace Mann we see the beginnings of a new idea in education: "By the word 'education' I mean much more than the ability to read, write and keep common accounts. I comprehend under this noble word such a training of the body as shall build it up with robustness and vigor, at once protecting it from disease and enabling it to act formatively upon the crude substances of nature—to turn a wilderness into cultivated fields, forests into ships, or quarries and clay pits into villages and cities. I mean also to include such a cultivation of the intellect as shall enable it to discover those permanent and mighty laws which pervade all parts of the created universe whether material or spiritual. This is necessary because if we act in obedience to these laws all the resistless forces of nature become our auxiliaries and cheer us on to certain prosperity and triumph. But if we act in contravention or defiance to these laws, then nature resists, thwarts, baffles us, and in the end it is just

as certain that she will overwhelm us with ruin as it is that God is stronger than man."

Looked at from the standpoint of society as well as of the individual education means not only the adaptation of the individual to his surroundings, but the training of him to understand his environment and thus the giving to him the power to modify and change it.

Take for example the physical sciences. Education along this line would require an actual understanding for instance of the ways of applying energy—by means of the lever and inclined plane with their modifications—of the nature and modes of action of electricity, the combinations resulting from the union of different chemical elements, etc.

This knowledge could then be used either in new inventions or in handling present instruments and materials.

Again the value of history in education does not consist in the mere knowledge of events or even the exercise of memory on the part of the individual, but in the principles for the guiding of future society that may be drawn from past events.

The power to read is not in itself an education, but the ability, by means of which to gain, for use, the knowledge of facts that have been stored up by other minds. This educative value of reading, this spontaneous making the thought of the author our own, has been largely destroyed by the formal methods of teaching the subject which have created a habit of observing words and their forms, and that only.

Like all things, however, education has been shaped in the past by the economic conditions and needs of society. Long after the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries education was chiefly characterized by a ponderous scholasticism. The artisan, not looked upon as in any sense a 'scholar,' was the only one who with a trained eye and hand could design and make things.

The past century has been a commercial age. It has been marked by great inventions, a vast increase in trading, an enormous production of goods and a growing intricacy of diplomatic relations. A careful survey of present educational methods and subjects of study must convince one that our schools are made to further the interests of the ruling industrial and commercial class of the time.

The technical school that practically serves the purpose of training passably good engineers and mechanics has marked the past few years. It is owing to these technical schools that Germany is to-day becoming able to compete with England both in foreign markets and at home. These best technical schools turn out such a vast number of trained workmen that, underbidding each other in the labor market, their value has

decreased until Germany has the cheapest skilled workmen to be found.

Plans are now under way to establish a commercial school at Berlin in which the study of English will be an especial feature. The reason for this is plain. Not only a great portion of Germany's export trade goes to English speaking countries, but English is fast becoming the language of commerce, and a knowledge of it will enable her merchants to push their trade more effectually.

It is interesting also to note the founding of large schools of diplomacy. When modern inventions have put great nations into proximity, and relations are strained, and it has become a matter of nations competing for trade and struggling for territory, it is essential that capital should have trained diplomats to skillfully adjust conditions in foreign markets and political circles and thus guard the interests of the ruling class. Such a school is founded in connection with Columbian University at Washington.

Mr. Gunton says in his magazine that more interest should be taken in these schools because—and here he gives the capitalists' only reason for education—"of the expansion of American trade." It is in this way that education, which should aim at a rounded man and womanhood, is being used for the benefit entirely of the ruling class.

The American manufacturer has heretofore been obliged to draw his designers and workmen of especial skill from foreign schools, but now he sees that it is far more economical to found such schools at home, either private or public, and use them to produce a limitless supply of skilled laborers who, competing with each other, will lower wages.

A recent report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics gives the following as one of the reasons for introducing manual training into schools: "Parents realizing that employers will insist that the boy 'start at the bottom in any industry' decide that he must begin to gain the industrial experience which will increase his wages at as early an age as possible, rather than to continue in school to learn the things which they feel will never be of real use to him."

It is with difficulties such as these that the new education finds itself confronted from the first. Like all revolutionary movements, for that is what in its essence the new education is, it finds the old system which it has outgrown—seeing itself unable to check the new movement—seeking to pervert it to its own benefit. Hence the ruling class see only in domestic science as taught in the schools the means for training more competent servants or in the sloyd work the making of better carpenters.

Our system of industry to-day demands no individuality of the immense body of workmen. It has grown so far mechanical that in the great industrial establishments there is small need for the inventor or artist. This is not contradictory with the statement before of the demand for skilled workmen. Skilled workmen in no way presuppose workmen with any individuality developed.

Our school system has not advanced beyond the demands of the economic conditions. It has the same leveling effect. So many children promoted into a certain grade. The same work and way of doing this work is required of each one. The teacher with forty or fifty children in a grade has little opportunity to study the inclinations of each child. All are made to "toe the same mark." The whole system has become dull and mechanical. The very power of initiative is crushed out of the child.

So entirely commercial is our age that we are not surprised to find our school system run upon that basis. Sufficient school buildings there are not. In many neighborhoods we find from two to three hundred children waiting to be admitted to the kindergarten while many more are attending but half time.

The number of teachers compared with the number of pupils is altogether insufficient. Forty-five or even sixty we have seen enrolled in ward schools under one teacher. These teachers, who are always overworked, are usually utterly unable to teach anything of science. They have never themselves been trained to observe or handle real things and cannot teach the child to see.

Laboratories in physical science may appear to us well equipped considering the condition of the apparatus used in teaching physics or biology or chemistry ten years ago, but the vast majority of the schools are still poorly furnished with the materials for good work in these lines.

But we are passing at present through a period of change, from a time of commercialism and competition to an age of co-operation, and there are present among us the germs for a new growth in education. Already the awakening has begun to be felt.

Beginning as far back as Rosseau, Cemenius and Pestalozzi, an effort was made to put actual perception and observation of things by the senses in place of the mechanical instruction by word. It is not generally known, however, that it is to Robert Owen that we owe some of the first clear statements of the coming revolution in education. He was the first to look upon instruction and education from the point of view of the social organization.

A recent article in the *Neue Zeit* points out that he brought

forward the demand that the intellectual and physical education should go hand in hand. That from the age of eight years up instruction should be united with regular labor in the house and garden. That from the thirteenth year children are to enter into the higher arts and trades and thereby be prepared to further the riches and well-being of society in the most effective manner with the greatest satisfaction to themselves. He comprehended the activity of labor in instruction not only as a necessary pedagogical end, but also as a means to the social production of goods.

The new education and socialism are being developed from the same social conditions. They have as their object the same thing—freedom. Freedom for each one to develop his own methods of thought and his own initiative. To express in material form his inner being. It is recognized that to furnish this inner man and woman with material there must be supplied to them constant contact through their senses with the outside world, for that which is produced is but what has gone in through the senses, modified by each one's individual characteristics and tendencies.

It is for this reason that the new education emphasizes the importance of work with tools and materials that the pupil may design and work out his design in a material form. Nature studies also are a prominent feature of the new education. Trips into the country bring the city child into contact with an entirely new phase of life. He sees the seed put into the ground, its growth, the processes by which wheat is converted into flour and bread, the growth of flax, cotton and wool as materials for the manufacture of textile fabrics. This is in a sense a "return to nature," but not the nature of Rousseau. It is a nature made large by the discoveries of science. Science has opened to us the secrets of the world's formation, the laws of gravitation, the mysteries of the growth of physical organisms and all its secrets have been discovered only by men working in direct contact with the things they tried to reveal.

Education under socialist conditions would produce men and women, not machines. As Marx has said, the end of socialism is "an association wherein the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all," "an economic order of society which together with the greatest possible development of social productive power secures the highest possible harmonious development of human beings."

To-day like the press, the pulpit and the lecture room, so the school is under the control of the ruling class which uses its control for its own advantage. When capitalism has demanded technical skill its schools have produced men trained along that line; when it has required any other quality its

schools have produced men with that quality; and when it has found that ignorance, docile and unquestioning, has served its purpose best it has reduced the laboring class to that condition.

To go a step further: as pointed out by Prof. John Dewey, "education should be a process of living and not a preparation for future living." The school to-day is an unnatural life calculated only to prepare one for future work. It has no relation either with the home or society. The life of the average American student is abnormal and returns him to society both scholastic and pedantic. To-day so-called education ends with the class-room instead of all of life being an education. Even the spirit of social solidarity and mutual interest is destroyed by the present system. For one boy to assist another in his task is a thing for which to be punished.

Again, education is far more than the training of the intellect alone. It was a principle of Greek philosophy to unite instruction with music and exercise. Socialism would require and make possible the physical development as well as the mental. Productive work would be united with education. The student studying into the mechanism of the steam engine would be able to put his hands upon one and learn by use its every part.

Following the manufacture of textile goods and the development of industry he would trace it through its primitive forms, the wheel for spinning and the clumsy loom for weaving up through the complicated machinery and vast looms of a modern factory.

Studying the industries connected with the production of foodstuffs, of agriculture in general, he would go out and use the tools employed in the raising of grain and see the growth from the pointed stick with which the savage scratched the ground or the flail that our forefathers used to beat out the grain, to the steam plow and threshing machine of to-day.

The pitiable ignorance of our city population of anything to be found in the country, and of our country folk of great manufacturing establishments, and of the majority of our whole population of any part of actual life outside the narrow confines of their own work must be a source of wonder to future generations.

Society would thus be presented to the child in a simplified form. He would begin with the primitive stages through which society passed in savage and barbarous times and gradually ascend in his education to the complex and intricate system of modern industry. Anthropology and etymology would become live and inspiring topics.

For education to be of value it must present a unity in the

things taught. Our old system has made each department of science an entirely new and foreign subject to the beginner, having no relation to anything either before or after. For instance, take geology and geography. Few have been trained to see that geography is the study of the present conditions of the earth that represent a certain stage in a long series of stages; that geology is the study of these different stages and the changes in the earth's surface that have resulted in its present physical appearance.

Every teacher should be able to take up subjects of study in due relation to society and the science of society—sociology. So far this unity or synthesis has been a subject of discussion among philosophers, but has received slight notice from the pedagogue.

At the beginning we stated that the object of education is the adapting the individual to his surroundings and the fitting him to change and modify them. These changes should be such as would lead to the progress of humanity. In how infinitely few cases, however, has science been used to benefit the condition of the great mass of the people except when protection for the ruling class demanded that certain steps should be taken. For example, study has put on record much of value in the scientific preparation of food, in the producing of sanitary conditions, and in the prevention of diseases.

Under socialism, with pure food well prepared and healthful surroundings, we shall look to see disease practically stamped out and the life of man extended.

The century has seen great advance in science in medicine, experimental psychology and physiology; yet this knowledge is the monopoly of the few. As shown by Kropotkin in his "Appeal to the Young": "In our society to-day science is only an appendage to luxury which serves to render life pleasanter for the few, but remains absolutely inaccessible to the bulk of mankind." "The philosophers are crammed with scientific truths and almost the whole of the rest of human beings remain what they were five or ten centuries ago, that is to say, in the state of slaves, and machines, incapable of mastering established truths." "We need to spread the truths already mastered by science, to make them part of our daily life, to render them common property."

Again, the discoveries in experimental and physiological psychology must revolutionize many of the old methods of teaching. Genetic psychology, for instance, has shown that the first years of a child's life must be a time of physical activity. The body of the child is not yet under control. It is impossible for him to remain quiet. Yet we remember when school discipline required these little bodies

to remain quiet in a seat for four or six hours in a day and our schools are but just beginning to throw off this old discipline and to guide this aimless but necessary activity into useful channels.

Not only the normal but the great number of abnormal will be benefited by the discoveries of psychology. Study has shown what can be done to make the mentally defective useful to society. Likewise with the criminals. The social conditions that have created a large part of them being changed their number would be vastly decreased. The others could be used somewhere in the social organism in productive work. This in no way argues that we should weaken the race by protecting the mentally weak and degenerate. Both would finally become wellnigh extinct if not left to perpetuate at will their kind.

May Wood Simons.



Social Evolution



UNDERSTAND the socialist philosophy to be a certain affirmation that all social institutions depend upon the industrial institution; that this industrial institution develops by necessary laws towards monopoly; that the people, through the state, are destined to appropriate this institution at some stage in its course towards monopoly; and that, when once thus appropriated, the other institutions will reflect the new conditions of the industrial institution.

I believe in the prime importance of the industrial institution. But I assert that the socialist philosophy deprives itself of the lessons of history because it does not build its conclusions upon a study of the evolution of other institutions. Other institutions have passed through the stages which the industrial institution is now following, and have reached certain destinations whose consideration might aid us in setting up a goal also for the industrial institution.

The institutions which I wish to consider are the family, the church, the state, industry and the political party. I would define an institution as a certain definite, and continuous, but evolving mode of living together for the satisfaction of a peculiar affection. Each institution has its own psychic affection. In the family it is sexual and parental love; in the church, it is religious belief; in the state, coercion; in industry, love of work; in the political party it is "political principles," or class interest.

My contention turns upon a clear distinction between the production of wealth, on the one hand, and private property, on the other hand. I agree that the production of wealth is fundamental. It is nothing more nor less than man's control over the forces of nature. This control determines in large part the form of organization of all institutions. But private property is entirely different. Private property is a social institution. It is a certain way of living together. It is not merely private property in the means of production. It is private property in the material basis of each institution. I hold that every social institution begins as private property. It then develops towards monopoly. Whether it shall always remain private property or whether another form of organization shall take its place, depends upon circumstances which I shall try to describe.

In primitive society there are no definite institutions. All

are merged and blended in a homogenous, indistinct communism. This communism of society is the corollary of the suppression, or, rather, the non-emergence of the individual. The individual first emerges as a self-conscious personality when external objects begin to have a definite value to him, i. e., when, in the struggle for existence, his own survival depends on appropriating an external requisite. Now, no object has value if it is unlimited in supply. Private property begins with those objects which, relatively to other objects, are limited in supply. To the primitive man, air, water, land, are unlimited. The only limited objects are women. Private property begins as property in women and children, and the exclusive ownership of these is a "requisite of survival," to use a term suggested, in other connections, by Professor Patten. He who has a number of women has food-hunters, weapon-carriers, numerous children, and eventually male slaves and warriors.

The family thus begins as private property in women and children. Thereafter natural selection and survival of the fittest are the survival of the fittest institution. Individuals do not contend with individuals, but families contend with families; or, rather, proprietors of families with similar proprietors. Survival depends upon three qualities,—size, unity and generalship. Size is numbers. Other things equal, numbers will win. The family grows in size until it numbers tens of thousands. Unity is the subordination of individuals to the will of one man. This is brought about by what is essentially a right of property, namely, control over subordinates through either direct control over their bodies or indirect control over their means of subsistence. This is the administrative side of private property, as distinguished from the equity side, which is the right to have the profits. By means of the rewards and punishments thus centralized in the hands of the proprietor, the subordinates execute his will as one man. This gives scope to the third requisite of survival, generalship. The institution with the shrewdest, boldest, wisest and most adroit manipulator of men will survive. These three qualities of survival—size, unity and generalship—characterize each social institution. They develop in the course of time into monopoly and centralization. The family produces the patriarch; the church, the pope; the state, the king; the political party, the boss; the industrial institution, the trust.

Now, notice that each of these institutions has developed into monopoly while it was dependent upon a requisite for survival which was limited in supply. The patriarchy depends upon a scarcity of women and men relative to land, and therefore the monopoly of the family is based on private property in women. But when land becomes scarce relative to men and women, the patriarchs, or heads of families, no longer cared for private

property in men and women, but transferred their ownership to land. Direct control over the bodies of men and women, known as slavery and polygamy, became indirect control over the means of their subsistence, known as feudalism.

Feudalism again proceeded towards monopoly. The largest landowner had the largest army, the greatest number of faithful retainers, and, with good generalship, he became the king. Feudalism ended in absolutism, based on private property in land.

A similar outcome attended the church. Here the peculiar object of private property was based on the conviction of guilt on the part of worshippers and their faith in the holy power of priests to remit punishment. The priest operated through his ownership and monopoly of certain external material objects which could be reduced to private property, namely, the sacred relics of saints, the holy shrines, and the apostolic succession. Through these he held the keys of heaven and hell, he forgave sins, and he even healed mundane diseases, or inflicted mundane woes. In the course of several hundred years priests acquired the landed property of the faithful, bishops arose in command of priests, and the Bishop of Rome in command of the other bishops. This monopoly depended on private property in relics, shrines and land.

Here we have three monopolistic heads of three institutions—patriarch, king and pope. Let us notice what followed. In Asiatic countries this monopoly was handed down to successors and became hereditary despotism. In England and Europe there were two other very different developments. The institution of the state continued to be a monopoly, but the feudal nobility, who had been suppressed by the king, forced him to admit them into partnership in the management of his monopoly, through the House of Lords. Later, the middle class forced admission into the combine through their representatives in the House of Commons. The state thus became a genuine partnership of three social classes. Legislation henceforth required the consent of crown, lords and commons, i. e., each member had a veto on the two others.

With the family it was different. King and church in England very early agreed to regulate the family. Polygamy was prohibited as early as King Alfred. Later, the father was prohibited from selling his daughter and the husband from buying his wife, without her consent. Still later, she was given the right of divorce in case of ill treatment. The state created courts of law with power to protect her against her husband. What is the explanation? It is this: The family was originally based on two principles, coercion and persuasion, i. e., private property in women and sexual love. The state, through its laws and courts, has deprived the patriarch of his coercive

control—i. e., his private property—in his wife, and has compelled him to resort to persuasion. The state also, in more recent times, actually takes children away from brutal parents, and so compels the parent to depend on love rather than coercion for obedience. The family no longer is a coercive institution based on private property, but is a persuasive institution based on love. Where love is lacking, the law forbids coercion. In other words, the state has extracted coercion from private control and has constituted itself the sole coercive institution. The state thus becomes the coercive framework within which the family operates. The state increases its functions and its organs, increases its courts, recorders, executives, legislation, to deal with this framework of the family, and in so doing permits the family to cultivate more extensively its persuasive soil, sexual and parental love. Husband and wife each has now a veto on the other. Their relation is one of partnership, based on persuasion instead of private property based on coercion. Wherever coercion and persuasion are combined in the hands of one person, the coercive factor tends to suppress the persuasive factor. By separating the two and making itself the sole coercive factor, with tribunals and rules of procedure to exclude caprice, the state liberates the persuasive factor and allows it to spring forth and bloom into the ideal family.

The church is following the course of the family. Two factors have combined to break its monopoly—loss of faith in relics and loss of earthly power. The loss of faith was largely caused by an over-supply of relics. The church grew greedy and permitted the manufacture and sale of counterfeit relics. This aroused Martin Luther and brought on the Reformation. Private monopoly of relics no longer sufficed when the people ceased to want relics. Afterwards the state proceeded to confiscate the lands and treasures of the church and to take away its right to taxation and tithes, and to substitute state courts for ecclesiastical courts for trial of church offenders. In this way the state deprived the church of control over the material necessities of life, and so took away its powers of earthly rewards and punishments. Henceforth the state became the coercive framework of the church, and the church itself has been compelled to rely upon persuasion. This is known in history as “the separation of church and state.” The priest henceforth becomes the preacher. The appeal is made to religious faith and not to the fear of earthly punishment, or the hope of earthly reward. The church monopoly is broken, and innumerable sects and no-sects take its place, each and all dependent upon the persuasiveness of their tenets.

Let us now compare these three institutions—family, state and church. In primitive society they were blended and undifferentiated. The patriarch was also priest and king. He

relied on both coercion and persuasion. But in our Western civilization, in course of time, the state has been differentiated as the coercive institution, and the family and the church as persuasive institutions. The state takes to itself the control of its members whenever that control depends upon material external agencies, such as direct control of their bodies or indirect control over their necessities of life. This is coercion. The family and church become voluntary institutions, seeing that henceforth they must rely upon psychic influence and not external force. Each relies upon its own peculiar psychic principle, the family on sexual and parental love, the church on the conviction of sin and the longing for moral perfection. Notice, therefore, the corresponding difference in organization: The state, which is the coercive institution, continues to be a monopoly, but, instead of a monopoly ruled by the caprice of one man, it is a monopoly ruled by the partnership on equal terms of three leading social classes. The other institutions, family and church, on the other hand, cease to be monopolies and are relegated back to their original competitive organizations. But this competition among themselves can no longer be evil, because the institutions have lost their teeth and claws. They can no longer build up a hierarchy of subordination because they cannot enforce their decrees against the will of the subordinate. They can only survive by converting the free will of individuals, i. e., by persuasion. This competition is not competition, but emulation. Thus the outcome of social evolution is a coercive institution, exercising a monopoly of coercion, and two persuasive institutions without monopoly, competing, or emulating, among themselves within the coercive framework provided for them by the other.

How do the foregoing principles apply to political parties and business corporations? The persuasive basis of a political party is the common political principles or class interest of its members. The coercive basis is the rewards and penalties in the hands of its managers. And, strangely enough, these rewards and penalties depend upon subordination of the state itself to the political party. The state has become sovereign over family and church, but the political party has become dominant over the state. The sources of this domination are the following: Election of superior officials; appointment of subordinate officials; distribution of contracts, franchises and legislative favors; private control of elections and primaries. With these four sources of power the management can command the services of "workers" and "heelers"; and, being organized for success, the greater size, unity and generalship develop the "boss." Now, notice the tendency of recent legislation. The Australian or secret-ballot law has taken the election machinery out of private hands; has made the ballot an "official" ballot

printed by the state. The more recent primary election laws have taken the party primary itself out of the hands of the party managers, and have handed over party elections to the control of officials appointed and paid by the state. "Civil service reform" has attempted to take subordinate offices out of the hands of the party boss, but it has largely failed because the boss appoints the examining board. All of these reforms are based upon the assumption that the political party is necessarily a monopoly under a single management, and that the only thing to do is to guarantee to the rank and file a voice in the election of the management. But there are two other reforms which, if adopted, would break the monopoly of the party. One is the initiative and referendum, by which contracts, franchises and legislation could be controlled directly by all the voters instead of indirectly through a party organization. The other is proportional representation, by which all minority parties could select their proportionate share of officers without being compelled to come into the ranks of the two leading parties. This would tend to break up the existing parties into the naturally divergent groups which at present are forced into one combination. With all of these reforms the political party would lose its coercive control over the necessities of life and would be compelled to depend solely on its political principles to persuade voters to join it. The management would no longer have rewards and punishments to distribute and the boss would become the statesman.

As regards business corporations, it is too much to say that every business which ends in a trust must be owned and operated by the state. The state is the coercive institution. If the state can extract from private corporations every element of coercion on which they now depend to discipline their subordinates, it will then deprive them, as it has deprived the family and the church, of the basis on which monopoly rests. They will become purely persuasive institutions, and the only psychic motive to which their managers can appeal will be the love of work. If men are freed from the dread of hunger and old age, just as they have been freed from the lash, then they will work only for those leaders who can fully persuade them, and under those conditions and hours which they like. Under such circumstances the trust, like the family and the church, would fall back into its original small groups, but the competition which now depresses them would be replaced by emulation which elevates them.

But there is an essential difference between the industrial institution and the other voluntary institutions which we have been considering. A man can manage to live without belonging to a family, a church or a political party, but he cannot live without land and capital. Consequently he is subject to the own-

ers of land and capital. On the other hand, the love of work is not an original passion, like sexual love or religious faith, but is an acquired affection produced by education. Now, coercion is a factor in education, and it is also a necessary substitute where education has failed. Therefore, coercion should not be wholly eliminated from industry. It rather should be regulated and placed under the care of the state. Remembering these essential differences, let us mention certain ways by which the state has lessened or may lessen the coercion of proprietors over proletarians. As to their effectiveness, opinions differ.

First: Protection for wage earners, by prohibiting destructive competition of foreign labor, child labor, female labor and overwork; by security against old age, accidents and sickness; by security against unemployment, arbitrary discharge and blacklist.

Second: Taxation of unearned incomes (ground rent, inheritances, etc.), thereby releasing labor and earned incomes, and so increasing the supply of land and capital.

Third: A distinction between distributive and productive industries. Distributive industries are those like highways and currency, which serve the community best by unity and free service, and which are capable of army organization. Productive industries are farms and factories which serve best by economy of production, and which require variety, subdivision of labor and attention to details. Distributive industries are essentially coercive because they control the access to markets. Productive industries are voluntary because they depend upon the love of work.

Fourth: With coercive control eliminated, business will rapidly become co-operative. Laborers will be admitted to partnership with employers, just as wife has been admitted to partnership with husband, layman to partnership with priest, lords and commons to partnership with king. This change is already taking place in those industries where powerful labor unions are joined with powerful combinations of employers to control the business.

Without stopping here for details, which would exceed my present limits of space, let us summarize the ideals above presented. In the two institutions, political parties and business corporations, there are two divergent phases which may be followed. We may faithfully accept the theory that monopoly is inevitable and perpetual and therefore that freedom will be secured only through state ownership and operation. This was the theory which prevailed in the reconstruction of the coercive institution, the state. Or, we may look deeper into the coercive factors which suppress the persuasive factors of the institution and then proceed to extract those coercive fac-

tors and annex them as functions of the state. This was the theory which prevailed in the reorganization of the family and the church. If we adopt the first policy in the case of the political party, we will content ourselves with the secret ballot, civil service reform and primary election reform, which retain the boss, but attempt to make him elective instead of self-elected. But if we adopt the second policy we will proceed to the referendum and initiative by which the monopoly itself is disintegrated and the party becomes a strictly voluntary and persuasive institution.

If we adopt the first policy in the case of the industrial institution, we will nationalize the trust by selecting officers of government for its officials. But if we adopt the second policy, we will extract from the trust the coercive principles by which it clubs wage-earners, competitors and consumers, and will reduce it from a coercive institution to a merely productive institution.

In either case the goal will not be reached except by participation of working people in their proportionate share of control over the legislative, administrative and judicial branches of government.

New York.

John R. Commons.



The Socialist Movement in Great Britain



THE labor movement in Great Britain is a sort of *pons asinorum* for socialists who go abroad to find out how the world is getting along. Our conditions are special; we have an insular habit of mind; we require a great deal of understanding. The object of this paper is to point out some of the special characteristics of the labor movement here, with a view to showing that, if we have a way of our own for doing things, it is because we have special circumstances to deal with.

To begin with, no other country has a trade union movement like ours. Commercial trade unionism has been inspired by the men who led the socialist movement. English trade unionism has had no inspiration whatever beyond the simple conviction that in making demands against masters, unity is strength. Now and again the English trade unionist has been fired by some enthusiasm for "a large movement" as during the sixth decade of the last century, but behind the enthusiasts there have always been a solid mass of men lacking imagination, anxious to grasp tightly the gains of the day before advancing to realize a greater gain. The English trade union movement as a whole has consequently stuck close to practical work—meaning by practical that which gives results most readily. So closely has it fixed its attention upon results that it has barely paused to inquire how valuable they were. An aim that could be nicknamed Utopian was doomed. An average Englishman has a considerable amount of assurance, but he flees from the approach of a New Jerusalem as a man flees from Satan. The English trade union movement, then, instead of showing a grasp of fundamental industrial economics and instead of laying hold upon a theory of social reconstruction under which the wage-earner in his modern significance shall disappear, has shifted its policy as the phases of industrial evolution have changed. When machinery was being introduced, the unions condemned machinery; when women's labor was being employed the unions tried to stop it; when the market was rising they attempted to force up wages or reduce hours. They were playing a game of check or of see-saw; they had no reconstructive ideas. The only glimmer of reconstructive effort they ever

had was when they added sick, out-of-work, death or other forms of insurance to their activities.

Looking back over the whole movement, two distinct epochs of policy seem to be marked off. Until about the end of the fifth decade of the last century the unions were striving to check the use of labor-saving machinery. The anti-machine policy was succeeded by another which was forced upon the unions rather than selected or discovered by them. A great demand for labor was growing up and the abler trade union leaders saw that their best move under the circumstances was to abandon all attempts to regulate the way in which labor was to be employed—whether it wielded a hammer itself, or saw that a steam engine was doing it properly—and strive so to organize the supply of labor that it would make a good bargain with capital. The problem was one of bargaining; the trade union was an instrument by which the individual workman might approach the possibility of making a really free contract. This policy marked the period roughly dating between 1845-50 and 1880-90. During the latter margin, trade union leader after trade union leader began to recognize that the old policy was played out. Whenever by a depression of trade, the sudden introduction of new machinery, a protective combination of capital (whether it be a federation or a fusion of independent firms) demand slackens or supply loses its power to regulate the market, the second policy of trades unionism becomes futile. What has happened is, that employers have seen that if capital would regulate its demand for labor, labor could not regulate its own supply. This is what is now happening. Trusts are being formed in some instances, and in others the masters in whole trades, such as engineering and building, are federating themselves in unions.

Those new conditions again demand a new trade union policy, and, let it be emphasized, the policy is being discovered not deductively from general industrial principles, from comprehensive economic facts, but inductively by a process of experiment. Some unions like the boilermakers and bedstead-makers have actually entered the alliance of their employers and have agreed upon scales of wages and profits; others have accepted a sliding scale arrangement by which profits and wages move in automatic sympathy. But these experiments are breaking down one after another, because they are unworkable. Their machinery, under one strain or other, goes out of gear. The clearest headed of the trade unionists are abandoning all hope of being able to rig what is called "the law of supply and demand" so that it may play into the hands of labor in making a bargain, and are beginning to make their demands on the ground of human and social right; and these demands are becoming known as a "physiological and moral minimum."

But no sooner do active unionists think in this way than they see that no "physiological and moral minimum" can be secured until the trunk industries of the country are held by the community and used to promote communal ends rather than individual gains.

At this point, two methods suggest themselves. The first is that of co-operation—a movement which in this country has also developed an existence separate from a social ideal. Great efforts are being made at the present moment to get trade unionists committed to co-operative production, but as the society which is pushing this matter has, quite naturally, associated with it some of the bitterest enemies that trade unionism has, it is not very likely to divert a great deal of trade union energy. The second is the political method. This is gaining in favor very rapidly. There has always been a tendency for trade unions to rush into politics when pushed into a corner, but their conception of political action has been as temporary and insufficient as their industrial policy.

In this connection it may be of interest if I quote a paragraph from the first annual report presented by the joint executive committee of trade unions and socialist societies to the delegates attending the conference on labor representation held in Manchester last February:

"It is appropriate that the first annual report of this committee should refer briefly to the various attempts that have been made to initiate a labor representation movement as an adjunct to trade unionism. Immediately after the reform act of 1868, which enfranchised working men in the boroughs, a movement started, both inside and outside the trade union ranks, demanding that an end should be put to the legal grievances which trade unions then suffered, by sending to the House of Commons a body of trade union representatives. The Labor Representation League, established for this purpose, was essentially a trades union congress offshoot. It failed in its efforts to get its candidates recognized by the managers of either political party, and was forced into "three-cornered" contests. A bye-election in 1869 was fought by Mr. George Odger on behalf of the trade unionists. In 1870, and again in 1873, the league had to split votes, and at the general election in 1874 it proposed to contest seventeen or eighteen constituencies. Fourteen of its candidates went to the poll, and of these only four were allowed a straight fight—A. Macdonald (Stafford); T. Burt (Morpeth); S. Mottershead (Preston); R. Cremer (Warwick). Ten were compelled to split votes—B. Pickard (Wigan); G. Howell (Aylesbury); Henry Broadhurst (Wycombe); G. Potter (Peterborough); Halliday (Merthyr); Kane (Middlesbrough); G. Odger (Southwark); Morris (Cricklade); B. Lucraft (Finsbury); Walton (Stoke-on-Trent). The most

pressing of the legal disabilities were shortly afterward redressed, and the Labor Representation League gradually disappeared. Little more was heard of such a movement (except amongst the miners, who had returned two members to Parliament in 1874) until a new kind of pressure began to be felt by trade unions—until the economic problem of capitalism took the place of the legal problem of anti-trade union legislation. Towards the end of the eighties, owing to depression in trade and the beginning of successful combinations amongst the employers, the attention of the trade unions was again turned towards labor politics. The London dock strike in particular marks the birth of the new political movement. The congress which met in Belfast in 1893 resolved that the unions should combine to form a parliamentary fund, but the parliamentary committee had to report next year that only two unions had agreed to put the resolution in operation. The matter had to drop for the time being. In 1890 the Labor Electoral Association was formed, but failed to impress the unions with the necessity for its existence, and congress itself could not be induced to take official action until 1899, when the railway servants' resolution, which originated the present movement, was passed."

At last the trade unions are being driven to formulate an economic policy of reconstruction and to adopt political methods. The movement has grown from within. Its existence does not show so much the success of a propaganda, though the Independent Labor Party—started in 1894—has done specially good work in drawing trade unionism on towards socialism. It is the evolution of a method designed to protect the wage-earner against the capitalist.

The new trade union method is bound to remain a little indefinite for some time to come—until there is a break in prosperity and until a socialist policy in Parliament wins the confidence of the rank and file of the trade unions. It would be a mistake to force it prematurely into dogmas and shibboleths. When a certain road is taken, certain goals must be reached, and when British trade unionism is driven to politics and to formulate demands for a labor representation which shall be independent of the non-labor political parties, it has entered a road that has socialism at the end of it.

As a matter of fact, when we consider men apart from movements, the best men amongst the trade unionists are socialists. It is practically impossible to fill the secretaryship of an important trade union now without appointing a member of the Independent Labor Party to the office. Two such offices were vacant recently, and in both cases they were held previously by men who had been active and bitter opponents of ours. The societies, moreover, were, generally speaking, "old-fashioned" societies—the boilermakers and the typographical association.

And yet the new secretaries of both societies are members of the Independent Labor Party. The secretary of the steel smelters has also become a convert of ours quite recently. There is not an executive of any important trade union in the country but has its group of socialists, mainly Independent Labor Party men.

I have just quoted from a report presented by the labor representation committee to a delegate meeting of members of trade unions. This is the committee which was started from the annual congress of trade unions in 1899. It did not get into working order until April in last year, and in ten months, despite much opposition from some of the more conservative unions, it had a membership of 375,931—353,070 trade unionists and 22,861 socialists; and in addition a more or less duplicated membership of trades councils amounting to 122,000.

The future of political trade unionism is largely in the hands of this committee. The report from which I have quoted contains another paragraph which, though long, may be again extracted as it puts as briefly as can be the work which the committee was able to do at the last general election.

“The abuse of constitutional power by which the government plunged the country into an election in order to snatch a hasty and unformed judgment from the electors, for its own partisan ends, made it impossible for the committee to complete its plan of campaign. The trade union candidatures, for the lack of such an organization as is now being built up, were specially backward, and were not so many as we should have wished, nor as they would have been had the election been delayed for a few months.

“And yet, the labor representation committee’s list fared remarkably well. Two members of the committee actually won seats for labor (the only victories which labor gained at the election), and, in every case but one, where comparison with 1895 is possible, its candidates improved their polls. The votes polled were 62,698 out of a total of 177,000. In ten cases the local organizations responsible for the committee’s candidates were strong enough to keep one of the ordinary parties out of the contest; in the other five constituencies they had to fight both parties. This favorable result is due, in no small measure, to the existence of the committee, and its manifesto to the electors in the constituencies where its candidates were running was signed by representatives of all the sections of the labor movement. This is a happy augury for the future. Three hundred and thirty thousand of these manifestoes were supplied gratis to the committee’s candidates. The following candidates were run by affiliated organizations and consequently were supported by the committee:

Constituency.	Candidate.	Opponents.	Labor vote.	Total vote polled.	Representation before contest.	Representation after contest.
Derby	R. Bell	2 Cons.	7,640	15,000	2 Cons.	1 Lab. and 1 Lib.
Merthyr	J. Keir Hardie	2 Libs.	5,745	13,000	2 Libs.	1 Lab. and 1 Lib.
Gower (Glam)	J. Hodge	1 Lib.	3,853	8,129	1 Lib.	1 Lib.
Sunderland	A. Wilkie	2 Cons.	8,842	19,102	1 Lib. and 1 Con.	2 Cons.
West Ham	W. Thorne	1 Con.	4,459	10,054	1 Con.	1 Con.
Blackburn	P. Snowden	2 Cons.	7,096	18,000	2 Cons.	2 Cons.
Bradford	F. Jovett	1 Con.	4,949	9,989	1 Con.	1 Con.
Halifax	J. Parker	2 Libs. and 1 Con.	3,276	13,000	1 Lib. and 1 Con.	1 Lib. and 1 Con.
Leicester	J. R. MacDonald	2 Libs. and 1 Con.	4,164	18,000	2 Libs.	1 Lib. and 1 Con.
Manchester, S. W.	F. Brocklehurst	1 Con.	2,398	6,415	1 Con.	1 Con.
Preston	J. Keir Hardie	2 Cons.	4,894	11,500	2 Cons.	2 Cons.
Bow and Bromley ...	Geo. Lansbury	1 Con.	2,558	6,961	1 Con.	1 Con.
Ashton-u-Lyne	J. Johnston	1 Lib. and 1 Con.	737	6,100	1 Con.	1 Con.
Leeds, East.	W. P. Byles	1 Lib. and 1 Con.	1,266	6,805	1 Lib.	1 Con.
Rochdale	A. Clarke	1 Lib. and 1 Con.	901	11,290	1 Con.	1 Con.

"These figures compare so favorably with other labor polls, and with the general result of the election, that they must convince every one that labor candidatures promoted by labor organizations have as good a chance of success as when they are promoted by either of the old parties."

For the first time for many years the labor and socialist sections issued a united appeal and prominent trade union officials, not quite socialists, identified themselves with prominent socialists who were candidates.

The work of organization is now being proceeded with in likely labor constituencies. Special efforts are being made to bring the trade unionists, socialists and co-operators into sympathetic touch for political purposes. A probable outcome of the present situation is that when the next election comes there will be some score of the labor representation committee's candidates running in constituencies without liberal opposition and at least a dozen ought to be returned to Parliament. Of these nine should be convinced socialists.

J. Ramsay Mac Donald,
Hon. Sec. Labor Representation Committee.



Straws

THE causes of all phenomena are equally adequate." Much has been said and written about the phenomena of nature. It is, however, the purpose of this article to call special attention to the phenomena of human nature, which would probably come under the head of social phenomena; also to look for the adequate causes of the same.

If the above quotation be a truism, is it the part of good common sense, or any explanation of the case to dogmatically assert that "the reason the tramp doesn't work is that he is too lazy?" How about laziness, anyway; is it a phenomena without a cause? If so, will some "conservative," "irreproachable," "respectable" "citizen" of "high standing," "calm judgment," and "clear insight," please rise and explain the cause of the great increase of that malady of late years. How comes it that this nation's army of tramps is much greater in numbers, though many times more expensive, than its standing army?

Those who persist in repeating that stale old chestnut about the prime cause of poverty being indolence and intemperance, are here invited to furnish us with an analysis of the two maladies; mental indolence and intoxication not to be considered in the treatise; that would perhaps be asking too much.

We have quit our superstitions in part, for some generations back; hence, if our watch ceases to work we are sure there is a natural adequate cause, and what to do with it is a question so simple that almost any child will find no difficulty in answering. But to the bourgeois wisecrack philanthropist, "the problem of what to do with the tramp is indeed perplexing," and becoming more and more so all the while. We ransack ancient, medieval and modern superstition to discover the causes of these various phenomena—especially those which disturb or interest us most—and finally abandon our research, as hopelessly in the dark on the matter as when we begun. And yet we have been reading the statement for 1800 years to the effect that men do not gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles. Our minds have been so clouded with superstition that we are only just now beginning to appreciate the significance of such quotations as the above and their bearing on the subject which we shall presently take up.

Straws indicate the direction of the wind, and if we study carefully the movements of the straws herein treated, we think we shall surely find that they are wafted along by "tradewinds."

It would be as well to begin at home. In our town a few of the brightest women are partially ostracized from society because forsooth "they will persist in dragging socialism into everything." "We just simply can't allow this political talk in our meetings." "I'd just like to ask her a few questions if it were not for getting her started." Further we shall see that no one does "drag in" socialism; that, on the contrary, socialism does the dragging, and impels the few to entreat the many to "take a thought and mend" and go and do likewise.

Perhaps the best thing the socio-religious world can do in this matter is to resign itself to its fate, in the reflection that it is "our manifest destiny" to rend the veil of the temple and turn their play-party into a lyceum.

In our town there are perhaps a dozen of the male sex who create more or less friction by "eternally talkin' socialism." "Everything they see, hear, smell or taste reminds them of socialism." (Nearly all roads lead some people to socialism, and the number of such is continually growing larger.) "They make me weary." "They don't know enough to let up when a fellow is plum exhausted."

The foregoing are some of the unfriendly comments one hears. Go to one of the three mercantile houses, one of the two blacksmith shops or to the pharmacy in town and you stand in great danger of becoming inoculated with the dread virus. Go to the U. S. postoffice, and even that institution savors of socialism, in spite of the fact that its master is a republican. And we must not forget the outlying shingle mills which teach classes in practical economics. And this reminds us not to overlook the public schools, where socialism is creeping in, though as yet inarticulate.

Now for another straw which the wind driveth about. For several years past during the winter months, it has been the custom of our town people to organize a literary society, which took the form of a popular entertainment, consisting principally of music, recitations, dialogues, readings, and once in a while a light drama. Debating was also in order. But economics has gradually been creeping in, and the result is that a motion to make a chapter from Bellamy's "Equality," with free discussion of questions involved, a part of each weekly programme, was carried at our first meeting this season.

One more item. The most important church organization in our town has changed preachers at least every twelve months for the past five or six years, and each succeeding incumbent is treated to a somewhat larger allowance of economic thought at the hands of the cranks. For example, the good parson at the Sunday evening service talks to the young people about "Success," i. e., he rehashes that 19th century sermon we've all heard

over and over about energy, temperance and frugality. And in the course of his discourse relates that inspiring incident in which a bank, a pin and a new testament play the leading parts. As a result an after meeting is held between the worthy minister and one of the cranks, in which they both testify. Meanwhile another crank has hurried home to burn the midnight oil in preparing a friendly criticism, soliciting an answer. The same he mails to the preacher but receives no reply, which, however, is no ill omen, as we discover a little later, for the very next socialist lecture in town is attended by our ecclesiastical brother, where he gets a clearer understanding of the cause and a kindlier feeling exists between all concerned.

Thus by this "ceaseless beat of thought upon the shores of error" ministers are among the great multitude who are continually being induced to choose whom they will serve.

It will be noticed that I have cited no circumstance outside my own immediate neighborhood; but the same thing, as all who have observed the phenomena, will attest, is all the while taking place in a greater or less degree throughout the whole civilized world.

The "Daily Voice," of Chicago, national organ of the Prohibition party, dated November 8, 1900, contains a very suggestive editorial to which we could call special attention, particularly from those who are interested in sociology.

The editor in referring to propaganda work says of the socialist: "The fact that has impressed us most is this, wherever you find a socialist you find an agitator; a man who makes it one of the foremost things of his life to set people to thinking along the lines he is interested in. Your socialist may be an uneducated man, he may have no abilities as a public speaker; perhaps he could not write an article to save his life; but he finds something that he can do to persuade people to his way of thinking. He learns to speak, he learns to debate; he develops the ability to write. He has read the great classics of his cause. He has their arguments at his tongue's end, and goes loaded for a discussion with every man he meets. No propaganda has been more earnest, and scarce any more efficient. We speak of these things to say to our readers the more pointedly, why don't you become an enthusiast for prohibition? Why don't you develop the power to speak and debate and write for the cause? Did you make any speeches during the campaign? Did you hold any curbstone discussions with a dozen or two of your neighbors around you?"

Now socialists in general, we feel sure, will be obliged to the editor for his remarks concerning them in spite of his suggestion that our "views may be one-sided and fallacious." As to the number of sides our cause has, a comparison with Prohibi-

tion will not greatly embarrass us. And right here I would like to predict that our cause will, in the coming four years, draw comparatively more from the Prohibition party than from either of the regular capitalist parties, because they are so wholly in earnest, mentally capable and morally courageous.

It is not my purpose to treat the above editorial in detail, but I do wish to make a few observations and answer his main query from the standpoint of modern scientific socialism. From the standpoint of casual observation the matter would seem to be of small importance and I am strongly of the opinion that the question was propounded without the slightest expectation of ever receiving a real adequate answer; nevertheless it is part of the phenomena, a significant straw.

Let us here refer to the quotation at the beginning of this article, but change the wording so that it will read: "The cause of every phenomenon is sufficiently adequate." Now this proposition being axiomatic gives a key to the whole situation. Briefly stated the prohibition movement has not sufficient cause back of it to induce the average adherent to put forth an amount of effort equal to that of the average socialist.

To be more explicit, let us quote from Heine: "We do not take possession of our ideas but are possessed by them. They master us and force us into the arena, where, like gladiators we must fight for them." I do not contend that socialists are inherently better, more intelligent or energetic than others, but that we are possessed by an idea great enough to compel us to hold curbstone discussions, study the great classics of our cause and develop ability to speak, write and debate. Now by this time I trust the answer to our editor's problem has begun to be apparent. Once let the socialist idea get possession of the republican, democrat or prohibitionist and he will be no less a propagandist than those of the socialist persuasion.

Capitalistic propaganda is carried on only by stump speakers and the public press, while with socialism you are liable to take it from any one who has it, as well as from observation and reading; it being not only contagious but epidemic; for as the editor has pointed out, every socialist is a propagandist. Probably not one prohibitionist in a hundred is a missionary in the cause. Furthermore, that party had substantially the same reason for its existence ten, fifteen or even twenty years ago that it now has; whereas the metamorphosis of capitalism is continually provoking new socialist thought, and making independent political action on the part of the exploited class, more and more imperative.

Ten years ago the New England operative in the vortex of our industrial system, doubtless had sufficient reason for taking an independent line of political action. Five years ago those same

operatives had many more reasons for such conduct, and many more wage laborers were caught by the inflowing tides of capitalism and made to see that their political interests were no longer identical with those of their economic masters; on the contrary, that the interests of those two classes (under capitalism) were becoming all the while more and more opposed, and this year of our Lord 1901 brings still many more of us to a realizing sense of where our class interests lie.

Thus this little distinction between the causes of these two political effects, viz: Prohibition and Socialism, becomes an item of no small importance.

As we go over and investigate, the molehill becomes a mountain. Our recent national election certainly verified the claim made by the socialists that the political and hence economic triumph of their cause depends primarily on the class-consciousness of the disinherited. And this mental state develops with the logic of industrial events. For instance in mechanical Massachusetts, socialists are mostly from the ranks of the factory operatives, where they have had the philosophy of the class struggle, of which they are thoroughly cognizant, practically presented to them from their youth up; consequently they polled a very respectable vote and sent two of their number to the legislature.

Let us investigate a little further along this line. Someone has said that "thoughts are things." Now then, as to the machine; the original object of course was that it should turn out only fabrics of one kind or another; various commodities representing as much surplus value as possible. But happily we have discovered that it is now already turning out an idea that is "possessing" and "mastering" the "man under the machine" and "forcing him into the arena" where he is fulfilling his mission, fighting humanity's noble, good fight, for the greatness of the cause constraineth him.

On the outcome of this world's battle depends a more normal society, and on a more normal society depends the abolition of the liquor traffic. The ship of state rides not on the ebb and flow of enthusiasm for a single phase of human advancement, but rather upon the ceaseless onward ocean-tides of industry; i. e., the social trend is dependent on the industrial trend.

But to return to consciousness, that is to class-consciousness; let us contrast the east with the west which has not made nearly so substantial a showing, simply because capitalistic industry has not yet developed far enough to create a class-conscious state of mind in the proletariat of that section; or we might have gone on to say that the mechanism of industry in the west is as yet too imperfect to turn out a real full blown economic idea. We further maintain that evolution is the power behind the

throne in the phenomena of industry, and that this same irresistible, inevitable, industrial evolution is gradually permeating the whole social fabric with socialist thought; and that, regardless of whether it be distasteful to this one or that one. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."

The foregoing is a brief outline of what seems to be capitalism's method of mustering and mobilizing the forces for its final overthrow; i. e., the means of its own extermination.

The "blade" we may say is typical of, or corresponds with the phenomena treated under the heading of this article—straws. The "ear," the epoch of class consciousness, and the "full corn," the period of political solidarity of the capitalist class on the one hand and the dispossessed class on the other.

It will be a war of ballots not bullets, and thus by sheer force of numbers, the citadel of capitalism is bound to fall. First a murmur and a query, then protest and investigation; then the great powerful political battering ram is turned against our industrial Jericho and its walls begin to crumble. As louder grows the noise and tumult from without, within the revel ceases, the prince of mountebanks comes forth and at the climax of a grand awful peroration exclaims, "What means this hammering at the gates of Capitalism?" And the morning of the new century answers that the real Democracy is now fitted to survive.

"Legion."



Mind and Socialism

Motto: It is not the conscious mind of man that determines the form of his being, but, vice versa, the social form of his being that determines the conscious action of his mind.—*Karl Marx*. Preface to "Critique of Pol. Economy.



WHEN Marx, in the stillness of the night, concentrated his powerful mind on the thought quoted above, intent on his life's purpose of forging the mental weapons for the emancipation of the proletarian mind from the baneful influence of capitalistic teaching, he could hardly anticipate that some of his latter-day followers would make his thought the cornerstone for such arguments as the following:

"If it is not the conscious mind of man that determines the form of his being, but quite the reverse, then it would follow that capitalistic society must grow into socialism as the outcome of the free play of economic forces, without the intervention of the conscious social mind, as embodied in the socialist party platform."*

"The historical merit of Karl Marx, which has immortalized his name, is that he has shown that capitalistic society is *growing into socialism*, whether we like it or not, by force of economic development."†

Such attempts to subvert the logic of the fundamental principles on which the socialist movement is based have lately appeared on our side of the "great pond," after the advocates of this new doctrine had met an ignominious defeat in Europe. Here, as they did over there, they shift uneasily from one subject to another when confronted by opposition. Here, as there, they seek refuge in pettifogging when their stock in trade of arguments is exhausted. And if nothing else will avail, they try to impeach the value of the arguments brought forth by the defenders of the "class struggle" by hinting darkly at the influence of theologic dogmas, this mummified bugaboo of a bygone era.

These and similar methods are necessary attributes of arguments directed against beliefs and hypothetical conceptions which they impute to us, but which we do not hold. It is a good way of biasing the clear judgment of the readers; but whether used intentionally or only as the result of illogical deductions from our reasoning, it can hardly be recommended as a good way of proving the strength of the position defended by such methods.

**Marrist Int. Soc. Rev.*, Oct., 1900; page 225.

†*Marrist Int. Soc. Rev.*, March, 1901; page 583.

Where have we attempted to fetter the freedom of scientific investigation? Have not we rather advised Marxist to investigate a little further by recommending the perusal of other works written by Marx?

The spirit of proletarianism is as far removed from religious sectarianism as proletarian socialism is from state socialism. This spirit will be the "bull in the china shop" of a frail philosophy that would represent us as the helpless victims of blind forces, that would stamp socialist propaganda as folly and that would ridicule the idea of a "class struggle," our one and only guiding star in the desolate wilderness of capitalistic economics. I propose to show—

I. That neither Marx nor any eminent "class-conscious" socialist after him ever shared Marxist's fatalistic view of the growing of society into socialism as the outcome of purely economic development, and

II. That the mind of man plays a very important part in the evolution of society.

I. THE ECONOMIC SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

Marx as well as the prominent representatives of class-conscious socialism in all countries have always held that the course of economic evolution must logically lead to a revolution. Not the brutal and blind revolution of a savage mob—as Marxist would fain represent our view—but the conscious application of legal means by an economically and politically organized proletariat.

"Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital," says Marx,* "who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class—a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with it and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

Does Marx think it will be a "violent revolution?"* No. For a little further on he continues:

"The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labor, into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process incomparably more protracted, violent and difficult than the transformation of capitalistic private property,

*Capital, Chapt. XXXII, page 487.

already practically resting on socialized production, into socialized property. In the former case we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people."

We see that we have passed the worst stage of the evolution, when the concentration of capital has become a fetter on the mode of production. Even Marxist admits that "capitalism has long since crossed the danger line which separates private property from public ownership."* Therefore I am at a loss to explain his "Fourth of July pyrotechnics" at our idea of social revolution.

What is there utopian in Marx's conception of this stage of economic evolution? We don't see it. Neither did Engels, who wrote in 1886:†

"The sighed-for period of prosperity will not come; as often as we seem to perceive its heralding symptoms, so often do they again vanish into air. Meanwhile, each succeeding winter brings up afresh the great question, "what to do with the unemployed"; but while the number of the unemployed keeps swelling from year to year, there is nobody to answer that question; and we can almost calculate the moment when the unemployed, losing patience, will take their own fate into their own hands."

What is the only hope for avoiding a social tragedy according to Engels?

To listen to the voice of a man, "whom . . . study led to the conclusion that the inevitable social revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means."‡

In replying to the criticisms directed against what Barth called the "economic conception of history" due to the influence of Marx, Engels wrote in 1890:§ "We had to emphasize the *dominating principle*—the economic side of the question—which was not admitted by our opponents. In doing so we did not always find time, space or opportunity to give due recognition to the *other factors* contributing to the general result."

And a little later he makes this point still clearer:¶ "There are innumerable forces, crossing and recrossing one another, an infinite group of parallelograms of forces. These result in the historical event. The latter, again, may be regarded as the product of a power that is, as a whole, acting unconsciously and involuntarily. For every one is hindering that which every one else is striving to effect, and the result is such as no one wished to obtain."

The same thought is again found in another letter, written

*Marxist, Int. Soc. Rev., October, 1900; page 225.

†Preface to Capital.

‡Ibid.

§Frederic Engels. Letter of 1890, publ. in "Der Sozialistische Akademiker," Oct., 1895

¶Ibidem.

by Engels in 1894:* "Political, judicial, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic and any other development is founded on economic evolution. But all these factors react on one another and on their economic foundation."

That Liebknecht shared the views of Marx and Engels on this subject, is well known. In the "Gotha Program" of the German Social Democratic Party, which gives expression to Liebknecht's convictions, we find the role assigned to the mind defined in the following manner:

"The liberation of labor demands the transformation of the means of production into the common property of society and the associative regulation of the collective labor with general employment and just distribution of the proceeds of labor.

The emancipation of labor must be the work of the laboring class, opposed to which all other classes are only a reactionary body. . . .

In order to accomplish our object we must organize ourselves."†

As to the position of Kautsky on this question, let his article on "Trades Unions and Socialism" in the present issue of the International Socialist Review speak for itself.

Bernstein, who finds such great favor in the eyes of Marxist, supports this position by his own testimony.

"Of course," he writes, "I do not assert that Marx and Engels have at any time overlooked the fact that other than economic factors are exerting their influence on the course of historic events. . . . Whoever wishes to apply the materialistic conception of history to-day, is obliged to use it in its developed, not in its original form. That is to say, full recognition must be accorded to the development and influence of productive forces and conditions as well as to juridical and ethical conceptions, historical and religious traditions of each epoch, influences of geographical and other natural relations. *Human character and mental abilities naturally belong to these causes.*"‡

This idea is more fully developed a little further on: "The more other than purely economic forces bring their influence to bear on social life the more variable becomes the effect of so-called historic necessity. . . . On one hand appears the growing insight into the laws of evolution and more especially of economic evolution. On the other hand we perceive, partly as the cause of this insight, partly as its consequence, *an increasing ability to direct the economic development.*" ¶

*Publ. in "Der Sozialistische Akademiker," October, 1895.

†Liebknecht. Socialism: What it is and what it seeks to accomplish. Translated by May Wood Simons. Page 23. Kerr & Co., Chicago.

‡Ed. Bernstein. Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie. (Stuttgart, 1899. J. H. W. Dietz, Nachf.) Page 7.

¶Ibidem, page 10.

In plain American, at present we cannot absolutely determine "the form of our being," but we can modify it by our influence.

Comrade Herron recently maintained this position in his famous speech at Central Music Hall, September 29, 1900:* "Hitherto, what we call society has been the evolution of blind forces which man did not understand and could not control. But we are reaching that moment when man will become the evolver as well as the evolved; when man will become conscious of himself as the decretal and creative force in evolution."

So far are all these men removed from the idea of fatalistic resignation to purely economic factors that they devote all their energies to the organization of the proletariat and to spreading the doctrine of "class-consciousness." If the social question could be solved by the agency of economic forces alone, then socialist propaganda would be folly indeed. But it cannot. Without the influence of socialist principles the evolution of society would end in a howling chaos of destruction and murder. Nothing will restrain and guide the penned-up passions of the oppressed masses but the scientific truth of socialism.

Let us look around and ascertain whether the concentration of capital in the United States has not reached a point when the signs predicted by Marx become visible, and the integument of private ownership may be burst asunder with less difficulty than the process of concentration offered.

We cannot judge our conditions by European examples, for our industrial development is far ahead of the European. Therefore no resolutions fitting the condition of the working-class in Europe, no matter how "plain and businesslike" the language of such documents may be, will give us any clew to the policy we shall have to pursue in our country. We must decide for ourselves.

Compare Marx's description of the critical moment with the present state of affairs in America. Do not his words convey the most accurate description of the situation that any eyewitness could give? Look at practically the entire railroad system of the United States combined under one management. Observe how the control of the industries supplying coal, steel, grain, sugar, cattle, glue, kerosene, gas, electricity is passing into fewer and fewer hands almost from month to month. Can concentration go much farther?

Mark how the number of unemployed increases at the same time. Watch the growth of misery, slavery, degradation and exploitation. Think of a man and his two half-grown girls

*Why I Am a Socialist. Publ. by Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Page 19.

earning together 60 cents for twelve hours of night work in a Southern cotton mill. Go to the "Western Electric" in Chicago and see college graduates working at menial tasks for \$7 per week. Travel through the vast regions of the South where farming on a small scale has become unprofitable and convince yourself of the abject poverty of the agricultural population. Read the regulations and restrictions to which the wage slaves must submit or face starvation, crime and the penitentiary. They can no longer eat, drink or wear what they like nor live where they choose.

The state will socialize these industries, says Marxist. But the state—that is Hanna. And if Hanna has the power to promise the next presidential election to Teddy,* who will force him to dissolve the trust that sustains him?

Since the Republican party will not, therefore, reduce the hours of labor for the "working cattle" or give them higher wages, and since the Democratic party is hopelessly reactionary, it is obvious that only the socialist party will be willing and able to do something for the progress of the world, which is now hampered by the Republican party.

Is it likely that socialists will be inclined to adopt state socialism when they can get the "real thing"? What is there in state socialism to recommend it?

"State socialism," answers Marxist, "means primarily public ownership or public control of monopolies for the benefit of the consumer."† Shades of Billy and Teddy! What do you think of this? You know very well that state socialism means primarily control of national resources for the benefit of those who contribute liberally to the campaign fund of the Republican party.

Instance the postal service paying millions into the spacious pockets of the transportation trust; the army and navy, a field that can tell startling stories of exploitations by pets of Republican party managers; the public school funds appropriated to political purposes and the employes of this "socialized" service, either instruments of capitalists or relegated to obscurity; heavy tariffs for the benefit of industries that have long outgrown the stage where they needed protection, and subsidies for steamship companies that could be better off by strict business management. And the consumer somewhere in the dim distance vaguely wondering where he will come in—that is state socialism!

Are we going to perpetuate such a monstrous "civilization," when we can put society on the just basis of collectivism?

*Marxist, *Int. Soc. Rev.*, March, 1901; page 681.

†Marxist, *Int. Soc. Rev.*, March, 1901; page 687.

"Ah, *wahen*," says Marxist. "This is where you fellows are utopian."

Are we?

"Mankind always sets to itself only such problems as it is able to solve; for upon close analysis it always appears that the problem itself is raised only then when the material conditions requisite for its solution are already in existence, or at least in process of formation."*

Now, here we have a state of society when centralization has almost reached the stage where one man can control all the nation's means of production. On the other hand, the sentiment in favor of socialism has been growing in all strata of society to such an extent that we may expect at any moment to see the movement assuming gigantic proportions. The problem is upon us. The moment has arrived for the proletarian mind to enter its field and reap its harvest. The iron is hot, and we must strike it.

II. THE INTELLECTUAL SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

Here is the point where we are justified in resenting a philosophy that would undo all the patient labor of fifty years of socialist agitation. Now more than ever it is necessary to forget our petty differences, if we mean business, to unite and to go to work in earnest. If we would not prepare the masses now for the inheritance into which they will by all appearances soon come, then the chance of our life will be missed. But no class-conscious socialist thinks of missing it. The handwriting on the wall is too plain.

"It is beyond doubt," writes Vandervelde, "that the concentration realized by trusts, while increasing the cohesion of employers and swelling the army of unemployed, weakens to that degree the resistive power of trade unions." †

Let the members of trade unions realize that industrial concentration is rendering the power to strike practically of no avail, and they will swell the army of class-conscious proletarians to such an extent that our political strength will at once become formidable. Self-interest will then draw over to us all those who do not derive any immediate benefit from their adherence to the Republican party.

It depends on us to bring the matter before the people in so clear a light that no doubt about the correctness of our principles can remain. The way is prepared.

Read the signs of the times. Is it not significant that a magazine like the North American Review is publishing articles

*Marx, Preface to "Critique of Political Economy."

†E. Vandervelde. *Collectivism and Industrial Evolution*. Translated by Charles H. Kerr, Chicago, 1901.

with socialist tendencies? Does it not matter that country papers all over the land are beginning to make socialist quotations a regular part of their columns? Is it nothing that Heron finds thousands of enthusiastic followers, eager to listen to him every Sunday? Has it not a deep meaning when young women leave their studies to spread the gospel of socialist brotherhood? Will it not change the world when sweet little tots, all unconscious of the deep emotions they stir in the breasts of men, sing on their walk to school:

Tho' we wield nor spear nor sabre,
 We, the sturdy sons of labor,
 Helping ev'ry man his neighbor,
 Shrink not from the fight.
 See our homes before us!
 Wives and babes implore us!
 So firm we stand in heart and hand
 And swell the dauntless chorus:
 Men of labor, young or hoary,
 Would ye win a name in story?
 Strike for home, for life, for glory,
 Justice, Freedom, Right!

Yes, it will indeed make a great difference whether such manifestations are part of our public life or not.

In fifty years, seven millions of class-conscious socialists, clasping hands around the world, have grown out of the old utopian Communist Club. In as many months we may see the number of socialists grow to the same figure in the United States, as a logical and unavoidable result of an unexpectedly rapid concentration of the means of production.

May those who still consider such a view as utopian remember that the "utopia of to-day often becomes the reality of tomorrow." The unexpected may happen that the proletarian mind, stirred up from its customary stupor by some unforeseen event, will suddenly awake to a consciousness of its supremacy. Let us be prepared to guide it so that it will obliterate the capitalist integument of private ownership, declare the practically socialized means of production collective property and proceed to organize the mode of distribution on collectivist principles.

E. Untermann.

The Charity Girl

By Caroline H. Pemberton, Author of "Stephen the Black," "Your Little Brother James," Etc.

CHAPTER III.



ARTHA McPHERSON was causing trouble to the matron and managers of "St. Agnes' Holy House"; Julian's presence was needed there to quell the in-subordinate outcast. This was the news that greeted him the following morning. In the afternoon he went out to the institution. Its managers were in friendly co-operation with the Association for Sociological Research.

He was led upstairs to a large apartment filled with cots and young women holding small bundles in their arms sitting beside the cots. Martha sat apart with her babe on her lap.

"We've had to keep her from the rest to prevent contamination," the matron whispered; "she's the worst we've got—shameless to a degree that makes me blush. Yes, sir! at my age and with all I've saw and knowed of the sinfulness of the world it makes me blush to behold her!"

Julian, glancing at the lady's round, purple face and huge head growing out of immense shoulders, vaguely wondered if he should indeed attribute her chronic floridness to a too prolonged contemplation of the frail feminine humanity gathered under that roof.

"What has Martha done?" he asked.

"I'll give you a sample; she'll show herself off quick enough. Just take a seat. Martha, this is the gentleman from the good society that has looked after you like a loving parent since you was took away by the 'Croolty' from your first parents that misused you so dreadful."

"They didn't misuse me," muttered the girl sullenly.

"They didn't? Not when they spent all their money on drink and gave you nothin' to eat and no clothes to put on your back?"

"That warn't misusin'," explained the Magdalen desperately. "Pappy was out o' work, and me mammy 'd drink jes' to keep up her sperrits. I've been misused worse since I left 'em—abused more than they ever done. I'd go back right to-morrow if I knowed where they was."

The matron shot a pleased glance at Julian.

"Now, you see the gratitude that's in her? But that ain't what we come to talk about. Martha, this here gentleman

wants to know what *we* want to know; he's taken the occasion to come on that errand and he can't do no more for you till he knows all them particulars that you're holding back in your wicked heart. Now, I want you to confess to him the whole truth. I want you to open that heart of yours and let the light of the Lord Jesus shine into it for just this one brief moment. Don't you know Him and this here gentleman is standin' together an' knockin' at the door of that wicked heart o' yours?"

Julian considered whether he would dispute this representation of the Teacher of Men conspiring with himself to further the ends of a vulgar prosecutor of the defenceless, but he decided to await further developments.

"There ain't nothin' to confess," replied the girl stubbornly.

"There, sir—that's all the answer we get to our pleadings. Why, you wouldn't believe the kindnesses that's been showered on her! Every one of our managers has been here a-pleadin' with her in turn. They come rollin' up in their carriages and a-rustlin' up in their silks and satins and their furs and velvets to waste their valuable time in this here sinful room, when they might be enjoyin' theirselves at their afternoon teas and receptions! One sweet, religious lady, she got down on her knees on this very floor and prayed and sang two hymns by her side. But did she get out of her the name of that there child's father? Not a bit of it—no more than you will now, sir!"

Julian was about to end the conversation by disclaiming indignantly any share of curiosity on the subject, when his attention was directed to Martha's face. She sat straight in her chair with glazed eyes fixed on the blank, unpainted wall, Her head was raised; her expression had frozen into a kind of petrified horror, as if she were looking straight at some awful object. Had the mention of her child's father raised a fearful apparition?

The matron laid a fat hand on Julian's sleeve. "Now you see it," she whispered triumphantly—"the look we've all been gettin'!" She raised her voice and addressed the girl threateningly, "You brazen-eyed creature! We've been castin' our pearls before such as you long enough! This gentleman's got the power to inflict proper punishment and he ain't goin' to take the lies from your mouth that—"

"Woman—be silent!" Julian turned upon her with a voice of command; he ordered her sternly and briefly to withdraw.

"I wish to speak to this girl alone." He arose from his chair and faced the astounded matron without the shadow of an apology in his manner. She gasped for breath, her voluble speech failing her in such an extraordinary crisis. With a gesture of rage and consternation, she fled from the room.

Julian turned to Martha. She was no longer staring at the wall, but was bending over her child devotedly. Her expression had utterly changed.

"What do you call the little fellow?" Julian asked as he leaned forward to touch the child's hand.

"His name is Tahmmy—an' it's Jimmy, too. Tahmmy-James. That's his name. There was the two of 'em,—but they're gone now."

"There were two," repeated Julian, bewildered. "Two what?"

"Two boys—my bruvvers—Tahmmy an' Jimmy. Their real names was Thomas an' James. The Cruelty got 'em. They was put away in a orphans' home. I guess they're dead now. Tahmmy wouldn't live long in a orphans' home. He didn't want to be no orphan, but he was took an' made one—him an' Jimmy—an' me, too."

"I never knew you had brothers." Julian hung his head over the incomplete knowledge of the various associations that had exercised such omnipotent control over this young creature's destiny. If they had known of the existence of the brothers, they had failed to pass it on.

"Could I find 'em, do you s'pose, if I was to go an' ask at all them houses where they has boy orphans an' look 'em over an' p'int 'em out to them as has 'em in charge—supposin' they ain't dead? I'd know 'em wiv their hair cut off quick enough! Tahmmy's got eyes like this here baby. You could tell they was all to one fam'bly. Look at my baby's eyes." She held the infant, who was now aroused from his slumbers, towards Julian, her pale young face full of pride and motherliness.

"The bitter standing in solitary possession of the 'waste places and the pools of water' might make a more appropriate show of family pride," thought Julian. He expressed his appreciation of the baby's eyes.

"He had eyes that looked like he was talkin' back to the angels in heaven—Tahmmy had. But Jimmy was born with just common eyes. I darsn't call my baby after Tahmmy an' not after him too, 'cause Jimmy was that jealous o' Tahmmy he'd s'pose I did it to spite 'im. I never made a pin's diff'rence 'tween 'em, but it's Tahmmy I seen always in my dreams after he was put away—lookin' white an' sorrowful. I used to wake up cryin' from sich dreams; but I don't have 'em any more since this here one's come. I 'member when Tahmmy was a baby like this here one. He's a-goin' to be Tahmmy right over ag'in. Mebbe he's sent a-purpose? Why did them dreams stop all to onct without he was sent a-purpose?" Martha turned her tear-laden, colorless eyes full upon Julian.

It was certainly best to pass over the inquiry. "I will try to

find out what has become of your brothers; but now we must decide about the baby and how you can manage to support it."

Martha looked cautiously around. "They want me to give him away, that's what they want. Some would be glad to be rid of 'im—but I ain't one o' that kind. I love my beautiful baby." She kissed him tenderly. "They ask me every day who he looks like. Why, who is there for him to look like *but me*—without it's Tahmmy? Just as if he had two parents like other folks!"

Was she merely protecting herself—as a flower shuts up its petals in the pelting rain? She was a simple creature—a mere child. Something very like innocence looked out of her eyes. She seemed to Julian to be obeying a mysterious, all-powerful instinct which forbade her contemplating for a second the evil that had surrounded her. She would live only in the present. She would not look into that degrading background. When forced to do so, it froze her young soul into the blank horror which he had witnessed in her eyes.

He moved swiftly to the conclusion that she should not remain another hour under that roof. The door opened to admit the matron, who came forward snorting. Julian stated his decision briefly. She poured forth a cataract of angry words.

"My lady managers will be told, sir, how their representative has been treated by the person wrongfully called a gentleman! Eleven matrons in sixteen years has been put in charge of this institution, the board o' managers havin' been a-strivin' and a-strugglin' in vain to obtain a lady of *my* experience and *my* respectability, which they was unable to do until I consented to sacrifice my worldly prospects and accept their paltry salary for the good of these poor creatures here below, an' the hope of a reward in heaven; and when I tell them that I've been called '*a woman*' to my face, sir—"

Julian's wits wandered during this oration; he was trying to decide whether he saw before him Mrs. Bumble or Mrs. Squeers in the flesh. He repeated blandly his former statement: "I wish to remove the girl. Be kind enough to get her and the child ready to leave at once."

"The child stays here," said the official, stamping her foot and folding her arms defiantly. "You can take the girl, but the babe belongs to the institution."

"I fail to understand," murmured Julian, looking away. He thought it extraordinary that a board of refined women should retain such a woman as this in a position of authority. And did not her eleven predecessors only emphasize the capacity of these "boards" for hideous blundering? He could not bear to look at this preposterous and terrible personage. Her vulgar outlines, only remotely suggested the

coarseness of the spiritual fiber within, but they actually hurt his eyes; he turned them away in obedience to an instinct of delicacy—an exaggerated deference to her sex—which would not betray all the disgust that was mirrored in his soul. But the august lady moved herself into the direct range of his vision.

"It's in the by-laws, sir! 'In consideration of the care, nursing and attention given to the inmates, it is resolved that the legal control of their offspring belongs to the board of managers who hereby constitute themselves guardians of all children born in this institution!'"

She recited these words with gleaming eyes, and finished with a lunge of her head like an angry bull.

"Both ridiculous and illegal," observed Julian coolly. "I shall remove Martha and the child immediately. Get your things on, Martha."

The girl rose with a frightened air and moved with faltering steps toward the door.

"Give me the child!" commanded the matron sternly.

"I'll take it," interposed Julian audaciously, holding out his arms. Martha laid the babe against his shoulder and disappeared. Julian sat down, holding the child awkwardly. He turned crimson, conscious of the absurdity of the situation. The matron smiled scornfully and continued her oration. It passed rapidly into vulgar abuse and insinuation.

He was thankful that Martha returned promptly, tying the faded ribbons of an old woolen hood under her chin; a thin, shabby shawl hung over her right arm. Julian asked for a heavier wrap.

"If you choose to break the rules of the institution and insult her who is the head of it, you can all go out just as you came in," was the vicious reply.

The two culprits descended the wide stairway, followed by the matron's mocking laughter. Their exit was hasty and undignified; at the last they had all the appearance of fugitives fleeing from a justifiable prosecution.

Julian was obliged to wrap the infant in his overcoat to protect it from a penetrating wind. Hurriedly they caught a street car. Undoubtedly they were a curious looking pair, and many eyes were directed towards them as they sat side by side. Julian resisted a strong temptation to take a seat at a distance. He supposed that they passed for a family group, notwithstanding that Martha's appearance was strongly suggestive of the poor-house. The cropped head and short skirt exaggerated the young matron's distressing youthfulness, and surprised comments were audible among the passengers.

The office was not reached until after 5 o'clock. Unfortunately, only Elizabeth was there writing, the other agents

having gone home. He would have to depend on Elizabeth's aid in disposing of Martha and the babe for the night.

Elizabeth raised her head and took a long look at Martha's forlorn figure. Her face assumed a peculiar rigidity. Martha looked back stolidly, her features slowly hardening into a similar expression.

"I guess you're one of the waifs," she observed in a high thin voice, after a prolonged stare at Elizabeth.

The young clerk drew back panic-stricken. She turned toward Julian.

"We're all alike, she thinks—everybody thinks! I will not stay here; I will not be a waif all my life!" She arose in her excitement and stood against the wall facing Julian. Her little figure was swelling with anger.

Julian went over to her. "You are looking across an immeasurable gulf," he said in a low voice. "I am sorry; I might have been a waif—but I cannot be a woman—and these two need a woman's hand."

Elizabeth glanced up into his face. Then she looked straight at Martha, her face growing solemnly, vaguely sympathetic.

"I hope you will do something to make her look like other people," Julian added imploringly.

Elizabeth held out her hand. The young mother arose and followed without a word. As they reached the head of the stairs, Julian called after them:

"I am hoping you will give her a frock with lots of trimming on it, and a hat with feathers and flowers, and—bright blue ribbons."

Elizabeth laughed silently in the darkness of the stairway. It was well known in the office that the board of managers had prohibited feathers and flowers for waifs, after discussing the subject at one special and two adjourned meetings, with sessions of three hours each. It was an accepted principle among them that the longer a subject was discussed the sounder was the conclusion reached.

Julian opened letters and wrote busily at his desk until he heard steps descending the stairs. He looked up to inspect the work of Elizabeth's hands as Martha entered the room. She was arrayed in a neat brown dress. The transformation was startling. Elizabeth followed with an armful of antiquated hats and bonnets.

"Trimmed with velvet," she murmured briefly, pointing to the brown dress.

"She gimme it, because we're both waifs," cried Martha joyfully. Elizabeth nodded gravely.

"We're both waifs," she repeated in a low voice.

Julian looked at her inquiringly. There was something odd

about her appearance. Her trim little figure was lost in a mass of black cashmere.

"She gimme *her* dress!" cried Martha with increasing enthusiasm, her pale eyes fixed upon Elizabeth.

Julian continued to scrutinize Elizabeth. A wave of color swept over her face. She looked down abashed.

"An old lady left the Association five black dresses. There's nothing else up stairs. I know it's too big—" She pulled at the quaint sleeves with her fingers.

"It's very old fashioned!" cried Julian, laughing.

Elizabeth planted a battered hat on Martha's head, and replaced it quickly with a gigantic bonnet. The effect was terrific. She tried them all, and at last gave up with an hysterical laugh.

"There's mine; she can take it—but there's no blue ribbon." She clasped her hands in confusion.

Julian looked at the little brown turban with its waving plumes. It was hanging from a nail on the wall. It looked exactly like Elizabeth. He took it down and handed it to her.

"Put on your hat and go with this child to some store where you can buy a decent article." He placed a bank note in her hand. "Buy a frock, too, and take yours back."

"It's her's now," said Elizabeth immovably.

"Buy another for yourself then."

Elizabeth turned away quickly and began tying on the baby's bonnet. She helped Martha with her hood and shawl, drew on her own coat, picked up a bundle and steered Martha out of the door with a resolute air.

Julian saw them depart, and then hastened to his boarding house, feeling tired and discouraged.

Denning greeted him with cordiality. "I've secured for you an invitation to the Charity Ball to-night," he said brightly, "and I've left a pile of white neckties on your bureau."

"Ah—white neckties!" repeated Julian absently. He was more familiar with old ladies' bonnets, he thought, as he turned the linen ties over in his fingers. He decided, however, that he would go to the ball in deference chiefly to Denning's plea that he needed the larger experience. Denning assured him that the Charity Ball was a promiscuous affair of which no one need stand in the slightest awe. Otherwise, he could not have obtained the invitation for Julian,—but of course he did not add this explanation.

CHAPTER IV.

Denning talked very pleasantly that evening for a couple of hours on the subjects of balls and young girls. He explained much concerning the social life of the great city that

to many minds remains shrouded in mystery, but it is doubtful if Julian understood much of what was said. His mind was in fact only half detached from the scenes and incidents of the day just ended. Until they reached the ball room he was still building hedges around his frail female waifs and rescuing others from situations of extraordinary peril.

Denning steered him onward into the very heart of the fairy-like scene. They paused for a moment beside a fluted pillar garlanded with leaves and roses, while Denning, bowing right and left to young girls and older women as they entered, looked about him for some one to whom he might introduce Julian.

"Don't let anything these young things happen to say disconcert you," he observed, "because it is a well-known fact that they don't know in the least what they're saying for more than a year after they come out. Sometimes they lose their heads, too, and we older men have to look after them or there'd be the devil of a talk. As you do not dance you will have to ask a girl to sit out a dance with you. There are plenty have to ask a girl to sit out a dance with you. There are plenty of corners for a chat. But if you get tired talking, the next best thing is to stand by the door and regard these frivolities with a grand, gloomy air,—as if you were some very distinguished person—a foreign ambassador, perhaps—you don't look unlike something of that sort. Here comes Miss Melville, to whom I shall introduce you. You cannot be with her long, for she's in great demand to-night; but there'll be time for a stroll through the corridors perhaps."

A few minutes later, Julian found himself walking by the side of a young beauty gowned in white and gold of such delicate texture that it might have been made of butterflies' wings. She carried an armful of large bouquets made up of roses. There were so many of them and they were in such danger of slipping from her that she handed Julian three of the largest to carry. She led the way herself and was busy casting smiles and nods in every direction, while she poured into Julian's ear a stream of daintily extravagant comments and exclamations. He listened as a man might do who finds himself swimming in green depths by the side of a mermaid whose discourse might be of interest to the curious—possibly of distinct scientific value to the learned—but is of too ethereal and incomprehensible a nature to elicit a reply. His unconcerned, yet very direct scrutiny reached the fair maid through the dazzling medium of her own glory, and passed happily for the nonchalance of a young man of the world.

The smooth, long face and slightly bald head of Cooper Denning suddenly appeared from a doorway. When not smiling he reminded one of an austere priest; but at this moment

he was laughing gaily and addressing a young girl by his side with an air of chivalrous devotion. They stopped beside Julian and formed a group.

Half a dozen young men approached to speak to Miss Melville. The next moment, Julian found himself walking in the opposite direction, not quite understanding how he had lost Miss Melville, or who had relieved him of her flowers. The young lady by his side appeared to be just as beautiful, however, though she had fewer bouquets, so it did not much matter; and in a few moments she was talking into his ear a brilliant continuation of Miss Melville's remarks.

Presently she spoke of Denning. He had introduced to her "quantities" of men, so that all her dances were engaged. He had told her from the first not to be afraid, and had advised what kind of a gown to wear. They had talked it over several weeks ago and he had insisted on white with pearl and silver trimming. Otherwise she might have worn pink. Mr. Denning had prophesied exactly the kind of time she was going to have—it was remarkable how he always knew. He was wonderfully kind, always doing the most unselfish things imaginable. Julian recalled that Miss Melville had sung Denning's praises almost in the same words.

There was another turn in the social wheel. Julian's companion and her bouquets were again torn from him, and he was soon escorting a third young lady, who was burdened with only one bouquet.

In reply to her direct questions, Julian explained in explicit sentences that he did not dance; he knew not the name of the waltz that was being played; he did not know the man who was leading the German; a string of negatives seemed to have become the sum and substance of his conversational resources.

The girl consulted her program; she lifted her head and threw a glance distractedly around.

"It is the *fourth* dance!" she cried in a trembling voice, and looked at Julian, who in searching through the annals of his experience for a precedent to guide his actions could think of nothing more definite than a scene in "Alice in Wonderland."

"You seem troubled; can I be of any assistance?" he asked quickly.

"Troubled!" repeated the girl. "I should think I was! I wish I were dead; I wish I had never been born!"

She turned to him in desperate appeal.

"Take me to some corner where I can hide myself, where no one will see me. There's nothing else that you can do—apparently."

Julian led her hastily to a small sofa partly concealed by tall plants blooming in gilded pots. Was the girl ill? Was she

going to faint? Or was he beginning to figure in a role fashioned after the escapades of heroes who accept mysterious missions intended for somebody else, and are led into situations of marvelous complexity, from which they escape only by taking wildly impossible risks? Or was this last experience in the nature of a fantastic joke—a young girl's effort to amuse herself by the indulgence of an extravagant imagination?

Julian begged her again to tell him what was the matter. She answered with unexpected irritation:

"You are dreadfully obtuse! Do you want me to say in the plainest of English that I'm not engaged for the German—or anything? Why, if you wanted to help me you would go out into the highways and bring up all the men you knew or ever heard of—you would bring up quantities of men to be introduced to me! How can I be expected to know all the men of this city when I have been living in Baltimore?"

Julian sat scowling at what seemed to him the indelicacy of this speech. In all his encounters with the "forwardness" of waifs and strays he had never met anything more repugnant to his taste.

"Unfortunately," he replied, eyeing her with coldness, "I cannot be your knight errant, for like yourself, I know no one at this ball—I know only one man here."

"Mr. Denning, I suppose—I saw you with him. It would be of no use for you to speak to him; he doesn't *choose* that I shall have a lovely time." Her tone was bitter. She went on with a sudden pathos that seemed to bring her suddenly within the range of a more chivalrous consideration:

"All the other girls are having such a good time—all but poor little me, left out in the cold! My beautiful sister forgets about me as usual—she is having a magnificent time herself, of course. It means that I am a dead failure. I shall have to hide my head somewhere and take to works of charity—Sunday schools and horrors of that kind. I shall have to wear clothes that don't fit and poke about in the slums, talking to horrid, ill-smelling poor people."

"You might try a convent," suggested Julian, thoughtfully—bringing all his kindly wits to bear upon the unusualness of her case—"but the slums are now altogether too fashionable; you would meet more of your successful rivals there than would be comfortable, I fear—from your standpoint—I mean—of a social failure."

The young girl turned upon him a stare of haughty astonishment; his cold-blooded candor had brought a deep blush to her cheeks.

"I have always heard," she observed with a shrug of her bare

shoulders and an irrelevance that was intended to convey a pointed rebuke, "that the men of this city were a set of odious antiques. I've heard they think it improper to be alone with a girl anywhere; they haven't the faintest idea what a stair-case is made for; if they make use of it at all, they all go and sit there together in a crowd—these absurd, odious little men!"

"You mean they leave the girls alone in the parlor?" asked Julian, who was beginning to feel sleepy.

"Oh! The girls go, too, of course! The point is that they all sit together. I never had to explain so much in my life before. There's just one nice man living in this whole town, a friend of mine says—she means Cooper Denning."

"He seems to be a great favorite."

"Yes, he leads everything. She told me an amusing story about him. He was dancing once with a very wild girl—a perfect madcap. She had been flirting with him desperately somewhere, just before he asked her to dance, and she was furious at him. She had been daring him to kiss her—setting him almost crazy—and she was furious because he would not try. Now what do you suppose that girl did? Why, she stopped suddenly while they were waltzing in the middle of the room—right before everybody—and shrieked at the top of her voice, and then cried out: '*He kissed me!*' Just imagine how the poor man felt when he *hadn't!* And what on earth do you suppose he did? What would you have done in his place?"

"I can't imagine—"

"Why, *he pretended that he had!* He did that just to save her! Wasn't it splendid of him? But, the truth leaked out afterward, for it seems that somebody overheard her daring him to kiss her and gave the whole thing away. Wasn't it a shame?"

"I don't know—" The ethics of such a situation were rather too much for Julian; his eyelids, moreover, were heavy—he was frightfully sleepy. The young girl went on mercilessly:

"I am going to tell you something funny. I was sitting on the staircase once, having a perfectly heavenly time with a man I had just met. We were perfectly absorbed in each other, and never noticed that another pair had seated themselves above us with plates of ice cream in their laps. They became perfectly absorbed in each other too—violently absorbed, I should say. The girl leaned to one side and suddenly sprang up—forgetting the ice cream on her lap. Down it came on the back of my neck! My dress was cut down to a point in the back, and the ice cream went down—down—to the belt of my dress—it actually did! Just imagine what a plate of ice cream would feel like on your spinal column! I had a chill right there on the spot. My teeth chattered, and the two men had to ram their silk handkerchiefs down my back—I made them—to get it

all out. They were so scared, too—the poor men! I mean—I suppose they were afraid I was going to have pneumonia.”

Julian knew not what comment to make on this anecdote and remained dismally silent. He was wondering if he would have to spend the night in the society of this terrible young person and if the ball was likely to last until morning. Immediately afterwards, however, she became absorbed in watching three figures that were approaching, one of them being Cooper Denning. As they drew near she leaned forward with eagerness—trembling, apparently, between hope and fear.

“Marian, are you looking for me at last?”

The palm leaves were pushed apart and revealed a young woman clad in iridescent silk of pale sea-green with a border of white flowers encircling her arms and shoulders. The face was one of great loveliness, and Julian rightly guessed that its chief charm lay in a wonderful radiance of expression.

Julian stood with his back against the fluted pillar, while his companion and her sister hastily exchanged explanations, apologies and ripples of laughter, to which Denning and the other man added dextrous compliments implying that they had been searching vainly for this particular young lady all the evening. Julian was conscious of a vague impression that the face of the sister was not new to him. Had he seen it in his dreams? It appeared to him miraculously as a composite reproduction of all the fair faces that one might imagine adorning the art galleries of the world. Its charm of perfect familiarity—as if it had always existed and was in fact as old as the hills in its eternal freshness and beauty—blended mysteriously with its claim to a positive uniqueness. As he gazed, its likeness to a secretly cherished ideal became more and more pronounced, until suddenly the lovely eyes fell upon him with a glance that was almost one of recognition.

A murmuring of names in which his own was omitted while he learned that of his companion to be Vaughn—her sister addressing her as Gertrude—broke the spell. Miss Vaughn, instantaneously transformed into a nymph of mirth and jollity—somewhat to the loss of her air of qualified prettiness—withdrew, chatting gaily with Denning and his friend, whom it now appeared he had brought up for the sole purpose of effecting an introduction, thus providing a bashful youth and a forlorn maiden with partners for the “German.” She looked back to utter a laughing farewell, and her glance, sweeping past Julian, expressed very distinctly the wish that she might never see him again. It did not ruffle his vanity, because in a second he realized that he was left alone with the beautiful sister whose first name he knew to be Marian; it vibrated in his ear as a name full of music and grace.

His sense that he was not of this new bewildering world into which he seemed to have stumbled from sheer lack of will to direct his steps that particular evening, began to dissolve into a consciousness that just now he was fitting into something that was both harmonious and interesting. Without embarrassment he waited for her to speak.

She spoke first with her eyes—so sweetly and reassuringly that Julian felt drawn at once into intimacy.

"My sister has left me without mentioning your name." Her voice was like a flute!

"She did not know or care who I was—I could not dance," laughed Julian.

"Gertrude thinks only of a shoulder to cling to and an arm to whirl her around. You might be the greatest lion in America, but Gertrude would have none of you unless you were willing to dance yourself to pieces for her benefit—but I should like to know what to call you—I am Mrs. Starling."

Julian told his name, after which it was natural to tell where he came from and as much of his history as he thought necessary for identification. He described his country home in the lake-studded county of New York with an inward smile over his wanton destruction of Cooper Denning's deceptive little scheme. To his surprise, he found himself elaborating all the reasons that had led him into a choice of what he called rather pathetically his "subterranean profession." Suddenly looking into her face he saw that it was illumined by a glow of feeling. It was like looking at an exquisitely wrought porcelain vase in which a lighted taper was burning.

She seized the theme that was the mainspring of his life—his enthusiasm for humanity, his desire to diminish sin and suffering—and adorned it with her tender fancies.

Julian abandoned his idea of the flute; her voice was like the chime of silver bells; he almost forgot the meaning of her words while searching for this simile. A sudden inspiration overpowered him.

"I am sure you sing!" He blushed at the irrelevance of his remark. She turned to him with an arch expression.

"And I am sure you love music!" It was almost as if she had sung the words. "You play some instrument—the violin, perhaps?"

Julian admitted that he had studied music—at one time with intense ardor. His eyes shone with a peculiar light; his dark, clear-cut face looked all at once strikingly handsome as the blood rose to his cheek. Marian's eyes rested upon him thoughtfully.

"And I sing—a little," she echoed in a low voice. She grew grave and cast down her eyes, for Julian was gazing at her as

if searching for a glimpse of the bird in her throat. He no longer felt sleepy or bored.

Later on they talked of other things, but frequently they came back to the subject of music which both of them loved. Once they stopped talking to listen to the playing of the orchestra, which they quickly agreed was not worth listening to. They did not concern themselves about supper, but walked once or twice through the corridors looking for Gertrude. It was not hard to find her; she was bent on dancing herself and her partners into the early morning hours, and it was a long time before Marian could persuade her that the cock was really about to crow. The sisters finally withdrew into the dressing-room. Julian waited outside where he was bidden to stand, and escorted them later to their carriage. He shut the door softly and watched the carriage roll down the street until out of sight.

As he could not find Denning, he walked home alone, hoping that Denning was already fast asleep in bed. He was a little ashamed at having stayed at the ball so late. As he looked with wide-open eyes at the stars which were still visible through the window, he smiled at the grey dawn. He tried to arrange and critically survey his impressions of the ball, but they merged into one definite charming recollection—beyond which all was confused and of no importance. His thoughts were now touching the deep, vast, incomprehensible verities—they were incommunicable, he believed; they melted rapidly, however, into pleasant dreams and profound slumber.

(To be continued.)



SOCIALISM ABROAD

Professor E. Untermann

FRANCE.

The inevitable reaction after the sham prosperity due to the Paris exposition, the rise in the price of coal, and a multitude of local causes, more or less directly traceable to the inconsistencies of the capitalist mode of production, have kept all France and especially the socialists in a feverish excitement of strikes during the last eighteen months. Notable among these struggles of exploited against exploiters are the strike of the metal workers in Creusot, of the miners in Montceau les Mines and Pas de Calais, and of the longshoremen in Marseilles.

The demands of the toilers were settled peaceably in regions where, as in Pas de Calais, the labor organizations are old and strong enough to command respect. There the employers concluded that discretion is the better part of—business, and made concessions without testing the fighting strength of their wage-slaves.

But in regions where these organizations are young and untried, the masters are displaying the usual overbearing arrogance characteristic of the "higher classes." Here the men asking for a greater share in the product of their toil met haughty refusals. Here, after the declaration of the strike, the wealth producers were confronted by the brutal resistance of the drones fed by them, the military, the police, the press and the clergy. And the upholders of law and order revealed in the force bestowed on them by the men they oppress.

In Chalon, a small town of 26,000 inhabitants, with an industrial working force of 2,500, the socialists were attacked by the soldiers, arrested by the police and terrorized by the judiciary, because—some anarchists had created a disturbance. *Tout comme chez nous!* Capitalistic methods are the same the world over. The strike was suppressed by force.

In Montceau les Mines, the miners have held their own. With an effective organization and a splendid discipline, they have given to their fellow workers an example of solidarity and quiet determination that will leave lasting results. No disturbance has occurred, no privations have been endured so far. By thirty-two distributing offices, 15,000 rations, costing 3,000 francs, are issued daily. Assistance is given by comrades all over the country in response to an appeal of Guesde and Lafargue pointing out that a daily contribution of one sou (1 cent) from 40,000 laborers will enable the miners to carry their strike.

A dispatch to the "Vorwärts," Berlin, states that the congress of mine workers has declared its intention to demand the nationalization of the mines within forty-eight hours, if the Society of Montceau les Mines does not accede to their demands. There is also a possibility that the strike will be extended to all the mines in France. A speedy settlement of the dispute, however, seems to be near at hand.

In Marseilles the strike inaugurated by 2,000 longshoremen has steadily assumed greater dimensions. One after another the sailors, the stokers, the coal-heavers have made common cause with their companions in slavery. And from Marseilles the movement has spread to Bordeaux. In these two main arteries of commerce in the south of France navigation is practically at a standstill.

The solidarity of the workers in this strike becomes doubly significant through the fact that nearly every nationality is represented in the trades composing the striking force. To American workmen it will be startling news that in Marseilles, as well as in Montceau les Mines, the socialist mayors openly sympathized with and assisted the strikers.

How valuable and indispensable to success international socialist co-operation may be is "strikingly" demonstrated on this occasion. For at the request of Mayor Flassieres of Marseilles, the laborers of Genoa and, according to later dispatches, of Naples, have also declared the strike. Only the Spanish ports of the west Mediterranean are thus left open to commerce. The latest reports of the capitalist press bring the usual sensational descriptions of disorders caused by the striking "mob," and a clash with the *gens d'armes* is said to have resulted fatally for some of the latter. According to the same source, Mayor Flassieres was snubbed by the Premier, Waldeck-Rousseau, for trying to secure government assistance for the strikers.

Just as we go to press we are informed that, owing to the pressure brought to bear on them by the government, the employers have decided to submit the matter to arbitration.

ITALY.

The new Cabinet Zanardelli-Giolitti is giving its first feeble signs of life. However liberal the men composing this body may be, the socialists are well aware that they cannot expect any thorough amelioration of social and economic conditions from the new ministers. And while our comrades are continuing their struggle against the forces of ignorance and barbarity, represented by the Roman clergy, the Camorra, the Mafia, the soldiery and a prostituted judiciary, the columns of the bourgeois papers are filled with startling and sensational reports about the famine in Apulia.

It is the noble and inspiring duty of the capitalist press to perpetuate by lying, misrepresentation and inventive genius an economic system that forces the people to reap the whirlwind when their exploiters sow the wind. And when the whirlwind is taking off uncounted numbers of wage-slaves, then the duty of this press is to solicit contributions to famine funds from middle class suckers who are willing to feed the helpless victims of the masters. The Italian bourgeois press is nobly doing its duty.

In the provinces of Bari, Foggia and Lecce, on the southern coast of the Adriatic, thousands of unemployed have been suffering starvation for months. This region lost heavily through the abolition of the reciprocity treaty with France. Besides, the vineyards were destroyed by the phylloxera (grape louse) twice within five years, and the olive crop ruined by the *mosca olearia* (olive fly). In consequence the land-owners could not pay their taxes, the tenant farmers were unable to pay their rent, and neither has the money to hire laborers. The latter, exploited to the limit, emaciated by hunger and half frozen, demand work. Twenty centesimi (5 cents) are eagerly accepted as a day's wages. Hunger riots have broken out in several districts.

"The government," writes "Vorwärts," "has at once taken measures against the hunger—a special train full of soldiers has been dispatched to the scene."

How different from this picture, worthy of the brush of a "Hell Breughel," is the aspect of things where socialists hold the political power! In Mantua, 17,000 farm laborers have recently organized into one provincial union, representing 116 different unions. Resolutions were adopted favoring "affiliation with those who agitate for the speedy realization of the following demands:

1. A law protecting women and children in industrial and agricultural pursuits, on the basis adopted by the congress of Italian socialists.

2. A law creating agricultural prud'hommes.

Vivat sequens! Next!

Even the capitalist press cannot refrain from paying tribute to the healthy atmosphere of a new life created by socialist organization. Adolfo Rossi, editor of the monarchist "Adriatico," describes the conditions in the province of Mantua in these words:

In Suzzara (electional district of Gonzaga that elected Enrico Ferri) the administration has been in the hands of the socialists for a long time. The transition of administrative control from the hands of the "moderates" into those of the socialists was not only accomplished without a revolution, but has even terminated the personal feuds that ruined the country. The oppositional parties, by ceaseless agitation for improvements in the municipality, have completely changed Suzzara within twenty years. A new town hall, the most magnificent hospital in the province, many new buildings and model schools have been erected. The industries have also developed splendidly. The level of general education is very high, thanks to the industrial school, having classes in physics, chemistry, mechanics and agriculture. . . . Elections are held in perfect order. . . . The administration distributes 200 tickets to farmers and poor people when the theater is open. The children receive meals in school, assisted by a small family tax. . . . Seventy-five per cent of the electors attend elections.

In Gonzaga the socialists founded a "consumers' and laborers' club for farmers." This club has now 200 members and its stock has risen from 6 lire to 18 lire.

BELGIUM.

In "A Trip Through Flanders," published in the Brussels "Le Peuple," Comrade Aug. Dewinne describes the condition of the working class in Flanders. Wherever clerical influence is prevailing the people are living in abject poverty. Farm laborers earn from 63 to 72 centimes (12 to 14 cents) per day, and during harvest time they average about 1 franc (20 cents) per day. On the other hand, a great many of them earn nothing at all during the winter. In Zeveneecken the weavers working with handlooms are so afraid of their masters that they do not dare to admit socialists into their homes. These weavers earn 10 to 12.5 francs (\$2 to \$2.50) per week, as long as they are young and strong, while old people average a daily wage of 50 centimes (10 cents). The working time is twelve hours per day.

In Hamm 95 per cent of the laborers cannot read. The children cannot go to school because they must help their parents to work. In heat or cold, rain or shine, little five-year-olds are standing all day turning the wheel for their fathers who manufacture cord by hand. Competition with machine spinners has forced the wages of the hand spinners down to the bare level of starvation. And though their

wages have been nominally raised, still they are the losers, for they are obliged to produce more cord per kilogram of raw material, which is equivalent to a reduction of wages. These spinners formerly had a union of 400 members; only seventy members have been left by the hungry waves of competition.

On the other hand, wherever socialism has become strong, the laborers are throwing off the yoke of clerical and economic oppression. A strong agitation for universal suffrage of both sexes is carried on, and although Vanderveelde's bill for the introduction of universal suffrage, and another bill granting an amnesty to all laborers sentenced for political misdemeanors, have been defeated in the Chamber of Representatives, we may confidently hope to see these measures carried into effect on the wings of socialist victory.

True to the resolutions outlined in the August number of the "International Socialist Review," our Belgian comrades are preparing for a general strike and a campaign of obstruction in the Chamber. The agitation for universal suffrage is being continued with renewed vigor.

DENMARK.

The progress of the co-operatives in Denmark has been extremely rapid. This advance means at the same time an equally strong growth of socialism. For in Denmark co-operatives, trade-unions and socialism are almost identical.

One of the main factors contributing to the impulse to form co-operatives was a law, capitalistic in spirit and reactionary in purpose, decreeing that within seven miles of any town merchandise should not be sold by other dealers than those residing in that town.

Instead of becoming tributary to the capitalist dealers of the towns, the socialists united in co-operative societies that do not come under this law.

In 1866 the first co-operative association was formed. In 1898 the official statistics reported 970 of these organizations, with an aggregate membership of 160,000. Eight hundred and thirty-seven consumers' clubs, having a total of 130,000 members, conferred their benefits strictly on members only. Of these clubs only eight had their seats in towns. There were, furthermore, 133 co-operatives that did not confine their dealings to their members. These, however, are regarded as commercial enterprises by the law. Producers' clubs are represented by 1,025 dairies, 25 lard factories and a number of bakeries.

"Frequently," writes H. Faber in the February issue of "L'Avenir Social," "a Danish farmer is a member of ten co-operatives and of a farmers' club or an agricultural society."

A personal letter from Comrade Gustav Bang, who has recently been speaking to enormous audiences in the University of Copenhagen, says that extensive preparations are being made by the socialists for the elections to the lower house, and that great gains will be surely made by the comrades.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes

On May 20 the nine-hour day is to take effect in all shops controlled by the National Metal Trades' Association, as per agreement with the International Association of Machinists. But there are hundreds of employers throughout the country who refuse to be guided by the first-named organization, and refuse to grant the concession, and consequently the union officials everywhere are working like beavers to organize the craft to enforce the shorter workday. It is even hinted that the members of the N. M. T. A. are liable to break their agreement, using as a pretext the fact that the independent shops refuse to yield. It is pretty certain that strikes will take place all over the country, and it is also quite probable that other metal workers will be drawn into it. Meanwhile the movement to federate the metal working crafts is gaining considerable headway, and it is estimated that at least 150,000 men will be combined by May 1.

Trouble on the lakes is looked for this year. The marine engineers have been on strike for several weeks at all the important ports. Their specific demand is that the lake craft be graded so that more men be given employment. The ship masters organized in sympathy and threatened to stand by the engineers, but suddenly allowed their organization to go to pieces, and the statement was given out that the cause was that they came in conflict with United States laws governing marine affairs. At this writing the longshoremen are in conference with their employers in Cleveland, and a deadlock has resulted. The workers want an increase of 10 per cent over last year, and the hours of labor reduced from twelve to ten a day. The bosses claim the wage rate was too high last season, and that no more concessions will be granted. The ship and dock owners say they are not adverse to having a strike now, as such an occurrence would stiffen prices. They are also quietly organizing a sort of beneficial union to break the power of the seafaring crafts when a crisis comes.

All signs point to a strike in the anthracite coal field on April 1. Although all the large operators posted notices in which they promised to pay prevailing rates of wages and continue present conditions generally, the miners in their convention in Scranton, Pa., the middle of the past month, took the bull by the horns and demanded recognition of the union. They insist that the operators must agree on or before April 1 to meet their representatives in joint conference or a walkout will take place. The operators appear to be just as stubborn on this point as they were last autumn, and it is claimed that, anticipating such a turn of affairs, they have worked their mines overtime and stocked up thousands of tons of coal, and are determined to give battle. Certain it is that J. P. Morgan has postponed his trip to Europe, where he was going for the purpose of negotiating for the absorption of the recently organized German wire and nail trust, com-

prised of eighty-seven mills, British street railways and other securities, to take a hand in the trouble.

Two thousand blast furnace employes in the Mahoning and Shenango valleys threaten to strike unless former wages are restored. Last fall, immediately after the election, while still hoarse from shouting for "the full dinner pail," these mill workers, who earn less than \$2 a day for the most laborious toil, were notified of a ten per cent reduction. They were unorganized, and after some grumbling accepted the terms of the trusts. Then, after the horse had been purloined, they started to organize, and now they are in fairly good shape and want their old wage rate back. In the interim the trusts boosted the price of pig-iron \$2 a ton, and are doing fairly well in the matter of accumulating dividends, which, of course, are needed for the purpose of gobbling up competitors and ensuring an absolute monopoly.

Building trades went on strike in Pittsburg for higher wages and shorter hours, and in other cities those crafts also threaten to go out on April 1 or May 1.

Railway trainmen on the New York Central are restless. They want a uniform scale on the whole system and other grievances remedied. An Albany dispatch says the trainmen, if a strike is ordered, will attempt a tie-up on all roads in the United States and Canada, and that the conductors and firemen will also be asked to join the strike.—The C., B. & Q. magnates gave union employes the option this month of leaving their organizations or the services of the road, and nearly all withdrew from the brotherhoods.

George W. Perkins has been re-elected president of cigarmakers' national union by a majority of two to one. Nearly all the old officers were also re-elected.

H. Gaylord Wilshire, the well-known California Social Democrat, has again challenged Bryan to debate the trust question. Wilshire offers Bryan the privilege of selecting time and place, will pay all expenses, and give the latter \$1,000 besides; and if the audience votes that the Nebraska man made the best argument, he will receive another thousand dollars. It's certainly a liberal offer; better than lecturing or running a paper.

A Colorado man has invented a combination automobile plow, cultivator, planter and harvester, which can be operated by gasoline or electricity for 75 cents a day, and can do the work of several teams of horses and men.—A Chicago man invented a new rotary engine, with a speed ranging from 250 to 1,000 revolutions a minute, and weighing about one-tenth as much as any other form of engine producing equal power. Its mechanism is reduced to a minimum, and gear, springs, bolts, screws, etc., cannot break because there are none. The engine can be placed on any sort of foundation, and experts pronounce it a success.—In New Bedford, Mass., a new device has supplanted the vivacious telephone girls. The subscriber can secure any number desired by merely pressing buttons, connections being made at the central station automatically, and absolute secrecy is guaranteed. The system is to be introduced in Fall River and other New England towns.—The Electrical Review says Poulsen's new telegraphophone is a success, and transmits sound better than the graphophone or telephone. It is an amazingly simple device, and reproduces magnetic strains in a steel wire permanently.—Baguulo, an Italian in-

ventor, has patented a new device to transmit power to a distance. It is based on the principle of transmitting pressure to liquids and gases, and a Paris technical journal says the new discovery enables the realization of 90 to 95 per cent of the initial energy and an equal distribution of power.

New York unions spent a heap of money to have a law enacted compelling contractors who do public work to pay the prevailing rate of trade union wages, and now comes the Supreme Court and declares that the law is unconstitutional, as it interferes with "the freedom of contract." Judge Dennis O'Brien, Democrat, and Judson S. Landon, Republican, wrote the opinion. That's worth remembering. Of course, the unionists are angry, but a few are even foolish enough to advise petitioning the legislature to call a constitutional convention, amend the constitution, and then re-enact the law.—The New Jersey Supreme Court handed down a decision which states in effect that the "labor law" existent in Paterson, making it mandatory to place the union label on official printing, is unconstitutional, as it also interferes with "the freedom of contract." The absurdity of lobbying for "labor laws" before hostile legislatures, and then, even where secured, expecting hostile officials and courts to enforce them, will probably dawn on trade unionists some day. If workingmen were sufficiently class-conscious to place their own kind in political power, no such farces would be enacted.

Striking miners of New Mexico have had a blanket injunction thrown over them. Old story.

Secretary Butcher issued charters to nine new S. D. P. locals in past month.—Referendum vote in favor of uniting all socialist organizations carried by large majority. June or July is favored as the time, and Indianapolis as the place by small plurality, though many are now considering Buffalo as convention city, holding that the attendance would be much larger and the expense reduced one-half, owing to the exposition.—Municipal elections in some New York, Pennsylvania and New England cities and towns recently show steady gains for S. D. P.—Chicago Socialist party leads the procession in the matter of growth, having 1,300 dues-paying members at present, 95 being admitted in one week.—Over 100 Italian socialists in the East seceded from the old S. L. P. and joined the Social Democratic party. They are about to establish a paper. F. M. Gorzone, 103 West Third street, New York, has the matter in charge.—Missouri S. D.'s will probably adopt name of Socialist party, as Democratic legislature enacted a law debarring them from official ballot hereafter.—Washington comrades defeated an infamous disfranchising primary bill before the legislature.—Michigan S. D.'s nominated complete state ticket.—Job Harriman has been elected labor secretarial in New York. His duties will be to attend to legal affairs of about 10,000 unionists.—The "Vanguard" is the name of a new S. D. P. paper at Brockton, Mass., and a French paper, "L'Veuil au Peuple," started at Nashua, N. H.—Raphael Buck, author of an anti-socialist book called "The Emancipation of the Workers," has come out in an open letter stating that he has destroyed the plates of his work and turned socialist.—Clarence Nugent, prominent Texas Populist, has joined S. D. P.—Minneapolis comrades will build a thousand-dollar automobile to send out on a propaganda tour.—Texas comrades raised \$500 for a state organ.—Father McGrady, the eloquent Kentucky priest, and Rev. Charles Vail, the New Jersey author-lecturer, spoke at some large meetings in Middle Western States during past month.—On two sep-

arate votes at different meetings the St. Louis Central Trades Council went on record by large majority in favor of demanding resignation of the president, who had accepted a nomination for office on the Democratic ticket, and that officers can only accept positions on class-conscious labor tickets.—Chicago socialists secured control of a church and turned it into a labor temple. Prof. Herron delivered the dedicatory speech.—It is rumored that Mrs. Pierre Lorrillard, Jr., has become a convert to socialism, and will use much of her wealth to spread the doctrine.

Total business failures last year were 21,838, according to United States government, instead of 10,000, according to Dun's and Bradstreet's, professional prosperity-puffers.

All eyes are centered on Morgan, the trust magnate, and everybody wonders what he is going to do next. No sooner is the billion-dollar trust launched than it is announced that the Rockefeller iron mines, ore-carrying railroad and lake fleet is absorbed, and the bridge and tin can trust also and the capital is to be increased another quarter of a billion dollars. Then about a dozen more anthracite coal mines are gathered in, and a comprehensive scheme is made public to make the monopoly complete and pile up many more millions by abolishing all retail dealers in the large cities and establishing a central coal station, by abolishing all sales gents, ten per cent of miners and railway employes, and hundreds of clerks, bookkeepers, etc., and by closing all of the poorest mines. Next the bituminous mines are to be brought in line, and the first step is to raise rates for carrying coal on Morgan railroads ten cents per ton, thus driving the small operators to the wall, and the acquiring of all the mines in several counties in West Virginia, as well as some large properties in Pennsylvania. These sweeping consolidations are important enough, but hardly as startling as the dividing of the American continent into zones so far as the railroads are concerned, with a few interests in almost absolute control. Thus the Goulds are to be masters of the Southwest, and are now combining their lines into a \$300,000,000 trust; the Harriman syndicate is to rule the great Central West, and J. P. Hill the Northwest. The Rothschilds control much of the South, and the Vanderbilt-Morgan interests hold almost absolute sway east of Chicago. Rockefeller is more or less interested in all the zones, and the bold buccaneers are now planning to girdle the earth with a transportation monopoly, and with this tremendous power control the markets of the world and absorb or paralyze industries in any country they choose.—Pages might be written of the movements among minor trusts, such as swallowing independent concerns, monopolizing raw material, reorganizing, increasing capital, beating down wages, raising prices, etc., etc., but the modest space of a monthly magazine will not allow it.

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

Professor George D. Herron

I.

At the heart of nature, and working itself out in human forces, is a relentless and yet merciful law of truth. No lie ever permanently prevails, even though it lasts for years or for centuries. Somehow and somewhere the truth about collective and individual life is known. This is the ground of our faith in nature and in the good outcome of human evolution. To some of us it seems to disclose a universal will at the heart of things—a good-will that is to at least have its way in life and history. So we work with this will, treasuring every scrap of truth as its precious gift, no matter how great and terrible the cost.

II.

Either co-operatively or retributively we all have to fulfill the truth of things at last. Life moves on by exact law or principle. What we fail to give in love we give in suffering; what we fail to give in service we give in sorrow; what we fail to give in co-operation we give in the waste of strife. The debt of each life to the whole life; the debt of the whole life to each life has to be paid—paid to life out of life, paid either by freely-given life or by life exacted by retributive processes.

III.

For instance, the truth that the world owes each man a noble, full and free living, is demonstrating itself every year of history. Every gain of one man at the expense of another, of one class at the expense of another, of one nation at the expense of another, of one section or race at the expense of another, comes back upon the gainer with relentless exactness, demanding not only principal but compound interest. Whenever and wherever we fail to keep our brothers who are destroyed in their destruction, as we ought to be. In so far as the interests of all men are not made common and equally sacred by civilization, just so far civilization fills itself with tragedy and revolution. That some people are entitled to more than other people, that some are entitled to rule over others, that some have greater and more imperative needs and rights than others,—this is the master-lie of civilization. All existing institutions are built upon that lie by the capitalistic system. No lie can be a safe foundation for any institution or any individual life. No lie can bring any kind of individual or social peace. The truth of the common and equal needs

of all men, of the common and equal sacredness of all lives, is the only basis on which a social order can build, or really be an order. It is the only basis, or individual attitude, upon or by which a man may proceed to do good or be good.

IV.

The fear of truth is the security of evil. Upon the concealment of truth every tyranny rests. Upon the exposure of truth all liberty and safety depend. So long as there is any kind of a lie in the fabric of civilization, in its organization or activity, in its production or distribution, just so long will civilization be full of misery and violence. Every compromise with truth begets tyranny and social torment. We can never get along with nine-tenths of the truth, or three-fourths of the truth, or any fraction thereof, great or small; we can get along only with the whole truth. We have to take the whole truth about a thing, about an economy, a situation, a problem, or go without any truth. We cannot really live and free ourselves with scraps of truth. We cannot say, in justification of compromise or opportunism, that a half-loaf of truth is better than no truth. Truth is not to be had in half-loaves. There is no market in the universe for half-truth, and we should be grateful that there is not.

V.

Yet the fear of truth is the most apparent fact of human disorder. What preacher is expected or appointed to take a free look at life and tell just what he sees, with no more, as truth? What politician was ever expected to try to find the truth about any question, or even take truth into consideration? What religious newspaper ever thought of seeking to justly or fairly state the truth about an opponent? How much does a desire for active truth about anything or all things control human action, social and individual?

VI.

But we have no freedom except as we stand on truth. Not only are we made free by the truth—nothing else makes us free. No price is too great to be paid for the truth. So long as there is any kind of a lie in our life we are in danger and torment; but so soon as we stand upon truth we league the universe with us. At any cost the truth is sweet; let us out with the whole of it. It is better to be in hell with the truth than in heaven without truth, or with nine-tenths of the truth. Only the freedom of the truth can make us glad.

VII.

I sometimes try to imagine the moral ecstasy, the winged joy of a world in which only the truth would be thought good; only the truth about anything sought, or thought safe. A brotherhood of the world, in which each soul would stand naked, its whole truth exposed, before every other soul, and not be afraid or ashamed; that is one of the joys that shall fill the streets of the holy city of the co-operative commonwealth.

GEORGE D. HERRON.



BOOK REVIEWS



Oratory: Its Requirements and Its Rewards. John P. Altgeld. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 65 p. Fifty cents.

The person who opens this book with the expectation of finding the same old hackneyed "exercises" for voice and gesture, with mechanical instructions for proper "delivery," will be agreeably disappointed. On the contrary, he will find a body of condensed, almost epigrammatic, fundamental principles that, whether consciously or unconsciously followed, are the only possible foundation for successful public speaking. It is a book to be studied and learned by heart, rather than simply read or retained as a book of reference. The arrangement and language are of such a character as to make the book an excellent example of the art it teaches.

Summary of Report of New York Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1900. The first part is on "The Eight Hour Day," of which the report says: "About two-thirds of the 407,235 employes work from fifty-eight to sixty-four hours a week—most of them sixty hours a week, or ten hours a day—while 30 2-10 per cent work not more than nine and one-half hours a day, and only 8.1 per cent of the entire number enjoy a working day of eight hours, which for a third of a century has been the goal of trade union effort."

Detailed tables show that there has been practically no change in this regard for ten years, and that taking the state as a whole whatever change has taken place has rather been in the direction of lengthening than shortening the day. Part Third of the report is on "Economic Condition of Organized Labor," and presents some very interesting features. "From the first quarter of 1897 to the third quarter of 1899, the number of organizations in the state increased from 927 to 1,636." It is also interesting to note that a constantly increasing number of working women are uniting with the unions. The statistics show that the amount of unemployment among these most favored of the workers was in the neighborhood of 25 per cent during a large portion of the "time of prosperity" from 1897 to 1900. This fact does not appear so clearly in the direct statistics of unemployment as it does in the statistics of the number of days worked, where it is seen that a large portion of the laborers only worked from ten to thirty days during each quarter, while the average number was between sixty and seventy days, or but about two-thirds of the time.

The Trust Problem. Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks. McClure, Phillips & Co. Cloth, 281 pp.

Viewed from the point of view of the capitalist academic writer, this is probably the best of all the many publications on the trust question, and no one, whatever may be his economic beliefs, will deny that it contains very much of value. The chapter on "The Wastes of Competition" is full of matter of interest and value. We

learn that the American Steel and Wire Company "found it possible to dispense with the services of nearly two hundred salesmen," and "when one of the later whisky combinations was formed about three hundred traveling salesmen could be spared without the business being in any way neglected." When competition is removed cheaper salesmen can be employed than when rivals must be met and ruined. To say nothing of advertising, premiums, etc., the American Steel and Wire Company found that they could save \$500,000 a year on "cross freights," by being able to always ship from the nearest mill. Much interesting information is given on methods of organization and internal management, and the manner in which the "promoter" is rewarded for his work. But when it comes to any discussion of the trust in its wider industrial and social relations, the work becomes pedantic in its style, narrow in range, and indefinite in conclusions. The author takes shelter behind what his class call impartiality and a scientific attitude, but which could be better called uncertainty or cowardice, an attitude much affected by professorial writers in the pay of capitalism, and thus he finally ends what started out as an excellent book with a lot of flabby recommendations in favor of various measures of restriction, with the heaviest emphasis on "publicity."

The People's Marx. Gabrielle Deville. Translated from the French by Robert Rives La Monte. Cloth, pp. 13. \$1.50.

Just as he would know the doctrines of evolution must still begin with Darwin, just so the socialist student who would know his subject thoroughly must familiarize himself with the works of Marx. But many draw back because of the length and difficulty of "Capital" in its entirety, and so there have been many attempts to abridge and popularize his work. While all of these leave something lacking this is probably the most satisfactory of all. Anyone who reads "The People's Marx" carefully and thoughtfully will have secured an accurate and fairly complete idea of the philosophy contained in "Capital." The work consists of selected portions of the original work, taken almost verbatim from the original and yet so carefully are they selected that there is no sense of disconnection.

AMONG THE PERIODICALS

LeGrand Powers, chief statistician in charge of the department of agriculture in the census of 1900, has some advance statements in the "Review of Reviews" relating to the increase in the number of farms and rural wealth. These figures are apparently arranged with the intention of making them as useless and misleading as possible, and this idea is strengthened by the character of some articles the author is giving to the public press, in which some remarkable and ridiculous conclusions are drawn. Ray Stannard Baker calls attention to the fact that the United States is rapidly coming to the front as a producer of beet sugar. "Twelve years ago the total product of beet sugar in America was 255 tons; six years later the product had jumped to 16,000 tons, and last year (1899) the product was about 80,000 tons. For 1900, those who know predict a product of 150,000 tons." It is interesting to note that the bringing of this capitalized industry to the farm has brought with it an increased exploitation of child labor. Prof. John R. Commons discusses "A New Way of Settling Labor Disputes," by which he means the elaborate system of bargaining that has grown up between some of the more highly organized laborers and their employers. He gives a somewhat fanciful

comparison between these negotiations and the legislative, executive and judicial branches of representative government, but seems to utterly overlook the one most important point of all—that this is only play after all, as in the last resort the whole scheme is subject to the action of the regularly established capitalist government, controlled by one of the parties to the dispute.

As usual "The World's Work" is singing the achievements of the capitalism that is paving the way to socialism. The working of the Homestead law is discussed under the title, "The Maker of Four Million Homes." "Wake Up England" is a wild cry to the British laborer to permit himself to be better exploited, like his fellow slave in America. A most laudatory biography of P. D. Armour contains much valuable material on the growth of the great industries with which he was connected, but is decidedly nauseating to one who knows the truth concerning the blood-dripping Armour millions. The department, "Among the World's Workers," is always full of the most important facts of current industrial history, but is so condensed that a further summary is almost impossible.

Andre Lebon has an article in "The International Monthly" on the "Situation of France in International Commerce," in which he concludes that "from the standpoint of international competition the principal articles for consumption offered upon the markets of the world are no longer distinguished, for the most part, save by the margin of profits that they leave for their importers—that is, by their cost price, or, to be still more exact, by the only variable elements of this price, namely, proximity to the raw materials, facilities for supplying the motors of the mills, accommodation for transportation, etc." He is forced to admit that in all these natural qualities France is very deficient, and therefore concludes that henceforth she must largely confine her activities to supplying articles of artistic and ornamental character to the leisure class. Those who are interested in the new revolutionary thought in education will be interested in Prof. James Sully's "Child Study and Education," while the same tendency in the field of biology finds expression in Prof. Thomas H. Morgan's discussion of "The Problem of Development."

In the *Journal of Sociology* Miss Nellie Mason Austen has one of the most thorough studies yet made of the sweating system in Chicago. She shows that the wages paid are worse than ever alleged by any alarmist. In only thirty out of fifty-two cases was the wages as high as five cents an hour, while one "housewife pants finisher" was earning five-elevenths of a cent per hour and many others almost as little. Even these horrible pittance are steadily growing less, wages in the sweating industry having fallen ten per cent during the past year of prosperity. She makes the following significant observation: "Closely related with those who expect much from organization of the workers are those who feel that the whole existing order of society is unjust, and that the remedy is to be found in socialism, a state of society in which each man shall have what he produces, no more and no less. It is undoubtedly true that at present there is a class who do little or nothing to add to the sum total of the world's goods, yet who have the most. It is also true that many of those who work hardest have least. Something is wrong if these conditions can exist; and whether or not the solution lies in the inauguration of the socialistic state, it is a serious question whether, if it is true that each person has a "right to be himself such as he is," he has not also the right to have undiminished that which he produces."



EDITORIAL



A STUDY IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Almost every day brings more startling rumors concerning the situation in China. More than three years ago socialist writers pointed out that if the competitive system continued a great international war must result, the contending parties to which would be determined by the lines of economic cleavage. These lines naturally separated the nations of capitalism into two great groups. On the one side is semi-barbaric Russia, with a group of weaker nations united to her by various ties. Opposed to her are the United States, England and Japan, representing the height of capitalistic development.

That England and Russia are destined to come into armed conflict is generally admitted by all students of the geography or the history of these nations. The imminence of this titanic combat has been pointed out over and over again and all manner of predictions offered as to its probable outcome.

When the problem is approached from the point of view of scientific inquiry, however, one is struck fully as much by the complexity as the immensity of the factors involved. This complexity makes all definite prophecy hopeless, and lends an elasticity to the relations affected that makes countless combinations, evasions and delays possible before the striking of any decisive blow. On the other hand many of the factors involved are of very sensitive and unstable character, making the whole combination highly explosive and liable to go off in a most unexpected way.

When the opposing forces met in China, England and the United States depended upon their superior competing power to found a commercial supremacy, upon which a political supremacy could be later based. For this reason they seek to enforce the principle of "the open door." Russia, being still dominated by dreams of military, territorial and political power, demands partition. Hence the conflict.

These various factors render the whole matter much more than a mere test of naval, military, or what is often more fundamental to-day, of financial strength, and all comparative figures along these lines, such as have been filling the columns of the press for the last few weeks, are practically meaningless. It is certain that no one nation will enter the fight unaided. We have neither the knowledge or the

space at our disposal to enable us to enter the tangled maze of European diplomacy and attempt to sketch the probable lines of future alliances. Suffice to say that when Russia shifted her efforts at expansion from Western Europe to Eastern Asia and put herself in a hostile attitude toward Great Britain, she linked to herself by various ties of interest the minor nations between her and the British Isles.

One phase often overlooked is that from the beginning Russia will to all intents and purposes fight as an ally of China. To be sure this will be with the ultimate design of gobbling China, but such a process will, from the Chinese point of view, be far less disturbing than "benevolent assimilation" by any less barbaric or less Asiatic country. Just how much actual assistance such an alliance would afford Russia it is hard to say. The Manchus and other North China people have never yet proved themselves to be of much use as fighters, the exploits of Gordon and the Black Flags being confined to the Canton provinces, which are inhabited by a very different class of people. But it would at least give a greater extent of territory to be crossed before the heart of Russia was reached, and the strongest defense of that country has ever been its majestic distances, which swallow up hostile armies.

On the other hand Russia has within her borders forces that may prove more dangerous than foreign invasions. There, as everywhere, tyranny has bred a fruitful progeny of revolutionary forces. With every day that passes those forces become less violent and spasmodic, but more determined, methodical and intelligent, and hence more dangerous to the tyranny enthroned as constituted authority. Poland is in a state of continuous revolt, and it is an open secret that her oppressed people are only waiting for foreign complications to afford them another opportunity to make one more desperate struggle for liberty. In this effort they will surely receive the support of the Finns who are at present bending under the double load of Russian brutality and an industrial crisis brought on by American competition.

But if Russia has foes within herself, the same is no less true of her opponents. While within the immediate confines of the British Isles the revolutionary spirit seems to have for the moment been stifled and bribed into an easy going, comfortable opportunism, yet such a condition cannot continue forever. The Englishman will stand almost unlimited oppression with only an occasional growl, if only it is done in a customary and established manner, but he will raise a rebellion if an old method of procedure is violated. Now he has long been taught that the one particular blessing for which he was to "thank God that he was not like other men" was in his exemption from "corn laws" and enforced military service. But an international conflict would at once introduce both the tariff and conscription, and might easily prove the last straw that would cause the English worker to throw off the whole load. There is little need to refer to

the tremendous handicap created by the Boer war, as foreign complications have been the last desperate hope of the burghers of the Transvaal for many months. It is perhaps less generally known that famines and official rapacity in India have built up another mass of highly inflammable material that might be easily ignited by some spark struck off in the clash of international interests.

These same internal complications will be found in almost every land concerned. Even the workers of America, the most exploited and most docile on earth, are beginning to revolt at the prospect of bearing further burdens in support of a policy of international piracy. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that the great capitalists of any country desire an international war such as we are now describing. Such a struggle would disturb trade and commerce, and consequently exploitation, at a multitude of points. More important still, we have seen that it might lead to international disturbances that might easily mean the overthrow of the whole capitalist system. Such a struggle is not a mere plundering expedition like the late Spanish-American war or the British exploits in South Africa, or even the combined piratical attack upon China. On the contrary it is the desperate savage struggle among the robbers themselves. The great industries devour their smaller neighbors until the supply of weaker victims is exhausted, when they turn in cannibalistic fury upon each other and fight until all but one is eaten, or a treaty of peace providing for a truce and a trust is arranged.

These great combats are always avoided by the contending parties and ended at the first favorable opportunity. The same will be true regarding these national struggles. Every possible expedient will be sought to postpone the inevitable conflict. But in this case no complete combination is possible while capitalism remains. The only thing that can check the oncoming of this frightful day of Armageddon is the rise of a socialist movement so powerful as to constitute a bond of common interest sufficiently strong to curb the contending passions of the kings of capitalism.

CAPITALISM IN THE UNIVERSITIES

The trouble at Leland Stanford University will not down, and there is a prospect that we shall have an opportunity to apologize to the professorial cult in America for our reflections in the last issue upon their lack of class consciousness. The American Economic Association, which is the nearest approach to a trade union yet attained among the professors, appointed a committee to investigate the matter. This committee summed the whole subject up in a somewhat pedantic document, which "exonerated" Prof. Ross (as if he needed any such action) and mildly condemned President Jordan for his contemptible

toadyism (which they of course gave a much milder name). Since then two more professors, including Prof. Frank Fetter, who it is rumored was slated for promotion to Prof. Ross' chair, have resigned. This makes it certain that there were at least seven among the Stanford faculty who had evolved far enough from the state of savagery to begin to comprehend the meaning of social solidarity. In the meantime the owners of the institution seem to have no difficulty in securing scabs enough to fill all vacancies.

In this connection a recent occurrence in Chicago educational affairs present some extremely interesting phases. These have not yet been noticed in the capitalist press, and what we say here in regard to the matter is entirely on our own responsibility without consultation with or knowledge of the persons concerned. The facts to which we refer are these: Prof. John Dewey of the pedagogical department of the University of Chicago is perhaps the ablest living exponent of the "new education" of freedom and development. Accepting the full logic of his philosophy, he has pointed out its sociological relations and close connection with the doctrines of socialism. Such a man, whether consciously or unconsciously, is most effectively propagating socialism. Indeed there is today no field more full of promise of revolutionary action than that of education. It is but ascribing ordinary intelligence to the defenders of capitalism to suppose that they have already seen this and are seeking to side-track and emasculate this new revolutionary movement as they have all similar ones in other fields. Now it so happens the man of all others most capable of doing this is in the city of Chicago. Col. Francis Parker is widely known as one of the foremost defenders of the new education, and there is no denying that he is a master of its technique. His writings and public utterances, however, show an almost childlike ignorance of the wider philosophical and social relations of his subject. He calls himself an individualist and seems utterly unable to see that the reason he has himself suffered petty persecution for his educational work was because of its, to him unknown, hostile tendency toward the established social order. But the new education, like the comparative method and economic interpretation in history, realism in literature and art, and evolution in science is bound to come and the shrewdest representatives of capitalism are now only seeking to divert it and render it as harmless as possible. Hence we were not at all surprised to learn that the Emmons Blaine School of Pedagogy was to be affiliated with the University of Chicago and that Prof. Dewey was to be relegated to a subordinate position, his wonderful model school disbanded and, in general, his power for good to the cause of progress and injury to capitalism be destroyed. It is possible that this is but a mere accident incident to the process of consolidation, but if so it was a remarkably lucky chance for capitalism, and when we remember whose hand shook the throw we are naturally suspicious of loaded dice.

American methods of propaganda, like American socialism, must be the most advanced in the world in order to properly reflect and combat the most advanced capitalism. Hence it is peculiarly fitting to learn that the Minnesota socialists are arranging to send an automobile on a propaganda tour during the coming summer. By this means they will avoid the high railroad fares and hotel bills, and at the same time will reach a section of the population hitherto largely untouched by socialist propaganda and one which is now more than ready for it. The intelligence of the rural population and of the residents of small towns in this country is higher than in any other country in the world, and nowhere are they more ready for socialism. These are the ones who will be reached by such a propaganda and who can scarcely be reached in any other way. The Minnesota comrades have been particularly fortunate in securing G. F. Lockwood and wife, who have been engaged in this form of agitation for some years with great success. One thousand dollars are necessary for the equipment of the outfit, and about one-half of this amount has been raised. Contributions to make up the remainder are requested, and may be sent to G. F. Lockwood, 2615 Nicollet avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

"Mother Jones" writes us concerning her article for this number: "I am worked to death. Will you let me off this month? I will give you a good article next month." Those of our readers who know the heroic fight she has been making in behalf of the Scranton silk mill girls will realize how genuine her excuse is. Our next number will be a "First of May number," and will contain articles from all over the world, giving the most complete "bird's-eye view" of the international socialist movement ever compiled. Articles have already been promised from Denmark, Italy, France, England and several other countries, by the representative socialist writers of these countries. Nor will the United States be neglected, for articles have been promised by prominent socialist writers in all parts of the country, giving a summary of conditions in the socialist movement in their localities. This number will be of great permanent value and all socialist sections should secure a supply for future sale. Write for special terms to socialist organizations. Newsdealers should also take note and increase their regular orders.

Our Co-operative Publishing Business

HOW SOCIALIST LITERATURE IS BE- ING CIRCULATED BY SOCIALISTS.

The International Socialist Review, the Pocket Library of Socialism, the Library of Progress and our other socialist literature are owned, published and circulated, not by any one or two individuals, but by a co-operative company, consisting of a rapidly growing number of socialists, already exceeding two hundred, and most of whom have invested just ten dollars each. In answer to many inquiries from our co-operators and from other friends who are interested in our work and who are thinking of becoming members of the company, we shall try in this article to give a fuller account of our work than has yet appeared in print.

The publishing business carried on under the name of Charles H. Kerr & Company was established in 1886, but for the first seven years its publications were in the line of "a religion that is rational and a rationalism that is religious," rather than on economic or social lines.

In 1893 the business was incorporated, without change of name, under the Illinois laws, with an authorized capital of ten thousand dollars, divided into 1,000 ten-dollar shares. We began in that year the publication of "New Occasions," the name of which was afterwards changed to "The New Time." This was a semi-populist, semi-socialist magazine. Like numerous other Americans, we were looking for real socialism, but as yet knew little about it. "The New Time," after reaching a monthly circulation of over

30,000 copies, was separated from our book business and passed into the control of the editor, Mr. Adams, who in the course of four months came to the end of his resources and disappointed his friends by transferring the subscription list to the "Arena."

During the years 1893-1899 we published a number of books, starting with money reform, government banking, etc., and even taking in such books on the border line of socialism as "Merrie England," but our real connection with the International Socialist movement began in the spring of 1899, when the Workers' Call was started in this city. We at once cultivated fraternal relations with its editor and writers, and in April began the publication of the Pocket Library of Socialism, which has appeared monthly ever since. Twenty-five numbers have already appeared, and the total number of copies printed up to this time is 230,000, while editions already ordered will shortly bring the number up to 270,000.

In January, 1900, A. M. Simons became vice-president of this company, and in July we began the publication of the International Socialist Review under his editorship.

The first number of the Review appeared July 1, 1900, with a list of yearly subscribers already secured to the number of about 800. This list has now increased to about 3,500, in addition to an average monthly sale of as many more copies, and both subscriptions and sales are increasing so rap-

idly that a monthly edition of 10,000 copies will soon be necessary.

Among other socialist publications issued by us within the last two years may be mentioned English translations of Liebknecht's "Socialism" and "No Compromise," Engel's "Socialism Utopian and Scientific" and Kautsky's "Life of Engels, also the "Socialist Campaign Book" and "Socialist Songs with Music," not to speak of the important works now in press which are announced on another page of this Review.

How was the capital raised to do all this?

About \$500 was subscribed by a few sympathizers who were able and willing to put in comparatively large sums to help the work, and somewhat more came from comrades who paid \$10 each for individual shares of stock. The money has not been used to pay running expenses; these have been met by subscriptions to the Review and sales of books. It has gone into editions of new books and into advertising which is daily increasing the circulation of the Review.

It is interesting to note that not a dollar of this stock was subscribed on the promise of dividends nor on the expectation of any profit on the labor of others. The one inducement offered, apart from the general motive of extending the socialist propaganda, is the privilege of buying our literature at cost, and it is an encouraging fact that a number of locals of the Social Democratic party have already subscribed for stock and are using their privilege to circulate increasing quantities of socialist literature at prices far lower than have been made before. The following table will show the exact location of our stockholders. We do not publish names, for the reason that publicity might endanger the jobs of many of our friends, but any socialist desiring the address of a stockholder in his own town can get it by addressing us with proper credentials from his S. D. P. organization.

List of Postoffices Where Stockholders Are Located

- ALABAMA—Branchville.
 ALASKA—Douglas.
 ARIZONA—Bisbee, Flagstaff, Safford.
 ARKANSAS—Arkansas City, Hot Springs.
 CALIFORNIA—Colusa, Glen Ellen, Healdsburg, Hemet, Independence, Jamestown, Lemoore, Los Angeles (three), Red Bluff, Virginia.
 COLORADO—Arastra, Colorado City, Globeville, Leadville, New Castle.
 CONNECTICUT—Berlin, Gildersleeve, New Haven (two), Torrington.
 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Georgetown, Washington (three).
 FLORIDA—Gilmore, Kissimmee, Milton.
 GEORGIA—Fitzgerald, Ruskin.
 IDAHO—Garnet, Gibbonsville, Wallace.
 ILLINOIS—Allerton, Caseyville, Chicago (24), Crete, Galesburg, Keithsville, Illiopolis, Jacksonville, Keithsburg, Morrison, Mt. Palatine, Pana, Quincy, Woodburn.
 INDIANA—Butler, Greenfield, Hammond (two), Huntington, Indianapolis, Terre Haute.
 IOWA—Clarinda, Davenport, Des Moines, Grinnell (two), Independence, Lenox, Sioux City, Van Home.
 KANSAS—Halstead, Kansas City (two), Lawrence.
 KENTUCKY—Covington, Louisville (three), Newport, Paducah, Science Hill.
 MASSACHUSETTS—Boston, Brighton, Dorchester, Fall River, Fitchburg, Lawrence, Lynn (two), Newburyport, Springfield, Vineyard Haven.
 MICHIGAN—Allegan, Detroit, Battle Creek (two), Benton Harbor, Eaton Rapids, Grand Rapids, Ithaca, Kalamazoo (two), Ludington, Ypsilanti.
 MINNESOTA—Hubbard, Minneapolis (four), St. Anthony Park, Tracy, Two Harbors.
 MISSOURI—Joplin, Kansas City, New Madrid, St. Joseph, St. Louis (four), Trenton.
 MONTANA—Billings, Butte, Lewiston.
 NEBRASKA—Bancroft, Columbus, Harrisburg, Omaha.
 NEW HAMPSHIRE—Chesham, Dover, Manchester.
 NEW JERSEY—Orange, Passaic.
 NEW YORK—Brooklyn, Daws, New York (five), Port Jervis, Rochester, Saranac Lake.

NORTH DAKOTA—Guelph, Mayville, Minot.

OHIO—Alliance, Cincinnati (two), Cleveland, Crestline, Latty, Massillon, Mechanicsburg, New Waterford, Salem, Springfield, Toledo.

OKLAHOMA—Augusta, El Reno, Filton, Wardin.

OREGON—Baker City, Eugene, Oregon City, Portland, Vernonia, Whitaker.

PENNSYLVANIA—Allegheny, Erie, Brownsville, Franklin, New Castle, Philadelphia (four), Pittsburg, Rodi, Wallaceville.

RHODE ISLAND—Providence.

SOUTH DAKOTA—Gann Valley.

TENNESSEE—Harriman.

TEXAS—Blanco, Killen, Mason.

UTAH—Clinton, Eureka, Murray, Sunshine.

VIRGINIA—Newport News.

WASHINGTON—Fairhaven, Langley, New Whatcom, Olympia, Parkland, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Tacoma.

WEST VIRGINIA—McMechen, Ripley.

WISCONSIN—Milwaukee, Madison.

CANADA—

British Columbia—Slocan.

Manitoba—Winnipeg.

Nova Scotia—Halifax.

Ontario—Collingwood, Kagawong, Malton.

The capital thus far subscribed is very far from being enough to meet the needs of the movement. Our monthly book sales have increased from \$409.15 for February 1900 to \$864.65 in February 1901, not including in the latter month the receipts of the *International Socialist Review*, which amounted to \$395.49 more. But this is only a hint of the increase that is possible in the near future if we can have the capital needed to advertise the *International Socialist Review* as it should be advertised, and to print the new socialist books for which a ready sale is almost certain as soon as they can be placed on the market. Six hundred shares at ten dollars each are still unsold, and the six thousand dollars that can be realized from their sale, if our comrades act promptly, will enable us to double and quadruple

the output of socialist literature and to reduce our prices even below this new scale now announced for the first time.

All stockholders, both those already holding stock and those who subscribe in response to this notice, will hereafter be entitled to the following special rates on book orders accompanied by the cash. (Keeping accounts makes needless expense):

Pocket Library of Socialism and other five-cent books published by us—Five thousand assorted copies, \$30.00; 1,000 assorted copies, \$8.00; 100 assorted copies, \$1.00; smaller lots two cents a copy.

Ten-cent books—One thousand assorted copies (freight at purchaser's expense) \$30.00; 100 assorted copies, \$3.50; 25 assorted copies, \$1.00; smaller lots, five cents a copy.

Other paper-covered books in hundred lots (freight at purchaser's expense) sixty per cent discount from list prices; in smaller lots, fifty per cent discount.

Cloth-bound books if sent at purchaser's expense, fifty per cent discount; if sent at our expense, forty per cent discount.

These rates apply only to books now published or hereafter to be published by ourselves. We shall as an accommodation to our customers supply other socialist books, but as we have to buy them of the various publishers at small discounts and as the labor involved is considerable, we cannot at present offer any reduction from retail prices on books of other publishers.

It is our hope and purpose to publish as fast as the work can be done a line of cloth-bound books to be known as the *Standard Socialist Series*, which will keep American readers in touch with the latest and most thoroughly scientific thought of the world, and at the same time will be readily understood by any attentive reader.

We can now definitely promise the first two numbers of the series early

in May. One will be Liebknecht's *Life of Marx*, described on page 589 of last month's Review. Even socialists usually think of Marx as a mere student, philosopher and critic. This book of Liebknecht's personal recollections of Marx, dealing mainly with the period of exile in London, shows Marx the man, his heroism through years of discouragement and persecution, his energy and steadfastness, his warm human sympathy and the atmosphere of love radiating from his home. The book supplies an indispensable chapter in the history of socialism.

We can also promise for publication in May the translation by Charles H. Kerr of Vandervelde's "Collectivism and Industrial Evolution," the table of contents of which is printed on page 588. We have just received Professor Vandervelde's manuscript of his preface to our edition, in which he says: "At the hour when the United States, finishing their industrial evolution, penetrating as victors into the markets of Europe, joining the capitalist crusade in the Orient, are mingling more and more in the concert of the powers of the old world, it is imperatively necessary that the socialists of Europe and America come into closer and closer touch with each other, learn to know each other better and better, and in so far as the diversity of environment may be reconciled with their common aspirations, unify their international propaganda against international exploitation."

Still another work of prime importance, which we hope to have ready early in June, is Engel's "Origin of the Family," translated by Professor Un-

termann. Space forbids a detailed description this month.

These three books, soon to be followed by others, will be issued in neat cloth binding and in convenient shape for the pocket, the size of page being that of the Pocket Library of Socialism. The retail price will be fifty cents a copy and the price to stockholders twenty-five cents.

There are other important books which we shall publish as soon as the stock subscriptions justify us in undertaking the expense, among them a translation of Professor Vandervelde's "Socialism and Belgium" and an original work by A. M. Simons on the Future of the American Farmer.

We have tried to show that every dollar invested in our company will bring large returns in two ways: first, to the local work of the comrade or the socialist club which pays for a share of stock, by the privilege it secures of buying socialist literature at the lowest possible prices; second, to the general work of socialist propaganda, by still further increasing our output of socialist literature.

If you individually cannot spare ten dollars, get other comrades to join with you in sending for a share of stock. It will have to be issued in one name for voting purposes, but each of you can have the privilege of buying books at reduced prices.

Do not put this matter off. Now is the time the money is needed. Send a postal order for ten dollars and you will get your stock certificate by return mail and will thereafter be entitled to all the privileges of a stockholder.

ADDRESS

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.