

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV

OCTOBER, 1903

NO. 4

New Tactics.

OUR opponents are once again pricking up their long ears. Quite in keeping with our usual custom, we have started an animated discussion just in time for our Dresden convention, and are carrying it on with our habitual spirited frankness. We are once again exchanging blows, and our enemies are anxiously watching to see whether that giant, the Socialist Party, will at last fall to pieces now, whether we will ourselves accomplish that which neither the hatred nor the cunning, neither the persecutions nor the temptations, of the enemies have been able to consummate. Of course, the hopes of our enemies are in vain. But the question suggests itself: "Is it necessary and appropriate to give rise to such hopes?" A man whom we all honor and esteem (comrade Bebel) has recently published in the *Vorwaerts* the angry words that "the time of hushing and mutual farce playing in the party is over." We, and with us probably the majority of the comrades, have asked ourselves with surprise, on reading these words: "How now? Those passionate discussions of the past years that shrank from strong expression and adjusted the internal differences in the party in the broadest daylight, were they nothing but hushing and farce playing?" In a certain sense we, too, admit that we play a little at farce comedy in the party and that we should make an end of it. We love to treat one another as adversaries, when we know full well that we are united for life and death by the same ideals, the same struggles, the same conviction and the feeling that our immortal soul is our immortal cause. We are a community bound together by a thousand indestructible ties—and yet we are so fond of creating the impression that the party consists of irreconcilable elements. At the same time, it is a proof of our

A reply of "Vorwaerts," August 30, 1903, which escaped the American Associated Press.

strength that we alone dare to express openly what would disrupt every other party.

If our party education is still lacking in perfection here or there, it is in the matter of party discussions. We are wont to rail impatiently at the theoreticians, although we are very proud of the theoretical fundament of our party. And yet we show a surprisingly small power of resistance against theoretical discussions which are not due to any internal necessity. The thing then grows like an avalanche, and in a short while it seems as if we had nothing better to do than to talk of the most indifferent matters, simply because it has pleased some theorizer to call attention to them. As it is only human to show personal likes and dislikes on such an occasion, when impulsive misgivings and the natural desire to carry a point enter into the question, the discussion often assumes an asperity which would only be justified, if vital principles of the party were at stake. A whimsical notion thus becomes a great principle or a terrible symptom of dangerous undercurrents. The popular, but not very useful, game of playing tag with the terms "principle" and "tactics" is diligently practiced. The worst of it is that in so doing we are wasting the time that might better be employed in the solution of weightier problems. Every one has the right in our party to get rid of his foolish notions by putting them into the party press and airing them in party meetings, and he must not be deprived of this human right, even if it serves as the only means of earning a reputation in the *bourgeois* ranks, or even of gaining the halo of a statesman and a smart and independent thinker. It might be desirable in such cases that many party editors should show a greater sense of responsibility by estimating in advance the probable effect of some literary notions and making use of their editorial duty of being the cool counsellors of hotheaded correspondents.

There is no justification for speaking in this new discussion of the "good old tactics" or prophesying the coming of a "new" tactics. The Socialist Party has rather arrived at a perfectly clear conception of the only possible tactics, especially during recent years, after a generation of hard struggles. There is neither an old, nor a new tactics. We have only THE tactics.

The tactics which the German Socialist Party is following did not fall from the clouds, but have been gradually acquired. It is not a sign of deep thought to refer to tactical problems with the more confusing than enlightening terms of radicalism and opportunism, marxism and revisionism, or whatever may be the names of intellectual sluggers. The fundamental principle of the tactics of the German Socialist Party is unalterable: it is the independent political action of the revolutionary proletariat resulting from the class struggle. But there have always been differ-

ences of opinion about the correct application of this principle, until the Socialist activity of recent years has clarified and unified our ideas on this point. The tactical problem lies solely in the connection of fundamental principles with the requirements of the practical politics of the day, of the situation to be dealt with for the time being.

This problem was also given for the bourgeois parties, but they have not succeeded in solving it. The pseudo-democratic liberalism started out by sacrificing all considerations of actual politics to the fundamental principles. Its tactics became a mere hollow demonstrative abstinence, which, e. g., led the liberalism of the fifties to yield to the new junker aristocracy that owed its existence to violations of the law. But this same liberalism ended by abandoning all fundamental principles and giving itself up to the shortsighted anarchism of ephemeral politics. Politics became a business with them.

Difficult as it is for the bourgeois parties to harmonize principle and practical politics, the difficulties increase still more for the Socialist Party in the same measure in which our fundamental demands assume the dimensions of a granite structure encompassing and transforming the world, a structure from which not a single stone can be broken and which towers above the bourgeois reform ideas, confined by their national and temporal limits, and representing only a loose collection of suggestions for reform.

It goes without saying that the Socialist Party could not solve in a single day this thorny problem of establishing internal unity between principle and practical politics, and that without contradiction and friction. There were vacillations and mistakes, we felt our way and experimented, until finally the problem was admirably solved, ripening in the course of historical development.

At the end of the sixties, the participation of the Socialist Party in the reichstag's elections was still a moot question. And when we finally took part, unwillingly enough, we thought that it was irreconcilable with our demonstrative agitation to make laws together with the bourgeois parties, to join, e. g., in the demand for industrial legislation. But this sterile attitude, while resolved upon, was never carried out. The Socialist mind was much too eager to work and did not permit itself to be crowded out of the daily work of society. We have only to recall the memory of the heated struggle over our tactics in the second balloting, the resolution of the national convention forbidding Socialists to vote for the radical candidates, and the opposition to the participation of our reichstag's representatives in the convention of seniors. In 1885, a resolution was adopted in Frankfurt, reminding our representatives that their practical work in the legislatures had very little value, and that their agitatory

work was most essential. The fight about the advisability of participating in the elections for the city councils was especially animated. In a great mass meeting at Berlin the most embittered struggle took place. One comrade said: "We don't want any half-way work. Anyway, it is a violation of the Socialist program to take part openly in a class election." An advocate of participation declared that those who opposed them were police spies. The following resolution was finally adopted:

"Whereas, The expenditure of intellectual and material strength in the participation in the municipal elections stands in no proportion to the benefits to be derived therefrom; and

"Whereas, Experience has sufficiently shown that the conquest of a few seats in the city council does not assist the rising development of the working class, while it opens the door to unscrupulous office hunters and authority grabbers,

"Resolved, That we decline to take part in the municipal elections."

That was an example of the "good old tactics," even if the resolution was declared unfortunate after more deliberate consideration.

The last great tactical struggle arose over the question of participating in the landtag's elections. In 1893, it was decided not to take part in them, especially because "it is contrary to the established principles of the party to compromise with our enemies during elections, as this inevitably leads to demoralization, and to schisms and dissensions in our own ranks." But it was recommended to carry on an active propaganda for universal, equal, direct, and secret ballots in the landtag's elections. One of the speakers declared: "Compromises are treason; they sacrifice the principles of the party." Nobody declared in favor of participation at that time. The resolution may have been quite correct at that moment, but its justification was incorrect. For in a matter of compromise, everything depends on the question who is the leader. For a small party, compromises easily become dangerous, and make it subject to its enemies. But if that same party has grown strong and takes the leadership so that it can make its own conditions, then there is no longer any danger, and it would be suicide to abstain from political action, even under the most unfavorable election laws. In this way a resolution which may have been all right in 1893 becomes a grievous error in the course of time. Today, there is hardly any difference of opinion as far as participation in the elections is concerned, and they are now considered as the best means of starting a live agitation.

With the settlement of the question of the participation in the landtag's elections, the last tactical question has been solved.

There is no other possible question of tactics on this field. For participation in a bourgeois government is out of the question in Germany. We have established complete harmony between principle and political tactics. We have learned the art of grasping every advantage for the proletariat, without sacrificing one particle of our fundamental principles. We are working in every field, penetrating into all institutions, but we do not think for a moment of trading or sacrificing the birthright of our democratic and Socialist demands for the sake of momentary advantages. This is THE clear and conscious tactics of the Socialist Party, which is not the "good old" one, neither does it require any revision.

It seems almost as if it was due to the overconfidence in our sense of unity that has prompted some subtle party writer to place the question of the vice-presidency on the order of business of our public discussions. Whoever has read the above historical reminiscences will not wonder at the fact that this paltry apology for a problem has again assumed the dimensions of a "symptom" or even of a "principle."

Now, it is perfectly plain that this question of the vice-presidency does not belong to that class of important discussions which we have formerly had in the party. It is simply a notion. It is not a question for the Socialist Party at all, but at best a question of parliamentarian self-respect for the bourgeois parties. For apart from the question of going to court, the matter is entirely indifferent to us as far as practical consequences are concerned.

Then, too, the bourgeois parties do not intend to satisfy our claim. True, in 1895, after the presidential strike of the conservative-national parties in consequence of the refusal of the reichstag to honor Bismarck, we were offered the second vice-presidency. But we declined the questionable honor right in the initial stages of the proceedings. Today, the center party has become the ruling party, and does not pay any attention to parliamentarian justice. They deny our claim for very specious reasons, even though they weaken the bourgeois parliament in so doing.

Nevertheless, we make our claim simply because we do not give up any right to which we are entitled. We do not expect to gain any advantages by this action. On the contrary: Careful observers of the tariff fight have long ago arrived at the conclusion that a Socialist vice-president would be rather harmful than otherwise to us in critical situations, and that it would be much better for us, if decent bourgeois representatives, who are mindful of their duties of president under all circumstances, were to hold that office. A few comrades who unfortunately are endowed with diplomatic gifts, think otherwise about those advantages. It may be admitted that this is a mistake, but it certainly is not

a crime, much less a reason for a great party action with all its concomitant "symptoms, principles, opportunisms and radicalism."

There is so little to be said about this very simple and quite unimportant question of the vice-presidency, that it is almost like a fairy tale that so much could have been said about it. And if a few party leaders have had some very wholesome tilts over this question, there is no reason for complaint. For really, the fate of the party does not depend so much on the opinions of the leaders, whose principal functions are those of counselors, educators, trustees, and experts. The hopes and the dangers are vested in the masses. As long as this bold, idealistic, far-seeing, and yet calm spirit lives in the Socialist Party, conceiving of the whole field of economics and politics as an inseparable unit, just so long will the party remain strong and invincible, and we need not fear the only real danger, viz., that the party might fall a victim to the disease of a short-sighted policy of special interests. Whether this or that leader speaks or writes one thing or another makes very little difference, compared to the great possibilities of our development. These fateful developments are not decided by literary notions. Everyone has simply to do his utmost toward a strong forward movement of the spirit of the masses, by which the intimate union between principle and practical politics was accomplished.

We should not have felt the desire to once more touch on these tactical discussions, which no one can compel us to regard as of any importance. We should count them among the customary summer discussions, that do no harm and serve no useful purpose. But the present political situation suggests to us the apprehension that an essential part of the Dresden convention might be wasted in useless internal discussions. That convention should be devoted entirely to matters of prime importance. It should sharpen the steel against all the enemies that surround us.

Never, perhaps, has the Socialist Party stood at the eve of such tremendous developments as those that confront us now. Let us not deceive ourselves. Our victory has made a deeper impression on the ruling classes and on the leading circles, than they show outwardly. There is something stewing and brewing. It is apparent that the center party intends to become the savior of the state. If the Prussian schools are delivered into the control of that party, then it is willing to lend its hand to any rascality of the government.

Under these conditions, the Socialist Party has no time to fritter away on such discussions as have been going on recently. We have only one duty: To reflect in what manner, under what forms, we can use our three million votes in the interest of the proletariat, of the German people, and of the future.

Translated by *Ernest Untermann*.

The Class Struggle in Great Britain.

THE world's great and ancient metropolis looks like the pictures one sees in books, from the first reader to the latest magazine, and so the weary pilgrim does not feel very strange after he lands. However, you, at once miss that headlong rush and rattle-de-bang noise seen and heard in New York and Chicago. The Englishman don't seem to be in a very great hurry—even the stage-coach horses take their time as they plod along through the narrow streets.

In an American industrial center we find the working class hurrying to the shops and factories at seven in the morning. Here an hour later is considered early. The nine-hour day is pretty generally observed, and especially the Saturday half-holiday. The well-organized trades only work eight hours a day. Wages, of course, are not as high as in the United States. Neither are the living expenses. On the whole, the English workingman lives as well, but hardly any better, than the American toiler. Judging from appearances, the Britishers wear as good clothes, live in as good houses, eat as well and are as strong and healthy, and have as many sports and amusements as the so-called Yanks. All of which goes to prove that the socialist philosophy is correct—that the capitalists of any nation allow their workers only sufficient to keep body and soul together and to propagate another generation of toilers; that the workers are compelled to wage a class struggle to maintain what they have gained in the shape of higher wages and shorter hours, and that only in proportion as they become educated and fight for increased advantages do they secure better conditions.

Great Britain, as we in America have learned in a general way, is busily occupied in extending the functions of municipal governments—they call it municipal socialism. Even the most reactionary Tories do not seem to have the horror of the word socialism that is formed among some of the poorest workingmen in the States. In fact, many of the Tories seriously regard themselves as the guardians of the common people, and they take a sort of paternalistic interest in those who produce wealth for them. For the profits that are turned over to them they appear to feel that they have some obligations to meet.

Hence we find that in nearly all of the principal cities the street railway systems are owned and operated by the municipalities. They also furnish light and power and are pushing the experiment of razing the slums and erecting decent habitations, which are rented to the workers. Baths, wash houses, milk depots, markets, libraries, and many other useful institutions are being established, and while those popular or populist reforms do not affect the capitalistic system materially, yet unconsciously

the bourgeoisie is treading upon dangerous ground. Labor's appetite for this sort of thing is being sharpened, and, irrespective as to whether or not the taxes of the capitalists are being somewhat lowered, and whether exploitation is being shifted from individual employers to the municipality controlled by their politicians, the fact remains that these experiments are being carried on, and successfully, too; and as, stated above, the workers are becoming familiar with the former bugaboo of socialism, and there are plenty of signs that indicate that in a very short time labor will take control of these municipal works and conduct them in its own interests, paying no attention to the taxation detail.

This view of the situation is being taken by the leading trade unionists of the country. Upward of \$1,500,000,000 of property has been municipalized in Great Britain, and the work is going forward at an accelerated rate, and the unionists make no secret of their intentions of securing control of the powers of government for the purpose of conducting public affairs in the interest of the people who produce the wealth instead of a few property-owners, who are everlastingly growling about taxes.

Great progress has been made among the workers of this country toward entering the political field with a united front. The unions and socialist parties have formed an agreement to work together for the election of members to Parliament, there to compose a distinct labor group. At present there are fourteen labor men in Parliament, and it is expected that at the next general election, which is likely to be ordered soon, that number will be doubled at least. Over a million members of trade unions are now assessing themselves for the purpose of creating campaign funds, and every week adds to the number. They are really in earnest, judging from the statements of their officials and newspapers, and, as it is estimated that fully one-third of the workers in the trades are organized, it can be seen that labor is bound to play an important part in the next contest for seats in Parliament.

The causes that produced this unexpected activity are many. In the first place the workers of Great Britain, like those of every country, are becoming more highly educated. Then, again, there has been quite a long period of hard times over here, and the insecurity of work has made the laboring people quite discontented with the old political parties. The South African war has increased their burdens in certain directions, while the employers, besides introducing labor-saving machinery, are also inclined to force upon them new schemes to drive them to increased production. The fact that the government passed a bill that will extend a measure of home rule to Ireland, which will make it possible for the Irish peasant to own land in twenty-one years, while the British workers will remain at the mercy of their aristocratic landlords, is causing much discussion. But probably the

most important question that the unionists are discussing, and the one that has opened their eyes to the necessity of using their political power, is the Taff-Vale decision and the hostile acts that have resulted therefrom. It will be recalled that the railway workers were mulcted out of a sum of \$114,000 about a year ago, as damages for striking and picketing. This decision fell like a bomb in the camp of the trade unions. It opened the way for a general assault upon the treasuries of the organization, and the employers have not been slow to take advantage of the situation. At this writing there are two more cases being fought in the courts. The miners of South Wales had enforced a system of "stop days"; that is, they ceased work on certain days to prevent the accumulation of a great surplus of coal, reasoning that the operators would use such surplus to enforce a reduction of wages. The men argued that they were wholly within their rights, because the employers had the power to, and, indeed, did, close down when it suited them. But the masters objected to the men taking the initiative, and brought suit for damages. The bosses claim they have suffered losses amounting to no less than \$350,000 owing to the enforcement of the "stop day" system. The Court of Appeals has already decided in favor of the bosses, and the union carried the case to the House of Lords, the supreme court of the land. In view of the interpretation of law in the Taff-Vale case, there seems to be little hope for the miners, as the "law lords" are not likely to reverse themselves. I am informed that the cost of this case will amount to \$250,000, and if it goes against the Welsh miners it will bankrupt them. The Yorkshire mine owners have also filed suits against the men of Cadeby and Deneby, and they place their damages at no less than \$620,000, which, with the costs, will bring the sum at stake close to a million dollars.

It can be taken for granted that this condition has aroused organized labor of Great Britain as nothing else ever did. The men see their years of saving and self-denial dissipated at one fell swoop. For years, in sunshine and in storm, they have placed their dependence in their unions, and now to have their only prop knocked out from under them is a severe blow, indeed.

The employers of Great Britain are also combining quite rapidly, and some of their syndicates are being merged with American trusts, thus assuring them of the abolition of cut-throat competition. No doubt within a couple of years this country will be in control of trusts as absolutely as are the people of the United States.

All of these questions will come up for discussion at the British Trade Union Congress at Leicester next week, and the indications are that the organized workers will take a long step forward to secure their emancipation from the wage-slavery of modern capitalism.

Max S. Hayes.

Socialism in Japan.

IT IS NOW over two years since I wrote you about socialism in Japan. During those years Japanese socialists have had varied experiences, but on the whole we have gained a firmer ground for socialism than two years ago. Socialism in Japan is now a recognized social force, much hated and feared by capitalists and the capitalistic government. Nowadays socialists' speeches are always interfered with and stopped short. Their freedom is trampled down in gross violation of the laws and constitution. Our police authority and courts are all deadly against the socialists. The old time-worn press law is strictly enforced upon our publications. Within three months our organ, *The Socialist*, was condemned and two numbers confiscated and the editor fined. For what reasons? It only published a translation of a poem, "International Liberty," in the one and a short article on socialism in the other.

We started on a socialist agitation tour some seven weeks ago, during which we visited ten prefectures and fourteen cities and towns. We held nineteen meetings in these places, and over half of the speakers were either interfered with or stopped and could not complete their speeches. In some cities our meetings were stopped at the very beginning. In one instance before the meeting was begun the police stepped in and dispersed the peaceful citizens who were present at the place of meeting. They were driven out of the hall by force in a most barbarous manner, violating the personal liberty guaranteed by the constitution. We are utterly powerless under these injustices, for laws and courts are all against us. The administration court to which we can appeal in such a case of injustice will never give a verdict for us, but invariably sustains the official acts.

Just now I am with only two young men, Messrs. Nishikawa and Matsugaki, working for the cause of socialism by giving all our time and energy and money. It is a very feeble attempt for the cause of socialism, but so much is the all we can do. There are a few able writers and speakers among socialists, but it is a sad fact that they cannot give their best time and energy to this cause, for they are all engaged in some profession, generally journalism or education. We feel that we ought to be doing more, but we socialists are few and poor and cannot do much. This trip of ours gave a light on our future, for the authorities seem determined to crush socialism and stop its spread by police force and oppression. We will fight out our cause at any cost.

While the horizon of socialism seems so sad and gloomy, we are nevertheless increasing in number and power everywhere. We have gained many adherents in those cities in which we held our

socialist meetings. These timely sown seeds of socialism will grow on the fertile ground of oppression, degradation and corruption caused by the capitalistic injustices and cruelties.

We found everywhere evils of capitalism. In the Navy Yard at Kose men are compelled to work thirty-six hours in one stretch and sometimes two full days and nights, or forty-eight hours in one stretch. Among the collieries in Kinshiu there are men, women and children of all ages working twelve hours in a deep coal pit. These coal pits have a depth of 2,000 feet, are dirty and unhealthy, without any protection for limbs of miners. Sometimes a mother with a child of two or three months goes down the pit to help the husband miners by carrying coals. During these twelve hours the child is left in the dark wet hole to breathe foul air. It is said that out of 7,000 miners some 800 persons were killed last year in one colliery having seven pits or an average of two and one-half persons killed every day through the year. But none of these atrocious crimes committed by the colliery owner Mitsuit are condemned by the press or law.

Tokyo, Japan, August 24th, 1903. *S. J. Katayama.*

The Referendum Movement and the Socialist Movement in America.

THE socialists of this country were the first to call public attention to the referendum. As early as 1889, the Socialist Labor party embodied in its national platform a referendum plank. It soon gained popularity with all reformers, and was in 1900 forced into the national platform of the Democratic party. Persistent agitation by the advocates of Direct Legislation has in many places compelled the Republican party as well to declare for the principle of the Referendum and the Initiative, so that at present the demand for it may be said to have spread beyond party lines. Singularly enough, the Socialists have scarcely taken part, as an organized body, in the agitation which owes to them its origin. This remark is not made in a spirit of fault-finding, for the writer is himself but a recent convert to the cause of Direct Legislation, and bears his individual share of responsibility for the lukewarmness of the Socialists towards this movement; he believes, however, that the facts which have convinced him may convince others that the Referendum and Initiative open to the Socialist parties a new and fruitful field for independent political action, without imperiling the integrity of the party or its uncompromising political attitude and without in any way interfering with other forms of political action.

Let us first see what has been accomplished by the movement for Direct Legislation. In South Dakota, the Legislature, a majority of whom were Populists, Silver Republicans and Democrats (fusionists), submitted, in 1897, to the voters of the state the question of adopting the Referendum and the Initiative. Most of the Republicans in the legislature voted in favor of the reform. At the next election, 1898, the voters adopted the system. In 1899, the Republican party, which then had a majority in each House, enacted a statute to put it into operation. The new act confers on the voters the veto power on any bill which has not received a two-thirds majority in the legislature. No such bill may become a law until the voters have had 90 days to examine it and, if found objectionable, to file a petition signed by five per cent of the voters and demanding that the bill be submitted to a referendum at the next election. The voters may likewise initiate legislation by filing a petition embodying a bill to be voted upon at the next election.

In Oregon, a constitutional amendment giving expression to the same principles was proposed in 1898, and adopted by a Republican legislature; under the Oregon constitution, an amendment must be passed by two successive legislatures and ratified by a popular vote. In 1900 all parties pledged their support to the

measure; the Republicans again had a majority in the legislature; the amendment passed the legislature and was submitted to the people, who in 1902 adopted it by a vote of 11 to 1. An act carrying this amendment into effect was passed by the legislature in February, 1903.

- In Colorado a constitutional amendment was adopted at the November election of 1902, providing for the amendment of the municipal charter of Denver by the Initiative and Referendum. Five per cent of the voters of the city and county of Denver may initiate any municipal ordinance or charter amendment and the proposition must be submitted to a popular vote at the next general election.

In Los Angeles, at the municipal election held December 1, 1902, a Direct Legislation amendment to the city charter was adopted by a vote of 12,846 to 1,942 (6 to 1). The amendment was ratified by the legislature on January 25, 1903. The amendment enables five per cent of the voters to initiate city ordinances at every regular municipal election.

In many other states the enactment of similar laws cannot be delayed very long. In Utah the Referendum and the Initiative have become a part of the constitution, but the constitution has been nullified by the legislature, which has so far refused to enact a statute to carry the principle into operation. Still such an anomalous condition cannot continue forever.

In Illinois the legislature in 1901 enacted a law for the submission of questions of public policy to a popular vote upon the petition of 10 per cent of the voters in the state, or 25 per cent in a municipality. Under that law a referendum was taken in the next spring municipal election (1902) in Chicago, upon the question of public ownership of street railways and lighting plants and resulted in a large majority for that principle. At the fall election of 1902 Direct Legislation agitators secured more than the requisite number of signatures to a "proposal question of public policy" in favor of a constitutional amendment embodying the Referendum and Initiative. The proposal was submitted to the voters of the state and received 428,000 affirmative votes against 87,000 in the negative. As this expression of popular opinion is as yet not mandatory upon the legislature, a bill in favor of a Direct Legislation amendment to the constitution was voted down at the last session of the legislature. Yet, in this country public opinion is the court of last resort, and there is little room for doubt that ultimately the Solons at Springfield will have to yield to the popular will.

In Missouri an amendment to the constitution was adopted March 11, 1903, which provides for the Initiative and Referendum upon a petition signed by from 10 to 20 per cent of the voters of each congressional district. The amendment is to be voted upon in the November election of next year. The per-

centage is unreasonably high and the law is so framed as to make it inoperative; yet in Chicago the requisite number of signers to the municipal ownership petition was as high as 25 per cent of all voters, and yet the requisite number of signatures was secured.

In Nevada, a Direct Legislation amendment passed the legislature March 12, 1903, and now awaits the vote of the people at the coming election. In Massachusetts a Direct Legislation bill was passed by the House of Representatives on May 5, 1903. In Idaho and Washington similar amendments received a majority in the legislature, but the vote in each case was short of the two-thirds required by the constitution; it is now only a question of winning over a few votes, and continued public agitation will ultimately accomplish that result.

On the whole, the results are encouraging, especially because they have been accomplished without lobbying, but by the pressure of public opinion. The persistent agitation of labor organizations and other non-political bodies forced the politicians to action, for fear lest the other party might gain votes by the advocacy of the popular demand.

With every Socialist party worker the question will arise, What particular benefit will accrue to the Socialist party from the Referendum and Initiative, that it should expend its energy in agitating for a reform which is likely to come through the efforts of others? In an article addressed to Socialist readers it would be a waste of time to dilate upon the justice of the principle itself, for it has been for a long time in practical operation in party affairs; the question need here only be treated upon the ground of expediency.

Up to this day political action by Socialist parties in this country has been confined to nominating candidates and electioneering; in but a few cases this agitation resulted in the election of Socialist candidates. Surely, if immediate success at the polls were the sole object of the Socialist parties, as it is with other parties, the results would not justify the energy expended. Socialist nominations are made because, it is thought, first, that they offer an opportunity for Socialist agitation, and second, that they enable us to gauge the Socialist sentiment abroad in the country. It is also believed that the gradual growth of the vote from one election to another advances the day of ultimate Socialist victory at the polls.

For any one of these purposes the Referendum and Initiative offer invaluable opportunities to the Socialist party.

The platform of the Socialist (formerly Social-Democratic) party consists of a declaration of general principles and a number of "immediate demands," whose enactment into law is urged pending the final triumph of the Socialist party. A great deal of opposition has been developed within the party to these "imme-

mediate demands." It is argued that the Socialist party upon gaining control of the political machinery, will be in a position to carry out the full programme of Socialism, so these "immediate demands" would be superfluous; prior to that day, however, these demands could not be enacted in any other way except by a non-Socialistic party, which is considered undesirable.

These objections are removed by the Initiative and Referendum. In South Dakota the Socialist party is today in a position to formulate all its "immediate demands" into bills, circulate petitions in support of them, and if 5 per cent of the voters are thus enlisted the bills must be submitted to the vote of the people of the state of South Dakota. In this manner any of these demands could be enacted into law over the heads of old-party politicians, full credit accruing to the Socialist party initiating the desired legislation.

In Los Angeles the Socialist party need no longer wait for the election of its candidates on the city ticket, in order to make its voice heard in municipal affairs. There were about 30,000 votes cast in Los Angeles at the last election; 1,500 signatures are sufficient to initiate municipal legislation. The vote for Debs in 1900 was 995; thus it is easily seen that the Socialist party would have no difficulty in securing a sufficient number of signatures to a bill embodying into law any of the propositions of the Socialist municipal platform.

The same is true of Denver, where there are about 40,000 voters; the requisite 2,000 signatures to an Initiative proposition for a municipal ordinance or charter amendment could be secured among the Socialist voters themselves.

In Illinois where the law authorizes the submission of broad questions of public policy to a popular vote, the Socialists might, if they thought it expedient, submit today the question, Shall all means of production and distribution be owned and operated by the people? Or they might embody the same principle in a number of concrete propositions relating, e. g., to the stockyards, the packing houses, the coal mines, etc., and thus gradually educate the public mind in the principles of Socialism.

That this must prove a powerful means of Socialist agitation is undeniable. The ante-election agitation continues at best for one or two months, whereas the circulation of petitions will require active work all year around. More than that, it will make every Socialist from a mere sympathizer an active agitator. The Socialist vote at the last election stood about 280,000, whereas the aggregate membership of both Socialist parties hardly reached 20,000. That leaves 260,000 men who express their belief in Socialism by casting a Socialist vote once in 365 days. If it became necessary, however, to collect a vast number of signatures to a Socialistic petition, each one of them would be constituted a committee of one to circulate it among his friends

and neighbors; questions would be asked, and every Socialist, who may not have the abilities of a public speaker, would have the opportunity of presenting the principles of Socialism in an informal talk to his acquaintances. A vast number of people could be approached in that way, who are not reached by Socialist meetings or by the Socialist press. The benefits of such an educational campaign cannot be overestimated. If the Socialist party should meet with sufficient support to have any of its propositions submitted to a Referendum, it would bring the principles of Socialism directly before the whole people, something which cannot be accomplished by any other available method of political agitation.

Let us next consider the second argument in favor of campaigning, viz., that it serves as an index of the strength of Socialism. While it is so as far as it goes, it does not go far enough. It has not been possible to muster the full strength of Socialism in any election. It is a well known fact that the head of the Socialist ticket, as a rule, falls behind his running mates. Should the number of straight votes alone cast for the full Socialist ticket be considered as the truly Socialist vote, which means the lowest vote cast for any candidate on the ticket, even then it is a fact that the number of such votes is liable to decline at a presidential or gubernatorial, or mayoralty election; numerous examples could be cited to prove it. Should these fluctuations of the Socialist vote be interpreted as reflecting temporary changes in the Socialist sentiment? Not at all. It merely shows that even among those voters who identify themselves with Socialism as far as voting the Socialist ticket, there are some who still take an interest in the political issues or candidates brought forward by other parties. There are many more who profess to be Socialists, yet for one reason or another do not vote the Socialist ticket at all. In 1896 some people considering themselves Socialists were so impressed with the impending danger to the interests of the working class from the free coinage of silver, that they cast their votes for McKinley. In 1900 the issue of Imperialism gave many votes to Bryan which might otherwise have gone to Debs.

In European countries the system of reballoting enables the Socialist voter to cast his first vote for the Socialist candidates and the second for one of the two candidates who have a chance of election; thus his first vote is a vote for his principles and his second vote a vote upon the issues of the day. In this country there is but one chance to vote, and it is the vote for Socialist principles that suffers by it. And what is more serious, under our system of elections, the further progress of Socialist agitation and spread of Socialist sentiment are apt to accrue to the benefit of scheming politicians. The declarations of the New York State convention of the Democratic party in favor of nationalization of the anthracite coal mines was avowedly a bid for the Socialist

or radical vote. The election returns seem to indicate that the Hill plank accomplished its purpose with many voters, who might otherwise have swelled the Socialist column.

The marked feature of the election of 1902 was the growth of the Socialist vote, which more than doubled in the United States since the last presidential election. In New York, however, which is the veteran state of Socialist agitation and could in all previous elections boast of a larger Socialist vote than any other state, the vote for the Social Democratic party increased only by 82 per cent as against 132 per cent throughout the United States, the vote for the S. L. P. increased only by 25 per cent as against 59 per cent throughout the United States, and the aggregate vote for both Socialist parties increased only by 54 per cent as against 113 per cent throughout the United States.

The election returns for the state of New York show that the total gubernatorial vote in 1902 fell 10 per cent short of the popular vote for president in 1900; the Socialist parties were the only ones that showed actual gains. If, however, Greater New York is segregated from the rest of the state, we observe that the Democratic candidate for governor in 1902 gained 11,000 votes as compared with the gubernatorial candidate in 1900, whereas Governor Odell lost 68,000 votes. As the percentage of stay-at-homes in Greater New York is shown by the election returns to have been the same as up-state, and there is no reason why in New York City there should have been a greater percentage of stay-at-homes among the Republicans than among the Democrats, it is reasonable to assume that there must have been large defections from the Republican to the Democratic camp beside the actual increase of 11,000 votes. Now the Democrats whom the silver agitation had driven into the Republican ranks in 1896, returned into the fold in 1900, when McKinley gained only 2,000 votes as against 127,000 gained by Bryan. The Democratic gains in 1902 must therefore have come from other sources; this may account for the comparatively low increase of the Socialist vote in New York. Many a voter who is in sympathy with the Socialist movement, must have reasoned that the Socialist party could not win, while the Democratic could; thus a vote for the Democratic party appeared to him under the circumstances as a vote for the nationalization of the anthracite coal mines.

The Initiative and Referendum will serve in this country the same end as the system of reballoting in Europe. It will enable every voter to vote for his principles, even though he may be anxious to vote for the "winning man." Moreover, it will effectively protect the Socialist party from any attempt of the old parties to "steal its thunder," for it will always be the Socialist party who will first initiate all Socialistic bills. Thus it is only the Initiative and Referendum that can bring out the full strength

of the Socialist sentiment and record it to the credit of the Socialist party.

This leads us to the third proposition, viz., that the growth of the Socialist party vote speeds on the ultimate victory of the Socialist party. It is obvious that the rate of progress in this respect is dependent upon the strength of the Socialist sentiment in the nation; anything that gives additional force to the Socialist movement is bound to result in an increased vote for the Socialist party. Therefore, the agitation for Socialism through the Initiative and Referendum must hasten the victory of the Socialist party. Moreover, when it becomes possible for the voters to enact laws and frame policies independently of Congress and legislatures, the argument in favor of voting for the "winning candidate," "the best man," or "the lesser of two evils," must be considerably weakened. Suppose, every opponent of Imperialism had the opportunity to vote directly for the Initiative bill, "Be it enacted by the people of the United States, that the President of the United States be and he is hereby instructed forthwith to withdraw all military forces from the Philippines and to relinquish the Philippine Islands to an independent government to be freely elected by the sovereign people of the Philippine Islands"—what justification would there have been for any believer in Socialist principles to vote for Bryan, as a rebuke to Imperialism? A vote for Anti-Imperialism could then have been combined with a vote for Debs. This would have added to the Socialist column many a vote from among those who were not convinced by the Socialist argument that the issue of Imperialism or anti-Imperialism did not concern the working class.

There is still more to be said. Today the Socialist has very little to say in the current affairs of the day. If there is a piece of vicious legislation pending, he can merely denounce it in mass-meetings or in his own press. With the Optional Referendum as in South Dakota, or Los Angeles, the Socialist party would constitute itself a permanent vigilance committee that would promptly call a popular veto on every bill which is hostile to the interests of the working class. This would infuse new vigor into the Socialist party and bring it into closer touch with the people in their work-a-day interests.

Nor would it in any way conflict with the uncompromising attitude of the Socialist party towards other political parties. The agitation for the Referendum and the Initiative need not involve the Socialist party into alliances of any sort with any other political party; the Socialist party has its own natural sphere of influence in the trade unions, which have in the past been the most active element in the campaign for Direct Legislation.

It was natural for Massachusetts to take the lead. A petition in favor of the Referendum endorsed by 570 trade unions of the

state and bearing the signatures of more than 50,000 voters was presented to the General Court by the Socialist Representative James Carey; the effect of this agitation can be gauged by the vote in the House on the Direct Legislation bill, which was 155 for and only 22 against the bill. In Massachusetts, as elsewhere, the politicians have their ears close to the ground.

In closing the writer wishes to be understood that it is not his intention to recommend the Referendum and the Initiative as a substitute for the present form of political agitation, but as an additional weapon in the fight for Socialism.

Marxist.

Italian Socialist Convention.

THE first annual Convention of the "Federazione Socialista Italiana" took place on September 6-7, in West Hoboken, N. J. There were 33 delegates present, representing some 30 Locals and eight different states.

The convention was opened amid great enthusiasm by G. M. Serrati, editor of "Il Proletario"—the Italian Socialist daily—who called the delegates to order and made some appropriate introductory remarks. It was voted by acclamation to send a congratulatory cablegram to Comrade Enrico Ferri in Rome, for his noble fight against the "grafters" in the Navy department. This also meant that the convention was with him, and stood for an uncompromising political attitude.

Aside from the minor work of the Federation's affairs, the most important questions for the Convention to discuss were the following:

First—The Party Press.

Second—The Co-operative Stores Movement.

Third—Establishment of an Immigration Bureau.

Fourth—Attitude of the Federation towards the trades unions.

Fifth—Attitude of the Federation towards the two Socialist Parties, the S. L. P. and the S. P.

Only one out of the thirty-three delegates is in favor of discontinuing the publication of the daily paper. Thirty-two delegates want the paper to be continued at all costs, even to the extent of having each Local pledge a monthly contribution to defray the expenses of publication. A true spirit of Socialism and of noble self-denial was shown by the delegates during this discussion, in which the comrades stated their willingness to share their scanty wages for the enlightenment of their fellow-men.

An able report was submitted by G. Lavagnini of Northfield, Vt., on the establishment of Co-operative stores, demonstrating their efficiency as an auxiliary to the Socialist movement, and showing their successful operation amongst the Italian Socialists of Vermont.

It was the sense of the convention that the comrades should encourage and work for such movements in all places where local conditions were favorable, especially in small cities, where large department stores did not exist.

The advisability of establishing an Immigration Bureau was then discussed, and the advantages that might accrue to the immigrant were plainly stated. The padrone, the banker and many other colonial sharks, made an easy prey of the poor and simple Italians migrating to these shores, defrauding them and selling them like chattels to the contractors. The Bureau would protect

them, assist them and put them on their guard. It was voted that it should be left to the Executive Committee to take the preliminary steps for the establishment of such a bureau.

It being impossible to discuss the trades unions without involving party tactics, a discussion on the same was then started.

As might be supposed, this brought about a warm debate, and it seemed for a time that the S. L. P. comrades were going to sway the Convention. A report was submitted by Dellavia, full of the false and time worn out vilifications against the Socialist party, and, in order to prejudice the delegates against our party, the same report had been printed and distributed some time before the Convention. Comrade G. M. Serrati, however, replied to the false accusation, and showed that while it might be true that in some instances the Socialist Party had been slack and of a too broad spirit, the majority of its members were good uncompromising Socialists, doing excellent work in all states of the Union, in many of which the S. L. P. did not exist at all. "In the S. L. P. press," he said, "I see nothing but insults against other Socialists; in the S. P. press I see nothing but Socialism. I am in favor of a union between the two parties, but cannot countenance the conduct of the S. L. P." He then read a communication of the International Socialist Bureau, informing him that the only Socialist Party recognized there at present was the Socialist Party.

Comrades Ecaterinara of Newark, N. J., and G. Lavagnini of Vermont also spoke in favor of the S. P., stating that it was the only party working for Socialism in their respective localities.

A number of resolutions were introduced, and one of Com. Serrati, to the effect that, *While the Federation was on general principles, with the S. L. P., it was optional for comrades in places where there was no S. L. P., to vote for the uncompromising candidates of the other Socialist Party.*

An official delegate from the S. L. P. was then given the floor to make his *pronunciamento* on the resolution. He said he was not in favor of it. If the Italian Socialists favored the S. L. P., they must either be entirely with the S. L. P. or against it. His Party would not stand for any half-way policy. He hoped the Italian comrades would open their eyes.

The answer of the Convention to this complimentary remark, was another resolution:

To sever all connections and alliances with the S. L. P., and constitute themselves into an independent organization, which was then put to vote and carried, 19 for, and 15 against.

The Trades-Unions question then naturally resolved itself, and the Convention voted to follow the tactics as laid down at the International Congress, which are those of the Socialist Party.

Several minor matters were then transacted: the election of a new Executive Committee, and the appointment of Local New-

ark to receive all complaints. The issuing of two dollar shares, to cover a mortgage on the Socialist Block of Barre, Vt., was authorized. The resignation of G. M. Serrati as editor of *Il Proletario* was unwillingly received. The Convention adjourned at 8:45 p. m. with three cheers for International Socialism.

While the constitution of the Federation did not allow the delegates of the Socialist Party to be officially recognized, comrades Solomon, De Luca and the writer were present and made many friends amongst the delegates, eventually furnishing them with useful information which had a decided bearing on their most important vote.

On the whole, the Convention was a credit to the Italian comrades. Party and personal feelings were all made subordinate to the Socialist movement. A sincere and intense desire to promote the cause of Socialism dominated all their actions, and when the vote to break away from DeLeon was announced, a voice was heard to say: "There are neither victors nor vanquished here, we are all comrades!"

Springfield, Mass.

Silvio Origo.

Wanted—A Constitution.

ABOUT 25 years ago Governor Plaisted, of Maine, said in an address: "Thirty years ago in our country, a pauper was as scarce as a prince, and so was a millionaire. Now we have thousands of millionaires and they own, as their private property, much more than is owned by all the rest of the people. The time is rapidly approaching when—unless there is an economic revolution—the only people in these states will be millionaires, their hirelings, and paupers."

It is certain, however, that the economic revolution will take place. Hitherto, the "middle classes" have been our most active opponents, but the syndicates will drive most of them into our ranks. One after another each business will be syndicated—grocery, dry-goods, clothing, furniture, hardware, baking, building, bookselling, printing; all manufacturing, fishing and mining; the farmer will have to sell his produce to the syndicates, and even the doctors and lawyers will be unable to compete successfully with the syndicate agents.

State and national collectivism will certainly be forced upon us by the syndicate collectivism. Ten thousand millionaires cannot subjugate all the rest of the people—who will not long endure a government by millionaires for the benefit of millionaires.

In preparation for "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," we ought to be learning how to govern, so that, when the time comes, we may begin without confusion and serious blundering.

When a captain asks people to accompany him on a voyage, he not only tells them what port he is bound for, but tells them which way he is going, and at what ports he will call by the way, and he has a well-defined chart of his course. It is time for us to have our chart—our Constitution of the Commonwealth. (Nearly thirty years ago, I drafted the form of such a Constitution—a form that might now be of some use as an aid in the framing of a less imperfect one.)

We have some very good general maxims for our guidance: "No rights without duties; no duties without rights," "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." To those I would add, No authority without responsibility, no responsibility without authority. No money to waste time over. And I would add Kipling's great lines: "None shall work for money and none shall work for fame, but all for the joy of the working."

The systems known as the Referendum, the Initiative, and the Imperative Mandate are essential for true republicanism. The people's organizations are, to some extent, already using them.

But we have yet to decide how, in the Socialist future, we shall govern each separate trade and locality; whether the State or Nation shall have control of the railroads, etc., the authority of the State over children, and many other problems.

For the satisfaction of the many thousands of people who are inclined towards Socialism, we should, as soon as possible, formulate our proposed Constitution. If honestly and wisely formulated, it will cause a few people to leave our ranks, but for each one that leaves a score will rally under our banner.

Lunenburg, Mass.

Wm. Harrison Riley.

To Socialism.

REVILED defender and upholder of the rights of Man;
Unflinching asserter of the Brotherhood of Man;
Unflinching facer of those future years so filled with
frowns of free-born men, no longer free who love
thee not—

Endue me with thy poise.

Provider of perpetual peace that stills pale, haggard Competi-
tion's call to war,

Sole selfless Savior of the race from all-enslaving Greed;
Unconscious Christian crying Christ's commands aloud, still nailed
upon the cross as He—

Endue me with thy peace.

Impartial pupil of imperial *Right* that places plenty in the hands
of each and all;

Stern slayer of the sullen soul will not surrender stolen, selfish
joys;

All-patient lover of the poor, still paid with penal name by por-
tionless participants of pauper's lot and fare—

Grant me to love as thou.

Forecaster of a future filled with faithful work performed with
joy by all;

Denouncer of these dotage-days that doom and damn both rich and
poor;

Courageous, calm Compatriot calling "Come" to rich and poor
alike—

Grant me to echo "Come."

Aspiring, some would strike all chains from willing and unwill-
ing slaves.

Aspiring to thy poise, thy peace, thy love unbounded free and all
despite of hate, thy call—to even echo it—one heard thee
say,

"Let be!

I am the solvent sets all free,
Bring them to me."

Aspiring sends this song from one whose bondage was dissolved
by thy embrace, in gratitude this day.

O Thou incessant and unstinting Sower of the life-bought seed
with wide-flung hand in ev'ry clime,

God speed, God speed, and SPEED.

—*Edwin Arnold Brenholtz.*

The Legal Fiction of Equality.

"There are no classes in America. I hate the name!" Judge George Gray, quoted in the "Outlook" of July 4, 1903.

IN order to a true understanding of that much misunderstood assertion of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are born free and equal, the economic significance of the American Revolution must be borne in mind. The chain of revolutions, of which that in America formed a highly characteristic link, whereby the bourgeoisie broke the power of the noblesse, was everywhere marked by an insistence on the worth and sacred liberty of the individual, untrammelled by any advantage arising to others from birth into a heritage of descendable class privilege. As hereditary privilege was the essence of the aristocratic status, its denial by the militant bourgeoisie was a matter of course. This, then, is all that was meant by the assertion of freedom and equality, namely, the repudiation of the legally recognized prestige of birth; and it would have saved much misconception if the principle had been expressed in negative form.

There is something very attractive, even to us moderns, in the aspect of the young, idealistic, revolutionary bourgeoisie, flushed with its victory over ancient and hallowed wrong, declaring that all men are *born* (note the word) equal, and proceeding to embody this rejection of inheritable ascendancy in its constitutions, customs and laws. But from this to the doctrine that all men shall remain forever after birth equal before the law, is evidently a step in advance; yet one which, in the then condition of American society, seemed but the necessary corollary of the first, or, perhaps, but another phase of the principle itself. For at that time, if we exclude the professional class which has never been inspired by a distinct economic interest, and the slaves who were not recognized as human, but one class existed in America—the middle class. Modern manufacture, with its splitting of the middle class into capitalists and wage-workers, was as yet unknown. The business of the country was agriculture; and the effect of unoccupied land in preventing the formation of a distinct class of wage laborers has already been pointed out in this magazine.* No injustice, therefore, resulted from the extension of the principle so as to exclude from legal cognizance not only the accident of birth, but all the accidents and vicissitudes of life as well.

How the principle, as thus broadened, has been preserved and consecrated in our jurisprudence, with the hearty approval of

*"The Economic Organization of Society," INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for July 1, 1903, p. 12.

bourgeois sentiment, through the application of the maxim *stare decisis*, or how necessary to an orderly system of laws conformity to precedent is, it is not the present purpose to discuss. It is enough that at the present day, while at least four major classes (speaking from an economic standpoint) appear in American society, with the germs and buddings of still further divisions, the courts still uniformly refuse, in deference to this legal fiction of equality, to see the facts before their eyes.

A distinction of class differs from that of caste in that the latter is hereditary and can never be escaped by the individual, while the former depends upon any incident or feature common to a group, which may be very transitory, so that the membership of a class may shift continuously. The basis of economic class distinction is the manner of securing a livelihood. Of the four classes referred to, naming them in the order of their prestige and political importance, the capitalists derive their living, without labor, from the three sources of rent, interest and profit, the latter usually assuming the concrete form of dividends. In practice, however, many capitalists still perform certain labor of oversight and direction in their businesses, thus occupying a position midway between the capitalistic and middle classes. The professional class differs from the capitalistic in that its income is derived from actual labor, while it differs from the wage-workers both in the quality of its services, its scale of living, which approximates the capitalistic, and in having for its employer the public at large. The middle class covers those whose living is derived from labor for the public performed with their own capital, and includes farmers owning and working their own farms, small storekeepers, the cross-roads blacksmith who owns his own shop, etc., etc.. This class is oldest of all except the professional, and furnishes, in our modern life, constant accessions to all the others, becoming, through this depletion, a disappearing class. Remembering the days of its past glory, it is politically reactionary, and the political interests of the smaller capitalists sometimes lead to their affiliation with it. Lastly come the wage-workers, laborers working with the capital of others, the subjects of capitalistic exploitation, it being their unremunerated toil which enables the capitalists to live without toil. It is a peculiar characteristic of this class, and one which the reader is asked to treasure in mind during the remainder of this article, that it lives from hand to mouth, the wage of one day barely sufficing for the necessities of the next as determined by its scale of living, so that any cessation of employment spells deprivation of the means of life. Nor are the members of this class enabled to practice to any considerable extent the bourgeois virtue of saving, and even where they have done so, their scanty hordes are quickly exhausted when drawn on for subsistence. Continuous employment, therefore, becomes for them the *sine*

qua non of continued existence, and this sinister dependence constitutes the fetters of that status frequently referred to as wage slavery.

Evidently it must be pleasing to capitalists, in their legal conflicts with members of other classes, to have any class advantage accruing to them ignored by the courts, and that there is such advantage will be readily conceded by those of their opponents who have felt the embarrassment of the unequal contest. It is in suits between capitalists and wage earners, however, that the discrepancy in position is most manifest. The employee comes into legal conflict with the employer chiefly, if not almost wholly, in two varieties of actions—those for personal injuries, and strike litigation. As to the latter, the law involved is still in too nebulous a state to permit of instructive generalization. It is in actions brought by the employee for personal injuries occasioned by the employers' negligence, the law of which has been developed contemporaneously with the capitalistic system itself, that we may particularly note the malign influence of the legal fiction of equality. When the wage-worker is maimed or killed through his master's negligence, and his labor power thus impaired or cut off altogether, with a corresponding reduction in or termination of ability to earn a livelihood, his claim, or that of his family, against his master for reimbursement, might seem to the uninitiated layman peculiarly meritorious. It shall be our business to notice some of the judge-made rules of law indicative of the attitude of the courts thereto. And first, as to the measure of care required of the master.

In his work on *Master's Liability*, Mr. Bailey, after summarizing the duties of the master as those of furnishing reasonably safe appliances, a reasonably safe place to work, and the employment of a sufficient number of competent associates, adds (p. 3), "In the performance of these duties, the master is bound to the exercise of reasonable and ordinary care, and such only." Later he quotes (p. 24) with approval from the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania: *"Absolute safety is unattainable, and employers are not insurers. They are liable for the consequences, not of danger, but of negligence; and the unbending test of negligence in methods, machinery and appliances is the ordinary usage of the business."

Passing by the principle, which is itself a luminous comment on the spirit of capitalism, that human life and limb are the subjects of only ordinary care, let us scrutinize the "unbending test" of that care, "the ordinary usage of the business." There is no question of the rule. It has been iterated and reiterated until a criticism of it seems almost pathetic in its futility. And yet whose province is it to fix "the ordinary usage of the business"? That of the employers. Any attempt of the workers to do so is

**Titus v. Railroad Co.*, 136 Pa. 618; 20 Atl. 517.

quickly resented as an unwarranted impertinence. The master erects his factory with a minimum allotment of space, air and light. He places cogs and belts and rollers where he will, and the workers are then invited to enter. Now, the only possible justification for this "unbending test" of negligence, is that they may refuse to do so. In other words, that the wage-earners may reject undesirable or hazardous employment, thus forcing a voice in the establishment of "the ordinary usage of the business." But as we have seen this is precisely what they cannot do. Enter they must, constrained by the imperious necessity which binds them in their status. Only when some single employer has exceeded the average disregard of human safety, may some of the more temerous refuse to work for him.

Thus the employers as a class establish the customary conditions of employment, sanctify by usage its dangers and discomforts and so fix the standards of their own liability. They are made judges of their own cause; and what any particular employer is held for, is not negligence, but *more than average* negligence. Then too, as the employer has no property interest in the bodies of his employees, unless he is actuated by motives of humanity or unless better conditions or safer appliances will also increase the output, there is no incentive for improvement. A need do no more than B, nor B than A. Old abuses of employment may continue eternally, carefully safeguarded by this rule of law. By this rule the courts have resigned their function of arbitrators between the parties, and contentedly accept the measure of responsibility prearranged by the defendant himself. That this is the practical effect of the rule is evidenced by the legislative effort to supply, as by factory and mine inspection laws, an impartial tribunal; or, as in the case of the act of Congress requiring safety brakes on cars used in interstate traffic, a measure of reliability in the law itself. It is, however, due to the United States Supreme Court to say that, latterly, some doubt as to the justice of the rule seems to have occurred to that eminent tribunal. It says:* "Ordinary care on the part of a railroad company implies, as between it and its employees, not simply that degree of diligence which is customary among those intrusted with the management of railroad property, but such as, having respect to the exigencies of the particular service, ought reasonably to be observed. It is such care as, in view of the consequences that may result from negligence on the part of the employer, is fairly commensurated with the perils and dangers likely to be encountered." But Mr. Bailey believes (p. 11) that the court afterwards receded from this, one would think fairly tenable, position.

But when even by these low standards, the master's negligence in a given instance has been proven, the injured servant's case

*Wabash Ry. Co. v. McDaniels, 107, U. S. 454; 2 Sup. Ct. 932.

is by no means won. Defenses peculiar to this class of actions still remain open to the former, among the most favorite being the doctrine of "assumed risk." Mr. Bailey's explanation of this doctrine (*Master's Liability*, p. 145) is so naive an expression of capitalistic sentiment, as to merit quotation at length:

"It is to be observed that persons and companies, and especially corporations, whose interests are large and business complex in character, and who necessarily have to intrust the management and performance of their business to officers, agents, and servants, do not always adopt such a method of conducting their business as to meet the requirements of duty as measured by the standard herein before stated and discussed. There are many classes of business, such as the operation of large factories and the management and operation of railroads, which are attended with great risks and perils, and the utmost, or even ordinary prudence, is not exercised, either in the manner of constructing their structures, providing machinery and appliances, or in their operation. If the strict rule of duty in these respects was always required, then it would be that many, if not most, of the enterprises of such character, which add so much to the convenience and material prosperity of the people, would have to be abandoned. Therefore it has come to be well settled that the master may conduct his business in his own way, although another method might be less hazardous; and the servant takes the risk of the more hazardous method, as well, if he knows the danger attending the business in the manner in which it is carried on. Hence, if the servant knowing the hazards of his employment as the business is conducted, is injured while employed in such business, he cannot maintain an action against the employer because he may be able to show there was a safer mode in which the business might have been carried on, and that, had it been conducted in that manner, he would not have been injured. Therefore the liability of a master to respond to his servant in damages for an injury received in the scope of his employment does not necessarily follow upon proof made that such injury was the result of the failure of the master to fully observe his duty as such, when measured by the standard of duty required, and governed by the principles stated in the preceding chapters, for the very plain reason that he may not owe his servant such duty or to such a degree. Such standard is that which is required and must be observed where the servant has no knowledge, actual or presumed, of the master's peculiar method of business, the situation of his premises, the character of his machinery," etc., etc.

Later Mr. Bailey (p. 170) thus formulates the rule: "The servant assumes the hazard of dangerous methods, as well as the use of defective tools or machinery, when, after employment, he learns of the defects, but voluntarily continues in the employment

**American Rolling Mill Co. v. Hullinger*, 07 N. E. 086.

without objection." The Supreme Court of Indiana, in a very late case* in which it frustrated, by reasoning unique in judicial annals, a bungling legislative attempt to get rid of the doctrine, thus carefully defines it: "Notwithstanding the duties the master owes the servant * * * , yet, if it appears that the latter had assumed the risk, there is no liability for negligence. This is but an application of the maxim '*Volenti non fit injuria*' (One who consents cannot be injured) which states a principle of very broad application in the law. The master may not have performed the duty required of him, but if the servant knows that such duty has not been performed, and appreciates the extent of the risk he thereby runs, or should have known and appreciated the same, he ordinarily assumes the risk, and this absolves the master from liability for his resulting injury."

That the servant is himself duly careful, that he has justifiably forgotten the defect or danger, that he is threatened with discharge if he does not accept the hazard prepared for him, have alike been held not to relieve him from assuming the risk of his master's admitted negligence. If he calls the master's attention to the defect or danger, and *secures a promise to repair or obviate it at a definite time*, this promise may, if he continues at work in reliance thereon, relieve him from assuming the risk, provided the danger is not too great, until it becomes apparent that the master does not intend to fulfill the promise, when the risk is again assumed.

In all the cases where the doctrine of assumed risk is applied, it is frankly and explicitly placed on the ground that the wage worker is the equal in all respects of the capitalist, that he occupies an equally advantageous position and enjoys the same independence of action, that he is at liberty to contract for such employment as he pleases, and to abandon it at will. Hence is exacted the price of this flattering liberty, that by accepting any given employment he assumes all dangers his master has culpably placed in his pathway, of which he knows or should know; and if the danger arises after employment, his continuance therein is visited by the same consequence. That all this is in full accord with the legal fiction of equality, and is likewise at profoundest variance with the facts, needs no argument to show. The judges who thus lightly remit the wage earner to a forfeiture of his employment, with the alternative of inability to recover for injuries incurred therein, have, as members of a different economic class, never known the worry of a "lost job," the bitter anxiety of being "out of work," or the humiliation of looking for employment. Judicial obliviousness to the shackles of economic necessity binding the laborer to his task, here works, probably, the cruelest injustice ever perpetrated by the courts upon the helpless in the name of liberty.

Another defense, of peculiar inequality, made in this class of actions is known as the "fellow servant doctrine."

It is a principle so old that its origin is lost in the mists of antiquity, that the master is responsible for an injury caused by the negligence of the servant while acting within the scope of his employment. This principle, known as the doctrine of *respondeat superior*, had an unquestioned place and uniform application both in English and American law till 1837, when the case of *Priestly v. Fowler* (3 Mees. & W. 1) was decided in England. In that case a servant sued his master for a broken thigh caused by the overloading and breaking of the master's van. The court in refusing him relief, said: "If the master be held liable to the servant in this action, the principle of that liability will be found to carry us to an alarming extent. * * * If the owner of the carriage is responsible for the sufficiency of his carriage to his servant, he is responsible for the negligence of his coachmaker, or his harness-maker, or his coachman. * * * The master, for example, would be liable to the servant for the negligence of the chambermaid, for putting him into a damp bed; for that of the upholsterer for sending in a crazy bedstead, whereby he was made to fall down while asleep and injure himself; for the negligence of the cook in not properly cleaning the copper vessels used in the kitchen; of the butcher in supplying the family with meat of a quality injurious to health; of the builder for a defect in the foundation of the house, whereby it fell and injured both the master and the servant by the ruins. The inconvenience, not to say the absurdity, of these consequences, afford a sufficient argument against the application of this principle (the doctrine of *respondeat superior*) to the present case." Thus an immemorial principle, so far as it would have protected the wage-earner, was disposed of by ridicule rather than argument, and that ridicule not only of a poor quality, but showing a very stupid failure to distinguish between a fellow servant and one from whom the master purchased goods.

Four years later, the Court of Errors of South Carolina* reached the same conclusion, basing it upon a wholly fanciful and fictitious "joint undertaking" by all the servants to work for their master.

A year later the Supreme Court of Massachusetts† announced the fellow servant rule, placing it squarely on the basis of assumed risk, and in 1850, the English courts‡ did the same, saying, "The principle is, that a servant when he engages to serve a master undertakes, as between himself and his master, to run all the ordinary risks of the service, and this includes the risk of negligence upon the part of a fellow servant when he is acting in the discharge of his duty as a servant of him who is the common master of both." The Massachusetts case has become the leading one on the subject in the United States, and the fellow servant doctrine may fairly be taken to be, in the view of the courts, but

a phase or special application of the doctrine of assumed risk, already discussed.

The rule itself is thus formulated by Mr. McKinney in his work on *Fellow Servants*, p. 18: Where a master uses due diligence in the selection of competent and trusty servants, and furnishes them with suitable means to perform the service in which he employs them, he is not answerable to one of them for an injury received by him in consequence of the carelessness of another, while both are engaged in the same service."

The extreme harshness and hardship of this rule when practically applied, has led some courts, notably that of Ohio, to distinguish between fellow servants and "vice-principals," and other courts to require that, if the rule is to operate, the servants shall be personally associated. It is now very generally modified by statute far enough to exclude railroad employees from its scope.

In conclusion, therefore, we may say that there are classes in America, and that the judicial pharisaism which refuses to recognize the fact has wrought cruel deception and bitter injustice. Flattered by meretricious assurances of equality, the workingman has exerted himself to preserve the existing order of things, while his sole asset, his ability to labor, has been made the plaything of judicial subserviency to capitalism. But does the workingman feel aggrieved by this attitude of the courts toward him? (he may not, for his patience is one of the most curious social phenomena of our time)—the remedy lies with himself. This same doctrine of equality which has been thus adroitly used to his undoing, has placed in his hands the ballot, the law making power, before even which courts must bow. Not one of the judicial doctrines here criticised but may be abrogated by half a dozen lines of properly drafted legislation. No constitutional sanction hedges them about, no vested right can be worked in their defense. All that is needed is that the wage earner shall cease to vote for candidates of old parties which are but the political expression of various capitalistic and middle-class interests, and cast an intelligent ballot in his own behalf. No workingman can doubt that a socialist legislature or socialist court would sweep away this entire fabric of subtle injustice with the rapidity of an avenging besom. Does he want to be rid of it? That is the only question.

Clarence Meily.

**Murray v. South Carolina R. Co.*, 1 McMullan 385; 36 Am. Dec. 268.

†*Farwell v. Boston & Worcester R. Corp.*, 4 Metc. 49.

‡*Hutchinson v. Nork, New Castle & Berwick R. Co.*, 5 Exch. 343; 19 L. J. Exch. 296.

The National Organizing Work.

THE contribution of one thousand dollars by Comrade J. A. Wayland of the *Appeal to Reason* to the National Organizing Fund comes in good season. It comes at a time when most needed and when it can be put to the best uses for the Socialist Party, which is the concrete expression of the Socialist movement in America.

While it is no exaggeration to say that the organizing work carried on by the National Socialist Party during the past eight months has exceeded that performed in any similar length of time before, yet even this was not all that was needed or desired to be done. It is simple enough to inaugurate a work of this kind; the great difficulty comes in continuing it after it has begun. It was quite impossible to satisfy all sections requiring or asking for organizers at once and the same time. The number of organizers employed was not sufficient to go around, the territory to be covered too large, and the resources of the national office too limited. For these reasons many comrades have been disappointed, and in some cases impatience has been manifested at being "neglected" when the national office was doing the best it could. The Quorum and National Committee are more than anxious to promote the organizing work, but they could not do it under the circumstances, however much they desired to.

But the *Appeal to Reason* donation, while not altogether solving the problem, makes the way easier. Upon its receipt the National Secretary submitted to the Quorum propositions which he has long had in mind, for extending the organizing capacity into territory heretofore untouched. These propositions have been approved by the Quorum, and their successful fulfilment will depend upon the comrades in the sections receiving the benefit, as well as upon the party at large.

In brief, the propositions may be outlined as follows:

That Comrade F. E. Seeds of Kentucky, if available, be appointed national organizer for the states of Maryland, West Virginia and North Carolina. Comrade Seeds has had much experience as a party agitator and organizer and is highly recommended to the National Office.

That J. W. Bennett of Iowa, be appointed national organizer for the states of North and South Dakota. Comrade Bennett was recommended by National Committeeman Work some time ago, but no opportunity was presented to use his services.

That P. J. Hyland of Nebraska, if available, be appointed national organizer for Wyoming, and should circumstances permit, for Utah. Comrade Hyland is a fine out-door speaker, and all around hard worker.

That changes be made in routes arranged for organizers already in the field as follows: Bigelow to go from Kansas to Arkansas, and then take Goebel's place in the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, instead of going on through Alabama and Georgia to Florida. Goebel will be confined to Texas and Louisiana until December. Ray will take Bigelow's place in Georgia and Florida, touching also South Carolina on the way. Alabama has already received some valuable attention from the national office, but will be cared for later on. McKee will remain in Arizona until November, and then probably enter Nevada. Wilkins will work in Washington, Montana, Idaho and Oregon. In the East John W. Brown and John Spargo will work in Rhode Island between now and November, assisting in the state campaign. New Hampshire and Vermont will receive attention about December. Delaware will be cared for as opportunity presents. In states not named either financial assistance has been already rendered by the National Committee, or arrangements have been made by the states themselves to support organizers. The Quorum has also voted to place an Italian Organizer in the field in the person of Silvio Origo, and he will make an interstate tour.

In the meantime Comrade Ben Hanford will be continuing his successful lecture tour, which will carry him to the Pacific Coast and back through the Northwestern States. Other lecture tours will also be arranged.

A study of these plans will show that within the next six months every state and territory will have received visits from national organizers or will be supporting organizers of their own. Comrades must bear in mind that every place cannot be visited AT ONCE. The national office cannot assume financial responsibility for any more organizers than it can afford to support. It is most important that the party be kept out of debt. But every place will finally be visited, if the comrades will but realize the immensity of the task we have undertaken and be patient with us.

In this connection it is in order to point out that while the national organizing fund has reached \$1,000 in round figures (apart from the *Appeal* donation) yet this sum has not nearly covered the amount expended by the national office for organizing during the seven months past. IF IT HAD NOT BEEN FOR DUES RECEIVED, the work could not have gone on as it has. The organizing fund has only assisted in starting the work, and without the revenue for dues it could not have been continued.

Besides, the running expenses of the office are steadily on the increase. Supplies are being furnished to affiliated organizations merely at cost, organizers have to be kept supplied, the leaflets "Why Socialists Pay Dues" and "How to Organize" are sent out free, and this means that printing bills must be constantly

met. An additional number of organizers will naturally involve additional expense of all kinds.

The office force is working night and day in order to keep up, but improvements in the method of conducting business are constantly needed. The National Secretary is arranging to fit out the office in thorough manner, so that the business can finally be run systematically and economically. This would have been done before, but some of the old debts are still unpaid, although the next three months will certainly see them wiped out for good.

All this should impress party members with the necessity of, first, paying dues promptly, and, second, subscribing what they can to the National organizing fund. Don't think that Comrade Wayland's donation has equipped us completely for the work of organization. **IT HAS ONLY GIVEN US A SPLENDID OPPORTUNITY** to become equipped, through organization, for the great battle of next year and the greater ones to follow. Coin cards for donations to the organizing fund will be furnished upon application by the National Secretary.

The objective point to be aimed at at present is to get every state into such a condition that it can support either one organizer, or more, for itself. To accomplish this the National Committee should be left free to carry out its plans through its representatives, and locals and states should render all the assistance possible and practice self dependence and self reliance at the same time. Do not expect too much from the National Office. Especially does this advice apply to the tendency to look to the National Committee for financial assistance for one purpose or another. All the money within reach is needed for conducting the organizing and lecture work.

Finally, let every party member keep in good standing by paying dues promptly and regularly and determine to gain at least one new member every month. By doing this the most effective and surest method will be used to solidify and knit together the revolutionary forces rapidly developing in America into compact organization prepared to enter the national campaign of 1904 to wage a conflict against capitalism which will result in making the Socialist Party the second political party in importance in this country and the leader of the international Socialist movement for working-class emancipation throughout the world.

William Mailly.

National Secretary,
Socialist Party.

The Present Aspect of Political Socialism in England.

MORALLY and intellectually Socialism is on the march; politically it hobbles along, lamely if gamely. I for one cannot conceal from myself a sense of anxiety and foreboding. This sense of disquietude has reference only to the comparatively restricted area of politics. It seems to me that it is time for Socialism to examine the situation. In a sentence, my fear is that unless in the near future we can bring about Socialist consolidation, we may find political socialism effectively sidetracked for a decade or more. The purpose of this article is to attract attention to certain political tendencies dangerous to our movement and to make one or two practical proposals for *Clarion* readers to consider and amend.

These tendencies affect Socialist organizations externally and internally. The first category expresses itself in the present fiscal agitation which is bringing in its train Liberal concentration. The second covers the present organization of the various Socialist bodies, their relation to each other and their joint relation to the Labor Representation Committee. It is obvious that what affects us externally must have vital relation to the inward arrangements of the Socialist groups.

It is now evident that Liberalism has nothing to say to Mr. Chamberlain's new protectionism beyond the blank negative. We all agree that the Chamberlain scheme is heretical and futile. Liberalism sees its chance and already a silent message speeds its course through the constituencies that, at all hazards and at whatever cost, the principles of Free Trade must be asserted. In plain English this means vote for Liberalism. But a blank negative is poor fare for empty bellies. The Liberalists are vehemently asserting that never has Great Britain been so prosperous and that if we revert to the discussion of food (or of imported manufactured goods) we make life unendurable for 30 per cent of the population now living on the verge of poverty. A country is strangely prosperous with 30 per cent of its population poverty stricken. It is precisely this large proportion of under-paid, under-fed, ill-educated fellowmen and women which most deeply concern Socialist propaganda. When, therefore, the Socialist asks the Liberal what are his constructive proposals in regard to this the "least of our brethren" the Liberal replies "Wait, we must first defeat Chamberlain." For two generations this has been the Liberal answer to this question. A question which now, thank heaven, is stern and insistent. "Wait, we must beat Salisbury." "Wait, we must turn out the ineffable Balfour." "Wait, we must unseat arrogant Toryism." It is a wearisome monochord, wait, wait, wait. We search in vain through the speeches

of Rosebery, Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith, Spencer, Grey and John Morley for the slightest indication of any sense of the real meaning of the poverty question. From the Socialist point of view, Liberalism is as barren as the Sahara. When, therefore, because Chamberlain made a foolish proposal, I am asked to vote Liberal and wait for a more convenient season for social reform, I respectfully decline. I shall vote Socialist or not at all.

It is at this point my troubles begin. Has Socialism anything to say to these immediate political problems, and does it possess the requisite political machinery to impress itself upon the electorate? On the first point I affirm that it is Socialism and only Socialism that has any constructive alternative to the shadowy Chamberlain project; on the second point I affirm that it is now practicable to construct the necessary political machinery *if Socialists will but attend to their own affairs.*

Alas, there is the rub. Can we really contend that Socialism asserts its distinctive message in the tumult and clamor of present politics? Is there not an immediate, urgent danger that the movement towards concentration on a Free Trade basis may submerge and nullify the Socialist propaganda of the past ten years? Does it look well for Socialist unity to see prominent Socialist platform men voicing indiscriminate Free Trade economics? It is necessary to remember that negative criticism spells Liberal revival; constructive alternatives spell Socialist consolidation. The Liberals must ultimately fail and deservedly so unless they are prepared with legislation that controls and humanizes our so-called industrial system; if the Socialists follow in the wake of the Liberal flock of downy negations they will inevitably share in the discredit.

In contrast with Liberalism's barren creed now let us see what Socialism has to say to the dominant political question of the hour. We are told that effectively to link up the colonies to the mother country we must tax food, food in general, bread in particular. Observe that the end in view is closer colonial connection; a means to that end is taxation of foodstuffs. This strikes at the very roots of political Socialism. We have something very definite to say on both points. I will take the second point first. The Socialist reply to Chamberlain is surely as constructive and explicit as the Liberal reply is negative and irrelevant. "Tax bread? No, thank you," says Socialism; "but we will make it." Here follows the obvious argument in regard to municipal bakeries, butcheries, and what not. Does the Liberal agree to it? Not in the least. He is as much committed to capitalistic production as the Tory, perhaps more so. Let the Socialist never weary in presenting his own constructive alternative to the Chamberlain proposal to tax bread and I do not fear the result. To the large issues involved in fiscal imperialism not much need be said. Again,

because of fundamental differences in principle, Socialism and Liberalism cannot camp together. To begin with, the Liberals are hopelessly divided. Rosebery and Asquith are Imperialists; they are committed to an arrogant military imperialism; they are in part responsible for the present fiscal proposals. They represent one school of imperialism. Campbell-Bannerman, Harcourt and John Morley are strenuously opposed to this type of Liberalism; they are the Old Guard Manchester, *laissez aller*. The Socialist has neither part nor lot with either faction. Again it is the Socialist who offers a constructive alternative to Chamberlain's fiscal levitation. We are glad enough to bring the colonies nearer to us provided no sound economic laws are contravened. We are glad to bring all countries nearer to us. If events so shape themselves that the centripetal movement first affects the colonies, why then we will take the occasion by the hand. But how? Obviously by seeking to control sea-transit. It is the shipping ring and the adverse freight rate that keep our colonies such a hopeless distance from us. To imperialize (I dislike the word, but there is no other) those shipping lines that connect us with our colonies; to reorganize freight rates on a reasonable basis; to preclude all preferential rates; to control the railway system, as we would control the mercantile marine; to resuscitate our canals—all this is in the direct line of Socialist economics and can only consistently be advocated by Socialists.

Nor must we forget that any constructive system, partial or complete, appreciates rent far beyond the extent of impost. You cannot dodge rent. Have the Liberals anything to say on the land question? You can cut the silence with a knife.

These then are the very political elements in which Socialists should positively revel. To make bread rather than to tax it; to control transit, both land and sea; to drive home the thousand morals of the land question; all this is fruitful Socialist politics. Are we doing it? A prominent American Socialist asked me the other day if the British Socialists had met to consider these urgent questions. What answer had I not to make ashamed? The truth is we are meekly following the lead of the *Daily News*.

To understand the secret of Socialist political impotence we must look inward as well as outward. Inward into what?

Certainly not into the Socialist Party, because there isn't one.

There are a number of Socialist groups, the I. L. P., S. D. F., Fabian and some isolated local organizations. They are all desperately busy upon their own concerns; the result is that the larger and more prominent interests of Socialism are regarded with Olympian indifference. I have never believed that Socialist concentration, to say nothing of unity, would come from the inside of the Socialist movement. There are too many temperamental clashings to nurse any such hope. Outside pressure, the menace of political extinction, must soon compel definite steps

towards consolidation. If the present Socialist leaders do not realize this, then they must be sent about their business. Our circumstances are becoming too exigent to consider the present susceptibilities.

The first thing to do is to define our attitude towards the Labor Representation Committee. Owing to the chairman's fatuous ruling at the York Conference the I. L. P. has solemnly declared that the only possible basis of Socialist unity is in affiliation with the L. R. C., an avowedly non-Socialist organization. Now this simply would not do; it is too ridiculous. Four of the five L. R. C. members of parliament are hard-shell Liberals. But to be distinctively Socialist in no sense precludes a cordial working arrangement with the trade unions. One of the greatest advantages of the Consolidated Socialist party is that it can be opportunist without sacrifice of principle or misconception. As things are now the I. L. P. is affiliated with the L. R. C., whilst the S. D. F. is not. This creates misconception and tends to irritation. I do not think that as yet there has been any sacrifice of principle on the part of the I. L. P., but it has gone perilously near the margin. Mr. Keir Hardie has now admitted (*Labor Leader*, August 8) that in the affiliation, the members of the I. L. P. deliberately ran the risk of merging their Socialism in vague and indefinable laborism. Personally I feel strongly that no such risk should have been run. Nor do I think it was in the least necessary.

The Taff Vale judgment meant the entrance of trade unionism into active politics. It tore aside all conventional coverings and laid bare that remorseless class struggle, the existence of which Mr. Bruce Glasier complacently denies. The trade unions saw that in this struggle they must fight politically as well as industrially. And in the fight it was the duty and the pleasure of all Socialists to co-operate. But whilst the Socialist seeks to end this class struggle by abolishing private capitalism, the trade unionist as yet accepts the present economic system, seeking ever to better his condition. At the moment he wants to reconstruct trade unionism at the breaches made by judges. I believe that the Liberals will amend the trade union law if they be returned to power. Supposing this to be the case, it is clear to my mind that the trade unions must finally split. Some will support Liberalism out of gratitude; others will realize the economic situation and gradually approach the Socialists. If the trade union movement towards Socialism is to make itself felt, there must be a strong Socialist party to welcome such an army of recruits. By all means let us help the trade unions—we must do so or we belie our principles; but we must establish a truer equipoise in the labor army by consolidating and unifying our Socialist forces.

How is this to be done? Not easily, I grant. Yet there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to divide us. The I. L. P. occupies

a fairly strong strategic position because it has one leg in the trade union camp and the other in the Socialist camp. But there are dangers. Let it beware lest it be torn asunder. Whatever tends to strengthen Socialism must in the nature of things materially strengthen our influences amongst the trade unions. The I. L. P. Leaders would be immeasurably stronger equipped if they voiced the sentiments of a united Socialist party. I frankly confess that why they stubbornly refuse passes my comprehension. The S. D. F. by its rigid adherence to Socialist doctrine pure and undefiled has bred great qualities in its members—qualities that have their inevitable defects. When I hear a body of S. D. F.-ers spontaneously break into the song, "We'll keep the old flag flying yet," I feel a crick in my throat, but my emotions are mixed. There is now ample evidence that the S. D. F. is ready to fall into the line of one Socialist party. Their knowledge of European Socialism urges them towards organic unity. None the less Socialist unity will not come in a day.

I venture to make two proposals, both of which would involve a step in advance. Let the conferences of Socialists be only to consider our attitude towards the Chamberlain scheme. The series of resolutions embracing communal production of food commodities, transit, and the land question would, I believe, give a unified purpose to political Socialism. The executives of the I. L. P., the Fabian Society, might take the business in hand.

My second proposal is of a more delicate character. It relates to the I. L. P. and S. D. F. only. Next year both parties hold their annual conference in different parts of the country; but no arrangements have yet been made for 1905. I suggest that in 1904 both conferences decide to meet in the same town and at the same time in 1905. Let each organization discuss its own affairs at its morning session; let there be joint sessions each afternoon to discuss national politics and, if possible, accept definite resolutions. If this be done—it is quite feasible and commits us to nothing—the next step toward party unity will not be long delayed.

For national reasons; for sectional purposes; to defeat the menace of political extinction; to secure discipline; to co-ordinate our all-too-scanty intellectual resources; to face the actual facts and mould political situations; to do these things needs Socialist consolidation. The time is ripe for Socialists of all complexions frankly to discuss the actual bearing of recent events upon our political efficiency. To conclude, consolidated Socialism spells enhanced political strength; desiccated Socialism means the impotent preaching of those principles crudely expressed.

—S. G. Hobson in *London Clarion*.

The Ferri Criminal.

A MAN in a public library, nowadays, must awaken to the fact that criminals are being studied as they never were before. And if this observing person happens to be a Socialist, he will be pleased to see that Ferri's book, "Criminal Sociology," is considered a standard work, to be given the same honors and shelf as Lombroso, Joly and others.

With scientists who are not conscious of a class struggle, a discussion on criminology can have but little attraction for the Socialist—for it would lack that fundamental unity of opinion which is necessary to right conclusions. But with Comrade Ferri—a class conscious Socialist—there should be no such stumbling block, and we can at least be sure of a starting point of agreement—however much we may disagree with some of his deductions.

In the English translation of his work, edited by Douglas Morrison, Ferri states: "Our task is to show that the basis of every theory concerning the self-defense of the community against evildoers must be the observation of the individual and of society in their criminal activity. In one word, our task is to construct a criminal sociology." (Preface xvi.) And again: "The science of criminal statistics is to criminal sociology what histology is to biology, for it exhibits, in the conditions of the individual elements of the collective organism, the factors of a crime as a social phenomenon. And that not only for scientific inductions, but also for practical and legislative purposes; for, as Lord Brougham said at the London Statistical Congress in 1860, 'Criminal statistics are for the legislator what the chart and compass are for the navigator.'"

From all this it must be plain that Ferri considers the study of criminology, for all practical purposes, to be the study of an exact science. But is it? Is the fountainhead of all the interesting conclusions arrived at by criminologists a well of truth? I refer to their tables of statistics in particular, and their subjects of study in general.

If criminology is a branch of natural history, then nature must have so marked, assorted and labeled certain men that wise professors can place them in their proper jars after a careful analysis. To bear this theory out, Ferri would have us study the skull, the brain, the vital organs, the mental constitution, and the personal characteristics of the criminal. Even the climate, the nature of the soil, the relative length of day and night, the seasons, the average temperature, meteoric conditions and agricultural

pursuits, all, we are told, are physical factors which assist in the determination of the criminal.

If it was from these natural sources alone that Ferri had constructed his criminal, our criticism would never have been born; but from what collection of "criminals" does he observe and deduce the *natural* history of crime? From a collection carefully gotten together by the capitalist class.

In prisons, controlled by the capitalists, Ferri makes scientific observations upon a class of men, women and children who have been put there for breaking capitalist law. And upon what human action has not capitalist law placed its ban?—always excepting the sacred right of accumulating private property. Has it not been said, but a few years ago, that men should burn if they were Protestants, die if they were Catholics, be whipped naked if they were Quakers? And today, does it not convict the Jew and the Seventh Day Adventist who fail to bow down to a Christian Sabbath? Under what law are more men made criminals than under any other? Under that of vagrancy. This law practically allows the arrest and conviction of any one who is without money and without work. Under this law a man, "without visible means of support," can be convicted of a crime for sleeping in a vacant lot (without having obtained permission of the owner), or for refusing to work when work is offered (the possible smallness of the wage offered not being taken into consideration by the law). These "crimes," and other offenses of like import, bring men to jail—there to be measured, analyzed, classified and labeled by the professor of criminology. We appeal to common sense!—is this the way to study natural history? If a goat, a pig, a chicken and a cow were all locked in a barn together, would the natural history student compare their eyes, weigh their brains, study their skins and come to a conclusion that their natures had brought them thus to a common center, constituting a class by themselves? What sort of a composite photograph would be evolved from the blending of this group of animal life? Anything natural?

What is a criminal? According to Ferri he must be a man convicted of a crime. What is a crime? Something that capitalist legislators say is wrong. Think of that!—think of the mob of pot-house politicians that yearly pile up laws in the various state capitals, being nature's classifiers of human life! See them!—the big thieves making laws to protect society against the little thieves! And upon the findings of these lawmakers Ferri bases his scientific conclusions. Here in California we have a law making it criminal to print an article in the newspaper without having the writer's name signed to it—this applies to editors and all—or to print a caricature. To be sure, this law is a dead letter, otherwise Ferri's table of measurements of criminals' heads would have expanded to a degree.

But let no one think that we would prove all good men in jail and the bad ones out. Undoubtedly there are brutes who find their way to jail, but does the common jail-herd signify a natural selection of human life?—a natural partition of those beings who are a menace to society? No. It is a capitalist selection of subjects that Ferri is studying. Let him look to his figures, his measurements, and his tables, and he will find that a threat against the private ownership of the necessities of life to be the greatest crime on the calendar, and the basic reason for the existence of a "criminal class."

Not only are the laws made by the property holders prejudiced against the propertyless, but even the juries are drawn from this same class. In this state no one may sit upon a jury who is not upon the assessment roll. And through this sieve of justice Ferri expects to see the wheat separated from the chaff—the evil-doers from the righteous.

The law of averages is not a thing to play with. Rightly used, its deductions are unquestionable, as, for instance, the mortality tables of a life insurance company, which shows the average length of life to a fair certainty. But what must we think of a scientific conclusion drawn from such tables of statistics as these prison records? And harder yet of comprehension, how can a Socialist of international reputation accept evidence from the capitalist class upon a matter of such vital importance? Why, the very existence of the capitalists depend upon their providing that these records are a scientific compilation of examinations of the evildoers of society. Are they? Are vagrants, who constitute one of the largest fractions of the imprisoned, a class that threatens the existence of society? These vagrants are on strike—without the organization of a trade union, to be sure, but yet on strike against too much work for too little pay. Will Ferri assert that these men are a menace to society, under present conditions, because they do not work for capitalists? Would he have us believe that if more men went to work for capitalism the world would be better off? Well do the capitalists know that they must prove every man a "criminal" who does not work, night and day, to increase the private ownership of wealth—and hence their laws, their prisons, and their records—all strictly "scientific."

The men who should study these records need not stop to measure heads—it will be enough if they but count noses. For if a poor man becomes a criminal through his poverty—as the vagrancy laws assert—crime is certainly on the increase, and Professor Ferri has come to at least one correct conclusion.

That a study of the imprisoned may result in the unearthing of much valuable data as to lunacy, mental irresponsibility, and a great variety of mono-maniacs, there can be no question, but, aside from this, that criminologists can arrive at scientific conclusions as to who constitute the natural criminal (those who

are a menace to society) we deny. "But," say our criminologists, "we've measured the skulls of all the thieves and murderers and found them to be abnormal." Are you sure you have? Why the capitalists only catch the little thieves and murderers—who are not in the trust—and the lack of wit of this small fry proves absolutely nothing except that they were weak-minded enough to be caught. Have you the measurements of Nero's skull, Napoleon's skull, or that of General Kitchener? None of these men, to be sure, ever bathed their own hands in their victims' blood, but neither does a poisoner. Of course this line of argument will only hold good with a socialist-criminologist (Heaven save the mark), for the orthodox professors probably believe in the divine right of these normal murderers. And then, again, why should we heap all the responsibility onto the generals in the field? There is the Sultan of Turkey and Joseph Chamberlain, both of whom were quite ready to wipe out men, women and children with any weapon that came to their hands. For a strictly scientific conclusion it would seem as if Ferri must yet examine a number of heads.

Now we can see our opponents in this argument ready to take a parting and deadly shot at us: "How do you account," they ask, "for the number of recidivists, the habitual criminals? Is it not proof that this is naturally a criminal class?" To be sure, this question looks like a poser, but after all these "criminals" are affected by the laws of competition. They, too, are living as they can, not as they would. A man is not necessarily insane who returns, again and again, to a place where he is treated like a dog. Day laborers are continually doing this without criminologists labeling them as crazy. These unfortunate pick-and-shovel men know only the tricks of their trade and, every time they hunt a job, find only one avenue open to them. Why even the professors of criminology themselves, if the world should wake up and see the joke of their calculations, would probably continue to recidivate and insist that their mode of getting a living was legitimate. You can't teach an old dog new tricks, he will, quite naturally and normally, recidivate.

Who has not heard of the many heart-rending attempts of "criminals" to make an "honest" living after they have once served time? Hounded by the police, who know that these men can always be arrested, innocent or guilty, when they need a victim to fit the crime, boycotted by the "respectable" citizen and merchants of the community, is it surprising that they return, again and again, to the one trade that they know, to fill their stomachs? This relapse does not necessarily show a diseased individual, but it does show a diseased community of capitalist-ridden fools, who are willing to starve amidst plenty and hunt for "criminals" among chicken thieves and vagrants.

JOHN MURRAY, JR.

EDITORIAL

Crisis in Trade Unions.

The last few months has seen an attack upon union labor along the whole International fighting line. How the Taff Vale decision of England establishing the principle that all unions are liable for any damages incurred to their masters through a strike has been accepted and extended throughout that country is well told by Comrade Max S. Hayes elsewhere in this number. The Employers' Alliance in America, notwithstanding the insane ravings of their spokesman, D. M. Parry, is evidently preparing for a desperate fight. The general strike in Holland precipitated by the capitalists with International assistance, has given the labor movement something of a set back there, while a general reaction seems to have extended through the Australian colonies following the crushing of the railroad unions. All this shows how widespread the battle has become.

Very appropriately, however, the center of the firing line seems to be in the United States, where, as usual, the class struggle is waging fiercer than anywhere else. The last two months have seen a series of concerted moves which would seem to indicate that American capitalists were making a last desperate stand against the attempt of labor to improve its condition, and were determined to crush all attempts at co-operative resistance. Roosevelt, who but a short time ago was posing as the good angel of the coal miners, now announces in the Miller case the principle of the "open shop," a principle absolutely incompatible with successful trades unionism. If trade unionist and scab must work side by side sharing all the benefits, while the unionist alone bears the burdens of the struggle for better conditions, the constant incentive to slip from the burden-bearing into the purely benefit-receiving class will disrupt any union. This will be specially true when we add to the other burdens which the unionist must bear the inevitable discrimination of the employer. All union leaders have recognized these facts, and the hardest battles ever waged by trade unions in this country have been in defense of the principle of the closed shop. The employers have recognized this as a strategic point, and are bending their energies to carry their point. The marble workers have just been locked out by their employers who have announced their determination to open

up only when the union men shall consent to associate and work with their most deadly enemies.

More serious than any of these is the movement in this country to take advantage of the Taff Vale decision. The most important application of this which also involves the extension of the principle as explained by the English courts is seen in the suit by D. Loewe & Co., of Danbury, Connecticut, against the American Federation of Labor and the United Hatters of North America. This suit is for \$350,000 damage and involves the entire question of the right of boycott or even of the use of the union label as a method of discriminating against scab goods.

Another suit involving something of the same principle is that started by John M. Stiles, of Chicago, against practically all the building trade unions, and demanding damages for over \$50,000, because of injuries claimed to have been inflicted upon the complainant through strikes, and the Chicago Candy-makers' Union has also been sued by its employers for \$20,000 on similar ground.

There are numerous other suits, but these are sufficient to show how widespread the movement has become. A publication which comes to us from Vienna as the "central organ of the Austrian employers," appeals to the employers of Austria to stand together with the employers of the whole world in a struggle against the trade union and Socialist movement. It is interesting to note that this holds up as a model the English trade unions, of which it says: "They do not fight against the social order, nor against capital. On the contrary they have always completely surrendered their whole skill, intellectual ability and well-fed bodily strength to the capitalists. They said to themselves, if we wish to eat more beef steak and drink more porter and whiskey, or if we wish to have more days for music or sport, then we must devote our whole intellectual and physical energy to the factories and workshops in which we labor in order to turn out the very best possible products." But it is complained that the English trade unions are no longer maintaining this disposition, but are following the terrible example of their continental brothers and are going into politics. The situation in every country in the world is reviewed, and they cite with admiration the work of the Employers' Association in crushing the strike of the Chicago hotel and restaurant employes, the building trades in New York, and the spinners in Lowell, and praise the work of the employers in Denver in fighting trade unions, from which it would seem that there was a conscious organized co-operation between the employers of the world to fight the trade union movement, and especially when it becomes Socialistic. As the quotation shows, they have little fear of the "pure and simple."

The question of the immediate outcome is one which it is impossible to answer at the present time. Of the ultimate outcome there can be no doubt. The working class is not going to be crushed. Whether unionism in its present form, however, can withstand the struggle is another question. It is certain that if the leaders persist in their ignorant and reactionary opposition to all intelligent use of political power, the union will suffer at

least a temporary defeat. There seems to be a tendency on the part of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor to temporize with the matter even to the extent of neglecting the direct instructions of the rank and file. The political plums that have been gathered by Sargent, Sovereign, Powderly, Madden, Clark and others have evidently caused a hunger and thirst for more political pap. Hence it is that we see the executive committee hesitating whether it shall dare to take a stand against Roosevelt on the "open shop," notwithstanding the fact that with one or two exceptions every trade union in the country is, and always must be, opposed to the idea of union and scab working together. In case these leaders refuse to respond to the new demands that are being made upon them it is pretty safe to say that the movement towards industrialism and independent political action will so gain in strength that the present political leaders will find themselves out of a job.

Never, perhaps, in the face of a great crisis have representatives of the workers shown themselves so contemptible as has the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor at the present time. According to the press reports it was John Mitchell who led the opposition to any criticism of Roosevelt. It would seem that the association with the "great men" of capitalism had had rather a bad effect on Mitchell's head, and that he was now showing himself, if not directly treacherous, at least hopelessly incapable of grasping the situation. If the rank and file of the trade unions of America do not administer a rebuke to such tactics it will indicate that their appetite for oppression has not yet been exhausted.

Just as we go to press comes the news of the formation of the Central Employers' Association in Chicago, including capitalists throughout the entire country. The following from the Chicago Journal tells the inspiration which led to the formation of this institution:

"The spectre of socialism has at last begun to frighten American employers.

"Promoters of the new Central Employers' Association, which is being formed by organizations from the Atlantic to the Pacific, admitted this today, at a conference in Frederick W. Job's office.

"If it were not for the growth of socialism," said A. C. Davis, assistant secretary of the National Manufacturers' Association, "this association might not have been thought of. The policy of not opposing the movement has failed. We intend to fight socialism as well as the illegal methods and objects of union labor."

"Socialism is the coming question," declared A. C. Marshall, of the Dayton (Ohio) Employers' Association. "There is an undercurrent of socialism in all labor unions and this is the great danger of the present time. Far greater than mere unionism. The Catholic Church has been the first to recognize this. Something must be done to check the tide..."

"Secretary Job, of the Chicago Employers' Association, agreed with the speakers, and J. C. Craig, president of the Citizens' Alliance, of Denver, Colo., told of the conditions in his home state:

"Labor organizations in Colorado," he said, "are openly socialistic. The Western Federation of Miners, or, as I should call it, "The Western

Federation of Murderers," is full of socialist agitators. So is the Western Labor Union, and the citizens are banding together to resist their aggressions. Our association has 14,000 members in Denver and many other similar organizations have been formed. We intend to promote law and order and uphold the constitution of the United States.'

"Another speaker pointed out the fact that the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor had recently adopted socialistic resolutions and declared for 'industrial democracy.'

"The fight of the new employers' organization against the unreasonable exactions of unions and the influx of the doctrines of Karl Marx and other extremists will be fiercely waged.

"A publication is to be established for discussion of the problems involved, in which the present state of society and the laws will be vigorously upheld.

"A bureau of education and organization will also be formed."

This marks but one more step in the process of organization by the capitalists and offers one more proof that socialism is the one thing they most fear. In the Chicago Chronicle report of the same meeting another phase of the subject is brought out which should be called to the attention of the trade unionists throughout the country. The Mr. Craig referred to above is quoted as saying:

"The American Labor Union and the Western Miners must go. Both organizations have reached the point where they are dangerous to the community at large. They are lawless aggregations, teeming with socialists and anarchists. They do no good to labor and have an astounding record of crime and murder. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, I regard as a comparatively conservative man, and the employers of the west would be glad to see him succeed in extending the control of the American Federation throughout the west."

That Gompers will permit himself to be used in the manner suggested is perhaps too severe an indictment to bring against even one who has shown as great subserviency to capitalism as he has. The fact, however, of his recommendation by such a man should serve to awaken the members of the Federation of Labor to the necessity of supplanting him with some one who really recognizes the interests of the working class.

The Situation in Nebraska.

A communication has just been sent out by the State quorum of Nebraska discussing the situation in that State. The communication, as a whole, is too long for our columns, and we have made it a general rule not to publish communications of so purely a factional character as this seems to be, yet there are many things in it which we believe are of importance to the members at large, and that justice to the Nebraska comrades

requires should be published. It appears that the Socialist movement in Nebraska had a most unsavory origin, being started by a body of grafters in pay of the Republican party. As soon, however, as it began to have anything of a working class membership these men were driven out. Many of them, however, are still concerned in the organization of the "Omaha Socialist Propaganda Club," concerning which there has been so much discussion in the Socialist press. It was this organization, under whose auspices Comrades Mills and Hagerty spoke. The regular Socialist local protests that it invited speakers representing all phases of the recognized Socialist movement and that, therefore, there was no reason for the existence of such a propaganda club, and that its influence in the movement is purely disruptive. It appears that several comrades have come from other States into Nebraska and engaged in propaganda work without consulting the party organization. It is complained that such work tends to disorganize the movement, and accordingly the State quorum calls for action by the national committee to prevent further action along this line.

The communication is signed by the following: Parker S. Condit, chairman; G. W. Wray, B. McCaffrey, P. J. Hyland, J. Alfred LaBille, J. P. Roe, State Secretary.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

The International Socialist Bureau at Brussels has published a call to the party organizations of all countries inviting participation in the coming International Congress which takes place at Amsterdam August 14-20, 1904. The different parties are requested to bring the matter up before their coming congresses or conventions. The subject for discussion as far as determined on are as follows:

1. The Report of Secretary.
2. The Report of Nationalities.
3. General Fundamentals of Socialist Politics.
4. General Strike.
5. Labor Unions and Politics.
6. Trusts and the Unemployed.
7. International Arbitration.
8. Emigration and Immigration.

This order of business is still provisional, the divisions of the party have the right to suggest further points, but these should all be sent in before the 1st of next December.

The various Socialist parties and the central organizations of Trades Unions are requested to send to the Secretary previous to December 31, reports of their activity since the last congress of 1900. The address of the Secretary is No. 63 Rue Heyvaert, Brussels, Belgium.

Germany

Once more the revisionists have pushed themselves into public attention, and in a most unfortunate manner, on the question of whether the Social Democratic Party should seek to have one of its members elected to the Vice-Presidency of the Reichstag. As this is treated quite fully elsewhere in this number little need be said about it here. The whole question is also discussed in an article by August Bebel, of about 10,000 words length, in the *Neue Zeit* for September 5. In this article the whole Bernsteinian position is gone over and its weakness and dangers exposed in a most thorough manner. In his original article which started the trouble Bernstein declared that the Prussian constitution was a democratically adopted document. Bebel declares that this statement would have made old Bismarck hold his sides with laughter and refers Bernstein to an article by his uncle, Aaron Bernstein, written at the time of the adoption of the constitution in which he says of that document that it "is such an unfortunate, crazy, foolish, garbled document that its equal cannot be found in the whole history of law making." In his desperate attempt to defend his position Bernstein had stated that the attendance at court of a Social Democrat would be an indication that the emperor was forced to bow before the revolutionary Socialist movement. This at once angered his bourgeois

adversaries, and they sat upon him with only a little less vehemence than the Socialists. Bebel, with masterly logic and sarcasm, exposes the ridiculousness of the whole question in that the moment a Socialist Vice-President should attempt to do anything of importance for Socialism, or should even neglect to call for a "Hurrah" for the emperor when he entered the chamber, he would be deposed and the whole farce would be played out. He shows how in this discussion the opportunists have completely reversed many of their former positions, so that Vollmar, for example, now declares that the form of the state is of no importance, offering this as an excuse for his advocacy of the court visit and consequent crawling before the emperor. Bebel contrasts the autocratic tyrannical attitude of the German government with other governments of Europe, points out the repression of the rights of free speech, assembly and press, and then asks if it is because of these special features that a Social Democratic should "Kotow to the emperor." Some of the Opportunists have even dared to suggest that if Singer was not acceptable to the capitalist majority that some other comrade be chosen, thus showing a willingness to let the enemy even select the representatives of the Socialists.

On the whole, the result of this latest expression of Bernsteinism has been to give the Opportunists such a rebuke as they have never before received.

The result at the Dresden congress is familiar to most of our readers. In a masterly speech of over four hours Bebel completely demolished the Opportunist position. Vollmar contented himself with a personal attack on Bebel, alleging that he wished to become the dictator of his party. A resolution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote re-affirming the revolutionary position of the party and denouncing the idea of electing a Vice-President to the Reichstag, or in any other way compromising Socialist principles. A full report of the proceedings will appear in our next issue.

The report of the party officials to the Dresden Congress has just been issued as a supplement to *Vorwaerts*, and is a most interesting and instructive document. The long list of dead to whom honor is paid in the opening pages brings to the mind at once the fact that the party has now reached an age where the first generation of veterans are being mustered out by death. The police outrages of the past year are enumerated, and in the stories of meetings violently dispersed, offices searched and comrades imprisoned we gain a glimpse of the difficulties under which the propagandist of Socialism in Germany must struggle. The total fines registered during the year for Socialist activity amount to 16,707 marks, while the total of sentences to imprisonment amount to fourteen years in the penitentiary and thirty-six years, five months and six weeks jail confinement.

Every year the participation in the minor elections increases until now candidates are nominated for most of the municipal and minor legislative bodies. Consequently the number of socialists elected to these bodies is rapidly increasing. The Social Democratic fraction in the Berlin council has appointed a committee to organize the municipal officers in the province of Brandenburg into a body for the purpose of evolving a municipal program. They have also taken some steps to secure the co-operation of all the municipal officers in Prussia, but the general council of the Prussian wing of the party deferred action owing to the fact that the whole matter of a general municipal program was to be considered at the Dresden Congress.

The report on the work done during the campaign is of especial interest, as giving some view of the causes of the tremendous progress made at the last election. The balance sheet of the party shows that 635,053.58 marks (nearly \$160,000) were handled during the year, and that at the close of the campaign 28,102.84 marks remained on hand. The principal campaign document was the manifesto issued by the Reichstag fraction (a translation of which has already appeared in this department) of which 632,800 copies were circulated. A campaign handbook for the benefit of speakers and

workers was published and 4,500 copies circulated. Large as these figures are, they are probably smaller than would be circulated in a national campaign in the United States with a much smaller membership and vote. In the circulation of periodicals also the comparison is decidedly favorable to us. *Vorwaerts*, to be sure, heads the list with a daily circulation of 78,500, but the *Neue Zeit* falls far behind the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, having only 3,850 circulation, while there are no weekly or monthly propaganda papers with anything near the circulation of some American Socialist papers. *Der Wahre Jacob*, a comic illustrated weekly, brought a profit to the party of 24,666 marks, which more than offset the loss on *Die Neue Zeit* and *Gleichheit*. The latter publication is designed especially for circulation among women and issued special editions of 7,000 each during the campaign, and has a regular circulation of 1,500 copies. *Vorwaerts* brought in a profit of 72,338.65 marks, of which 31,286.58 marks were used to meet deficits on other papers.

From the *National Zeitung*, of Berlin, we learn that the trade unions affiliated with the Social Democratic Party have increased in membership from 677,510 in 1901, to 733,206 at the present time. In 1893 they had only 223,540 members and there was little increase until 1897. Since that year, however, the growth has been steady and rapid. These Social Democratic unions include at least 14.42 per cent of all the workers engaged in the branches represented. In some of the better organized trades practically all the laborers are included.

Italy

Some time ago Enrico Ferri, as editor of the *Avanti*, published an exposure of the corruption existing in the Navy Department. In this article he showed, among other things, that the common soldiers and sailors had been left to suffer with insufficient food and no pay because the money intended for this purpose had been pocketed by the commanding officers. The article forced the resignation of the Minister of the Navy, and was followed by a suit for libel against Ferri as responsible editor for the *Avanti*. The suit has just come to trial, and the thirty-five complainants who appeared in court were informed that since the article referred only to a "system of corruption in the Navy Department" and mentioned no names, there was no official reason for believing that the thirty-five complainants represented the navy, or were a part of the system of corruption, consequently the case was dismissed.

This outcome of the case was wholly unexpected and undesired by Ferri, as he had come into court wholly prepared to prove his charges. Doubtless it was a knowledge of this fact that led to the dismissal of the case.

The split in the Socialist Party in Italy seems to be rather widening than otherwise. A weekly paper entitled *Il Socialisti* has been started by the reform wing in Rome with Bissoloti, Cassola and Monomi as editors. These men were the previous editors of *Avanti*, who were displaced when the party disavowed their reform tactics. They announce their intention, however, of not taking part in the internal fight, but confining themselves to propaganda work.

Norway

There will be five Social Democrats in the new Storting. The total Social Democratic vote at the election of September 3 was 14,046 in those cities from which returns have already been received. In the previous Storting election in 1900 there were only 7,013 Social Democratic

votes. The *Vorwaerts* report states that it is probable that with the elections that are yet to be held that the present number of votes will be doubled.

Later information states that 25,000 Socialist votes were given at the last general election in Norway for the Storting. As a comparison it may be observed that there are at present ten Socialists in the Folkthing in Denmark and four Socialist members of the Rikstog in Sweden.

Russia

In spite of the close censorship, rumbles of the tremendous class struggle which is taking place in the heart of this great empire reaches the outside world. The press reports state that over 25,000 men have been out on strike in the neighborhood of Odessa during the past few weeks, and the usual scenes of military abuse, the atrocities of the Cossacks and the wholesale imprisonment of workers have taken place. It is significant that in one case where the troops were ordered to fire upon the strikers the lieutenant stepped forward and told his men that they were laborers like those upon whom they were called upon to shoot, and advised them not to fire. It is needless to say that this officer was at once shot, and it is said that the Czar showed more than ordinary haste in signing the order for his execution. It is to be hoped that the Russian comrades may find some way of letting the outside world know the name of this martyr to the cause of Socialism, that it may be enrolled with the already long list of those who have given up their lives to the cause.

It is extremely significant that one of the directors of the police department in Odessa, in the course of his statements to the strikers, declaring that there should be no concessions made to them, advises them to read the works of Edward Bernstein, whom he asserts to be "an undoubted true friend of the laboring class."

Bernstein declares in a letter to *Vorwaerts* that only a portion of his *Voraussetzung* was allowed to pass the Russian censor, and that all reference to Socialism was cut out in this portion.

The special correspondent of *L'Action* (Paris) reports that the revolutionary activity in the neighborhood of Cracow has just reached a height never before known. The soldiers have received orders to be particularly severe in suppressing all extension of the revolutionary propaganda, and all correspondence coming from this region is subjected to a most severe censorship. Nevertheless the revolution proceeds rapidly, in spite of the bloody path which it leaves behind it. There has scarcely a day passed for some time in the industrial centers that the Cossacks have not killed from 250 to 300 workers. The movement in the vicinity of Cracow is directed by the students of the University, who go into the neighboring villages, at the peril of their lives, in order to preach revolt. The principal revolutionary centers are Cracow, Odessa, Kief, Batoun and Bakou. In the little villages the situation is particularly serious. On the 3d of last July 16,000 workers had gone on a strike, all business connected with the refining and shipping of petroleum, of which Bakou is the center, was suspended, the trains ceased to run and the electric lights, which were used for lighting the city, were unable to be operated. The entire country was at once filled with the military, but at the last report industry was still very much disturbed while the revolutionary movement is spreading to other localities.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Finland

The Finnish Workers' Party, as the Socialist Party, called, held its convention August 17-20 in Forssa, a small town. Forty branches sent delegates. The party has 59 branches and about 10,000 members.

The government district secretary and several gendarmes and policemen watched over the meeting.

The convention unanimously adopted a party platform, of which the following is a condensation: The Socialist Party of Finland, like the Socialist Parties in other countries, strives to liberate the whole people from the fetters of economic dependence and from political and mental subjection. Among the party's immediate demands are universal equal suffrage for all Finnish men and women who have reached the age of 21, in municipal and national elections; one house of parliament; complete liberty of association, assemblage, speech, and the press; compulsory education, free instruction in all educational institutions.

A municipal program, similar to that in other countries, was adopted.

A suffrage resolution was passed: "The party declares the struggle for suffrage begun and appeals to the workers and just persons of the higher classes to take part energetically in the conflict. If all other means fail a general strike will be declared to obtain universal suffrage."

The convention discussed the question of co-operation. There are from 40 to 50 co-operatives who members are nearly all workers. A resolution was passed that as the workers support the co-operatives the co-operatives should also support the Labor Party.

An agrarian program, including collective ownership of land, was adopted.

The following demands were made: An effective law protecting women, the election of women factory inspectors, old age government pensions going into effect at the age of 55, prevention of disoccupation by establishing the eight-hour day insurance against disoccupation, a minimum limit of wages, state and municipal public works for the unemployed, agricultural colonies, etc.

The next convention will be held in August, 1905.

Edward Walgas, of Helsingfors, and J. K. Kari, of Abo, were elected delegates to the International Socialist Bureau in Brussels. The party executive committee consists of nineteen members, seven of whom live in Abo. The party headquarters are in Abo. The president of the party is T. Tainio; Seth Heikkilae is vice president, and J. K. Kari is secretary and treasurer.—Berlin "Vorwaerts."

Servia

La Petite Republique announces the formation of a Socialist Party in Servia. The dispatch states that this has been impossible hitherto, but that the new king offers no opposition. Five hundred persons were present at the first meeting and arrangements were made for the drawing up of a platform and plan of organization of the party. Later Associated Press reports state that an election held for the Skupshtina (the legislative chamber) on September 22, resulted in the election of 65 "extreme radicals," 73 radicals, 15 liberals and 2 Socialists.

Denmark

The progress of Socialism in Denmark is steady and continuous. The telegraphic dispatches announce that at the municipal election just held in Copenhagen the Socialists were victorious, in spite of a coalition of all other parties. The following, taken from an article by J. Arthur Fal-lows, in the *I. L. P. News* tells the story of the rejection of all com-promise tactics by the Danish Socialists and their appearance as a wholly independent body:

"In Denmark there is one compact centralized Socialist party, which contains most of the members of the working classes in the large towns, who are also almost invariably members of Trades Unions. The work-ingmen buy and read the daily Socialist papers, especially the *Social Democrat*. They meet at the Socialist clubs on week nights, and on Sundays at suburban restaurants, where they hold open-air meetings in the summer and indoors in the winter. In the City Council of the capital, Copenhagen, there are now 19 Socialists, out of a total member-ship of 42. Elections cost very little, and the candidates do not have to pay a single penny thereon. The elected members meet weekly. As in England, the subjects discussed include housing, tramways, wages, early closing of shops, and so forth. In the Danish City Councils there are four official mayors, who are salaried heads of executive depart-ments, and hold office for life. A year ago the Socialist party managed to elect members of their organization as mayor and deputy-mayor. This led to a great agitation among the bourgeoisie, who coalesced in "The Anti-Socialist party," and won several seats from the Socialists.

"The last Socialist congress marked an epoch in the history of the Danish Socialist movement, because of its decision to put an end to the partial alliance with the Liberals which had previously been in effect. This alliance was formed at the time when both the Liberals and the Socialists, as minority and opposition parties, were arrayed against an extremely arbitrary Conservative government, which was determined to hold on to power after it had lost its majority in the Folkething. Two years ago the government was compelled to yield, and a Liberal ministry was formed, and the Socialists in the Folkething gave their support to this ministry in consideration of its promise of considerable reforms—reduction of the war budget, an extensive program of amelio-rative labor legislation, extension of manhood suffrage to local elections (for in Denmark, as in most European countries, the suffrage is much more restricted in municipal and communal than in national elections), and other progressive measures.

"Instead, however, of carrying out this program, the Liberal gov-ernment began at once to follow the example of the Conservative min-istry that had preceded it, completely disregarding its pledges, effected a rapprochement with the Conservative majority in the upper house to carry out its reactionary plans in defiance of the opposition in the popular branch.

"In consequence of this experience the party congress unanimously voted to dissolve the alliance and to treat the Liberals on the same terms with the Conservatives, as political enemies. On this line the recent election was fought and a noteworthy advance made for Social Democracy. In the manifesto announcing this change of policy the party declared: 'We do not regret having aided the left to get into power. We foresaw that after the victory of the majority' (that is, the Liberal-Socialist coalition) 'a new conflict would arise within that majority, al-though we did not expect that it would rise so quickly or in such a severe form.' "

England

The article by Comrade Hobson, published elsewhere in this issue, gives a very good view of the present Socialist situation in England. But a few words of explanation regarding some things not touched upon by him will assist in clearing up the matter. It is now evident that a Parliamentary election cannot be long postponed and the Socialists are making their nominations for this election. The S. D. F. has placed H. M. Hyndman in nomination for the district of Burnley and the most strenuous efforts are being made to elect him. There is every prospect of success and it will be a disgrace to the laboring men of England should he fail. There is perhaps no other man in the whole international Socialist movement who could do more in a legislative body than Comrade Hyndman could do in the House of Parliament. He has been recognized for years as one of the ablest students of English political affairs. He is a splendid speaker, a man of undoubted integrity and devotion to the working class.

The general situation in England, however, cannot be said to be encouraging. The Labor Representation Conference, about which we hear so much, because it has nearly a million and a half of trade unionists supporting it with regular contributions for political purposes, is, after all, not a Socialist body. Whether it will evolve into a Socialist organization or not, remains to be seen. The Social Democratic Federation has withdrawn from the Labor Representation Conference, because of its refusal to stand upon a Socialist platform.

The members who have been elected by the L. R. C. to Parliament have, by no means, all been Socialists. Some of them have openly disavowed Socialism after election; others show much more willingness to affiliate with the Liberals than with the Socialists, notwithstanding the fact that the one thing upon which the L. R. C. rests is independent political action.

British Columbia

Associated Press dispatches announce that two, and perhaps three, members have been elected from British Columbia. This gives the Socialists a balance of power in the legislative bodies, and under a Parliamentary government this means that it will be impossible to conduct business, and, consequently, a new election will have to be ordered shortly. The growth of Socialism in Canada has been remarkable. The American Labor Union is very strong in British Columbia and its members are, almost without exception, Socialists.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Political History of Slavery, by William Henry Smith; E. P. Putnam's Sons. Cloth, 2 vols., 806pp.; \$4.50.

The majority of the histories of slavery in America were written by participants in the struggle, lacked historical value and were tinged with extreme partisanship. The present work, to some degree, avoids the first of these defects, but with regard to the second point, the bias is almost as evident in this as in any of the contemporaneous works.

The fundamental proposition of the work is that the Republican party could do no wrong. Once, however, having recognized this position, it is easy for the reader to make allowance, and the author has certainly brought together much new material and co-ordinated it in better form than in any preceding history. The most distinctive feature about the work is the scanty recognition which is given to the early abolitionists of the Garrison-Phillips type, and the much greater importance assigned to western factors. There is no doubt but what this is the trend at the present time, and that it is justifiable. There is little recognition of the economic factors that lay back of the great movement he is describing, and almost no notice of the divergent interests of the economic classes which were struggling for mastery. He does bring out much plainer than ever before the fact that the war was not waged for the abolition of slavery. He repeatedly calls attention to the fact that the Republican party was not abolitionist. He shows how during the war the seaboard states, which were largely commercial, desired above everything, to secure a compromise with the South.

The chapter on "Proposed Concessions" is perhaps the one which is most valuable on this point. Here, it is shown that the Republican senators were all willing, even after the Southern States had seceded, to adopt a constitutional amendment "prohibiting congress from abolishing or interfering with slavery in the States." And an amendment was actually passed through congress to this effect. Finally, after the battle of Bull Run, a resolution was introduced into Congress declaring "that this war is not waged for any purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States." "In the House there were only two votes in the negative; in the Senate there were four votes against it cast by dis-unionists."

In the chapter treating of the re-arrangement of affairs after the war, it is pointed out quite clearly how capital gathered into great aggregations, owing to the abnormal conditions of government contracts and the high tariff made necessary by the war.

It would be very easy to go through the book and point out any number of places where the author had refused to see any truth that did not accord with the accepted codes of capitalist ethics. But until the class nature of our present social thought has been transformed, these defects will be common to all books of this character.

Loan Credit in Modern Business, by Thorstein B. Veblen. Reprinted

from Vol. IV., of the Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago. Folio. paper, 22pp.

It is always difficult in Professor Veblen's work to determine in just how far he is poking fun at the orthodox political economist. He announces in regard to this study that "the subject of this inquiry is the resort to credit as an expedient in the quest of profits." He shows that competition forces every capitalist to increase the size of the business turnover by the use of as great credit as possible. This was originally done by loans and current bills. When these could not be met they were said to be "excessive." If these cases included a large number of firms, the resulting liquidation became a crisis.

Professor Veblen points out that the only canon of judgment to determine whether credit was "excessive" was whether the debtor became bankrupt or not.

With modern corporations this credit extension is pushed to its fullest limit at the time of the organization of the company, instead of being a process drawn out through many years. Or, as he puts it, to be "carried out thoroughly it places virtually the entire capital, comprising the whole of the material equipment, on a credit basis. Stock being issued by the use of funds, such funds as may be needed to *pay for printing*, a road will be built, or an industrial plant established, by the use of funds drawn from the sale of bonds; preferred stock or similar debentures will then be issued, commonly of various denominations, to the full amount that the property will bear, and not infrequently somewhat in excess of what the property will bear." [Italics ours.]

One cannot but think that Professor Veblen must have smiled when he wrote such a paragraph as this: "In the ideal case, where a corporation is financed with *due perspicacity*, there will be but an inappreciable proportion of the market value of the company's good will left uncovered by debentures."

In a note he casts some rather suggestive remarks at "the student who harks back to archaic methods for a norm of what capitalism should be." He shows that once a corporation is financed by this method, it is easy to clear out the holders of "excessive credit" and in this way the trust maker is in some respects a substitute for a commercial crisis.

The whole essay, however, is certainly the most keen analysis of modern trust financing that has ever been published, and will repay reading to any student of this phase of industry.

Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society. By Richard T. Ely. The Macmillan Co. Citizens' Library. pp. 497. \$1.25.

In this work we have for the first time set forth something approaching a social system by an opponent, although almost a friendly one, of socialism. In the first part, which consists of a general survey, the author shows how the idea of evolution in society has arisen, and traces the stages through which society has passed in much the same manner that the socialist does. He gives much valuable statistical material concerning present conditions and the recent tendency of industrial evolution.

The second part, which deals with some special problems of industrial evolution, is a series of essays on various subjects. The author states his problem on page 270 to be "what can we accomplish in order to ameliorate the condition of the masses without departure from the fundamental principles of the existing social order." And it is plain to be seen throughout the whole book that the spectre of socialism is ever before him, and that he is constantly asking himself "what shall we do to be saved?"

He admits that the foresight of Marx and Engels concerning the industrial evolution was almost marvellously prophetic, and that we are approaching the fulfillment of the final stages of that prophecy. He thinks it still possible to maintain the competitive system and so patch up things

as to make conditions endurable without disturbing "the fundamental principles of the existing social order," yet somehow the work fails to carry conviction.

No one can deny the scholarly character of most of its pages, and it is in our opinion one of the most valuable contributions to social thought that has been produced in many years. At the same time whenever the subject of socialism is approached the treatment is most unsatisfactory. This is not because he does not agree with the socialist, but because he seems to constantly avoid coming to an open issue.

There is a section entitled "economic classes," to which we turned with the expectation of finding a fair statement of the socialist theory of the class struggle with the refutation, or at least the attempted refutation, of that position. We do find the well known quotation from the Communist Manifesto beginning with "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles," but having thus given the statement we look in vain for any comment. On the contrary, we find that the great social classification of the Manifesto is given as if it were simply one of several equally important classifications that might be made, and the author even places as apparently co-ordinate with it, the statement that "we may divide the workers according to their kind of occupation," and then follow a few commonplaces such as "The effects of classes are both good and evil."

There is no recognition of the tremendous social significance of the principles laid down in the Manifesto as quoted, if they are true, or any attempt to refute them if the author considers them false.

The same feeling of unfairness arises in the treatment of economic determinism. Here the statement is made that the socialist exaggerates the importance of the economic factor, and an example of such exaggeration is given by a quotation from an article by May Wood Simons which appeared in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. Unfortunately, however, the example, which is instanced as an exaggeration, is almost identical in statement with the position of Prof. Seligman, who is quoted in the same note as having stated the theory in so mild a form that "it is difficult to see why the doctrine should have roused so much discussion." (See Seligman's "Economic Interpretation of History," p. 9.) But no attempt is made to support this opinion of socialist exaggeration, notwithstanding that this is the most crucial point in the whole discussion.

It would be easy to multiply instances of this, but we will give only one more, and that because it applies to the criticism of an article by the reviewer. In his discussion of the contrast between socialism and social reform he quotes an article written by the editor of this REVIEW on "Special Privileges," which, if correct, is a refutation of the whole position on which the book rests. When we saw this we expected at once that some attempt would be made to overthrow the arguments there made. On the contrary Dr. Ely contents himself simply by stating that he believes to the contrary, but offers no reasons for that belief.

It is such quotations as the following, however, that make the socialist smile: "If there is to be a new social order there is every indication that it will be socialism." "If we let things alone we shall have an evolution much like that which the great socialists Marx and Engels predicted."

The whole first part of the book is filled with proofs of the fact that society is evolving, and that new social orders are continually succeeding to the old, and therefore we may be sure that there will be a new social order. In the second place there is a vast body of workingmen who are not only not going to "let things alone," but are going to assist them in moving toward "an evolution like that which Marx and Engels predicted."

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

What to Read on Socialism.

A booklet bearing this title and containing brief descriptions of the standard books on Socialism was published from this office last year, and fifty thousand copies have been circulated. The growth of our publishing house and the number of new books in preparation have now made the booklet out of date, and no more copies will be printed. Its place will be taken by a larger book under the same title. It will be of 36 pages, the size of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and will contain portraits of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht, Vandervelde, Whitman, Carpenter, Blatchford, Simons, and other writers. There will be an introductory essay by Charles H. Kerr on "The Central Thing in Socialism," explaining in as simple language as possible the principle of Historical Materialism, as developed by Marx, Engels and Labriola, which lies at the foundation of scientific socialism. The body of the book is taken up with descriptions of all the best books on Socialism which are available for American readers, with quotations from many of the more important works. It will be printed on fine book paper, with cover of white enamel, equal in appearance to a ten-cent book, but it will be sold for one cent a copy or \$1.00 a hundred, postpaid, or fifty cents a hundred by express at purchaser's expense. This is less than cost, and on this book there will be no reduction to stockholders.

CAPITAL, BY KARL MARX.

A new importation of the London edition of Marx's Capital has just been received, and it is selling so rapidly that it will be nearly exhausted by the time this issue of the Review is in the hands of its readers. A large order has been placed, and we shall soon be in a position to supply the book as rapidly as it is called for. The phenomenal sale of "Capital" is a good index to the growth of the Socialist movement in the United States.

A non-Socialist publishing house in New York has inserted in some Socialist papers a misleading advertisement of a cheap reprint of "Capital." The fact of the matter is that the London edition contains 847 octavo pages of clear, open type, and was printed from plates which were revised and corrected with the minutest care, under the supervision of Frederick Engels himself. The New York edition is a hasty reprint from the London edition, and it is crowded into less than 600 pages, the lines being close together, and thus much harder on the eyes. The inferior edition sells for \$1.75, while ours sells for \$2.00 at retail, \$1.20 to our stockholders, if mailed, and \$1.00 to stockholders if sent by express at expense of purchaser.

A NEW EDITION OF "THE AMERICAN FARMER."

The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons, is a pioneer work in an untouched field, the application of the principles of Socialism to the social and political questions affecting the farmers of the United States. The first edition of two thousand copies appeared a little over a year ago and is exhausted. The author has been studying the subject constantly during the past year, and has brought so much more material to light that it has seemed best to rewrite the entire book instead of printing an edition from the old plates. Nearly every chapter will be found in the new edition to be materially improved, and so much so that those who have read the first edition will find it necessary to read the second, if they wish to keep up with the subject. Ready about November 10; cloth, 50 cents.

LABRIOLA'S GREAT BOOK.

"Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History," by Professor Labriola, of the University of Rome, is recognized by European socialists as the most important work which has appeared since Capital. Charles H. Kerr has completed a translation of this book, which will be ready about Dec. 1. It will contain about 300 pages, will be handsomely printed and bound, and will sell for \$1.00, with the usual discounts to stockholders. Advance orders are solicited.

THE POCKET LIBRARY OF SOCIALISM.

"The Capitalists' Union or Labor Unions, Which?" is a new booklet of 32 pages, prepared under the authority of Union 7386, American Federation of Labor, for affiliated unions. It is No. 40 of the Pocket Library of Socialism, but the word Socialism is purposely left off the front page, for the reason that the booklet is addressed to the union man who is not a Socialist, and who is probably prejudiced against Socialism, and the idea is to interest in him certain well-understood facts that concern his immediate interests, before leading up to the subject of socialism. The principles of Socialism are set forth, ably, clearly and uncompromisingly, in the latter part of the booklet.

"The Socialist Party," No. 33 of the Pocket Library, has been re-issued in an improved form. The descriptions of socialist literature are omitted, since they are given more completely in the new book "What to Read on Socialism." Their place is supplied by a complete directory of the socialist locals of the United States with their secretaries. The compilation of this list involved great labor and expense, and was only made possible by the co-operation of the national and state secretaries. The price has been left at the low uniform figure charged for any issue or for assorted issues of the Pocket Library of Socialism; five cents singly, six for twenty-five cents, fourteen for fifty cents, thirty for a dollar, \$1.33 for the complete set of thirty numbers. To stockholders, two cents a copy for any number less than a hundred, one dollar a hundred, by mail or express, prepaid; eight dollars a thousand by express at the expense of the purchaser.

ALL BUT DELAWARE AND NEVADA.

We received a stock subscription in September from the Socialist Party local at Columbia, South Carolina. We now have a stockholder in every state of the union, except Delaware and Nevada, also in every territory, besides several provinces of Canada and several foreign countries, including England, Scotland, Mexico and Cuba. Less than two hundred shares remain for sale, and it will soon be necessary to take a vote of the stockholders authorizing the issue of additional stock. No

one will hereafter be requested to subscribe for more than a single share, since it is desired to keep the future control of this co-operative publishing company in the hands of the rank and file of the Socialist Party, and not of any individual or small group of individuals.

REMOVAL TO LARGER QUARTERS.

The office of our company since 1895 has been on the fourth floor of the Garden City block, 56 Fifth avenue. The recent growth of our work has crowded our rooms to overflowing, and we have now taken the lease of suite 504-505 on the fifth floor of the same building, giving us double our former space. This will enable us to display our literature in much better shape for the convenience of comrades visiting us. Our post-office address will be as before, Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publishers, 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

A SOCIALIST CLASSIC



THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, Private Property and the State

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

Translated by Ernst Untermann.

There are a few books the reading of which constitutes a necessary foundation to an understanding of Socialism. One of these is Engels' "Origin of the Family." Hitherto this has not been accessible in English, although it has long been translated into almost every other European language. (

) It deals with fundamentals and traces the growth of those social institutions which are to the student of society what elements are to the chemist. Yet it is written in plain language easily understandable without the knowledge of any technical vocabulary.

It starts with the beginnings of human life and traces the institution of the family, of private property and the state from their first rude origins to their present forms, showing the great changes that have taken place in response to economic transformations.

As a study in Socialist philosophy of institutions, as a storehouse of information on fundamental points, there is no book of anything near the same size that can begin to rival it.

CLOTH, 218 PAGES, 50 CENTS POSTPAID.

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