The Freemen of Ancient Athens.

The materialistic interpretation of history, first discovered and formulated by Marx and Engels and first adequately elaborated by Labriola, is only now beginning to be applied, at least in writings accessible in the English language. The histories to which we must go for our facts if we would know anything of the past life of the world are still the histories written by men with theological or other ideological explanations for the course of events, by men who believed that ideas fell from heaven or were bestowed upon the race by gifted individuals who arose from time to time, and each in his turn infused new life into a sluggish, stupid humanity.

Yet these old historians and the sheltered, conservative scholars who cling to old traditions have preserved countless facts of untold value, which only need to be re-interpreted in the light of historical materialism, to make the past history of mankind luminous with meaning and prophetic with the promise of a larger life for the generation next to come.

My subject in this article is the freemen of ancient Athens. I wish to speak in particular of that period of Athenian history, the fourth and fifth centuries before the Christian era, and more especially the last half of the fifth century, in which were produced so large a proportion of the works of literature and art which have left their impress on the intellectual life of the world ever since. Was it by accident that in this one city at this one epoch the mind of man reached heights that have scarcely been equaled through all the ages, even amid the material achievements of the last hundred years? If no accident what was the cause? This is a riddle that has baffled the historians of all subsequent ages, and only the socialist has the clue to the answer. It is found in our fundamental principle of historical materialism.
For an adequate statement of this theory, it is necessary to go to Marx, Engels or Labriola, but this time, instead of quoting from these writers, I will try to give a brief summary of the theory in easier and simpler language than they employ. I am well aware that I shall be sacrificing complete accuracy to simplicity, and I trust it will be understood that I am not attempting a scientific definition.

Human beings, in order to live, are obliged to provide themselves with food, and, outside the tropics at least, with clothing and shelter. All human beings of whom we have any definite knowledge have supplied these material wants by some sort of associated labor, from the communal gens of the Iroquois Indian to the capitalist society of today with its wage slaves and its trust magnates. Now the discovery of Marx is that each successive industrial system, by which the people of any given time and place supply their material wants, is the determining cause of the political systems which accompany it or follow it, and likewise of the general currents of thought, opinion and feeling which accompany or follow it. In other words, it is not the ideas of men which determine their material conditions, but, speaking generally, it is, in the last analysis, the past and present economic conditions which determine the prevalent ideas, and in fact the whole current of what we call intellectual life. This does not mean that ideas have had no part, in the progress of the human race, but it does mean that every victorious idea has had its roots in a definite economic situation, and could not have developed had the economic situation been radically different.

There is a sharp contrast between the social life of the self-governing cities of Greece, and that of the despotic monarchies of vast extent which covered western Asia and northwestern Africa. One obvious cause for this difference lies in the geographical character of the territory. The level plains of Assyria and Egypt were favorable to the movement of large armies, and the primitive communism of these countries was crushed out by the growing military power of rising rulers, at least two thousand years before the Christian era.

Greece, on the other hand, is cut up into little valleys by steep mountains, while a large part of its territory is composed of islands large and small. The communal system thus persisted far later than in Asia, and its traces are distinctly visible in the organization of the state of Athens as we find it at the earliest historical period. And as clans and tribes evolved into states, with ruling and subject classes, each valley and each island in Greece became a state by it-
self. Frequent wars between tribes and the discovery that a prisoner was a valuable asset, since he could produce more food than he could eat, had made general a system of chattel slavery throughout the states of Greece. The slaves were not members of an inferior or alien race. They were almost always native Greeks, of the same blood as their masters, and with the shifting fortunes of war, it was not impossible for master and slave to change places. Agriculture was of course the main industry, especially in the earliest historical period. But Greece was not only mountainous, it was also easily accessible to the sea, with a multitude of good harbors, and the timber for ship-building ready at hand, and so it was that the Greeks became a sea-faring people, exchanging their own products with those of Phoenicia, Egypt, Italy and the other shores of the Mediterranean. Piracy in those days was a respectable industry, and necessarily every merchant ship had to be a war ship in self-defence.

Thus about the year five hundred before the Christian era we find the people of Greece living in their little self-governing states, gaining their living by agriculture and commerce, using slave labor to a limited extent, and mainly taken up with their wars between city and city, and with their spreading commerce. They had founded colonies wherever their ships sailed, and some of the most important of these colonies were cities on the west coast of Asia Minor. At the time we are considering the king of Persia had consolidated under his rule all the other great monarchies of western Asia, and laid siege to these Greek cities. They called on Athens, the largest city in Greece, for help, and the Athenians accordingly fitted out an expedition. It did not save the Greek cities of Asia from capture, but inflicted considerable damage on the Persians, and drew down the wrath of the Great King upon Athens. He fitted out a fleet to attack the city of Athens. It was wrecked in a storm and the expedition came to nothing. The king persevered, and in the year 490 B. C. fitted out the famous expedition we have all read of in our school books, which landed near Marathon, on the coast of Attica, near Athens. The battle of Marathon resulted in the defeat of the large Persian army by a much smaller army of Greeks. It is what the old-fashioned historians call one of the world's decisive battles. Perhaps it was, if battles ever are decisive. But there were economic forces that turned the scale in the battle of Marathon, and it resulted in its turn in a re-adjustment of economic forces that were to bring about immense changes before a generation passed away. The Persian army was composed largely of unwilling soldiers drawn from subject nations, forced on pain of
death to go to an unknown country and fight the battles of the Great King. The Greeks were the rulers of their own state. They had no theories of natural right and no conscientious principles whatever against the system of chattel slavery, but when it came to applying that system, they preferred to be on top rather than underneath. They won the battle of Marathon, and the moral effect of that battle was to give confidence to the Greeks in subsequent wars with the Persians, and to increase the prestige of the city of Athens among the other Greeks. The Athenians, or at least the wiser heads among them, knew that the Persians would not be satisfied with the result of the battle. The Persian king died soon after, and Greece thus gained a breathing spell, which the Athenians used in building more ships. Ten years after the battle of Marathon came the famous invasion of Greece by the immense army and navy of Persia under Xerxes. Conventional historians waste most of their enthusiasm, in describing this war, over the battle of Thermopylae, where three hundred Spartans threw away their lives in defending a pass after the enemy had already found another way around. This historical episode reminds me of the remark of the little girl who had been regaled with Mrs. Hemans' story of Casabianca,

"The boy stood on the burning deck
Whence all but him had fled,"

and staid there until burned up because he had been ordered by his father to remain until further notice, and an untimely death on the part of the father had prevented the further notice. The opinion of the little American girl was, "I fink he was dreffle good, but he wasn't the least bit smart." So with the Spartans, they may have been dreffle brave, but they didn't display any great amount of brain work.

The Athenians were different. When the Persian army, said to number a million men, reached the neighborhood of Athens, they didn't stand their ground and fight against overwhelming odds until the last Athenian was slain. That might have made fine material for poets, but the Athenians were strictly materialistic. They moved their wives, their children and their movable property from the mainland to a neighboring island, while their fighting men went on board their ships and with rather ungracious support from the other Greeks, met the Persians where they were weakest, at sea. Persia was an inland country, and its fleet was drawn from subject nations who were none too enthusiastic in fighting for their conquerors, moreover, they were no match for the Greeks in naval tactics. The Persian fleet was driven
from the coast of Greece, then pursued home and demolished there. The land campaign dragged on for a year, but the Persians finally withdrew in defeat, never to return. It was at sea that the real contest was fought out, and the smaller states of Greece were obliged to recognize that it was to the energy and vigor of Athens that they owed their escape from slavery to the Persians.

The Athenians, as I have said, were materialistic, and they were not slow in utilizing this sentiment for practical ends. They organized at once a confederacy of the maritime states of Greece, under their own leadership. The object of this confederacy was to keep the Aegean sea clear of Persian warships. At first each city provided its quota of ships, but by insensible changes one city after another began to pay a sum of money instead of furnishing war vessels, until finally the confederacy had become an empire. Athens provided the ships and the marines while the subject cities put up the money.

As every socialist knows, the character of a people is modified profoundly by changes in its way of getting a livelihood. Let us then try to get a glimpse of the economic change that came about in Athens as the maritime supremacy of this city became an established fact.

The new revenue, which made Athens the wealthiest city of Greece, arose partly from the direct money tribute of the subject cities and partly from the commerce with countries near and far, now made possible by the fact that the Athenian navy commanded the seas, and could protect its merchants and merchant ships wherever they went, an advantage far more rare and important in those troublous times than it seems now.

Private wealth in Athens increased by leaps and bounds. But there was a distinct obstacle to its concentration in the hands of a very few. The political power was not, as in more civilized nations, in the hands of a small group of plutocrats, it was in the entire body of free citizens. There were occasional attempts on the part of the better classes, as they called themselves even at that early day, to get control, but they were usually ineffective. On two occasions the aristocrats were temporarily successful, but only to be hurled from power again.

In the long run, it is the essential class which holds the political power, and in imperial Athens the essential class was the citizen soldiery, ready on occasion to put down revolts of subject cities, and to meet the enemies of Athens in the field or at sea.

So it was that the democracy remained in power. And it
used its power to put pretty heavy taxes on the holders of exceptionally large fortunes, and to provide a modest support, in the way of pay for jury service and other political duties, for all free Athenians who did not draw a comfortable income from the labor of slaves. Commerce was to a large extent in the hands of aliens and freed slaves, of whom there were at the age we are considering, according to the figures of Engels, 45,000. Of free Athenian citizens there were 90,000, and of slaves 365,000.

I am not attempting to discuss the physical, moral and social status of these slaves who made up the greater portion of the population, nor shall I try to discuss the question of whether slavery was right or wrong. The Athenians were fond of ethical discussions, but we have no record of their discussing this question. Slaves then were the same necessary element in production that machinery is today. And by the way, at Athens the slaves were private property, while at Sparta they were collective property, but that slaves could be dispensed with simply did not occur to either Spartans or Athenians.

Some facts are preserved regarding the social status of the slaves, but they would be irrelevant here. We are now concerned with the freemen.

Here at Athens was a situation absolutely unique in the history of the world even up to the present day, yet presenting a striking analogy with the probable situation when collectivism shall have been established. Here were ninety thousand men, women and children in a single community, all raised above the need of drudgery and the fear of want, with a large degree of freedom and an abundance of leisure. If we were to accept the theories of the opponents of socialism, we should expect to find a brutish degeneracy, a reversion to savagery. What as a matter of fact we do find in this one epoch and in this one city, is the most intense intellectual life that the world has ever known, a life that produced the tragedies of Aeschylus. Sophocles and Euripides, the orations of Pericles and Demosthenes, the dialogues of Plato, and the sculptures of Phidias and Praxiteles.

To socialists there is nothing strange in this. We understand that human beings can not survive on this earth without gratifying their material desires. We understand that as long as social adjustments make it hard for each individual to gratify his material desires, so long he must be mainly concerned with them, since otherwise he probably would not survive. And we can see, too, that if a large body of people in one community, where they can act and react upon each other, could be relieved from the everlasting pressure of material wants, the way would be open for intellectual wants to rise
into consciousness and dominate the life of the community. This is precisely what happened at Athens, and it does not seem unreasonable to look for like results when like conditions shall repeat themselves on a larger scale.

There is, however, one point of contrast to be noted between the motives operating on the freemen of ancient Athens and those operating on the freemen of the future collectivist society. At Athens the matter of greatest concern was to maintain the supremacy of the city by war and diplomacy, and therefore these arts were most highly esteemed and were perhaps the readiest path to distinction. In the future society the most essential thing will be the improvement of means of production, the perfecting of processes so as to produce the greatest results with the least outlay. The inventor and the efficient superintendent will thus be honored as the greatest public benefactors.

But while noting this one contrast, we must note many points of agreement. And first, ethics. The moral ideal which was current among the Athenians was not an ideal of personal holiness, of self-renunciation and saintly purity, to be rewarded by eternal felicity in some hypothetical hereafter. True, they had their traditions and their speculations about the hereafter, but we may safely infer from one of the popular comedies of Aristophanes that they did not take them very seriously. Their moral ideal was the ideal of a citizen highly developed in all his faculties and highly useful to his native city, and this ideal being a reasonable one and to an extent attainable, was sincerely held. The Athenians did not need to be hypocrites and they were not hypocrites. Hypocrisy is the consequence of a different economic situation from the one that prevailed at Athens. Most well-to-do Americans are hypocrites, but it is foolish to blame them for it, they have to be if they are to become or remain well-to-do Americans under present economic conditions. I shall not go into particulars, I do not wish to say unkind things regarding a class among whom I have friends. Besides, there is a better example to contrast with the Athenians, and that is afforded by a contemporary and neighboring nation with whom they came into frequent contact.

The Spartans, so dear to bourgeois moralists, were consummate, contemptible hypocrites. Perhaps contemptible is too strong a word. I should rather say deplorable. They were hypocrites because they had to be hypocrites to keep their commanding position, just like countless other hypocrites since. They were the descendants of a small but warlike tribe who, shortly before the historical period began, had migrated from northern Greece into the peninsula west of
Athens known as the Peloponnesus, and had established themselves as rulers over the natives. They were only a small part of the population there, they had no particular advantage in the way of superior weapons, and their position as the ruling class gave them a very comfortable living on the labor of others. But this position was a precarious one, and it rested on the belief that they, the Spartans, were invincible in battle and were marvelously brave, to the point of preferring death to surrender. Now this was a colossal humbug, the Spartans were very much like other people in their natural impulses, and on one notable occasion, when the Athenians had a Spartan army cornered on the little island of Sphacteria, it sensibly chose the alternative of surrender rather than death, much to the surprise of the rest of the Greeks, who had been successfully humbugged by the Spartans for so many years.

I said a little while ago that the Spartans held their slaves as collective property. There was a necessity for this. The very existence of the Spartans as a ruling class depended on the efficiency of their military discipline, along with the popular opinion of the other Greeks as to their bravery. If they had allowed their young men to divert their interest from military affairs into the pursuit of wealth, their supremacy would have ended. Historically, that is the way it finally did end. They kept up the pretense of superhuman bravery and contempt of wealth so effectively that they won the allegiance of most of the other Greeks, and, with their aid, finally defeated Athens in a war which lasted a whole generation. The Spartan generals then had immense resources at their disposal, they forgot their traditional contempt for wealth and went after it eagerly, the military discipline of the nation was relaxed, and with the next war Sparta was defeated and sank into obscurity, never to rise again.

The difference between Sparta and Athens was this: the supremacy of Athens rested on a genuine efficiency, intellectual as well as physical, on the part of a large body of equal citizens. There was no subject class at Athens except the slaves, who didn’t count, not being soldiers, and the freedmen and resident foreigners, who were well treated and contented. There was a substantial identity of interests among the ninety thousand freemen of Athens, and therefore it was not necessary for them to be hypocrites. They had not learned to make a virtue of total abstinence from the wine that their vineyards produced, neither had they learned to make extra profits by putting poisonous chemicals into their wines. They had not learned to sentimentalize over the eternal justice of recognizing the equality of all men, Greek and Barbarian, bond and free, but on the other hand they had not
invented the sweat-shop, and they inflicted summary penalties on such of their own citizens as were guilty of cruelty toward their slaves.

The traditional religion of Athens, with its roots in an economic situation far earlier than the one we are considering, was a worship of the Olympian deities such as Homer describes, and especially of Athena the tutelary goddess of Athens. This religion was a social, not a private matter. There was no special coterie of particularly good people, who were more religious than the rest and were therefore supposed to be surer than the others of a safe passage to the Elysian fields, which by the way are rather a more artistic conception than golden streets. Quite the contrary, religion was an everyday matter for the men as well as the women, but it was closely identified with patriotism. And again, patriotism was not something that had to be harped on as a sacred duty, it was to the Athenian the natural expression of his enlightened self-interest, since the welfare of every Athenian citizen was closely bound up with the prosperity of the Athenian state.

My statement may be challenged by some who have read of the Eleusinian mysteries, which undoubtedly contained the germ of the introspective, personal-holiness element of Christianity. But the interesting point to note is that these mysteries did not develop into an important part of Athenian life until the liberties of the city had been lost. When the gods ceased to provide the Athenians with the material comforts of life, and with the fullest liberty for self-expression, then the need was felt for an introspective religion by way of consolation, and the versatile Athenians developed a very good religion of its kind; indeed no one knows how large a deposit it may have left in our historic Christianity.

Introspective religions have prevailed during the world's long night of slavery. But with the dawn of freedom we listen back to Athens for our moral ideas. Not purposeless self-sacrifice but rational self-development, not asceticism but the moderation that prolongs and intensifies pleasure, not humility and obedience but strength, beauty and freedom, these are the ideals that will reanimate the men and women of all the world as the victorious proletariat wins for itself the same right to live that the freemen of Athens enjoyed twenty-three hundred years ago.

As to the art of Athens, the facts are so bewildering in their number and significance that I shall not attempt any comprehensive survey. The architectural remains of the Acropolis have served as models for Europe and America through all the ages since this era we are considering, and the sculptures are still preserved as our most precious possessions. But it is of the dramatic art of Athens that I wish to speak especially, because here
the influence of genuine democracy upon art is most clearly manifest.

The early beginnings of the Attic drama were bound up with the primitive worship of Dionysos, the god of wine. The first festivals of Dionysos-worship of which we know anything consisted of choral singing in praise of the god or in commemoration of some of the simple legends about him. As the choruses grew longer and more elaborate, an actor was introduced, who carried on a dialogue with the leader of the chorus while the singers rested. Later, a second actor was added, and finally a third, three being the limit to the number of actors on the stage at one time even in the most highly developed Attic drama.

The festivals of Dionysos were held twice a year, and it was only on these occasions that dramas were presented. All ordinary occupations were suspended at these times, and thirty thousand men were seated in the great theater of Dionysos. It was open to the sky and the dramas were always presented in the daytime. On each occasion several new plays by as many different authors were offered in competition for a prize. All day long the thirty thousand Athenians listened with critical attention to plays of a character that demanded even more intellectual effort on the part of the spectator than the plays of Shakespeare. Thirty-three of these tragedies and eleven of the comedies have been preserved intact through the ages, and they are still in many respects the models of the dramatic art.

Conventional writers speak of the surpassing genius of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes, the writers of these plays that have been preserved, as if the genius of these individuals explained the pre-eminence of Athens in the dramatic art. But we know that while these writers won many dramatic contests, they were sometimes defeated by others whose works have been lost. There was thus a large group of dramatists of surpassing intellectual power, suddenly appearing as Athens reached the economic stage we have been discussing, and disappearing when that stage was passed. Art can grow only when there is a public capable of appreciating it. And to this appreciation two things are needed, leisure and education.

Education at Athens was not thought of mainly as a means for fitting boys to earn their living. The freemen of Athens all lived fairly well, measured by their own standards, and they were not oppressed by the fear of starvation, except once after the loss of a great naval battle, when the enemy commanded the sea. What they were mainly concerned with in the training of their boys was that they should grow up into well rounded men, capable of serving their country as soldiers, orators or diplomats, but also ca-
pable of enjoying life intellectually as well as physically. Poetry and music, art and literature, were the inheritance of every freeman at Athens. This liberal education along with freedom from mere drudgery and anxiety for bread made the freemen of Athens the leaders of the world.

We hear much now of industrial education. It is perhaps a necessary swing of the pendulum back from the merely ornamental education which prevailed a generation ago. Body and mind need to be educated together. The Athenians knew that and acted upon it. Again, it is perfectly true that the progress of modern industry makes necessary extreme specialization of study and of effort, if progress is to be continued. But from ancient Athens we need to learn that no specialist can do his best work in any great undertaking without the appreciation and the criticism of a large body of people capable of apprehending in its main outlines the special work he has to do. And no specialist can do the highest work in his own chosen field unless he can take a broader view that will show him the relations of his own special work to the work of the rest.

The Athenians were not perfect. Privately I am inclined to believe that a perfect nation would be uninteresting, but I never knew of one and so can not be sure. They were emerging from barbarism just as we are emerging from commercialism. They had an inspiring sense of solidarity and loyalty to their city, just as we the workers when we turn from the final conflict for our emancipation to the task of rebuilding the world shall inevitably have a splendid sense of the solidarity of the working class, a class that by the disappearance of parasites large and small will have become as broad as humanity itself. They realized, as we shall realize, that the welfare of each was inevitably bound up in the welfare of all. They had no need to be hypocrites as we shall have no need. They accepted physical pleasures as rational if taken in moderation, with a clear view of their consequences. But they trained their children in such a way as to open up before them an intensity of intellectual enjoyment that made physical pleasures very small by comparison and made possible intellectual achievements that have stimulated the life of all who have come after.

The city of Athens was submerged by the physical force of ignorant despots, but the ideals of Athens, rooted deep in fortunate economic conditions that are soon to re-appear, not this time for a few, but for all, these ideals will re-assert themselves in the free and happy life of the world that is soon to be.

Charles H. Kerr.
Socialism and the Trades-Unions.

The question of the relationship of the trades-union movement to the Socialist movement is still an open question. It is true our national convention spent two days in debating it, and finally by a divided vote passed a comparatively innocuous resolution on the subject. But it is unsafe to assume that the resolution passed really states the views of all the delegates actually recorded as voting for it. The debate unfortunately took such a turn that many delegates who believed an expression on the subject unwise and unnecessary, felt that a vote against the proposed resolution would inevitably be construed as an expression of hostility to trades-unions, and so reluctantly voted for a resolution which they believed injudicious.

Regarding, then, the whole question as one open for discussion, with no pretentions to infallibility, or even to being a mouthpiece of the derided "intellectuals," I shall try to contribute a few thoughts that may aid the comradeship in reaching a rational conclusion. By way of preface, permit me to say that, though I was one of those who were opposed to any resolution on the subject, I gladly admit that the new resolution is a great improvement over the Indianapolis resolution, as it is in the main a statement of fact, while the Indianapolis resolution was an attempt to persuade us that an iridescent rainbow was a cold, hard fact. So far, so good. But there is one sentence in the new resolution which places us in an absurd position. The sentence referred to is: "Neither political nor other differences of opinion justify the division of the forces of labor in the industrial movement." What an edifying spectacle we present—the omniscient Socialists perched on our theoretical mountain-peak gazing at the distant battlefield, where the American Federation of Labor and the American Labor Union are engaged in a war to the death, shouting through a cracked megaphone to the combatants that their division is not "justified"! Justified or not, the division is there; the war is on and is going to be fought out. If we are to be true to our own philosophy, we must deal with the facts, as they exist, not as we would have them to be.

But this by the way. Let us try to take a deeper view of the whole question. To this end, the view-point of our more intelligent antagonists may be of real service to us. Prof. John Bates Clark, of Columbia University, in the Political Science Quarterly for December, 1903, says:

"The recent extension of the principle of monopoly, both in the practice of the trusts on the one hand, and in that of the trade-
unions on the other, has brought prominently into the field of discussion the nationalization of industry on a socialistic model. Now that free competition has been driven from the field in many branches of industry, it is admitted that its action tended toward progress and a wide approach to honesty in the sharing of products, such as monopoly altogether precludes.

"The conclusion, however, that socialism is the only cure for monopoly is premature, for the trade-union, although it may appear friendly to socialism, is in principle opposed to it. * * * The reason for the probable conservative attitude of the trade-union is not difficult to discover. If organization causes some workingmen to thrive *partly at the expense of others* there are limits to the extent of the co-operation between the more and the less favored classes. It is commonly said that trade organizations are monopolies; and if the statement is true, there must be something about the working of them that is contrary, not only to the public interest, but to the interest of the remainder of the working class itself. 'Give us an advance in wages, and charge it to the public,' is often the demand, tacitly or openly expressed, of union men in the employ of the trusts. It is often to the advantage of a monopoly to share its spoils with its employes. * * *

* * * "Such an ultra-democratic program as socialism proposes may not be expected to appeal strongly to those whom monopoly gains have raised above the common level of immigrant and unskilled, or at least, unorganized laborers."

In the ordinary Socialist conception of the trade-union movement as the economic army of the working class, in the same sense that the Socialist movement is the political army of the working class, has not the wish been father to the thought? And has not the coldly critical eye of our enemy, Prof. Clark, discerned the facts more accurately? Is not Prof. Clark on the solid ground of reality when he says that the victories of unionists are won *partly at the expense of others*? To illustrate, while I was in Wellington, New Zealand, the workers in the meat and butchering industry secured an award from the Arbitration Court, giving them fairer conditions and a substantial increase in wages. Immediately the retail price of meat advanced to a point hitherto unknown, and when I left New Zealand the retail price of New Zealand lamb and mutton was lower in London (England) than in Wellington. I do not assert that there may not have been other factors, such as monopoly, in this rise in the retail price of meat, but I do assert that the rise in wages was a factor in the rise in meat, and that the victory of the meat workers was "partly at the expense" of all the workers, organized and unorganized, in Wel-

---

1The italics are Professor Clark's.
lington. For the meat workers this rise in the price of meat was more than compensated for by their increased wages, but there was no such compensation for the unorganized workers or for many of the organized, as for instance those in the building trades. These are cold facts, and the only safe rule for a Socialist is to continually test his theories by seeing how they fit proved facts.

De Leon and that ilk might reply by saying that the rise in the price of articles of consumption is no concern of the unorganized worker, since, be his food and clothes high or low, he gets a bare subsistence wage in either case. Apply the infallible fact test. Has the rise in the cost of living in the past seven years here in America been compensated by an equivalent rise in wages? Consult Bradstreet and Dun, and you will see that this reply goes down before the fact test.

It is true that wages tend to the subsistence level, but this level is not fixed and stationary. It is possible to depress the standard of living of the working class. In these days of international competition every rise in the cost of living is a lever to depress the standard of living of the American working class. As our new platform says, "The condition of the most exploited and oppressed workers, in the most remote places of the earth, inevitably tends to drag down all the workers of the world to the same level." The subsistence level of the individual varies with varying conditions. Things that I formerly thought absolutely indispensable for my subsistence, I have found, since I became a proletarian agitator, to be entirely superfluous. My standard of living has been depressed.

Trades-unionism, then, is not a struggle of the working class to better its conditions of life; it is not a class struggle, but a struggle of individuals (combined, it is true, but not sufficiently differentiated economically to form a true class) to better the conditions of life of the individuals in the unions, "partly at the expense" of the non-union workers. It is true the unorganized workers in a partially organized craft share a part of the fruits of the victories of the organized workers, but these benefits never reach the unorganized crafts at all. If these conclusions be sound, if they pass the fact test, let us Socialists have the courage to proclaim them, whether so doing seems expedient or not. A revolutionary movement can never afford to sacrifice truth for expediency. It emasculates itself when it does so. _Toujours l'audace_ is the only motto for the revolutionist who has burned his bridges behind him.

The Socialist movement would not deter a man from joining a union to better his condition in life; it would not deter a man from buckling his belt tighter every meal time in order to save money to buy himself a house; it would not deter a man from denying
himself beer and whisky with a view to his financial, physical and moral well-being. But, on the other hand, there is no reason why Socialist parties should pass resolutions counseling their membership as to their action in these purely individual matters; and indeed it is impertinent and undemocratic for them to do so.

As trades-unionism is essentially a struggle of individuals to better their condition at the expense of other (less favorably situated) individuals, so the philosophy of trades-unionism is the radically individualist philosophy of *laissez-faire*, of the Manchester school, of the late High Priest of Competition, Mr. Herbert Spencer. The chief methods of the union—picketing, boycotting, sympathetic strikes and refusal to work in "open shops"—can only be defended by Spencerian arguments—the same arguments used by capitalists everywhere to defend the competitive system and capitalist methods in the conflicts of capital with labor. In maintaining the employers' right to blacklist, Judge Rogers of the United States District Court at St. Louis held "(1) that an agreement by any number of persons to do a lawful thing is not a conspiracy; (2) that employers may maintain and circulate a blacklist, provided that its contents be truthful; (3) and that employers may deprive workmen of opportunities to earn a livelihood and even combine to attack and destroy organizations of employees, by means of blacklisting agreements." As Mr. Victor S. Yarros has truthfully said, "No labor leader has ever gone beyond the position taken in this judicial opinion. Substitute the word 'boycotting' or the words 'peaceable picketing' for the word 'blacklisting,' and every contention of organized labor is sustained. * * * There is no theoretical *issue* between organized labor and organized capital, since neither side honestly and earnestly denies what the other side affirms. Both invoke the same individualist principles." To quote Mr. Yarros once more, "Neither morally nor legally does an employer's blacklist differ from a unionist 'unfair list.'" Governor Peabody and Comrade Haywood, of Colorado, both rely in justification of their respective courses on an extreme individualist philosophy, but slightly differentiated from Anarchism—in fact, on that "idea of liberty" in which, our national platform truly says, our "nation was born."

Do not the facts thus far disclosed justify Prof. Clark's statements that "the trade union is in principle opposed to Socialism"? Trades-unionism rests upon an extremely individualist philosophy perilously close to the border-line of Anarchy. Socialism boldly proclaims the philosophy, or rather, the religion of Human Solidarity, and does not hesitate to say the individual must give

---

way wherever the assertion of his so-called rights would relax or break the bonds of human oneness. Viewed from this standpoint, how absurd was the attempt of the Indianapolis convention to make Siamese twins of Trade-unionism and Socialism! Nor was this ridiculous freak of belated utopianism wholly abandoned at Chicago. The "intellectuals" at Chicago were derided as utopians because they were charged with ignoring the battle in progress on the economic field. The true utopians and visionaries were the defenders of the trades-union resolution, who asked us to judge of the trades-unions by their roseate conception of what the trades-unions should be instead of by the fact of what they actually are.

One more question. Is Prof. Clark right in saying that the "ultra-democratic program of Socialism may not be expected to appeal strongly to those whom monopoly gains have raised above the common level of immigrant and unskilled, or at least unorganized laborers"? Let us appeal to the fact-test again. In my experience as an agitator here in Kansas City (Mo.) of the past few months, I can say emphatically that I have found the mind of the non-union man far more open and receptive to the doctrines of Socialism than the mind of the union man. I do not suppose this to be a fair criterion by which to judge union men all over the country. But I shall be surprised to find that it is not true in more places than it is false; and where it proves false I shall expect to find local and special conditions accounting for its falsity. What is the explanation of this fact (assuming it to be a fact)?

The first and most obvious explanation is the one suggested by Prof. Clark and implied in our rallying cry: "Workingmen of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, and a world to gain!" Workingmen occupying the specially advantageous position that many trade-unionists do, may readily enough fancy they have something to lose by the change socialism would bring. The unorganized worker can harbor no such delusion.

Believing, as we do, that thought is moulded by economic conditions, we would naturally expect the organized skilled worker working in a social form of production, and convinced through his union of the advantages of combination, to be peculiarly accessible to our propaganda, but this is offset not only by the reason given but also by the fact that in defending his actions as a unionist, he is compelled to resort to laissez-faire principles so constantly, that all his psychological processes come to conflict with the philosophy of collectivism.

What practical conclusion is to be drawn from our investigation of the essential nature of unionism? That there is no natural connection or relation between unionism and socialism and that the utopian attempt to depart from the sure ground of fact and artificially combine or connect the unrelated is to do violence to both
and good to neither. Does this mean that we ought to fight unionism \textit{per se}? Not at all; any more than we ought to fight thrift, temperance, insurance or any other effort of the individual to better his condition. Unionism is simply one product of a moribund system, capitalism, and when capitalism falls, unionism (if still in existence) will fall with it.

The chief reason why I personally was strongly opposed to any trades-union declaration at Chicago was that we are making history in this field so rapidly that it is unsafe to make any party declaration upon it to stand for four years. With the principle of the Taff Vale decision established, and with their present organization (ever growing more perfect), employers can destroy unionism if they want to. If they do not, it will be because they recognize that unionism is a valuable buffer against socialism. In short, my belief is that before 1908 there will be no trades unions, or trades unions will have become the first line of defense of capitalism against socialism. In either case, the Chicago resolution was a mistake.

My genial comrade Carey will no doubt be shocked to find that an article defending the "intellectual" position on the trade-union question is not peppered over with quotations from Lassalle, Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Vaillant, Lafargue, Labriola \textit{et al.}, and that the only quotation I have permitted myself from socialist authorities is from the Communist Manifesto, and is so familiar to every comrade that even he might have made it, without losing caste in A. F. of L. circles, but none the less I hope that he and the rest of my union friends will not disdain to read an argument that is utterly unsupported by any authority, save that one so despised by our "practical" friends, the authority of the facts.

ROBERT RIVES LAMONTE.

Kansas City, Mo., May 20, 1904.
The Socialist Movement in the Argentine Republic.

BUENOS AIRES became necessarily the starting point of the socialist movement in the Argentine Republic, not because it is the metropolis, but because industrialism and capitalist exploitation developed nowhere else in the land so strongly and rapidly as in that city.

On January 1, 1882, the German club Vorwärts constituted itself with thirteen members, at the initiative of G. Nocke and C. Mücke. Its declared object was to "assist in the realization of the principles and aims of Socialism, as expressed in the platform of the German Social Democratic Party." The club Vorwärts grew slowly through the advent of new German elements that had, like the majority of its founders, fled from the persecutions which began after the adoption of the anti-socialist laws. It developed and extended its influence within the bounds of its means and environment. It had acquired 250 members when it inaugurated its own headquarters at 1141 calle Rincon, in 1895.

In May, 1886, the club acquired its first meeting room. And in October of the same year it published the weekly Vorwärts, edited in German by A. Uhle. This paper was continued until the middle of 1901. A dramatic section and a singing society were also founded, which many of its members joined. And in 1890 a co-operative bakery was founded which existed until 1898.

The club Vorwärts has offered the free use of its club rooms to all workingmen who began to unite for the amelioration of their condition, since 1886. It also has to its credit the manifesto, written in Spanish, which was dedicated to the working class of the federal capital in commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of the French Revolution. It furthermore took the initiative in celebrating the First of May, in 1890, and in agitating, since 1891, for the naturalization of strangers with a view to encouraging their participation in the political struggle and wrestling concessions from the Argentine bourgeoisie.

The initiative in the celebration of the First of May resulted in the constitution of a committee of organization in 1890, which had charge of the program corresponding to that adopted by the international congress of Paris, July, 1889. The first celebration of the First of May in Buenos Aires proved a success far beyond the expectations of the committee of organization. Three thousand citizens met in the Prado Español, and the public meeting held in that place decided to organize the Federacion
Obrera de la Republica Argentina (Federation of Labor of the Argentine Republic). An international labor committee was organized, which was entrusted with the formulation of a suitable program. This was quickly accomplished, and the federation was permanently constituted on June 29 of that year.

Although exclusively a labor organization in character, the federation nevertheless had a straight socialist program, modeled after that of the most advanced European countries. It soon had a strong section in Buenos Aires, composed of carpenters, shoemakers and a federal union; also sections in Mendoza, Rosario and Santa Fé, where the First of May had also been celebrated.

On December 12, 1890, the first number of the periodical El Obrero (The Worker) was published, edited and managed by Comrade G. Ave-Lallemant. It became the organ of the federation.

This organization presented two petitions to Congress and one to the president of the republic, asking for laws protecting the working class, and for the organization of a labor exchange. The Santa Fé section did the same before the legislature of the state of Santa Fé. It goes without saying, that all these petitions met the same fate—they were shelved without the respective committees taking the trouble of considering them.

On August 15, 1891, the first labor convention was held by the federation. The carpenters and auxiliaries, the German printers, the bakers, the socialist club Vorwärts, the metropolitan federal union, and the local unions of Santa Fe and Chasco-mus attended. The comrades who then devoted themselves to this organization and to the socialist movement were full of confidence and enthusiasm. But they met many difficulties. Along came the financial embarrassment of the country, the political disturbances, and a prolonged state of siege. The growing organization was prevented from continuing its propaganda and in 1892 it was completely weakened and dissolved. the periodical El Obrero was discontinued.

But under the ashes the sparks still glowed. Comrades A. Kühn and G. Hummel, who had belonged to the federal union of the Federation of Labor, formed the Agrupacion Socialista (Socialist Group) in December, 1892. Their organ was El Socialista, which began publication in March, 1893, but was abandoned soon after.

On April 7, 1894, the publication of La Vanguardia (The Vanguard) was begun, with Comrade Dr. Juan B. Justo as chief editor. And in August of the same year the Agrupacion Socialista changed its name to Centro Socialist Obrero, which it has retained to this day. Three other groups also came into the field: A French group, Les Egaux (The Equals), which soon after published the periodical L'Egalité (Equality); an
Italian group, Fascio dei Lavoratori (Bond of the Workers), which edited La Rivendicazione (The Demand for Betterment); and a group of students, Centro Socialista Universitario. There were, then, five socialist groups. This led, in December of the same year, to the formation of a central committee, which was the first link between the Argentine socialists.

In 1895 there were already seven socialist groups in Buenos Aires. They adopted a declaration of principles and a minimum program, and decided to take part, for the first time, in the elections of 1896, with comrades Dr. Juan B. Justo, J. Schaeffer, A. Patroni, G. Avé-Lallemant, and G. Abad, for candidates. On June 28-29 of the same year the first socialist convention was held in Buenos Aires, which resulted in the permanent constitution of the Socialist Party. As the invitations for this convention were liberal, it was attended by the delegates of ten straight socialist sections, seven labor organizations, eight unaffiliated socialist sections and seven unaffiliated labor unions. The Centro Socialista Obrero transferred La Vanguardia to the party, making it the central organ.

Since then the affiliated sections and individuals of the Partido Socialista Argentino have carried on their work continuously. The existing labor organizations and the propaganda of the socialist ideas and principles have taken all their time. The state of siege of 1902 was unable to shake them.

It must be admitted that the progress of the party is slow. But, nevertheless, it is manifest. The sections belonging to it have grown in quantity and quality. While only ten sections were represented at the convention of 1896, there were thirteen in 1898 and eighteen in 1900. The fourth convention, held in La Plata in 1901, the only one called outside of the federal capital, showed an increase to twenty-one sections, and the fifth, held in July, 1903, counted thirty.

Owing to special local conditions and vicious election practices, against which the mass of the people are indifferent, the party has not obtained many votes in the four national elections in which it participated. The unreliable official statistics gave us 52 votes in 1896, 99 in 1898, 136 in 1900 and 204 in 1902. But it must be considered that many socialist votes were never counted. The election officials have a wonderful ability in confiscating the votes of the opposition. Computations made by reliable and very reasonable comrades attribute to us 250 votes in 1896, 500 in 1898, 700 in 1900, and 1,100 in 1902.—M. H. Schultz in Almanaque Socialista de la Vanguardia Para, 1904. (Translated by Ernest Untermann.)
Economic Classes and Politics.

In view of the approaching presidential campaign, a description of economic classes as they exist in America today, and a discussion of their political expression, may not be amiss. The basis of economic classification is the manner of getting a living. All living must come by labor, either one's own, or another's. "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread," is still in the long run the embodiment of a great truth, though much of the energy of the race is expended in seeking to avoid a personal application of it. Two classes are distinguished by the fact that they live from the labor of others, not by their own—the capitalistic and the criminal.

The first of these, the capitalistic class, is the most influential and important in America, as in other countries brought under Western civilization—is in fact the governing class. Its living is derived from the three sources of rent, interest and profit, a trinity made familiar by populistic agitation. Through these channels the wealth of the country steadily concentrates in its hands, bringing with it increasing power and an aristocratic status; and these possessions and power are used in the effort to hasten the process, to get more wealth and get it faster. Hence arises a more perfect and elaborate organization of the industrial structure, the elimination of competition through trusts and combinations, and the immensely increased productivity of our modern industry. For while in its perfect development this class becomes purely parasitical, its economic function is the extremely important one of organizing industry in a collective fashion, and stimulating production. Historically it is an outgrowth of the middle class.

The next in point of prestige and influence is the professional class, which, however, owing to its lack of distinctive economic interests, is commonly overlooked by socialistic theorists. It may be made to include not merely doctors, lawyers, preachers and teachers, but also scientists, authors, artists, etc. While the capitalistic class is the real authority in government, the actual occupancy of official positions is, in America, generally intrusted to members of this class. Its living is derived from technical or highly specialized labor performed for the public at large in consideration of specific fees for each act of service, or salaries paid by the whole or considerable portions of the community. Historically it is the oldest of existing classes, dating its origin back to the priests and medicine men of pre-historic times. Its lack of any peculiar economic purpose or significance is because, in any
community, its members, chameleon-like, take color economically from their clientele, whose prosperity is their prosperity. A peculiarity of the labor performed by this class is that it is chiefly devoted to the production of desirable conditions, rather than of commodities. This makes the problem of its compensation under the co-operative commonwealth one of the puzzles of constructive socialism.

Probably the next oldest class in America, as also, probably that largest in numbers, is the middle class. This class represents an ideal, if relatively primitive, condition of industry, in which the worker is himself the owner of the means and materials of labor, before the introduction of machinery and the factory system make individual production on a small scale costly and unprofitable. The members of this class are workers, working with their own capital in the production and distribution of commodities, and the class includes farmers owning their own farms, small storekeepers, mechanics having their own shops, etc. The historical evolution of this class from the handicraftsmen and merchant traders of the middle ages down to and including its parentage, in America, of the capitalistic and proletarian classes, is of great interest, and constitutes much of the material of critical socialism. At the present time, the control of production having passed (except in agriculture) to its lusty descendant, the capitalistic class, its new position as a purchaser and consequent contributor to the stream of profit which feeds this descendant, is sapping its resources and bringing about its disintegration. Already it has practically disappeared from the cities and become a rural class. To rise from it to the capitalistic class, though once a normal evolution, is now practically impossible, since the capitalistic class itself, though increasing in wealth, is decreasing in numbers. The more able of its children find their way into the professions, while the great bulk lapse into the proletariat. Remembering its lost wealth and dominance, the middle class is reactionary, seeking always to turn back the march of industrial progress and restore its vanished Eden of a scanty population, living in primitive luxury by individual production independent of accumulated capital. It still complacently refers to itself as "the great unorganized public" and "the people," though contemporaneous political events, mentioned later, would seem sufficient to dispel the latter delusion. Its unfortunate condition begets in its members a peculiar personal vindictiveness towards the capitalistic class, the members of which decline to indulge in internecine competition for its benefit, and organized labor is also not infrequently an object of this animosity. Its future, as a class, is hopeless, except in the domain of agriculture, which as yet capitalism has not successfully invaded.

We come now to a congerie of classes which we may collect-
ECONOMIC CLASSES AND POLITICS

...ively describe, with perhaps a slight critical inaccuracy, as the proletariat. These are wage-laborers, tenant farmers, and the criminal class. We shall also notice a development from the wage-laboring class, which has ceased to regard itself as proletarian, namely the sub-class of executive agents of capital.

Aside from the criminal class, which as before remarked seeks to live without labor, the characteristic of the proletariat is the performance of productive labor by the use of the capital belonging to others, that is, for practical purposes, to the capitalistic class. Proletarians are thus the "dispossessed," those whose only property is their labor power, and who in consequence become the subject matter of that qualified traffic in human flesh known as the wage system. Of these proletarian classes the most numerous and important is the wage-laborers, a class which properly includes not only skilled as well as unskilled laborers, but also those whose labor is of an intellectual rather than a manual sort, such as the great army of clerks, bookkeepers, salesmen, the less skilled musicians, actors, etc. Members of the professional class, employed by a single master, become wage-laborers, since it is no longer the result of their labor that is paid for, but their labor power. In America this class has developed from slaves, imported and afterwards freed, from immigration, and from the disintegration of the middle-class.

Tenant farmers, with farm hands, form the so-called "rural proletariat." They are either farm hands who have married and become renters in the hope of supporting a family, or else they represent a further phase of middle class disintegration. The condition of the rural proletariat is, in many sections, pitiable in the extreme—poverty, hardship and isolation combining to make the lot of the urban wage-worker happy in comparison.

The criminal class is commonly included in the proletariat because its membership comes largely from the "dispossessed," and, on reformation, again proffers itself in the labor market. The criminal class, economically defined, is that which obtains the property of others by wages, theft, fraud or violence, or through the medium of illicit traffic. What traffic is to be deemed illicit in this connection depends on the provisions of the positive law. An important capitalistic addition to the criminal class must be noted—namely, stock gamblers.

As the capitalistic class ceases more and more to discharge the functions of superintendence, they are intrusted to the stronger, more willing, skillful and successful wage workers, who thereby become what we have called executive agents of capital. These may be regarded as forming a sub-class of wage-workers which is proletarian in all but interest and sympathy. Their remuneration is commonly large enough to make them beneficiaries of the capi-
talic system, and they are, therefore, among its most enthusiastic supporters. It is these the Sabbath school teacher and the politician have in mind when they assure the children of the poor, and the poor themselves, that in this free and glorious America, honesty, industry and loyalty to the employer's interests will open the door of opportunity to the humblest, etc. But as the number of superintendencies is necessarily limited, and only the strongest and most able can attain them, the incentive to virtue thus held out is not, in analysis, so alluring as its exponents might wish.

Having thus sketched the economic classes which exist in a republic founded on the principle of equality, let us look at their practical expression in the field of politics. Here we cannot enter upon a historical survey, but must be content with the assumption that since the days of Andrew Jackson one or another group of the capitalistic class has been in control, though at times not in perfect or undisputed control, of the national government. To understand, therefore, the economic significance of present day parties and policies, we must first attend to these capitalistic groups as they now exist.

The capitalistic class, which in politics designates itself as "the business interests of the country," lives, as before remarked, off of rent, interest and profit—the first two representing investments in land and loans, the last investments in industrial and commercial enterprises. Two groups of capitalistic interests are thus formed; the first such as flow from relatively fixed incomes, independent of trade, the principal or "parent capital" of which is, in the case of loans, also to be returned in kind; the second, such as arise from the receipt of profit depending immediately upon commerce and manufacture. Now this first group of interests lies in having the purchasing power of the fixed incomes mentioned as great as possible, while the goods purchased are rendered as cheap as possible. In this way the incomes themselves reach a maximum. Accordingly the conservative or "gold" wing of the Democratic party grows fervid in its advocacy of sound money, and is also the exponent of a free trade policy. Being independent of trade, these interests and the political faction which represents them are free to conciliate the radical Democracy by an acceptance of a reactionary, anti-expansion policy, which is the more favorably received as it promises a lightening of the burdens of taxation.

The second group of capitalistic interests, being immediately concerned with trade and manufacture, must through its political representative, the Republican party, voice their exigencies. Of these a protective tariff is foremost, both to enable a bonus to be collected for manufacturing enterprises from a purchasing public, and also to preserve the American market from being used to relieve the characteristic glut formed by capitalistic production
abroad. But the glut formed with the same inevitableness at home, must also be relieved. Hence the entry into the world race for foreign markets, expansion, the "open door," imperialism, etc. The policy of sound money in the Republican party is merely a half-hearted concession to the first group of capitalists, made at their persistent and frantic importunity at St. Louis, in 1896, after the control of the Democratic organization had been temporarily wrested from them by the insurgent middle class.

The radical Democracy, under the picturesque leadership of Mr. Bryan, represents the middle class, and has its stronghold in the rural west where that class is dominant. This is evident from the characteristically reactionary nature of its policies. As a purchasing class, the middle class seeks to restore competition among sellers by legal fiat; hence its violent opposition to trusts, and its veneration of the Sherman Act as the acme of statesmanship. It is not interested in manufacture, rather, having lost control of it, is hostile to it; consequently it favors free trade and opposes expansion. More than this, it develops ultra democratic tendencies—advocating measures calculated to facilitate its political ascendency, such as the initiative and referendum, etc. But most of all, constituting with the rural proletariat that portion of the community on which the rent and interest-receiving capitalists prey, did it find its shibboleth in “free silver,” seeking by an expansion of the currency and cheapening of the dollar to lighten the contributions to capital thus levied upon it. It is this diametrical opposition of interests between the middle class, and the first group of capitalists, that explains the peculiar hostility between the factions of the Democratic party, which leads either to prefer capitulation to the Republican forces, rather than acquiescence in the other's leadership.

Passing by the Prohibition party as representing a moral sentiment rather than an economic interest, and therefore destined to insignificance, we thus see all classes which have distinctive economic interests represented in the field of politics, except that large, voiceless, politically inert mass, the proletariat. For with the exception of the part borne by the rural proletariat in the middle class rebellion of the latter '90s, these classes have had no part in the country's political life except to furnish the votes by which the ascendancy of “the business interests of the country” has been maintained. The wage-earning class, dependent itself on trade and manufacture, has, consistently enough, presented its vote to the second group of capitalists, and in 1896 and 1900 thus helped to disastrously defeat “the people,” despite the fact that the latter was aided by the solid south, which, on account of its peculiar prejudices, must be reckoned as a separate political element. At present, Mr. Roosevelt's somewhat simple-hearted endeavor to enforce the law (i. e., the Sherman law) as he found it, has made
him the idol of "the people," and left Mr. Bryan with a diminished following. But it has also put Mr. Roosevelt decidedly out of touch with "the business interests of the country," and placed him rather in the attitude of one who has proven recreant to his party's historic function. The query arises whether, assuming Mr. Roosevelt's nomination by his party, the middle class can win over the opposition of the solid south, where under otherwise similar circumstances, it suffered two crushing defeats, though aided by the solid south. This must obviously depend on the vote of the wage-earning class, and, though a protectionist, Mr. Roosevelt is not exactly the idol of wage labor. Nevertheless the protective policy might prove triumphantly decisive, were it not apparent that, as long as the capitalistic system of production exists in America, there is no possible danger of free trade.

We have spoken of the proletariat as the "dispossessed", a consequence of the capitalistic system, which separates the laborer from the materials and instrumentalities of labor, access to which is only permitted in consideration of a toll laid upon him; and we have also spoken of the laborer's want of representation in the political field. This latter circumstance is not, however, explicable on the theory that he is destitute of economic interests, nor on the more common assumption that these interests are identical with those of his employer. The rapid growth of trades unions on the one hand, and the formation of employers' associations and "citizens'" alliances on the other, and the savage conflicts between the two, presaging with increasing menace a state of industrial chaos, sufficiently demonstrate that identity of interest between the proletariat and the capitalistic class is a poetic figment of the politician's imagination, or of middle class ignorance and outworn ideals. And nothing is clearer or more certain than that a conflict between economic interests must be reflected and finally disposed of in the field of politics.

Now, it is evident that nothing can afford the proletariat, both rural and urban, complete relief, but the restoration to the laborer of the means of production and distribution, free from any toll levied by the capitalistic class. And it is equally evident this can only be brought about, consistently with human progress, not by breaking up accumulated capital into individual holdings, according to the middle class ideal, but by preserving and promoting the high organization to which capitalistic domination has brought industry—in other words by public or collective ownership. And a third thing is evident, namely, that this change in the legal form of title to capital can only be brought about through the political dominance of the proletariat, since it would be folly to expect the capitalistic class and its adherents to let go voluntarily. This is
socialism, and the declared purpose of the Socialist party. After such a revolution the capitalistic class, having fulfilled its mission in human history, would have disappeared. But as the middle class has proven itself unable to alone grasp political power, so it is probable that the proletariat can never be fused into such an intelligent and harmonious whole as to win its cause unaided. It must look to the middle class for assistance, and this raises the question of how far the proletarian solution of the problem meets the interests of that class. One thing is daily growing increasingly obvious, and that is that for proletariat and middle class alike capitalistic domination becomes intolerable. Yet the interests of the two differ in this, that the proletariat desires free access to the materials and tools of labor, while the middle class merely desires to use the means of production it already privately owns, free from the extortions of capitalistically controlled industry and means of distribution. Public ownership will evidently accomplish the former for the proletariat, but will it not equally accomplish the latter for the middle class? The now defunct Populist party, which was even more frankly and intelligently middle class than the radical Democracy, thought so, when it declared for government ownership of railroads.

But one objection immediately occurs to the middle class farmer, and is, as to him, entirely valid. Would socialism take from him his farm? If so, he will have none of it. It should be apparent from what has already been said that collective ownership and operation of industry can only follow a capitalistic stage in production, during which the industry is brought to a high state of organization and efficiency; and that capitalism itself can only invade those industries which lend themselves to the factory system, or in which quantities of machinery so large as to preclude ownership by the individual laborer can be successfully employed. Now, with all its powerful incentive to make a profit when and where it can, capitalism has not yet succeeded in competing with middle class production in agriculture. The reason is plain. The development of agricultural machinery has not yet passed the point where ownership by the farmer himself ceases to be practicable. It follows that agriculture is not yet ready for collective operation, and may never be. Middle class production in agriculture, therefore, not only may but must persist, even under socialism. True, it would undergo modification. For instance, hired help would no longer be available, since the quandam hired man would have a farm of his own. The amount of land possessed by one farmer would therefore be limited to what he and his boys could themselves successfully operate. Title to all realty might be placed in the state, but this would only operate as a guaranty against capitalistic landlordism and "mortgageeism," while, perchance, giving the public the right to insist on husband-
like farming. On the other hand public control of the distribution of products would operate as a most efficient insurance against crop failures and accidental losses, while the exchange of goods at labor cost possible under socialism, and the final freedom from capitalistic extortion, would undoubtedly raise the farmer's income to a point now reached only by the most prosperous.

It must be frankly conceded that radical public ownership is not the ideal middle class remedy. The point is, though, that it is the only remedy which the advance of industry has left practicable. More than that, it is the only platform on which, from the very necessities of the case, the proletariat can stand, since middle class production could not support so dense a population as our own. The question for the middle class voter, therefore, is not as to a choice of remedies, but whether he prefers capitalistic oppression or an advance to the next stage in industrial development, namely, the collective ownership and operation of capitalistically organized industries.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *

But all that an analysis of the political situation based on economics can do, at best, is but to explain in some degree the ebb and flow of majorities and the decisive influences at elections. The great mass of the voting population casts its ballots in obedience to a blind habit, prejudice or tradition, with the vital connection between economic interest and party affiliation scarcely if at all perceived. Yet, nevertheless, it is these same economic interests that in the long run and large view are the determining factors, not only in popular, but in all, government.

**CLARENCE MEILY.**
A Twenty Billion Dollar Combine.¹

A BOOK on trusts by a man who has spent a lifetime in Wall Street and is willing to tell "the truth about the trusts," must at all seasons command public attention, especially so on the eve of a presidential campaign in which both leading political parties will be waging war on the trusts, while the trusts will supply the sinews of war to both sides. The whole truth about the trusts will not be told until the law will compel corporations to make public reports of their business and the government of the United States will be honestly determined to enforce the law. As it is, Mr. Moody may rightly claim the credit for having given to the public more of the truth than the United States census, with all the resources of the national government at hand. The book is replete with reference matter and statistical information, though mostly in crude form, not easily available for general use. It is the object of this paper to digest it for the benefit of the busy reader.

There are, according to the author, in the United States today an aggregation of over 440 large industrial, franchise and transportation trusts of an important and active character, with a floating capitalization exceeding twenty billion dollars. The McKinley Industrial Commission a few years ago estimated the capitalization of all trusts at seventeen billion dollars, while the XIth census places it at a little over three billion dollars. To the statistical student it is clear that this enormous variance is due to a difference in classification. The Census has framed a purely artificial definition of an "individual combination" as an aggregation "of formerly independent mills which have been brought together into one company under a charter obtained for that purpose." As a result, many important trusts were excluded, "comprising a number of mills which have grown up, not by combination with other mills, but by the purchase of old plants." In other words, if a trust has bought out all its competitors instead of admitting them into the councils of the new body, it is, according to the census, not a combination. Moreover, the strength of the most powerful trusts lies in their mining and railroad properties. But the census of 1900 was limited to manufactures in the strict sense of the term; therefore the income of the trusts from their mines and railroads was eliminated from the census returns.

As a typical specimen of this sort of statistics may be cited the fact that the reported value of the output of all refineries in the United States for 1899 exceeds the cost of production by about $11,000,000, whereas during the same year the Standard Oil Co. distributed in dividends $33,000,000 and had for three years previous paid the same rate of dividends.

Mr. Moody has accepted the definition of a trust framed by Mr. Dodd, solicitor of the Standard Oil Co. According to this definition, a trust is a combination "formed with the intent, power, or tendency to monopolize business, to restrain, or interfere with competitive trade, or to fix, influence, or increase the price of commodities."

The solicitor for the Standard Oil Co. certainly knows what is an "industrial combination," and explains it with frankness because his article was written for the *Harvard Law Review*, which is not read by the Hoi Polloi.

All trusts are arranged by Mr. Moody into the following classes.

I. The Greater Industrial Trusts. This group includes:
   (1) The Standard Oil Co., which is a consolidation of about 400 formerly independent plants;
   (2) the United States Steel Corporation (the Steel Trust), which controls 785 formerly independent properties;
   (3) the Consolidated Tobacco Co., controlling 150 properties;
   (4) the American Smelting & Refining Co., which controls 121 plants; this trust has of late become conspicuous by its relentless war against the miners' organization in Idaho, Colorado and other western states;
   (5) the American Sugar Refining Co., which has absorbed 55 plants;
   (6) the Amalgamated Copper Co., or the Copper Trust, with 11 properties, and
   (7) the International Mercantile Marine Co., the Morgan Shipping Trust, with 6 properties.

II. The Lesser Industrial Trusts.

III. Important Industrial Trusts in process of reorganization, i.e., in plain English, bankrupt trusts.

IV. Franchise Trusts, which include telegraph and telephone trusts, and 103 gas, electric light and street railway consolidations.

V. The Great Steam Railroad Groups.

VI. The "Allied Independent" railroad groups, i.e., minor railroad trusts.

---

(2) Moody, I. c., p. 111.
(3) Moody, I. c., p. XIII.
A TWENTY BILLION DOLLAR COMBINE.

The following table presents the principal features of these consolidations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of trusts</th>
<th>Number of plants controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Industrial Trusts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Industrial Trusts</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankrupt Trusts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Industrial Trusts</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Trusts</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Steam Railroad Groups</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Allied Independent&quot; Railroad Systems</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Franchise and Transportation Trusts</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total outstanding capitalization of these trusts, as stated, exceed $20,000,000,000, of which about three and three quarters billions represent franchise trusts, over nine billions, railroad consolidations, and over seven billions, industrial trusts. Of course, it must be understood that these values are purely fictitious even from a capitalistic standpoint, being largely diluted with "water," which is a conventional term for fraud practised by the bigger fish upon the capitalistic small fry. But these figures serve, nevertheless, the purpose of graphic illustration. They clearly indicate the importance of public ownership of railroads and municipal ownership monopolies as parts of the general collectivist program.

Nominally there are today about two thousand railroad companies in the United States. In reality, however, a small circle of capitalists controls directly 93 per cent. of the vital steam railroad lines and influences the policy of the remainder. This is accomplished through the so-called "community of interest" plan, i. e., through the concentration of a controlling interest in the outstanding stock of those lines in the hands of the same group of capitalists.

The details of this organization are interesting. There are now about 204,000 miles of steam railroads in the United States; of these, however, about 26,000 miles are small local lines, which are either feeders for the large system and are therefore dependent on the latter, or else they are directly controlled by six "communities of interest," viz., the Morgan group, the Rockefeller-Gould, the Vanderbilt, the Harriman, the Pennsylvania and the less known Moore group. The same interests dominate and partially control the balance of the 13,000 united, and it is only a question of two or
three years when they will absorb most of the latter. The roads over which the Railroad Trust exercises no control, comprise the useless, worn out, profitless mileage of the country, which represents the waste of the American competitive system of railroad construction. Whatever portion of it may become valuable to the larger systems will sooner or later be acquired by them.

Furthermore, the six groups, with the allied "independent" lines are banded together by the closest of commercial and industrial ties. There are elements in every group which are also parts of other groups. The financiers who dominate this railroad trust are J. Pierpont Morgan, the Rockefellers, the Vanderbilts, George J. Gould, Cassatt, Hill, Rogers, August Belmont (the democrat), and a few others.

No intelligent man can be blind to the fact—says Mr. Moody—that general railway consolidation in the United States has now proceeded so far that we can never go back to the old discarded method of the many small competing lines. When the Supreme Court of the United States declared traffic agreements and pools illegal, the various competing lines were impelled from motives of their self-protection to consolidate into various "communities of interest" with much greater rapidity than they might otherwise have done.

The author, conscious of the corporation censorship of the press, offers directly no remedy of his own; yet, as the custom is wherever the press is censored, he lets the reader see through the lines of the following statement:

"The question of public ownership and operation will not be discussed here. Its wisdom or unwise can only be judged according to the point of view. It is of course an abstract proposition at the present time as far as the American railroads are concerned, and it is not believed that more than 10 per cent. of the American people would advocate its adoption."

Translated from the Russian into the language of free men, it means that though the demand for public ownership of railroads is as yet not strong enough to make its adoption an immediate political issue, yet there are already as many as 10 per cent. of the American people, or 1,500,000 voters who would advocate its immediate adoption.

Speaking of municipal franchises the author again finds himself compelled to adopt Aesop's language in order to hide his ideas from the corporation censor.

"A franchise monopoly," he says, "is a natural condition, and there is no way to prevent its existence, and, furthermore, there should be no desire on the part of the public to prevent its existence. Of course, there are those who claim that this monopoly
should be transferred from the hands of private individuals or corporations, to ownership and operation by municipalities or state. The wisdom of such a course can only be judged according to the point of view of those interested."

Of the 318 active Industrial Trusts, 236 have been incorporated since January 1, 1898. This embraces only large combinations. "Countless smaller and less important combinations" have not been included in these statistics. The degree of control exercised by the trusts within their respective fields has been ascertained by the author for 92 combinations. This is better than the report of the Industrial Commission, which has ascertained this percentage only for 25 trusts. The 92 trusts may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of trade controlled</th>
<th>Number of trusts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 per cent and over</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 80 per cent</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 60 per cent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50 per cent</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total .............. 92

Where a combination controls the major part of an industry, while the rest of the field is divided among a number of competing concerns, it is "lack of sincerity," as Mr. Moody puts it, to deny the existence of monopoly.

"The more conservative element," says he, "insist that there is no such thing as monopoly in modern industrial and commercial life; and the cant is given learned expression from the mouth of the modern augur in professional cap and gown. A typical specimen of these "official denials" is quoted by the author from a personal conversation with the manager of one of the larger trusts:

"This talk of the elimination of competition is all nonsense. Competition is keener than ever today, but it is of course carried on on a larger plane. Where formerly the small producer competed to reduce his costs and undersell his competitors by the ordinary means of great economy and superior efficiency, he has now gone beyond that point; he has passed the mean level where he can recklessly compete and survive, having found that he must look to other and better methods to obtain advantages over competitors. The advantages he now seeks are not so crude. They consist in going to the root of things, in acquiring and dominating the sources of supply and the raw material; in controlling shipping rights of way; in securing exclusive benefits, rebates on large shipments, beneficial legislation, etc."

See the point? Talk of the elimination of competition!
Why, just look at the bullish market for legislation! Legislators common sell above par, legislators preferred in great demand!

Mr. Moody cannot be accused of equivocation. He states squarely that monopoly does exist. The day is past when competition was the life of trade. Nowadays men find that they can accomplish the same ends far more cheaply and satisfactorily than in the old ways. Monopoly has become a necessary part of modern commercial and industrial methods. The organization and workings of the new industrial system are described in the following lines:

"The greater trusts are all dominated by Standard Oil interests. The dividends of the Standard Oil Co. are more than $40,000,000 a year and its net profits exceed $60,000,000 per year. The same interests dominate a variety of minor industries.

"The Rockefeller interests practically dominate the entire public service aggregations of Greater New York, represented by over $725,000,000 of capital; they are allied in interest with the well known United Gas Improvement Company of Philadelphia, which is itself the leading corporation of the famous Philadelphia or Widener-Elkins group, and which dominates the public utility interests in a number of the largest centers of population in the United States, and in addition controls the lighting interests of a score or more of the smaller American cities.

"And turning to the steam railroad field, we find that the Standard Oil interests are one of the conspicuous factors and are steadily increasing their influence there. It is now freely predicted in Wall street that the next decade will see the Rockefeller interests the single dominating force in the world of railway finance and control.

"The great Rockefeller alliances in the railroad and industrial fields are supplemented and welded together, as it were, through the New York city financial interests of the group. Their banking influence is of very great importance, and their ramifications are far reaching and of great effectiveness. Thus, the Standard Oil chain of banking institutions, headed by the great National City Bank, with a capital and surplus of $40,000,000, and deposits exceeding $200,000,000, includes also a number of smaller institutions. Some of these banks have strong dominating influences with the larger banking institutions of other great cities. The Standard interests are also closely allied with the great life insurance companies, such as the Equitable and the Mutual of New York.

"The Morgan domination, like the Standard Oil, makes itself felt through the means and influence of large metropolitan financial institutions and great banks.
"The great life insurance companies, such as the New York Life, and trust companies, are generally rated as being at least partially under the Morgan control.

"It should not be supposed, however, that these two great groups of capitalists and financiers are in any real sense rivals or competitors for power, or that such a thing as "war" exists between them. For, as a matter of fact, they are not only friendly, but they are allied to each other by many close ties, and it would probably require only a little stretch of the imagination to describe them as a single great Rockefeller-Morgan group. It is felt and recognized on every hand in Wall Street today, that they are harmonious in nearly all particulars, and that instead of there being danger of their relations ever becoming strained, it will only be a matter of a brief period when one will be more or less completely absorbed by the other, and a grand close alliance will be the natural outcome of conditions which, so far as human foresight can see, can logically have no other result.

"Around these two groups, or what must ultimately become one greater group, all the other smaller groups of capitalists congregate. They are all allied and intertwined by their various mutual interests. Viewed as a whole, we find the dominating influences in the trusts to be made up of an intricate network of large and small groups of capitalists, many allied to one another by ties of more or less importance, but all being appendages to or parts of the greater groups, which are themselves dependent on and allied with the two mammoth or Rockefeller and Morgan groups. These two mammoth groups jointly (for, as pointed out, they really may be regarded as one) constitute the heart of the business and commercial life of the nation, the others all being the arteries which permeate in a thousand ways our national life, making their influence felt in every home and hamlet."

(pp. 491-593.)

Though the power of monopolistic combinations over American industry is thus firmly entrenched, failures are not unknown in the realm of monopoly. People with whom optimism is professional never miss the opportunity to point to these examples as proof that monopoly cannot endure. The table quoted above shows 13 trusts, controlling 334 plants, "in process of organization," which means fraudulent bankruptcy. That is only 3 per cent of all trusts reported and about 4 per cent of all consolidated plants. As well might one claim that capitalism has an ephemeral existence because a few capitalists have been declared bankrupts.

The recent slump in all "industrials" has wiped out nearly two billion dollars of their market value.

With a carefully concealed sarcasm the author reminds the
trust managers and manipulators of the "widows and orphans," who were induced by trusted advisors to transfer their savings into stocks like steel common, copper, etc. Many thousands of this class have been involved in the general collapse. The stocks of 100 leading trusts have declined 43.4 per cent. below their former value. It would seem that there is in that little occasion for rejoicing. Yet the "Commercial and Financial Chronicle"—representative of Wall street interests—has triumphantly declared that "the Trust problem has solved itself"; free competition has automatically rectified the overcapitalization of the Trusts by reducing their quotations, to their actual value and now no further remedies for the Trust evil are wanted.

Mr. Moody deceived neither others, nor himself with regard to the future of the Trusts. It is quite probable, he thinks, that there will be various reorganizations within the next few years, but that most of them have come to stay there is no doubt.

The anti-Trust legislation, in the light of past experience, will prove ineffectual.

"Since the passage of the Sherman Anti-Trust law, the public agitation in opposition to Trusts has resulted in no Federal legislation of importance, unless the recently created Department of Commerce and Labor can be regarded as important. The new department has now been in existence about one year, but like the Interstate Commerce Commission, it is already quite apparent that its scope will not go beyond that of a mere statistical bureau, which will file records of comparison for general public uses. It was claimed at the time of the passage of the bill that the new department would have a large and important influence on the future of Trusts in this country. The clause creating the department reads: "The commissioner shall have authority to make under direction of the Secretary, diligent investigation into the organization, conduct and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, and to gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress, for legislation for the regulation of such commerce and to report such data to the President from time to time as he shall require.

"If the various remedies which have from time to time been tried or are now being discussed aim at anything they aim to 'curtail monopolies said to be maintained in restraint of trade.' That those which have been tried have not 'cur-
tailed* anything has been well demonstrated by events and we may be equally sure regarding the others.

"In view of these facts, the Anti-Trust legislation which has thus far been tried or broached in this country would appear to be singularly inefficient and beside the point. It does not seem to be in any sense in conformity to the spirit of modern tendencies and conditions. It aims merely to pick the pimples of the social problem, rather than go to the root of things. For when we realize what monopoly is, its depth and width and general importance in modern industrial and commercial life, we can readily see that any kind of legislation aiming to abolish or materially retrench monopoly, would have to be far-reaching and radical in its effects and would constitute a practical revolution in the bases of modern society. Whether one may regard monopoly as a cause or a blessing it is too deeply rooted in civilized society to be whisked away with a broom. This being so there would seem to be no immediate prospect of effective legislation touching the Trust problem."

As a result of these conditions the author notes the growth of a Socialistic sentiment. "Prominent men in business, journalism and also in financial fields are beginning to quietly admit that they are Fabian Socialists, and assert that public sentiment should be guided with a view to the possibility of a quasi-socialistic regime coming upon us within a generation or so."

Coming from a writer who, as he says himself, has had special facilities for viewing the Trust question from the Wall street standpoint, this testimony is significant. It coincides with other manifestations of the same trend of middle class public opinion. The resolutions in favor of government ownership which were presented by the committee on commercial law of the American Bar Association at its session last August were given wide publicity by the press and need not be repeated here. We wish to quote, however, the following from the final report of McKinley's Industrial Commission:

"There is logically no reason why, if Government operation is desirable as to railroads and natural monopolies, it should not be made to apply to monopolies coming from patents, or to capitalistic monopolies whose chief advantage is that of great capital shrewdly handled."

Among the witnesses who testified before the Commission was Mr. F. B. Thurber, a Trust promoter and a contributor to "The Trust, Its Book" (a eulogy of the Trusts). The following is taken verbatim from his testimony:

---

Q. Perhaps this is the right place to ask whether, in your study of combinations and Trusts, you have discovered, together with a tendency toward the development of monopolies in all industries, a tendency toward government control of such monopolies; or, in a word, is there a direct tendency to ultimate Socialism of some kind, or government ownership of all things?—A. The tendency is undoubtedly in that direction.

Another witness, a Republican congressman from Ohio, Mr. Robert W. Taylor, gave evidence of the utter helplessness felt by the old party politicians in the face of the Trust problem and his fear of Socialism, whose ultimate victory he clearly sees to be inevitable. Said he:

I do not know what the remedy is for the evil—if it is an evil, as I assume it to be—or how we are going to get at it. I do not think that any set of men can be trusted with the power possessed by the combinations as we now find them. I think that no normal man under normal conditions can ever be trusted with great and, in a human sense, omnipotent power, and therefore when you reach that position you have the menace of everything conceivable. I do not doubt at all that as a physical fact of society, as well as an evolutionary movement in the minds of men, the Trust leads to Socialism, points inevitably to Socialism, and will reach governmental Socialism. This is because, first, of the condition of the public mind growing out of it, and, secondly, because whenever the people discern that instead of a number of interests owning or controlling any product or property or production or method of transportation, those elements are unified into one group under one mind and one control, there will come the temptation and the opportunity to the public to say: 'Now, we discover that these enterprises are operated by only a few for the benefit of the few; it is a perfectly simple physical act for us to lay hands on them, and so we will now acquire and operate them for the benefit of all.' The difficulties of government acquiring ownership and the difficulties of bringing the public mind up to the proposition of government ownership arise largely out of the vast contrariety of interest and ownership. Whenever it becomes a simple physical proposition to lay hands on that thing and say, 'We will take that under the right of eminent domain and administer it for the benefit of all,' then you are likely to have that result speedily following.

It is interesting, indeed, to watch the stock objections to Socialism crumble under the pressure of economic conditions.

---

Speaking of the recent Wall street wars for railway control, the *Bankers' Magazine* in a recent issue notes their demoralizing effect upon the management of roads. While the superiority of private over public operation is vanishing, the conduct of government business, says the editor, is, with the extension of the civil service system, becoming more efficient.

The middle class sentiment in favor of public ownership of industrial enterprises is the outgrowth of "Morganization of Industry," to use a phrase coined by Mr. Moody in a little pamphlet issued about two years ago. "State capitalism" suggests itself to the capitalistic mind as a safeguard of the interests of the capitalist class as a whole against usurpation by a clique of trust magnates.

* * *

In conclusion, the writer wishes to recommend Mr. Moody's book to Socialist lecturers and speakers as a veritable storeroom of information on Trusts. Details are given on a hundred leading combinations; fifteen pages devoted to the smaller Trust will be read with interest as a side light upon the Colorado events. A feature deserving of especial notice is a series of graphic illustrations representing the Trusts as celestial bodies with their comparative magnitudes clearly shown. Statistics are indigestible food for an audience, but these illustrations could be made quite effective and telling with the magic lantern or in the form of charts.

**MARXIST.**

---

*The Bankers' Magazine, November, 1903, p. 674.*
Impossibilism, Opportunism and Marxism in Italy.

FROM April 8 to 11, the Italian Socialist Party held its eighth national convention, at Bologna. Nearly the entire time of the convention was taken up by the discussion of the tactical extremes which form the Scylla and Charybdis of the socialist parties of all countries. A short glance at the past history of the party will explain how it is that this tactical problem could assume such dimensions in Italy.

In 1892, at Genoa, the Italian Socialists separated from the anarchists and adopted the Marxian method and philosophy. Next year, at the convention in Reggio Emilia, the young party prepared for a speedy conquest of the political power. However, in 1894, at the Parma convention, the Socialist Party found itself confronted by a royal decree of dissolution and by-laws of exception. Of course, even a royal decree could not stop the social evolution. The Socialist Party proceeded on its forward march, just as the German movement had done under similar circumstances, and adjusted its organization and methods to the changed conditions. The conventions at Florence, in 1896, and at Bologna, in 1897, showed the adherence of the party to strict Marxian tactics in their electoral and parliamentary activity. But in 1898, the capitalist counter revolution swept down upon the Socialist Party, and the defense of the most elementary rights took, for a time, precedence over all considerations of typical socialist philosophy. This forced the Socialist Party, quite against its will, toward a cooperation with the radical capitalist parties. As the immediate consequence of these conditions, there appeared a desire on the part of some socialists to approach the radical capitalist parties, and the strict Marxian tactics were gradually undermined by a pronounced opportunist sentiment. The next consequence was a counter reaction in the party itself, which produced an impossibilist wing as a balance for extreme opportunism. Between these two extremes, the strict Marxian tactics found themselves for a while in a rather difficult position. After the general elections in 1900 came the national convention in Rome which, under the guise of local autonomy, threw the doors of opportunism wide open. The unity of the party came into question more than once after that, and has been severely tried up to the present day. Indeed, the danger of a formal separation into a reform and a revolutionary party is by no means past. The convention at Imola, in 1902, found the opportunist element in full control of the party, and they soon went the full length of their rope. Then, when it be-
came apparent that the whole character of the party was being slowly but surely changed, when not only the class-conscious proletariat began to ask itself where it was "at," but also the capitalist government found that the pressure from below was growing perceptibly weaker, there came a double reaction. The government went to sleep so far as social improvements for the working class were concerned, and the class-conscious proletariat prepared for a house cleaning. The opportunist element was confronted by a determined opposition. Their leaders were finally overthrown and the control of the central organ of the party, *Avanti*, was transferred to the hands of the Marxian element.

But in the meantime, the impossibilist element had grown almost as rapidly as the opportunist element, and everybody felt the necessity of making an end to such an unbearable state of affairs and of finding out whether the incongruous elements now united under one political name could stay together or not. Two debaters were appointed, one from the opportunist, one from the impossibilist wing, and instructed to present to the next national convention a full statement of their side of the case. Leonida Bissolati, the former editor of *Avanti*, was selected as the opportunist champion, and Arturo Labriola (not to be confounded with Antonio Labriola, the writer of the "Essays on the Materialist Conception of History") as the champion of the impossibilist side.

Each debater presented his position in the form of a resolution and defended it in a detailed argument. Bissolati’s resolution read as follows:

"The convention reaffirms that the Socialist Party must always maintain its autonomous character as a proletariat class party so far as any form or tendency of the capitalist government is concerned, for our final aim is the emancipation of the proletariat from capitalist exploitation. But while maintaining its class character, the party may support such tendencies of the capitalist government as offer a sufficient guarantee for the promotion of reforms that may at any given period be most needed by the proletariat. The convention declares that the party shall continue to make what use it can of the present institutions, without renouncing its intention to transform them whenever they may offer resistance to the demands of the proletariat."

On the other hand Labriola offered the following resolution:

"1. The convention reaffirms the permanently uncompromising and revolutionary character of the Socialist Party and its antagonism to the capitalist state. It brands as a degeneration of the socialist spirit the transformation of the political organization of the proletariat
into a pre-eminently parliamentarian, opportunist, constitutionalist, and monarchical possibilist party. It repudiates, therefore, as irreconcilable with the principle of the class struggle and with the true essence of the proletarian conquest of the political power, that co-operation of the proletariat with the capitalist class which consists either in the participation in some monarchical or republican government of some members of the party, or in the systematic support of any tendencies of the capitalist government.

"2. Considering furthermore that any reform under the capitalist regime, even if due to the pressure of the proletariat and partially useful for it, remains always patch work and does not in any way attack the fundamental mechanism of capitalist production, the convention declares that the promotion of reforms shall be left to capitalist parties without any co-operation or compromise of the proletariat, whose mission it is to demand, call forth and superintend the execution of such reforms as manifestly represent the conquest of positions which are useful for the development of the class struggle against capitalism.

"3. Considering also, that the fundamental principles of the socialist theory are distinctly opposed to the institution of monarchy and that the prevalence of monarchical possibilism among the opportunist element demands at the present moment a clear and sharp affirmation of the republic, the convention is of the opinion that the propaganda of the party should spread the conviction of the incompatibility of the proletariat with royalty.

"4. Considering, finally, that the parliamentarian activity of the party culminates in the propaganda accomplished thereby, in the training of the proletariat in the management of public affairs, and in controlling the action of the government, and that the party cannot inaugurate Socialism by an act of parliament, nor abolish capitalism or introduce even the measures preparing the new society, the congress declares that the party should not renounce any of its weapons of attack or defense, and should even reserve for itself the right to use force, if necessary."

Each of the two debaters had given out a printed argument in favor of his resolution. Bissolati’s argument is summed up by Oda Olberg, in the *Neue Zeit*, in the following words: "The capitalist class is not one sole reactionary mass against which the proletariat must advance in a body. The proletarians have com-
mon present day interests with some of the more radical capitalist elements and must assist them in the struggle against the reaction. Socialism is prepared by reforms and daily realized by them. The reforms most needed by the proletariat at the present time are: Freedom to organize and to defend itself, school reform, tax reform instituting a progressive income tax in place of the tax on domestic consumption, municipalization of public utilities, reduction of the military budget, preparation for the organization of a militia instead of a standing army. The proletariat must support international treaties and arbitration courts, a tariff reducing certain duties and abolishing others, nationalization of railroads, and labor legislation. None of these reforms are incompatible with the monarchy, for the monarchy does not oppose any of them. The proletariat has, therefore, no reason to make any special objection to the monarchy at the present time. If the proletariat insists on doing this, the whole capitalist class will unite against it and thus prevent the conquest of powers by which the proletariat might increase its strength and class-consciousness and forestall a return of the reaction. The proletariat builds up the republic by its present day work, by rising to better conditions of existence through taking advantage of the various tendencies of the capitalist government, by the direct action of the economic organizations, and by the indirect action of legal reforms."

Labriola, on the other hand, claimed that "the conquest of the power by the proletariat does not proceed gradually, and that the co-operative commonwealth is not built up step by step. It must be inaugurated by force and by the sudden expropriation of the owners of the means of production. This expropriation is not prepared by any of the present day reforms. The Socialist Party must not spend its energy on any of these reforms, which will be introduced by the capitalist class itself in the interest of their own power. It is rather the duty of the Socialist Party to educate the proletariat and enable it to relieve the capitalist class in the conduct of public affairs. So long as the proletariat has not attained to maturity, all forcible transformation will end in disaster."

American socialists will readily see that both resolutions and both arguments are extremely one sided. Between these two extremes, the Socialist Party would be rent in twain, for there is no common ground on which they can stand. Luckily for the Italian Socialist Party, there is between these two irreconcilable extremes a strong element which sees the inconsistencies in both of them and acts as a check on them. This middle of the road element stands for unity and Marxian tactics, that is tactics which are neither opportunist nor impossibilist. While either of the two extremes would gladly split the party and each go its own way, provided either could take this middle element along, they
feel that they would be outclassed, if they attempted to split without this Marxian element. And so this element serves to keep them all together. The relative strength of these three factions may be seen by the vote on the two resolutions. When this vote was taken, the middle element abstained from voting and left the two extremes to fight it out among themselves, thus preventing a clear majority vote. Bissolati's resolution received 12,255 votes from 316 delegates, Labriola's resolution 7,410 votes from 198 delegates, while 315 delegates with 12,560 votes abstained from voting. Since the middle element held the balance of power, it forced the two extremes to consider and vote on a resolution which affirmed the unity of the party. This resolution, introduced by Enrico Ferri, read as follows:

"The convention declares that the principle of the class struggle does not admit of any support of any government tendency nor the participation of any socialist in the capitalist government. But the work of the Socialist Party includes many forms of present day activity for the education of the proletariat to a socialist form of consciousness, of criticism of the system of exploitation and parasitism, and of the conquest of political, economic and administrative reforms. The minority must abide by the decisions of the majority and the work of all socialists must be carried on in a united socialist party."

Ferri summarizes his argument in favor of his resolution, in Il Socialismo, in the following manner: "The unity of the party does not imply the superiority of one over the other, but the fraternal co-operation in a work of great variety, in which every one may follow his own nature, without hating the other or attacking him personally. So long as the capitalist reactionaries threatened the party, all stood together for the common defense. Now that comparative liberty has been obtained, every one is free to act according to his inclinations. And so it seems sometimes, as if there were ground for quarrels. But there are only natural differences of opinion. As for reforms, they are necessary, but it would be a mistake to devote ourselves entirely to them. Apart from obtaining reforms, we have still much more to do. And the main duty of the Socialist Party is the formation of socialist minds. It is often said that we cannot get reforms, because our thirty deputies are not sufficient to force any of their demands through parliament against the will of the capitalist majority, and that therefore we should work for the establishment of a democracy in Italy. But can we get that democracy with our thirty deputies? The comrades who argue in this way suffer from the illusion that we can reap without having sown. They believe that we can have
a democratic government simply because a few deputies may have an understanding with the present government. I am opposed to Bissolati’s resolution, because it still insists on a ministerialist policy in spite of the bitter disappointments of the last years. And I cannot accept Labriola’s resolution, because, first, I am opposed to a theoretical affirmation of violence, and second, because it does not express itself correctly as to the essence of reforms.” Ferri closed with the appeal to forget personalities and think of the party.

The impossibilist element supported this resolution and it carried with 16,304 votes against 14,844. Thus the unity of the party was once more reaffirmed. But nevertheless, the ministerialist element is strong, and it is by no means certain that they will not bolt in the near future.

Ernest Untermann.
An "Impossibilist" Position.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the name "Impossibilist," as applied to a certain faction of the Socialist party in Chicago is not one of its own choosing. Certain friends who held to quite opposite views in regard to socialist tactics and possibly to fundamentals and who may or may not have considered name-calling argument—or it may have been in lieu of argument—supplied this rather euphonious title.

Not to quarrel over so small a thing as a name they have cheerfully accepted it, not however admitting its import but claiming on the other hand that they present the only possible line of tactics and that those who are opposed to them, programists and immediate demanders are self deceived, Utopian and unable to get away from the capitalist mode of thought.

While some of the aforesaid friends have been reasonably busy considering they were drawing no salary for it in explaining the position of the impossibilists the following is submitted as the nearest approach to anything like official action they have ever taken to define their position, being the platform they have proposed to be submitted to a referendum of the party membership in place of the one adopted by the national convention:

PROPOSED PLATFORM FOR THE SOCIALIST PARTY.

We, the members of the working class, who are organized politically into the Socialist Party, call upon every member of our class to join with us for the purpose of capturing the powers of government, that we may take possession of the tools of production, abolish the wages system and establish a system of production for the benefit of the workers.

To-day the tools of production are owned by the capitalist class; they are operated by the working class, but only when their operation will make profits for the owning class. Ownership of the machines, mines, factories and railroads gives to the capitalist class control over the lives of the members of the working class through the wages system.

The owning class can give or withhold employment at will. As a result of this absolute power the workers who perform all useful labor must humiliate themselves by begging for jobs of a class that performs no useful labor. If this permission to work is withheld they and their families must starve.

The wages system is the cause of starvation, disease, crime, prostitution, child labor, stunted bodies and warped minds for the workers, while it gives to the capitalists palaces for homes, the pick of the world's markets for their food, the finest raiment, culture, education, travel and all that makes life worth living.
Society is thus divided into two hostile classes, capitalists and wage-workers. This condition has brought into birth the Socialist Party, the political expression of the struggle of the working class for power. This party owes allegiance to and is a part of the International Socialist Movement.

With a system of industry owned and operated by the workers the struggle for existence would be shifted from the individual to society as a whole.

The ownership of the means of production and distribution by the capitalist class gives this class control of the legislatures, the Courts and all executive offices; republican, democrat and reform parties are financed by the capitalists, and are, therefore, their servants, thus in effect making government the executive committee of the capitalists.

To capture the government in the interests of the working class is the mission of the Socialist Party.

We, therefore, in the name of the working class, call upon every worker, without regard to sex, race or color, to cast aside all considerations and unite with us for the purpose of transforming our class from the slave class of society to the ruler of society.

"Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain."

Washington, Idaho and I am informed some other states have already adopted this platform with one slight change, also quite a number of locals so that it has some backing outside of Chicago.

For this platform we claim that it states our position and having done that stops without going into the realms of speculation; that it is written in the language of the working class and may be understood by any man who can carry on an ordinary conversation in the English language.

A platform amounts to very little in the Socialist Party except as it may indicate a tendency in the party to swing in one direction or the other. Chicago Impossibilists are fearful that the platform adopted by the national convention represents a tendency toward the middle class ideals. This is indicated more by its wording than the actual substance of the platform after one has sifted the wheat from the chaff. It acknowledges that the Socialist Party is a working class party but it appears to be afraid that some of its nice friends who wear good clothes and shine their shoes every morning will find it out.

Said one young man, a very intelligent fellow: "The more I study the platform adopted by the convention the better I like it." In that very declaration lies a fundamental objection. A socialist platform should be so plain that no one would have to study it. If interpreters are necessary then we are preparing the way for a set of priests who shall understand our platform and explain it to those who are dull of comprehension at so much per.
I don't say this is the case. I only speak of the tendency. I do not say, that there is even cause for alarm in it. The Socialist Party will swing in one direction one year and in another direction the next as action or reaction happens to be the predominating force at the time the platform is written. At all times it will reflect the economic interests of the delegates and their intellectual developments. Some may wince under this statement but if it is not true then it is the case that we have had the law of economic determinism repealed for the special purpose of the socialists when in convention assembled. If a convention is composed largely of men who were elected as delegates because they could pay their own way or of men who are drawing salaries from the party then the platform will reflect their economic interest. It may be lezé majeste to say it but we will have to hold power before we can calmly refuse to apply to ourselves the rules by which we explain history. In this connection I mention the fact that of the eighteen delegates from Illinois thirteen were either party officials, party employees, lawyers or newspaper writers. This is not to their discredit only it might jar a trifle with the theory that the emancipation of the working class must be the work of that class. Conditions are different in this country from any other country. The capitalist class of the United States is not the capitalist class of Germany of ten and twenty years ago during the period of the rise and development of the Socialist Party over there. Here where the exploitation is the fiercest the socialist expression should be clearest.

We are now in our formative period but some of our programists insist that we shall play we are a full grown party and go out of our way to find issues that at best must savor of middle class demands. When we grow up we must express ourselves on all questions that in any way affect us but trouble of that sort will come soon enough without looking for it.

Now it is our business to teach economics and to develop "clearness" in our ranks for when the democratic party goes to pieces we will have a crowd coming to us that will tax all our powers to assimilate. The leaven which is to give life to the whole lump must be as large as possible. There will be members enough who want programs to balance the party up without those who want socialism meeting them more than half way. In our party at the present time the "left" which is represented by the impossibilists is too small to keep the party well balanced or else it has not yet found expression. If, however, the telescope through which I look at Colorado shows me clearly the signs of the times they indicate some immediate issues for us before which "schoolhouses not too large but large enough" (I quote from the program) will pale into insignificance.

D. M. Smith.
EDITORIAL

The Platform.

Seldom has there been a more violent tempest in a tea-pot than the one which is now agitating a small portion of the socialist party over the question of the platform adopted at the Chicago convention. Yet, after all the volume of criticism is really remarkably small. When it is remembered that it was over a month after the platform was adopted before five out of nearly two thousand locals showed sufficient dissatisfaction to demand a referendum, it can hardly be said that the disaffection was widespread, even if it does appear to be deep. When we examine the criticisms we find them concentrated upon three points. First, on the historical accuracy of an allusion in the first section; second, on the somewhat scholastic phraseology, and, third, on the extreme length of the platform as such.

The allusions in the first section turn out to be due partly to the fact that the platform is generally published incorrectly. It has been assumed that there is a reference to the "American people" as being "the defender and preserver of the idea of liberty and self government," when as a matter of fact the "Socialist Party" is the subject of the clause quoted. Elaborate articles have been written to show that the American revolution was a move in the interests of the just arising capitalist class. No one is more pleased to see this fact recognized than we are, since we have been endeavoring to show this point for some years and practically all that has been said by those who attack the platform from this point of view is to be found in our "Class Struggles in America." But to catch up a phrase like this and tear it out of its text is one of the most dishonest methods of reasoning, and especially since nowhere will the modifications of this point of view and the class character of our present and past government be found more clearly stated than in our present national platform. Again, it is taken for granted that the writers and defenders of the platform do not know that "the idea of liberty" which prevailed at the time of the Declaration of Independence was purely bourgeois laizzez faire, "free contract," etc., sort of liberty. But this idea of liberty was at that time absolutely essential to the development of social institutions, and those who overlook this fact are themselves taking the bourgeois view of history, in that they are
assuming the existence of "the nature of things," instead of taking the scientific, comparative, historical, evolutionary view, which recognizes that each institution springs into existence as a part of social evolution. There is not a word in the platform that leads any one to believe that its writers thought that the "idea of liberty" held at the time of the foundation of this government was in any way identical with that held by the socialists at the present time. Personally, I do not like this reference, neither do I like the attempt to utilize the bourgeois prejudices in favor of individual property which is found elsewhere in the platform, yet in each case the explanation is so clear that it becomes only a question of literary style and clearness of statement, and not one of principle.

Again, we are told that this platform ascribes some sort of a super-natural or, at least, super-revolutionary origin for the Socialist Party, when it says, "into the midst of the strain and crisis of civilization the Socialist Party comes." If the word "into" was changed to "from," we would have an evolutionary statement which the strictest Marxian could not criticize. Again, it is claimed that the platform surrenders the inevitability of socialism. This is the first time that I knew that this was a dogma of the socialist movement. There is no reason why, so far, at least, as any one country is concerned, the capitalist class might not precipitate a bloody revolution which would, temporarily, crush all resistance of labor and leave us, not under a "benevolent feudalism," but under an autocratic reactionary tyranny. The first reply to this would be that this presupposes an unintelligent proletariat. Exactly. And an intelligent proletariat presupposes a socialist movement, which, if we permit the theological phraseology, is "to save the world from chaos." Again, I do not like the phraseology, but again no question of principle is involved, but only one of rhetoric.

It might be well, since we are on the subject of platforms and their influence on a party, to take a look at a platform which is held by a party at which some of those who are criticizing the platform of the Socialist Party are casting "goo-goo eyes." I therefore include here the present platform of the DeLeonite Socialist Labor Party:

"The Socialist Labor Party of the United States, in convention assembled, reasserts the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

With the founders of the American Republic, we hold that the purpose of government is to secure every citizen in the enjoyment of this right; but in the light of our social conditions we hold, furthermore, that no such right can be exercised under a system of economic inequality, essentially destructive of life, of liberty, and of happiness.

With the founders of this Republic, we hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be owned and controlled by the whole people; but in the light of our industrial development we hold, furthermore, that the true theory of economics is that the machinery of production must likewise belong to the people in common.

To the obvious fact that our despotic system of economics is the direct opposite of our democratic system of polities, can plainly be traced
the existence of a privileged class, the corruption of government by that class, the alienation of public property, public franchises and public functions to that class, and the abject dependence of the mightiest of nations upon that class.

Again, through the perversion of democracy to the ends of plutocracy, labor is robbed of the wealth which it alone produces; is denied the means of self-employment, and, by compulsory idleness in wage slavery, is even deprived of the necessaries of life.

Human power and natural forces are thus wasted, that the plutocracy may rule.

Ignorance and misery, with all their concomitant evils, are perpetuated that the people may be kept in bondage.

Science and invention are diverted from their humane purpose to the enslavement of women and children.

Against such a system the Socialist Labor Party once more enters its protest. Once more it reiterates its fundamental declaration that private property in the natural sources of production and in the instruments of labor is the obvious cause of all economic servitude and political dependence.

The time is fast coming, however, when in the natural course of social evolution, this system, through the destructive action of its failures and crises on the one hand, and the constructive tendencies of its trusts and other capitalist combinations on the other hand, shall have worked out its own downfall.

We, therefore, call upon the wage workers of the United States, and upon all other honest citizens, to organize under the banner of the Socialist Labor Party into a class-conscious body, aware of its rights and determined to conquer them by taking possession of the public powers, so that, held together by an indomitable spirit of solidarity under the most trying conditions of the present class struggle, we may put a summary end to that barbarous struggle by the abolition of classes, the restoration of the land and all of the means of production, transportation and distribution to the people as a collective body, and the substitution of the Co-operative Commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder; a Commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his facilities, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilization."

I have given this quotation in full, because it is probable that nowhere else in the entire realm of the international socialist movement can there be found another platform that contains as many bourgeois, middle class, ideas as are included in that platform. It has Rousseau's Doctrine of Natural Rights; it ascribes a purpose to government, apart from its class character; it assumes the existence of a "true theory of politics" which involves the acceptance of the theological and bourgeois idea that governments derive their character from the purity of the theory in which they are founded. The platform makes the same error with regard to economics; assumes that we have a democratic system of politics; that our government is "corrupted" to class domination, instead of being such by virtue of the capitalist government organization, and talks about the "alienation" of public property, public franchises and public functions by the capitalists, as is they had ever been in the possession of any one else, and assumes with patriotic fervor that the "mightiest of nations" is in "abject dependence" upon that class, instead of being the creation of the capitalists. It assumes a "humane
purpose' on the part of 'science and invention,' and finally closes with a call 'upon all other honest citizens' to come in as a sort of deus ex machina to right this horrible condition. It is especially worthy of note that it was no other than the great DeLeon himself, who personally defended all of this rot in the last S. L. P. national convention.

The reason, however, that we have taken up so much space with the platform of this defunct organization is, because it is worth while, as an illustration of the comparatively unimportant part which the platform plays in the development of a party.

As to the platform which the Chicago impossibilists have proposed to substitute for the existing one, this is mainly distinguished by the fact that it contains the word 'class' nine times in the first three paragraphs, and seventeen times within less than four hundred words of length. Yet, in spite of all these 'blessed words,' it does not contain a statement of the class struggle, nor is it written from the class struggle point of view. The historical cause of the origin of classes is not given, and from all that the platform says, socialism might almost equally well have arisen under chattel slavery or feudalism. It has nothing to say of the historical function of the proletariat, nothing to say of the movement of concentration in industry, no explanation of why the working class wants to capture the government, and, in short, is little more than a jargon of some badly worn-out phrases.

Thus, it will be seen that, so far as any positive position is taken, the impossibilists are utterly lacking. So far as their criticisms of the existing platform are concerned, they are mostly questions concerning its literary style and its language. As we have said, several times, we do not like this, either, but we do believe that they are as good, or better, than anything that has been suggested, and we include in this the Indianapolis platform, of which we were one of the writers.

The fact is that the platform has chanced to be the object around which certain opposing tendencies within the party are attempting to rally. It is manifestly unfitted for this purpose, since its defects are not those of principle, and to make a party division over questions of rhetoric and phraseology is hardly possible, to say nothing of being fruitless in its results.

This position is further strengthened by the fact that the rank and file of the membership have paid practically no attention to the discussion so far. It has been carried on by the professional writers and agitators. This is in no sense a reflection upon the class to which we belong, but should serve as a warning that we will largely have our efforts for our pains.

The one lesson which, it seems to me, can be gained from this whole matter is, that our present methods of writing platforms are all wrong. As we stated in a previous issue of the Review, the platform should not be written 'between days' by men worn out with convention work. Neither should it be the work of one or two individuals. The only way to avoid both of these things is for the national committee to appoint a
subcommittee at its meeting two years hence. This subcommittee to report one year before the convention of 1908. This will give ample time for examination and discussion and will reserve to the convention its true function, that of passing upon definite points of disagreement.

Some time ago we received a communication from Local Elgin of the Socialist Party, which has been crowded out for lack of space, signed by every member of the Local, certifying that none of the signers were the authors of the anonymous letter which was answered by Comrade Debs in the January issue of the International Socialist Review. The writer of the letter claimed to be a member in good standing of Local Elgin.
THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The class war in Colorado has attracted the attention of the American reading public more than any other industrial, political or social incident during the past month, having been thrust prominently to the front by the dynamite explosion at Independence, Col., in which a dozen non-union men were killed and many others wounded. Immediately the capitalistic press from one end of the land to the other began to charge the Western Federation of Miners with the crime, the militia that had been withdrawn from the district over the protest of the mine owners was returned, and a reign of terror such as this country has never witnessed since its formation was inaugurated. Every unionist and every sympathizer was hunted down by the soldiers, armed deputies and the Citizens' Alliance "law and order" guardians, thrown into "bull-pens," and later deported into Kansas and New Mexico. "Death to organized labor!" was the slogan, and not only the miners, but members of the A. F. of L., such as printers, carpenters, waiters and other workers were ordered to leave the district. Later, when the capitalists and their tools discovered that they had undertaken a bigger task than they could carry to a successful conclusion, they modified their orders and declared they would simply wipe out the Western Federation of Miners in Colorado, and finally they concluded that they would only uproot the socialism that existed in the miners' organization.

Almost simultaneously with the explosion at Independence the Supreme Court of Colorado decided the case of President Meyer, of the W. F. of M., who was languishing in a bull-pen, as the prisoner of Governor Peabody, who had denied the right of the miners to procure a writ of habeas corpus. The court upheld every act of Peabody, including the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, and the latter, who was "doing" the World's Fair when the decision was handed down, quickly rushed into print with this remarkable statement:

"This is the first time the Supreme Court ever sustained this idea, although it has been advanced any number of times. Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, all tried to suspend writs of habeas corpus on occasions during their administration, but their action never was sustained."

Able attorneys question the accuracy of Peabody's claim that Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln attempted to suspend the writ of habeas corpus when the courts were duly organized and prepared to enforce the law. However, that may be, the Supreme Court of Colorado, by a stroke of the pen, placed the crown of imperialism upon this little Nero's brow while he was fiddling away on the World's Fair pike. At one blow capitalism asserted and enforced its right to smash the fundamental principle of republicanism to protect its privileges and hold the working class in subjugation and slavery. Quick to appreciate their advantage, the mine owners and their Citizens' Alliance, in so many words and by their acts, the absolute rulers in the mining district, and the public officials, such as county judge, sheriff, auditor, clerk, etc., were duly summoned
to appear before the self-appointed guardians of law and order and show cause why they should not be removed and chased from the country. Where any of the officials attempted to remonstrate they had their attention pointed to a rope or were required to gaze into the muzzle of a gun, with the result that all the officials who were chosen at the ballot-box by the voters were forced to resign, and the farce was carried to its logical conclusion by the appointment of mine owners and their thugs to fill the vacancies.

To the unintiated it may seem singular that little or no attention is being paid editorially to this revolution in Colorado by capitalistic dailies. Their efforts are wholly confined to casting suspicion on the miners for the Independence explosion. They ignore the unprecedented Supreme Court decision and clearly unconstitutional and anarchistic method of removing legally elected public officials. The truth of the matter is that the prostituted press is between the devil and the deep sea. If it upheld the courts and the mine barons it convicts itself of high treason to republican institutions, the country and the flag, and thus the shameful occupation of the editors of procuring and seducing voters for their capitalistic parties would become rather precarious. On the other hand, if the daily organs should denounce the capitalistic cannibals of Colorado and their lawless methods it would displease their masters all over the country; for if the capitalists are anything they are class-conscious and quickly checkmate the least sign of treason in their own camps. So the newspapers, "the molders of public opinion," "the watch-dogs of liberty," and so forth, are omiiously silent regarding the invasion of constitutional rights and republican principles as they have been understood in this country for over a century, or occasionally mildly reprove the Peabodys and Bells and their imps for being unduly severe in punishing persons who are not miners.

This same capitalistic press—which informs workingmen how to vote—was, it will be remembered, pretty unanimous that the miners were guilty of committing such crimes as the attempted wrecking of the F. & C. C. railway train, the explosions in the Sun and Moon and Vindicator mines earlier in the strike. Fierce were the denunciations that were heaped upon the 'lawless' unions for their alleged criminal methods, and many and long were the editorials ground out to show how our institutions and society must be protected, how violence and the show of force is bound to injure the cause of the miners, and what a bad lot generally the latter really are. But when these cases came to trial and the thugs and scabs in court not only failed to fix these crimes upon the strikers, but convicted themselves out of their own mouths as being the real culprits, dynamiters and train wreckers, hardly a word seeped through the censorized Associated Press, and the writer does not know of a single daily paper that made any editorial comment regarding the damnable plot to convict innocent men of dastardly crimes that were instigated by the mine owners or hatched by their imported thugs. Not one newspaper reader in ten has the slightest idea how those earlier trials culminated, and no doubt the vast majority believe that the miners were guilty of the crimes that were laid at their doors by the reptile press. The fact is that in the strike of almost a year not a single miner has been convicted of committing murder or any other overt act.

From all the information that I am able to gain by a careful perusal of the weekly newspapers that have not been suppressed in the strike district I do not hesitate to express the opinion that never before has this country been disgraced by such infamous conspiracies and crimes as those perpetrated by Peabody, Bell, the Mine Owners' Association, the Citizens' Alliance and the other unhanged scoundrels that they control. So rotten with corruption has Colorado's ruling class become that even Butcher Bell, in a moment of sanity, handed in his resignation before
the Independence explosion and the Supreme Court decision and issued a statement to the Denver newspapers in which he charged that his partner in inquity, Governor Peabody, used the militia to further the ends of the mine owners, declaring that ‘‘that force was actually degraded to the uses of the local corporations who connived at the breaking of the law.’’ Later it was stated that the reason Bell threatened to resign and go to Mexico to engage in mining was that he and Peabody quarreled about a division of spoils. Bell was to hold the militia near Denver, to make a demonstration at ‘‘target practice’’ during the municipal election and throw the troops into the city when an expected disturbance occurred that was doubtlessly planned beforehand, for which he was to receive $5,000. But at the last moment Peabody is said to have made an arrangement with the Democratic bosses to give the latter a free hand to win a ‘‘victory’’ at his expense and because of his unpopularity. The Republican bosses and the Citizens’ Alliance denounced and threatened him, but without avail—he had probably received his price. At any rate, by ‘‘borrowing’’ the money in a school fund, and with the assistance of his Denver Democratic allies, Peabody went down to the St. Louis pike, the Democrats won the election and Bell handed in his resignation. Thus the situation looked somewhat desperate for the mine owners. There was demoralization among their supporters, the militia was being withdrawn, and their mines and smelters were as crippled as ever. All was quiet for a few days, when suddenly the Independence horror occurred, the Supreme Court decision was sprung. Peabody and Bell apparently settled their differences, and the reign of terror began.

When all the facts are brought to the light of day, if that will be possible, they will undoubtedly startle the country as nothing has for generations. That there have been dastardly plots and foul conspiracies hatched among the petty tyrants and plutocrats of Colorado there is little doubt, and considering the history of the great struggle in that state, and the acts of those who have flagrantly trampled upon all laws, principles and constitutions, every fair-minded person is forced to come to the conclusion that if there is hemp to be stretched a beginning should be made at the top. It is to be hoped that the miners’ officials will spare no effort to expose the real criminals in Colorado and bring them to justice.

In conclusion, I must mention the fact that the United States Supreme Court has just decided a case that was hardly noticed, and certainly not commented upon by the daily papers, but it was, nevertheless, one of the most important decisions rendered in the history of American jurisprudence. The Supreme Court holds that a fellow-servant is responsible for either the carelessness, the negligence or incompetency of another employe. The case at issue was one in which the operator failed to give orders, which resulted in the death of a fireman. His wife brought suit for damages against the company. The case was carried to the Supreme Court. The court held by a vote of 5 to 4 that the railroad company was not responsible, holding that the wife should seek redress from the operator who was in error. If this decision stands, and it will now that the highest tribunal has spoken, it means that employers’ liability acts are not worth the paper they are printed on, and that henceforth capitalists need pay no attention to damage suits that are filed by unfortunate victims or their relatives who are compelled to suffer because of the greed of a calloused employer. This is the decision that every corporation in the land will hail with delight. Now Money Bags is no longer liable for the murderous method in which he dictates his shop, railroad or mine must be run. He has unloaded that responsibility upon labor, of course, and can now speed up the machinery and turn any industry into a veritable hell.
That the Colorado outrages are having a tremendous effect upon the working people of the country in causing them to seriously consider the industrial conditions of our time is undoubted. For weeks the class struggle in the Centennial State has been the one important question to be discussed by the labor press, in meetings of trade unions and among the toilers generally. Everywhere the men and women in labor's ranks are becoming aroused by the outrages that have been perpetrated by capitalism and its politicians, everywhere there is a demand for information and literature relating to the class war, and the thoughtful unionists are beginning to agree that something must be done in a political way to resist the unbridled tyranny of combined capital and its puppets in office. Add to the Colorado turmoil the activity of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Citizens' Alliance and various organizations whose avowed intention is to enforce "open shops" in every branch of industry and disrupt the trade unions, and it can be readily understood that the workers are in a frame of mind where they will listen to every reasonable plan proposed to safeguard their interests and deprive the few rights they still possess. They have seen the trusts and combines arbitrarily advance the prices of necessities that enter their homes with one hand and with the other cut down wages and destroy the purchasing power of the workers in the principal industries. While the unions resisted the reductions and were unsuccessful, and at the same time were helpless to prevent the raise of prices of living, the members are beginning to see that as industrial organizations purely they are unable to solve the problem, and that those who control the courts, the legislative bodies, the militia and police hold the whip. Hence it is that the principles of socialism—political solidarity of the workers along class lines to conquer the powers of government—are given ready ear, and it is admitted that they compose in fact the only real live issue before the people. There is no question but the campaign this year will result in widespread education and fewer men than ever before will be herded at the ballot-box like cattle by capitalists and voted for the old parties. The industrial developments during the past year have played straight into the hands of the Socialist party, and there is no escape for the working class except through that party. The Republicans are defenders of the great capitalist interests, as practically every student of economics admits. The Democrats are again "reorganized," the radical element having been killed off, and they are making a bid for the support of the trusts and combines. Thus it is merely a scramble for office, with both parties competing for the honor (†) of serving labor's historic enemy—capitalism. The trust barons have barrels of money to give out and the politicians are crazed by the smell of graft and they care absolutely nothing about labor or its complaints. What they have done or left undone in Colorado can be applied to any other state or community. When labor is in trouble the politician, who is kept in office by labor's votes, takes to the tall timber and aids the capitalists. He is never heard of assisting the men and women who go on strike against oppression and for better conditions. Then why should those hypocrites be placed in power? Let the capitalists, whose friends they are, vote for them and elect them if they can. If labor must make its own industrial fights, why should labor not make its own political fights? These are questions, I repeat, that are now being discussed by the organized workers, and the platform adopted and the candidates nominated by the Socialist party at the Chicago convention look good to the thinking men of the trade union movement.
SOCIALISM ABROAD

Germany.

That the fear of German Social Democracy is steadily increasing among the ruling classes is evidenced by the recent establishment of an "imperial union against social democracy." The founders of this organization talk very much like the Citizens' Alliance and Employers' Association crowd in America. The capitalist papers, however, seem to think that much will come from it. The organization claims to have an income of 50,000 marks a year, of which 18,000 marks only comes from the memberships, the rest coming from some unknown individual. Vorwaerts remarks that the working class will derive new courage and new willingness to fight from the appearance of this new opponent.

There has been considerable discussion over the recent trials of some of the revisionists within the party, but the committee which was appointed to consider their cause has reported against the expulsion of any of them.

The Volks Tribune of Vienna comments as follows upon Edward Bernstein's new weekly paper Das Neues Monatags Blatt: "While there is no law in Prussia providing for legal rest on Sunday, this is the first instance of a Social Democratic paper appearing on Monday. One of the Vertrauenmanner from the Fourth Berlin Electoral District has protested against this latest private enterprise of the principal revisionist of the party and has called upon the comrades to withhold all support from the new editor. It seems like an insult to the idea of a May festival for a comrade standing in the foremost ranks of the party membership to bring out a paper on the second day of May dedicated to the support of a party which demands a thirty-six-hour Sunday rest and that the first number should be brought out, of all times, upon a Sunday which was the first day of May."

Norway.

The Norwegian Socialist Party held its congress on the 23d to the 26th of May at Drammen. There were 194 delegates present. The report of the party showed that the past year was one of the most rapid growth in the history of the party. Ninety-one new organizations united with the party, which now number 347 organizations, with 19,800 members. At the last election four delegates were elected to parliament with 24,526 Socialist votes. The municipal government of Christiania has 14 Socialist members in its council. These, however, are able to accomplish little, as they are faced by a compact majority of 48 reactionaries. There is a Woman's Movement connected with the party with 450 members. A municipal program was adopted, containing the following;
1. Continuous development of popular schools, having in view the attainment of universal education for all children (the expense of all instruction to be paid through taxation).
3. Municipal nurseries without taint of charity.
4. Humane care for the needy, old and incapable of work in municipal homes.
5. Municipal libraries and baths.
6. The regular municipal budget to be increased by the addition of a sum to be applied to the creation of a fund to supply work for the unemployed and for temporary assistance of the same as well as contributions to the treasuries of the unions.
7. Abolition of the contract system.
8. No new establishments for the sale of intoxicating liquors and the greatest possible restriction and taxation of those existing at the present time.

From Vorwaerts we learn that the liberal labor movement is rapidly dying out in Norway. One of the oldest liberal unions, that of Drammen, by a vote of 102 to 3, decided at its last general meeting to unite with the Social Democratic Party.

France.

Even the French Socialist papers agree that it is almost impossible to decide exactly what has been the effect of the recent French elections on the strength of the Socialists in municipalities. At first the election was hailed as a defeat to the Socialists, since Lille and Montluçon were lost to the party after having been held for several years. Nevertheless, when the elections as a whole are considered it is a conclusion of Louis Dubreuilh in Le Mouvement Socialiste that the party as a whole has gained since it controls more municipalities than ever before and has largely invaded new territory. Their defeat in the places named above was due to the fact that for the first time the liberals refused all support to the socialist ticket, so that the vote as it now stands is a measure of the clear socialist strength.

Belgium.

The following is the result of the Belgian elections: The Socialists have gained two seats in the Senate and the Government majority in that body, which was one of 16 before the election, is now only 10.

In the Chamber the Socialists lost seven seats and gained one; the Liberals gained nine seats, while the Clericals lost three seats. In the new Chamber the Government have only a majority of 20, instead of one of 26. It looks as if the Democrats had voted for the Liberals instead of voting as before for the Socialists. It must be remembered, too, that the Liberals had adopted some articles of the Socialist programme.—Justice.

Sweden.

The Swedish Parliament has once more adjourned without granting universal suffrage. It will be remembered that nearly two years ago there was a great universal strike in Sweden, lasting for three days, at the close of which the laborers were given assurance that the next session of parliament would grant them universal suffrage. However, the proposition was this time defeated by a very close vote of 116 to 108, which would indicate that the day of victory was not far distant.

This work is very largely a compendium of facts. It is just the sort of study of census and other official documents that has been needed in the Socialist movement for some time. The chapter on Pauperism and Poverty in the United States leaves one with an impression of the terrible mass of poverty existing in the United States that can never be forgotten. In the third chapter these facts are specialized with regard to the "children of poverty." This gives details of the number of destitute children, the number who are engaged in industry, with some illustrations of the worst conditions in such industries. In the fifth chapter, on Industrial Evolution in the United States, we have a very satisfactory summary, with, as before, an immense mass of statistical information concerning the changes which have taken place in capitalization, wages received, amount of product, etc., for the United States. The final chapter on the Abolition of Poverty draws the irresistible conclusion from the facts built up in the previous chapters, that the terrible mass of poverty and suffering by men, women and children is unnecessary, and that it is due to the present organization of industry. Furthermore, he shows that this industrial organization is moving towards socialism. There are few books that will prove more irresistibly convincing to the non-socialist reader, or more fertile of valuable information to the socialist worker.


It is interesting to note that the first work by a socialist on the American trust movement should be written by our well known French comrade. It shows the internationality, at once, of capitalism and socialism. The reason for the writing appears from the following quotation from Marx, which appears upon the title page: "The country the most highly developed industrially shows to those who follow upon the industrial scale the image of their own future."

There is an excellent survey of the existing trust movement, together with short chapters treating of the Standard Oil, Tobacco and Steel trusts somewhat in detail. But the most important portion of the book is that in which it discusses the economic action of the trust system. The various sub-heads of this part will give a hint of the subject matter. They are as follows: Industrial Integration; Trust System and Commerce; Profits, Banks; Depersonalization of Property.

Although the author repeats Marx's statement, that exploitation takes place in the act of production and not in the act of exchange, he accepts the position that the trusts have the power to raise prices, and states, in regard to the trusts and the handlers of agricultural products, page 86, "they dictate the price of grain and animals."
Life of Albert R. Parsons, with a Brief History of the Labor Movement in America; Also Sketches of the Lives of A. Spies, Geo. Engel, A. Fischer and Louis Lingg. Edited and Published by Lucy E. Parsons. Chicago, Ill.

The hanging of the anarchists in Chicago is now sufficiently a matter of history to permit its discussion without the heat of prejudice that a frightened capitalist press had thrown upon it at the time of its occurrence. The pardon of Governor Altgeld, with his reasons for granting it, which is included in this work, has shown with absolute certainty that the men who were hanged upon that November day in 1887 were murdered for no other reason than because victims were needed to frighten the working class back into humble submission. This work tells the facts of the events leading up to and during that tragedy in as full and accurate a manner as they are to be found anywhere. There is a brief introductory chapter, giving a survey of the labor movement in America. Then only a small portion is distinctly biographical of Parsons, the most of the work being given up to selections from his writings and speeches, and in describing the Haymarket massacre, and the subsequent events. This is as it should be, since these events make up a part of the history of the struggle of labor in America, and while, from the side of labor, this is principally valuable as showing errors to be avoided, it is also valuable as showing, if any further proof were necessary with Colorado before our eyes, that the present ruling class will stop at nothing in their endeavors to terrorize those who threaten their rulership. Although little attempt is made at "fine writing," there are portions which, because of the tremendous and terrible facts that are being told, reach a dramatic height that thrills and enthralls the reader.


This marks the beginning of what it is hoped will be a series of very valuable books. As a beginning, it is excellent. It contains within the compass of one convenient volume a large proportion of the facts which any worker along social lines will want to use. The portion on vital statistics is very satisfactory, covering, in addition to population, nativity, etc., the ownership of homes, marriages and divorces, occupations, size of families and persons in a dwelling, area of parks and play grounds, etc. The facts concerning the growth of manufactures in the United States since 1850 are given with considerable detail, the census figures being supplemented from other sources. The statistics on child labor are supplemented by a summary concerning child labor legislation, as is that on accidents by a similar summary of factory legislation. The figures on socialism have been compiled by National Secretary Mailly, and the editor of the International Socialist Review, and these are supplemented by an article by H. G. Wilsbire on the Progress of Socialism in 1903. It is manifestly impossible to summarize anything so condensed as a reference book, and we have only attempted to give a suggestion of its contents. It would be easy to criticise. There are sins both of omission and commission, many of which will be rectified in a later number. Perhaps the most unsatisfactory part of the work consists of the series of articles on foreign countries. Some idea of their onesidedness is gained when we notice that the articles on France, Germany and Italy give no hint of there being such a thing as a socialist movement in existence, while the Russian article, on the contrary, is devoted almost exclusively to the socialist movement, and has almost nothing to say of the remarkable industrial evolution which lies back of the socialist movement. The bibliography which is given is, also, rather unsatisfactory, and will require much revision. Nevertheless, the book is one which every socialist writer and speaker at least should have at his hand.
PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE POCKET LIBRARY OF SOCIALISM.

This series of booklets, started in 1899, and now including forty-one numbers, is one of the most important means for educating new converts in the principles of international socialism. Each booklet contains thirty-two pages with transparent parchment cover, the type being larger or smaller according to the number of words to be brought within the space. The size is just right for an ordinary business envelope, and the paper used is so light that one of the booklets may be mailed with a letter of one or two sheets under a single two-cent stamp: The booklets cover a wide range of subjects, so that they afford answers to almost every question likely to be asked by a prospective convert. The price is five cents a copy, but stockholders in the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company have the privilege of buying copies at a dollar a hundred, postpaid, or two cents each in smaller lots, while if ordered in quantities by express at purchaser's expense, the rate to stockholders is eight dollars a thousand. The latest addition to the series is "The Socialist Catechism," by Charles E. Cline. The answers to the questions in this booklet are for the most part given in the exact words of the standard writers on socialism, and they are supplemented by study-references to books explaining each subject in detail. The booklet is thus an exceedingly valuable one to put into the hands of a beginner.

New Stock Subscriptions.

The fifth day of July breaks the record for new stockholders. On that day three subscribers paid ten dollars each for a share of stock, two others made their final payments and received their certificates, two more made application for stock within the initial payment, and still others sent money to apply on stock subscriptions. The co-operative company has grown to a point where membership in it is a necessity to any local or individual trying to circulate the literature of scientific socialism. The company is not run for profit; it could undoubtedly make more money by publishing literature appealing to careless and ignorant readers rather than to those who are looking for the truth and are willing to study. But it is not run to make money. No one receives any dividends, and the officers have thus far worked for less than the wages of a union carpenter or bricklayer. Possibly they may strike when the debts are
paid, but to get the company out of debt is the first concern. As long as any money is owing to non-socialists, the danger remains that in a time of industrial crisis, the creditors may act for the capitalist class as a whole in suppressing the socialist publishing house. And there is even a danger in any permanent debt to socialists, since in the event of any acute disturbance over questions of party policy, the heavier creditors might bring pressure to bear to throw the influence of the publishing house on the side of one particular faction.

We have the nucleus of an organization which will insure the democratic control of the company by a large body of socialists, too widely scattered over the country, or rather over the world, to be subject to waves of local prejudice. (It may be interesting to note that one of the new subscribers to our stock during the month of June was the Social Democratic Federation of London.) But to put this company on a safe basis it is necessary to clear off the debt.

Contributions Since Last Month.

On page 776 of the Review for June is an acknowledgement of the subscriptions to the fund for wiping out the deficit on the Review for last year. This fund should grow until, with the increasing stock subscriptions, it wipes out the entire debt of the company. The fund now stands as follows:

Previously acknowledged ........................................... $718.47
George D. Sauter, Missouri ........................................  .60
Anonymous, Massachusetts ........................................  10.00
Mrs. Mary Girod, Wisconsin .......................................  1.00
Albert Smith, Maryland .........................................  1.00
W. D. Hurt, Missouri ...........................................  1.00
George W. Blue, Indiana ........................................  2.00
Allen W. Stuart, Missouri .......................................  1.00
Henry Fliniaux, Nebraska ....................................... 10.00
Frank Scherrer, Montana ..........................................  5.00
Thomas Jensen, Washington ..................................... 10.00
Cameron H. King, Jr., California ................................  5.00
James C. Wood, Illinois (additional) .......................... 10.00
I. H. Watson, Texas .............................................  5.00
Mrs. A. M. J. Howe, New Hampshire ......................... .. .50
Frank Fisher, California .........................................  2.00
H. R. Kearns, New Jersey ...................................... 13.00
H. B. Asbury, Kentucky ........................................  8.50
A. F. Simmonds, New York ......................................  .50

Total ................................................................. $804.57

A circular letter has been mailed each stockholder explaining in fuller detail than our space here will admit, the offer of a stockholder to whom the company owes over $8,000, that he will from this balance contribute
the equivalent of the total of all other donations made to the co-operative company during 1904. Large sums count on this proposition, and so do small sums. If each reader of the Review will do what he can, the necessary fund will soon be raised.

This announcement is not so interesting as the description of a large variety of newly-published books. But the company has already published books up to the limit of safety. The description of these in "What to Read on Socialism," mailed to any address on request, speaks for itself.

To go on publishing more books on borrowed money, on the eve of a probable industrial crisis, would endanger the whole publishing house that hundreds of socialists have so toilsomely built up. One united effort during the next few weeks will clear the way for a more rapid growth in the output of socialist literature than has ever been known in any country before.

America is ripe for socialism. Whether genuine international socialism is to come at once to the front, or whether we are to have a long and painful siege of opportunism, depends largely on the amount and the kind of socialist literature circulated in the near future, and this again depends to a very considerable extent on the financial position of this publishing house.

Comrades, it rests with you to say whether the growth of our work shall be rapid or slow.