

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV.

SEPTEMBER, 1903.

NO. 4.

A Review of Essentials

THE zeal of the new convert is proverbial—his energy, his interest in novel surroundings, his impatience for results, his final realization and philosophical acceptance of the fact that "Rome was not built in a day," and then if he is made of the right stuff, his grim determination to settle down for a long, hard fight. There are few of the tried workers in the Socialist movement who have not passed along this road. In the enthusiasm following their discovery of what they considered a panacea for the ills of society they have plunged into propaganda and proclaimed in a mighty voice the glad new tidings. They have expected all those who love their kind to pause entranced at the sweetness of the new song. They have expected the oppressors of the poor to stand at first appalled when their infamy was proclaimed in the market place and then flee in confusion and dismay into the darkness of oblivion. Then, slowly, the light begins to break in upon the new convert. He learns the bitter lesson that the world has no particular interest in abstract justice, that the electorate doesn't generally vote "yes" or "no" on the simple right or wrong of a given policy. This lesson learned, the convert, if he is persistent, begins to re-examine his ground—his Socialist philosophy—and discovers some of the meaning of "economic determinism," realizes that it is a mighty hard proposition to hurry evolution. Once these things are realized the Socialist movement has a valuable worker, a veteran who, while not despising the advantage of the moment, knows it is more important to emerge victorious from the war than to win an isolated battle.

There is another type of Socialist recruit almost equally familiar. This is the "reform" politician who has expended time and energy, voice and money, in pushing the movements whose

bleaching bones strew the political battlefield. He has been able to arouse great enthusiasm; he has swept certain sections like a prairie fire; he has won victories and captured public powers, only to see his fond hope for humanity go glimmering. Undismayed and with beautiful courage he has sought the reason for his failure, determined, when it was found, to push on again. He has decided his weakness was in a mistaken apprehension of the exact cause of economic, political and social evils. He has said it was this, that or the other, only to fail, and now he has embraced with enthusiasm the Socialist position—or at least that part of it which indicts the wages system as the basic cause of poverty in the midst of plenty, serfdom in a “sweet land of liberty.” Apprehending so much the reformer buckles on his harness again and sallies forth, determined to “whoop ’em up” and “set the woods afire” with his new battle cry. He is an experienced politician, familiar with the most approved methods of generating enthusiasm, he expects to work up “the people,” go lickety split to Washington and usher in the Co-operative Commonwealth with a “hip, hip, hurrah.”

The reform politician—(no reproach in the word “politician,” for he is a good fellow)—hasn’t had opportunity yet to fail on his new tack, but the old Socialist—the believer in evolution and economic determinism—knows that failure is as sure as death. And the old Socialist, even if he makes himself disliked by saving it, must utter his warning cry and proclaim the necessity for adherence to the classical Socialist position—a position taken after a critical study of all history by master minds, a position which has proved impregnable through fifty years of bitterest assault.

As eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so is a clear comprehension of the essentials of Socialist philosophy an absolute necessity in the minds of the governing power in the Socialist party—the majority of the membership. It is only by a knowledge of what it is fighting for, a knowledge of the historic means by which social changes are effected, that the party can achieve its great mission, avoiding the pitfalls of an alluring opportunism and the traps set by a crafty, resourceful and unscrupulous enemy. With a rapidly swelling party membership it becomes a matter of vital importance that the recruits understand the conditions of the fight they are to wage. A sane conservatism must see to it that neither the new convert, impatient for results, nor the reform politician, with an unassimilated knowledge of Socialist essentials, is allowed to dominate party councils or direct party activities. This must be done from motives of common prudence and with absolutely no reflection upon the honesty or capacity of the friends who come bringing to us rich gifts of mind and heart.

All our civilization has not been able to eradicate that human credulity which is always looking for the miracle, that impatience which chafes under the slow operation of natural laws. We see the trait in the faith curist, who, disdainful of the accumulated knowledge of the centuries regarding the treatment of disease, jumps with avidity at a theory according to which it is only necessary to say Presto! and that which was is not. There are other amiable "new thought" people to whom the process of ratiocination is too slow and who spend long hours prayerfully contemplating the ends of their noses in order that they may cultivate a power higher than mind and reach conclusions independent of the syllogism. But in spite of these amiable people the world is not yet ready to cut loose from logical, scientific methods and substitute for law, ascertained by painful investigation, a supernaturalism whose sacred word is abracadabra.

The type of mind which these credulous supernaturalists exemplify is restive under the restraint of cautious science, but its impatience cannot make us forget that according to our scientific Socialism social changes are accomplished in a certain way.

We believe that the "history of mankind has been a history of class struggles" and that men as a rule have fought on one side or the other to serve their immediate material interests. Any other than the economic interpretation of history is as archaic and useless as the theory of special creation and it must necessarily be the key to our interpretation of contemporary events and the basis of our party organization. Never before were the great classes in conflict so clearly defined and never before was the necessity so urgent for a strict adherence to the class struggle plan of campaign. It is not mere dogmatism to assert and insist upon this. It is only a recognition of scientifically ascertained facts—facts which cannot be safely ignored or declaimed away by advocates of an invertebrate philosophy of universal brotherhood. Of course we all concede the essential unity of the human race and the desirability of harmony in social relations, but as "fine words butter no parsnips," so do platitudes about fraternity fail to advance the day of peace on earth. Humankind is arrayed in hostile camps, and if we want peace we've got to fight for it—the class struggle must be waged to its logical conclusion before the final emancipation of "society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles."

As hard and as cold as these facts may be—and science is never alluring to the sentimental temperament—they are not inconsistent with a liberal and enlightened propaganda. They have never and need not in the future keep from us individuals, who, though their immediate material interests are with the capitalist class, are yet able to judge the trend of events and desire to fight

for the cause which means a larger liberty, comfort and happiness for the race. History is irradiated by the example of men who have battled, and suffered if necessary, for the abstract ideal of justice. The Socialist movement today owes much to these men of education and ideals, but their usefulness is largely due to the promptness with which they apprehend the fact of the class struggle and the faithfulness with which they adhere to their perception of scientific truth.

It would be idle to deny that there are differences in the Socialist movement today as to the wisdom of certain features of organization and methods of propaganda. It is unfortunate, of course, that these differences should bring from the adherent of this or that idea vigorous statement and heated retort, but most of us philosophically recognize that we can't have perfection, even in debates between Socialists, in this sadly imperfect world of ours. However, we can insist that every proposition advanced for the good of the movement be judged according to its harmony with our fundamental principles and demand of all more than a mere lip recognition of the essentially proletarian character of our movement. The cry for "American methods for an American movement" is all right in so far as it takes into account our peculiar political conditions, but there can no more be a distinctive "American Socialism" than there can be an "American mathematics." American human nature is just like European human nature and the law of economic determinism rules in the United States just as surely as it rules in the countries of the old world. So the conclusion is irresistible that when the cry for "American methods for an American movement" is not merely an expression of the restiveness of the impatient recruit it is either disingenuous or the evidence of a chauvinism absurd in the light of our boasted internationalism.

One sometimes hears the sneer that some Socialists are "afraid the movement will get too big," and there are proposals that the so-called "military character" of the movement be abandoned. Of course no one fears bigness when bigness means solidity, but we may well fear and fight against the bigness which represents mere hot air which will vanish at the prick of a pin. The so-called "military character" of the movement, in so far as that means a pledged and dues-paying membership, is our tower of strength, and proposals that the party "simply pledge to everybody, and to everybody alike, the collective ownership and democratic management of industry" is the crass Utopianism of a sanguine camp-meeting exhorter who imagines the movement can be adequately supported by inviting the brethren to step up to the contribution box. We must have organization, and a well disciplined organization at that. We can't achieve or eat the fruit of victory with

a mob. The Socialist party organization, in giving to every member a voice in the discussion and settlement of questions of policy, cultivates individual initiative and that capacity for self-government which is showing many signs of atrophy under the so-called representative, but rather machine, system. A membership thus actively participating in party affairs is the strongest bulwark against the ever threatening political vampires—the tricksters, bosses and grafters—seeking a new and vigorous body whose blood they may suck. It has proved its efficiency by standing fast in many a storm that threatened to destroy the party and there is no evidence of its incapacity to settle right present and future problems. There have always been well intentioned men who have thought they could do better for the people than the people could do for themselves, but that is the theory of benevolent despotism—of theocracy, not democracy—and we want none of it. We shall have—we already have—honest, astute, and masterful men whose influence will intensify the effectiveness of our efforts, but it is a delusion to think that we are sheep without a shepherd, a helpless mass waiting for some Moses to lead us out of the wilderness. The working class must emancipate itself, and while it welcomes the assistance of all those “in sympathy with it,” the Socialists at least entertain no delusions and must prepare for the work ahead as prudent, practical men.

CHARLES DOBBS.

Some Phases of Civilization

IN AN article written by Frederick Harrison, originally published in *The Fortnightly Review*, for April, 1882, entitled "A Few Words about the Nineteenth Century," I find the following:

"In one of those delightful tales of Voltaire, which nobody reads now, I remember how the King of Babylon cured of excessive self-esteem a great satrap called Irax. The moment he awoke in the morning the master of the royal music entered the favorite's chamber with a full chorus and orchestra, and performed in his honor a cantata which lasted two hours; and every third minute there was a refrain to this effect:

"*Que son mérite est extrême!
Que de grâces! que de grandeur!
Ah! combien Monseigneur
Doit être content de lui-même!*"

The cantata over, a royal chamberlain advanced and pronounced a harangue that lasted three-quarters of an hour, in which he extolled him for possessing all the good qualities which he had not. At dinner, which lasted three hours, the same ceremonial was continued. If he opened his mouth to speak, the first chamberlain said: 'Hark! we shall hear wisdom!' And before he had uttered four words, the second chamberlain said: 'What wisdom do we hear!' Then the third and the fourth chamberlain broke into shouts of laughter over the good things which Irax had said, or rather ought to have said; and after dinner the same cantata was again sung in his honor. On the first day Irax was delighted; the second he found less pleasant; on the third he was bored; on the fourth he said he could bear it no longer; and on the fifth he was cured.

"I sometimes think this (the nineteenth) century, with its material progress and its mechanical inventions, its steam and electricity, gas, and patents, is being treated by the press, and its other public admirers, much as the chamberlains in *Zadig* treated the satrap. The century is hardly awake of a morning before thousands of newspapers, speeches, lectures and essays appear at its bedside, or its breakfast table, repeating as in chorus:

"*Que son mérite est extrême!
Que de grâces! que de grandeur!*"

"Surely no century in all human history was ever so much

praised to its face for its wonderful achievements, its wealth and its power, its unparalleled ingenuity and its miraculous capacity for making itself comfortable and generally enjoying life. British associations, and all sorts of associations, economic, scientific and mechanical, are perpetually executing cantatas in honor of the age of progress, cantatas which (alas) last much longer than three hours. The gentlemen who perform wonderful unsavory feats in crowded lecture halls, always remind us that 'Never was such a time as this nineteenth century!' Public men laying the first stone of institutes, museums, or amusing the Royal Academy after dinner, great inventors, who have reaped fortunes and titles, raise up their hands and bless us in the benignity of affluent old age. I often think of Lord Sherbrook, in his new robes and coronet, as the first chamberlain, bowing and crying out. 'What a noble age is this!' The journals perform the part of orchestra, banging big drums and blowing trumpets—penny trumpets, two-penny, three-penny or six-penny trumpets—and the speakers before or after dinner, and the gentlemen who read papers in the sections perform the part of chorus, singing in unison:

'Ah! combien Monseigneur
Doit être content de lui-même!'

"As a mere mite in this magnificent epoch, I ask myself, What have I done, and many plain people around me, who have no mechanical genius at all, what have we done to deserve this perpetual cataract of congratulation? All that I can think of is the assurance that Figaro gives the count, 'our lordship gave ourselves the trouble to be born in it!'

"It is worth a few minutes' thought to ask what is the exact effect upon *civilization*, in the widest and highest sense of that term, of this marvelous multiplication of mechanical appliances of life? This is a very wide question, and takes us to the roots of many matters, social, economic, political, moral, and even religious. Is the universal use of a mechanical process *per se* a great gain to civilization, an unmixed gain—a gain without dangers or drawback? Is an age which abounds in countless inventions thereby alone placed head and shoulders above all the ages since historical times began? And this brings us to the point that the answer to the question largely depends on what we mean by civilization. We need not attempt to define *civilization*. Before any one can fully show the meaning of civilization, he must see in a very clear way what is his own ideal of a high, social, moral and religious life, and this is not the place to enter on any such solemn, not to say tremendous, topic.

"Let us hail the triumphs of steam, and electricity, and gas, and iron; the railways and the commerce; the industry, the appli-

ances, and conveniences of our age. They are all destined to do good service to humanity. But still it is worth asking if the good they do is *quite* so vast, *quite* so unmixed, *quite* so immediate as the chamberlains and chorus make out in their perpetual cantata to the nineteenth century.

"Let us note some of the mechanical glories of the last hundred years, as they are so often rehearsed. For four thousand years we know, and probably forty thousand years, man has traveled over the land as fast as his own legs, or men's legs, or horses' legs could carry him, but no faster; over sea as fast as sails and oars could carry him. Now he goes by steam over both at least at three times the pace. In previous ages, possibly for twenty centuries, about a hundred miles a day was the outside limit of any long continuous journey. Now we can go four thousand miles by sea in fourteen days, and by land in five days. It used to occupy as many weeks, or sometimes months. We have now instantaneous communication with all parts of the globe. The whole surface of our planet has only been known about a hundred years, and till our own day to get news from all parts of it to one given spot would certainly have required a year. The president of the United States delivers his message, and within three hours newspapers in all parts of the world have printed it word for word. For twenty thousand years every fabric in use has been twisted into thread by human fingers, and woven into stuff by human hands. Machines and steam engines now make ten thousand shirts in the time that was formerly occupied by making one. For twenty thousand years man has got no better light than what was given by pitch, tallow or oil. He now has gas and electricity, each light of which is equal to hundreds and thousands of candles. Where there used to be a few hundred books there are now one hundred thousand; and the London newspapers of a single year consume, I dare say, more type and paper than the printing of the whole world produced from the days of Gutemberg to the French Revolution.

"The Victorian age had a thousand times the resources of any other age. Permit me to ask, Does it use them to a thousand times better purpose? I am no detractor of our own age. * * * We all feel, in spite of a want of beauty, of rest, of completeness, which sits heavy on our souls and frets the thoughtful spirit—we all feel a-tiptoe with hope and confidence. * * *

"Civilization is a very elastic, impalpable, indefinable thing. But where are we to turn to find the tremendous relative superiority of 1882 over 1782, or 1682, or 1582? We may hunt up and down, and we shall only find this: Population doubling itself almost with every generation—cities swelling year by year by millions of inhabitants and square miles of area—*wealth counted by billions*, power to go anywhere, or learn anything, or order

anything, counted in seconds of time—miraculous means of locomotion, of transportation, of copying anything, of detecting the billionth part of a grain or a hair's breadth, of seeing millions of billions of miles into space and finding more stars, billions of letters carried every year by the post, billions of men and women whirled everywhere in hardly any time at all; a sort of patent fairy-Peribanou's fan which we can open and flutter, and straight-way find everything and anything the planet contains for about half a crown; night turned into day; roads cut through the bowels of the earth, and canals across continents; every wish for any material thing gratified in mere conjuror's fashion, by the turning a handle or adjusting a pipe—an enchanted world, where everything does what we tell it in perfectly inexplicable ways, as if some good Prospero were waving his hand, and electriciv were the willing Ariel—that is what we have—and yet, *is this civilization?* Do our philosophy, our science, our art, our manners, our happiness, our morality, overtop the philosophy, the science, the art, the manners, the happiness, the morality of our grandfathers as greatly as those of cultivated Europeans differed from those of savages? We are as much superior in material appliances to the men of Milton's day and Newton's day as they were to Afghans or Zulus. Are we equally superior in cultivation of brain and character to the contemporaries of Milton and Newton? * * *

“Why is it that we don't get any farther? Because we know that Shakespeare got to the root of the matter of tragedy quite as deep as Mr. Irving. No one can call Pope or Addison, Voltaire or Montesquieu, wanting in culture. No one can deny that Milton had a fine style and a fine taste; no one can say that Johnson, Congreve, Dryden, Pope, Fielding, Reynolds and Charles James Fox passed narrow, stunted, dull lives. And yet the tools, the appliances, the conveniences of these men's lives were, in comparison with ours, as the tools, appliances and conveniences of the ancient Britons or the South Sea islanders were to theirs. Why, then, with all this arsenal of appliances, do we not do more? Can it be that we are overwhelmed with our appliances, bewildered by our resources, puzzled with our mass of materials, by the mere opportunities we have of going everywhere, seeing everything, and doing anything?

“When we multiply the appliances of human life, we do not multiply the years of life, nor the days in the year, nor the hours in the day. Nor do we multiply the powers of thought, or of endurance; much less do we multiply self-restraint, unselfishness, and a good heart. What we really multiply are our difficulties and doubts. Millions of new books hardly help us when we can neither read nor remember a tithe of what we have. Billions of

new facts rather confuse men who do not know what to do with the old facts. Culture, thought, art, ease, and grace of manner, a healthy society, and a higher standard of life, have often been found without any of our modern resources in a state of very simple material equipment.

"Steam and factories, telegraphs, posts, railways, gas, coal and iron, suddenly discharged from a country as if by a deluge, have their own evils that they bring in their train. To cover whole countries with squalid buildings, to pile up one hundred thousand factory chimneys, vomiting soot, to fill the air with poisonous vapors till every leaf within ten miles is withered, to choke up rivers with putrid refuse, to turn tracts as big and once as lovely as the New Forest into arid, noisome wastes; cinder-heaps, cesspools, coal-dust, and rubbish—rubbish, coaldust, cess pools and cinder-heaps, and overhead by day and by night a murky pall of smoke—all this is not an heroic achievement, if this Black Country is only to serve as a prison yard for the men, women and children who dwell there.

"To bury Middlesex and Surrey under miles of flimsy houses, crowd into them millions and millions of overworked, underfed, halftaught and often squalid men and women; to turn the silver Thames into the biggest sewer recorded in history; to leave us all to drink the sewerage water; to breathe the carbonized air; to be closed up in a labyrinth of dull, sooty, unwholesome streets; to leave hundreds and thousands confined there, with gin, and bad air, and hard work, and low wages, breeding contagious diseases and sinking into despair of soul and feebler condition of body; and then to sing pæans and shout, because the ground shakes and the air is shrill with the roar of infinite engines and machines, because the black streets are lit up with garish gas-lamps, and more garish electric lamps, and the postoffice carries billions of letters, and the railways every day carry one hundred thousand persons in and out of the huge factory, we call the greatest metropolis of the civilized world—this is surely not the last word of civilization.

"Something like a million of paupers are kept year by year from absolute starvation by doles; at least another million of poor people are on the border-line, fluttering between starvation and health, between pauperism and independence; not one, but two, or three, or four millions of people in these islands are struggling on the minimum pittance of human comforts and the maximum of human labor; something like twenty millions are raised each year by taxation of intoxicating liquors; something like one hundred thousand deaths each year of diseases distinctly preventable by care and sufficient food and sanitary precautions and due self-restraint; infants dying off from want of good nursing like flies;

families herded together like swine, eating, drinking, sleeping, fighting, dying in the same close and foul den; the kicking to death of wives, the strangling of babies, the drunkenness, the starvation, the mendacity, the prostitution, the thieving, the cheating, the pollution of our vast cities in masses, waves of misery and vice, chaos and neglect—all this counted, not here and there in spots and sores (as such things in human society always will be), but in areas larger than the entire London of Elizabeth, masses of population equal to the entire English people of her age. I will sum it up in words not my own, but written the other day by one of our best and most acute living teachers, who says: 'Our present type of society is in many respects one of the most horrible that has ever existed in the world's history—boundless luxury and self-indulgence at the one end of the scale, and at the other a condition of life as cruel as that of a Roman slave, and more degraded than that of a South Sea islander.' Such is another refrain to the cantata of the nineteenth century, and its magnificent achievements in industry, science and art.

"What is the good of carrying millions of people through the bowels of the earth, and at fifty miles an hour, if millions of working people are forced to live in dreary, black suburbs, miles and miles away from all the freshness of the country, and away miles and miles even from the life and intelligence of cities? What is the good of ships like moving towns, that cross the Atlantic in a week, and are as gorgeous within as palaces, if they sweep millions of our poor who find nothing but starvation at home? What is the use of electric lamps, and telephones and telegraphs, newspapers by millions, letters by billions, if seamstresses stitching their fingers to the bone can hardly earn fourpence by making a shirt, and many a man and woman is glad of a shilling for twelve hours' work? What do we all gain if in covering our land with factories and steam engines we are covering it also with want and wretchedness? And if we can make a shirt for a penny and a coat for sixpence, and bring bread from every market on the planet, what do we gain if they who make the coat and the shirt lead the lives of galley slaves, and eat their bread in tears and despair, disease and filth.

"We are all in the habit of measuring success by *products*, whilst the point is, how are the products consumed, and by whom, and what sort of lives are passed by the producers? So far as mechanical improvements pour more wealth into the lap of the wealthy, more luxury into the lives of the luxurious, and give a fresh turn to the screw which presses on the lives of the poor; so far as our inventions double and treble the power of the rich, and double and treble the helplessness of the poor, giving to him that hath, and taking away from him that hath not even that

which he has—so far these great material appliances of life directly tend to lower civilization, retard it, distort, and deprave it. And they *do* this, so far as we spend most of our time in extending and enjoying these appliances, and very little time in preparing for the new conditions of life they impose upon us, and in remedying the horrors that they bring in their train.

“Socially, morally and intellectually speaking, an era of extraordinary changes is an age that has cast on it quite exceptional duties. A child might as well play with a steam engine or an electric machine as we could prudently accept our material triumphs with a mere ‘rest and be thankful.’ To decry steam and electricity, inventions and products, is hardly more foolish than to deny the price which civilization itself has to pay for the use of them. *There are forces at work now, forces more unwearied than steam, and brighter than the electric arc, to rehumanize the dehumanized members of society; to assert the old immutable truths; to appeal to the old indestructible instinct; to recall beauty; forces yearning for rest, grace, and harmony; rallying all that is organic in man’s nature, and proclaiming the value of spiritual life over material life.* But there never was a century in human history when these forces had a field so vast before them, or issues so momentous on their failure or success. There never was an age when the need was so urgent for synthetic habits of thought, systematic education, and a common moral and religious faith.

“There is much to show that our better genius is awakened to the task. Stupefied with smoke, and stunned with steam whistles, there was a moment when the century listened with equanimity to the vulgarest of flatterers. But if machinery were really the last word, we should be rushing violently down a steep place, like the herd of swine.”

A few words from R. Heber Newton, from the Arena, January, 1902:

“Labor strikes have tended to end, as in Homestead, in the revolver, and the bomb.

“Manufacturers have not hesitated to dispense with the arm of the law and to hire the *condottiere* of our modern civilization, the Pinkerton police.

“Railroads have ignored laws for the protection of life among their employes.

“Corporate wealth has high-handedly bade defiance to law, crushed recklessly all competition by thoroughly anarchistic methods, and not stopped short of corrupting legislatures.

“Out on Long Island life is daily endangered by a high-handed defiance of the laws regulating the speed of vehicles on

the part of rich men, whose automobiles terrorize horses and drivers alike.

"While such practical anarchism prevails, we must not wonder at anarchistic assassinations. While lawlessness is found everywhere, and *ordinary* life is held so lightly, we must expect lawless disregard of *exceptional* lives."

Had this article been written later he might have included the beef combine, to monopolize meats—one of the necessities of life—and the "divinely appointed" coal combine, to manipulate and control another necessity, and demonstrate to the millions of humanity that it holds inexorably in its hands the right, "divine right," to freeze us.

I wish to call attention to one other writer, Theodore D. Wolsley, D.D., LL.D., ex-president of Yale College, and author of "Political Science;" "Introduction to the Study of International Law;" "Communism and Socialism."

In the last named work, written in 1879, about three years prior to the article of Mr. Harrison, above quoted from, how like a prophet he speaks when he says: "If, however, that to which we have referred already more than once should be found to be a law of social progress—that the free use of private property must end in making a *few* capitalists of *enormous* wealth and a *vast* proportion of *laborers* dependent upon them; and if there could be no choice between *this disease* of free society and the swallowing up of all property by the state—then, we admit, it would be hard to choose between the two evils. Nothing would lead the mass of men to embrace Socialism sooner than the conviction that this enormous accumulation of capital in a few hands was to be not only *an evil in fact*, if not prevented, but a *necessary evil*, beyond prevention. We have no desire to see a return to the time of the '*latifundia*,' or broad farms, which, as Pliny and Elder said, were the ruin of Italy. If such a tendency should manifest itself, it would run through all the forms of property. A Stewart or a Claflin would root out smaller tradespeople. Holders of small farms would sink into tenants. The buildings of a city would belong to a few owners. Small manufacturers would have to take pay from mammoths of their own kind or be ruined. Then would the words of the prophet be fulfilled: 'Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place that they may be placed alone in the earth.' For if it went to an extreme in a free country, *the 'expropriated' could not endure it*. They would go to some other country, and leave these proprietors alone in the land, or would drive them away. *A revolution, slow or rapid, would certainly bring about a new order of things.*"

Now for over twenty years (since the above was written)

we have been waiting for this promised improvement, we have been hoping against hope, and what do we see? Any of the promised restraints by legal enactments; any amelioration of the condition of the wage-earning people?

Is it not rather that there are more millionaires, more gigantic combines, and more lawlessness among this class; that every legislative body, national, state and municipal, has its powerful lobby that usually gets all that it asks for for its friends? Is it not that it becomes a little harder for the laborer—either mental or physical—to “make both ends meet;” that employment is becoming a little more uncertain? Is it not that the once great middle class is being swept from among men and is dropping into the class of wage-earners—no man now, of moderate means, can invest his funds in any legitimate business and pay expenses in competition with the trusts, even if they let him alone. Is it not that the army of employed, those that would willingly work, is becoming daily larger; that the cost of living is advancing at a rapid rate, far in advance of the pittance of advance in wages, where any advance is conceded? Is it not that food stuff, as it advances in price, deteriorates in quality until it is often actually dangerous to take into a human stomach?

Verily the time prophesied by the good doctor has arrived when “we must go to some other country, * * * or drive them away.”

The “divine” coal combine, through their Christ, suggests that the federal government should give an island to the Socialists where they could go and invent Socialistic schemes. This is magnanimous, to say the least, and worthy of the brain that evolved it. But, let us ask, where is this island? The Socialists are already numbered by the millions; are casting votes by the millions all over the world; there is no island on this earth large enough to contain one-tenth part of us. Would it not be more expeditious and more economical for the federal government to *give* an island to the capitalists where they could go and exploit themselves and cease exploiting labor? A very small island would contain them all.

There being so many Socialists in all countries that they cannot “go to some other country,” then the only ready remedy suggested by Dr. Wolsey is to “drive them away.” But we will be more magnanimous than he—we will let them remain where they are. We are not asking for the gift of islands that are already ours; we are asking that the government take over some of the property that belongs to it, to *all the people*, now controlled by trusts and combines, and use it for the benefit of all the people to whom it belongs, instead of for the benefit of the few and the oppression of the many. Our motto is a government “of the

people, by the people, and for the people," instead of a government "of the people, by the rascals, for the rich."

"I affirm it is my conviction that class laws, *placing capital above labor*, are more dangerous to the public at this hour than chattel slavery in the days of its haughtiest supremacy. *Labor is prior to and above capital*, and **DESERVES A MUCH HIGHER CONSIDERATION.**"—*Abraham Lincoln.*

"The trusts of today are the revival in industrial life of exactly the same spirit that created absolutism in states. Formerly men aimed at *administrative absolutism*; now the trust leaders' object is the attainment of *financial absolutism*.

"It is as pernicious in its latter day as in its former aspect, and *it is as vital to the interests of humanity and progress that financial absolutism SHOULD BE DESTROYED as it was that absolutism among rulers should be ABOLISHED.*

"The whole history of Anglo-Saxon civilization has been the history of a steady, tenacious fight against absolutism in the state, a fight which has been entirely successful. *Financial absolutism must be fought, and, in my opinion, the influences that will fight and overcome it will be that same Anglo-Saxon civilization which has CRUSHED ABSOLUTISM IN OTHER FORMS.*"—*Benjamin Kidd.*

The haughty, dictatorial conduct of the "divine" combine in the late coal strike to the governor of the state of New York, to the president of the United States, to the commission appointed to hear and arbitrate, tells us only too plainly the position of combined capital today. It is not only imperialistic, but assumes the position of absolutism. "*The earth is mine,*" and "*if you do not like me and my ways, all you have to do is simply to 'get off the earth.'*"

The "revolution" predicted by Dr. Wolsey is now here and certainly will "bring about a new order of things."

When Socialism prevails, and there is no other adequate remedy, we will have "changed cars for Paradise," at least for an earthly paradise.

IRA C. MOSHER.

Value and the Distribution of Commodities

That which determines how much of other commodities can be gotten for a certain quantity of a given commodity in a free market unaffected by monopoly or force or fraud is its value.

It is apparent that the better the commodity the greater its value and the greater its quantity the greater its value. That is to say in general of a quantity of a commodity compared with another quantity of the same that its value is greater if its usefulness is greater, and vice versa. It is accordingly easy and natural to draw the false conclusion that the value of an article depends upon its usefulness and is determined by the people's desire for it. A thing must be useful in order to be valuable; but nothing is valuable merely because it is useful. A thing more particularly and generally useful than water can hardly be mentioned. Yet water is without value where no one has to work to get it. It may be remarked just here that it requires more labor to make a good article, a good crop of corn for instance, than to make a poor one. It requires more labor to make more of a commodity. If it did not, if a good crop could be made without more labor than the poor crop, the poor crop would not be made at all. It is sure, therefore, if some of a commodity is better than another lot of the same, more labor is generally consumed to make it. The advance in value of one over the other has been preceded by an advance in the labor usually consumed. If comparison be possible, how much more useful is bread than gold, yet how much less valuable, because the labor of production of the latter is greater. If one picks up luckily a nugget of gold, his labor does not fix the average expended for our supply of gold.

Anything usually made for sale is a commodity; but it is impossible to compare the values of these things on the basis of their relative usefulness and people's desire for them. It is as irrational to try to measure the usefulness of iron with the usefulness of bread or of gold as to attempt to measure distance in pounds or temperature in feet. They are no more comparable.

Corn is not sold for corn or beef for beef or gold for gold. Commodities are sold for others not for the same generally. On what do the quantity of other commodities which can be gotten for a certain quantity of a given commodity depend in a free market? In other words, what is value? Where it is shown that no constant consistent relation can be between two things, the one cannot depend upon the other. One article is not worth more than another because it weighs more or because its volume

is greater. It can readily be shown by an indefinite number of instances that the values of commodities do not vary according to their relative weight, size, color, or any other physical properties. There can be no relation whatever between the values of commodities and their physical properties. Therefore there is no dependence one upon the other. Of all these properties combined the usefulness is made up. The value often does increase through scarcity, whereas the usefulness is less. Value falls where the usefulness has increased in many instance. A certain amount of labor will make now 35 times as many watches, 22 times as much wheat, 4,000 times as many screw posts, 111 times as many pairs of hose as it would without improved machinery fifty or sixty years ago. The products are better than the old. They are not accordingly more valuable. While a few would be sufficient, a multitude of illustrations could be found to show that there is no law of dependence of value upon usefulness and the desire for them. All commodities are alike the products of human labor. They are not exchanged in relative quantities according to their physical properties. We cannot compare their relative usefulness or people's desire for them. But we can measure the amount of human labor which society must expend to provide them; and there is a perfectly obvious and constant relation between the value of commodities and the labor of their production. The greater the labor of production of the commodity the greater its value, and the less the labor the less its value. The quantities of other commodities which can be gotten for a certain quantity of a particular commodity vary directly in a free market with the average amount of useful labor necessary to provide this commodity. This is the law of gravitation of commodities.

Averages are such elastic quantities and the average labor of society so particularly uncertain of close measurement, it is objected that such a basis as the above conclusion is dangerous for far reaching and important deductions. The conception of value presupposes the existence of a community or of a society. Where there is not the exchange of goods there is no such thing conceivable as value. Where there is the exchange of goods we have at least the beginnings of a community. Society values its supply of iron as much more or as much less than its supply of wheat as the labor of making its iron is more or less than the labor necessary to make society's supply of wheat. If society is obliged to expend twice as much labor to produce its supply of wheat as to produce its supply of iron, one billionth part of its wheat supply, suppose twenty bushels, would be valued twice as much as one billionth part of its supply of iron, say one ton. The value of commodities is seen to be society's labor to produce them.

For the measurement of length we take something having

length. And so for the measurement of value we take something having value, a commodity, and compare others with it. Anything with which society is supplied by human effort may be made the standard, money. Some of the things used have been very curious, cattle, beads, tobacco, slaves. Most convenient, because of the great amount of consumed human labor carried in the small bulk, are the precious metals. It is found convenient to have the money metal made into pieces of regular weight with the denomination stamped thereon—coin. So the human labor usually consumed in producing a few pennyweight of gold is made the standard for measuring the labor in other commodities. That commodity which is sought everywhere in exchange for other commodities and generally accepted as a universal equivalent of value is money. It is exceedingly undesirable to have a changing standard for measurement, as it would be exceedingly inconvenient to use a foot rule that varied in length, sometimes more and sometimes less than one foot. The use of a commodity as standard of value has therefore its disadvantages, since all commodities fluctuate in value with the changes in the labor of their production. Moreover, any commodity can be cornered, gaining thereby a temporary fictitious value. Government credit makes it possible to circulate stamped paper in place of this money commodity, while the public are confident of its exchange for the precious metal or other commodities. The basis of government credit is its power to tax the nation's industries. The standard of value might more reasonably be the average labor of a day than the average labor consumed in a certain weight of gold. The labor certificates, money, of an industrial democracy controlling the industries of the people would be less liable to depreciation than the negotiable paper now in circulation from our banks and other financial institutions and from the government itself.

That value is labor is not inconsistent with its being offered in any of its multitudinous forms, generally in money as the means of payment, for things which in the nature of them could not involve the consumption of society's labor for their production. Things which may be offered directly or indirectly as an inducement to labor come to possess a value as great as the labor they can induce.

Change in the demand for or the supply of a commodity so invariably precedes the fluctuation in its price and is so noticeable that it is rightly considered to be the immediate cause of the change in price and falsely understood to determine the value. Value is determined by the law of supply and demand, it is said. We have no controversy with these people, but let us ask them what determines the supply and demand. When the price for the time being is constant, supply and demand just balance each

other. One nullifies the effect of the other. What causes them to just balance at this price?

People are moved by an infinite variety of motives. The motive for work is to get the necessities first, and then the luxuries and refinements of life, and the gratification of that infinite variety of human desires which the labor of society can directly or indirectly, wholly or in part, gratify. In a community making commodities men don't make shoes to wear themselves. They make goods for the consumption of others, because it seems to each that his effort expended in this way will better gain the object of his desires than in any other that he can command. In a better industrial order men may find the motive for their work more largely in the love of it. From the same motives that individuals seek the greatest results for their labor, society buys in the cheapest market.

It frequently happens that change in the conditions of production so increase the labor necessary to turn out a certain quantity of product that the same labor cannot turn out nearly so much as before. The supply is short. Some who have expected to buy as usual at the old price, must go without or give more than they who sell may prefer to sell them. The value is advanced by the action of the law of supply and demand with the increase of the labor necessary. Or through an opposite change in the conditions of production, better crop conditions perhaps, or improved machinery, a certain amount of labor produces more product than before. The supply is now greater than the usual demand at the old price. Some must sell for less to sell at all. The commodity will be consumed where it would not have been consumed at the old price. The value falls through the action of the law of supply and demand with the decrease in the necessary labor of production. The price becomes constant again when adjusted so that supply and demand balance each other. The change in value is according to the change in the labor necessary; for this balance of supply against demand cannot continue if a given amount of labor expended in this kind of production or service gets much better or much worse pay and conditions of life, than the same effort expended in other employments. The entrance of the capitalist into the process complicates it without changing the result. He is at least as jealous of his profits as the laborer is of his wages, and can transfer his investment almost as readily as the worker can change his job.

Quite reasonably should we expect in the chaotic conditions of the perpetual financial war now prevailing, where no intelligence whatever can be devoted to the distribution of the productive labor of society, according to the various needs of society, that with one kind of goods the market will be flooded while the supply of an-

other commodity is so far short of the demand that some people will prefer to pay much more than the price due to the labor necessary in its production, rather than be inconvenienced by the lack of it.

Let us suppose that a premium is offered on the production of a commodity above the normal value because of an increase in demand which occurs without increase in the labor of production. The conditions of production of practically all commodities permit the processes to be hastened to meet unusual demand by the application of unusual labor. But the remuneration offered must be at least as great as the usual labor which must be consumed. It is not now a matter of making corn or iron or paper or some other commodity under the ordinary processes of production, but of forcing production in some places where conditions make this possible by the application of unusual labor. The price of the commodity now increases by the action of the law of supply and demand, just as much as the labor necessary to get the results required.

There also occurs from time to time a reduction of the demand for a commodity below the supply without change in the labor of its production. Other things have been found to better fulfill its purpose perhaps; or its purpose has ceased to be. A part of the labor of production has been useless labor, wasted labor, creating no value therefore, though necessary to produce so much more of the product than can be used. As before, the value of the aggregate product will be the amount of average useful human labor necessarily consumed in it, something less than the labor actually consumed.

It seems that there is a simple law of dependence of the value of a commodity upon the average useful labor alone consumed in its production, and that such constant dependence upon anything else alone cannot be shown to be. It is suggested that value is a dependent, variable function of several independent variables; the law of its dependence is not yet suggested, much less demonstrated. Special causes may present peculiar problems. A great many forces in a community may interfere to create unusual complexities, as the passing wind or a falling body disturbs the surface of the lake to its utmost limits. But it will be found at last that according to the general law, after force or fraud, or even a prolonged monopoly have spent themselves, the prices of commodities seek the level of the labor of their production as surely and persistently as water runs down hill. Value is abstract and distinct entirely from those concrete things useful to human wants in which it is embodied, and which constitute wealth.

The manipulation of value for the getting of more value without useful labor on the part of those who profit is common. In-

deed the consumption of human life in unpaid labor to create profits, interest, and rent is the basis of our business system. Those who successfully manage the accepted and legal processes by which this eminently respectable purpose is accomplished are the men whom we all delight to honor. They are not to be held responsible for a business system they did not design, and which they cannot change; but their willingness to profit by it and defend it is seen. To the value so manipulated only the term capital properly applies. Capital is value manipulated in one form or another according as in one or the other it is expected most rapidly to be increased beyond the useful labor its owners add to it. "Value, therefore, now becomes value in process, money in process, and, as such, capital. It comes out of circulation, enters into it again, preserves and multiplies itself within its circuit, comes back out of it with expanded bulk, and begins the same round ever afresh. $M-M'$, money which begets money, such is the description of capital from the mouths of its first interpreters, the mercantilists (middle of p. 82 of *Capital*). Its common processes have attained the standing of orthodoxy.

The power to labor being commonly for sale, has become a commodity. As a commodity its value is determined like the value of all commodities by the average labor necessary to produce such quantity and quality of it. The value of labor power is the labor of its production, the labor of producing and sustaining in working order a human being, that is the labor of production of the things he consumes. The opportunities of employment are limited by the chances of profit and the owners of the means of employment. The chances of profit are limited by the possibility of selling the products of industry at a price greater than paid for their production, and consequently greater than the producers can pay for their own product. The sale of the product is therefore dependent upon an expanding market ever beyond the field of present capitalist production. But physical limits have very nearly been reached; and the nations which are now a foreign market for our goods very rapidly become themselves manufacturers competing fiercely for the smaller foreign market remaining. Competition among workers for the inadequate opportunities of employment reduces the wage of labor to the price of its subsistence. The labor power of the man applied to the means of production will create more wealth than sufficient to sustain his own life. If the labor power purchased at the price of his subsistence could not create a surplus above what the laborer must consume, no wealth could be accumulated. The estimate made by the capitalist class in the last United States Census shows that in 1900 by the labor of the wage workers a value twice as great as their wages was added to the raw materials of the products of American manu-

facturers, after paying all miscellaneous and other expenses besides. (P. 982 of Manufactures, Part II, 12th Census of the United States.) But in order to invest a portion of his capital in the labor power which is the source of his dividends, the capitalist must invest a larger and ever larger part of his capital in the means of production which are not the source of his dividends. The machinery that saves more labor is more complex and more expensive, and in it more capital is tied up. It works up more raw material, with which it must be supplied, and in this more capital is involved. The capital invested per employe in American manufactures in 1850 was \$557, in 1900 it was \$1,721 (see above reference). Each wage worker must produce the interest on three times as much capital as fifty years ago. The part of his working day consumed in unpaid labor for the creation of profits over and above his wages must be increased, and the part paid for in his wages must by all possible means be reduced. We should expect accordingly what all available evidence converges to a focus upon proving. We are triumphantly told that the average wage of the American employe has increased 77 per cent since 1844. It is of no consequence that the productivity of his labor has multiplied, according to these gentlemen, ten or twenty times, and that against the resistance of the greatest monopolies the prices of his products have been but slightly reduced. Eighty-four cents will buy now what one dollar was required to pay for of the necessities of life when methods of production were crude; so that the average wage will purchase now almost twice as much. But the wage of the working class can now buy a smaller part of their product than ever before.

Since the illogical and unrighteous distribution of wealth produced in the present industrial system is its most intolerable wrong, the determination of the pay of the worker and the distribution of commodities in whatever business system this one is immediately to develop can be a matter of no small concern, and will be its first problem. As a business proposition, socialism guarantees to every worker the full product of his toil. Our principal objection to the present system is that some are enriched by the unpaid labor of others. Many people are confirmed in the belief that socialism involves equal pay to all workers in a co-operative state. A great many do not distinguish between socialism and communism. The motto of communism is, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." That this should be the fundamental principle of a business system immediately to replace the present one is obviously impossible, whatever the development of the industrial order may be beyond industrial democracy. It must be equally impossible to maintain a business system in which every worker receives the same pay for whatever service. This would

antagonize the very purpose of the socialist movement. It has never been proposed and would be impossible to restrict the desire to do useful work for which unlimited opportunities are afforded by nature. It is moreover true that the labor of various persons is not equally productive, nor could it be made so except in special conditions and to an approximate degree. All cannot receive the same pay, therefore, unless some are rewarded by the unpaid labor of others.

Very few commodities are the product of the labor of one or a few workers. The making of a watch, for instance, involves eight hundred operations. Whose, therefore, shall the product be? While it is plainly impossible to divide the product into the shares that belong to each worker, it is equally plain that the part of the work done by each can be estimated as to its time, its intensity, and its skill. And every worker shall be paid accordingly if each receives the full product of his labor; that is, if industrial democracy secures to every useful worker a share of the whole product of labor, the same as his share of labor. It is not his own product that the worker desires, but the products of other workers in place of his own. The fact that some particular workman in taking a day to make a certain thing consumes three times as much as the usual time, does not entitle him to the product of a day's labor three times as productive as his own, though he is entitled to his own product after the raw material is paid for. Nor would the fact that the skill of another man enables him to get in one hour the results of three hours average labor rightly deprive him of three times as much for his labor.

Here we are at once involved unavoidably in the exchange of commodities, and must consider the law governing, the law of gravitation of commodities. This law rules the middle or the dark ages of finance now passing "as an over-riding law of nature," notwithstanding the ignorance and defiance of its industrial lords. How accurately and how absolutely is shown in "Capital, A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production," by Carl Marx. The desire of men to get the greatest results possible for the effort expended is natural, and legitimate and enduring. The resulting economic law is equally enduring and strong enough to govern the past and present industrial systems not only without their recognition, but against the utmost resistance of their greatest financial institutions and the governments. If we are considering what may be the industrial system which may be expected to develop out of the existing industrial feudalism, rather than in speculations on the distant future, it must be concluded that economic law will rule as surely the immediate future as the immeasurable past. So are the prices of goods adjusted to accord at least approximately with the labor of their production. If the reward for ef-

fort in a certain kind of employment were better than for the same effort in other lines, labor would be attracted to that employment. The fact that an excessive number sought work therein would be the best possible evidence that the advantages of such employment are excessive. Vice versa, there could be no better proof that the conditions and remuneration of a certain class of work were relatively poor, and that injustice was being done than that the number seeking employment therein was insufficient to meet the requirements of the work. There must be readjustment accordingly. Mistaken attempts to fix arbitrarily prices and the wages of various kinds of labor would be overwhelmed, even if these mistakes were enforced by the greatest of all monopolies, the machinery of the state, organized society. That the equalizing of the attractiveness of the various employments and the approximate equalizing of pay would gradually result in industrial democracy "in order to attract or retain a supply of labor equal to the demand in any stated employment," is a happy condition that must grow out of equality of opportunity to all.

New York, July 26, 1903.

WARREN ATKINSON.

Ascending Stages of Socialism

The central idea running through that conception of the universe which the discoveries and generalizations of modern science have imposed upon the cultivated thought of the present day is that of evolution. We now know that nothing in the universe is fixed or stationary. All things are in a state of flux and constant change, and have arrived at their present state by a long-continued process of development. The solid earth under our feet was once a gaseous mist, and at this very moment is rushing restlessly and with unthinkable velocity toward the uncharted wastes of boundless space. The so-called "eternal hills" have many a time reared their towering summits to the skies only to be washed down again and again into the abysmal depths of the sea. The teeming and varied life upon the globe has risen from humble beginnings, and passed through many mutations of form and fortune, ere reaching, after the strain and strife of the ages, its present perfection and beauty of adaptation; and proud man himself must see in the *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, or extinct Ape-Man of Malaysia, the link of kinship that binds him to the rest of the animal kingdom.

Now the development of the human race from animality, and through savagery to civilization, has only been possible with the slow and concurrent development of its physical, intellectual and social powers, or faculties, and these powers or faculties must continue to grow and expand as man rises to a higher scale of life and a higher civilization. At every stage of human culture there must be an adaptation between the powers of the individual and the requirements of the social environment, and it is impossible to hurry on the development of social forms and institutions ahead of the development that is taking place in the powers of the individuals composing society. The goal of evolution is in that form of economic life in which there shall be a complete harmony of interests between the individual and society, and between each individual and every other individual; a harmony of interests which shall permit and make possible the full and unrestricted gratification of every man's desires without such gratification diminishing the opportunities for the gratification of any other man's desires, and in which none shall have desires which it shall not be possible out of the social abundance to thus fully and completely gratify; but the organic and industrial changes which are required to enable men to attain this most perfect state are too profound for us to rightly imagine that it can be brought about as rapidly as

paper constitutions can be amended, or as ideological conceptions can be nominally accepted as the political faiths of majorities.

The nature of man as he exists today in the regions subject to the conditions of modern civilization, is the result of the compromise between the egotistic passions inherited from and indispensable in that long period of the earlier evolution of life during which the maintenance of the species and the progress of being could only be achieved by universal conflict and unmitigated individualism, and the altruistic feelings generated in that later form of evolution under which fitness of life comes to mean fitness for social life, and under which conflict tends to give way to concord, competition to co-operation, and individualism to Socialism. While the individual is thus, at the present time, at about the middle point in the development of his moral nature between the conditions appropriate to the isolated and warring life of the past, and the conditions essential to the highest form of social and co-operative life, the changes that in the course of a century have revolutionized industry have suddenly brought us face to face with problems the solving of which requires an equal revolution in government and society and an equal revolution in the mutual relations of the individuals composing society.

The economic development has now reached the point where the old individualistic struggle for existence by the process of competitive production and the private ownership by the user of the means of production has become impossible. Competition is no longer the state of stable equilibrium in the economic life of society. The scale of production has grown and grown until it has become national and international in its magnitude, excluding ever more the possibility of a real rivalry of establishments, and the function of ownership of the now vastly enlarged and costlier machinery of production has become divorced, and necessarily so, from the labor of operating it, while being concentrated under the monopolistic control of a small non-producing class. The just and the unjust, the wise and the foolish, the industrious and the lazy, have thus alike fallen a prey to the exploitation of the few who now own all the means of life and labor, and upon whom society is dependent for the maintenance of its existence.

Clearly, such a state of affairs, so detrimental to the interests of an increasing majority, so destructive of the conditions of social welfare, cannot continue forever. The producers of the world will not indefinitely continue to permit the major portion of the fruits of their labor to be appropriated by a parasitic class owning the earth by divine right.

But a return to primitive individualistic production is now impossible. By an irrevocable edict of progress, production has now become a social function and must remain so. It is only the

private control of production as a source of unearned profit and the private appropriation by the non-producers of the profits of the social labor that must be eliminated; and this means the substitution of social control and social ownership for private control and private ownership. It means that Socialism is the only alternative to plutocratic individualism.

Here let us stop for a moment to see just what is meant by the word Socialism.

Socialism is a generic term. There are many kinds of Socialists and many conceptions of what Socialism properly is. Much confusion is hence caused since the advocates of any particular form of Socialism usually represent it and often succeed in having outsiders accept it as the real and only true Socialism. Neglecting, however, the narrow construction which fanatics, whether calling themselves Socialists or Individualists, would put upon the word, we will here define Socialism as being any order of society or doctrine favoring any order of society, under which the prevailing mode of production is by public agency.

Now when we study the works of the different writers, from Plato and Sir Thomas More to Bakounine and William Morris, who classed themselves or who would by the above definition be correctly classed as Socialists, we find that the essential difference in the teachings of these various writers consists in the different degrees of confidence which they placed in the individual, and the amount of external control over the actions of the individual which they believed to be necessary for the maintenance of order and the continuance of their system.

We find that, in general, the earlier writers favored rigid supervision and restraint, both in the field of production and of consumption, over the economic activities of the individual, and as a corollary thereto they also favored the existence of a separate supervising and regulating class not responsible to the masses of the people and whose members were to be recruited either by birth within the ranks of the regulating class, or by merit, or else by seniority; this autocratic system having been, indeed, actually realized in the Empire of Peru; on the other hand, the modern school tends to the opposite view as to individual liberty, particularly in the domain of consumption, and to the most unqualified democracy in government and administration.

Of course, it is out of the question to suppose that modern Socialists, simply out of respect for the opinion of theorists of another age, would consent to relinquish any part of the political progress that has already been achieved by the race under capitalism. We need not, therefore, here further discuss those social proposals of writers of past generations which the advancing thought and changed conditions of the world have left so far

behind. There is no danger of modern Socialism going deliberately backward in the path of political progress upon acquiring possession of the powers of government. The indications point rather to the danger of its going too rashly forward, with the use of the perfected political machinery, towards attempting to realize an economic idealism in the distribution of the product of the social labor for which humanity is as yet far from being ripe. It is in the formulæ of distribution or consumption of the various schools of modern Socialism that there is to be found food for thoughtful consideration at the present day.

If we keep clearly in mind the great truth of evolutionary philosophy, that the present organic and moral development of the race represents but a passing phase of its history, we must see that it is impossible to formulate a scheme of wealth distribution which shall be exactly suitable to mankind in its present state of organic and organically moral progress and which shall at the same time be equally applicable to any and all future stages of advancement. The normal form of distribution prevailing in any society must correspond to the particular stage of progress towards social perfection attained by its units. Any attempt to institute a higher and more idealistic form of distribution in a society than is warranted by the state of moral and organic development of its members must result in retrogression instead of progress; for where the individuals in a community would not voluntarily, and as part of their ordinary private conduct, regularly and habitually practice such self-restraint in the satisfaction of their various desires, both egoistic and philoprogenitive, as would maintain the equilibrium between the collective resources and the demands upon them, it would be necessary for the community, in its coercive capacity, to decide, by means of enactments having the force of law, what each individual's consumption should be. Thus the formula: "To each according to his needs," if that, for example, should be the principle of distribution adopted, would come to mean: "To each according to his needs as determined by others," and would involve the most odious and far-reaching tyranny in its practical application.

But Socialism, as we have seen by our definition, is not committed to any particular scheme of distribution. Socialism has to do, properly, only with the general mode of production. Each generation of the people of the future will have to settle by itself this question of distribution, whether it settle it right or wrong.

However, even though we are living in an age when the cause of Socialism has yet to be won, and indeed, for that very reason, it is incumbent upon us and in no way presumptuous, to endeavor by the method of scientific reasoning and with the light cast upon the subject by the philosophy of evolution, to solve, at least

to our own satisfaction, this problem of distribution under Socialism and to trace the changes in the form of distribution that must follow the rise of man as an individual to that higher organic life vouchsafed by the teachings of modern science.

We have seen that the fundamental difference between the various schools of Socialists consists in the degree of confidence they put in the individual and in the resulting more or less liberal measures they advocate as to the mode of distribution between the citizens of the Socialist Republic of the product of the common labor. We have also seen that according to the teachings of evolutionary philosophy, human nature is not unalterable, but is on the contrary undergoing a process of constant change, moving ever onward to a higher and higher stage of intellectual and moral development and tending ever to approach the state of perfect adaptation to the conditions of existence that must prevail under the most advanced and ideal social order. If this be so, then a mode of distribution and of the regulation of the social labor which would be wholly inapplicable for men as now constituted and as they will doubtless be constituted for a long time to come, might be perfectly appropriate for men of a more advanced type and at some future period of the world's development. The proposals of the idealists must, therefore, be condemned, not as being absolutely wrong, but as being wrong relatively to the time and the period of history in which they are now advocated. Viewed in this light, it becomes important to examine, even at some detail, these various proposals concerning the mode of distribution under Socialism, since the proposals foreshadow actual future stages of the economic development.

First, then, let us turn our attention to that most popular and least Utopian of these idealistic proposals; the proposal, namely, which would require that every individual in an industrial democracy shall receive an equal income from the community and shall in return be expected or compelled to give the utmost that he is capable of giving in effort for the common weal, at least within the regular hours of labor.

There can be no doubt that such a system of social economy, if we exclude the compulsory feature in the regulation of the individual's labor which it necessarily involves, represents a higher and more generous social idea than where the formula of distribution would be: To each according to his deeds. It must also be conceded that the spirit of solidarity and brotherhood which such a system must promote, must itself be conducive, to that extent, to more intense and more effective economic effort. Notwithstanding all this, however, the objections against this system of distribution of incomes are, as we shall see, too grave to permit

us to accept it as the form of distribution adapted for men as now constituted.

The rise of man in the scale of being as a member of organic creation may under one of its aspects be regarded as consisting of a growth or progressive increase in the amount of vital energy available to each individual, and the amount of energy available to each individual is dependent upon the biological law of use and disuse. It is by the exercise or *use* of any faculty that its power increases and it is by the putting forth of due effort or energy in the exercise of the various faculties that the total sum of energy or power of effort increases. But the amount of effort that must be put forth in the exercise of the faculties in order to increase their power, the amount of labor, physical or mental, that must be performed, in order as with sufficient nutrition, to permanently increase the sum of physiological and psychological energy at the disposal of the individual, is such as requires a painful and long continued overcoming of natural inertia. This overcoming of natural inertia is, however, indispensable to the organic progress of the race and the maintenance of a high and ever advancing civilization. As there is a difference in the amount of energy that can with the same relative effort be put forth by different individuals, and as there is a consequent difference in the relative value of their labor, physical or mental, the stimulus of reward in the product, or in the value of the product, is essential to induce the maximum social product, the maximum social efficiency, and the maximum social and individual progress.

The formula of distribution for the existing type of humanity, therefore, must be: To each according to his deeds. To be carried away by sentimental considerations and institute the system of equality of remuneration immediately or even within a few generations after the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth, would be fatal to the highest interests of human advancement and so diminish the total product of labor and the amount to be divided among each that all would lose. The more capable and productive individuals would not, on the average, exert themselves to the utmost of their power, when the fruits of their efforts would be shared in alike by the slothful and incompetent, and the latter, on their part, would also fail to labor as diligently as they might otherwise do, if all could partake equally and irrespective of one's personal merit or industry in the output of the wealth of a continent. In proportion to the diminution of the per capita income would the dissatisfaction with the system increase and the increasing dissatisfaction with the system would still further reduce the total social product and the total per capita income. Finally, if despite the manifest disadvantages of the system to the great majority of the population, the latter still

continued to give it their political support, as capitalism is now, for example, supported by its victims, the per capita income would become too small to provide the adequate physical and mental energy to the individual to enable him to labor so as to maintain production even at the point required to supply the bare necessities of life, and there would be at last result a breakdown that would compel the abandonment of the system.

From another point of view we may also see that the arbitrary equalization of incomes of the individuals in a society, and irrespective as it necessarily must be of their individual merit, is contrary to the intentions of nature and must in the end become impracticable.

That fecundity of life which covers the earth from Pole to Pole and from the highest mountain summits to the uttermost depths of sea with animal and vegetable organisms, in the human race likewise stimulates multiplication to the point where over any given area and at any given point in the development of the arts of production and of the institutions governing the distribution of wealth, population could not further increase without reducing the standard of living prevailing at the time by unduly raising the ratio of population to the natural resources and to the available supply of the means of subsistence.

Now where the incomes of the masses of the people depend upon each man's personal efforts or are directly proportionate to the value of their labor, taken individually, then where under the particular conditions as regards the productivity of labor, the natural resources of the country, the ratio in which the producers as a class share in the wealth they produce, etc., population reaches the point where any further increase would involve a fall in the average income and in the average standard of living of the masses of the people; there come into play certain forces and motives which act upon the individual so as to wholly or partly restrain such further increase. Each individual being obliged out of his own earnings, which are proportionate to his exertions, to provide for his own needs and for the needs of his family, if he have any, there results a tendency to restrain the average size of families and to raise the average age of marriage, and the fall in the birth rate which thereby ensues tends to maintain population at an equilibrium with the natural resources and with the desired standard of living.

Far different, however, must it be, where each individual is guaranteed an equal income with every other individual and irrespective of his own condition in labor and effort towards the production of wealth, and where, as a corollary thereto, each individual is also absolved from the task of providing at his own expense for the support of his offspring, however numerous these

may be, but has the cost of their maintenance and education paid for by the community. Lacking, as he must then, the motive which alone can restrain him from such satisfaction of his sexual and philoprogenitive instincts, as must in the natural course of things involve a rapid and progressive increase of population so long as the physical conditions permit; the income of each individual and the standard of living must, after a certain degree of populousness has been reached, begin to decline and to fall ever lower and lower until it has reached a bare existence level, and then, the motive for the restraint and overcoming of these instincts being still absent, the continuing births must bring about a state of overpopulation in which the scarcity and inadequacies of the necessities of life must result in so increasing the death rate as to bring it to an equality with the birth rate, and thereby, at last, establish an equilibrium, but an equilibrium based upon universal poverty, starvation, and misery.

It is often assumed, indeed, by Socialists of the "more advanced" or Utopian school, that by the biological law of animal fertility, according to which, the higher the scale of life the lower is the power of reproduction, we are justified in asserting that under the intellectually and spiritually stimulating environment of the Co-operative Commonwealth, the greater cultivation and development of men's higher faculties will so diminish the power of the lower instincts as to reduce the birthrate to a point where, while it will ensure the perpetuation of the race, it will no longer have a tendency even under a regime of economic irresponsibility in the relation of parents to offspring to cause overpopulation. This assumption is, however, as we must see, unwarranted. The fertility of a race is a function of its physical organism, and the physical organism and the innate power of the physical organism of any race or species can be perceptibly modified only in the long course of centuries or even of geologic epochs.

We are thus obliged to admit, that for many generations after the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment in its place of the system of collective ownership of the means of production and collective administration of industry, it will be necessary to leave untouched those basic principles regulating the relation between the individual and his product and between the individual and his progeny in accordance with which evolution has hitherto proceeded. To fit men for a higher life in the illimitable future which we know is ahead of us, the race must continue for an indefinite time to come under the dominion of that law of progress according to which each individual must be responsible in his own person for the results of his own actions, and according to which as parent he must be responsible for the maintenance and education of his offspring.

That social polity, then, which while it would secure to every individual equality of opportunity to the use of the means of production, would also ensure to each individual producer neither more nor less than the full value of his individual product, and which out of that product would oblige every individual to provide not only for all his own needs but also for all the just needs of his natural dependents, represents the first stage of Socialism through which the race must pass in its ascending journey toward the Perfect Commonwealth.

When, however, in the course of the further evolution of the race, man will at last have risen to the duties and responsibilities of the co-operative life; when, after the discipline of the ages, the individual will have been molded to the requirements of the future society; and when the old egoism, the old indolence, the old intellectual apathy and vacuity, the old savage passions and brutish appetites, will have disappeared and made way for new aims and desires, for new habits and feelings; when, in short, a new race will have arisen fitted for equality, equality will come.

The second stage of Socialism, however, the stage of equality, equality, that is, in the sense of equality of incomes, as depicted, for example, in Bellamy's works, is apparently not destined to be of very long duration. The superior attractiveness and superior economic advantages under conditions of high productivity of labor and high organic and moral development of the individual of that still more advanced state of society in which there will be neither money nor price, neither buying nor selling, will cause the Communistic principle of social economy to be adopted within a comparatively short period after the abandonment of the system of payment by results or payment according to the value of one's labor. There are practically no arguments against Communism which may not be urged with almost equal force against the system of equality of remuneration, and when the race will have become fitted by reason of its moral and physical adaptation to the conditions of a higher civilization and by reason of the progress in production to successfully apply the latter principle in its economic relations, it will not be long before it will be ready to enter into the next highest stage of social development which we are bound to recognize must be Communism.

Communism represents a higher civilization than mere Collectivism does. Communism represents a higher faith in the individual. Under Communism it would not be necessary to be perpetually carrying about documentary evidence, whether in the form of money or other credit tokens, of the right to partake of the means of existence. The purely economic advantages of this system, and considering merely the saving it would effect in the vast amount of labor now required in the collecting, receiving,

exchanging, etc., of money and other representatives of value are considerable. In some industries or forms of service from one-third to one-half or more of the cost of operation represents the labor of collecting the charges from the consumers or patrons; as, for example, in the case of street car transportation, privately operated bridges, turnpikes, etc. Even now we are compelled to acknowledge the utter wastefulness and impracticability, in many cases, of the direct payment system, by leaving our streets, public parks, and various other public utilities, free to all who would use them; and as time goes by the tendency to convert purchasable values into free and inalienable utilities will become more and more marked.

As fast as the private man will prove himself worthy of public trust; as fast as the public interest will be increasingly recognized as the individual's highest private interest; as fast as the instincts will become enlisted in the service of altruism, will it become safe to devote the wealth and the resources of the whole of society to the free satisfaction of the needs and desires of each individual. There will be no necessity for restraining consumption by limitations of purchasing power when there will be abundance for all, and there will be no incentive to extravagance in consumption when there will be no honor in ostentatious display.

But freedom merely in consumption does not represent the final and highest stage of social and economic evolution. Evolution cannot be said to have reached its limit until the adaptation of the individual to the social environment has become so complete that pleasure is found in the due performance of all the activities necessary for the maintenance of society. To this happy outcome of the evolutionary process we may, however, with full faith look forward. But when men will have come to perform all the needful labor of the world for the pleasure of the work; when the productivity of their labor, multiplied by now undreamt of inventions and unsuspected natural forces, will have become so great as to provide for their utmost needs; and when their moral development will have come to preclude the possibility of disputes as well about the distribution of the product as about the distribution of the work, there will be no longer need of external regulation; there will be no longer need of the rule of man by man; there will be no longer need of the State.

Anarchist-Communism is thus the best and highest stage of political and economic progress. But how unscientific it is to advocate in the present period of the world's development a theory of society which only after a transformation amounting to a revolution in the very nature of the race, a transformation that would under the most favorable conditions require thousands of

years for its consummation could scarcely then begin to be practicable.

The true radical is not he who would force the world into experiments which like that of the young frog that as related in the fable desired to expand to the size of an ox, could end only in disaster; but rather it is the man who, recognizing the limitations of our nature and recognizing also the possibilities of its development, would help to so order things that an environment would be created that would tend to the greatest happiness of the greatest number in the present while hastening the world's progress towards the more perfect society of the future.

RAPHAEL BUCK.

Economic Aspects of Chattel Slavery

(Continued.)

The greater cheapness of the wage slave made itself most apparent in the border states and consequently these states began to show a steady decline in the number of chattel slaves. As a result of this there arose a sharp division between two classes of slave states. Virginia, Maryland and North Carolina became known as the slave breeding states, while Georgia, Mississippi and Louisiana were the slave using states. This was accompanied by a shifting of the cotton industry to the southwest, or rather the shifting of this industry was a primary cause of the change in the center of the system of chattel slavery. Another reason for the rapid increase of slaves in Louisiana was the growth of the cane sugar industry. The following table showing the increase in the fifteen years preceding 1850 gives an idea of this movement. It is taken from James F. W. Johnson's "Notes on North America," published in 1851, Vol. 2, p. 363:

“In Louisiana there were of sugar estates and of slaves employed in the cultivation of sugar in

	With	Horsepower.	Steam	Power.	Total.	Slaves.
1844	671	480	762		63,000	
1849	671	865	1,536		126,000	

This same author points out the results of this system in a most vivid manner (pp. 354 and 355). “One of the most melancholy results of the system of slavery in Virginia, especially since slavery ceased to be profitable within the state itself, is the attention which proprietors have been induced to pay to the breeding and rearing of slaves and to the regular sale of the human produce to the southern states, as a means of adding to their ordinary farming profits—as a branch in fact of common rural industry. One of the representatives to congress from Virginia in a pamphlet on the slavery question recently published says: ‘Virginia has a slave population of nearly half a million, whose value is chiefly dependent on southern demand.’”

The author then makes calculations to show that it is much more profitable to raise slaves for sale than for use. “The number of slaves in Virginia is diminishing. In 1830 it was 470,000, while in 1840 it was only 450,000, and it is probably less now. The number sold, therefore, exceeds in a small degree (by 2,000 a year) the natural increase. Now the annual increase of the whole slave population is about 3 per cent, which upon 450,000 is 13,500. And if only 1,500 slaves a year be sold beyond this

natural increase, about 15,000 will every year go south to the slave markets from the state of Virginia. As these will generally be sold in the prime of life, they may be reckoned worth at least \$300 a head, which for the 15,000 gives \$4,500,000 as the price received for human stock exported every year from Virginia.

But Virginia produces yearly 50,000,000 pounds of tobacco, and 2,500,000 pounds of cotton, the value of which, at an average, of 8½ cents a pound, is \$4,375,000. That is to say, the slave rearing husbandry brings in more money yearly to Virginia than all its tobacco and cotton do. It is surprising, then, that the Virginians, both individually and as a state, should be anxious to enlarge and keep up the southern demand.”*

As the struggle between the two systems of exploitation grew sharper there arose a great amount of literature to show the economic superiority of wage slavery. One book which treated this subject most exhaustively was Hinton Rowan Helper's "The Impending Crisis." This book was written by a resident of the western portion of North Carolina, and right here it is worth while to note the fact that in the mountain regions of West Virginia and North Carolina and northern Georgia and Alabama there was a system of small farming and minor manufactures very similar to that existing throughout the northern states. As we might almost know without examination, this was a strong anti-slavery locality. It was from this region that Helper came. His book consists of a marvelous wealth of facts intended to show the economic disadvantage of chattel slavery. He shows how utterly deficient the south was in comparison with the north in manufactures, enterprise, education and material wealth of all sorts. He points out how the commerce of the south declined as that of the north grew; how the great cities of the south stood still while those of the north advanced by leaps and bounds; how immigration came into the north while it shunned the south; how land on southern plantations was impoverished and taxable property continually grew less and less in value while the reverse was true in the north.

This book had a most remarkable circulation in the years immediately preceding the war, and probably if the truth as to the real factors which made public opinion could be determined, it had far more to do with bringing on the Civil War than did "Uncle Tom's Cabin." At one time a committee of northern capitalists raised sufficient funds to circulate 100,000 copies of a

*McHenry, "The Cotton Trade," pages 212-13, denies that Virginia was a "slave-breeding" state and instances a law passed in 1812 by the Virginia legislature forbidding the exportation of slaves. See also Wilson, "Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America," Vol. I, pages 100-101, and especially Wm. Henry Smith's "Poetical History of Slavery," Vol. I, pages 2-5, where the whole subject is treated.

synopsis of it. When it is remembered that it is a book of over 400 pages some idea is gained of how important it was considered by the ruling classes of the North at that time. Copies of it are still generally to be found in most second hand stores, and I would urge every Socialist to buy a copy and read it, as it will prove an eye-opener to most people, especially if they have gained their ideas of American history from popular text books.

He addresses his book to the poor whites of the south and this calls attention to a class which is ordinarily overlooked. He makes the following classification of slave holders in 1850 which is of so great interest of showing how few men there were who really owned more than five slaves, at a time when one would naturally think from a reading of Southern literature that every white person in the South was a plantation owner.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE SLAVE HOLDERS—1850.

Holders of	1 slave	68,820
Holders of	1 and under	5	105,683
Holders of	5 and under	10	80,765
Holders of	10 and under	20	54,595
Holders of	20 and under	50	29,733
Holders of	50 and under	100	6,196
Holders of	100 and under	200	1,479
Holders of	200 and under	300	187
Holders of	300 and under	500	56
Holders of	500 and under	1,000	9
Holders of	1,000 and over	2

Aggregate number of slave holders in the United States347,525

He points out that even this table is inaccurate in that it includes slave hirers and some duplications and he computes that the actual number of slave holders in 1850 amounted to 475,525. Ingle, in his "Southern Sidelights," p. 263, states that this number remained practically constant until 1860. As there was a total white population in the slave states of 6,184,477 in 1850, it at once becomes apparent that the slaveholding class, like all ruling classes, was really but a small proportion of the whole.

George Weston wrote a book in 1856 which he calls "The Poor Whites of the South," in which he claims that their whole degraded position was due to slavery. His remarks as to the unimportant place which they played in determining public opinion, etc., are extremely interesting:

"The non-slaveholding whites of the South, being not less than seven-tenths of the whole number of whites, would seem to be entitled to some inquiry into their actual condition, and

especially as they have no real political weight or consideration in the country and little opportunity to speak for themselves. I have been for twenty years a reader of Southern newspapers and a hearer of congressional debates, but in all that time I do not recollect ever to have seen or heard these non-slaveholding whites referred to by Southern gentlemen as constituting any part of what they call 'the South.'

This appeal to the poor whites of the South by the Northern anti-slavery politicians was not so disinterested and ingenuous as it appeared on the surface. William H. Smith, in his "Political History of Slavery" (Vol. I, p. 76), says concerning a pamphlet issued by Salmon P. Chase and nominally appealing to the non-slaveholding Southern whites: "The chief purpose Mr. Chase had in view in addressing the non-slaveholders was to influence the political action of the intelligent working classes of the North, by bringing into sharp contrast the two systems of social order."

Here indeed was a delicate point for the Northern capitalist. The problem which confronted him was how to rouse the Northern wage worker to the fighting point against the South and chattel slavery without at the same time opening his eyes to the fact of wage slavery. It was necessary to find an "issue" which did not involve this dangerous point and yet on which the North and South would be divided. This was finally found in the cry of "Save the Union." Few people would learn from the text-books on American history used in our schools that the abolitionists were the most rabid disunionists, or that New England states had ever threatened to secede. The "Hartford Convention" of the war of 1812 is an example of the second point, while countless quotations from the abolition sources can be found to prove the first. Wendell Phillips was particularly violent in his advocacy of a dissolution of the Union. In 1856 he delivered a speech entitled "The Constitution a Pro-Slavery Compact," in the introduction to which he said: "To continue this disastrous alliance longer is madness. The trial of fifty years only proves that it is impossible for free and slave states to unite on any terms, without all becoming partners in the guilt, and responsible for the sin of slavery. We dare not prolong the experiment, and with double earnestness we repeat our demand upon every honest man to join us in the outcry of the American Anti-Slavery Society—"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."*

Even in January, 1860, after South Carolina had already seceded, Phillips delivered a speech in Music Hall, Boston, with a mob howling at the doors, in the course of which he said: "'The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice.' The 'Covenant of death' is annulled; the 'agreement with hell' is broken to pieces. The chain

*Capitals in original report circulated by the society.

which has held the slave system since 1787 is parted. Thirty years ago Northern abolitionists announced their purpose to seek the dissolution of the American Union. Who dreamed that success would come so soon?"

Two years later, however, he had changed his position and in a letter to the *New York Tribune* of August 16, 1862, he states that "From 1843 to 1861 I was a disunionist. * * * Sumpter changed the whole question. After that peace and justice both forbade disunion."

The reason for the fanaticism of the North on the question of the Union is at once apparent to any one with a knowledge of modern capitalism. In the strife for world markets the government would be a prominent factor and the capitalists desired that this government should be as strong, extensive and centralized as possible.

There was still another reason which was seen by some observers at that time and should at once occur to the Socialist student. Capitalism constantly demands new fields for exploitation in order to dispose of the surplus product which it takes from the laborers. For this purpose it has need of some territory with a lower economic organization than itself. This is the motive which impels the seeking of colonies. Kettel, in "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits," saw this point very clearly and thus states it (pp. 19 and 42): "We have seen that England, in the course of her colonial system, had, by furnishing goods and slaves, and enjoying the carrying trade of her dependencies, acquired a vast capital, while the colonies that produced that wealth had accumulated nothing; they had, in fact, become poorer. * * * The New England states from the first were mostly engaged in navigation and manufactures. It was there that capital first accumulated from application to those employments. Agriculture spread in two directions, viz., across the mountains to the west and southwest from the South Atlantic states. These two agricultural branches divided naturally into free and slave labor, and both sections held the same position to New England as all the colonies had before held to the mother country. The manufacturing and navigating states, as a matter of course, accumulated the wealth which the other sections produced."

Moreover, the capitalist class of the North had already learned how valuable the national government was to them in the enactment of tariff laws, the creation of internal improvements, the granting of land to railroads, etc. Edward A. Pollard, in "The Lost Cause," p. 52, thus describes the attitude of the North on this matter: "In the North there was never any lack of rhetorical fervor for the Union; its praises were sounded in every note of tumid literature, and it was familiarly entitled 'the glorious.' But

the North worshiped the Union in a very low commercial sense; it was a source of boundless profits; and it had been used for years as a means of sectional aggrandizement."

There is one phase of the evolution of the last two decades preceding the Civil War to which I have never seen any reference in any books reviewing this period with a single exception, to which reference will be made later. Yet it is one which could not have helped but add to the antagonism between the ruling classes. There was quite a tendency on the part of the Southern slave owners to enter the field of manufacturing. At the time this movement was attracting considerable attention. Among the numerous books which were written to reply to Helper's "Impending Crisis" was one by Thomas P. Kettell, which he entitled "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits," the meaning of this title being, of course, that the South was the real wealth-creating section of the country, while the North simply traded upon and exploited this wealth. He instances many figures (p. 53 *et seq.*) to show that manufacturing was increasing in a much more rapid rate in the south than in the north during the period from 1840 to 1850. From the census of 1860 we discover that this movement did not continue with quite the same rapidity that he expected, although there was a steady growth in the manufacture of cotton goods, boots and shoes and a few other branches.

The increase in the value of the production of cotton goods from 1850 to 1860 being 43 per cent, the total value of the production for 1860 amounting to \$8,145,067. In regard to boots and shoes the census of 1860 says: "In the southern states there was an increase equivalent to 89.9 per cent, the aggregate value being \$3,973,313." Kettell states the hopes of the southern slave owner in this direction as follows:

"What we do find in these figures is, that the south having become possessed of capital, is prosecuting manufactures at a rate which will soon make a 'home market' for its raw materials and place it foremost in the ranks of exporters of goods. The figures show that it is fast supplanting northern imported goods within its own industry. It will not, like the north, however, have provincial markets to supply, but having all within its own border, will actually diminish its purchases from the north. It will have foreign markets for its surplus. The countries of South America and Asia will be open to it, and if it there encounters British and New England competitors it will have the advantage of having unprotected developed its manufactures in the face of the competition of New England goods in the home market, and therefore become able to meet these goods in any market. If in a few years it does not become a seller of cotton goods to the north on a large scale, as it already is on a small scale, since Georgia and Alabama

cottons are favorites in New York, it will take none of them. The north will, however, still require food and materials and the scale of dependence may vibrate."

In many of these plants the negro slaves were being used. This whole movement is quite thoroughly described in Ingle's "Southern Sidelights," pp. 75-93. Here we find such papers as the *Dry Goods Economist* began to speak "fearfully of southern competition in cotton weaving." An English observer, whom we have previously quoted, Mr. James F. W. Johnson, says on this point, p. 364: "There is another aspect of this question which awakens gloomy apprehensions as to the future of the American slave. The introduction of the cotton manufacture into the slave states—Virginia, Kentucky, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Mississippi—in which there are some hundreds of factories, consuming already from 300,000 to 400,000 bales of cotton a year, has brought a new use of his slaves within the reach of the southern planters. The same power which compels them to toil in gangs under a burning sun will constrain them to waste life in the factories, if it can be done profitably to the master. The great difficulty of the manufacturers in the New England states is the question of labor—the scarcity of work-people, the high wages they demand, and the delicacy required to manage them. In the south these difficulties vanish. Slave labor is easily obtained and the slave obeys as mechanically as the machine he superintends. A great and rapid extension of the factory system is therefore looked for in the south and many predict that the manufacturers of the eastern states will sink before them."

Just how far this movement would have progressed under slavery is now of course impossible to tell. It is noteworthy, however, that in the years just prior to the Civil War a large number of "conventions" were held throughout the south where the need of offering encouragement to manufactures was the principal subject of discussion.

A phase of the subject upon which emphasis was not laid at the time, but which undoubtedly had its weight, is set forth in a decidedly remarkable preface to a translation of De Cassagnac's "History of the Working and Burgher Classes." This preface is written by Benjamin E. Green and is dated 1871. He declares that the entire object of the Civil War was to "divorce southern capital from labor." He claims that the northern capitalists realized the coming of a struggle between them and their wage workers and were determined that the southern capitalists should not enjoy the privilege of an undisturbed industry. He claims that "The advocates of low wages learned that abolition would produce pauperism, that pauperism would increase competition in the struggle for bread; that increased competition would reduce

wages, with cheaper food and coarser clothing and fewer of the necessaries of life to the laborers. * * * The great party that elected Mr. Lincoln made war upon and subjugated the south and abolished slavery that free labor might be made cheaper than slave labor; which simply means a reduction of the wages of free labor below the cost of feeding and clothing the negro and taking care of him in sickness and infirmities of age."

He gathers together a host of quotations from the speeches of Northern men before the war which seemed to bear out this interpretation. He sums the whole matter up in the following most striking statement:

"The real conflict was, not between free and slave labor, but it was between the capital that hired free labor and the capital that owned slave labor. The interests of the former required a system of legislation that would put down wages and put up the cost of living. The interests of the latter require a diametrically opposite system. Wages went into, and the cost of living came out of, the pockets of the capital that owned slave labor. Wages came out of, and the cost of living went into, the pockets of the capital that hired free labor. Mr. Seward and Mr. Chase were not long in discovering that herein consisted the philosophy of Mr. Jefferson's celebrated aphorism, 'The Democracy of the North are the natural allies of the Republicans of the South.' They were not slow to see that, while the interests and inclination of the capital that hired free labor called for a system of taxation imposing heavy burdens on the laboring classes, the interest and inclination of the capital that owned slave labor required a system of light taxes, high wages, fair prices for the products of labor, and cheap living."

This is, of course, the exact reverse of the idea which has been carefully inculcated in the schools and organs of "public opinion" in the North. Here we have always been taught to believe that "In essence it was from beginning to end a struggle by free labor at the North to free labor at the South."*

As the struggle went on the power of the North grew ever greater; railroads were flung through to the West to draw the allegiance of the Western farmer from Southern slave holder. The Abolitionists rung the changes on the word "free" to fire the enthusiasm of the laboring masses of the North. The efforts of the South to extend its territory involved the annexation of Texas, the Gadsden Purchase and the organization of filibustering expeditions against Cuba and Central America. The mighty flood of immigration which was pouring into the North

*A Political History of Slavery, by William Henry Smith. Introduction by Whitelaw Reid, p. XI.

was furnishing it with a body of voters who would soon deliver the government into the hands of their master, the capitalists.

This movement of extension I must pass over with far less attention than it deserves, as I hope to treat the whole subject of territorial extension in a later article. For the same reason I am compelled to omit all consideration of the part which the great frontier element played in this struggle, notwithstanding that these two points are perhaps as important as any belonging to the subject.

Indeed, it was the Frontier that finally turned the scale and Lincoln, who became the foremost figure in the whole conflict, was, as I have frequently said, a child of the Frontier.

Once that Lincoln was in power and the government in the hands of Northern capitalists there was absolutely no hope for the Southern slaveholder save in secession, and this notwithstanding the fact that the Republican party at that time was distinctly opposed to any abolition movement. But a ruling class which belongs to a social system already outgrown must, if it is to live, have complete and practically undisputed control of the machinery of government within which it exists. This was the case with the Southern slaveholders until the election of Lincoln.

Indeed this fact of the slaveholding domination of the central government was one of the principal causes of complaint by Northern writers and speakers. The presidency, speakership of the house, cabinet and federal offices had all been controlled by the slave power for the greater portion of the time since the formation of the government.*

During all this time the ruling class of the North was the clerical, capitalistic, trading and commercial class of New England. Owing to its peculiar character this ruling class lacked the flexibility and forms of Democracy which are the especial characteristics of a purely bourgeois ruling class. We see a somewhat similar phenomenon in the South at the present time. The old slave-holding aristocracy could never have produced a "Pitchfork" Tillman. It was only when competitive capitalism invaded the South that such as he appeared. In the same way it was really the highly competitive capitalism of the West that produced the party that was really capable of wresting supremacy from the chattel slave-owners. The Republican party arose from the frontier but was quickly accepted by the manufacturing capitalists of the East as expressing their position.

With the struggle of these two forces for supremacy, the Civil

*Helper's "The Impending Crisis," pp. 307-318 gives a complete table of the offices held by the North and the South since the establishment of the government. The facts in the text are taken from there.

War, Emancipation and reconstruction I must be content with short notice. It should now be evident to everyone that it is the rankest nonsense to talk about the Civil War being waged to abolish negro chattel slavery. Lincoln repeatedly declared such was not its object. Even after secession had begun and the War was almost upon the country, with Lincoln elected President, the leaders of the Republican party of the North offered to adopt a constitutional amendment forever securing the permanency of slavery in the South.*

When Fremont freed the slaves who came to his army during the early stages of the war, his action was promptly disavowed by the general government. Some of the generals even went so far as to return slaves to their masters and even to permit the latter to come within the Union lines and search for runaway slaves. Finally it was only as a war measure that emancipation was declared, and in no sense as an expression of any "moral sentiment" of the North.

The struggle from first to last was simply a contest between two classes of exploiters as to which should have the use of the general government for their purposes. That finally the North was only able to win by abolishing the particular method of exploitation in vogue in the South was largely an accident due to the fortunes of war.

I have had no time to treat save indirectly what is generally considered the most important phase of this whole subject—the contrasting forms of social organization which sprang from these two different forms of exploitation. This has already been done so many times that I think all my readers will know where to turn for anything they may wish to know in relation to it.

There is just one observation that I wish to make in reply to an alleged argument that is often offered in connection with the Civil War and its relation to the present effort of the wage-slaves to free themselves. It is said that it was not the negroes who freed themselves and therefore the Socialist position that "he who would be free, himself must strike the blow" is false. To this I would reply that the Civil War "freed" nobody, and least of all the negro. It was simply a squabble between exploiters for control of one of the instruments of exploitation—the general government. In the same way the illustrations and comparisons which are so often used by some Socialists in relation to the "freeing of the negroes" are essentially meaningless, since the grounds for comparison do not exist.

A. M. SIMONS.

*See Smith's "Political History of Slavery," Vol. I, pp. 331 to 343 *passim*.

EDITORIAL

The Ignorance of the Schools.

The surprising ignorance of Socialism which prevails in scholastic circles is an ever recurring evidence of the existence of class-divisions and the dominance of capitalist class interests. A visit to the class rooms of Sociology and Economics in almost any great university, would find much time given to the theories of society held by the Physiocrats and Mercantilists, and to theories of rent, interest, wages and profits long since forgotten outside purely scholastic circles. These long dead and gone and often admittedly false theories are studied from the dusty writings of their originators with greatest care against error and misunderstanding.

Now however crazy may be the philosophy of Socialism, it is older than many of these theories and has gained in importance ever since its first promulgation, and is now the working philosophy of a body of something over thirty million people, scattered throughout the civilized world, and with a tremendous influence on all fields of thought and action. Yet of this philosophy we find our universities most hopelessly and childishly ignorant. The majority of university curriculums fail to mention it at all. In a large and ever increasing minority some sort of teaching is ostensibly offered on the subject. In a great many cases (including some of our "best" universities) there is a course with some such title as "Social Reforms." The catalogue goes on to tell us that this course embraces a study of "Single Tax, Socialism, Eight-Hour Legislation, Organized Charity, and other schemes of social amelioration." If there be any among our readers who have received a college education at such an institution and have been thereby rendered incapable of realizing the ridiculousness of such a statement we would simply say that a corresponding ignorance applied to the biological department would include the theory of evolution in a course on "Hog Raising."

In perhaps a dozen of the really best institutions a course is offered treating exclusively of Socialism. Even then the text-book is all too frequently Professor Somebody-or-Other's "treatise," or "history" or

"impossibility" of Socialism. As a result the students come away worse than completely ignorant of Socialism, for ignorance at the worst implies an intellectual cavity to be filled, while their craniums are crammed with worthless rubbish.

In still fewer institutions the students are actually brought in contact with at least some of the writings of socialists. Even here, however, the students are kept from any knowledge of the real vital portions of the socialist philosophy. Not that any conscious attempt is made to deceive. It is simply a case of the "blind leading the blind" and both wallowing in the ditch of ignorance.

Such classes are generally assigned portions of "Capital," and this work, especially when attacked in this piece-meal manner with ignorant instructors, is absolutely unintelligible to the average college undergraduate. This may seem strange to those of our readers who can call to mind workingmen, absolute strangers to college walls, who have nevertheless mastered Marx's great work.

The workingman, however, sees in "Capital" but an accurate and carefully expressed analysis of his own life, experiences and closest interests. The average university student, even though he should occasionally be the son of a workingman, has had his mind so thoroughly impressed by the capitalist class-consciousness of the preparatory schools that he can gain access to the by no means simple propositions of Marx only across the broad chasm of divergent class psychologies.

All this would still be true even if Marx were fairly presented. But Marxism is a broad, comprehensive social philosophy, and not a series of formulas. Yet in all the university courses of Socialism concerning which we have been able to get any information, but two aspects of the Marxian philosophy have been presented, and these in a distorted form. Marx is presented as the formulator of a crude "labor value theory" and as the foreteller of a "co-operative commonwealth," and in both cases these are set forth in a utopian manner, as foreign as possible to the whole spirit of Marxian thought. Very little, if anything, is said about the materialistic interpretation of history, while the whole heart and soul of Socialism, the doctrine of social progress through class struggles is seldom even noticed.

And the strange thing in this connection is that these are just the phases of Socialist thought which are easiest to understand and which have been set forth in language that constitutes a model of clearness and logical form. In the scope of a small pamphlet, "The Communist Manifesto," written by the two greatest of Socialist writers, indorsed by hundreds of Socialist organizations, circulated during a half century by millions of copies in almost every known language, these fundamental principles of Socialism are set forth in words no one can well misunderstand. Surely even if such a pamphlet were filled with the veriest nonsense it would still merit attention because of its vast circulation and influence.

Yet a few years ago while we were lecturing before the Political Economy Club of the University of Chicago we held up a copy of this book before the over one hundred students present, nearly all of whom claimed to have studied Socialism more or less during their college course, and less than half a dozen had ever seen or heard of the work, and not one had read it. A less public but almost equally far-reaching inquiry at the University of Wisconsin exposed an equal ignorance, while conversation with Harvard students of a few years ago would indicate a similar condition there.

Another instance which shows how widespread ignorance of this work is in educated circles, was furnished by Mr. Ghent, the author of "A Benevolent Feudalism." He recently published a sort of roast of his reviewers in which he makes merry over what he evidently considers to be two contradictory statements appearing in the editorial notice of his book in this REVIEW, to the effect that while most of his ideas were taken from the Communist Manifesto, it was written largely from the small capitalist standpoint. A slight familiarity with the Manifesto would have shown him that his idea of capitalist class rule (which is all his "benevolent feudalism" really means) is there clearly set forth, without, to be sure, the fantastic terminology in which he has clothed it, and which, however clever it may be as a literary artifice, can scarcely be said to add to scientific accuracy of statement. At the same time he uses this idea in just the manner that would appeal to the little capitalist hoping to become an "industrial baron." Even more, if Mr. Ghent will read further he will find that the Communist Manifesto describes just that sort of literature and tells what part it really plays in social evolution. It is worthy of note as illustrating this same point that according to the aforesaid "roast" by Mr. Ghent none of the capitalist reviewers recognized the lack of originality in his book, while all the Socialist papers discovered this at once.

Still another example is furnished by the fact that not one of the hundreds of volumes written to refute, expose or explain away Socialism have ever clearly attacked the position set forth in the Manifesto. This notwithstanding the fact that these are the positions most clearly stated, easily understood, and most frequently repeated in all Socialist literature, while the labor value theory and the ideas of a future Socialist state are much less accessible to the casual reader.

We will venture to set forth in a series of postulates these fundamental principles, which are thus universally ignored, in the hope that if this comes across the vision of some scholastic observer he need no longer be compelled to plead ignorance on these points.

1. Social institutions are determined by the methods of producing and distributing economic goods.
2. Each economic system brings into the position of social rulership the possessors of the economic essentials of that system.
3. Improvements in the methods of production constantly make new

things essential economically and thus create a new class of social rulers who secure their domination only after a struggle with the previous ruling class. This is the method of social progress.

4. The present system has placed the owners of capital in possession of social control and they are using that control to advance their own interests.

5. Improvements in the method of production have now reached a stage where the capitalist class is less essential to social progress than the laboring class and hence the latter is struggling to displace the former with the certainty of victory.

6. The social system corresponding to laboring class domination of the economic system of today and of the probable future will have as its distinctive feature common ownership of the instruments for the production and distribution of wealth.

These are a series of simple assertions, easily understood and with no equivocation, yet we believe that ninety per cent of the literature of Socialism consists of elaborations and proofs of these. While many Socialists would disagree with the form in which they are stated and they have probably been much better stated elsewhere, especially in the Manifesto itself, yet few Socialists but would agree that they contain the essentials of the Socialist philosophy. Still one might search the hundreds and thousands of volumes that have been written by the opponents and critics of Socialism in vain to find any reference to them.

They are much more easily understood than the labor value theory or any fantastic theories of a future society. Why do not the scholastic critics of Socialism "expose their fallacy" if they are fallacious? If they do not do so are not Socialists justified in their belief that it is because those propositions are irrefutable?

It would be easy to go on and show from the writings of such men as Simon N. Patten, Lester F. Ward, Franklin Giddings and other of the foremost professorial exponents of economics and sociology, how they repeat as original, ideas long ago elaborated by Socialists, or how they ascribe to Socialists positions absolutely foreign to the whole Socialist philosophy.

Yet in closing we would wish to warn against the very justifiable contempt which most Socialists have for the writings of such men. It is true they are hopelessly ignorant of Socialism and no Socialist would take seriously anything they might say on that subject, yet they have often gathered quantities of material of greatest value to a knowledge of Socialism, and of much assistance in Socialist propaganda. At times also they have arrived at positions held by Socialists, or that help to support the Socialist position without themselves being aware of the fact.

Marx's Capital probably contains more references to non-Socialist economic literature than any work ever published, and the book could never have been written without a knowledge of that literature. Yet

poor and barren as most of the economic literature of the scholastic world of today is, it is much superior to that so carefully studied by Marx and it is a mistake on the part of Socialists to ignore it. Indeed it would be almost as easy to write on the ignorance of capitalist economics by Socialists as of the ignorance of Socialism by capitalist economists. Perhaps that may make the text of another editorial.

We publish elsewhere an article by Comrade Buck on "Ascending Stages of Socialism," to much of which we wish to express our dissent, notwithstanding its many excellent features. We do not believe that a particle of evidence has ever been produced to show that increase of population bears any direct ratio whatever to the economic well-being of the individual. It also seems to us that the utopian definition which is given of Socialism is so wholly out of agreement with the one which Socialists have come to accept that it is apt to merely mislead instead of explain. Neither do we think that it tends to clearness of thought to revive that other utopian idea which our opponents so often ascribe to us, that Socialism supposes the conscious "adoption" of any detailed "principle of distribution." It seems to us that such an idea is distinctly at war with the whole tendency of modern evolutionary thought, of whose application in social lines Comrade Buck has given us so many valuable examples.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Two important matters were acted upon by the convention of the International Typographical Union—one relating to the purely economic struggle and the other to the advanced political side. The Typographical Union, which is the oldest of the national organizations, was the first to give conciliation and arbitration a fair and general trial. But it looks as though the experiment has proven a failure—at least that impression is growing among the printers. The reasons are plain. The employers demand their own way in everything. For instance: In Seattle and Spokane, Wash., where the test cases took place that led to the rupture between the International Typographical Union and the Newspaper Publishers' Association upon the arbitration question the bosses started out as though it was a preconceived plan to make a farce of conciliation and arbitration. In Seattle the Union had made a request for an increase in wages and reduction in hours, claiming that living rates had advanced, which was just cause for higher wages, and that they had increased the output, which was a good reason why hours of labor could be reduced. Without attempting to controvert the facts presented the employers filed a counter proposition, demanding a reduction in wages and increase of hours of labor. Furthermore, they even had the audacity to ask that certain laws that had been adopted by 40,000 printers in a national referendum be made the subject of arbitration in their local contest. The Seattle Union requested that the questions go to the national commission, composed of President Lynch, of the Union, and President Driscoll, of the publishers. This the local bosses refused, whereupon the Union took the bull by the horns and enforced its new scale. Previous to this occurrence the printers of Spokane asked for an increase of wages. A monopolist controls the three newspapers, as well as "public opinion" largely in that city. The proposition went to an arbitration board composed of representatives of the printers, the newspapers and "the public." A preacher was the spokesman for "the public." Mr. Preacher was informed that he was expected to find for the newspapers, and he did as he was told. The printers' representative was even told that they did not need his signature to the agreement (?), and when the jug-handled contract was promulgated the workers refused to swallow it and went on strike, and then a loud hewl went up that the International Typographical Union had "violated every principle of arbitration!" In New York city the newspaper printers also put in a request for higher wages or a reduction of hours; they also proved that living rates had increased and that their output was greater than ever. Here also a preacher (a bishop, by the way) was chosen as the third arbitrator. This gentleman, after considering the testimony, was forced to admit that prices of necessity had advanced and that the workers had increased their output, but, he argued, "the public" should have the benefits, as the printers were receiving "fair wages" and the employers "fair profits." In Minneapolis the employers also succeeded, by the aid of a politician, in securing advantages over the workers.

Taking their cue from their fellow publishers in the aforementioned cities, the newspaper proprietors of Denver have met the demands of the printers for higher wages with a counter demand for a reduction of wages and lengthening of hours of labor. It is international law that newspaper printers work but eight hours a day, but that makes no difference to the Denver bosses. They insist that the law should be repealed and the men should work nine hours. No doubt the publishers in other cities will pursue the same tactics in the future.

This is the situation that confronted the International Typographical Union convention which met in Washington. President Driscoll, of the Newspaper Publishers' Association, was present and received a hearing. In a carefully prepared statement, which was sent over the Associated Press wires verbatim, he attempted to show that the International Typographical Union, through its officers and local Unions, had violated the principles of arbitration. But after hearing the testimony of the national officers and local Unions, which was cut and garbled to suit the "molders of public opinion," the delegates by unanimous vote endorsed the position of their representatives and refused to recede an inch. It was freely declared that the employers violated every principle of justice and decency, and that if they desired to destroy conciliation and arbitration agreement and were looking for fight they would be accommodated. The whole question is now up to the Newspaper Publishers' Association, which seems to have become "paralyzed," and it is for them to say whether it shall be peace or war.

Another matter of general interest was the International Typographical Union convention's action on the advanced political proposition. By a parliamentary trick sprung at a late hour during the night session preceding the day of adjournment an endorsement of the principle of collective ownership was defeated by a vote of two to one, but the following morning, when a resolution came up for the appointment of a committee to consider the question of taxation and its relation to wages, an amendment was attached thereto to instruct the committee to investigate and report upon the advisability of nationalizing trusts and monopolies. This amendment, after some sharp and fast debate, was carried by 76 to 18. While the majority of delegates were unquestionably non-Socialists, still there was a strong sentiment in the convention in favor of taking advanced ground. As one of the national officers put it: "The bulk of our members know little about Socialism, but I believe the printers ought to be tolerant enough to give this great and growing principle an unprejudiced hearing, and if they find that it contains the merit that its advocates claim we will be the first to acknowledge it." There were vague rumors during the early part of the convention that my action in the New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Labor, in advocating Socialism contrary to the "muzzle" resolution adopted at the Cincinnati session a year ago, would be condemned, that I would be impeached, etc., but there was no basis for such yarns other than the ineffectual attempts of a few political skates and office-seekers who hung about the convention to create trouble, especially for the Socialists. The action of the American Federation of Labor delegation as a whole was unanimously endorsed.

* * *

New York.—America's metropolis is in bad shape from the labor standpoint, especially in the building trades. The attempt of the contractors to abolish the sympathy strike and minimize the power of the business agents of the unions has largely succeeded. Over a hundred thousand men were locked out early in the season, and they were informed that just as soon as their unions signed agreements that had been prepared by and were satisfactory to the employers they might return to work. At first only a few of the smaller unions signed, then gradually some of the larger ones broke away,

and at this writing only the bridge and structural iron workers are standing out. This is an important organization, and under ordinary circumstances could keep the building trades tied up to a large extent, but the capitalists are playing a trump card by forming an opposition union composed of a heterogeneous mob of professional scabs, ex-members, non-union men and some who had formerly worked at the trade, but went into other occupations, and finally a sprinkling of skilled men who became disgusted with the Parks method of conducting affairs. Parks, one of the union's business agents, is now on trial for blackmailing contractors, and some damaging testimony is being brought out. It is alleged that he has become rich and lives like a prince, owing to his ability as a grafter. Then, again, the expose in the Stonecutters' Union, an officer of which has been sent to the penitentiary for stealing a large sum of money, and rumors of crookedness in other organizations, have greatly discouraged the honest rank and file, while some of the deplorable jurisdiction fights and internal dissensions have also tended to weaken organized labor and arouse the suspicion of the great mass of workers who are not in unions. There will have to be a general shake-up and weeding out in the unions of New York, and that very soon, if the labor movement of this city is to go forward. Furthermore, since the employers have combined and are daily strengthening their associations, and, of course, are unanimously backed up by the daily press (except the *Volkszeitung*, the Socialist party daily), the workingmen of New York are beginning to discover that it is necessary to secure control of the city's political machinery and use it for their betterment instead of being mere voting cattle for Tammany Hall and the Platt machine. Many of the active workers in all trades are joining the Socialist party or reading Socialist literature, and a prominent member of the party, who is usually careful and conservative in making estimates, predicted that the Socialist party would poll fully 40,000 votes this fall, or double the number of a year ago.

The thoughtful workingmen of New York are awakening not only because their organizations are being attacked by employers' combines, or because of the brutality of the police and courts during strikes, or for the reason that some of the corruptionists in their own ranks have been feathering their own nests while howling to the honest rank and file to keep clean labor politics out of union affairs, but on account of a wider spread of intelligence and a desire to enjoy more of the comforts of life. The sober-minded workers observe this great city increasing in population at a tremendous rate, and their own quarters are becoming more cramped every month. Thousands of foreign laborers are pouring through Ellis Island each week and many more are coming in from surrounding cities and towns, many of whom are attracted by stories of high wages and boundless opportunities to make fortunes. Naturally rents are steadily going upward, as well as prices of food products, and those who are lucky enough to receive \$2.50 to \$4 per day find that there is nothing left in their pocketbooks at the end of the month, although they may have exercised the greatest care in expending their wages. The highest paid workers usually live in apartments of six to eight rooms, for which they pay \$18 to \$40 per month. Then they must add car fare, insurance, union dues and other necessary expenses. Clothing is high and food products can almost be seen advancing in price, especially where they must be purchased at retail and in dribbles. Such a thing as a worker owning his home here and stocking his cellar with potatoes, vegetables, meats, etc., is not even to be dreamed of. About 6 per cent of the capitalists of the city own the whole of Manhattan Island, and they can tax the balance of the people almost what they choose. The laboring class leads a hand to mouth existence and the wolf of hunger and poverty is always at the door. As these facts dawn upon the intellects of the workers who are capable of thinking they begin to wonder what all their shouting for Tammany and Platt has amounted to, and when they contrast

their own conditions with those of the political boodlers whom they have supported their disgust tends to lead them into new channels of thought and action. Hence, the near future belongs to Socialism in New York, and it is a reasonable prediction to make that the Socialists of the metropolis will elect city councilmen and members of the State Legislature inside of two years. The old party politicians are keeping an anxious eye upon the growing new party, and not the least important work of the Socialists from now on will be to successfully meet the schemes and methods of the wire-pullers and machine-builders who have been in control of governmental affairs so long and used that power to create an arrogant, plutocratic privileged class on one side and to hold an army of wage-slaves in subjection on the other.

NOTE.—Comrade Hayes has agreed to write regularly for the Review while on his trip to Europe as fraternal delegate from the American Federation of Labor to the English Trade Union Congress.—EDITOR.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Bulgaria.

The Ninth National Congress of the Bulgarian Socialists showed a steady growth of Socialism in that country. The membership has grown from 2,180 in 1902 to 2,507 due-paying members in seventy-three organizations in 1903. An interesting phase of the report is the one relating to the education of the party membership. This shows that 116 had received university instruction, 545 intermediate school training, 1,785 had passed the primary grade, while only seventeen were wholly without scholastic training.

The party received 13,815 votes at the legislative elections of 1900; 13,283 in 1901, and 20,307 in 1902, when seven Socialist deputies were elected.

The party has organized popular schools for adults in many cities and villages. During the past year these have been attended by 418 regular students, of which 29 were women and 196 were members of the party. The income of our party during the past year was over \$1,500. Over 30,000 copies of an annual "almanach" were circulated during the same period.

The omnipresent question of "opportunism" occupied a large portion of the time of the convention. One faction of the party, led by Sakazoff, denied the existence of the class struggle and were calling for a union of all classes for the purpose of accomplishing some immediate reforms. This faction, like Bernstein at Lubeck and Millerand at Bordeaux, sought to avoid discussion by the Congress and declared that no "questions of principle" were involved, but only "personal quarrels between leaders." Nevertheless the Congress took up the subject. Towards the end of the debate three tendencies appeared. One, led by Markovsky, demanded that the party take the most radical steps to clear itself of all suspicion of opportunism. The second wished the Congress committed to the opportunist position. The third wished simply to place the party on record as opposed to opportunism, while leaving the individual members free to act as they wished. The last tendency prevailed and a resolution was adopted which denounced opportunism and reaffirmed the proletarian character of the party.

Hungary.

The National Congress of Hungarian Socialists, which has recently been held, contained 274 delegates, representing 165 communes. The Servian and Roumanian nationalities, which were wholly unrepresented at previous congresses, sent a number of delegates to this last gathering. Another interesting feature was the large representation from the agricultural districts.

During the past year the party has been carrying on an active campaign for universal suffrage, and a petition to this end received more than 170,

000 signatures. Great activity in propaganda work has been displayed. Public meetings with immense audiences, reaching at times to between 15,000 and 20,000 persons, have been held. The press has grown until there are nine Socialist periodicals. Several of the propaganda pamphlets in the Hungarian language reached a circulation of between 10,000 and 25,000 copies, while some of those in the Servian language reached over 6,000 circulation, which is much more than is usually attained by the bourgeois pamphlets in that language.

The *Arbeiter Zeitung*, of Vienna, tells of a celebration by the Hungarian Socialists of the enactment of a law of which they had secured the passage abolishing all Sunday labor in all mercantile pursuits in Budapest, and providing that mercantile establishments in the other portions of Hungary could only be open after 10 A. M. This is the result of a three years' agitation, in which 130,000 leaflets were circulated, a large number of public meetings held and many of the Socialists suffered imprisonment for taking part in the movement.

The *Neues Pester Journal* gives another view of the Socialist activity in Hungary in a news item describing a Socialist meeting, at which over ten thousand persons were present, which was held on the 21st of June. The account has the following suggestive conclusion: "The meeting, which had continued for over two hours, concluded. The Socialists dispersed with absolute order and the police found no reason to interfere."

Germany.

The more the election statistics are studied the more reasons the Socialists find for gratification, and the other parties for dismay and anger. The *Reichs-Anzeiger* has just discovered that not only did the Socialists gain from nearly all the other parties, but it succeeded in doing what has been for several years considered impossible—rousing the great non-voting mass to take an interest in political affairs. This paper publishes the following table, showing the increasing percentage of the whole voting population which is supporting the Socialists:

Year.	Per cent qualified voters.	Per cent actual voters.
1874.....	4.0	6.7
1877.....	5.5	9.1
1878.....	4.8	7.5
1881.....	3.4	6.1
1884.....	5.9	9.7
1887.....	7.3	10.1
1890.....	13.9	19.6
1893.....	16.8	23.2
1898.....	18.4	27.1
1903.....	24.1	31.7

Vorwaerts has recently secured and published a secret circular issued by an organization formed to abolish universal suffrage, which gives an interesting picture of the panic which the approach of Socialist victory is producing among the capitalists of Germany. A letter which accompanies the circular (the first edition of which is said to have been 1,000,000 copies) calls upon the capitalists of Germany to raise a fund for the purpose of fighting equal suffrage. This letter has as its opening sentence a quotation from Joubert to the effect that "Politics is the art of leading the masses, not whither they would, but where they should go." The circular proposes a sort of graduated suffrage modeled on the Belgian plan, giving additional votes to employers of labor and graduates of universities.

The emperor has given utterance to the very Delphic observation that "The Social Democracy is a phenomenon whose development must be awaited; it is not necessary at this time to deal with it." Just what this means every one is at liberty to imagine for himself.

The articles in the capitalist papers are about equally divided between those declaring that the Social Democracy has changed its character, and is now nothing but a Liberal party that will soon die, and those declaring that the Social Democracy is about to precipitate a violent revolution and proposes to overturn every social institution. Sometimes both kinds of articles appear in the same paper, and it is hard to tell which is the most amusing.

These same papers are amusing themselves in debating with great gravity the question which Edouard Bernstein raised as to whether the Socialists should accept the position of second vice-president of the Reichstag. *The Freisinnige Zeitung* declares that under no condition would the majority permit Singer to take this place. Indeed, this seems to be the general position. One cannot but feel that this is a high tribute to Conrad Singer. On the other hand, it should be something to cause Bernstein to blush that all agree that he would be especially acceptable to the capitalist class of Germany.

Italy.

The divergent tendencies within the Socialist Party have at last led to open division. Led by Turati, the Socialist Federation of Milan has left the party. The *Vorwaerts* correspondent declares that the dispute seems to be largely personal, although the seceders represent the opportunist wing. The branch of the party located in Rome has demanded the expulsion of Turati and his followers from the party, as there was some doubt as to whether the withdrawal of the organization from affiliation with the central authority really placed its members outside the party. In order to arouse as little antagonism as possible Enrico Ferri, the editor of *Avanti*, has declared his intention to keep the controversy out of that paper, except through the publication of such news items regarding it as may be rendered necessary.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Place of Industries in Elementary Education. Katherine Elizabeth Dopp. The University of Chicago Press. Cloth. 208 pp. \$1.25.

Socialists have frequently pointed out that the most modern pedagogy is simply adapting the philosophy of Socialism (generally unconsciously so far as the writers in this field are concerned) to education. This book is an excellent illustration of this fact. With a few unimportant exceptions it is simply an exposition and application of well-known principles of Socialist philosophy. The principle of economic determinism constitutes the whole foundation of the work, and is thus stated in the introduction: "From the remotest to the most recent times, in the simplest as well as in the most highly organized societies, industry has been a dominant force in the up-building and maintaining of social structures." The outline and object is stated to be "an attempt to bring together from the domain of education on the one hand, and of anthropology, sociology and history on the other, ideas that will mutually reinforce each other. . . . In order to secure a basis for the work it has seemed best to consider, on the one hand, the several stages of industrial development in the race with reference to the educational significance of each, and, on the other, the successive periods in the development of the child. In the consideration of an industrial epoch an attempt is made to discover (1) some of the more important interactions that take place between man and his natural and social environments; (2) how these result in different forms of industry, and (3) how forms of industry influence the social organization of people and the development of the sciences and arts. The attempt is also made to show that there is more than an accidental relation between the technique represented in the tool and the intellectual, moral and social condition of the people." The second chapter consists of a survey of industrial epochs, largely founded on Carl Bücher's "Industrial Evolution." The third, on "The Origins of the Attitudes that Underlie Industry," is an examination of the psychical effects of these stages as seen in the mental makeup of the present child. Each stage through which the race has passed has left its impress upon mankind in the form of inherited mental traits and attitudes. In obedience to the well-known law that the individual in his growth reproduces the history of the race from which he sprang, or, to express it in technical terms, that ontogenetic and philogenetic development are parallel, it follows that the education of the child should be adapted to the various social stages through which, so to speak, the child is passing in his development. The fourth chapter deals with "Practical Applications" of these principles, and, although of greatest value to the teacher, need not concern us here.

While almost the entire attitude of the book is Socialistic, yet the author seems to be wholly ignorant of the fact that she is covering ground that has often been treated before, and it is almost unnecessary to say that there are no references to the work of Socialist writers on the subjects treated. As usual also, the most important phase of her subject, and one which would

modify many of her positions, is untouched. This is the doctrine of the class struggle. She does not see that this constitutes an insurmountable obstacle to adoption of the methods of education which she advocates. It is safe to say that were the schools of any city to adopt the principles here laid down capitalism in that locality would soon be doomed. Just imagine a capitalist-controlled school system basing its whole method of instruction on the materialistic interpretation of history, where slavery was treated from the point of view given in the following quotations from this work:

"The advantages of agriculture as a means of furnishing an abundant supply of food from a small area soon became apparent. Man's labor acquired a value hitherto unknown. Captives in war were now too valuable to put to death. They were enslaved and compelled to carry on agriculture under the supervision of their conquerors.

"In the early stages of slavery there was little difference between the position of master and slave. Both did the same kind of work. With the increase in the number of slaves and in the property of the master it became necessary to organize the slave labor in gangs with overseers. Labor thus became compulsory, and disgrace was attached to the unfortunate members of society who became the victims of a stronger power. Society was cleft in twain, and the chasm has not yet been completely bridged. From this time labor became distasteful to the leisure class, not so much on its own account, as because of its association with an inferior class and with domesticated animals. . . . It became irksome to the slave because the problem was external to his own interests and needs. He was no longer free to choose his problems or to control the conditions under which he carried on his work. . . . Succeeding stages of culture have tended to perpetuate the distinctions between the leisure and the industrial classes first drawn in the pastoral and agricultural stages. Labor, which at first was a free manifestation of the whole being and the part of each member of society, came to be a forced expression of muscular movement of certain members of society.

"Industry, enriched by the contributions of science, becomes more and more complex. The end becomes farther and farther removed. The worker, no longer able to perceive the whole process of production, has need of a greater consciousness of collective life than ever before. His activity is no longer a personal occupation that brings him honor as in the period of household industry, nor a civic function, the actions and interactions of which are within the range of his perception, as in the period of handicraft labor, but a social function in a national if not a cosmopolitan society.

"The industrial development that has advanced from being a function of the household to that of the city, and finally to that of the nation and nations of the earth, needs to be paralleled by an enlargement of social consciousness from the personal, through the municipal, to such a consciousness as recognizes the brotherhood of all men."

Just how she expects this to be done it is necessary to say the author does not state. This defect in the line of thought the Socialist supplies. Remembering this fact, it is not too much to say that the book is really a contribution to Socialist as well as educational literature. It is one which every Socialist who is interested in education, and all Socialists should be so interested, should read. Those who are engaged in municipal work especially should make themselves familiar with its contents, for in few fields can Socialists accomplish more when elected to municipal offices than in the field of education.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

HOW WE PUBLISH SOCIALIST BOOKS

The last four pages of the August number of the International Socialist Review contain a condensed alphabetical list of a hundred and fifty books, most of which have been published within the last four years by the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company. Averaging the small books with the large ones, it is safe to say that this list represents an investment of about \$100 for each title, or about \$15,000.00.

All this has been done in spite of the fact that when in the spring of 1899 we began the publication of the literature of scientific socialism, we were without cash capital (as we are still) and were carrying a heavy load of debt. Meanwhile no one has made any large subscription of capital, and while we have sold great quantities of socialist literature, it has been at prices barely covering the cost of printing and handling, and yet we have doubled several times over the supply of socialist literature available for propaganda in America. How has it been done?

The answer is in the fact that our co-operative plan for supplying books to stockholders at cost has been enthusiastically accepted by the socialist party of America, not by any official vote, which would be unnecessary and unadvisable, but by the separate action of about one hundred socialist locals and six hundred individual socialists, who have each subscribed ten dollars to the capital stock of our company, for the double purpose of aiding us to circulate the literature of international socialism, and of securing their own supplies of this literature at cost.

We can not publish a list of these stockholders, for the reason that many of them are so situated that they might lose their jobs or otherwise suffer injury if their connection with the Social-

ist Party became public. We therefore publish merely the places where the stockholders are located. Boldface indicates that the local of the town thus distinguished is itself a stockholder.

LOCATION OF STOCKHOLDERS.

ALABAMA — Branchville, Fairhope, Phenix.

ALASKA—Valdez.

ARIZONA—Bisbee, Chloride, Flagstaff, Hillside, Jerome (two), Phoenix, Safford, Tucson.

ARKANSAS—Hot Springs, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA—Alameda, Benicia, Berkeley, Cedarville, Clarksburg, Colusa, Crockett, Dixon, Dos Palos, Dunsmuir, Eureka, Glen Ellen, Goleta, Grass Valley, Hayden Hill, Haywards, Healdsburg, Hemet, Lemoore, Los Angeles (eight), Morgan Hill, Oakland (two), Oxnard, Petaluma, Red Bluff, Redlands, Redondo, Rio Vista, Riverside (two), Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, (three), San Francisco (four), San Jose, San Marcos, Santa Ana, Santa Barbara, Sespe, Sawtelle, South Berkeley, Tulare, Vallejo, Westminster.

COLORADO—Buena Vista, Colorado City, Conrad, Cripple Creek, Denver (eight), Gunnison, Leadville (two), Newcastile, Ordway, Sterling, Telluride.

CONNECTICUT — Berlin, Bridgeport (two), Gildersleeve, Hartford, New Haven (two), Reynolds Bridge, Waterbury.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Georgetown, Washington (six).

FLORIDA—Gilmore, Key West, Kissimmee, Miami, Milton, Pensacola, St. Augustine (two), Tampa (two), West Palm Beach.

GEORGIA—Fitzgerald, Macon, Ruskin.

IDAHO—Boise, Burke, Garnet, Mullan, Moscow, Noble, Pocatello, Wallace.

ILLINOIS—Canton, Caseyville, Chicago, (forty-five), Chicago Heights, Dwight, Elgin, Evanston, Galesburg, Glen Carbon, Glen Ellyn (two), Groesdale, Illiopolis, Jacksonville, Kankakee, Keithsburg, Lake Forest, Leclair, McNabb, Melrose Park (two), Middle Grove, Oak Park, Pana, Peotone, Quincy, Rockford, Secor, Steger, Streator, Winnetka, Woodburn.

INDIANA—Anderson, Andrews, Boonville, Brazil, Butler, Evansville, Greenfield,

- Greensburg, Greensfork, Huntington, Indianapolis (two), Marion (two), Peru, South Bend, Whiting.
- INDIAN TERRITORY**—Krebs.
- IOWA**—Ames, Avery, Cedar Rapids (two), Clarinda, Davenport (three), Decorah, Des Moines (two), Dubuque, Independence, Lenox, Little Rock, Logan, Lyons, Muscatine, Ryan, St. Ansgar, Shelby, Sigourney, Sioux City, Van Horne (two).
- KANSAS**—Abilene, Beloit, Clay Center, Darlow, Enon, Fuller, Galena, Geuda Springs, Girard, Herington, Hillsboro, Kansas City (three), La Cygne, Lyons, Mulberry, Oketo, Osage City, Rosedale, Topeka.
- KENTUCKY**—Augusta, Covington, Louisville (four), Newport, Science Hill, Spottsville.
- LOUISIANA**—New Orleans.
- MAINE**—Bath, Intervale, Lewiston, Portland.
- MARYLAND**—Baltimore (two).
- MASSACHUSETTS**—Boston (five), Brighton, Chelsea, Clinton, Dorchester (two), East Boston, Everett, Fall River, Haverhill, Lawrence, Lynn (two), Newton (two), Northboro, Plymouth, Springfield (two), State Farm, Taunton, Vineyard Haven, Ware, West Fitchburg, West Newbury, Worcester.
- MICHIGAN**—Adrian, Allegan, Battle Creek (three), Benton Harbor (two), Detroit (two), Eaton, Rapids, Flint, Ithaca, Kalamazoo (two), Laurium, Grand Ledge, Grand Rapids, Holly, Ludington, Manistee, Saginaw, St. Charles, St. Clair, Ypsilanti.
- MINNESOTA**—Ada, Austin, Crookston, Fergus Falls, Holdingford, Hubbard, Lindstrom, Minneapolis (five), Montevideo, Noble (Local Angus), St. Anthony Park, St. Paul (two), Tracy, Two Harbors, Ullman, Willmar, Zumbrota.
- MISSISSIPPI**—Jackson.
- MISSOURI**—Bevier, Kansas City (three), New Madrid, Paris, Pleasant Hill, St. Joseph, St. Louis (nine), West Plains.
- MONTANA**—Aldridge, Anaconda, Billings, Bozeman, Butte (six), Chico, Fort Logan, Great Falls, Helena, Lewiston, Livingston, Monarch, Pony.
- NEBRASKA**—Blair, Columbus, Fairfield, Grand Island, Leavitt, Lincoln, Omaha (two), Simeon, South Omaha, Thurston.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE**—Chesham, Concord, Contoocook, Dover, Manchester (two).
- NEW JERSEY**—Arlington (three), East Orange, Camden, Moorestown, Newark, Paterson, Trenton, Woodbine.
- NEW MEXICO**—Albuquerque, Roswell.
- NEW YORK**—Albany, Arkport, Auburn, Bloomingburgh, Brooklyn (three), Buffalo, Catskill, Cold Spring, Kenwood, Mount Vernon, New Rochelle, New York (twenty-six), Northport, Peekskill, Port Jervis, Port Richmond, Rhinebeck, Richfield Springs, Rochester (three), Schenectady, Yonkers.
- NORTH CAROLINA**—Asheville, Cherryville.
- NORTH DAKOTA**—Chaffee, Devil's Lake, Fargo (two), Guelph, Mayville, Milton, Tagus, Valley City.
- OHIO**—Ashtabula, Burton City, Canton, Cincinnati (four), Cleveland (four), Conneaut, Corning, Crestline, Dayton, Fostoria, Hamilton, Latty, Martin's Ferry, Massillon, Maynard, Mechanicsburg, Sandusky, Springfield, Toledo (five), Youngstown, Zanesville.
- OKLAHOMA**—Bedford, Carmen, Cereal, Geary, Guthrie (two), Kingfisher, Lacey, Medford (two), Nardin, Oklahoma City, Shawnee.
- OREGON**—Albany, Baker City, Echo, Eugene, Medford, Oregon City, Portland (three), Shaw, Vale, Vernonia.
- PENNSYLVANIA**—Allegheny (two), Allentown, Braddock, Brownsville, East Pittsburg, Erie (two), Hughesville, Leechburg, Lehigh, Newcastile (two), Philadelphia (eight), Pittsburg (four), Reading (two), Renfrew, Rodi, Rowenna, Russell, Springchurch, Titusville, Wilkes Barre, York.
- RHODE ISLAND**—Providence (two).
- SOUTH DAKOTA**—Aberdeen, Sioux Falls.
- TENNESSEE**—Knoxville (three), Nashville (two), Et. Eimo (Local Chattanooga).
- TEXAS**—Bonham, Dallas, Fort Worth, Gonzales, Houston, Palestine, San Antonio, Toyah, Turnersville.
- UTAH**—Logan, Murray, Ogden, Park City, Plateau, Salt Lake City, Sunshine.
- VERMONT**—Burlington.
- VIRGINIA**—Newport News, Richmond.
- WASHINGTON**—Arlington, Ballard, Bremerton, Centralia, Charleston, Edison, Fairhaven, Hoquiam, Lynden, Olympia, Port Angeles, Puyallup, Redmond, Ritzville, Seattle (three), Silvana, Snoqualmie, Spokane (three), Sprague, Stanwood, Tacoma, Waterville, Yelm.
- WEST VIRGINIA**—Dallison, McMechen, Pennsboro.
- WISCONSIN**—Deer Park, Elroy, Madison (two), Marinette, Milwaukee (four), Two Rivers, Wausau, Whitewater (two).
- WYOMING**—Cheyenne, Laramie (two), Rock Springs, Sheridan, Lusk.
- BRITISH COLUMBIA**—Nanaimo, Phoenix Revelstoke, Slocan (two), Vancouver, Victoria.
- MANITOBA**—Winnipeg (two).
- ONTARIO**—Applehill, Collingwood, Dublin, Malton, Mindemoya, Simcoe, Kaga-wong.
- CUBA**—La Gloria (two).
- ENGLAND**—Salford.
- NEWFOUNDLAND**—St. Johns.
- SCOTLAND**—Paisley.
- DECEASED OR ADDRESS UNKNOWN**, sixteen.

Special Prices on Literature to Stockholders

International Socialist Review.—Single copies, 5c each, renewal of stockholder's own subscription, 50c, renewals forwarded for others, 90c. Subscription post cards, each good for the *Review* one year to a new name, will be sold to stockholders at 25c each until Dec. 31, 1903, after which they will be 50c each. These cards are not good for

Chicago or foreign subscriptions without the payment of 20c additional for postage.

Madden Library.—One cent a copy, 50c a hundred by mail; \$4.00 a thousand by express at purchaser's expense.

Pocket Library of Socialism, 2 cents a copy on all orders for less than a hundred; \$1.00 a hundred by mail; \$8.00 a thousand by express at purchaser's expense.

All other paper covered books published by us.—Fifty per cent discount if we prepay postage or expressage; sixty per cent discount if purchaser pays expressage. For example, a ten cent book is 5c if prepaid by us, otherwise 4c; a twenty-five cent book 12½c if prepaid by us, otherwise 10c; etc.

Cloth bound books.—Forty per cent discount if sent by mail or express at our expense; fifty per cent discount if sent by express at the expense of purchaser.

These discounts apply only to books published or imported by ourselves, and included in our catalogue. We do not solicit orders for books of other publishers, though as a matter of accommodation we endeavor to obtain them for our stockholders when the full advertised price is sent with order. All book orders should be accompanied by cash, except that when stockholders prefer, they may make a deposit with us and order books against it from time to time, thus saving the trouble and expense of obtaining many small postal orders.

A Dollar a Month Pays for Stock

Where possible, it is of course less trouble on both sides to pay the full ten dollars for stock at the time of subscribing. But our offer of books at cost to stockholders is made for the benefit of just the ones who are not likely to have ten dollars to spare at one time, and we have therefore developed a system by which we can receive a stock subscription if accompanied by one dollar, the rest of the money to be paid in nine monthly installments of one dollar each. A subscriber who has paid his first dollar will be entitled to all privileges of a stockholder except voting, provided he keeps up his payments at the end of each month as agreed.

No dividends are guaranteed, and while the question of declaring dividends

in future will be in the hands of the stockholders to decide, it is not likely that any will be declared, since the amount coming to each stockholder would in any case be trifling, and it will probably be thought preferable to use the earnings of the company to increase the variety and reduce the prices of socialist literature, after the debt is paid off.

Four years ago, the company was heavily indebted to printers, binders and paper dealers, and its notes, discounted by these creditors in Chicago banks, and maturing at frequent intervals, were a constant source of anxiety, while the rate of interest paid was high. Today, little debt remains except that to our own stockholders, and most of it is at five per cent interest, while the few loans at a higher rate can be taken up as soon as the capital is available.

The present capitalization of the company is limited to ten thousand dollars. We shall soon, however, ask our stockholders to vote on a proposition for increasing it to twenty-five thousand dollars. This will enable us to extend the privileges of stockholders to fifteen hundred more socialist locals and individuals, and we shall offer the stock only in single shares.

This co-operative publishing company with its seven hundred stockholders already comes far nearer to being under the control of the Socialist Party of America than any other publishing house, and the new issue of stock will be offered only to socialists, and only one share to each. Special efforts will be made to secure subscriptions from the locals of the Socialist Party, since thus the profit on books sold by the company at cost and by the stockholder at retail will go directly to the benefit of the party, and every party member will have an added motive for pushing the sale of literature.

The wide distribution of the stock over the whole country will ensure against the control of the publishing house falling into the hands of any local clique with factional ends to serve. The present directors, Charles H. Kerr, A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch, will remain in charge of the affairs of the company only so long as they satisfy the stockholders that they are using the resources of the company to the best of their ability for circulating the literature of International socialism, and when any of them become for any reason unable

to discharge the duties of directors, their places will be filled by socialists commanding the confidence of the rank and file of the party.

Is *your* Local already a stockholder? If not, bring the matter up at your next meeting and get action taken.

Are you a stockholder? If not, send on the ten dollars that will pay for a share, or the dollar for the first monthly payment, and have the satisfaction of knowing that you are a part of the co-operative company that is keeping the movement supplied with the literature of clear-cut, scientific socialism.

And if you are a stockholder, make sure that the privilege conferred by your stock certificate, of buying literature at cost, is utilized. If you have no time to sell books, perhaps there is another socialist near you who has the time but has not the money to pay for the stock or even for the books. You can buy the books for him and let him pay for them as fast as sold, and you will thus both be helping in the most effective propaganda. For it can not be repeated too often that to get a non-socialist to pay his own money for a socialist book is ten times as effective as to give him a book. What you give him he will look askance at, wondering what your motive is in offering it to him. What he buys he is going to read, so as to get his money's worth.

All this has been addressed to those who can help only with small sums. We can use large sums also, but not on a plan that will give a controlling interest to the large investor. If you have money from which under capitalistic conditions you need to draw an income while you live, and would like the money to be used ultimately for the spread of socialism, we can give good security for the carrying out of a contract that will ensure you a life income of six per cent on whatever money you invest with us.

Walt Whitman's Works

Whitman lived and died before economic conditions were ripe for an American socialist movement. Yet Whitman is distinctively the poet of American socialism. He foresaw the coming social change and rejoiced in it. He accepted the socialist foundation-thought of historical materialism, and upon it built up a nobler creed than theologians ever dreamed of. His writings to-day are a powerful inspiration for those who are in the thick of the fight for the coming revolution.

No edition of Whitman has thus far been easily accessible to socialists. Our co-operative company has therefore brought out a handsome library edition, about 350 large pages, printed in clear type on extra paper, and substantially bound in cloth, with gold lettering on the back. Our retail price is 75c, postage included, to stockholders, 45c by mail or 37½c by express at purchaser's expense. The best introduction to the poet's writings is the study by Mila Tupper Maynard entitled "Walt Whitman," price \$1.00, with usual discounts to stockholders.

Socialism and the Organized Labor Movement

A booklet by May Wood Simons bearing this title will be issued about the middle of September as number 39 of the Pocket Library of Socialism. It traces the historical growth of the trade union movement, and shows the inevitable tendency of the trade unions toward political action through the Socialist Party. Advance orders, to be filled on publication, should be sent in at once, since this booklet will be one that will be of unusual interest to union men everywhere, and it will be one of the most effective socialist propaganda pamphlets ever issued. Address

Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publishers
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago

THE REAL FACTS ABOUT RUSKIN UNIVERSITY

So many conflicting rumors have been circulated regarding the past, present and future of Ruskin University, that I believe the Socialists of the United States would like an impartial statement of the facts in the case. By way of preface I desire to explain that I am in no way connected with the management of the university, while I have had the best of facilities for personal observation of its work and acquaintance with its officers and students, since my residence is at Glen Ellyn, where it is located, and I am financial secretary of Local Glen Ellyn of the Socialist Party, the membership of which consists largely of Ruskin students.

While the Ruskin College was operated at Trenton, Mo., Walter Vrooman was its chief financial support. His connection with the institution was definitely ended at least three months ago. Socialists can hardly be blamed for looking askance at Ruskin while Vrooman was a director. He is a generous, whole-souled fellow with the greatest enthusiasm for Socialism as he understands it; but he is hopelessly erratic, and he refuses to work inside the Socialist Party, because he wants to be dictator in whatever is doing. He is out now and it is needless to discuss him further.

Ruskin University is an amalgamation of various schools, among which are Ruskin College, which removed from Trenton under the direction of George McA. Miller, and the Chicago Law School, at the head of which was J. J. Tobias. This Tobias became the chancellor of the university, in charge of its Chicago office in the Schiller building, while Miller, with the title of Dean, was in actual charge of the class work at Glen Ellyn.

An essential part of the University work which had been agreed upon by all parties concerned before the consolidation was that economics and sociology should be taught by Socialists, from the Socialist point of view, not, however, excluding their presentation from the capitalist point of view also if found desirable. As a matter of fact the only course on these subjects in the spring term of 1903 was a course of lectures on Socialism by May Wood Simons. I had the privilege of listening to most of her lectures and found them instructive and stimulating in a high degree. They were attended by a large proportion of the

students, and had a marked effect in clearing their ideas.

Toward the end of the spring term Chancellor Tobias evidently became alarmed at the growing prominence of the Socialist thought in the University, and resolved to check it if possible. He gave out interviews and newspaper letters falsely asserting that a small group of students was alone responsible for any Socialist tendency on the part of the University, and he undertook from that time to get rid of Socialist students and also of Dean Miller.

An animated though not noisy contest ensued for the control of the Glen Ellyn property and I am happy to announce that Miller has won out and that under his direction scientific Socialism will be taught at Ruskin by A. M. Simons, May Wood Simons, and probably soon by other members of the Socialist Party. Miller himself has not thus far been a party member, although he votes the Socialist ticket, but the logic of events is bringing him to us irresistibly. When he comes into the party organization it will be to stay. I have known him for years and know that he is a man to tie to.

Ruskin College may continue to affiliate with the various Chicago schools that with it made up Ruskin University, but it will have its own board of trustees, and its own local government, so that there will in future be no interference with its established policy of teaching the truth on social problems. It is the purpose of the college to furnish its students with employment, for a sufficient portion of their time to enable them to earn their board and room rent. Courses, both resident and correspondence, will be given by Mr. and Mrs. Simons as originally announced in history, economics and sociology. I can unhesitatingly commend the school as one to which Socialist parents can send their sons and daughters from fourteen years up, with the assurance that their minds will not be perverted by the capitalistic atmosphere such as surrounds most colleges. It is also the best possible place for a young workingman who desires to get a broad education while earning his own living.

It appears that inquiries from Socialists addressed to Ruskin University have been deliberately neglected by Tobias, who received the mail. To ensure getting a prompt answer address inquiries personally to Geo. McA. Miller, Glen Ellyn, Ill. The fall term opens September 15.

CHARLES H. KERR.