

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

MAY, 1903.

NO. 11.

## Workingmen As Judges.

**W**HAT does the cry for a non-partisan or non-political judiciary mean? It means that the Socialists are right when they say that there is no fundamental difference between the republican and democratic branches of the capitalist party; that the pretended fight between them is only a struggle for the offices and the patronage; that both have been tested and found to be thoroughly reliable servants of the non-producing class; and that the so-called business men, that is those whose business it is to take from those whose business it is to produce, are well satisfied with judges drawn from either branch. They know their men. When they say the bench is not a political office they express a wish rather than a fact. They wish the workers to believe that the courts are not used for political purposes and that capitalism is so firmly established on everlasting foundations that all hope of overthrowing it must be abandoned, and that as they make no distinction between republican and democratic judges, so the working class should make no distinction between capitalist and Socialist judges.

If it were true that the bench is not a political office; that the business of the judicial department, one of the three great branches of our government, has become of such a character that the working class is not interested in it and cannot understand it; that there is an impassable gulf between the working class and the courts; then it is a sad commentary on our social development; then we say, so much the worse for the courts, or so much the worse for what is called politics, or, if you please, so much the worse for the condition of the working class as developed under capitalism. But we shall find upon examination that the bench instead of being a non-political office is in fact the most political of all offices.

If judges had only technical matters to deal with, like architects and engineers, it would be proper enough to nominate

only trained lawyers for these offices. But they have to pass upon more important matters than the fine points of pleading, practice and evidence. Let us consider for a moment the character of our laws, the powers of the courts and how these powers are used. The body of our laws is made up of two parts,—first, legislative enactments called statute law; second, decisions of courts, called common law. The statute law is comprised in a single volume; the common law is to be found in tens of thousands of volumes of court reports. This distinction, however, is superfluous, because the few little statute laws are not laws for sure until they have passed into decisions of the courts, so that these decisions, after all, are the whole thing.

At an early day in this country, the courts usurped the power to declare statutes unconstitutional, and thus unconstitutionally set themselves up as the sovereign power over and beyond the reach of the people; for although a judge may be deposed that in no way changes the effect of a decision already rendered. They knew of no other way to meet an unconstitutional statute except by an unconstitutional decision. It never occurred to them to refer a doubtful statute to the real sovereign, the people, to ratify or reject it. This hamstringing of democracy was not done without vigorous protest at the time. Chancellor Kent justified it as necessary to protect the rights of minorities; but it is now used with the avowed object of defeating the rights of majorities. See Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations*, chap. VII, where this question is discussed. Judge Cooley says: "In declaring statutes unconstitutional, the courts only do what every private citizen may do in respect to the mandates of the courts when the judges assume to act and to render judgments or decrees without jurisdiction." There you have the pure and undefiled gospel of anarchy, so characteristic of capitalism.

Abraham Lincoln, in his first inaugural address, referring to the Dred Scott case, said: "The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

In England it has not been necessary as yet for the courts to usurp the power of setting aside acts of parliament. The reason is not the lack of a written constitution, as commonly supposed, for Lord Coke asserted the supremacy of the courts over parliament without a constitution. But this supremacy is not now exercised. The reason is obvious. Restricted suffrage and the hereditary

house of lords afford sufficient guaranty against the rule of the people. Remove these two checks and the necessity would at once be felt of placing the ultimate power "somewhere," as our courts queerly express it, meaning somewhere beyond the reach of the people, somewhere besides in the people themselves.

To avoid the appearance of partiality and to maintain their reputation for being "non-partisan," the courts not only reverse the legislature, but also reverse themselves. In fact, it is a peculiar advantage of court-made law that it is flexible. It can be either followed or overruled, as the occasion demands. Former decisions are not binding, except in the particular suits in which they were rendered. There is no law preventing a court either from overruling an old precedent or establishing a new one, if wanted. The federal income tax of 1894 was illegal because though there was precedent for it the court refused to follow the precedent. Sweeping and revolutionary injunctions are issued against labor unions, because though there is no precedent for them, a new precedent is wanted. But an injunction to restrain employers from endangering the health and lives of their workmen cannot be granted, first, because there is no old precedent for it and no new precedent is wanted; second, because even if there were a precedent for it the precedent would be bad and would not be followed.

The result is that our judges form a kind of hierarchy, and their law is a mystic lore capable of the most wonderful constructions. If you asked a Grecian priestess, sitting on a three-legged stool in the Delphic temple, a plain question, her answer would be so ambiguous that however the affair afterwards turned out an interpretation of her answer could always be found to fit the event, and this, of course, was the right interpretation; all others were wrong. Ask a plain question of a capitalist judge, sitting in a high-backed, four-legged chair in the temple of Justice, and he will deliver you a grave oracle about what is right, what is fair, what is just, what is honest, what is reasonable, what is moral, what is equity, what is good faith, what is public welfare, and all this nauseating stuff, which means nothing, because it may mean anything which it is handy to have it mean on future occasions. But you come before this judge with a case based on specific facts, involving a vital point between the subject class and their exploiters, and you will quickly find out what the ambiguous words mean. You will find that the public welfare always and everywhere in the last instance means the mastery of the non-producing class over the producing class, and the consequent degradation and suffering of the latter. That is, the public welfare of the capitalist class means the public suffering of the working class. This is honest, this is fair, this is just. No other form of

justice is conceivable, except justice for the non-producer and injustice for the producer. In a society where labor power is treated as merchandise, there is no way of protecting capitalist property except by confiscating labor property and no way of protecting labor property except by confiscating capitalist property. Hence the agents of capitalism, whose hands are red up to the elbows with the blood of confiscated labor, are the loudest in their denunciation of any attempt to abolish capitalism as being confiscation. The permanent question before the courts is not the negative one, how to protect property; it does no good to protect property; if protected and left severely alone property soon melts away. The question is a positive one,—how to keep up a steady confiscation of labor. Unless this can be done there is no object in owning capital, as capital is only useful as a means of confiscating labor. And this affirmative assistance is what the courts in effect render to capitalists.

The courts also control the very important subject of taxation. They set aside an unwelcome tax on the ground that it was not levied for a public purpose, and they themselves are the sole and final judges of what is a public purpose. The people are not competent to decide this; they need somebody to tell them.

This judicial priesthood is the bane of all Anglo-Saxon countries. They are judge-ridden. It is a common remark that a complicated system of laws seems inseparable from what is called political liberty, i. e. bourgeois liberty. This merely means that the transfer of supreme power from the executive to the judicial branch of the government necessitates a multiplicity of regulations in order to blind the people to the fact that a court despotism is just as essentially a despotism as a military despotism, though different in form. The producing class is as effectually crushed under the one as the other. True, political liberty gives to the producing class the means to free itself, but it still remains subject until it learns how to use these means for the purpose of recovering and retaining sovereignty over itself; it is not enough to shift it from one branch of the government to another.

Our courts not only have a veto on the legislative branch of the government, but they have control over the executive branch. The so-called executive branch does not execute the laws. There is no provision made anywhere in our system, for the faithful execution of the laws, and that is why so many of them remain unexecuted and why so many private societies spring up among people who have a fad for seeing some favorite law executed, but are indifferent about other laws. A society for the prevention of cruelty to animals is all right; but imagine, if you can, the great business men of Chicago, heads of corporations, bankers, preachers, leaders in church and fashionable life, forming a voluntary

association to look after the faithful execution of the tax laws, the listing of property at its full value and the assessment of all church-owned property not used for strictly religious purposes, as required by law? Wouldn't it jar you?

What our executive branch does is not to execute the laws but to execute the orders of court. You may neglect a law with impunity, but you neglect an order of court and you are put behind the bars forthwith. In the last instance, therefore, our courts control both legislature and executive, and in fact rule the country, not because of any technical knowledge pertaining to court practice, which is an incidental matter, but because they usurp the power to decide public controversies in favor of the exploiting class.

Not only do the courts control the legislature and the executive; their power extends to all kinds of contracts between individuals. They can either annul contracts or enforce them as they see fit. They allow and enforce waivers of exemptions and many other legal rights, which the legislature attempts to secure to the weaker party. They assume to say what is an equitable contract. But there is one class of contracts which they exclude from the temple of justice; such are the contracts between employer and employe. When the laborer comes and asks them to pass on the fairness of this contract, they slam the door in his face. Anything is fair against the working class. To make money out of brother capitalists is stealing or cheating, and if carried too far the courts will interfere to stop it. There is only one strictly legitimate and honorable way of making money, and that is to make it out of the working class. So long as a man confines himself to this field he will not be interfered with. There is no law limiting the exploitation of labor. It would be unconstitutional to do that.

As the real supremacy of the courts in our system and their effectiveness in thwarting democracy becomes more generally recognized, no wonder that the salaries of judges are raised and that the dignity of the bench is rising in the eyes of the capitalists. No wonder the Chicago Bar Association, otherwise so barren and impotent, has introduced the custom that all present rise to their feet on the entrance of the judge, and that we hear suggestions of a judge's gown, to put his apparent dignity in keeping with his real power. But as the courts rise in the estimation of the capitalists they justly sink in the eyes of the working class and become more and more an object of suspicion and distrust, as their attitude and leanings in the class struggle become more unmistakable.

Such being the powers of the courts and their way of using them, what shall we say about the fitness of workingmen for this

office? The principal business of the courts does not concern the relations of capitalists among themselves; these matters swell the volume of judicial proceedings, but the fundamentally important function of the courts is to assist the owning class to confiscate labor and thus maintain class supremacy.

Loria well says: "Now this part of the law (affecting the relations of capitalists with each other) presents a deep impress of equity and thus give countenance for the moment to the idea that the law is indeed the realization of justice. But this is simply due to the fact that these legal provisions regulate the affairs of men who are economically equal—or at least enjoy a liberty of choice—and among whom usurpation is excluded. But as soon as we turn our attention to the legal provisions regulating the relations between proprietors and non-proprietors we perceive at once that our former concept was but an infantile delusion; for this side of the law shows us an obstinate, impudent and thorough consecration of privilege and a decisive preference for proprietary rights."

Now, in all matters involving issues between the capitalist class and the labor class, being the only vital matters which a court has to pass upon, why are not class-conscious workmen fully capable of acting as judges, even though they are not lawyers? In fact, the ordinary training which a lawyer receives poorly fits him to act as judge in such matters. The best protection the working class can have is judges elected from its own ranks, whose minds are not befuddled by queer theories about capitalist human nature and capitalist justice as the final and eternal form of all development.

In so far as it is proper to speak of law as a science at all, it is such only as applied to the relations of the exploiters of labor among themselves, as regulating and keeping within bounds the quarrels of the robbers over their booty. It is probable that workmen would at first make some mistakes in acting as referees in these contests, from lack of familiarity with the rules of the game. But what possible harm would be done anyway? The mistakes would only affect the relations of capitalists among one another and would not harm the working class. But when we come to the relations of the exploiters with the laborers themselves, questions involving class issues, there is no such thing as a science of law, and no previous judicial knowledge or experience is necessary. It is purely a question of political or judicial power, as it was formerly a question of physical force. It is only necessary to know the difference between the class which produces without getting and the class which gets without producing; and a working class judge could make no mistake here; he would be thoroughly qualified, both by knowledge and experience,

to decide questions arising between these two classes. Those fundamental parts of the constitution which are now contemptuously brushed aside by the courts as being intended for effect only, would then be made effectual.

Workingmen are waking up to the fact that the principal purpose of the military forces is to assist employers in time of strikes, and a great cry has been raised over the new militia bill passed by Congress, which gives the President extraordinary powers with reference to the use of the militia. It is well to make a note of such laws. But do not get excited. The executive will not use the powers of the new militia law except to enforce the orders of the court, as in the Debs' strike of 1894. We have no reason as yet to fear the Man on Horseback in this country. He is superfluous. What we already have here is the Judge on Horseback; and the meekness with which the American people bow their heads and submit to court-made and unauthorized law speaks volumes for the thoroughness with which the plutocracy of England and America has done its work of overawing and perverting the minds of the workers, so that they no longer distinguish between what is law and what is only the dictum of a law-breaking judge.

*Marcus Hitch.*

## Contradictory Teachers.\*

**T**WO remarkable books recently published are Ghent's "Our Benevolent Feudalism," and Brooks' "The Social Unrest." These two books should be read together if the reader would extract the full value from either. The reader who may be interested in social questions will take huge delight in them, not alone because they are filled with the very latest and most significant industrial and political facts, but because the opposite sides of the great labor problem are expounded by two men, each devoting himself with apprehension to the side he hopes will be beaten.

It would appear that they have set themselves the task of collating, as a warning, the phenomena of two counter social forces. Mr. Ghent, who is sympathetic with the Socialist movement, follows with cynic fear every aggressive act of the capitalist class. Mr. Brooks, who yearns for the perpetuation of the capitalist system as long as possible, follows with grave dismay each aggressive act of the labor and Socialist organizations. Mr. Ghent traces the emasculation of labor by capital, and Mr. Brooks traces the emasculation of independent competing capital by labor. In short, each marshals the facts of a side in the two sides which go to make a struggle so great that even the French Revolution is insignificant beside it; for this later struggle, for the first time in the history of struggles, is not confined to any particular portion of the globe, but involves the whole of it.

Starting on the assumption that society is at present in a state of flux, Mr. Ghent sees it rapidly crystallizing into a status, which can best be described as something in the nature of a benevolent feudalism. He laughs to scorn any immediate realization of the Marxian dream, while Tolstoyan utopias and Kropotkinian communistic unions of shop and farm are too wild to merit consideration. The coming status which Mr. Ghent depicts, is a class domination by the capitalists. Labor will take its definite place as a dependent class, living in a condition of machine servitude fairly analogous to the land servitude of the middle ages. That is to say, labor will be bound to the machine, though less harshly, in fashion somewhat similar to that in which the earlier serf was bound to the soil. As he says: "Bondage to the land was the basis of villeinage in the old regime; bondage to the job will be the basis of villeinage in the new."

At the top of the new society will tower the magnate, the new feudal baron; at the bottom will be found the wastrels and inefficient. The new society he grades as follows:

---

\*Our Benevolent Feudalism. By W. J. Ghent. The Macmillan Company. The Social Unrest. By John Graham Brooks. The Macmillan Company.

I. The barons, graded on the basis of possessions.

II. The court agents and retainers. (This class will include the editors of "respectable" and "safe" newspapers, the pastors of "conservative" and "wealthy" churches, the professors and teachers in endowed colleges and schools, lawyers generally, and most judges and politicians.)

III. The workers in pure and applied science, artists and physicians.

IV. The entrepreneurs, the managers of the great industries, transformed into a salaried class.

V. The foremen and superintendents. This class has heretofore been recruited largely from the skilled workers, but with the growth of technical education in schools and colleges, and the development of fixed caste, it is likely to become entirely differentiated.

VI. The villeins of the cities and towns, more or less regularly employed, who do skilled work and are partially protected by organization.

VII. The villeins of the cities and towns who do unskilled work and are unprotected by organization. They will comprise the laborers, domestics, and clerks.

VIII. The villeins of the manorial estates, of the great farms, the mines, and the forests.

IX. The small-unit farmers (land owning), the petty tradesmen, and manufacturers.

X. The subtenants of the manorial estates and great farms (corresponding to the class of "free tenants" in the old Feudalism).

XI. The cotters.

XII. The tramps, the occasionally employed, the unemployed—the wastrels of city and country.

"The new Feudalism, like most autocracies, will foster not only the arts, but also certain kinds of learning—particularly the kinds which are unlikely to disturb the minds of the multitude. A future Marsh or Cope or Le Conte will be liberally patronized and left free to discover what he will; and so, too, an Edison or a Marconi. Only they must not meddle with anything relating to social science."

It must be confessed that Mr. Ghent's arguments are cunningly contrived and arrayed. They must be read to be appreciated. As an example of his style, which at the same time generalizes a portion of his argument, the following may well be given:

"The new Feudalism will be but an orderly outgrowth of present tendencies and conditions. All societies evolve naturally

out of their predecessors. In sociology, as in biology, there is no cell without a parent cell. The society of each generation develops a multitude of spontaneous and acquired variations, and out of these, by a blending process of natural and conscious selection, the succeeding society is evolved. The new order will differ in no important respects from the present, except in the completer development of its more salient features. The visitor from another planet who had known the old and should see the new would note but few changes. Alter et Idem—another yet the same—he would say. From magnate to baron, from workman to vellein, from publicist to court agent and retainer, will be changes of state and function so slight as to elude all but the keenest eyes."

And in conclusion, to show how benevolent and beautiful this new feudalism of ours will be, Mr. Ghent says: "Peace and stability it will maintain at all hazards; and the mass, remembering the chaos, the turmoil, the insecurity of the past, will bless its reign. . . Efficiency—the faculty of getting things—is at last rewarded as it should be, for the efficient have inherited the earth and its fulness. The lowly, "whose happiness is greater and whose welfare is more thoroughly conserved when governed than when governing," as a twentieth-century philosopher said of them, are settled and happy in the state which reason and experience teach is their God-appointed lot. They are comfortable, too; and if the patriarchial ideal of a vine and fig tree for each is not yet attained, at least each has his rented patch in the country or his rented cell in a city building. Bread and the circus are freely given to the deserving, and as for the undeserving, they are merely reaping the rewards of their contumacy and pride. Order reigns, each has his justly appointed share, and the state rests in security, 'lapt in universal law.'"

Mr. Brooks, on the other hand, sees rising and dissolving and rising again in the social flux the ominous forms of a new society which is the direct antithesis of a benevolent feudalism. He trembles at the rash intrepidity of the capitalists who fight the labor unions, for by such rashness he greatly fears that labor will be driven to express its aims and strength in political terms, which terms will inevitably be Socialistic terms.

To keep down the rising tide of Socialism, he preaches greater meekness and benevolence to the capitalists. No longer may they claim the right to run their own business, to beat down the laborer's standard of living for the sake of increased profits, to dictate terms of employment to individual workers, to wax righteously indignant when organized labor takes a hand in their business. No longer may the capitalist say "my" business, or even think "my" business; he must say "our" business,

and think "our" business as well, accepting labor as a partner whose voice must be heard. And if the capitalists do not become more meek and benevolent in their dealings with labor, labor will be antagonized and will proceed to wreak terrible political vengeance, and the present social flux will harden into a status of Socialism.

Mr. Brooks dreams of a society at which Mr. Ghent sneers as "a slightly modified individualism, wherein each unit secures the just reward of his capacity and service." To attain this happy state, Mr. Brooks imposes circumspection upon the capitalists in their relations with labor. "If the Socialistic spirit is to be held in abeyance in this country, businesses of this character (anthracite coal-mining) must be handled with extraordinary caution." Which is to say, that to withstand the advance of Socialism, a great and greater measure of Mr. Ghent's benevolence will be required.

Again and again, Mr. Brooks reiterates the danger he sees in harshly treating labor. "It is not probable that employers can destroy unionism in the United States. Adroit and desperate attempts will, however, be made, if we mean by unionism the undisciplined and aggressive fact of vigorous and determined organizations. If capital should prove too strong in this struggle, the result is easy to predict. The employers have only to convince labor that it cannot hold its own against the capitalist manager, and the whole energy that now goes to the union will turn to an aggressive political Socialism. It will not be the harmless sympathy with increased city and state functions which trade unions already feel; it will become a turbulent political force bent upon using every weapon of taxation against the rich."

"The most concrete impulse that now favors Socialism in this country is the inane purpose to deprive labor organizations of the full and complete rights that go with federated unionism."

"That which teaches a union that it cannot succeed as a union turns it toward Socialism. In long strikes in towns like Marlboro and Brookfield strong unions are defeated. Hundreds of men leave these town for shoe-centers like Brockton, where they are now voting the Socialist ticket. The Socialist Mayor of this city tells me, 'The men who come to us now from towns where they have been thoroughly whipped in a strike are among our most active working Socialists.' The bitterness engendered by this sense of defeat is turned to politics, as it will throughout the whole country, if organization of labor is deprived of its rights."

"This enmity of capital to the trade union is watched with glee by every intelligent Socialist in our midst. Every union

that is beaten or discouraged in its struggle is ripening fruit for Socialism."

"The real peril which we now face is the threat of a class conflict. If capitalism insists upon the policy of outraging the saving aspiration of the American workman to raise his standard of comfort and leisure, every element of class conflict will strengthen among us."

"We have only to humiliate what is best in the trade union, and then every worst feature of Socialism is fastened upon us."

This strong tendency in the ranks of the workers toward Socialism, is what Mr. Brooks characterizes the "social unrest;" and he hopes to see the Republican, the Cleveland Democrat and the conservative and large property interests "band together against this common foe," which is Socialism. And he is not above feeling grave and well-contained satisfaction wherever the Socialist doctrinaire has been contradicted by men attempting to practice co-operation in the midst of the competitive system, as in Belgium.

Nevertheless, he catches fleeting glimpses of an extreme and tyrannically benevolent feudalism very like to Mr. Ghent's, as witness the following:

"I asked one of the largest employers of labor in the South if he feared the coming of the trade union. 'No,' he said, 'it is one good result of race prejudice, that the negro will enable us in the long run to weaken the trade union so that it cannot harm us. We can keep wages down with the negro, and we can prevent too much organization.'

"It is in this spirit that the lower standards are to be used. If this purpose should succeed, it has but one issue—the immense strengthening of a plutocratic administration at the top, served by an army of high-salaried helpers, with an elite of skilled and well-paid workmen, but all resting on what would essentially be a serf class of low-paid labor and this mass kept in order by an increased use of military force."

In brief summary of these two notable books, it may be said that Mr. Ghent is alarmed (though he does not flatly say so) at the too-great social restfulness in the community, which is permitting the capitalists to form the new society to their liking; and that Mr. Brooks is alarmed (and he flatly says so) at the social unrest which threatens the modified individualism into which he would like to see society evolve. Mr. Ghent beholds the capitalist class rising to dominate the state and the working class; Mr. Brooks beholds the working class rising to dominate the state and the capitalist class. One fears the paternalism of a class; the other the paternalism of the mass.

*Jack London.*

### Laborism, Impossibilism and Socialism.

**I**N Great Britain we are only just now entering upon the daily, practical work of a Socialist party. The reasons why we are so far behind all other civilized nations, including even the United States, I gave at length in the first number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW of Chicago, and there is no need to repeat them here. It is enough for us to know that not only are the English and Scotch workers behindhand in education, but that they still, for the most part, look at their own questions from the point of view of the dominant class; confine their attention to maintaining or increasing their rate of wages; refuse to work out the facts before them to their logical conclusion; and are as a rule incapable of conceiving or working for the attainment of any ideal. It has taken us, consequently, two and twenty years of assiduous propaganda to get as far as we have, and if we gauge our progress not by the actual numbers of enrolled Socialists—the only safe test, I admit, for actual working capacity—but by the spread of our ideas, we have got a great deal farther than many of us think. I do not doubt myself, either, that the near future will witness the consolidation of a definite working-class Social-Democratic party in the House of Commons. We are at the moment in a period of transition when, having rendered ourselves more or less formidable, it is worth the while of existing political factions, and especially worth the while of the capitalist-Liberal political faction to try to take advantage of the enthusiasm we can arouse without in any way committing themselves to the principles which constitute the basis of our propaganda. That was to be expected. It was natural. But it is not at all dangerous if genuine Socialists are true to themselves. For when once any body of politicians get on to the inclined plane which leads to Socialism, they will discover that it is a well-greased declivity on which they cannot stop till they reach the bottom. They may occasion us a little temporary annoyance, and postpone our triumphant progress for a short time; but this will not last long. When, for instance, the leaders of the Liberal faction clamor for the expropriation of Lord Penrhyn in order to meet and satisfy in some degree the demands of their "Labor" nominees, they do us excellent service. For if Penrhyn is to be expropriated, why not Furness, why not Cadbury, why not the Railway boards who monopolize our railways? Why, indeed? It is a fine educative word that "expropriation," and the idea is still more enlightening than its method

of expression. In fact, we owe our best thanks to the owner of Bethesda for his staunch upholding of his "right to do what he likes with his own," sorry as we are for the men who suffer. Of course, Bannerman and his set don't mean business in the Penrhyn matter. But what of that? They never do. All the same, however, the proposal has been made, and it is for us to push it a great deal further than the mere political tricksters intend.

No, the difficulty at present is not so much, it seems to me, with outsiders or with the general course of events. Things are coming our way as fast as they can. Everywhere, in all civilized countries, it is obvious that Socialism is the power of the near future. The anxiety of the landlords and capitalists to "dish" us is a testimony to our growing strength. Their desire to bring about splits and schisms in our ranks is evidence of fear. Their dodgery of putting forward trade union barristers, who sell their tongues for money in the courts during the day, and for position in the House of Commons at night, with others of the like kidney, as "Labor Members," is part of a careful scheme to cajole the workers, and head back the Socialists, which serves at the same time as clear proof that they feel very uneasy. Their steady refusal to discuss the existing position in public, and the determination of their corrupt press to boycott our meetings tell the same story. So, I say, the outlook generally is not unsatisfactory, especially when taken in conjunction with the desperate eagerness of the Tories to crush trade unions, and to wreck as they think the only chance of real national education. Our enemies know we are gaining ground daily, and that they are unable to meet us in fair fight. Consequently, suppression of working-class organizations, and the fostering of ignorance, hypocritical sympathy, and pretended co-operation are the order of the day.

Now is the time, therefore, when we might take advantage of the opportunities which the economic and social development and our own propagaanda have created for us. But we are prevented, I repeat, not so much by the dexterous action of our opponents as by the lack of consolidation on our own side. There are the deliberate opportunists and hand-to-mouthers, the half-loaf men who are hungry for political sawdust, and who imagine that they can help to carry Socialism by forswearing all its principles, on the one hand; and there are the furious impossibilists with their anarchical absurdities, partly engendered by the surrenderers themselves, on the other. The latter are the more annoying: the former the more injurious.

As to the impossibilists, they are many of them at bottom anarchists, who honestly believe that all political action is harm-

ful. They are justified in holding that opinion, if they so believe; but they are certainly out of place in a political Socialist party. There are others who know as well as we do that political action is unavoidable, but then it must be conducted wholly in the way which they approve. They refuse to accept the ruling of the majority of the organizations they belong to, they vilify everybody who differs from them, and they say what they know perfectly well to be untrue about the men with whom they claim to be working. De Leon, who was a man of ability, and did good work in his time, is the worst specimen of this type, and he has carefully destroyed his own party and driven away all its best men. Even Socialists like Guesde and Lafargue, whose services to the Socialist cause in France are universally recognized, have gone too far in the same direction, with the result that they have played into the hands of their opponents and have lost their hold on great cities where the Parti Ouvrier was formerly supreme. At present, impossibilism in Great Britain is represented by small knots of men, here and there, who without the slightest claim to have shared in the heavy work of the past, most of which was done before they were born, think they can improve the situation by declaring that the S. D. F. does not preach the class-war, as Kropotkin always used to say we clung to the wages system, and by pretending that the "officials" of the party prevent the development of their genius. Criticism all expect and are the wiser for, but mere lying and slander are much better got rid of and dealt with outside.

The impossibilists are thus to a large extent the excuse for the trimmers. The latter can point to the others as hopeless people, with whom none can possibly work who has the slightest respect for the movement or for himself. They strengthen the position of such a man as Millerand, for instance, by misrepresenting the action taken by the great majority of Socialists at the International Congress who never approved of Millerand's action at all, and by affirming that never, under any conceivable set of circumstances, not even with the approval of the overwhelming majority of Socialists, can a Socialist join a transition government for a temporary object. More than this, people of this sort are never happy unless they are endeavoring to reduce all organized action to an absurdity by insisting upon everything which is done being made public at the time.

Who can wonder that, the tendency to trimming and compromise in this country being what it is, those who do not thoroughly understand Socialism, or who are convinced that it is not even partially realizable in our day, should be confirmed in their bootless opportunism by this sort of folly, little as there may be

of it? Obviously, we have to work in the world as we find it, and, although we must retain our definite class-war principles and organization, it is as ridiculous to say that we must never co-operate with people who partly agree with us, as it is ruinous to sink ourselves in a flabby sort of Laborism which has no principles that it can or dare formulate, and no policy which it is willing to avow. "Laborism," with or without Liberalism, is not Socialism, nor anything approaching to it. Impossibilism, with or without Anarchism, is not Socialism, nor anything approaching to it. The soundest exponent of active political Socialism in our time was old Wilhelm Liebknecht. He made mistakes like the rest of us, or he would never have made anything at all; but he kept throughout to the main road of practical, determined, class-war propaganda, using all the means which came to his hand to help on the great cause. It seems to me that we have reached a period in the English Socialist movement when we have to emulate his readiness to combine with all Socialists who are genuinely determined to obtain possession of the great means of production and distribution for the whole people, and to push aside relentlessly, as he did, the cranks and impossibilists who think that they must be right because they never agree with the mass of their fellows.—*H. M. Hyndman, in London "Justice."*

## Causes of Social Progress.



ANY recent writers on social progress have adopted what is called the economic interpretation of history. This is the view taken by Carl Marx and summed up by him in the statement that "all social institutions are the result of growth and that the causes of this growth are to be sought not in any idea but in the conditions of material existence."

This view is developed and defended by May Wood Simons in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* for March. The article starts out with the statement that "the standpoint from which one approaches the study of history is of the first importance. All depends on the answer to the question as to the cause of social progress. What is the reason for great changes in human thought and human life? What is the underlying motive force in social action?"

The only standpoint from which one can properly approach the study of any subject is the standpoint of the truth-seeker. If one is to study a question with a view to get at the bottom facts, he must divest himself of all preconceptions and come to his work with a mind not only open to truth from every quarter, but looking to every quarter for whatever may be found. He must not come with a theory already formed and seek for facts which may give it a show of support.

The questions with which the writer of this article referred to follows her opening statement indicates that she was no longer seeking truth, but felt herself prepared to impart truth to others. She has evidently answered to her own satisfaction each and all of the questions which she here raises. She had found the one cause of social progress, the one reason for great changes in human thought and human life, the one underlying motive force in social action in the "conditions of material existence" and "not in any idea" or ideas whatever.

And yet, assuming this to be her actual conviction, one is at a loss to understand why she should come before the world with this particular idea,—why she should be giving her whole life in a spirit of genuine devotion and sacrifice to the promulgation of socialistic ideas. Evidently this is a dominant conviction, which no philosophy of social progress can quite dispel, that ideas do play a part, and a very important part, in the work of social evolution. The contention that they do not puts one very much in the attitude of those who claim that "nothing is certain,"—a statement which is evidently self-refuting, since the statement itself

can only be true on the supposition that one thing at least is certain,—viz., that “nothing is certain,”—an utterly contradictory conclusion.

The attempt to find one cause of social progress, one reason for the changes which take place in human thought and human life, one underlying motive force in social action, is like trying to trace the Mississippi to a single source. The waters that have been recently making such hayoc in the South country,—such changes in human conditions and human laws,—do not take their rise in any one spring or any one lake. - No one lake or spring can be said to be dominant even in the changes which the mighty river—made up from a thousand lesser streams—is working.

Undoubtedly economic causes have been too largely overlooked in the past. But they have never been absent or inoperative. Why have they not more generally brought about the changes to which they have steadily pointed and tended? If the causes of social changes are not to be sought in any idea or ideas, but only in material conditions, why have not material conditions uniformly effected these needed changes?

Evidently because men have not understood the workings or meanings of the economic forces and laws amid which and under which they have lived. That is, the ideas which those forces and laws warrant and to which they have been steadily pointing and tending have not been understood or realized. They have been hidden or obscured by other and contradictory ideas, and so the mental or mind forces of the race have not been free to study the workings of economic law and to make clear the pathway of individual and social progress.

Economic laws and forces have been at work in all ages and among all peoples, but there has been no uniformity of growth or progress even among peoples similarly conditioned as to soil and climate. I am not speaking of knowledge of these laws and forces, but of the laws and forces themselves. Knowledge of these takes us at once into the realm of ideas, and the contention of the philosophy we are combatting is that the causes of social growth are not to be sought in any idea but “in the conditions of material existence.”

The conditions of material existence have been substantially the same in China for thousands of years. Economic laws and forces have steadily demanded changes which have never been effected. Why? Because the people have been dominated by ideas and institutions which have tended to perpetuate the existing order.

And the same thing to a lesser degree has retarded the march of progress in our own country. Unquestionably, the nature of the universe, which includes human nature and human environ-

ment, involves a relation between material conditions and human development or social progress. Economics is the science of these relations,—the science by which man learns to adjust himself to his material surroundings in a way to make them contribute in the highest degree to his development and happiness. Ethics is the science of human relations—the science by which man learns how best to adjust himself to his fellow-man,—how to make the most and the best of himself and to get the most and the best out of his neighbor. Religion is the science of man's relations to the universe,—to that invisible, indefinable, power, energy, intelligence,—call it what you will,—which is back of all phenomena and manifests itself through them; to that which is the source and soul of all force, all order and all law; to that which awakens in us a sense of dependence, of confidence, of love.

Economics, ethics and religion, therefore, are inseparably related. The view which a man holds in any one of these departments of thought has much to do in shaping his views of other departments, and the views which really root themselves in convictions, or which become forceful to act strongly on his hopes or fears, are the views which determine action. Sometimes the religious idea is the dominant force, sometimes the ethical and sometimes the economic. Very rarely does either operate unmodified by the others. The causes of social progress, therefore, are not to be found wholly in material conditions. They are to be found also in the social and religious nature of man.

Animals have the same material conditions, so far as soil, climate and environment generally are concerned, as man. Why do they not make the same social progress? Some of them are quite as social or gregarious in their habits as man, but so far as we know their habits, customs, institutions—if one may so speak—are just what they were thousands of years ago. They have made no improvements in the matter of shelter, in their method of procuring or preparing food, or in guarding against want in the future. They have devised no labor-saving inventions, no new means of communication or transportation, and so far as we know, have no closer relations with their fellows in other parts of the world and no more knowledge of them than they had thousands of years ago.

Why is this, if the causes of social progress lie wholly in material conditions? They do not. They trace back into the essential nature of man, and into the character and purpose of the universe as revealed or embodied in the very constitution of man's being. Perhaps it is better to say embodied than revealed, because knowledge of this character and purpose comes slowly, comes only in the degree in which man attains to a **knowledge of himself and his environment, only as he comes**

to know the laws which condition his life, and to understand the relations which subsist between him and his fellows. Were it not for the ideas and thoughts awakened in man by the phenomena of the universe and by his experience under its laws, all the material conditions of his life would leave him as untouched and unmoved as they leave the brute. Having the nature which he has, his experience under law enables him not only to avoid doing that he has found to be injurious and to repeat that which has proven beneficial, as the brutes may do, but to discover relations and deduce principles of action which may come to guide him in matters where experience has not yet been had. The brute cannot go so far. It is in the discovery of relations and in the formation of principles of action rooted in these relations that we are to find the causes of social changes. Institutions are only expressed and embodied ideas. Ideas invariably precede, contemplate and effect the changes. It is not true, therefore, to say that the causes of social progress "are not to be sought in any idea, but in the conditions of material existence."

The writer of the article under consideration says "the old conception of society viewed history as a series of biographies of the great men who had successively appeared and drawn society onward. This was the "one man theory." From this viewpoint Martin Luther was reckoned as the one person who by force of character and strength of will brought about the Reformation." This view,—which no one perhaps would be quite ready to father,—the writer declares unwarranted. "Martin Luther was but the person whom conditions had produced, and that the tide of events bore to the top and made its mouthpiece. He in himself had no power to stay or bring a reformation. Years before other priests had said the same as Luther, but their words had no effect for economic conditions were not ripe for change." How does the writer know that their words had no effect? How does she know that they did not help to make conditions ripe and to prepare the people for the fuller and stronger message which Luther brought?

Granted that the old forms of Feudalism had been giving way, that a new individualism had been coming into existence, how does the writer know that ideas of something better, juster, more human and brotherly, were not at the root of this social growth, furnishing the chief nutriment and inspiration from which it sprang?

The same questions may be asked touching the conditions respecting the work of Cromwell, and Napoleon. Of course, conditions that made these men possible and gave them their opportunity had been gathering for generations. But how does

she know that ideas, ideas of brotherhood and justice, had not a hand in shaping the material which those men had the power to organize and use? How does she know that these men themselves did not contribute by their thought and influence to determine in large measure conditions which followed? What right has she to draw the conclusion that "Society, then, is not advanced to higher planes through the influence of individual great men?" Of course, individual great men are not the sole factors, perhaps not the chief factors, in any great social advance, but they surely constitute a power that no student of history can afford to ignore. And this not because they are great men simply, but because, being great men, they have power to give form and vigor to ideas which are held by the people, but held so vaguely and loosely that they have no organizing or building power.

Great social changes do indeed arise from causes which strike roots deep down in the life of the mass of the people, but these causes are not simply material conditions of existence. They are convictions and feelings which create a divine discontent with conditions which shut men out from their natural rights, and rob them of the higher and nobler enjoyments to which they aspire. Men who have no aspiration for the higher human, who care only for comfort and pleasure, do not furnish the material for social advances. They are ready to be the hirelings of those who would keep them as they are, ready to murder their fellow toilers for pay, and protect the vested interests of the men who keep them in degradation. The men who are working their way out of present conditions, who are seeking economic advancement, and seeking it with a persistence and devotion that are commanding the respect of the nation, are men with ideas of right and justice which they wish to embody in laws and institutions.

The decision of the recent strike commission is on the whole a great tribute to the labor organizations concerned in that struggle. These organizations were not above criticism, not wholly free from reproach, but their attitude on the whole showed a degree of fair-mindedness—a regard for right and justice, which placed them ethically far above the operators.

Our writer says: "Heretofore history had no continuity. It was conceived of as a series of isolated stages. There was no attempt to point out the growth from one stage to another,—no effort to trace the thread of progress, or the line of cause and effect that runs through society."

This is largely true, but the inference she wishes us to draw is wholly unwarranted. It does not at all follow that the economic interpretation of history is the only one that shows or can show continuity. Of course, no interpretation of history can

be valid that ignores the economic. The economic is inseparably woven with the ethical and religious, and no interpretation of history can be just or adequate that leaves out any of these factors. They work together always, though not always in the same direction. Sometimes they aid and sometimes they hinder or counteract each other. Often false religious beliefs have operated to retard or prevent social progress. This is conspicuously true of ancestor-worship in China. Ancestor worship has produced a cult that treats all social changes, all attempts at improvement in aims or methods as a kind of sacrilege, as indicating disrespect for the objects of worship. Something of the same influence long prevailed in Japan, keeping it back from social progress it was well fitted in many respects to make. Not until American ideas were introduced among the people did she wake up to the possibilities that lay before her and begin a rapid economic development.

Even in Christendom itself we may trace the different effects on social progress of differing religious beliefs. Wherever belief in the rightful authority of the church and the priesthood has held sway over the people, social progress has been retarded. Where the people have held to the right of private judgment and individual responsibility, their ethical and economic advances have been immeasurably greater. In other words, in the degree in which religion has been ethical it has also been favorable to progress. Unfortunately, all branches of the church have been heavily handicapped with unethical and obstructive dogmas.

No church holding to the commonly received or orthodox system, whether Catholic or Protestant, has dared to encourage freedom of thought and honesty in speech. All have been hampered in their thinking either by the authority of the church or of the book, and so the ethical side of religion has had scant development. Over and over again in the course of Christian history this ethical side of religion has been brought to the front by communities of people considerable in numbers, and in every case it has revealed a distinctly economic and progressive tendency. It has sought to substitute the co-operative for the competitive spirit; to organize men for mutual service, and for the express purpose of bringing the Kingdom of Heaven, or the reign of love, here upon earth. But its dogmatic departure from the standards of faith and its social heresies brought down upon it the anathemas of the church and the armies of the State, and so an economic system has been developed in harmony with the creeds, but at variance with every ethical principle of every religion.

But this ethical element is again to the front. It is demanding social changes more radical and far-reaching than any contem-

plated by the heretics of the past, and all who are urging these changes are urging them on grounds of justice and equity, of humanity and brotherhood. Of course, they are changes in the interest of a true economy, and are urged on this ground, but they are more than this, and the chief consideration named by their advocates are the moral and spiritual advantages which will accrue to all concerned.

True, indeed, the economic development which has taken place in the last few years has not been affected by ethical ideas, nor is it at heart an ethical development. It is ethical, as moving on the lines of economic law, but unethical as to the purpose and spirit of the men who are chiefly instrumental in bringing it about, and in the distribution of the benefits derived. The demand now growing and voicing itself is that it be made ethical in its character,—that it be so widened in its scope as to embrace in its benefits the whole body politic.

The vital question at issue is whether economic forces alone are adequate to the work of effecting this change. Here we come to the dividing line between the strictly economic view of society and the position we hold. Our writer says "the idealistic position holds that ideas move society. A man may conceive a good thing and then persuade men to adopt it. In other words, as our writer has said: "Beautiful schemes may be thought out and then applied to society from without by propaganda." All this our writer repudiates. Ideas have nothing to do with social growth. They are effects, not causes, and effects which in her philosophy cannot become causes.

And yet, she took the trouble to write this article to help people to clear thinking on this subject. If clear thinking has no relation to rational economic action, one cannot but wonder to what end she put herself to this trouble. I can understand the Presbyterian with his doctrine of pre-destination. When the son, who was being punished by his Presbyterian father for some act of disobedience, demurred to the punishment on the ground that he was pre-destined to do it and could not therefore refrain, the father replied that he also was pre-destined to give him the trouncing, and was equally blameless in the matter. There is some show of logic in this, but I can see no consistency whatever in writing an article full of ideas for the one and only purpose of proving that ideas have nothing whatever to do in shaping human action. The palpable absurdity of the thing makes one stop and re-examine the statements of the writer lest I do her an injustice, but if her language has any definite meaning, I am certainly guilty of no misrepresentation. Suppose it be true, as she affirms,—and I believe it is—that "industrial life—the way in which men get their living—is dominant and that, as reason-

ing beings, we must, no matter what ideals we may have cherished, deal with present facts and acknowledge the fundamental character of economic—of physical conditions." Suppose these conditions are fundamental—that the bread and butter considerations, generally speaking, outweighs all others. It does not at all follow that the people pressed by these conditions are led by this pressure to the best possible means of bettering their condition.

The chief causes of distress and poverty may lie in their ignorance or their indolence,—their want of energy and thrift—their lack of ideas and ideals. Let a man like Bishop Fenelon come among such a people, wise, active, energetic, full of kindness and brotherly interest, winning their confidence and regard, inspiring them with something of his own purpose and spirit, teaching them, guiding them, developing in them habits of industry, economy, sobriety, thrift, in a few years the whole character of that community will be changed. They will be living in comparative comfort. Their homes will be clean, their children will be well clad, and at school, and the people generally industrious, sober and thrifty.

Are we to seek the causes of such a change only in the material conditions of their existence? Have ideas, ethics, religion, nothing to do with their social progress? Material conditions of existence alone do not effect changes of this kind. Wherever they take place you will find other and higher forces at work aiming directly at this end.

No matter if all we know of ethics and religions has come to us through the processes of evolution, and largely through contact on the economic plane, such knowledge is not void of power because thus evolved, and there is no stage of human history in which ethics and religion do not enter as factors in the social evolution. Often they are the chief and determining factors.

The movement on the part of the American people which resulted in Free Cuba, and in several other things which they did not contemplate, was undoubtedly due to considerations of humanity, and in no degree prompted by the hope of economic benefits. And while the final issue may be regarded as the natural outcome of Cuba's struggle for better material conditions, it is safe to say that American rule in the island has done more for social progress in Cuba during the brief period of its continuance than Cuba herself would have wrought out unaided in half a century. The sanitary and other reforms wrought in the large cities of the island and now in good measure adopted and supported by the Cuban people were due to American ideas and American ethics, not at all overindulged in at home.

How far the American people have been influenced by re-

gard for the future of the Filipinos in supporting the policy of the government in extending American rule over their islands it is difficult to say. Certainly they have not been influenced by any considerations of material profit realizable in their lifetime. How far national pride and other less worthy considerations have moved them we can only guess. But of one thing we may rest assured, unless the American people hold their government to a high standard in its administration of Philippine affairs and insist that American rule be conducted in a way and with a view to fit those people for home rule, our new relations with the Filipinos will not contribute to our own social progress. This does not imply that we are under any obligations to set the interests of these people above our own interests on any plane, but that we should deal with them justly, ethically, and cultivate in them the qualities that give strength and worthy character to a nation.

Deficient as our people may be in the matter of ethics, they are much farther advanced than they are in economics. They know very well the attitude they ought to sustain in their dealings with their fellows, but they have no conception whatever of any social or industrial system making practicable the justice they feel ought to exist. Economic conditions press hardly on multitudes of people, but throw no light for them on the problems they need to have solved. They need light and light that does not come from the prison. They need ideas, but ideas are not always born amid conditions of ignorance, poverty and distress.

It may be true that every great economic change has brought a corresponding change in ethical codes. But individual ethical teaching may have played a large part in effecting the economic change which made possible the better code. There has been no period of human history for many thousand years in which the standard of right as held by the wisest and best of every nation has not been far in advance of the most progressive society in existence. And the growth all along the line has been toward this standard. The conviction that men should love their neighbors as they love themselves was never formulated by any Congress or Parliament as the result of a nation's economic experience. It was formulated in the mind of a seer,—one who had a deep knowledge of human nature and a profound insight into human relations. In all ages of the world this thought has been voiced in one form or another by the wise and the good, and no economic improvement has ever taken place that has not in some measure been quickened and guided by this or some kindred thought.

The real truth that we need to realize is that we can never

hope to bring society to this level through any religious or ethical teaching which does not demand and effect such economic changes as justice and equity require. Religious and ethical teaching will both prove practically abortive so long as they are shut out from the realm of economics. The church since the days of Constantine has never sought to enter that realm. Business has been one thing and religion another, and ethics it has always regarded as nothing but a form of paganism.

Hence, it is not strange that students of history have everywhere found in governments, literature, ethics and education the predominating influence of the economic conditions of the time and place at which they were evolving. Of course they have. The level of a people's government, literature, education and ethical practice can never rise much above the level of its industrial life.

The real character of people is found in those activities into which they put the greater part of their thought, their time, their energy. But if we wait for economic developments to give us worthier conceptions of God and duty—if we drop all talk about justice and brotherhood and neighborly obligation and wait for the movement of economic forces to bring us into juster and happier relations, under the impression that ideas play no part in social development, we will have a long wait of it.

No, truth is the great reformer. But we want to insist on its visible expression and embodiment in all our laws and institutions. It is not a thing to be talked only. It is a reality to be lived, to be wrought into every product of our daily activity, and to enter into every relation we sustain. When the ethical and religious teachers of the world shall take this attitude and seek for truth as they dig for hidden treasures, then social progress will show another pace. The Republic of God will come, and his will will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

*Rev. Alexander Kent,*  
Peoples' Church.

Washington, D. C., April 5, 1903.

## A Reply to Professor Seligman.

### I. Socialism and the Materialistic Conception of History.



PROFESSOR SELIGMAN of Columbia University deserves the thanks of all students of economics and the philosophy of history from the fact that he is the first American scholar who has been bold enough to project into the realm of discussion the historical philosophical concepts of Marx and the Socialist school.

This he has done in a recently published work entitled "The Economic Interpretation of History," which title is a modernized and Americanized rendering of our old familiar "materialistic conception."

Little fault is to be found with the change of title, except perhaps, that it is slightly unnecessary, and, that as the book is really an examination of the theories of Marx and Engels in respect of the philosophy of history, it might have been more advisable to retain the name which they themselves had given to their ideas. But any objection of this sort is but carping criticism, particularly in view of the painstaking and, for the most part, fair and judicious way in which the task has been accomplished. It is a gain of no little importance to have the matter fairly stated, and will open the way to a frank discussion of the relations of economic and other phenomena which have been too much overlooked by the students of English-speaking countries. If it accomplishes nothing else it must tend to a modification of that, for want of a better term, "high-falutin'" view which is so generally adopted, and that perniciously virtuous parochialism which is the distinguishing quality of most American university works in this department of study.

If a decent appreciation of the value of the economic factor in history even as stated in this little work had been taught twenty years ago, Bryanism would never have lifted its noisy voice, and it would not take the twenty years, which would now appear to be necessary, to inform the graduates of our colleges that the political contest pending is one between the trusts and the proletariat for the possession of the means of production.

So that students, as well as Socialists, have every reason to thank Professor Seligman for the beginning which he has made.

It now remains to the Socialist to traverse the statements of the learned professor and to discover wherein they are not such as can be accepted offhand and, particularly, as regards the alleged want of connection between Socialism and the "economic interpretation" of history. Upon this point Professor Seligman is very strong. He says:

"There is nothing in common between the economic interpretation of history and the doctrine of Socialism except the accidental fact that the originator of both theories happened to be the same man. Karl Marx founded "scientific Socialism," if by that curious term he means his theory of surplus value and the conclusions therefrom. Karl Marx also recognized the economic interpretation of history and thought that his own version of this interpretation would prove to be a bulwark of his socialist theory (page 105).

This is rather a questionable method of approaching the matter. "The accidental fact" that the man, with whose name modern Socialism is more closely connected than with that of any other person, held to both theories and found them not only not mutually exclusive, but very closely connected, should have led to a closer examination of the reasons why Marx regarded them as mutually dependent. But so far from giving this matter the necessary amount of thought Professor Seligman blunders into an almost inexcusable error.

He defines "scientific Socialism" as "the theory of surplus-value and the conclusions therefrom." Such a definition does not meet the case and our author appears to be himself aware of the fact, for the qualifying clause, "if by that curious phrase he means," is a rather disingenuous method of saddling Marx with a definition of the term to which he would never have acceded. "Scientific Socialism"—and the clumsiness of the term is fully conceded—includes the materialistic conception and the theory of surplus value, and of these the former is the more important, so much the more, indeed, that the latter, as will appear, may be eliminated from the definition without impairing it as a statement of Socialist doctrine.

In fact so far from the materialistic conception of history serving as a "bulwark" of the surplus-value theory, the latter has been generally supposed by those who have controverted it to have originated in the desire of Marx to provide an economic auxiliary for agitation of the proletariat by proclamation of the class war, which class war is deduced by Marx from his observations of political and economic history and upon which both he and Engels laid the greatest possible stress. Thus Engels says: "In modern history at least it is therefore proved that all political conflicts are class conflicts, and all fights of classes for emancipation . . . finally turn on economic emancipation" (Feuerbach 2nd. ed. p. 48. Dietz).

That such a view of the relation of the two theories is not farfetched nor made for purely controversial purposes will be the more evident when it is understood that non-Socialist writers have seen this relation from the same standpoint, as is here

taken and which is, in fact, the only one from which the development of the Socialist movement can be examined with any chance of comprehensibility. Thus in his "Western Civilization" Benjamin Kidd says:

"Marxian Socialism is not merely or even chiefly an economic theory, but rather a complete self-contained philosophy of human life and society" (p. 130).

Now such "philosophy of human life and society" as Marx holds is founded, without question, on the economic interpretation of history, and, hence, it is upon this that Socialism in the last analysis depends and not at all upon the theory of surplus value, the truth or falsity of which is not here in the least under consideration. Thus the discrediting of the surplus-value theory cannot be taken as discrediting Socialism, even Marxian Socialism, and any attempt to drag the "surplus-value" theory into the discussion is simply to befog the issue which the professor has raised between "scientific Socialism" and the "economic interpretation."

Our contention on this point derives additional force from the statements of non-Socialists and those who have no interest in defending the movement. Thus in Kirkup's well-known "History of Socialism" we find "There can be no doubt that in his theory of surplus value obtained from unpaid labor, Marx, as agitator and controversialist, has fallen into serious contradiction with himself, as scientific historian and philosopher. . . . His doctrine of surplus value is the vitiating factor in his history of the capitalist system. The most obvious excuse for him is that he borrowed it from the classical economists" ("A History of Socialism." Kirkup, pp. 146-7. Black, Lond. 1892). And as evidence of the relative value of the two theories according to Kirkup we find:

"The cardinal point in the theory worked out by Marx and now impressed upon the League (The League of the Just) was the doctrine that THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS CONTROL THE ENTIRE SOCIAL structure, therefore the main thing is a social revolution, a change in economic conditions" (id. p. 159).

It appears therefore that even if we give up the whole case for surplus value and fall prostrate at the feet of Professor Böhm-Bawerk, "scientific Socialism" is still by no means posed of, and that the main conception which is manifested in the Social Democratic movement and which furnishes that movement with a consistent philosophy and with keen political insight, is nothing other than the materialistic conception, of which our author says in its relation to Socialism: "It is plain that the two things have nothing to do with each other" (p. 106).

But Professor Seligman himself unconsciously admits the whole case against his contention. He says: "The Neo-Marxists themselves such as Bernstein, for instance, disagree with Marx's views as to the immediate future of the class struggle, and consider that his doctrine of the 'impending cataclysm of capitalist society' has been disposed of by the facts of the half century which has intervened since the theory was propounded. Yet Bernstein would not for a moment abandon his belief in the economic interpretation of history as we have described it" (p. 107). In support of this statement is quoted as follows from Bernstein's "Zur Geschichte and Theorie des Sozialismus" "realistische Geschichtsbetrachtung die in ihren Hauptzügen unwiderlegt geblieben ist."

Says Professor Seligman; in effect: "Bernstein has abandoned the extreme Marxist position, but retains his faith in economic interpretation, but Bernstein is a Socialist, therefore there is no connection between the economic interpretation and Socialism." The "merry gods" must laugh to see our Vulcan limp so lamely at the board.

But this is a trifle compared with what the learned professor can do when he gets really warmed up to the work. He goes on: "In fact, the Socialist application of the economic interpretation of history is exceedingly naive. If history teaches anything at all it is that economic changes transform society by slow and gradual steps." Then he proceeds to show how slowly society has developed and incidentally makes the following remarkable assertion: "The characteristic mark of the modern factory system, still in its infancy, is the predominance of the individual or corporate entrepreneur on a huge scale, as we see it typified in the present trust movement in America" (p. 107). This is in support of the stability of private property, when we are all well aware that the result of the trust movement is to place individual control of property at a greater disadvantage than hitherto, and that the creation of huge joint-stock affairs menaces with annihilation the "private property" of the small investors.

This, merely by the way; but since when did Professor Seligman learn that the modern Socialist is wedded to a catastrophic doctrine or that it is a fundamental theory of "scientific Socialism" that "private property and private initiative . . . will at once give way to the collective ownership, which forms the ideal of the Socialists?" To be a Marxist is not to see visions and dream dreams. Suppose that Marx did expect an earlier development of the collectivist movement than has been the case, such an idea with regard to the realization of their propaganda is not unusual with propagandists, and in fact some

such faith is necessary to send men on missionary enterprises, but it is by no means binding on their successors. Christianity would shrink to small proportions nowadays if it were proposed to limit the term Christian to those who believed in and looked for the second advent of Christ, though there can hardly be a shadow of doubt that the early Christians did devoutly so believe and based their actions on such belief. Succeeding generations have moderated their expectations, so with the Socialists.

No better evidence of this can be shown than the preamble to the famous resolution introduced by Karl Kautsky to the Socialist International Congress held in Paris in 1900, and which has been the subject of much heated discussion in the Socialist sections. It will be noticed in this connection that the Kautsky resolution cannot be attributed to individual opinion, for there is no doubt that it represents substantially the general opinion of organized Socialists, as the vote by nationalities in the Congress stood twenty-nine for and nine against the resolution.

This preamble is as follows: "In a modern democratic state the conquest of the public powers by the proletariat cannot be the result of a coup de main, it must be the result of a long and painful work of proletarian organization on the economic and political fields, of the physical and moral regeneracy of the laboring class and of the gradual conquest of municipalities and legislative assemblies."

There is no touch of "impending cataclysm" in this and this represents the sentiment of sober Socialist thought at the present time. Kautsky is a Marxist, not a neo-Marxist, he still maintains the surplus-value theory, and in spite of that cannot be accused of any catastrophic tendencies. But the learned professor may thereupon reply that he is not a Marxist proper. That sort of retort, which is far too common, will not do, however. The attitude adopted by Professor Seligman towards modern Socialism is very suggestive of a freethinker who reads the Bible in order to confute Christianity. After a close study of the sacred writing he arrives at the conclusion that Particular Methodism is the religion which Christ instituted and which therefore the Church follows. He thereupon directs his entire argument upon Particular Methodism and withers it with beautiful scorn. Soon, however, he runs across a Christian who objects to his diatribes upon the ground that they are directed against Particular Methodism, and that he is not a Particular Methodist. To which the freethinker triumphantly and conclusively replies: "You are a believer in the Bible, therefore you must be a Particular Methodist." This conclusion may be eminently satisfactory to the freethinker, but it will be ob-

served that it does not even make a Particular Methodist of his adversary, and still less does it point out to that adversary wherein he is wrong.

The argument of Professor Seligman will not bear examination. It rests on a foundation which is not only flimsy but is inherently false, for the definitions of 'scientific Socialism' upon which he predicates its differentiation from the economic interpretation have been shown to be insufficient and misleading. It is almost inconceivable how he could have so misunderstood the significance of the Socialist propaganda. He could hardly have read a Socialist paper of standing in any language without being convinced that the whole propaganda is based upon the economic interpretation of history and not upon any particular economic doctrine or ethical scheme of reform. The very case of Bernstein is in point. He is in good standing in the Social Democratic Party, he does not suffer in Socialist estimation as a popular politician, and all the academic disputes which occur with regard to his modifications of the strict Marxian doctrine are to be regarded not as fundamentally affecting his standing as a Socialist, but simply as illustrating a certain growth or deterioration, according to the personal point of view, from the strict Marxian doctrine. They serve rather to show the independence of the movement and its freedom from "doctrinaire"-ism, or catastrophic teaching.

Its practical politics are proof of exactly the same thing. If Socialism represented merely a catastrophic notion or an abiding faith in the bare theory of surplus value, we should find the party abetting all schemes of attack upon the proprietary class. But this is not the case. We find, on the other hand, the greatest possible caution on the part of the leaders of the movement, and a very marked desire not to interfere with the free play of economic forces, except as far as concerns the economic condition of the workers. Australian or empiric Socialism which aims at interference with the accumulation of capital is not regarded with favor by the real exponent of modern Socialism and attacks upon the trusts are left to our strenuous President and the Democratic party.

But the learned professor is not content even with what he has done to differentiate Socialism and the economic interpretation. He says: "Socialism is a theory of what ought to be, historic materialism is a theory of what has been, the one is teleological, the other is descriptive. The one is a speculative ideal, the other is a canon of interpretation" (p. 108).

He is no more fortunate here than formerly. Socialism, modern Socialism, the Socialism of Marx and Engels is by no means a theory of what ought to be though the term might be applied

with sufficient truth to the famous schemes of pre-Marxian Socialists against whose glowing visions Marx launches the strongest invective.

Now if Professor Seligman means to imply that modern Socialism is the promulgation of "the Kingdom of Heaven at hand" idea, the setting forth of a millennium, then he can only find support in the platform utterances of perfervid enthusiasts whose oratory is not to be taken as typical of the teaching of modern Socialism. Such a source is not authoritative and Professor Seligman would certainly not employ it for controversial purposes. Still he is possessed with this notion, and repeats oracularly that the one is "teleological." Who, after reading the works of Engels, could associate the word teleology with the party which is the avowed advocate of the views expressed in that word? To accuse the works of Engels of being "teleological" in their teachings is the very height of—shall we say pedagogical—assumption? By whom has the dialectic mode of thought and conception of the universe been more clearly enunciated than by Engels?

Socialism on its active side is the practical recognition of the truth of the economic interpretation and the class-struggle, Socialism as an objective ultimate, and even so the term is loosely employed, is merely the victory of the proletariat in the class-struggle—nothing more and nothing less—that is if we are to accept the teachings of its recognized exponents, rather than be misled by the clamor of the unauthorized speaker and pamphleteer.

How would an exponent of Republican ideas like to have the views of Mr. Blodgett, candidate for the office of Coroner in the well-known district of Slaughter's Gulch, held out as representative? Professor Seligman's definition of Socialism is objectionable on every ground and cannot be accepted as a basis of argument.

Neither is the definition of the economic interpretation any more satisfactory, but the occasion for an examination of that will arise later. It is sufficient to say for the present that the statement, "there is nothing in common between the economic interpretation of history and the doctrine of Socialism," has not been established and that the definitions of Socialism which have been given in support of that statement are misleading and not in accordance with the actual facts.

*Austin Lewis.*

### Restricted Interpretation.

---

**I**N a former communication to this journal the writer threw a paper wad in the direction of the recognized orthodox teachers of scientific Socialism, under the caption, "The Dogma of a Cause World." For several reasons the critic was made quite brief, and confined to purely philosophical grounds. On reflection I conclude that if one is to assume the role of a critic at all, he should make the application of his remarks quite plain, so that, right or wrong, the matter may be looked into. He should also, if possible, himself point out the necessary amendment.

Let me pause here to speak a word in my own defense. I am anxious that the reader should understand at once that I am a Socialist myself, a fighter for economic justice, and not just simply a fault finder with the weapons with which others fight. At least, the writer of these remarks has never voted any other than a Socialist ticket, and the matter of that, small as it is, he feels to be a better passport than assuming the role of critic.

In the article above mentioned I laid at the door of the teachers of Socialism a breach of the logical sequence of cause and effect in the matter of assuming what I called a "cause world." Let me define what I mean by a "cause world" as the assumption of a solitary, omnipotent cause as the source of all phenomena or effects; which, of course, implies as its necessary corollary the denying to all the other facts their rightful heritage in philosophy, the potency and necessity of being causes. This criticism is aimed at the doctrine of economic determinism as it is taught, though I observe that it does not apply to any of the definitions of that principle that I have yet seen. None of the definitions—per se—assume, or imply a solitary cause, nor set apart a class of causes as being the only ones that apply. The definitions simply name a cause as being the principal, or most fundamental one. Here is the definition by Professor Seligman, which the editor of this magazine tells us in the best worded one yet: "The existence of man depends upon his ability to sustain himself; the economic life is therefore the fundamental condition of all life." Let me repeat that I find nothing to criticize in this. Nevertheless, I do find much to complain of in the way it is being interpreted and taught.

Let us remark here that the position of one who takes a positive stand for any system of teaching and "stands for it," is a far more arduous and important one than that of the irresponsible critic—the mere bushwhacker in the thicket. Yet the one

is no more under obligation, in the first place, to give us a faultless philosophy than the other.

The writer is enabled to make the concrete application of his philosophical quibble by the appearance in the March number of the REVIEW of a most lucid presentation of the doctrine as it is understood and taught by Socialists in this country, from the pen of one of our ablest teachers. I have insinuated that the doctrine as taught is philosophically unsound. "Now there it is for you; what is the matter with it, pray?" Just only this—the difference in the meaning of the words "principal" and "only" as applied to causes. A very small matter, apparently, when thus simply stated, but a mighty difference indeed when elaborated into a philosophy of human life and history! Now let us proceed to make carpet rags of the thing, seriatim, being careful to note points of agreement as well as difference.

We can begin our agreement with the first sentence of the article now under review, "The Economic Interpretation of History," viz.: "The standpoint from which one approaches the study of society or history, is of the first importance." We might continue to agree but that in the next sentence: "All depends on the answer to the question as to the cause of social progress"—I would change "cause" to "causes," making it plural. And why? Because I deny that effects all flow from some one "Great First Cause"—albeit a material one. All science, and all sound philosophy, I maintain, recognize the interaction of all the contingent causes. Our conception of the process of social growth, to be truly scientific, must be founded in a just estimate of the balance struck by all the contributing causes, and not upon this theological notion of an all-sufficient cause of things, to which all else must stand as mere effects.

What is it that we want? We want a philosophy of human life and history that is sound—i. e., well established in the principles of that philosophy of the actual called science. This notion of a first, or all-sufficient, cause is not one of the principles of scientific thought. The conception of results as arising from the combined influence of all the contingent causes is the scientific thought. That the conception of social growth has arisen to its present status let us rejoice. But a science of society not grounded in the continuity of cause and effect, and a just estimate of the several influences that interact in producing effects, is a "black sheep" among the sciences. But let us proceed with the review.

Our teacher proceeds to tell us in an admirable way, how the all-sufficient cause of things sociological was first sought in the "great man theory," and easily disposes of the "great man" as a great first cause. "Society, then, is not advanced to higher

planes through the influence of individual great men." As sole causes, certainly not. But the question remains as to whether they are not contributing causes to that effect.

Let us see. In an article on "Democracy and Education," by this same writer, I can pick up this flat period: "Frederick the Great was the creator of Prussia" (I. S. R., Aug., 1902, p. 92). Of course I take no offense at this remark. Though not literally true, yet in a large sense, the sense the writer means and the reader readily understands, it is true. The point I make on it is that if Frederick, the great man, was the creator of Prussia in any sense or in any degree, he must necessarily at least have entered among the causes that resulted in the making of Prussia. If Prussia's great man can make Prussia, what is to prevent a great man for each country being, in the same sense, and degree, the making of all the countries? It appears also from the article here under review that the influence of individual "great men" is distinctly traced in the genesis of Socialist philosophy. Individual effort, then, is not entirely unavailing, and great men (with the help of enough of other men) may be a factor in human progress.

In the same easy manner our writer finds no all-sufficient cause in the political interpretation, "that throughout all history there can be discerned a definite movement from monarchy to aristocracy, from aristocracy to democracy." The truth of this is not questioned, but as it will not answer for a "cause world" we must seek further for one.

"Finally, a third idealistic view of society has been held by those who have believed they saw in religion the keynote of social advance. As pointed out by numerous writers, religion is really a product and not a cause." However many authorities may point it out that way, however great the men may be whose ipse dixit is assumed to make things so or not so, I raise the question here as to whether it is scientific to speak of any existent fact as being thus absolutely and per se, only an effect, or, vice versa, a cause. Here is where extreme agnosticism, having traveled around the world in the other direction, brings up at the most positive dogmatism. Predestination and fatalism are both logically involved. Take notice that the existence of man as a free-will agent depends upon this that I contend for—the plurality of interacting causes. Man's power over nature, and over himself, lies wholly in this opportunity to choose and apply causes, to combine them, and to offset cause against cause. Assuming a "cause world" our fate is predestined, we are but helpless automatons in the hands of—determinism. It is well to be positive about what we do certainly know, but an ultimate, first

cause we do not yet know. At least, not by the method of science. Science knows many causes, but not "the" cause.

"These three lines include practically all the important attempts to explain social growth from the idealists' standpoint." I would though, on my own account, add to these yet a fourth important line of human development, idealistic or not, viz.: the progressive softening and melting out of human nature of the savage and brutal, and the corresponding ripening of the truly human or humane. As examples in point I would mention the growing aversion to war; the discontinuance of the practice of duelling, or its amelioration to a harmless farce, and the falling off of the habit of resorting to fisticuffs on the slightest provocation, notwithstanding that our sporty "betters" are cultivating pugilism as the manly art. Seen also in the mitigation of scolding wives, and the cultivation of tolerable manners by most people.

With the history of the rise of the idea of social solidarity and growth given by our comrade I am well pleased and heartily concur as to its paramount importance. I would only aid, by applying to it the severest criticism (which is an indispensable part of the scientific method) in perfecting it into a sound and unassailable science. This restricted interpretation must go! The "cause world" must go! Finally we come to Marx. "His proposition was 'that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch.'"

Here the Socialist shouts Eureka! Behold, we have, indeed, at last found it. Found what—the Eldorado? No; but the Cause World—the solitary, omnipotent cause of all things. Behold, the secret of all things is just in this—the way that the human animal browses is the sole and only cause of the way it builds its nest, the way it tunes its lay, the way it gambols upon the green and the way it contemplates the starry sky. Will the human mind ever grow capacious enough to entertain more than one idea at a time? Sometime, perhaps, we shall have assorted all the useless from the useful in the results of our age-long religious training. Evidently the theological thought dies hard.

"Industrial life, the way in which men get their living is dominant, and as reasoning beings we must, no matter what ideals we may have cherished, deal with present facts and acknowledge the fundamental character of economic—of physical conditions." Well and good. "Throughout all the superstructures that have grown upon this foundation—governments, literature, ethics and education—there may be traced the predominating influence of

the economic conditions of the time and place in which they were evolving." This, however, does not prevent the tracing of the other influences; as, for instance, of religion in literature, music, ethics, education, etc.; of education in all the others, even the economic; of forceful and active individuals—great men—in the political and industrial movements, in fact in all departments of human activity. The crutches of a cripple may be said to be the "principal conditioning factor" of his locomotion. Whatever impulses he may have he can hardly move without them. Still one would not say that the crutches were the sole cause of his progress, once he gets them and gets off.

All this, of course, does not inveigh against the philosophy that apples are not plucked until they are ripe. But to this again I could rejoin that apples, however obviously ripe for the plucking, may rot upon the trees if the expected pluckers prove too stupid or timid to get their feet off the ground. In point of fact, the practical question seems to resolve itself into the question not of who should but of who will dare shake the trees. This matter, however, is not necessarily involved. Let us to the point.

It appears to be a fault of the teachers of Socialism to say one thing and mean another in this matter of the economic interpretation. At least, they give one to understand quite another thing from what is implied in the definitions of the principle itself, and the plain logic of the interpretation is constantly leading to awkward attitudes. We could aptly call the restricted interpretation of the principle the "martingale" of our Socialist harness, since it is only an awkward way of holding the head.

For instance: "The industrial interests of the North caused the Civil War. It was fought for the purpose of making free labor cheaper than slave labor." It is a perfectly logical inference from this that ardent abolitionists like Garrison, Lovejoy and Harriet Beecher Stowe were in no wise inspired by the same spirit of liberty and humanity as the Socialists to-day, but were conscious conspirators on behalf of the capitalists. This, notwithstanding the abolition agitation was not the sole immediate cause of the war. These desired the freedom of the blacks. The war gave them that freedom. Free competition of labor makes it cheaper to the capitalists than chattel slaves. But let us take a parallel case. The invention of labor-saving machinery has the same effect, it makes labor cheaper (more profitable) to the capitalists. Now if we accept this restricted interpretation and assume that because "the economic life is the fundamental condition of all life," therefore the material selfish interest is the only motive cause of human action, we not only renounce the whole moral nature of man, but make of the loftiest impulses

the basest of treachery, and of the most useful activities, such as invention, to be crimes against humanity simply because under this misfit economic system the ultimately result in evil. If we are to renounce as inherently evil all that is perverted to evil under this vicious system, and as worthless or impotent all the better part of human nature, which is repressed by the unfavorable environment, what shall we have left to cling to at all—not even our own souls! Though this logical sequence is not, since lately, insisted upon by Socialists, and the reasoning pushed to its *reductio ad absurdum*, it yet remains a logical sequence from an illogical interpretation.

Once more: "So we find that the economic conditions impress themselves on the literature, the government and the forms of education that exist in any period." Quite true; and yet these Socialist agitators seem to be laboring under the delusion (?) that literature, government, education, etc., will, on the other hand, impress themselves upon the economic conditions to the extent of working an entire social revolution. Let us hope they are right about that.

In conclusion, let me ask whether it is not probable that when the bread and butter question is settled, as we Socialists say, the economic factor—"the bread and butter question"—will have lost its supremacy as being even the "principal" determining factor. May we not hope that ethics, for instance, will have risen in influence to a sufficient extent to at least hold its own with the economic—though still, of course, "conditioned" by it—so as to maintain this thing we are struggling for, economic justice? In fact, may we not hope that this simply material "conditioning factor" will be held in control by the more distinctively human factors, with the result that they will no longer be "dominated," perverted and overridden by it as they now admittedly are? We hope so, of course. And if we are right in these, our expectations, then it would appear that if we cling to this restricted interpretation, and confine our philosophy of life within its narrow bounds, we would on "the day after the social revolution" find ourselves with a philosophy of life on our hands that would be not alone illogical and imperfect as it now certainly is, but entirely inapplicable then.

*Z. C. Ferris.*

## A Correction.

**T**HERE is an old saying "that figures won't lie, but liars will figure." This may be a little too severe to apply to the election returns quoted by John Murray, Jr., in his article in the January number. I send you authentic figures and you can judge for yourself.

I will admit that it is perfectly justifiable to quote facts in support of any argument, but I hold it to be unworthy of a Socialist to distort the truth or misrepresent facts to bolster up a cause.

If Comrade Murray had been desirous of making an honest comparison of the vote cast in different years, he might have chosen the highest vote cast, or the lowest vote cast, or the average vote cast, and nobody could have criticised his action. But to compare the highest vote cast in one election with the lowest vote cast at an ensuing election, and with the lowest vote cast in a subdivision only of the district at a third election is most certainly a contemptible method of juggling.

Election of 1898—Vote in San Francisco:

Head of ticket .....	1,298
Lowest School Director .....	2,205
Highest School Director .....	4,331

Election of 1901—Vote in San Francisco:

Head of ticket .....	915
Highest candidate .....	1,457

Election of 1902—Vote in San Francisco:

Head of ticket .....	1,977
Congressional, 4th .....	616
Congressional, 5th .....	408

Congressional vote in San Francisco .....	1,024
Highest Socialist candidate .....	2,681

If Comrade Murray wishes the truth to be known he can say the vote fell off from 4,331 in 1898 to 2,681 in 1902. Or, he can say the vote fell off from 1,298 in the year 1898 to 1,024 in the last election.

But I submit that to claim the vote fell from "our four thousand" to "but 616," is false. All this is entirely apart from the merits of the question discussed in Comrade Murray's article. It refers merely to facts misstated.

*Oliver Everett.*

## Reply to Comrade Everett.



LIVER EVERETT'S letter, criticising certain figures in my article in the January number of your Review, was forwarded to me at this place. His statement that the total vote cast for Congressman in San Francisco at the last election was 1,024 (and not 616, as I believed and stated) is correct. Thus far his letter is in good part, but let us consider the balance: In the first place my contention that the Socialist vote in San Francisco suffered an enormous falling off every time it fought the Union Labor party is as much borne out by his figures as mine. For instance, he says that the head of the ticket in 1898 polled 1,298 votes (no opposing candidate of the U. L. P. in 1898) and but 915 votes in 1901 (Socialists fought the U. L. P. in 1901), while in 1902 the "head of the ticket" received 1,977 votes. This would appear to show a gain in 1902, but is it? Here is the joker: In 1902 the "head of the ticket" had no opposing U. L. P. candidate—the trades unions had no State ticket in the field, and the Socialists had nominated a well-known trades unionist for Governor, who had received the official endorsement of the U. L. P. in Los Angeles. This candidate, Mr. Brower, had not only received the official endorsement of the U. L. P. in Los Angeles, but was also well and favorably known as a staunch trades unionist and as being strongly in favor of the policy in question. No wonder that the Socialist-trades unionist "head of the ticket" in 1902 received an increase of 1,000 votes over the anti-trades unionist "head of the ticket" in 1901. But see what the candidate in the same district received who fought the U. L. P. candidate at the last election—1,024 votes! Here we have a difference of almost 100 per cent between the Socialist candidate who stood for organized labor and the Socialist candidate who opposed it. But the figures speak for themselves,—I am perfectly willing to rest my case on Oliver Everett's figures—especially since many of Mr. Everett's faith insist that the votes cast for Costle (1,024) represents the Socialist vote of San Francisco.

One other matter in Everett's letter I must speak of,—for in several portions he practically calls me a liar. A lie must be intentional. Now is it probable that I would seek to falsify public records so carefully studied by the San Francisco comrades as the last election returns? The truth is that I had been informed that the Fourth Congressional District practically covers San Francisco, and in this I was wrong. In the past, neither

Oliver Everett, nor any other Socialist, has ever accused me of lying, and a fair critic would have first tried to ascertain whether or no I was merely ignorant of a fact rather than to rush hastily into personal vilification.

*John Murray, Jr.*

---

**To an Eminent Divine.**

---

**In Gratefulness, Not So Much for What He Has Done, as That Which He Has Refrained From Doing.**



WHO have looked to you for light,  
To teach me the way and the Truth,  
And to keep my feet in the rugged path  
While life was yet in its youth:

I who have knelt at the foot of the Cross  
With my head bent down in prayer,  
While my soul, as a bark on the angry waves,  
Was tossing—I knew not where!

I am weary of living if life be naught  
But this damnable reign of Hell,  
And my soul is weary with grief and strife  
Which nothing but Truth can quell.

But you, in this hour of trying need,  
Have dropped her torch from your hold;  
When the hour draws near for man's brotherhood  
You barter your priesthood for gold.

Now the time is passed when we look for Light  
To be fanned from a creed's dead coal;  
But her beacon light must be kindled bright  
From the spark in each man's soul.

And forth from this night-time of greed and shame  
There shall issue a perfect day;  
And the despot Might yield his scepter to Right,  
Who shall rule in Love's Kingdom for aye.

*Graff Clarkc.*

## • Special Organizing Fund.

Omaha, Neb., April 10, 1903.



O the Members of the Socialist Party.

Comrades—A great opportunity confronts the Socialists of this country. The rapidly growing sentiment for Socialism, the working class tendency towards independent political action, the increasing number of industrial conflicts and strikes, the futility of Civic Federations and Arbitration Commissions to avert these conflicts and produce harmony between the antagonistic forces represented by the working class and the capitalist class, the promulgation of decoy labor parties, the deterioration and breakup of the Democratic party, the abject failure of the Republican party to handle the trust question, and the open activity of the capitalist class in its opposition to Socialism; all these and hundreds of other evidences, apparent on every side, should teach us that the time has come when Socialists must prepare for the final struggle between Socialism and Capitalism.

For years we have been sowing the seed for the ripening harvest. Socialist papers and literature, agitators and writers, scholars and thinkers have grown in number until they can be found in every city, town and village in North America. Our press extends into every State and territory, and turn which way it will, the capitalist class sees the doom of the present system written in an increased Socialist vote. All this has come to pass after years of work and trial on the part of men and women now living, and of brave souls who have passed away ere the dreams they dreamed came true.

One thing above all others remains for the Socialists to do at this time. The circulation of the entire Socialist press must continue to increase, our lecturers and speakers must continue to attract larger and larger audiences, and the capitalist class must give more and more attention to Socialism; but we must be organized to take full advantage of the agitation, education and publicity that will surely follow. We must co-ordinate our efforts and conserve our energies so that the forces that make for Socialism shall be crystallized at the ballot box in an effective demand for the co-operative commonwealth. It is imperative that the Socialist party be so organized during this year that electoral tickets can be nominated in every state in the Union for the national election of 1904.

To achieve this, the national headquarters must have money with which to work. We are developing plans by which every

state can be covered with organizers, and every Socialist enrolled as a party member. We must enter the national campaign with an organization that will place the Socialist party at least second when the votes are counted. This can be accomplished if the Socialists themselves but choose to will it so.

We therefore call upon you to contribute what you can to a special organizing fund, to be used by the national headquarters for immediate organizing purposes. We cannot have a strong and effective organization unless we have organizers, and we cannot have organizers so long as we are without the necessary funds to ensure their taking the field. While the regular revenue of the national office is growing steadily, yet part of this must go toward relieving the party of its legitimate debts, which have already been unsettled too long. These debts must be cleared as soon as possible, and we have already begun a systematic effort to bring this about.

The special organizing fund will be used to the best advantage of the entire movement. Many states, already organized, need assistance in order to revive delinquent locals, to encourage other locals, now working, and to organize new ones. If we can get the organized states into a condition where a steady revenue is assured the respective state committees and the national committee, the states will be strengthened and provision thereby made for extensive operations in unorganized states. An organizer must be sent through the Southern states, where interest is growing, and where organizations that will provide tours for speakers must be formed. Interstate tours for reliable organizers and speakers will be arranged. We intend to make the national office the headquarters for the best party lecturers, thus ensuring economy in every way, guaranteeing a systematic method of conducting our propaganda, and at the same time enabling this office to fulfill its real mission as the National Agitation Bureau of the Socialist Party.

All this can be achieved in a comparatively short time, Comrades, if you will help do it. We know that the demands upon your meager resources are never ending, but we wish to impress you with the fact that \$1,000 expended for organizing purposes by this office within the next few months will return in increased revenue and membership many times over before the year closes; and we want, and should have, at least that sum by May 1st. We do not wish to go to the expense of issuing subscription lists, but we request that locals get out such lists in their respective localities. There are many sympathizers who will subscribe to our fund if their attention is called to it.

Socialists of America, you must act NOW so that all the Socialist Party can enter the national campaign next year fully

equipped to meet the enemy in the first national struggle between Socialism and Capitalism.

Fraternally yours,

WILLIAM MAILLY,

National Secretary.

Approved:

J. P. ROE,  
JOHN M. WORK,  
ERNEST UNTERMANN,  
GEORGE H. TURNER,  
SAMUEL LOVETT,

Local Quorum.

Note.—Contributions will be received direct at this office by the National Secretary or through the various state committees. Acknowledgment will be made in the Socialist press. Prompt action is requested, and remember every penny counts.

# EDITORIAL

## Call for Organization.

We publish this month, elsewhere, what we believe is one of the most important documents that has ever been issued from the National headquarters of the Socialist Party. It does not discuss great questions of principle, nor does it deal with any of the many controversial points in Socialist doctrine, and yet it may well be of more historical importance than any of those bearing upon these topics. We refer to the call for an Organization Fund which the Local Quorum and National Secretary are sending out.

We have already pointed out in these columns some months ago that the great pressing need of the party at just the present moment is its organization, and the proper parties to take hold of this are the National headquarters, working, of course, in close co-operation with the State authorities in those States already organized. It is something to be regretted that with a voting strength which is approaching close to a half million, there are only about 15,000 dues paying members in the United States. This is of special significance at the beginning of a National campaign.

The work for Socialism that is most effective is done through the party organization. Indeed, it is only through such an organization that the scanty resources which must always be at the disposal of a proletarian party can be utilized to any advantage. Not until the party membership has reached a point where it constitutes a means of reaching simultaneously and effectively every portion of the country, are we really in a position to carry on a political campaign.

There are other reasons which we have pointed out in a previous editorial, which makes organization specially imperative just at this time. There is not the slightest doubt but that the organized forces of capitalists and laborers are lining up for some of the most tremendous battles that ever have been waged. The passing of the new militia bill, the distribution of "riot cartridges," the mapping of the great cities for military purposes, all these point to the fact that capitalism is preparing for, and will welcome, a violent anarchistic outbreak on the part of the laborers. If this is to be prevented and the tremendous energy which is now to be found in the ranks of the dissatisfied laborers who are organized in the economic field be used effectively, it must be through the extension of the organization of the Socialist forces. We must be able to direct this energy into intelligent, fruitful channels. We cannot do this if we are ourselves a

mob. We cannot do it if our organization is confined to a few localities.

Some may think that confining organization to a few great cities means concentration of effort on strategical points, but it really means the reverse. If we are not organized outside of these cities, we will have no forces to concentrate on them when the struggle comes. If, on the other hand, every nook and corner of the country has its Socialist Local we will be able to bring all the resources at our disposal throughout the nation to bear upon any single point should such action become necessary.

There is still another reason for invading the hitherto unorganized territory. Capitalism depends for its support upon the small towns, the rural districts, the economically backward sections of the country, particularly the South. It is from these that it draws the votes in times of peace and the militia in times of labor troubles that can be used to coerce rebellious wage slaves.

In many cases the only information which reaches these places comes through channels completely controlled by the most reactionary portions of capitalism. Even if the organization in such a place is only a very small one it nevertheless gives an opportunity of getting our side of the case before the people when needed, and by virtue of the fact that our appeal is directly in accord with the interests of the people to whom we are speaking, while that of capitalism depends upon deception, we can, even with much smaller resources, counteract the capitalist forces.

It should be easily possible for the Socialists of the United States to raise a fund of several thousand dollars for this purpose, and such a fund will have the power of constantly renewing itself, as every new center of organization will prove a new source of revenue. Not only will it prove such a source directly, but as the Locals grow nearer together geographically, it will make possible local co-operation and an organization of speakers by circuits such as is now being conducted with such remarkable success by the comrades of Michigan.

Should the National headquarters take charge of the organization of such circuits in so far as the general National organization of speakers is concerned, it is probable that a combination of National, State and Local co-operation could be devised that would mean the adequate covering of the entire United States before the close of the campaign of 1904. However, all this is still in the future.

The urgent need at the present time is for money to lay the foundations of this work. If the Socialists of America respond, as they should, to this call the rest will follow as a matter of course. We believe that subscription lists should have accompanied the original call, as the money which is raised in Socialist ranks is almost invariably raised in very small sums and requires the circulation of such lists. This is, however, an occasion in which some of the more wealthy comrades of the party may well come to the front immediately and meet the first expenses necessary to support the work, and by the time these first sums are expended, the smaller sums collected through the party machinery will begin to arrive.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

If the United States Congress has turned down labor at the recent session by pigeon-holing and amending the bills handed in by the trade unionists, the various State Legislatures have done no worse. About everything that organized labor proposed in New York was defeated; in Massachusetts, the Socialists, Carey, MacCartney and Ramsden, did all in their power to force through measures to establish the eight-hour day, better factory inspection, municipal coal yards, to limit child labor, to clip the claws of the injunction-throwing courts, and many other palliations, but the Republican and Democratic members joined hands in a "non-partisan" effort to defeat the three laborites, and they succeeded. In Connecticut nothing was gained, and the politicians went out of their way to attempt to force through a law making it compulsory for unions to incorporate. In Pennsylvania, as soon as a bill went through the House it was strangled in Senate committees. The anti-injunction bill and other important measures were knocked out so rapidly in the upper chamber that a Republican representative, Garner, of Schuylkill, became disgusted and read the riot act. In a sensational speech, he advised taking retaliatory action and the holding up of Senate bills until the labor bills were passed in the upper house. "I want to say to Senators Quay and Penrose, and the machine leaders of the Republican party," he said, "that we have almost come to the parting of the ways. The laboring classes of this State have been fooled for many years. The Republican party has promised to do this, and the Democratic party has promised to do that. Both have lied, and lied in their hearts, when they said it." But his pleadings were in vain. In Indiana the labor press is full of denunciations for the vote-catching solons who had promised the workingmen everything under the sun—until after the ballots were counted. In Nebraska they tell the same story. One of the labor lobbyists at the State capital declared that "so far labor has not been able to hold what it had, let alone to get any more. The thing at Lincoln is rotten." In Utah the labor bills were dumped overboard as quickly as they were introduced or reported, while the bills proposed by the capitalists went through with a rush. In Idaho the unionists held indignation meetings to denounce the politicians for defeating the eight-hour bill and similar measures. In California all the labor papers agree that the labor bills were killed. The unionists made a particularly hard fight to secure the enactment of an anti-injunction law, but the politicians amended the bill in such manner that it is not worth the paper it is printed on. Down in Texas most of the labor measures

were not only defeated or vetoed, but the politicians forced through an anti-trust bill that hits the unions the hardest. Under its provisions union men can be fined, sued and imprisoned, and when labor committees waited upon Bourbon bosses and requested that the law recognizing the legality of unions be re-enacted the politicians dismissed them with the remark that "we are friendly to labor." The Missouri unions announce that nothing was gained; ditto in Georgia, Alabama and other States. In Kansas the organized men are so disappointed that they threaten to start a new party in the near future to fight the old capitalistic parties. The lesson is coming home to the intelligent workers that nothing can be gained by bending the pregnant hinges of the knee to the capitalistic politicians. The only way that they will display respect for worksmen is for the latter to fight them at the ballot-box by supporting the Socialist Party. When they learn that they can no longer use the labor men as what the Germans call "stimmvieh" (voting cattle), they will be willing to make concessions to postpone the deluge.

Not only do the politicians refuse to pass labor bills in the legislative bodies, but where here and there a so-called labor law occasionally gets over the riffle it is only to bump into the judicial rock. For a number of years the unionists of Indiana labored for the enactment of a law providing for a minimum scale of 20 cents an hour for all unskilled labor employed on public works. Now comes the Supreme Court and declares that the law is unconstitutional, and all the time and money spent by organized labor to establish a legal dead line has come to naught. It looks more and more as though labor will be compelled to secede from the old parties and elect class-conscious men from its own ranks to enact and interpret laws.

The window glass blower is the latest mechanic to be wiped out, so far as his skill is concerned. For some months the window glass trust has been experimenting with a blowing machine in Alexandria, Md., with the result that April 18 the window glass plants were closed and 20,000 men, who have the strongest unions in the United States, were told that the services of many were no longer required. In discussing the economic advantages that the trust will now enjoy, Mr. Frank Gessner, the well-known expert in glass manufacturing, says: "Let us take a 54-blower tank, and put the wages of blowers, gatherers and snappers at such a low average rate that no one versed in the art can raise any possible objection. Say there are fifty-four blowers whose wages, single and double strength, average \$40 per week; fifty-four gatherers at \$30 per week, and forty-four snappers at \$10 per week. Anybody interested may figure out the total, which is \$4,220 per week. In the machine equipped factory there are no blowers, gatherers or snappers required, no skilled labor and not a single high priced workman. In the factory at Alexandria, operating four machines, we counted only eight workmen, all told. In comparing the difference between the hand blowing and the machine process, a very well-informed window glass blower allowed eighty common laborers, at \$1.50 each per day, as a full working

force capable of doing the work of fifty-four blowers, fifty-four gatherers and fifty-four snappers. We did not see anything like that number of laborers in or about the works, proportioned to the number of machines in operation; but we are not going to quibble, and will allow eighty common laborers, whose wages at \$1.50 per day would amount to \$720 per week as against the fifty-four gatherers, blowers and snappers, or a weekly saving of \$3,600, and that means a saving of \$14,400 per month, of \$144,000 in a ten months run on a single 54-blower tank furnace plant. When it is stated, therefore, that the cost of producing window glass by the machine process is about one-fifth of what it cost by hand, and that the machine reduces the cost of production fully 80 per cent, it is a very conservative estimate. From the above facts it is evident that hand blowing factories cannot possibly compete with the machine equipped factories, for the very simple reason that if the gatherers, blowers and snappers were to work for \$1.50 each per day, their wages would aggregate \$243 per day against \$120 per day, so that, other things being equal, the manufacturer employing skilled hand labor at \$1.50 per day would be losing \$123 per day on every 54-blower tank employed."

During the past month the annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers was held in New Orleans, and in his annual address, which covers sixty pages, book form, President Parry did not mince words in referring to organized labor. He reiterated his former charges that the unions are lawless institutions and should be destroyed root and branch. He accused the so-called "pure and simple" leaders with attempting to bring about Socialism by forcible methods and differed in this essential with the Socialist Party, which was aiming to accomplish the same end through the ballot-box. Of course, Gompers and other national officers are storming and declare that Parry does not present the real views of the manufacturers, and this opinion is also shared by Mark Hanna and other politicians and their newspapers, who are working overtime to obscure the class struggle. But, all the same, the delegates in New Orleans almost to a man endorsed the sentiments of Parry. They adopted a platform that declares against strikes, boycotts, etc., and favors "open shops" and wage rates and pay days to suit themselves; they endorsed the so-called independent "unions" that are springing up in different parts of the country, declared in favor of "regulating the bad in unions," and patted themselves on the back for defeating the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills in Congress. Finally the manufacturers decided to organize the employing class by trades and federating them on lines similar to those followed by the unions, and for the purpose of resisting the demands of the latter. To clinch matters and to prove that they heartily endorse their president's policy, the convention re-elected Parry unanimously. The trade unionists of the country may as well understand at once that they are going to confront a powerful organization of employers in the future, for the N. A. of M. has experienced wonderful growth during the past year and dozens of organizations in close sympathy with that body have also been formed in different industrial centers which may be merged gradually. It is absurd to be-

little this movement of the capitalists. Nothing can be gained by imitating the ostrich and sticking one's head in the sand. What the unionists should do is give serious consideration to the dangers that confront them by reason of capitalistic unification, put an end to their suicidal jurisdiction controversies, federate more closely all along the line and be prepared for trouble. "In times of peace prepare for war" is advice that holds good as long as the capitalistic system of production remains. And the unions should not neglect to educate the workers to defend their class interests at the ballot-box as well, instead of maintaining an anarchistic passiveness and allowing a small minority of capitalists to run things to suit themselves.

Well, as was predicted in this department some time ago, the British Taff Vale precedent, in which the English railway workers were mulcted out of \$115,000, has found lodgment in American soil. In Rutland, Vt., about 200 machinists went on strike in the F. R. Patch Manufacturing Company nearly a year ago. The company sued for \$10,000 damages, alleged to have been suffered as the result of the strike, and the jury awarded \$2,500. When the suit was brought, over one hundred writs were served on the members of the union. Every piece of available property belonging to any member was attached, and the lawyers say that the Patch Company can recover the judgment from this property. That this case was more important than the mere sum involved is proven by the comments of the daily press and the legal fraternity generally. There are several more damage suits pending, and probably before *The Review* is printed they will be decided one way or another. The damage suit is a natural sequence of government by injunction, which evil has become so thoroughly entrenched that it cannot be abolished without overtopping the whole system that it safeguards, and any thoughtful person can readily see where union funds can be tied up or confiscated, or where the home-owning members in an organization can be held responsible for losses sustained by employers in a strike or boycott, that a new and grave danger has arisen. The shibboleth of many unions during the past dozen years has been "high dues and a strong treasury," but where the capitalists can raid the financial strength of an organization it looks as though the workers are supplying the sinews for their own undoing. But instead of discouraging the progressive workers, this new turn of affairs should spur them on to educate their fellows to meet the issue intelligently and fearlessly. Old methods and political idols must be relegated. The time has come to place class-conscious men in the halls of legislation and the administrative offices. Otherwise the capitalists will continue to have the advantage and laugh in their sleeves at the stupidity and cowardice of labor.

Heretofore we were wont to regard the East as the leading section of Socialist activity and success. When Massachusetts sent three members into the Legislature and carried Brockton, Haverhill, Amesbury and several of the smaller places, it looked as though New England would be the banner district for some time. But the victories of the Yankees merely served to encourage the Westerners to fight all

the harder, and the results of the recent municipal elections indicate that the Eastern Socialists will have to look to their laurels. Chicago has gained a foothold in the city government by electing an Alderman; in Sheboygan, Wis., the Socialist Party swept the city, electing Mayor, City Attorney, Treasurer, Assessors, Justices of the Peace, five Aldermen, three Supervisors and two school Councilmen; in Racine, Wis., an aldermanic candidate won; in Telluride, Colo., the Socialist Party gained an Alderman; in Red Lodge, Mont., two out of three Councilmen; in Anaconda, Mont., Mayor, Police Judge and three out of six Councilmen; in Battle Creek, Mich., two Aldermen, making a total of four; at Pine River, Mich., Supervisor and also Commissioner; in Kenosha, Wis., an Alderman, Supervisor and School Director; in Two Rivers, Wis., an Alderman and School Commissioner; in Kiel, Wis., the Mayor; in Plymouth, Wis., an Alderman; in Marion, Ind., two Councilmen; in Rich Hill Mo., the Mayor and the Marshal; in Boone, Iowa, a Councilman; in Liberal, Mo., a Councilman; in Mystic, Iowa, a Councilman, and there are still some counties to hear from by slow freight. In scores of cities and towns west of the Alleghanies the Socialist Party vote doubled and trebled, and the old party politicians only saved themselves from defeat in many places by uniting the Republican and Democratic parties in a so-called Citizens' party. The tide is steadily rising, and the capitalist politicians will do well to prepare their rafts for a flood.

# SOCIALISM ABROAD

## Germany.

Vorwaerts publishes the following table showing the relative strength of the various parties in Germany at the present time, and incidentally showing how effectually the Social Democrats have been discriminated against in the Parliamentary representation. We preserve the German names of the parties throughout rather than to attempt to translate them, owing to the fact that in some cases various translations have found their way into the English language:

Party.	Votes.	Represen- tatives.	No. of votes to each Rep.
Sozial-Demokraten .....	2,107,076	56	37,626
Centrum .....	1,455,139	110	13,228
National-Liberale .....	971,802	47	20,666
Konservative .....	859,222	54	15,911
Freisinnige Volkspartei .....	558,314	29	19,252
Deutsche Reichspartei .....	343,642	23	14,941
Antisemiten .....	284,250	10	28,425
Polen .....	244,128	14	17,437
Freisinnige Vereinigung .....	195,682	12	16,307
Andere Partelen .....	143,658	14	10,261
Bayrischer Bauernbund .....	140,304	4	37,576
Bund der Landwirthe .....	110,389	3	36,796
Suddeutsche Volkspartei .....	108,528	8	13,566
Elsasser .....	107,415	8	13,427
Welfen .....	94,359	9	10,484
Danah .....	15,439	1	15,430

There comes to the office of the International Socialist Review each month clippings of all matters relating to Socialism appearing in the entire German press. Just at the present time these clippings, so far as the capitalist press is concerned, would seem to indicate a sort of panic on the part of the opponents of Socialism. "Gegen die Sozial Demokratie" (down with the Social Democrats) is the favorite watch-word of the clerical and reactionary press, which is filled with various suggestions of methods with which to combat the impending danger. The Romische Zeitung has a long article on the influence of the Social Democratic propaganda on the Catholic population, and after admitting that Socialism is making great inroads among Catholics, con-

cludes by saying, "Here complaints and murmurs will not help things. Nothing but positive, practical work of reform in the social and political field will be of any effect." It is needless to say there is no suggestion of just what this reform is going to be.

Recently a Farmer's Congress was held in Berlin and the Cabinet went boldly in their official capacity to participate in its deliberations. One of the Socialist representatives rose in the Reichstag the next day and asked if this was to be considered as a precedent, and if the Cabinet would attend the next trade union congress that met in Berlin. Count Posadowsky, the presiding officer of the Cabinet, replied in the negative, and the capitalist press in commenting on it declared the question an insulting one, since all trade union congresses were directly under the control of the Socialists and it would be inviting the government to participate in its own destruction.

The Dresden Journal declares that the diminution of the Socialist danger is the great task of the next election.

The great campaign fund which the workers of Germany are gathering for the coming elections is another source of worry to the capitalist papers, and they are claiming that no fund of this size could be collected without the assistance of other than laborers and are attempting to use this as proof that the Socialists are not a party of the working class. Meanwhile, the Social Democrats are gathering and organizing their forces for the tremendous battle which lies before them. They have carefully selected the districts which are doubtful and are concentrating their forces upon these. A long list of such districts was published in a late issue of the *Vorwaerts*, and it is seen that in very many of them the number of additional votes needed by the Socialists for victory is very small.

Meanwhile the Socialists of other countries are giving evidence of the International solidarity of the Socialist movement. The Belgian Socialists have sent 1,280 francs directly from their central treasury and at the same time sent out an appeal to the various local organizations asking them to assist in this matter. Several organizations in the United States have sent small sums and assistance has also come from other European countries. Needless is it to say that the Emperor is decidedly uneasy in these days. Seeking to escape from the ubiquitous Social Democracy at home he fled to Denmark, only to be welcomed by the Social Democratic Mayor of Copenhagen. Latest press dispatches declare that in despair he is now talking of turning Socialist himself. Simultaneously the word comes that he has started a labor paper as a final means of fighting the Socialists. Perhaps both reports are true, as Wilhelm II. is evidently in a very much disturbed state of mind.

---

### Austria.

---

The Social Democratic Congress of Lower Austria was held at St. Poelton on Feb. 15 and 16. Owing to the fact that there had been a decrease in the vote at the last Parliamentary election there was some feeling of discouragement, but this decrease was largely account-

ed for on the grounds of the disfranchisement of large numbers of the workers through election trickery, and, in the second place, by the deception practiced by the Christian Socialist party. As a result there was a very strong feeling against the Christian Socialist party and a resolution was adopted declaring them to be the greatest enemies of the working class at the present time, and stating "that the fighting and conquest of the Christian Socialist Party is not only demanded by the interest of the laboring class in its battle for freedom, but is also an essential of the further development of our whole culture."

Here, as everywhere, the peasant population constitutes a great obstacle to the advance of Socialism. Comrade Hoeger declared that "the farmer is first of all a possessor and strives continuously to increase and add to his possessions even at the cost of his friends and relatives, and by all possible means. His heart clings above everything else to possessions. Even the farm laborer thinks only of the possibility of securing land and property. Whoever strives only for possession, however, can, according to my opinion, never become a proletarian Social Democrat." He concluded by declaring that "we should remain with our members who have made the Social Democratic movement great, the industrial laborers, and perfect their organization."

There was considerable opposition to this, although even those who maintained the possibility of winning the farmer admitted that their allegiance seemed to be very uncertain.

---

### Finland.

---

The Socialist Party in this country, although newly organized, has already won some notable victories. Some time ago two Socialists were elected to the Municipal Council of Helsingfors, the Finnish capital. These were Comrade Drockila, a newspaper man, and Comrade Hackland, a miller. At a more recent election held in the city of Tamersfors three Socialist Councilmen were elected.

Another sign of rapid growth is found in the success of the Socialist press in Finland. Three large dailies are already published in the Finnish language, and a weekly paper in Swedish. The weekly circulation of these newspapers amounts to 80,000 copies. This is really remarkable, in view of the fact that the whole population of Finland is less than three million, while the number of industrial laborers of the country does not exceed 80,000.

A still more significant sign of the growing strength of the working class movement in Finland is found in the fact that the employers' association of Helsingfors recently decided on its own motion to close the factories on the 1st of May, the international labor holiday.

Thus far the Socialist Party of Finland has no complete written program. The lack of such a document is being more and more acutely felt, and steps are now being taken to provide one. The outline for the program which seems most likely to be adopted is the one developed by the school of Socialist propagandists at Abo, whose most conspicuous member is Comrade Painio. This outline, which

has many points in common with the new program adopted by the Social Democracy of Austria, will, after a preliminary discussion by the locals of the party, be submitted to the National Congress which is soon to be held. Its adoption will naturally strengthen the Finnish labor movement by giving it more unity of action.

Unfortunately by the side of this movement which is so rapidly developing there is arising a terrible danger in this country. That is to say, the increasing invasion of Finland by the despotism of Russia. The principal conditions which have favored the growth of the labor movement are the liberties and political rights enjoyed by the working class, thanks to the relatively liberal Constitution of Finland. If the plans of the Russian bureaucracy are carried out these liberties will disappear along with the autonomy of the Grand Duchy and the Finnish working class will be subjected to the same system of arbitrary oppression already inflicted upon the working class of Russia and Poland.

Thus the Finnish proletariat is, like the other classes of the population of this country, interested in defending the autonomy of Finland against the encroachments of Russia, since this autonomy involves the political liberty indispensable for the normal development of the proletariat. Its interests, however, will be closely linked with those of the laborers of other countries and especially with the revolutionary Socialists of Russia. Finland alone will be helpless against the Russian autocracy, but the united revolutionary movement of Russia will sooner or later overthrow the Czar.

---

### New Zealand.

---

At last there seems to be some sign of the awakening of the proletariat of New Zealand. It may come with somewhat of a shock to those who have looked upon New Zealand as already well on the way to Socialism to learn that it is behind almost every other nation in the world in this respect, and that the first germs of the Socialist movement are just beginning in that country. Comrade La Monte, who is familiar to most of our readers as a translator and writer of Socialist literature, is now located at Wellington, New Zealand, and sends us a number of papers giving an account of the recent formation of a Socialist Party in that city.

This party adopted the following platform for the municipal election:

"The Socialist Party appeals strongly to men and women of all classes who are willing to join the workers in their struggle against oppression and exploitation, and for emancipation. It confidently relies for present support and future victory upon the workers of Wellington, and especially upon those workers who have shown their consciousness of the class struggle by joining the trades unions of their crafts, and it appeals to them and to you to support the Socialist ticket during the coming contest.

"Workers of Wellington, unite under the banner of the party of your own class, the Socialist Party! You have nothing to lose but your chains, and a world to gain!

"We will present to you in due course working men as candidates

for seats on the City Council, pledged, if elected, to work for the following measures in your interests:

"1. The erection by the City Council of houses to meet the requirements of the citizens, such houses to be let at a rent just sufficient to cover interest, sinking fund and maintenance.

"2. The establishment by the city of municipal coal depots to distribute coal to the people at cost.

"3. The erection by the city of retail and wholesale markets for meat, fish, fruit and provisions of all kinds.

"4. The establishment of municipal institutes and refreshment rooms, as the first step towards municipalizing the food and drink supplies of the citizens.

"5. The acquisition or erection by the city of a plant or plants to light the streets and furnish light to stores, houses, etc.

"6. The erection of municipal abattoirs.

"7. The abolition of the contract system on public works. Direct employment of labor by the city, at union wages, and under union conditions."

Comrade La Monte assures us that it was difficult to get even this much Socialism into the platform of the Socialist Party in New Zealand.

At this meeting the party put itself on record against the conciliation and arbitration act and numerous trade unionists pointed out that this act had been of no avail to the unions of that country. This has stirred up the capitalist press, and they are attacking the Socialists most vigorously. Among the items which are noted in these papers, however, are some which tell of trade unionists being compelled to wait in vain outside Minister Seddons' office in the hope of securing governmental action, and complaints appear here and there of lack of work.

The first number of "The Commonweal," the first Socialist paper to be published in New Zealand, and of which Comrade La Monte is the editor, has come to hand. It has the old familiar ring of the International Socialist movement, and the probability is that the time is not far distant when New Zealand will really take her place in the ranks of the nations of the world in the battle for Socialism.

---

### Holland.

---

It is difficult to give any satisfactory statement concerning the situation in Holland until further information shall be received. As most of our readers know from the reports of the daily press a general strike was declared, and, in spite of this fact, the anti-strike law was passed through the Chamber, which then at once adjourned. Under these conditions the strikers thought it best to declare the strike off, as there was no possibility of the attainment of their end during the time in which they could remain on strike. Contrary to the statements which have been published in anarchist papers, the Socialists of Germany assisted them while they were out on strike, and the Vorwaerts continuously encouraged and endorsed their action.

## BOOK REVIEWS

The Pit. By Frank Norris. Doubleday, Page & Co. Cloth, 421 pp., \$1.50.

It is impossible to discuss this book without to some degree comparing it with "The Octopus," which formed the first of a series of works of which there were to be three, "The Pit" constituting the second, had the work not been unfortunately interrupted by the death of the author. Many of the critics have declared this book to be superior to "The Octopus," but we cannot agree with their judgment. There is strength in "The Pit," but it is a more conventional strength than that displayed in "The Octopus." When the author leaves the soil he seems to lose something of the crude, primeval power which accompanied his first work. "The Pit" deals with a gigantic wheat speculation in Chicago, and its moral is the resistless power of wheat as opposed to man. While Jadwin, the hero, is financially crushed beneath the tremendous flood of wheat that pours in from the Northwest, one cannot but feel that there is by no means the certainty that his defeat was not due to some oversight or lack of financial strength which might be at least within the bounds of human possibility, and there is not, consequently, the same tremendous, unconquerable force which is to be found in "The Octopus." The strongest passage in the whole book, and which reminds you most forcibly of the author's earlier work, is his description of the wheat pit on the Chicago Board of Trade.

"Thus it went, day after day. Endlessly, ceaselessly the Pit, enormous, thundering, sucked in and spewed out, sending the swirl of its mighty central eddy far out through the city's channels. Terrible at the center, it was, at the circumference, gentle, insidious and persuasive, the send of the flowing so mild, that to embark upon it, yielding to the influence, was a pleasure that seemed all devoid of risk. But the circumference was not bounded by the city. All through the Northwest, all through the central world of the wheat the set and whirl of that innermost Pit made itself felt; and it spread and spread till the grain in the elevators of Western Iowa moved and stirred and answered to its centripetal force, and men upon the streets of New York felt the mysterious tugging of its undertow engage their feet, embrace their bodies, overwhelm them and carry them bewildered and unresisting back and downwards to the pit itself.

"Nor was the Pit's centrifugal power any less. Because of some sudden eddy spinning outward from the middle of its turmoil, a

dozen Old World banks, firm as the established hills, trembled and vibrated. Because of an unexpected caprice in the swirling of the inner current, some far-distant channel suddenly dried, and the pinch of famine made itself felt among the vine dressers of Northern Italy, the coal miners of Western Prussia. Or another channel filled, and the starved moujik of the steppes, and the hunger shrunken coolie of the Ganges' watershed fed suddenly fat and made thank offerings before ikon and idol.

"There in the center of the Nation, midmost of that continent that lay between the oceans of the New World and the Old, in the heart's heart of the affairs of men, roared and rumbled the Pit. It was as if the Wheat, Nourisher of the Nations, as it rolled gigantic and majestic in a vast flood from West to East, here, like a Niagara, finding its flow impeded, burst suddenly into the appalling fury of the maelstrom, into the chaotic spasm of a world-force, a primeval energy, blood-brother of the earthquake and the glacier, raging and wrathful that its power should be braved by some pinch of human spawn that dared raise barriers across its courses."

One looks in vain for the social teachings which permeated his other works and which really gave life to it. We cannot but feel that this defect is in a large degree responsible for the greater weakness and has at the same time insured to it the more favorable attention of the conventional critics.

*The American Cotton Industry.* By T. M. Young. Chas. Scribner's Sons. Cloth, 155 pp., 75 cents.

This consists of a series of articles originally contributed to the Manchester Guardian by an English weaving expert who spent some time in America. It is written entirely from the technical point of view to afford information to the weaving capitalist. But it is really more than this; it is an extremely valuable handbook for the social student.

The author makes many very striking observations. He notes the fact that even Massachusetts is still behind England in factory legislation. Everywhere he points out the much greater productivity of the American worker as compared with the English. He frequently shows that measured by product wages are lower here than in England. Even in Massachusetts he finds also that "the faces of the weavers looked pinched and sallow and the arms of many of them were pitifully thin. I do not care how many dollars a week those people were earning they are badly off."

When he comes to visit the Southern mills he gives some interesting figures on wages. At one mill "the first girl to whom I spoke was running ten looms and gave her weekly earnings at \$2.08; the next, who had ten looms, too, said that she made \$2.50 a week, sometimes more and sometimes less; whilst the third, who had only eight looms, put her weekly earnings at only \$2, and complained that she was not allowed to have more looms. I supposed that she was a learner, and asked her how long she had been weaving; to my surprise she replied, "Three years."

He makes one observation which is most striking when we remem-

ber that it is injected into the midst of the most technical form of language on wefts, picks and warp, splashers, drillers, etc.

"As the train came into Columbia a curious little procession passed up the street. About a score of black convicts, dressed in an ugly uniform of dirty white cotton, with broad black stripes, carrying picks and shovels over their shoulders, and chained together, two and two by the ankle, swung up the hill, followed by a white man with a rifle. It was the chain gang returning from its day's labor upon the roads. And about the same time, I suppose, white children of 12 years old, no more free agents than the convicts, were filling into the mill at Barnesville to begin their long night of toil amongst the tireless machines."

"What I Saw in South Africa." By J. Ramsey McDonald. "The Echo." Paper, 135 pp., 6d.

This is the record of the visit of the well known English Socialist to South Africa shortly after the war. This is for its compass one of the best general surveys of the present situation in the Boer country that has ever been published. It gives a series of sharp, searching pictures of the situation, outlines various forces that are at work there, and suggests something of probable future revolution.

"Tactics and Strategy." By Thomas Bersford. Author. Paper, 69 pp., 15 cents.

This is a work which consists mainly of personal opinions given with a very authoritative air. Some of the suggestions which are offered are excellent, some in our opinion are silly, and others decidedly pernicious. This latter applies especially to the attempt which is made to arouse antagonism along lines of occupation among the workers and to encourage independent organizations along sex lines. The work, however, enters on a new field and will be welcomed as a first attempt to reduce to system what has often been chaotic—the work of agitation and organization for Socialism.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### Britain for the British.

Without doubt the writer that has been most successful in popularizing the thought of Socialism is Robert Blatchford. His book, "Merrie England," has already had a circulation of considerably over a million, and is still selling rapidly. He has, however, written a much better book than "Merrie England," under the title of "Britain for the British." This work has already reached a circulation of several hundred thousand copies in England, and it is gradually making its way in this country. The title helps it there and to some extent hinders it here. The central thought of the book is that Great Britain is now owned by, and run for, a small class of parasites, whereas the working class might and should own it themselves, and run it to suit themselves. The arguments apply as well to America as to England, and the book is as useful here as where it was written. It is far better propaganda than "Merrie England," since the former book had little to say of the class struggle and was quite as likely as not to leave its readers disposed to vote for the "New Democracy" and subscribe to the Hearst newspapers. "Britain for the British," on the other hand, emphasizes the need of a distinctively working class party, and the brief appendix to the American edition by A. M. Simons points out that the Socialist Party is the only one deserving the confidence of American workmen.

In the January issue of the International Socialist Review we published the opinion of Eugene V. Debs on this remarkable book. We give here a few extracts from reviews of the work written by prominent English Socialists:

Ben Tillet: The press may not accept "Britain for the British" because it is paid to foster a Britain for the brutish few. It is a great moral book, without suspicion of preaching. A charity permeates it throughout, broad as the brotherhood of man it teaches. Its pure sympathy, the tender lovingness of its appeal should go straight to the heart and understanding of all who want the world for the world's workers, and "Britain for the British."

J. A. Hobson: The waste, the folly, the cruelty and injustice of the present industrial order, as set forth in Mr. Blatchford's pages, are so gross and palpable, the remedy is so clear, simple and intelligible that, laying down the book, one asks, "Why haven't we done it?"

Harry Quelch: No man, I think, possesses to a greater degree than our friend Blatchford the faculty for saying what he wishes to say

in a pleasing and attractive fashion, in plain and simple language—understood of the common people.

George Bernard Shaw: There are very few men who can write as Blatchford does, with conscience and strong feeling; and yet without malice. We have plenty of political essayists who write without malice; but it is easy to be polite when you are indifferent to your subject, and are really concerned about nothing but your own manners and style. We have a few who write with conscience and strong feeling; but they begin with virtuous indignation and culminate in venom. Blatchford keeps his temper, and treats the heathen as fellow men to be converted, not as reptiles to be scotched.

"Britain for the British" is published in cloth at 50 cents and in paper at 25 cents, including postage to any address. The usual discount is allowed to stockholders in our co-operative company.

### Emblem Buttons.

In 1902 the Socialist Party of America, by referendum, adopted for its official emblem the design of a pair of clasped hands across a globe surrounded by the words, "Socialist Party: Workers of the World Unite." A variety of emblem buttons have been manufactured in accordance with this vote, but most of them have been extremely unsatisfactory in appearance and particularly by reason of the fact that the words "Socialist Party" appeared in small black letters on a dark red background and were almost illegible without close examination. This of course defeats the main purpose of the button, which is to familiarize workmen everywhere with the fact that the Socialist Party is in existence.

We have lately had designed a new button, in which the lettering appears in white letters on a red background and in which the letters are also somewhat larger than in previous designs, so that the words "Socialist Party" can easily be read at some distance from the eye. The general appearance of the button is also more tasteful than that of any other manufactured in accordance with the referendum vote. We are now manufacturing these buttons in large quantities and are thus able to announce a reduction in prices which will hereafter be as follows:

To our stockholders, 20 cents a dozen; \$1.50 a hundred postpaid; to others, 30 cents a dozen; \$2.00 a hundred postpaid.

### A Gift to the Socialist Party Organization Fund.

The editorial pages of this month's Review explain the urgent need of a national organization fund for the Socialist Party. We have to announce that William English Walling has given twenty-five shares of stock in our co-operative publishing company to be sold for the benefit of this organization fund. Any Socialist Local or individual may obtain one of these shares by sending \$10.00 to this office at once and the full amount of the remittance will be turned over in the name of the remitter to William Mally, National Secretary, to apply on the

organization fund. The holder of each share of stock so bought will have the privilege of buying literature at cost the same as if the share had been subscribed for in the ordinary way. It is of the utmost importance to the Socialist Party that this fund be raised quickly, and we trust that our readers will make a prompt response to this offer.

---

### The Standard Socialist Series.

The eighth volume, "Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy," by Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis, is now ready. It is an indispensable book for any one desiring to speak or write intelligently upon Socialism. The other numbers of the series are as follows:

1. Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs. By Wilhelm Liebknecht.
2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde.
3. The American Farmer. By A. M. Simons.
4. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-Operative Association. By Isaac Broome.
5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State. By Frederick Engels.
6. The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky.
7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels.

These books are handsomely bound in silk cloth, stamped with a uniform design, and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents a volume. Stockholders in our co-operative company have the privilege of buying them at 30 cents by mail or 25 cents by express at purchaser's expense. Two booklets, "What to Read on Socialism" and "Co-Operation in Publishing Socialist Literature," will be mailed free on request.

---

### Rev. Stewart Sheldon's Book.

"The Root of All Kinds of Evil," the publication of which was announced last month, is a remarkable book, coming as it does from one who has spent a lifetime in the orthodox Christian ministry. The author has re-discovered for himself the truth familiar to Socialists but denied by most members of his profession, that personal character is to a great extent the product of economic conditions, and can most readily be improved by improving these conditions. Starting with premises drawn from the Bible, and using the phraseology familiar to religious people, the author leads up fairly and logically to the conclusion that the way to establish the "Christ order" is to vote and work for the Socialist Party. Paper, 10 cents.

---

### God's Children—A Modern Allegory.

This new book by James Allman is the most readable description of our present capitalist civilization that can be found. The author represents God as desiring to secure accurate information regarding

the welfare of his children on this planet, and as sending Mercury on a tour of inspection. The heavenly messenger, after getting some preliminary advice from the recording angel, lands in London, and at once begins a series of varied and instructive experiences. We will not spoil the reader's enjoyment of the book by detailing any of them here. It need only be said that "God's Children" is an entertaining story from start to finish, and at the same time is a powerful argument for Socialism. The book is handsomely printed and bound and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents.

---

### **Class Struggles in America.**

---

This new work by A. M. Simons is something far more important than its size or price would indicate. It is the first definite beginning in the task of writing the history of the United States in the light of the principle of economic determinism. Incidentally, the clear and simple style of this book, together with the fact that it treats of things near at home and familiar, will make it a help to any who may have found the thought of economic determinism a difficult one to grasp. Paper cover, 10 cents, postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,  
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.