

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. V

NOVEMBER, 1904

NO. 5

The General Strike in Italy.

THE center of revolutionary interest in Europe constantly shifts from country to country. Now it is Russia that startles the world with some sudden movement of her underground proletariat. Then, it is Germany with a three million socialist vote that shakes the tottering throne on which the Kaiser sits. To-day it is Italy that occupies the center of the stage. For some time the Italian government under the ministry of Giolitti has been remarkable for the brutality which it has exercised against the working men, although it is almost needless to say that it has done nothing that could compare with what has been done in Colorado. Nevertheless every strike was used as an excuse for setting the militia in motion and several strikers have been shot. Finally, when on the 15th of September, word came of one more of those massacres at Sestri near Genoa, it was felt that something must be done to make the protests of the workers effective. Without any definite orders laborers all over Italy began on the 16th of September to lay down their work. The socialist members of the Chamber of Deputies and the staff of the socialist daily *Avanti* decided that the time was ripe to co-operate with this general movement of the masses by calling a general strike to last for at least two days. Consequently they issued the following call:

“To the Sections of the Socialist Party and the Executive Committees of the Chambers of Labor in Italy:

“The undersigned, members of the Socialist party organization in Rome, the parliamentary fraction, and the staff of the Central organ, *Avanti*, convinced of the pressing necessity of an energetic and unanimous protest of the organized proletariat of Italy against the bloody massacres which have followed one another in such quick succession as to show them to be parts of a systematic and concerted plan, welcome the initiative of the labor bodies of Italy and call upon the organizations to announce a general strike,

with the greatest possible extension, throughout all of Italy as a legal, suitable and living expression of the condemnation of the governmental methods which continuously lead to fraternal murders, and also as an assertion of class defence on the part of the proletariat and its right of existence."

This was signed by representatives of the various bodies mentioned in the call. Although all efforts were made to prevent the general circulation of this document, yet it reached nearly the whole of Italy during the next day, and the most general strike ever known in history followed. For three whole days the city of Genoa was without light, bread or meat. In Rome, Turin, Bologna, and thousands even of the smallest towns all work ceased. It was a most striking example of the helplessness of bourgeois society without the proletariat. Even in the purely agrarian province of Mantua 120,000 laborers left the fields. In some of the cities the whole police force was withdrawn, evidently in the hope that mobs would result, which would give an excuse for massacres by the troops. The socialists, however, at once organized a police force, and it is on record that but one violent death took place throughout the entire territory covered by the general strike, and this was in no way traceable to the disorder, so that it was probably the most peaceful period ever known in Italy. Orders were given to close all places dispensing alcoholic liquors, while at the same time men were detailed to distribute milk to the sick and to children. The daily papers all ceased to appear, but the central labor bodies in each city issued small strike bulletins containing such information as was essential to the proper conduct of the strike. In Milan the strike lasted for five days and during all those days the city was in the hands of the *Camera del Lavoro* or Chambers of Labor. This body attended to the public functions, the distribution of bread where necessary and the cleanliness of the city.

When the strike began most of the military were some distance away from Milan, and as all railroad connection was broken, they were obliged to march back and did not arrive until the closing day of the strike. On their arrival they found no mob on which to fire and quickly dispersed to begin a search for food.

Finally, work was quietly resumed on the orders of the labor bodies with as perfect order as it had been laid down. It is safe to say that, while no direct pledges of any value have been given, since the pledges of Giolitti are considered absolutely unreliable, yet it will be a long time before troops are used against the strikers, without much greater provocation than has existed in previous cases.

The following telegram however was sent from the *Sindac Barinetti* at Rome to the laborers of Milan:

"CITIZENS: The Home Minister has taken action in order to repress the abuse by the military; the carbineers suspected of

guilt have been subjected to penal procedure and arrested. The Minister has also taken steps to hinder the authorities from intervening in conflicts between capital and labor, leaves full liberty for all manifestations, refrains from intervening (save in cases of danger) in public meetings. These assurances having attained the aim of the strike, I trust that calm will be everywhere maintained and that all will return to their work."

This use of the general strike has again aroused the most intense interest in the possibilities of this means of activity. There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that it is a weapon which must be used with the greatest care and which demands for its effectiveness a high degree of organization. In Italy there were times when there was great danger of the forces that had been unchained breaking loose in unintelligent uprising and it was only with the greatest of skill that they were controlled.

This movement is of special importance in connection with other events in Italy. The general elections are to take place on Nov. 6th, with a supplementary ballot on Nov. 13th, and the new parliament is to open on Nov. 30th. The socialists have nominated nearly 300 candidates throughout Italy, and are carrying on an extremely active campaign. They are getting so near to possible victory now that their opponents are frightened. The Associated Press dispatches bring news of two important movements in this regard. The first is the statement that Austria and Germany, the other members of the Triple Alliance, have notified Italy that this alliance will be dissolved unless she can find some way of suppressing the socialist movement. Otherwise, these countries claim, Italy will constitute a source of weakness rather than of strength in International politics. Incidentally neither the emperor of Austria or Kaiser Billy offer any suggestions as to how this "suppression" is to be accomplished, or any explanations concerning their failure to "suppress" the socialists of the countries over which they rule.

Other facts are equally important in showing the power of the Italian socialist movement. Ever since the formation of the present government in Italy, and the removal of temporal power from the Pope, the latter has taken the ground that he was a "prisoner in the Vatican" and all Catholics have been warned against taking part in any way in the Italian government, even to the extent of voting. Word now comes that the Pope has changed his mind on this point, and has instructed all church officials to enter into an active campaign against the socialists. From all reports the Pope has awakened much too late since a large number of the Catholics of Italy are already voting the socialist ticket.

There is a significant sentence in the Associated Press telegram concerning the coming elections. It says: "All the garrisons have been reinforced and a squadron of warships is at Genoa." In this connection however another quotation from the

Associated Press dispatches is also interesting. The dispatch reads as follows:

"GENOA, Oct. 16.—The following dispatch from Rome, evidently mutilated by the censor, has been received here:

"The minister of war has addressed a circular to the military authorities saying that in the recent rioting the extreme party tried to induce soldiers to disregard discipline and rebel at Padua. The subversive propoganda in the army is seen, but it is powerless against the sense of duty strongly rooted in the Italian army; still there is at present a grave danger, which must be fought."

Who Foots the Bills?

SOME FACTS FOR WORKERS.

JUST after the Civil War the practice of engaging labor to work "on shares" was universal in the South because nobody had any money to pay with. One day an impecunious old reb, guying an equally impecunious comrade, proposed to hire him to pick blackberries on shares, offering to give him in payment half of what he picked.

Stated in this crude form the absurdity of the proposition is so manifest that nobody—not even the workingman who still continues to vote the old party ticket—would think of regarding it as anything else than a joke; but when the compilers of the United States Census* gravely put it forward as a subject for general gratulation that the laborers employed in the mining industry receive back as wages no less than 50 per cent of their product, nobody appears to see the absurdity; nobody stops to ask who gets the other 50 per cent. Does somebody else contribute to an equal degree with the laborer in producing this unaccounted for half, and if not, who bears the burden, and who gets the benefit? Is it those that labor most diligently who have most abundantly? Let us look into the matter a little and see who spends the money and who foots the bills.

The last census (1900) gives the total continental population of our country as approximately 76,000,000. Of these, the same authority informs us, 58,000,000, in round numbers, are over ten years of age, leaving some 18,000,000 children under ten, who are presumably incapable of contributing to their own livelihood. Now, as society is responsible for permitting these 18,000,000 souls to be brought into the world, without asking their consent to be born, it is clearly responsible for their support until they arrive at years of maturity, and the labor of the remaining 58,000,000 is justly pledged for their maintenance and education.

If this were all nobody would have a right to complain, but this is not all, by a good deal. The census tells us further that of these fifty-eight and odd millions only 29,000,000, in round numbers, or about one-half, are engaged in any gainful pursuit, leaving the other 29,000,000 to be set down to the account of superannuates and defectives, paupers, tramps, criminals, millionaires, and other deadbeats and idlers that have plagued society since the beginning of civilization. And to these the 18,000,000 minors who are, or ought to be, out of the race for self-support, and we have a grand total of 47,000,000 dependents riding on the

*For 1890; no statement for 1900 on this point has yet been given out.

backs of 29,000,000 laborers, or less than 2-5 of the entire population supporting the other 3-5. The exact percentage as given by the census, for the adult population, counting all over ten as adults, is 50.2 per cent producers in 1900 against 48 per cent in 1890. But this increased percentage, due partly to immigration and partly to the crushing down of small capitalists and middle class people into the ranks of the proletariat, instead of rebounding to the benefit of the workers, as it would do under a system where the products of labor were fairly distributed, places the toiler of 1900 at a distinct disadvantage compared with his predecessor of 1890, unless it can be shown—as has not yet been done satisfactorily—that the percentage of the product falling to the share of labor has increased in a corresponding degree. There are now 50 per cent of the adult population scrambling for jobs, where there were only 48 per cent in 1890.

But this is not all yet. The official figures tell us that of the 29,000,000 engaged in gainful pursuits, 1,750,178 are children. Just what ages are embraced under the very indefinite term children, is not stated, but as 14 is taken as the age limit in most of the states that have laws against child labor, we may assume that the census reports mean to include those between the ages of 10 and 14. But as few young people under sixteen can be expected to do more than earn their own support, we may fairly deduct all under that age from the burden-bearers of the nation. The most that can be expected of them is that they will not themselves be a burden upon others. Two million would be a moderate estimate of this class among the laborers, especially as the census gives a much larger ratio as their proportion to the whole population. Eliminating these then, from the producers of surplus wealth, without adding them to the consumers, we have our force of burden-bearers brought down to 27,000,000.

But even this is far from stating the case fairly. The census enumerates among persons engaged in gainful occupations, lawyers, bartenders, saloon-keepers, liquor dealers, tobacconists, soldiers, marines (military), pension and other claim agents, and many more whose usefulness to society it would take a very clever special pleader to make apparent. Nearly two hundred thousand are enumerated as engaged in the liquor traffic alone, and over two hundred and forty thousand claim agents, to say nothing of other classes engaged in useless or harmful pursuits. Some allowance must also be made for superfluous government and other officials and for the vast amount of labor wasted in competition. There are also large numbers, such as teachers, clergymen, domestic servants, artists, actors, authors, musicians, etc., whose business, while useful and necessary, is not directly productive, and whose maintenance must therefore come out of the general fund. But as the professions just named, or a large proportion

of them, increase the effectiveness of productive labor in various ways, they may fairly be counted as producers. The man or woman who educates a child into greater proficiency as a citizen, is, in fact, a part producer of the wealth created by him; and so, too, the one who by cooking my dinner gives me a chance to earn an extra dollar by the use of my brain, is fairly entitled to a share of that dollar.

The value of actors, authors, musicians, and the like, may not be so apparent at first sight as that of cooks and school teachers, but in proportion as they increase the efficiency of the laborer by refreshing and uplifting him through the wholesome amusement or the moral inspiration they give, they are indirectly part producers of the wealth he creates. There is no class so ready to encourage all sorts of wholesome amusements as the laboring class, for none feels the need of recreation so much. Including, therefore, only those occupations that are clearly useless or harmful, such as quacks and nostrum dealers of all sorts, jockies, turfmen, and the flunkeys of the rich, commercial travelers, advertising agents and other wastes of competition, superfluous officials, etc., 1,500,000 seems a very moderate estimate to allow. Deducting these from the producers and adding them to the consumers, we have something like 25,500,000 as the effective laboring force of the country against 48,500,000 non-producers, or one to two, approximately. A further deduction should be made on account of defectives and old people among the workers, who, like the under-aged, cannot be expected to do more than take care of themselves.

From all this we see pretty clearly who foots the bills of the American people. One-third of the population produces all the wealth, while less than one per cent owns one-half of it, and one-two hundredth of one per cent owns over one-fifth.

But even yet the case of the laborer against the loiterer has not been fully stated. In considering the deadheads he has to carry we have assumed that they were all of equal weight, which is far from being the case. For consider. While each pauper supported in almshouses, according to the census of 1890 (the statistics for 1900 have not yet been published), costs the nation upon an average about \$33 a year, or a little less than 10 cents a day, a millionaire of the proportions of a standard oil or a steel trust magnate, for instance, cannot be sustained on less than \$10,000 to \$40,000 a day. The income of at least one of these gentlemen was proved in court nearly a score of years ago to be not less than \$9,000,000 a year (see Lloyd's *Wealth Against Commonwealth*), and it is probably more than treble that amount now. Carnegie's \$300,000,000 of steel securities alone bring him an income of more than \$15,000,000 a year, or \$41,000 a day, while John Rockefeller praises God to the tune of \$2,000

an hour for every hour in the day all the year round! Taking the smallest of these estimates, \$10,000 a day, as our basis, we find that a millionaire of the proportions of the half dozen richest members of the little group who own one-fifth of all the wealth of the country, is equivalent to an army of 100,000 paupers in the burden his maintenance imposes upon the producers, and 760 of him would represent a burden equal to 76,000,000 paupers, or the entire population of the United States! Or to put it still another way, this little group of millionaires, comprising about 3,800 individuals, of whom it may safely be assumed that they toil not, neither do they spin, appropriate to themselves 4,000 times more than their proper share of the national wealth, which would be theirs on the principle of fair play and equal justice to all.

We see now where the other half of the wages goes, but let us look at the matter from still another point of view; and here we shall have to turn again to the census of 1890, since the figures for 1900 are not available. As the conditions, however, which produce these results have been greatly intensified since then, the figures will apply with greater force than ever. The total public revenue for the year 1890 from all sources, including national, state and territory, county and municipal taxation, amounted to \$1,400,000,000, or \$16 per capita of the total population at that time. Now, this sum is paid exclusively out of the product of labor; there is no other source for it to come from, for land and capital are but dead matter till waked to life by labor; in fact, capital itself is but stored up labor. The capitalist and the land holder think that they are the chief taxpayers, and so, for the matter of that, does the laborer himself; but where do they get the money to pay their taxes if not from the income of their stocks and bonds or the rent of their land? And where do this interest and this rent come from, if not from the sweat of the laborer's brow? Hence, the workingmen, as little as they suspect it, are the real taxpayers, and as the effective force has been shown to comprise somewhat less than one-third of the total population, their actual contribution to the support of public functions is about \$48 per capita. Is it robbery if they demand that some portion of this fund be spent on public baths and libraries and lodging houses for their benefit?

I leave these figures to speak for themselves. Can any one look upon them and doubt who it is that foots America's bills? Who it is that bears her burdens, feeds her charities and sustains her glory? It is not the poet, not the soldier, not the millionaire philanthropist, but the workingman and the working-woman. It is those that labor, whether with hand or brain, to make the earth bring forth her increase and human nature to bear its richest fruits.

E. F. ANDREWS.

Political Unrest in Australia.

LABOR politicians are jubilant. The Federal Labor Party still retain office; the Labor Parties both in Victoria and Western Australia have been greatly strengthened by the recent elections of those states. In South Australia the Labor Party has at length risen to the dignity of His Majesty's Constitutional Opposition. The state elections for both New South Wales and Queensland take place during the month (August) and high hopes are entertained of the party being strengthened in both states.

Since assuming office the Federal Labor Ministry has busied itself with the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. It has shown time after time that quite a number of its principles could be easily disposed of. The Labor Party, with the aid of some of the free-traders, defeated the Deakin government on the question of the inclusion of the civil servants among the workers over which the Arbitration Court was to have jurisdiction. The Labor Ministry, on taking up the bill, announced its intention of not including civil servants (with the exception of railway employees) among the workmen who were to be brought under the provisions of this act. An amendment was accepted by means of which any union registering under the act is prevented from using its funds for political purposes. The question of preference to unionists, which was regarded as being vital to the bill, was decided in the negative, and the Ministry went through the pretense of considering its position. The Government was also defeated in its attempt to include seamen in the bill. The bill has yet to go through the Senate, and the Ministry are apparently relying on this house amending the bill in the direction of granting preference to unionists and of extending the provisions of the act to seamen. This precious piece of legislation as it now stands is such that Reid, one of the most conservative of Federal politicians, is able to express satisfaction with it. It inflicts fines and penalties for breaking agreements, and when put into force will thoroughly tie up the unions.

At the Victorian elections, which took place some two months ago, the Labor Party succeeded in returning eighteen members. In Western Australia, at the recent elections, the Labor Party captured twenty-three seats out of a house of fifty. As the other twenty-seven members are split into three factions, it is possible that the W. A. Labor Party may be called upon to become "His Majesty's Constitutional Advisors." The Queensland Coalition Ministry had its working majority considerably reduced and an early election is the result. In New South Wales, although the Labor Party has not coalesced with the Government Party, it

has for a long time given them loyal support. The Labor Party is in evidence in all the states, and in many quarters it is regarded as the cause of the present political unrest here. Its increasing strength is, however, the result of the prevailing unrest—the cause of which lies much deeper. Political unrest implies economic unrest, and it is to economic causes that we must look for an explanation of current political happenings.

For several decades now Australia has been in the clutches of the foreign money lender. This money power—through the financial institutions—has been ruling the country with a high hand. It is the pastoral industry which has received most attention from the foreign money lords, and it is this industry which has been best developed. The pastoralists controlled the state parliaments and passed such legislation as suited their own interests or, rather, the interests of their masters, the money lenders, for the runs in many instances were only nominally owned by the local squatter. A very large proportion of the money borrowed by the various states was spent in building railways into the pastoral districts. Having had a large say in the government of the states, the pastoralist has been able to place a large proportion of the taxation necessary to pay interest on the shoulders of others—chiefly on the small industrial capitalist and farmer. The burden of this taxation fostered an anti-borrowing spirit with which the Labor Party allied itself—largely, no doubt, through hostility to the pastoralists, whose wage-slaves formed the backbone of the Labor movement. This anti-borrowing cry has been getting stronger and stronger just in proportion as the smaller capitalist felt the pinch of additional taxation, and this fact accounts to a large extent for the increase in the strength of the Labor Party—the only party pledged to an anti-borrowing policy. The Labor Party has also to a large extent identified itself with Protection, and thus unwittingly has taken sides with the local industrial capitalists against the pastoralist, financiers and importers. The hostility of the industrialists—most of whom are small capitalists—is gradually being withdrawn, whereas the hostility of the pastoralists continues.

The Labor Party fondly imagines that it has won over its opponents by its arguments, but it would seem that what is really happening is that the economic center of gravity is shifting from the pastoralists to the industrialists. Australia, economically, is in a position of unstable equilibrium. It is the Labor Party's sympathy for the middle class which has drawn it unconsciously to the side of the industrialists. One of the most significant features in the manifesto of the Queensland Coalition Ministry is state encouragement of immigration. The Labor Party in the past has been bitterly opposed to this. Probably these state-aided immigrants will form splendid material for exploitation by the industrial capitalists. The Labor Party assisting the indus-

trial capitalists to gain supremacy would be a striking instance of the irony of fate, for its platform tends rather to hinder than to aid economic development.

The farmer class has also won the sympathy of the Labor Party, and now in all the states legislation is promised for the cutting up of large estates. Light lines are to be constructed in agricultural districts. In Queensland, the Agricultural Bank Act is to be altered so as to allow farmers to borrow money on easier terms than at present.

It would thus seem that the Labor Party, hitherto *feared*, is now to be *used*. The plank in regard to nationalizing monopolies does not yet possess any terror for the industrial capitalist, as monopolies are few at present. As the party gains power it is more than likely that its members will learn that the industrial mechanism cannot be lightly interfered with. In that case they will gradually get rid of their useless lumber and become very similar to the politicians of the other sections. If, however, the ideals of the party are strictly adhered to, the industries of Australia will be tied up and economic development will be postponed for a time. An honest attempt to carry out its platform would lead to reaction and stagnation, but the history of the Federal Labor Ministry and of the Queensland Coalition rather favors the view that in a short time the labor party will only with difficulty be differentiated from the other parties. From the leaders of the party one never hears any reference to the class-struggle; occasionally one hears references to socialism but it is always of the governmental control variety. Tom Mann frequently gives expression to socialistic sentiments but he seems to be converted to a belief in compulsory conciliation and arbitration and other nostrums.

One of the recently elected labor members for Western Australia (for years a labor journalist), puts the case thus: "The old fear of the labor party is dying out. And for the best of reasons. Labor has outgrown its callow days. It no longer expects to reconstruct society in a week and have the millennium going full blast in a fortnight (evidently a reference to the A. L. F. manifesto of 1890). . . . A wider experience has given labor a deeper knowledge. The Mudgee Taylors are giving way to the Watsons; the agitator of yesterday has become the statesman of to-day. In this great fact lies the hope of labor. For, as it becomes more and more realized, the foolish fears of the past will give way to confidence and trust and our ranks will be swollen with recruits from the cultured and professional classes."

The following extract, taken from the Brisbane *Telegraph*—one of the most conservative organs in Queensland—expresses somewhat similar sentiments "Clearly no good will result from any attempt to stifle the socialist (?) party in the Federal or any other Parliament. This party represents a large section of the

constituents; and any endeavor to stifle the representatives of those constituents obviously is an endeavor to stifle the constituents themselves. . . . Perhaps it would be well if members of that party were invested with part power in the government of the country, thereby having their extreme ideas reduced in the process of training. . . . Any attempt to stifle the party will only fan the flames of discontent."

The labor party is still regarded as a socialist party by a number of dissatisfied political opponents who find themselves without portfolios and also by some of the most earnest workers of the labor movement itself.

ANDREW M. ANDERSON.

The Propaganda of the Heart.

Oh! for that hidden strength which can
Nerve into death the inner man!
Oh! for the spirit, tried and true,
And constant in the hour of trial,
Prepared to suffer or to do,
In meakness and in self-denial.

—John Greenleaf Whittier.

THROW with some force a pebble into water. At the point of impact the vortex of the particles of the disturbed water will be the most intense, penetrating into the depth but circumscribed in its area. Somewhat further from the point of impact the motion produced by the pebble will be less intense, less deep, but comprise a larger area. The loss in depth will be compensated by a gain in breadth, the farther we will look from the point of impact, from the center of the vortex toward its periphery.

The instinct of self-love is deeply rooted but circumscribed in the individual. The love between near relatives comprising a family is broader but less intense than the love of self. And the further we move away from the center of the vortex of the instinct of love of self, from the individual toward the periphery of more and more complex aggregates, from the family to the clan, from the clan to the tribe, from the tribe to the people, the nation, the race, the broader, but at the same time the more superficial and shallow appears the consciousness of kinship and feeling of the solidarity of interests.

With the intensification of life, with the advance of culture and civilization, the instinct of self-preservation of the human race is getting stronger and stronger. Correspondingly there is a notable increase, a marked intensification of the consciousness of kind and of the feeling of the solidarity of interests of larger and larger aggregates of men, of ethnical, political and social-economic units. This consciousness of kind and feeling of solidarity affects the conduct of men and shapes their moral conceptions. The terms "selfishness, self-seeking, self-aggrandisement," etc., gain more and more in the popular conception, the flavor of undesirable properties. On the other hand the love to one's own family, clan, tribe, people or nation, devotion to the collective interests of an aggregate of men, faithfulness to a set of altruistic ideals, to a *cause*, self-abnegation and disinterestedness are more and more becoming to be considered as virtues. The subjection, the subordination of individual interests to the interests of more and more complex aggregates is being considered in a larger and larger measure as the very essence of correct behavior. Civilized nations consider any act inimical to collective interests blameworthy, immoral and vice versa. Any act calculated to further and advance collective interests are looked upon as praiseworthy, moral. The

aggregate prescribes—at least in theory—the line of conduct to the individual under the penalty of disapproval in one form or another. Public opinion rules private opinion. Morality—hedonistic and utilitarian as it was and will always remain—takes broader and broader aspects as humanity advances on the thorny path of culture and civilization. The family rules the individual, the clan the family, the tribe the clan, the people the tribe and so on till we reach the largest aggregate—the human race in its entirety, till the *consciousness of self is merged in race—consciousness in socialism*. This is in a nut-shell the evolution of ethics.

Nature cares little about individuals, but very much about species. The development of race-consciousness in human kind is therefore in perfect accord with the laws of nature. However, there is an essential difference between the methods used by nature for the preservation of species and the means and ways employed by the human race for its own preservation.

Man is a psysical being and as such uses psysical means to attain his ends. The most potent factor in the uplifting of mankind from the mire of individualism to the heights of race-consciousness, from anarchism to socialism was and is the *human mind*. The human mind comprises all psychic activities, the conscious, controlling forces as well as the subconscious controlled ones, the intellectual as well as the emotional powers, the functions of the brain as well as of the heart. It is generally conceded by all those who in one way or another work in the interests of humanity, that nothing can be accomplished without an appeal to the reasoning faculties of men. Far be it from us to disparage the effectivity of the *propaganda of the brain*. We want here only to point out the one-sidedness and eventual sterility of intellectual propaganda alone, i. e., without its natural counterpart—the *propaganda of the heart*, the appeal to the emotional side of the human mind. It is of course of paramount importance to know and understand what and how and why certain results are to be attained. Human intellect is after all only a tool. As any other tool it may be left unused, it may be misused and may be used in the proper way and manner. If there is no motive for action the intellectual faculties, however well developed and enriched with knowledge they may be, will remain dormant. If the motive be narrow love of self the intellect will be misused in individual interests. Only when the moral and emotional side of the mind is developed to the exclusion of sordid personal motives, only when the consciousness and feeling of kind subordinates the consciousness and feeling of self, we are justified in expecting acts of self-sacrifice, disinterested devotion to a cause. More knowledge of what is wrong and what is right leaves us cold and passive. Mere *knowledge without a motive* for the application of it con concrete cases *is not dynamic*, but static. The motive

of human actions is supplied chiefly by the emotional side of mind. A close study of history proves the fallacy of the popular assumption, that the intellectual development alone is a progressive factor, while emotion is either an indifferent or even a retrogressive element. On the contrary, history proves that cold, calculating, logical reason without the aid of powerful emotional under currents never shaped human events, never swayed human destinies. History teaches us, that the great leaders of men on the path of moral development, the development of the consciousness of kind as opposed to the consciousness of self, that the great seers of the hoary antiquity, that our modern great moralists and revolutionary heroes were not necessarily intellectual giants, but rather simple-minded *heroes of the heart*, dreamers, poets, idealists.

"Bards who sung
Divine ideas below
Which always find us young,
And always keep us so."

The "saviors" of human-kind did not preach
"Organized charity scrimped and iced
In the name of a cautious, statistical Christ."

Indeed the traditional Christ of the Bible was anything but cautious or statistical. There was little cold reasoning about him. It was his eminently emotional consciousness of kind, his love to the human race, that left its impress on the history of humanity. He did not attempt to prove to the people the scientific correctness or the unimpeachable logic of his moral teachings. The Sermon on the Mount is all pure emotion, enthusiasm, passionate love to humanity. Joseph Mazzini said: "All great national enterprises have ever been originated by men of the people, whose sole strength lay in that power or faith and of will which neither counts obstacles nor measures time. Men of means and influence follow after, either to support and carry on the movement created by the first, or, as too often happens, to divert its original aim."

Any great world movement of the past can be traced back to emotion clarified by intellect, none to intellect alone.

The greatest modern world movement—*Socialism*—is a movement for the readjustment of human interrelations on a new principle, consequently it is primarily *an ethical movement*. Socialists must, therefore, in order to succeed, appeal to the heart as well as to the brain, they must arouse enthusiasm, a passionate hate of wrong, an intense love of justice and fair play in human relations. Our present mercantile civilization favors mercantile morals. It favors the development of the lowest activities of the brain—cunning, shrewdness, craftiness. Socialists have to extirpate the individualistic morals, the gross individualistic materialism of our age and preach the noble morals, the lofty materialism of humanitarian aspirations.

ISADOR LADOFF.

The Socialization of Humanity. A Reply.

HERBERT SPENCER in his Autobiography complains that none of his books were ever adequately reviewed; that the critical notices they received give no notion of their contents; and, in order that he may be fully understood, he reviews each of his books himself in the way he thinks it should be done. I take this occasion in replying to Mr. Untermann in his review of my book, "The Socialization of Humanity," to review it, it is because it is the best reply that can be offered to what Mr. Untermann has said, and to avoid criticism for self-reviewing, I quote the precedent of Mr. Spencer and his justification.

The object of the book, as stated in the preface, is to trace physical, organic and social phenomena to their sources in order to discover their laws, so that the subsequent expenditure of energy in nature life, mind and society may be determined for human welfare. Through an analysis and synthesis of matter and energy as seen in physical, organic and social nature, I conceive the universe to be a process in the adjustment and readjustment of the two forms of energy constituting nature: gravitant energy constituting matter and radiant energy constituting the conditions of matter; and that the universal process is accomplished by different methods in the expenditure of these two forms of energy along the line of least resistance. There are four forms of this law. First, as in physical nature where the line of least resistance is determined by the blind conflict of the contending energies, resulting in no economy of energy whatever; second, as in organic nature, where the line of least resistance is determined by mind, resulting in a degree of economy of energy to the advantage of the individual possessing mind; third, as in morality where the line of least resistance is determined through the moral sense, attaining a still greater degree of economy of energy by saving part of the energies heretofore wasted by the individual through selfishness, turning it to the advantage of society as a whole; fourth, as in perfect sociality where the line of least resistance is determined by the social sense, resulting in conscious society with perfect economy in the expenditure of all energy, turning the energy heretofore wasted to the advantage of society as a whole.

Mr. Untermann seems to think because energy under each of these laws always takes the line of least resistance that there is no difference in them. But there is all the difference in the world. Under the first law, while the line of least resistance is followed, it is at incalculable waste of energy. By waste I do not mean that energy is destroyed, yet Mr. Untermann would try to make it appear that I did; but that it accomplishes no work. Witness the enormous waste of energy of the rivers of the earth, such as Niagara Falls; the still greater waste of the wind currents of

the earth. Think of the incalculable waste of electricity which is produced by the friction of the phenomena of nature! All of this waste of energy is expended under the law of motion that the line of least resistance is determined by the blind conflict of the contending energies. Under the second law of the expenditure of energy, while mind directs these wasting energies of nature, yet it is only to individual advantage, the social advantage following being merely a by-product. Under the third law the moral sense takes control of the individual's selfish control of energy and directs it to social advantage by the process of feeling, conscience and duty. Control by the moral sense does much good; but the acme of economy is not reached until the line of least resistance is determined by the social sense, resulting in conscious society, the socialization of the race, the line of least resistance being determined by scientific knowledge, being a perfect reproduction of the environment in the mind of man.

Now in elaborating these four laws of motion I discuss them in detail, and it is these details that Mr. Untermann criticises rather than the laws themselves. He would make it appear that I do not understand what the mind is, that I give no explanation of sex, that I take my notion of morality from Herbert Spencer, that I give no adequate conception of the moral and social senses, that I know nothing of co-operation except among men, that my conception of religion is erroneous, and that I do not understand the evolution philosophy. He seems to think that because mind exists today that it must have existed always; that because morality exists today that it must have existed always, and so of every thing.

He says:

"The question of which was first, mind or matter, can simply be answered by declaring that the one cannot be without the other; that one exists as long as the other, that they are both eternal and that their origin is co-eternal." p. 158, lines 14 to 18.

While this is an universal belief among metaphysicians, yet, when the true concept of mind is understood, it is an absurdity. While the human mind, consisting of the emotions and the intellect, is due to the organization of the two forms of energy in nature, internal and external energies, and the two forms of energy in themselves are everlasting, yet the mind depending upon the organization of these two forms of energy, passes away when the organization ceases to exist; but the energies as energies continue to exist forever. Mind is a mere phenomenon. It is unscientific to personify mind and make it an entity like matter, when it is simply a method of expending energy in nature; for it leads to mysticism, metaphysics and superstition whereby the oppressing classes cheat the common man out of his birthright, a perfect life in this world, and give him in lieu thereof a promise

of a life everlasting which does not and can not exist. But it is perfectly scientific to trace the factors of mind back into nature, and forward into morality and sociality; to find the laws of the expenditure of all energy so that it may be turned to social advantage; to discover the myriad phenomena of nature under their various guises, and show that while nature is many, yet it is one. This is monism. And this is what I have attempted to do in my book.

Beginning with Newton's three laws of motion, the expenditure of energy through the mind is a fourth law of motion, through the moral sense a fifth law, through the social sense a sixth law.

What the mind is: a fourth law of motion:

"A sense is a result of the way a physical, external energy, light, heat, pressure and so forth, registers itself in an animal organism; and after countless ages of development ends in a highly developed sense organ to receive such external energy. The registrations are the residua of the impacting, external physical energies; and it is through them that the animal cognizes and classifies similar external energies, such registrations in the course of countless ages developing into the intellect. The functions of the registrations is to discharge, and furnish avenues of escape to the internal energies of an organism liberated by them, and thus adjust the organism through its motor apparatus to the environment. The residua increase in number—each residuum, impression, sensation, perception or idea, or whatever you may call it, being a path of escape to the internal energies of the organism, due to partial chemical decomposition, oxidation—and after countless ages of development and organization, from amoeba to man, end in the phenomenon we call intellect. The function of the intellect is to direct the ensuing action of the organism, due to external stimuli. It varies the law of action and reaction, the law of expending energy along the line of least resistance, determined by the contending energies, by making each reaction of an organism not controlled by present stimulus alone, as in inorganic bodies, but controlled by ideas, being the expenditure of energy through the accumulated experiences of the organism, from the registration of the stimuli it has inherited from its ancestors, and has experienced in its own life, and all the combinations it has been able to form from them. p. 8, 9.

What the moral sense is: a fifth law of motion:

"Human energy comprising feelings and emotions, like all energy when uncontrolled, expends itself along the line of least resistance or the greatest attraction, the resultant of the conditioning energies; and in expending itself, registers itself in the nervous systems of the acting individuals by the law of external repetition, leaving residua which in time become a moral sense through which similar energies are afterwards cognized and classified, and which has the function of regulating and determining the expenditure of the energies of the individuals in reactions from similar stimuli. As the physical energies have originated the physical senses in the animal organism to make it aware of external nature, so that it may expend its energies in the most economic manner possible from the point of view of the individual in nature; so human energy, feelings and emotions, in its expenditure in registering itself in human organisms, as adjusted in society, originated a moral sense in the individual, which makes him aware of human energies as they exist in human being in society, and which determines the expenditure of his energies in society in the most economic manner possible." pp. 130-1.

What the social sense is: a sixth law of motion:

"The social sense is the accepted body of knowledge of a tribe, a

nation or the race, commonly designated cult, mythology, superstition, philosophy or theology; it is the race's knowledge of itself, stored in many ways, consisting of the popular concepts of the race contained in tradition, public opinion, literature and institutions. It is through this body of knowledge that the individual knows society, and performs his functions in society as it is through his senses and intellect that he knows nature and performs his functions in nature. This body of knowledge performs the function of a sense in that it receives, classifies, registers ideas of society in the form of concepts, and furnishes forms of expending energy which guide and control the expenditure of the energies of the individual in accordance with it. The uncontrolled and original ideas of an individual produce a certain low form of society; for each individual strives within himself to realize his idea of society, but as individuals act from different points of view, much of their energy is dissipated in neutralization and opposition. Naturally in this great conflict in the expenditure of energy among primitive people, controlled by individual ideas, some form of expenditure will be better than others; then the conflict instead of being between individual and individual is between the individual and this common form. This is the incipient social sense, beginning in the opinion of an individual and ending in verifiable scientific truth of society, after having passed through primitive man's allegorical interpretation of the facts of nature, life, mind and society." pp. 162-3.

"If the individual's moral and social senses were perfectly developed the individual would hold within himself both the individual and the race. Just as man's intellect is a mirror of nature, so his moral and social senses are a counterpart of society. The moral sense is a repetition of society in the individual from the point of view of sensibility; the social sense is a repetition from the point of knowledge. The moral and social senses are in fact society in us, a part of our constituent being. Society is in us as a God to be ever present to watch over the expenditure of our energies to reward the good, to punish the bad. The relation existing between man's individual and social natures some day will be perfect. There will be no need of external social control, except for the purpose of developing the moral and social senses, for the perfect individual will expend all of his energies with perfect economy by the control of his moral and social senses. Society will not have to coerce such an individual, for compunctions of conscience will be sufficient to deter him from wrong actions, and self-approval will be sufficient reward for good actions as it is to-day with the most highly developed individuals. With society constituted of such individuals a perfect social organism will be reached. The individual will be just as much concerned with social functions as with individual functions. This is the acme of the universal process of matter—conscious social evolution, directing all the energies of nature, man and society to the greatest possible economy thereby securing the greatest organization possible to the matter and energies of nature and the greatest happiness of the human race." p. 160.

What we are;

"All nature is one. We can interpret all nature in terms of our life, and our life in terms of nature; thus we are akin to everything and everything is akin to us. This is monism. We see ourselves in the most insignificant phenomenon as well as the sublimest. All nature has a meaning to us—the ceaseless changes in the inorganic, the interminable strivings of the organic, and the complex and baffling struggle for existence in the social world—all are one and the same interminable adjustment and readjustment of the gravitant and radiant energies of nature following the great law of repetition from primal mist, through the organization of nature, life, mind and society back to the primal mist again *ad infinitum*." p. p. 236-7.

II.

Mr. Untermann has not criticised any of the fundamental doctrines of my book. In the opening sentence one would think he intended showing wherein I differed from Marx and Engels, yet he does not do so. I contend that when looked at in the light of the philosophy of monism there is nothing in my book which conflicts with Marx's doctrine of economic determinism. I simply emphasize the psychic factors of civilization, Marx the economic. A much too narrow interpretation heretofore has been placed upon the theories of Marx and Engels as is shown in their later work. Seligman in his *Economic Interpretation of History*, quoted by Mills in his *Struggles for Existence*, pp. 42-3, says:

"It is, however, important to remember that the originators of the theory (economic determinism) have themselves called attention to the danger of exaggeration. Towards the close of his career Engels, influenced, no doubt, by the weight of adverse criticism, pointed out that too much had been claimed for the doctrine. 'Marx and I,' he writes to a student in 1890, 'are partly responsible for the fact that the younger generation have some times laid more stress on the economic side than it deserved. In meeting the attacks of our opponents, it was necessary for us to emphasize the dominant principle denied by them; and we did not always have the time, place or opportunity to let the other factors, which were concerned in the mutual action and reaction, get their deserts.'—'According to the materialistic view of history the factor which in the last instance is decisive in history is the production and reproduction of actual life. More than this, Marx nor I have ever asserted. But when any one distorts this so as to read that the economic factor is the sole element, he converts the statement into a meaningless, abstract, absurd phrase.'"

It will be seen from this that Marx's economic determinism is but a part of the philosophy of monism in general, and, if I have given a philosophy of monism, then I can not be seriously in opposition to Marx or Engels. The facts are, if any one will read my book carefully, he will see that the only difference between us is one of aspect; that I treat the whole subject of nature from the point of view of monism, whereas Marx and Engels confine themselves to an economic interpretation of history.

Mr. Untermann seems to think that the chief function of the critics is to point out contradictions, and wherever I have used a word in two different senses, for example, the use of the word nature, when I say: "Life and mind are developed in spite of nature, not with its assistance"; and "It is the nature of matter and energy to develop life, mind and human society, as it is for them to manifest themselves in any other way," he notes the seeming contradiction. Any one ought to see that nature is personified in the first sentence, whereas in the following, it is not; that the two sentences contrast naturalism with supernaturalism. Mr. Untermann follows this plan of criticism throughout, often criticising the nonsense he sees in one sentence through misunderstanding with the sense he really understands in another. In some

cases he takes my ultimate conception of a phenomenon and shows how it contradicts an undeveloped form of it. This is true of my concept of morality. In the following sentence he completely misunderstands my meaning. In order to keep the reformer from becoming discouraged, I show that the unconscious forces of nature work for the socialization of the race, I say: "That no matter whether the reformer proselytizes or the conservative persecutes, it matters not, the natural action, inter-action and reaction of the factors of physical, organic and social nature will inevitably end in a perfect social organism;" but Mr. Untermann totally misunderstands me, and thinks I am arguing against the necessity of agitation and goes into details to show the importance of agitation as if I had not done it time and again in the book.

But Mr. Untermann is so self-confident of his perfect orthodoxy in socialism, in monism, in the evolution philosophy that I am tempted to criticise his expression of the monistic philosophy in his review of my book. He says:

"In our further evolution, we shall find that there is no waste, and what seems like waste to us now was necessary and economical for its own time and place. As for co-operation all nature is constantly co-operating, all forms of life are but links in the universal division of labor."

If this were the only co-operation known to man, and Mr. Untermann implies that it is, then *laissez faire* is true, competition is right, the struggle for existence is desirable, war inevitable, and the natural condition of things not to be interfered with or improved; for we might disturb nature with our ignorant and unholy meddling and knock things helter-skelter. Socialism is a dream, the control of nature a utopia and dualistic theology is the true philosophy; for has it, too, not told us that every thing was for the best; that it is unwise, impious to criticise nature, to object to and improve nature; that every thing is in a divinely arranged plan, that "In our future evolution we shall find that there is no waste, and that what seems like waste to us now was necessary and economical for its time and place." Certainly this thought of Mr. Untermann is a reminiscence of his childhood days, and is not monistic materialism at all.

It seems strange to me that Mr. Untermann should criticise my book for not understanding co-operation when I show that nature everywhere blindly co-operates through the law of motion that all energy takes the line of least resistance determined by the conditioning energies; that the origin of plants and animals was due to a division of labor blindly made in nature (p. 70); that this is the explanation of sex (p. 72); that the same division of labor is seen in society in the elements of order and progress (p. 74); but that this form of co-operation is under Newton's three laws of motion, that all energy expends itself along the line of least resistance determined by the contending energies; and that the co-operation secured by the mind, by the moral sense and by the

social sense is conscious co-operation and will ultimately expend all energy with perfect economy doing away with poverty, the struggle for existence and war in the ultimate socialization of the race.

Mr. Untermann criticises my conception of class-consciousness. It is true that I state the doctrine in different language to him, yet none the less I state it. The ideas of Marx and Engels are not inspired so that we can not vary them, and no one has a patent on the truth. If I have arrived at a concept of class-consciousness by a study of all nature, it is just as much the truth as if I had arrived at it by a study of economics as did Marx and Engels. On page 301 I give the origin of class-consciousness and in conclusion say: "The true function of government of all, by all, for all can only come about with the democratization of the race. The ultimate goal of all humanity as seen in all history as family has enlarged into class, class into a people, is to make the whole of society into one people, thus realizing the democratization of the race." On page 213 I show how class-consciousness creates the moral sense. On page 444 in giving my concept of society, I say: "Human association is an organization in which the function of the organization is not to benefit the organization as a whole, or some class, or profession, or some corporation, or some great individual; but the benefit of all indiscriminately comprising it the least as well as the greatest." Mr. Untermann says that I fear to mention class-struggle, yet on page 462 I show the class struggle that is now going on in the United States and say: "Society must compel capitalists to abandon expending energy by the fourth law of motion, by introducing action by public corporate knowledge, the fifth and sixth laws of motion, the moral and social senses, to compete with private corporations and thus supplant them." On page 446 I say: "It is just as necessary that all the individuals of society shall be developed to their fullest capacity as that all of the constitutional units of the animal body be healthful, be able to perform their functions; for in each case the whole organism's condition is determined by the condition of its units." On pages 454-6 I show that class consciousness is but an incipient form of social consciousness; that when socialization is realized then the social organism will be perfectly conscious, so that a wrong done to the least member will be felt and seen as vividly by every one as if it were done to the greatest, and be remedied as soon as discovered. The happiness of all will be the chief concern of each, for without universal happiness there can be no individual happiness. This is the function of social consciousness.

Mr. Untermann appreciates what the book has attempted to do, but says it fails of accomplishing it:

"The author has gone deeply into things which are vital to the human race, and read many authors with understanding. But his read-

ing did not lead him to that source of light which would have enabled him to correlate the ideas of the various authors under one common conception wide enough to include and explain them all. This source is the literature of historical materialism created by the modern socialist movement. If he had grasped the meaning of the socialist philosophy and coupled this understanding with his great earnestness, his lofty concept of human relationship, and the sincere warmth which pervades his book from cover to cover, he would have created a work of epoch making value."

If this were true then indeed would I feel sad, for the object of my life has been to find the truth and utter it; and if I did not appreciate modern socialistic literature, it is because I can not, not because of neglect. I feel that this judgment is that of a contemporary which will not be shared in by the rising generation. Books that heretofore have attempted to do what my book failed to do, according to Mr. Untermann, yet so strenuously attempted, that is, make a wider generalization than heretofore had been attempted by any one, have always met with such criticism, yet in the end have gained appreciation and recognition. I have no fear that the fate of my book will be otherwise.

III.

The great defect in modern socialism is a lack of dynamic. It is urged against it that it can never be realized until there is a change in human nature. This means that while socialism may be absolutely just, may be perfectly scientific, yet there is no power known to man which will cause him to adopt it; that the race knowingly and wilfully would rather follow the injustice of capitalism with its lack of scientific qualification to adapt man to his environment, with its resulting incompleteness of life than to adopt socialism with its ideal and perfect system of living. It is this fundamental objection to socialism which caused me to make a complete analysis and synthesis of all the energies of nature to see if I could not discover the true dynamic which will secure the socialization of the race, be the basis of a scientific sociology which can be realized in the life of man today; and I think I have found it to be nothing more nor less than religion produced by the expenditure of energy through the moral and social senses. This is the ultimate conclusion of my book, yet it was overlooked by Mr. Untermann, he giving instead of my final conclusion, what I had to say in regard to our transitional period.

For the want of space I can only give a meagre concept of the ultimate religion of man and its function in the development of society. On page 53 I show that while external energies were developing the senses of sight, touch and hearing and the intellect, then the moral and social senses, that at the same time the internal energies were developing the sense of smell and taste, the desires, the will, love and finally religion; that man's intellectual nature is the highest form of external energy, while his emotional nature is the highest form of internal energy; and that the greatest

emotion of man is religion; that it can only be produced in its perfect form by morality, that kind of conduct which has been found to be of the greatest utility to the race, which expends all energy with perfect economy.

"Religion is the ultimate development of the primitive internal energy constituting matter, which causes it during the universal process of adjustment and readjustment of external radiant energy and internal gravitant energy, to unite into higher and higher organizations, beginning with molecular compounds and ending with humanity. Religion is the ultimate form of internal energy of matter which binds all organizations together. It begins with chemism in chemical combinations, then extends to living compounds. * * * In a still more differentiated form it unites the sexes in love. In its highest differentiated form, it begins by binding animals into species, men into clans, tribes into nations, and finally as religion, it will unite all humanity into one great organism. Religion is the energy of society, as feeling is the energy of the individual, and chemism is the energy of chemical compounds." p. 242.

If orthodox socialism is to be a factor in the ultimate socialization of the race, it must raise itself to the greatness of its mission, be not only a system of economics, not only a political program; but a philosophy of existence, a system of living, a religion that is to take the place of Christianity, and be the ultimate religion of man to make life worth living through all the coming ages, be a compensation to him for all of his individual sacrifices in the great battle he is now waging with capitalism in the socialization of the race. When socialism means this, it will be a fold for all the oppressed and down-trodden the world over; the home of the meek and lowly, the wise and just; the great cause which all enthusiastic reformers can embrace; the solace of the scientist in his arduous work for humanity; the inspiration of the artist in his picture of the ideal; the theme of the poet in all of his songs of hope and happiness; the machinery of the epic of humanity which will last until the race is no more; the model for the statesman to realize; and the school of the teacher in which he can interpret to all humanity the greatest thought he is able to think; and the life of the common people, for them to live in peace and happiness here on earth, the realized heaven of the poets and philosophers in all ages. Then socialism will be the greatest power the world has ever seen, be to the twentieth century what Christianity was to the first except instead of being a slave religion with a theological social sense, it will be a free man's religion with a monistic social sense which will see the way all energy should be expended and the socialization of the race will be attained. Then socialism will mean something, and not be the choice and watched doctrine of a band of persecuted spirits crowded in some garret to starve and dream; or the hope of some distant future which literary men allude to and flavor novels with, a hazy body of doctrine which can not be realized in practical life. Instead of taking a narrow view of socialism as Mr. Untermann would lead you to think, I take this view of it, and hail it to the world!

CHARLES KENDALL FRANKLIN.

Tolstoy and "The Times."

"Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast pearls before the swine, lest haply they trample them under their feet, and turn and rend you."—*Jesus Christ*.

A LONG article by Leo Tolstoy on the Russian-Japanese war, entitled "Bethink Yourselves," was published in "The Times" of June 27, together with a comment by one of the editors. Both article and comment are eminently characteristic utterances; the one being no less straightforward and unanswerable than the other is feeble and evasive. We can well imagine the mingled feeling of embarrassment and gratification with which Tolstoy's manifesto on the war was received at the office of the famous organ of capitalism in Printing House Square. "The Times" had evidently been highly delighted at the prospect of publishing an essay on an actual topic by the greatest of Russian writers, and had announced this particular article some weeks before its publication as an extraordinary and unique attraction. On the one hand, it was a clever stroke of business for "The Times," especially at a moment when it is putting forth strenuous efforts to increase its circulation, to print an article on the war by such a distinguished author as Leo Tolstoy, and on the other hand, the essay was doubly welcome as an indictment of the Russian government, with which the personal relations of "The Times" have not been quite so cordial of late, as one might be led to expect from two such ancient and honorable pillars of the existing commercial, political, moral, and religious order of the world.

Unfortunately for "The Times," however, Tolstoy is an independent thinker, who absolutely refuses to adapt his views to the current capitalistic opinion which "The Times" represents; he is neither an imperialist nor an admirer of international politics, and worst of all, has a most uncomfortable habit of plain speech, and a profound contempt for capitalism and all its manifestations. So, as I have already said, one can well imagine the mingled feelings of the champions of British imperialism, the Tibet expedition, Chinese labor in South African mines, and Mr. Chamberlain, on the receipt of an article, in which the author instead of limiting himself to a fierce denunciation of the manners and methods of the Russian autocracy and of this particular war, launched forth on a general arraignment of all governments and all wars, and even went so far as to include among the latter the recent glorious conquest of the Dutch farmers in South Africa.

Well, the article having been abundantly advertised by "The

Times," and with its customary modesty it had to be printed, and it had to be printed in full, for Tolstoy will not allow the publication of special editions of his works, abridged or otherwise watered-down for the use of middle-class gentlemen of conservative tastes. Consequently, the only thing to be done was to select a member of the staff to write a leading article, sufficiently apologetic, unctuous, and inept to restore the balance of good feeling between "The Times" and its outraged subscribers, and sufficiently patronizing to avoid all appearance of incivility or disrespect to the distinguished contributor. That considering its hundred odd years of experience as a newspaper, "The Times" has carried the art of trimming to a height of perfection hitherto undreamed of, is no more necessary to say than that the editor, to whom was entrusted the important duty of writing the fatuous and patronizing leading article, fully succeeded in vindicating his journal from all suspicion, either of improper designs on the present order of society, or of sympathy or understanding for the great Russian philosopher.

We are all more or less familiar with Tolstoy's views on war.¹ His writings of the past ten years have been a continuous denunciation of the patriotism by which war is inflamed, the so-called Christianity of the orthodox churches by which it is countenanced and encouraged, the diplomatic falsehoods with which it is ushered in, and the system of exploitation and wage-slavery upon which it is based. His sympathy for the unfortunate and unknowing peasants and workingmen who are driven forth, like so many wretched animals to slaughter, is no less than his contempt for their leaders, the men "who wish to distinguish themselves, or to do a bad turn to each other, or to earn the right to add one more little star, fingle-fangle, or scrap of ribbon to their idiotic glaring get-up," for the "journalists, who by their writings * * * incite men to war," for the "diplomatists who prepare war by their deceits," and for these "pastors of churches, calling themselves Christians," who "appeal to that God who has enjoined love to one's enemies—to the God of Love himself—to help the work of the devil to further the slaughter of men."

"The dissertation upon the war by Count Leo Tolstoy which we publish today is a remarkable document," says the "Times'" editor. "It is at once a confession of faith, a political manifesto, a picture of the sufferings borne by the peasant soldiers of the Tsar, an illustration of the crude ideas fermenting in many of these soldiers' minds, and a curious and suggestive psychological study. It reveals with impressive distinctness the great gulf fixed between the whole mental attitude of the purely European nations and that of the distinguished and influential Slav writer who has imperfectly assimilated certain disjointed phases of European thought. In no country but Russia could a writer of the first rank so incongruously jumble the logical methods of the thirteenth century with the most 'ad-

(1) Comp. "Patriotism and Christianity," 1896; "Letters on War," 1700; "Patriotism and Government," 1900; "The Root of the Evil," 1901; "Thou Shalt Not Kill," etc., etc.

vanced' ideals of modern socialism. Count Tolstoy uses texts from the Gospels as political arguments with all the assurance and all the irrelevance of a medieval schoolman, and in the same breath he rejects, as idle and pernicious superstitions, not merely the rites and teachings of the Russian Orthodox Church, but the cardinal dogmas of historic Christianity." . . .

To this it must be replied that a more incongruous combination of nonsense, inaccuracy and self-righteousness would be difficult to beat. Either the writer is completely ignorant of the tendency of Tolstoy's writings, in which case it would have been more discreet to have been silent on the subject, or else as is most probable, he is guilty of intentional misrepresentation. That Tolstoy is not a socialist, that he has never understood modern socialism, and is opposed to all legislative action as a means of social revolution or reform is apparent not only from his earlier works,¹ but also from the article under discussion, where it is stated:

"Therefore, however strange it may appear to those occupied with military plans, preparations, diplomatic considerations, administrative, financial, economical measures, revolutionary, socialistic propaganda, and various unnecessary sciences, by which they think to save mankind from its calamities, the deliverance of many, not only from the calamities of war, but also from all the calamities which men inflict upon themselves, will take place not through emperors or kings instituting peace alliances, not through those who would dethrone emperors, kings, or restrain them by constitutions or substitute republics for monarchies, not by peace conferences, not by the realization of socialistic programmes, not by victories or defeats on land or sea, not by libraries or universities, nor by those futile mental exercises which are now called science; but only by there being more and more of those simple men who, like the Dukhobors, Drojzin, Olkhovik in Russia, the Nazarenes in Austria, Condatier in France, Tervey in Holland, and others, having placed as their object, not external alterations of life, but the closest fulfilment in themselves of the will of Him who has sent them into life, will direct all their powers to this realization. Only such people realizing the kingdom of God in themselves, in their souls, will establish, without directly aiming at this purpose, that external kingdom of God which every human soul is longing for."

In short, Tolstoy, like the reformers with whom he is most in harmony, is not a socialist but a "Christian anarchist," in other words a revolutionary sectarian, who looks almost exclusively to religion and to the state of consciousness which may be induced by religious emotion as the source of salvation. Nor has he anything more in common with socialists than a recognition of the inherent evils of the present social order and a sincere desire to labor for its abolition. It is true that his ideal, so far as the material wealth of the world is concerned, is "each according to his needs, from each according to his ability," but this is plainly the (unorthodox and) utopian Christian ideal of thoroughgoing communism, which is, in the first place, as old as the hills, and in the second place, too far removed from the present to be of any practical importance except, indeed, as an

(1) "Some Social Remedies," 1900; "The Slavery of Our Times," 1900; "Appeal to Social Reformers," 1903, etc.

ideal,—too “ultimate” to be included in any modern socialist programme.

With Tolstoy's religion “The Times” fares even worse than with his socialism. That Tolstoy should quote texts from the Gospels and at the same time reject the rites and teachings and dogmas of orthodox Christianity can be a matter of surprise to no one who is familiar with the Christian teachings as expressed in the Gospels and with the gospel of capitalism as proclaimed in the orthodox Christian churches. The statements (attributed by all Christians to the founder of their religion) in regard to murder, armed resistance, the taking of oaths, and various other essentials of modern warfare, are sufficiently explicit as they stand in the current versions of the New Testament to require no explanation. The Gospels and their teaching have always been looked upon as the central document of Christianity: if any one reject them he is not a Christian, *i. e.*, one who professes to believe in the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ. The Russian priests who march at the head of advancing columns bearing in their hands an uplifted cross are no more Christian than the Church of England parsons who acted the part of recruiting sergeants during the Boer war, or the American clergymen who prayed to the Almighty God of Battle for the success of the arms of our own plutocracy in Cuba and the Philippines. Such actions are in direct contradiction to the moral teaching of the religion which they profess, and judged by that religion, their conduct is no less inexcusable than amazing. All this has been pointed out for years, not only by Tolstoy but by dozens of writers, Christian and non-Christian, and their indictment is unanswerable. And so long as the precepts in question are allowed to remain in the Gospels, and the Gospels themselves are held to be sacred by the orthodox ministers of religion, this contradiction—which it must be admitted is not particularly edifying—will continue. If the churches were openly to proclaim themselves not to be Christian, or if they were to prepare a new official revision of the Gospels, in which all passages that can be considered in any way objectionable or offensive to the spirit of an imperialistic capitalism have been carefully suppressed, there is no doubt but that the world would be much the better off for it. A sincere barbarian is certainly preferable to a pious fraud.

After a few weak remarks to the effect that Tolstoy “holds the governing classes of his own country up to the execration of ignorant peasants with a recklessness which might lead in certain circumstances to the cruelest of all bloodshed—the bloodshed of social war,” and that “he does not shrink from telling the suffering masses that they feed the ‘sluggards,’ who thrive on a system of fraud, of robbery, and of murder.” “The Times” editor goes on to say in his most patronizing tone, that Tolstoy's “earnestness

and sincerity are unquestionable; but the unmeasured vehemence of language, which imparts vividness to his invective and actuality to his descriptions, would alone suffice to deter sensible readers from accepting his statements without reserve. . . . His inability to perceive, even dimly, the elementary facts which dominate the social and political order of the world, his intolerance of the men and the institutions upholding that order, and his powerlessness to suggest any working alternative for the system he would overturn become more and more prominent as the news of successive engagements and disasters reaches his ears. He has none of the serene patience which comes of the conviction that in the evolution of mankind it is ordained that good shall triumph over evil."

No, it must be confessed, Tolstoy has none of that serene patience which "The Times'" editor, in common with some of our modern professors of political economy and sociology, apparently hold to be the summit of human wisdom. He knows that the conscious activity of man is essential to all effective progress, and that although it may be "ordained" that good shall triumph over evil, it is at any rate certain that whatever the forces are which are productive of the evolution of good, and however numerous, active human endeavor is the one indispensable agent to that end, without which nothing may be accomplished. He realizes that of all the factors of evolution conscious effort alone possesses moral worth, and that although good may indeed sometimes result indirectly from exploitation, oppression, and bloodshed, it must be placed to the shame rather than to the credit of the individuals who *unconsciously* participate in its production, all the while that their *conscious* endeavors are being devoted to the pursuit of their own selfish ends. For example, the capitalists may by their clumsy efforts to stave off an impending crisis open up vast territories to western civilization, which, with all its drawbacks, is unquestionably superior to the barbarism which as a rule it replaces; they may through the agency of their factories and industrial centres bring together large aggregates of workers, thereby rendering it possible for a uniform belief to be spread among them; they may by exploiting and crushing their workmen to the point of desperation arouse in them that spirit of unrest and sense of injustice which finally develops into an organized labor-movement, trade-unionism, and Social Democracy. Just as in Germany, where the anti-socialist speeches of the emperor are employed as an effective means of propaganda by the very political party which he is most anxious to suppress, and as in Colorado, where the bloodshed occasioned by the lawless rule of an unscrupulous plutocracy is hammering the lesson of class-conscious political action into the hard heads of those American workmen who have hitherto been gifted with that

serene patience which the "Times" editor apparently so highly recommends, so in Russia, the present autocracy has involuntarily rendered its own self feeble, ineffective, and corrupt, and has unconsciously furthered the development of the very class that will some day assist in occasioning its fall. But it is plain that Tolstoy, who views all things from a purely religious and ethical standpoint, cannot be tolerant of individuals who, although consciously striving to uphold the present order, are, without knowing it, paving the way to its destruction. Unconscious action, whether beneficial or not, can by no possibility have a moral value, and not only is it morally worthless, but, as will be shown later on, it stands lowest in the scale of evolution. Nothing can illustrate more clearly the utter bankruptcy of current "bourgeois" ethics, than the implication of the "Times" editor that Tolstoy does not perceive even dimly the elementary facts of the social and political order of the world, *simply because he is intolerant of the immorality and stupidity of those individuals who, while engaged in the pursuit of their own egoistic endeavors are at the same time unconsciously and involuntarily assisting in the gradual triumph of the good over evil.*

It is no wonder that Tolstoy has been driven into a somewhat exaggerated contempt of orthodox social and political science, which accepted authorities of the present day in their endeavor to adapt to the moral necessities of the governing classes have severed from all organic connection with the *science of ethics*, thereby displaying the utmost indifference to what the last fifty or sixty years have accomplished towards the unification of knowledge. And this bankruptcy of "bourgeois" sociology and ethics becomes only the more evident when the "Times" editor goes on to say, in the certainty of the approval of his cultured readers, that

"Count Tolstoy applies his dogma of the unmitigated wickedness of all war with the rigid logic which so commonly plunges idealists into papable absurdities in the real affairs of life. He lays down the startling proposition that it is the moral and religious duty of each individual Russian, whether he be soldier or civilian, to refuse to take part in the present contest, directly or indirectly. Whatever be the consequences—whether not only Port Arthur be taken, but St. Petersburg and Moscow' as well—this duty is absolute. The individual, whether he be the autocrat on the throne or the peasant tilling the fields, has no right even to consider the consequences of its violation. They may mean death to himself and ruin to the state. No matter, he must do his duty and refuse to kill."

Here the same train of thought repeats itself. No doubt even the editor of a yellow journal is willing to admit that war *per se* is—stated in the mildest possible terms—an evil. Moltke himself was willing to concede so much. And he knows perfectly well that the practice of warfare is characteristic of a lower rather

(1) "The most fatal error that ever happened in the world was the separation of political and ethical science."—*Shelley*. (Quoted by Tolstoy as a motto to his "Appeal to Social Reformers.")

than of a higher phase of human development. He is also aware that Tolstoy believes that war is something "incomprehensible and impossible in its cruelty, falsehood, and stupidity"—for this very statement occurs in the article he is criticising. Notwithstanding all this, he has the effrontery to speak of Tolstoy's simple and straightforward advice to men, not to take part in the present conflict or in any other war, that is to say, not to assist in what he himself has recognized to be—at the very least—an evil, as "fantastic propositions!" Perhaps the editor is surprised that Tolstoy, instead of denouncing war, does not express himself somewhat as follows: "It is true, war is incomprehensibly cruel and stupid, and through the agency of warfare certain irresponsible and unscrupulous members of society endeavor to attain certain definite objects. Although these objects are seldom attained and are in themselves almost invariably immoral and worthless and injurious to society, nevertheless the ultimate (unconscious) effect of war is to further the development of humanity towards civilization. One result of the present war may be the introduction of a more liberal form of government into Russia; it may even lead to the subversion of the present autocracy, the stronghold of reaction on the continent of Europe. The effects of the fall of the Russian autocracy will be felt throughout the entire world, and will further the development of liberal ideas and institutions in all countries. On the other hand, a great number of the most pugnacious and ferocious of modern savages may succeed in ridding the world of one another during the course of the conflict, and in spite of the general increase of brutality, which is one result of war, their mutual slaughter may still have the ultimate effect of reducing to a slight degree the savage instincts of humanity. Since we all have that serene patience which comes of the conviction that in the evolution of mankind it is ordained that good shall triumph over evil, and as it is quite impossible for us to put an end to the hostilities (even if we were desirous of so doing), let us further the evil with all our hearts that the more good may come of it. The end sacrifices the means."

Now, if Tolstoy were a journalist or sociologist, or economist, who has reduced himself to mental and moral incapacity in the service of Mr. Kipling's redoubtable God of Things as They Are, he might, indeed, say something of this sort, and be in thorough harmony with the ethics of capitalism. However, as a moralist of lofty aims, as a man whose life is devoted to the furtherance of human welfare, and as the greatest of modern prophets, standing as he does—in spite of his environment—in the forefront of progress, it would be a physical impossibility for him to return to a conception of human life and conduct which differs from the conceptions current in former ages (when barbarity was a still more universal phenomenon than it is

to-day), only in its hypocrisy. Having recognized that war is a crime, it is Tolstoy's duty as a man to condemn war, and as an ethical teacher to do all that lies in his power to dissuade his fellow beings from taking part in war. And in this, his moral sense and his feelings,—his sympathy for the working classes who bear the chief burden of suffering and in the end pay for the struggle with their labor,—are not "plunging" him into "palpable absurdities," as the "Times" editor very naturally would have us believe, but, as will be shown in the following paragraph, are in complete harmony with the most advanced scientific thought of the present day. Indeed, no other attitude is possible, once we have detected the hollowness of the sophism that an ethical (or intellectual) sanction for modern warfare and for the economic, social, and religious order from which it derives its material and "moral" support, is to be found in the fact that each or any of these may be demonstrated to contain an advantageous element.

It has already been pointed out that the advantageous element of war is almost exclusively a result of the unconscious and involuntary action of the individuals who are responsible for war, the results of whose *conscious* actions, *i. e.*, the killing, maiming, brutalizing, and extension of capitalistic industrial methods can hardly be called other than "unmitigated wickedness." Now it is scarcely necessary to say, first, that the capacity to foresee the future consequences of our actions, individual and collective, in other words, the power gradually to emancipate our lives from the tyranny of the "unconscious,"—the so-called element of chance,—a process by which man acquires, relatively speaking, a greater and greater control over his own destiny,—is one of the most marked characteristics of the upward progress of humanity towards civilization. The greater the sphere occupied by the unconscious, the lower the grade of culture. In the second place, it is a still more obvious truth that moral conduct is more highly evolved than immoral conduct. It follows, therefore, that individuals who only achieve good unconsciously and involuntarily, who have not the capacity to look out beyond the immediate consequences of their actions, and who are therefore in a high degree slaves of the "unconscious,"—and whose *voluntary* acts are as a rule unmitigated wickedness,—can scarcely be considered to be traveling in the direction of progress. All that need be said of them is that from the standpoint of morals and intellect they are ciphers,¹ and from the point of view of evolution, irresponsible survivors of a type that is in process of disappearance from the earth.

As to the actual practice of warfare it may be said, further, that the evolution of mankind is characterized among other things

(1) Unconscious ciphers, be it understood. Men like Baer, Carnegie and the "Times" editor are not as a rule inclined to let their light shine under a bushel or to class themselves among the publicans and sinners!

by the conquest of blind instinct and rude, primitive emotion by reason and the higher feelings, by an increasing definiteness and coherence of actions and consequent improvement in the adaptation of acts to ends (Spencer). There is no organized social activity (with the possible exception of the capitalistic method of production) in which actions are so incoherent, so indefinite, and so ill-adapted to their ends as in warfare; nor is there any activity of which the results are so uncertain, and if achieved, so utterly disproportionate to the amount of energy expended. The appalling amount of unproductive labor consumed, the death-rate of the troops engaged—due less to the bullets of the enemy than to enforced neglect and disease—the quantity of wasted gunpowder and projectiles, the futile random movements of opposed armies, the loss and destruction of supplies, of ships, of conveyances, the damage done to the property of non-combatants and to industry, and the subsequent well-known effects on the moral and mental qualities of the survivors—all these things are characteristic of a relapse into the incoherence, indefiniteness, and general irresponsibility of the most primitive stages of barbarism.

Thus Tolstoy's attitude toward war and his advice to the effect that it is better not to have anything to do with it, is not only supported by ethical and humane considerations, but is, as was to be expected, entirely consistent with the laws of social evolution, and consequently—to borrow the words of "The Times,"—with *those elementary facts which dominate the social and political order of the world.*

It remains to be said that, inasmuch as the theory of advantageous elements in human calamities is one of the most popular and pernicious of the many fallacies which are employed as a means of bolstering up the intellectual and moral side of the capitalistic order of society—a fallacy which is constantly to be met with, not only in the daily press, but also in the works of scientific writers of recognized ability, where it frequently appears in the form of the problem how to reconcile ethics with the facts of evolution, in other words, how to find an ethical sanction in the evolutionary hypothesis for the stupidities and atrocities of capitalism—and since, on the other hand, an inclination has been shown by various modern socialists, who advocate violent revolution in countries where there is no representative government, to make use of the same theory in support of their arguments, exception will, I hope, not be taken to the amount of space which has here been devoted to it.¹

HENRY BERGEN.

(1) There is no better illustration of the enlightened attitude of the great majority of Social Democrats toward war and violent revolution, than the following declaration of sympathy, addressed a few months ago by the Japanese Socialist Labor Party to their Russian comrades,—at a time when both organizations are being subjected to the most brutal persecutions by their respective governments.

Lawson's Economics.

WHILE "divying" up \$36,000,000, the proceeds of an "honest day's labor," Thomas W. Lawson, the Boston financier, was cheated, by his "pals" in a manner most modern and scientific, of his full share of the "swag." Whereupon Tom "exploded" and "denounced" and finally appealed to a "Just God" to right the wrongs of "our sons and daughters."

Yes, Tom; it all depends on whose ox is gored. So long as "our sons and daughters" were being skinned by you and your "pals," it never occurred to you that the "just God" had any business to butt in. It was different when they cheated you. You immediately found that the "just God" was neglecting his duties of a policeman.

Lawson's "disclosures" are to the Socialists an old story. It is an oft-told tale. Lawson's frenzy affords consolatory reading to the shorn "lambs" and acts as a sort of a safety valve. The Socialists have taken but little interest and scant notice of Tom's fulminations in *Everybody's*. And so long as Lawson confined himself to merely "hollering," it would have been unjust to criticise him. To "holler" is the inalienable resort of the injured. There Lawson was on his legitimate ground. But in the Fifth Chapter of Frenzied Finance, Lawson abandons this ground and ventures into the field of economics. Lawson may still call what he says "finance" but this name was adopted for their trade by the "*chevaliers d'industrie*" to which Lawson belongs and we are inclined to let them have it. Lawson had a reason for his venture. Lawson never felt a "call" to make the wrongs of all the wrongs of Lawson, but he evidently thinks that it would be a good move to induce all to make Lawson's wrongs as their own. And this is why Lawson wrinkles his brow, and fumbles with his fingers, trying to prove that 2 and 2 make 3 and some times 5.

When "exploding" and "denouncing" Lawson plies his pen with a facility almost equal to his deftness in picking the pockets of our "sons and daughters." Lawson should have stuck to this spectacular method of airing his wrongs as the best way of gaining our sympathy. For he was delightfully amusing, and the chief "*raison d'etre*" of his articles—advertising the advertisements of *Everybody's Magazine*—would have been subserved just as well, if not better. But, as I said before, Lawson was ill advised enough to assume that he could instruct as well as amuse, and, in a moment of dismal cogitation, he plunged into the most dismal of all sciences—economics. And a dismal mess he made of it.

"What is this Standard Oil"? "What is its secret"? "Whence came it"? He "demands fiercely." And then significantly and portentously—"Can our republic endure, if it, too, endures?"

Simple Tom; had you stopped right here, we might have suspected that your display of guileless simplicity was merely an artful dodge. Instead you proceed to answer your own queries and naturally blunder, bungle and mess in a way pitiful to behold.

"To-day 'Standard Oil,' the 'Private Thing,' is the greatest power in the land—more powerful than the people individually or as a whole, and its secret is the knowledge of the trick of finance by which dollars are 'made' from nothing in unlimited quantities subject to no laws of man nor nature. The dollars that 'Standard Oil' makes are the exact equivalent of the dollars of the people as made by the Government which we know can only be coined and put into circulation in accordance with law and for the benefit of all the people." (Sic!)

The mystic nature of "Standard Oil's secret" which is "subject to no laws of man nor nature" is enough to make our flesh creep. But the vague and fearful sensation aroused in us by this uncanny "Private Thing"—"Standard Oil"—is soothingly allayed by Mr. Lawson who reminds us of a Providential Government which "we know" coins the dollars and puts them in circulation "for the benefit of all the people."

Lawson now waxes didactic and for those "readers not versed in the technical phrases of finance and economics" he condescends to "convey common sense" in an exoteric manner.

"In speaking of dollars brought into existence by the trick of finance I have referred to I shall call them henceforth 'made dollars' to distinguish them from dollars coined by the Government and legitimately acquired by the individual or corporation."

This distinction between "made" and "acquired" is as novel as it is suggestive. It suggests a train of thoughts as to the class that is "making" and the class that is "acquiring."

"These 'made dollars,'" Lawson continues, "it must be remembered, are really 'made' for all purposes of use as surely as if they had the Government's stamp, yet they are not made in the sense of the known volume of the people's money being added to. So, however, many of these 'made dollars' are brought into existence by this trick of finance, only the men who 'made' them can know and profit by their existence. The people are no wiser nor can they adjust themselves to the change of conditions brought about by the creation of all this new money, yet if 'un-made' or lost, the entire volume of the nation's wealth would be contracted."

This harping on the "people's money," "nation's wealth," brings fresh to our minds Section 7 of the Standard Oil Code, according to Lawson:

"——We are the people, and those people who are not us can be hired by us."

Lawson fails to explain how "the entire volume of the nation's wealth would be contracted" which means that part of it

would be destroyed, if some or all of the "made dollars" be "un-made."

But let Lawson continue: "I can better set before my readers this trick of finance by which 'made dollars' are brought into existence by an illustration than by any process of definition. Let us suppose that the United States Government at Washington, the only power legally entitled to issue money for circulation among the people, puts forth a particular \$10,000. All the conditions prescribed by law have been followed, and all the people in the country are benefited by the issuance and circulation of this particular \$10,000 each in the proportion the laws prescribe."

We ask of Lawson, earnestly and urgently, in the name of a "just God," to point out to us the laws which prescribe how all the people in the country should be benefited by the issuance and circulation of any particular \$10,000. We have been undoubtedly overlooked by these laws. For we are one of "all the people in the country." We think. If Lawson will apprise us of these interesting laws, we give a solemn vow that henceforth we will take a much more lively interest in the issuance of the \$10,000 bills than we have done heretofore. And here is Lawson's illustration:

"'B', a Western farmer, tills his soil and receives, by the sale of his wheat, the particular \$10,000, which he then deposits in *the bank*. *The bank*, being a part of the Government machinery, only receives, holds, and uses the \$10,000 under safeguards provided for by the laws of the land, so hereafter 'B's' material life is conducted on the basis that he is the full and actual possessor of \$10,000. He knows, further, that his \$10,000 cannot be expended nor contracted, nor its relation to any of the other money of the people which is in circulation, changed without his knowledge, because he knows it cannot be changed but by the Government. I say he knows this—he has every right to believe he knows it, but, in fact, it is not so, because of the working of the secret financial device of the Private Thing. At this stage enters 'C', the Private Thing.

"'C' purchases with \$3,300 ('B's' money) which he borrows from *the bank*, a copper-mine, depositing the title which he receives from the seller with *the bank* as collateral for the \$3,300. After purchasing, he arbitrarily calls the copper-mine worth \$10,000—arbitrarily because his act is not controlled nor regulated by any of the laws of the land—arbitrarily because the actual cost, \$3,300, is his secret and his alone. Then, arbitrarily, 'C' organizes his \$3,300 of copper property into the Arbitrary Copper Company, and issues to himself a piece of paper, which he arbitrarily stamps '10,000 stock dollars'. This he takes to *the bank*, and by loan or other device exchanges it for the remaining \$6,700 belonging to 'B', and thereafter 'C' conducts his affairs on the basis that he is the possessor of \$6,700, his 'made dollars' in the transaction. At this stage there is actually in use among the people

\$16,700 where 'B', the farmer, the legitimate factor, and his kind the people, suppose there is but \$10,000—\$10,000 which is recorded, known and legal, being used by the legitimate factors, 'B' and *the bank*, and \$6,700 which is unrecorded and unknown to any but 'C' and *the bank*, being used by the illegitimate *Private thing 'C.'*

"The next step is where 'C' sells his \$3,300, stamped '10,000 stock dollars' (which, as already shown, he has exchanged with *the bank* for the \$10,000 deposited by 'B'), to 'B' for \$10,000 which \$10,000 'B' withdraws from *the bank* by simply making out a check in favor of 'C'. * * * 'C' deposits 'B's' check with *the bank* and thereby liquidates his \$10,000 indebtedness to *the bank.*"

Even when stating the facts of his illustration, Lawson is hopelessly confused. Lawson does not state that the mine purchased by "C" is not worth more than what "C" actually paid for it. The purchase price proves nothing. It may be worth \$10,000 or \$100,000. But let us assume, as it is reasonable to do from the entire scheme of the illustration, that "C" paid for the mine its actual value, not more and no less. By what arithmetical process, then does Lawson arrive at the proposition that "at this stage there is actually in use among the people \$16,700"? \$16,700 of what? Of wealth, commodities, use-values? Or of money, circulation medium? If of the former, then Lawson should have remembered that the actual wealth "in use among the people" in his illustration is still the wheat and the mine. And all manipulations of all mystic "systems" cannot add one grain of use-value to the use values of the wheat and the mine. And their exchange value is still \$13,300. If of the latter, then it is plain that the actual money "in use among the people" is still the \$10,000 deposited by "B" in the Bank and which the Bank turned over to "C." The \$10,000 stock issued by "C" to himself and then deposited by him in the Bank as collateral, is no more money or dollars than a bill of sale or a deed of the mine would have been. The stock stands for the mine and is a commodity and not money or "made" dollars. And even after "C" sells the stock to "B" for \$10,000, still the total sum of exchange values is the equivalent of the wheat now owned by "C" and the equivalent of the mine now owned by "B", a total of \$13,300; and the total sum of money in circulation is still \$10,000. To be sure "C" borrowed \$10,000 of "B's" money and thereby was enabled to "do" him out of \$6,700 of the same, but what would you have? "Business is business," "fair exchange is no robbery," and "*caveat emptor*" and what not. There is no secret trick whatsoever about it. To buy in a cheap and sell in a dear market is the basic principle of trade. As a stock broker, Lawson does it or tries to do it every time he buys and sells. You cannot make money without some one losing it. As the mine cannot pay dividends on more than

\$3,300, the stock is bound shortly to shrink to 33 per cent of its par value.

The reasons for Lawson's confusion are many. The first is that Lawson confuses between the wealth of a country—which includes all commodities, possessing both use-value and exchange-value—and the money of a country whose only use-value is to serve as a standard of value and a medium of exchange for all other commodities. Now it is evident that there is vastly more wealth whose exchange-value is measured by money than there is money in circulation. Ten dollars will buy a \$100 worth of wealth after it has passed 10 hands. We need not 10 yardssticks for the purpose of measuring 10 yards of cloth. But Lawson speaks of money as if it were the wealth of the nation. He speaks of the "made" dollars—"yet if 'unmade' or lost, the entire volume of the nation's wealth would be contracted." Now, if you scatter "made" or "acquired" dollars over the highways of the nation as thick as the leaves in autumn, this would still not add one pin's worth to the entire volume of the nation's wealth. Nor would this wealth be contracted by the unmaking or loss of any dollars. Least of all would the nation's wealth be contracted by the unmaking of "made" dollars which are not dollars at all, but merely stock, or certificates of ownership of certain property. The expansion or contraction of the volume of the medium of exchange may aid one class to prey upon the other and thereby affect production, but the nation's wealth does not expand or shrink as this medium.

Lawson evidently labors under the erroneous notion that the dollar possesses its exchange-value because it is issued by the government. Lawson of all men should have known that the exchange-value of a dollar is based upon the fact that it is gold or redeemable in gold.

Lawson may not be a believer in "fiat" money, but his reasoning shows him to be one. Hence, Lawson states that "he ('B') knows, further, that his \$10,000 cannot be expanded nor contracted." If "B" knows this then he knows a thing which it would be useful for him to forget. For, though \$10,000 always remain \$10,000, their purchase power expands or contracts as the prices of commodities fall or rise. On the other hand, not even the government can change "the relation of this \$10,000, to any of the other money of the people which is in circulation" or out of it, Lawson to the contrary notwithstanding. The government can enhance the purchase power of this \$10,000 and of all money is good for "B," the Western farmer, burying of money is purchase power by refusing redemption in gold or making it difficult.

We draw different conclusions from those of Lawson from his illustration. "B" puts the \$10,000 into The Bank. Anything wrong in that? Lawson claims that thereby "B" puts the \$10,000

at the disposal of the unscrupulous "system." What else can he do? Bury the money in the ground? Well, if burying of his money is good for "B," the Western farmer, burying of money is good for the whole A, B, C, of farmers of all points of the compass. But what results will follow: A contraction in the medium of exchange must ensue, which "B" and other farmers will find out to their detriment when selling their products or paying the interest and principal on their mortgages. But this is not all. The more contracted the currency becomes the easier it is for a "system" to secure control of it. That is all there is of merit in the Bryan's economics. But this prophet of expanded currency has found out by this time that the expansion of the currency merely changes the ways of Providence, but the "system gets there."

Hence we find "B" at the mercy of some "system" whether or no he deposits his money in The Bank.

What of The Bank?

Lawson claims that "a careful study of his illustration will clearly show that the foundation of this transaction was The Bank's putting in jeopardy the \$3,300 of B's."

What would Lawson have The Bank do? It must invest the money somehow. Jeopardy? It seems that the mine was worth \$3,300 or "C" would not have paid that sum for it. But admitting a margin of risk, the bank can point to the fact that the total gain to the depositors exceeds the total loss and that there is enough insurance to cover the risk.

A careful study of Lawson's illustration has convinced us that the crucial moment is not when the bank loans \$3,300 to "C" but when "B" pays to "C" \$10,000, each redeemable in gold for "C's" stock whose par value is \$10,000, but whose actual exchange-value is only \$3,300. It is evident that "B" is "done" by "C" out of \$6,700. "The more chump he," will you say. "What business has he to speculate?" But what do you want "B" to do? In this instance he bought a mine. "It is speculation," you will protest. But all business is speculation, more or less. "B" is a typical middle-class man. If he should leave stocks alone, not speculate in real estate and so on and so forth, "B" and the whole class of "B's" might as well abdicate here and now. Evidently the thing for them to do is to deposit their savings in the "System's" Bank and hire themselves out to the "system." This fate must eventually overtake the tribe of "B's" anyhow. Still we should not expect "B" to "rush" fate.

The analysis of Lawson's economics has been drawn out to a greater length than we expected. It is, however, much easier to analyze erroneous theories than a bewildering confusion of assertions that cannot stand separated nor hang together.

We can now patiently wait for the "remedy" announced by Lawson with such fanfaronade.

HENRY L. SLOBODIN.

Letters of a Pork Packer's Stenographer.

LETTER NO. IV.

Chicago, Ill., May 1, 190-

My Dear Katherine:

THE night is "cold and dark and dreary; it rains, and the wind is never weary," and I am going to end one of the gloomiest days I have ever known by telling my woes to you. The sky was ominous and overcast all day long, and it was not much comfort to know that "behind" the clouds the sun was still shining, which reminds me of the "prosperity" cant the capitalist newspapers feed us working people—ALL on the other side.

The "Skin" Department was constantly lined with a stream of the "Maimed, the Halt and the Blind," who came to throw themselves upon the mercy (?) of the company's lawyers. "Our" assistant attorney spent the whole day at the County Hospital with one Peter Piper, a truck-man, who was injured while crossing one of the chutes, which was so rickety that it gave way, precipitating him across one of the sheep pens, thirty feet below, and breaking his back. It is the fear of the Legal Department that if Peter shuffles out of this vale of tears without signing a release for the company, his wife or brother may bring suit, as the case is clearly one of liability.

And so Attorney Karles waits at Peter's bedside, ready to greet his conscious gaze with a smile full of brotherly love, and a pencil, with which to have him sign away the only hope of the little Pipers for an education and the "higher life." For compulsory education laws don't do much good for the little boy who has no trousers. The demands of the small stomachs are apt to be considered more imperative than the development of their minds, and School Inspectors eluded that the children may earn clothes for their backs and a shelter over their heads. Poor little Pipers!

We received a call from the wife of the Hon. Phony Bumpkin, Alderman of the ———ent Ward. About a week ago, it seems, while one of "our" guides escorted Mrs. B. and a friend, by whom she was accompanied, through the various departments explaining the wonders of the plant, a linen dress which she wore was spotted with lard by the bursting of a pipe. The line of "The Maimed, the Halt and the Blind" was waylaid outside the Law Office, in order that we might sympathize in private with Her Ladyship, and our attorney-in-charge assured her deferentially that the check for \$50.00 which the company presented to her was only to compensate for the inconvenience to which she had been subjected. She explained that while she did not need it and the

gown could be cleaned, she deemed it no more than right, etc., etc., and drove majestically away in her carriage.

She was immediately followed by a young workman, who said he was twenty-eight, but who looked much older. Owing to the absence of gates on one of the freight elevators, his right foot had been mashed and consequently amputated two months ago. Immediately upon his appearance the attorney-in-charge became so busily engaged among his papers that it was some time before he noticed the young man at all. As the moments passed, the poor fellow grew more painfully timid and nervous, and finally, reduced to a pitiable state of subjection, signed a statement releasing the company from liability for the magnificent sum of \$10.00.

This much have I learned positively, my dear; if you want to gain anything from a corporation, don't say you NEED it, nor that it is right and just that you should have it; but rather that you have more money than you can use—and then demand it anyway, and in all probability you will get all you ask for—particularly if your father is an alderman or a railway official.

One cannot but observe that the old axiom applying to War has been altered in the minds of men to read "All is fair in business;" nor can one help noting the close relation between the two. After all, business is merely a more refined method of war, whereby men become the masters of their fellowmen, not by physical superiority, but through possession of those things whereon their lives depend. And surely no king is so powerful as he who holds the needs of men!

But as I was saying "our" unspoken motto is "All is fair in business." It is the legitimate (?) occupation of getting something for nothing, and so everything is made for profit, instead of for use, or primarily for profit, and only secondarily for use. Profit, not money, it seems to me, is the root of the evil.

Perhaps you remember reading in the newspapers a few years ago, of the sudden exposure of underground pipes that a Chicago Packing Company had secretly laid and connected with the city mains, in order to obtain their water without paying for it, and in this way robbing the city of thousands of dollars annually. Of course you do not remember that anybody was punished for it! No? Well, neither do I; nor does any one, for nobody was punished. There are a good many more thieves out of jails than there are in them; but they are among our most "esteemed citizens," and none of them ever stopped at stealing a loaf of bread. As an observing writer said a short time ago,

"A man goeth to jail for stealing a loaf of bread,
And to Congress for stealing a Railroad."

But to continue the story I started out to tell you. There has been in the employ of Graham & Company for about five years,

a young man called Franz Ellsworth, a collector, who called on our customers in certain Indiana towns. This young man has no father or mother. Three years ago he married a girl from one of these towns, and set up housekeeping on \$12.00 a week. It does not take much bravery to make a man a soldier in our land of perfected man-killing equipment, but it takes a great deal of love, and a lot more of courage and ignorance to induce a man to try to keep house on \$12.00 a week.

The first year a baby came, and another six months ago, since when the young father has divided his attention between taking care of Baby No. 1, who had the whooping cough, and devising ways and means with which to meet the new and necessary expenses. He had already given \$50.00 out of money collected for the company to the matron of the Mercy (?) Hospital, who demanded payment in advance, hoping that a little care might save his Mary's life. But she grew better and worse, and worse and better for six or seven weeks, until her husband's resources were completely exhausted. He had appropriated over \$100.00 of the company's money, and was forced to send false reports to the house. But "Murder will out," and he was bound to be caught between the press for funds at home and our demands for payment from our customers, before he could possibly pay it back.

The blow fell to-day, when he was summoned to appear before the Fates. His wife then learned the situation for the first time, and spent the greater part of the afternoon in boring the treasurer of the company with a recital of her woes. There were doctor bills, and baby clothes, and rent, and the "Poor Man's Friend," who had loaned her husband \$40.00 at the rate of \$10.00 a month, and for which she had receipts showing payments amounting to over \$60.00. But the "Poor Man's Friend" was insistent in demanding his principal. She deluged the attorney with her tears, while I sniffled in silence over my Remington, over the sorrows of the Poor!

O yes; I know. It sounds as though I were upholding crime and extravagance. Of course. Poor people have no business in hospitals! Nor in having babies! Or wives either, for that matter! All a poor man ought to want is WORK!

I am not as strong as I was five years ago, Katie, dear, and I am usually a rag by five o'clock. You know how hard I have struggled ever since I was a little girl, to reach the Heights; how I addressed envelopes during the day, and practiced my music in the evening; made out bills while I studied stenography; hammered my Remington all day, and prepared myself for the university at night, and how I worked my way through two years' study there. And you know, too, that it was because my life has been one long, never-ending effort to progress that I have been able to gain a few rounds—a very little of learning, the

world would say. And the price that I have paid is health and strength.

I am tired in the morning, often, Katie dear, and only more tired at the close of the day. And now that I have so little strength to add to the treasure stores I have gathered at such cost, I fear to see them slowly slipping from my grasp.

It is not the loss of fortune that constitutes tragedy; not Death, nor the defeat of an army; nor kings overthrown! It is the toiling man and woman, old at twenty-five; the daily death of sweet desires, of natural impulses; of longings crushed; the growing soul, without room for growth; the mechanical effort; the forgetfulness of everything, save work and bread and sleep; and work, and bread, and sleep, until the final curtain falls!

Something is wrong somewhere, dearie! Something is wrong! I cannot tell you what it is; but the ignorance, and poverty, and misery in the world, prove to us that the wrong is there! Show us that there is something better, nobler, happier than the society of to-day, and the society of yesterday. Harmony and happiness crown all efforts made along natural laws, and a society that produces wars, prisons, poverty and prostitutes, in a land of plenty, is not based upon those laws.

If there is plenty for all, surely the man and woman who toil should have enough! Something is wrong somewhere, dearie; but I am too tired this evening to try to think it out. This much only do I know. They tell us the country is "afflicted with over-production," and I, who have worked always, have need of many things.

You may overlook a dismal letter this time, but I have a bad headache; and throbbing temples would make anybody pessimistic.

Teddy was over last night, and we read Browning together. Browning was right, after all:

"What is the use of the lips' red charm,
The blood that blues the inside arm,
Unless we use, as the Soul knows how,
The earthly gift for an end divine!"

Had he ever heard of the women who toil, of the women machines, who work until they are thrown to the junk pile, I wonder? "A Lady of clay is as good, I trow!"

It is not riches I want; nor power; nor yet fame! It is to make work a means, and not the end of living; to have a little play among the toil; to watch the sun rise in the freshness of the morning; to see the spreading of leaves, and the growing of flowers; to progress a little, instead of losing a little; to be able to pause, amid our hurry-ever, to rest and dream awhile!

A thousand tender wishes, and a thousand tender kisses, from

Your loving

MARY.

LETTER NO. V.

CREDIT DEPARTMENT.

Chicago, Ill., June 19, 190-

My Dear Kate:

Your letter came yesterday telling me of the nice little bank account your accommodating Uncle Benjamin left you when he said farewell to the troubles of his little grocery store—and I have been happy ever since. Five hundred dollars is a very comfortable sum to a young woman who is working her way through a course at the university, and I mean to see that you use it in smoothing the path to this darling ambition.

We have agreed that the laws of inheritance are ridiculous, and absolutely opposed to the principles of Democracy, and that for the daughter of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to be born three hundred times a millionaire is as foolish as for the people to permit the sons of kings to become themselves kings—born into the throne—in the “barbarous days of old.” Any sort of an unearned income is only another word for theft, for *somebody* sowed the seed, for *another* to reap the harvest—and represents somewhere an *unpaid*, uncompensated worker in the world, defrauded of his rights!

But a young woman, like you, who has worked years for a wholesale hardware company that keeps fourteen spies in its employ to record the work accomplished, the social relations, the degree that an applicant for work needs, or does not need, work, a company that “docked” you for half an hour, when you were one second late in the morning, and kept you working two or three nights a week, with no extra pay, and used cyclometers attached to their typewriters, to make you work the faster, whose vice-president ushered you into a pew at church on Sunday, and couldn’t see you at all on Monday—and that declared 48 per cent dividends at the end of the year—certainly has, in the pocket of somebody else in the world, an unpaid income! And so, dear, do not feel any scruples about taking the few hundred that will mean so much in your struggle for an education. Don’t be foolish and stay through the summer unless you take botany, boating, and another course that will keep you out doors as much as possible. It don’t make much difference how many studies you take, but what you get out of them, that figures in the long run. A rounded life is the better life, and it is as unfortunate to run all to brains as it is to develop only in body. Mind and muscle should go hand in hand to make a perfect man or woman, and I only see my mistake since I have begun to lose the more precious of the two.

I am up in the Credit Department, taking the place of one of the girls who is sick to-day. And while I wait for my dictation, I will endeavor to get a few lines off to you.

I am in disgrace this morning, for I was ten minutes late in getting to the office. The timekeeper checked me in with a blue pencil; the office door was locked, and I was compelled to stalk through the Departments on the first floor and run the gauntlet of a hundred pairs of rebuking eyes. I will confess to you why I was so unusually remiss. Teddy took me to a Thomas concert last night, and I got home at about 12:00 p. m., and as a result am utterly worn out this morning. I rose, however, at almost the usual time, took my cold plunge, swallowed a bit of toast and coffee, and tore madly down to catch the first car. I caught it; leaned comfortably against the carpet cushions (?) in the corner and fell asleep. I forgot to get off at the proper corner, was roused by the jolting at the car barns, and had to walk back eight blocks to transfer. It is simply a physical impossibility for me to go out in the evening and work—as I have to work here—the day after.

Last week one of the girls fell asleep at the breakfast table, and Friday evening, when Teddy came over, Sally found me dreaming peacefully on my bed, where I had lain down to rest a few moments before dinner.

Mr. Ralston is getting his correspondence into shape to dictate to me, so no more for the present. I give you below a sample of his letters; also his manner of enunciating:

‘‘ceipt-chur-favo-rof-fifth. We wan-tchu-t’distinctly-understan-‘we’re-no-tin-business-fe-rour-‘ealth. ‘fyou-can’t-payfer-billsas-theycom-due, we’ll-pu-tchu-on-nour-C.O.D. lis-tor-refuse-to-fill-yer-rorders. WE-WAN-TOUR-MONEY, ‘nd we WAN-TIT-QUICK! ‘fwe-don’t-ge-tour-money-by-return-mail, ‘e’ll-put th’accoun-tin-th-handsof-you-rattorney. Free’t- Jones-Why don’tchu-wanswer-rours-sof-the...eenth ! ‘fyou-can’t answer-rour-letters we’ll-getta-manin-yer-place-thut-can. Follow-wou-rinstruction-sor-resign-en-that QUICK! We’re-charging th’ F. E. Davi-saccount-tyou-because you won’t-c’lect. ‘N-we’ve-puttchur-friend-Mister-Razzol-lon-na-C. O. D.basis-He-was-zacorrd-the privil’ge-g-of-buyin-fro-mus- bu-twe-don’twan-tis-sorder-sif-fee-cap’t-pay-‘is-bill-spromptly.’

If you are able to make this out, you will have a fair sample of the way the Credit Department writes to its customers, and the kindly interest (?) it takes in the employees.

I wrote a letter for Mr. Ralston this morning to a man who complained at having to pay for fifty pounds of beef, when he only received 42 pounds, saying that when he sold cattle to the Packing Company, he not only had to pay the freight, but was only paid for what the cattle weighed here.

You see, when a farmer ships to this point we pay him the market price (made by us), and when we ship back to his town, or to him, we weigh the meats, and he pays for what we think our weights are—here at the plant. If he refuses, we ship him no more meats—and naturally (or artificially) he goes out of business.

The Treasurer of the Company is in this Department, and known as the Financial Manager. In the last two days he has

dictated letters to me borrowing at least \$900,000.00 for four months at 5½ and 6 per cent to conduct the business on. So you see when we buy a dollar's worth of meat—and 6 cents goes to the banker, and—perhaps 10 cents to the railroads, and something as taxes—and PROFITS—for the FIRM—there is little wonder that we don't get so very much for our money!

Nearly all our customers are practically on a cash basis, because the highest legal rate of interest we dare charge on accounts would be only about one-fifth the rate we charge the Public—in PROFITS.

I have also written to fifty or sixty employers this morning, whose names were furnished the company as references, by men applying for jobs. Some of these applications would make your heart ache. There is one from a teamster, aged thirty-five, who wants a place, and who is "willing to work for \$6.00 a week"; who has "no other means of support," but who has "a wife and four children." The blanks he was required to fill out covered the history of his life—twenty years of hard work—and small pay. Is it any wonder that the factories are filling up with little children! For even the Poor Man must eat! Or is it any wonder that Poor Men steal! *Six* dollars a week, in a land of "Over-production"!

We received a letter from our Branch House Manager at Birmingham, Ala., this morning, enclosing a request from the Ladies' Aid Society of the _____ Church, asking for a donation of two quarts of ice-cream, or some canned goods, for their Sociable, which will take place tomorrow evening. Our Branch House Manager advised the Ladies that he would refer the matter to Kansas City, who were, in turn, compelled to refer it to us. We will reply to our Kansas City Office tomorrow, to write to our Birmingham Manager, to say to the President of the Ladies' Aid Society, that we regret that her request reached us too late to give us an opportunity of being of service to the Ladies, etc., etc.

I wish I could accept your invitation to spend a month with you during the hot weather, but I have had such horrible doctor bills resulting from my sickness this spring, that I can't afford to take a vacation this summer, much as I may need it. If I had any faith in doctors, I might try to get a good tonic, but there would be sure to be cause for another big bill. My experience with a medical triumvirate for whom I worked last winter, was not calculated to increase my already waning trust in the profession.

There was an "Ear, Nose and Throat" specialist (?)—only respected because of his exorbitant charges; Dr. Meyers, out for all there is in it, and Dr. Jack, young and honest, who gained the usual reward of virtue by being frozen out shortly after I left.

When he couldn't do anything for a woman, he told her so; and if he did not understand what was the matter with a man, he

confessed his ignorance. To him measles were measles, and small-pox was smallpox, whether his patient was a pauper or a millionaire.

Dr. Meyers, on the contrary, called tonsillitis "sore throat" among the poor, and "incipient diphtheria" in the homes of the rich. He cured, or neglected the former, and quarantined the family of the latter for a week, called three or four times a day; apparently effected a wonderful cure—or prevented a serious illness—and sent in his bill for \$150.00 at the end of the month.

Dr. Meyers used to give box parties at the theater every few evenings—with suppers afterward at Rector's or the Annex, and confide to us how he made his patients pay for them—and he generally did.

One morning a pale, weary looking woman came into the office, in a faded pink waist and a shiny figured black skirt hiked up about three inches in front, and sagging painfully in the rear. She looked just about as I would very likely look in ten years from now, if I married Teddy on \$15 a week. Doctor Meyers seemed to take little interest in her case. He said he had half a notion to turn her over to Dr. Jack—and I wished afterward he had—because she would have gone out just \$85.00 richer than she did after Doctor Meyers held her up.

At first he truthfully diagnosed her case; sent the drug clerk out to put up her medicine; made out her bill for \$5.00, and then Shifty Sadie handed him a hundred-dollar bill—and waited for her change. And right here was where Dr. M. got in some of his best work. He asked her additional questions, and seemed to grow more concerned and alarmed at each of her replies. He grew so grave, in fact, that the poor woman, unable to endure the suspense, asked if she was worse than he had thought and whether or not he could cure her. After he had worried her into a few tears, he grew sympathetic and soothing; said he thought he could bring her through with an operation (Mon Dieu! Of course!), insisted that she must come in to be "treated" twice a week, and took her into the Chamber of Horrors (the operating room), laid her on the table, and gave her four or five electric shocks with a marvelously ominous apparatus then and there—to clinch the scare.

Convinced of the gravity of her case, he persuaded her to buy a small battery and a set of "Dr. Meyers' Ills of Women," gave her enough medicine to kill an army, and sent her home—or work more likely—with just \$10.00 in her pocket.

This, Doctor Meyers says, is one of his favorite "roles." So, you see—added to my own experience—this leaves me little faith in doctors—barring dear old Doctor Buckley—of course. The lunch bell has rung—so no more for to-day. A great deal of love.

From your own,

MARY E. MARCY.

EDITORIAL

After-Election Work.

It is a trite saying that each socialist campaign begins the day after the election that closed the previous one. Never, however, was this so true as at present. The campaign that has just closed was in so many ways a campaign of beginnings, of preparation for the greater tasks that lay before, that the months that are immediately to follow must in many directions be filled with even more difficult work than those that have passed. The presidential campaign of 1904 will go down in socialist history as the greatest campaign of agitation ever carried on. We are now about to enter upon a campaign of education and organization. The growth during the past few months has been largely in quantity. It is for the socialists of America to see to it that it grows as rapidly in quality during the coming year. Even faster than party membership has grown the number of believers in socialism.

To a large extent organization has been done in the past merely as auxiliary to the work of agitation. Only when the traveling speakers have found men pressing forward for membership have organizations been formed. The work of organization has been carried on only in a sporadic and unsystematic manner. Little isolated locals have been formed which will probably disappear almost as quickly as they were drawn together. This has been to a large extent the usual method in a majority of states even between electoral campaigns. An alleged organizer is sent out on one-night stands, who makes a soap-box speech, gathers a handful of men together, takes their names, collects the dues, sells a little literature and sends in a charter application. This is often the last that is heard of the local.

It would seem almost unnecessary at the present time to urge the necessity of systematic organization. Yet owing to the fact that agitation has so largely outrun the party machinery of this country, such urging becomes imperative. Hustling for papers, distributing literature, making soap-box speeches, talking to friends and neighbors are of tremendously fundamental importance. Yet after all, this work is only sowing the seed. If organization and education are neglected the crop may perish for lack of care and there will be no harvest to be reaped. A mob of a half million voters has far less strength in the battle against capitalism than 50,000 organized workers.

In the stirring days that will soon be upon us the army of the proletariat must be drilled, disciplined and ready for quick concerted action if it is to meet the encroachments of capitalism. We must be capable of setting all our forces in motion simultaneously when needed, of concentrating our strength when necessity demands, of reaching every corner of the country in instant co-operation when such tactics are more effective. All this demands organization first, last and all the time.

The time has now come to adopt definite systematic methods of work. A plan which has been tried with great success in a few states, and there is a reason back of its success, is to start no new locals save in very exceptional cases, unless they can be directly connected with some near-by stronger local. The first effort of the State organization is to build up a few strong organizations in industrial localities.

When these have become practically self-supporting they are then taken as centres from which to proceed in the work of organizing the immediately surrounding territory. An organizer is sent to the central local with instructions to remain there as long as is necessary to cover the ground adequately. He organizes a little body of men who can give their time while the organizer is at work in visiting the localities to be organized. In this way there are several workers at the first meeting and the local can be set firmly upon its feet. It then elects delegates to the central organization and is then at once tied to the older and stronger body. In this way few locals are lost and little organizing energy wasted.

This plan also secures a much better membership. It vests the control of each organization in the older and better trained Socialists. This is a point of especial importance from now on. The Socialist Party is no longer a thing to be sneered at. Membership in it no longer carries a badge of disgrace even in the capitalist circles. It has become feared and therefore respected. It is moving on toward victory. It is inevitable, therefore, that many will seek to attach themselves to its fortunes in the hope of being dragged along with it to success. The most prominent class of these hangers-on will be disgruntled office-seeking politicians. Not understanding the nature of the Socialist movement, they will see in it only one more opportunity to accumulate goods in which to trade across the political bargain counter. It is a good plan when a man comes in who has been prominent in the party machine of the Democrats or Republicans to "keep him on ice" for a few months and not place him in official positions. To be sure, this suspicious attitude may be easily overdone. When it is extended to such a degree as to make occupation a test of membership or to give rise to continual internal suspicions, bickerings and dissensions we know from sad experience what disastrous results may follow.

Still another class will seek to hitch their fortunes to our car. All those who have any disagreement with existing conventionalities will claim to be kindred spirits. New Thought followers, Christian Socialists, anti-vaccinationists, free lovers, and, in short, all who find themselves opposed in their particular fad by any existing social regulations will now seek to identify themselves and their cause with the Socialist movement. This is

neither the time nor place to discuss the merits or demerits of any of these things. Suffice it to say that they have no part or parcel with Socialism and the persons who seek to attach them to the Socialist movement are simply fastening barnacles to the great ship of social revolution.

A word, however, with regard to these may not be out of place. Social conventions *per se* are neither good nor bad. We may say, however, that the presumption is in their favor, especially when they have continued through many social stages. This very continuance shows them to have played some part in social evolution. The Socialist does not attack institutions for the mere fun of overthrowing them. He is not unconventional merely because the majority is conventional. He is not "agin the government" merely for the sake of opposition. Socialism attacks those features of capitalism upon which rest the exploitation and enslavement of the working class. The battle is too fierce to permit of dispersion of forces. Again, every feature not essential to the main fight affords grounds for dissention. The fewer and more fundamental the principles upon which we unite the more compact and far-reaching the union.

EDUCATION.

With agitation and organization must go education. Without the latter the first two are but bare skeletons. Agitation and organization do not make socialists. They certainly do not make intelligent socialists capable of spreading the doctrine of socialism or of acting effectively in its interest. Never was this phase of the movement so important as at present. Hundreds of thousands have been drawn to the socialist standard by discontent, hatred of former party affiliation, or chance bits of socialist propaganda. These are still a source of weakness rather than of strength. They may easily prove a source of disruption and an obstacle in the road to socialism unless they can be made to understand the reasons for the faith that is in them. This does not mean that every member of the Socialist party, still less every man who votes the socialist ticket must be able to explain the materialistic interpretation of history, the philosophical place of the class struggle in social evolution, or the relation of surplus value to economic theory. He should however know something of the historical forces back of present conditions, and why they lead to the policy and tactics peculiar to the socialist movement.

It is certainly the minimum of expectations to insist that those who act as agitators and speakers should be fairly familiar with socialist philosophy. That philosophy has been written in language which can be understood by any one who is able to read ordinary journalistic literature. There is no excuse save laziness for the socialist speaker or writer who does not familiarize himself with the principles of the philosophy which he seeks to expound. Yet it is still easy to find socialist editors who publish "dictionary definitions" of socialism as authoritative, and statistics so erroneous that the most superficial statistician could tear them to pieces.

We often boast of the willingness of our speakers to debate with opponents. It is fortunate for us that our challenges are not always accepted.

We have listened to speeches from men who were acting as official organizers and agitators containing errors that the merest tyro in capitalist economics would have exploded. Now that we have proven ourselves dangerous, capitalism will no longer ignore us, but will soon begin to utilize all the powers of prostituted intellect that it controls. For a speaker really well grounded in socialism there is nothing to fear from any opponent. But conceit and ignorance are a poor armor in which to meet even the defenders of capitalism.

Many comrades confuse agitational and educational material. Five cent propaganda pamphlets never made a trained socialist worker. These are for the unconverted. A steady diet of propaganda literature on the part of socialists while it helps to keep up a sort of hysterical enthusiasm tends also to create a superficial conceit that acts as an obstacle to any serious thinking.

SOME SPECIAL PROBLEMS.

The next few months are going to bring on several pressing problems. The municipal elections next spring will certainly place thousands of socialists in office in large and small cities. On the way that these men do their work will depend in no small degree the rate of progress of the socialist movement. For the last two years we have been urging the necessity of preparation for this time and, fortunately, steps have been taken that will prepare us for the work. No time should be lost however in submitting the municipal programme to a referendum and arranging for a thorough discussion of its various phases.

We also wish to urge once more the absolute necessity of a municipal secretary in the National office. To be sure this was voted down at the Convention. It is however none the less an inevitable necessity. The only question is when we will realize that necessity.

The press bureau is another line of work which has been allowed to lie idle during the campaign because of the imperative necessity of giving attention to our work. It should now receive the attention of the socialist organization. This is not something which the National office can make or unmake. Its success depends upon the number of socialist Locals which are willing to make the small payment which is necessary to secure matter. Almost every locality has some weekly paper which will publish the matter if it is paid for, and this is much the cheapest way to reach two or three thousand people in their own homes each week.

Several matters concerning the national organization are about to be submitted to a referendum. The members of the national committee which will largely determine policies and tactics for the next three years will soon be chosen. These years will be the most crucial ones in the history of the American Socialist movement. Much depends upon the character of the men who are elected. Care should be taken to secure comrades with as broad an outlook upon social facts as possible, and who also are capable of planning and directing the campaign of education and organization which lies before us. Needless to say that they should be men of experience in the Socialist movement and not new recruits. However brilliant the latter

may be, they must for some time at least lack that comprehension of the Socialist esprit de corps and general attitude which the German characterizes as *socialistische weltanschauung*.

The work lies before us. Everything is ready, the working class of America are eager to know more of Socialist philosophy and to work for the success of Socialism. Whether they are enabled to do this in the most effective manner or not depends upon those who make up the present membership of the Socialist Party. The future alone can tell whether we are sufficient unto the occasion.

Our next number will contain a complete and accurate summary of the Socialist vote by states, with discussion of the results. This will give just the information that every Socialist will want for reference during the next four years.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

At least one knotty jurisdiction problem among the national trade unions has been untangled. The solution of the question was as easy as rolling off a log, although it was not accomplished until after some unnecessary fighting and bad feeling, which finally gave way to much diplomacy, mysterious conferences and the unwinding of a few miles of red tape. The International Association of Machinists and the Allied Metal Mechanics have settled their differences in the only manner that they can be settled—by amalgamating. There never was any good reason why the metal mechanics should have a separate existence, unless it was to provide an opportunity for a few gentlemen to pose as "great labor leaders," and their organization would perhaps not have been formed if the machinists had not regarded themselves as quite exclusive, dontcherknow, when the bicycle industry began to flourish. The metal mechanics are machine-tenders, and that's about all that the machinists are nowadays. The skilled craftsmen are gradually disappearing and making room for the handy men and "monkey-wrench" mechanics, who were regarded with more or less scorn by the proud skilled man. But the inventor is great leveler and has a way of knocking aristocratic notions out of the heads of those workers who become inflated with their own importance. After bumping up against the development of our modern capitalist system, the machinists suddenly began to realize that the world do move, that old methods must disappear before new ones, and so they entered upon an era of expansion along industrial lines by laying claim to all workers employed in machine shops, which was a correct position to take. But while the I. A. M. has adopted the principle of industrialism, and is absorbing kindred crafts to strengthen itself, President O'Connell and some of his friends are ardent "autonomists" when it comes to other trades, and have supported Gompers and his narrow policies from start to finish. It might be added, too, that with probably one exception there is more socialism among the machinists than any other national labor organization, but O'Connell has never given the slightest support or encouragement to the movement that has become so popular with most of the active workers in the I. A. M. in every industrial center. In fact I know of no national officer who is so thoroughly out of harmony with the progressive spirit of his own organization than James O'Connell, but it is a certainty that unless he moves forward he will get his bumps pretty soon. By the amalgamation O'Connell becomes the captain of a hundred thousand men, which places the I. A. M. well to the front among the large organizations. Another good feature of the merging was the virtual effacing of John Mulholland, president of the metal mechanics. In the last few years he has been almost constantly in hot water in explaining away scandals, overcoming factions that arose in the organization, and in trying to resist encroachments of other national unions. I haven't met anyone yet who has been able to give a good reason why Mulholland became prominent in the trade union movement. Pretty nearly everybody agrees that he would have made a great hit in the theatrical profession as a matinee idol and handsome hero who exposes the hellish plots of villains and saves the beautiful maiden in melo-

drama. Maybe Mulholland will yet go on the stage, now that he is out of a job of leading labor up a hill and then down again. Let us hope so.

The coming year seems destined to become historic with big events in which the forces of organized labor will be interested. Combined capitalism, unless it has become sane enough to understand that this year's great increase of socialist sentiment is the handwriting on the wall that pronounces the doom of exploitation and oppression, intends to open a campaign of union-smashing all along the line. It is not likely that labor's rapid progress toward socialism will serve as a warning to frenzied finance. When tyranny becomes drunk with power it simply rushes blindly forward and over into the chasm and disappears. The edict has gone forth from the haunts of capital that organized labor must go, no matter what the cost. The war that has been waged against the iron and steel workers in the Mahoning valley since last summer is to be continued wherever lodges exist that attempt to dispute the arrogant decrees of the United States Steel Corporation. The Carnegie branch of the octopus has set aside one million dollars for the purpose of wiping out the Amalgamated Association in its mills, and it is stated that other branches of the combine, and even some of the independent concerns, will make similar moves. In Chicago the vessel owning interests are said to be preparing to attack the unions of seamen, and in Cleveland representatives of the same interests have declared publicly that the powerful longshoremen's union is to be killed off next season. Last spring they were successful in destroying the masters' and pilots' organization, which, in many respects, enjoyed a sort of monopoly so far as skill was concerned, and next season they threaten to follow up the advantage gained. Next year also the agreement in the anthracite region, under which the operators have been chafing ever since it was enforced, runs out and another battle is promised there. Some of the daily papers are also printing stories to the effect that certain railways intend to make efforts to "throw off the yoke" of the brotherhoods, while the running fights in the building trades will be continued along the lines of the open shop crusades. It is also announced that the National Manufacturers' Association intends to make an onslaught against union labels of all the trades, and that employers everywhere who have heretofore been upon friendly terms with labor organizations will be forced to take one side or the other in this fight. The war of extermination that has been waged against the metal workers, such as the molders, machinists, metal polishers and brass workers, etc., is to be continued and made more general, while the teamsters, especially those of Chicago, who have long been feared by all classes of employers, are in for a struggle. As far as I am able to learn from official journals and discussions with national union representatives practically all the organizations will be on the defensive in 1905. The single exception will probably be the International Typographical Union, which is accumulating a war fund and will make an aggressive campaign to enforce the eight-hour day in all the job printing plants in the country on January 1, 1906. The proposed move of this organization is already meeting with the condemnation of the Typothetae, the employers' combine, which is being backed by the Parryites, and they, too, are collecting funds for the purpose of resisting the demands of the printers. While I confess to being somewhat biased in favor of the I. T. U. because of membership in that organization, still a fair examination of the conditions from as unprejudiced standpoint as possible under the circumstances indicate that the printers will win their fight and beat the employers to a finish if the latter insist on forcing trouble. The printers are well organized, well disciplined, intelligent and progressive. They were the pioneers of trade unionism in this country and are just as surely at present becoming more generally represented among the pioneers of socialism. They know what they are up against and will strengthen every weak point in their forces before plunging into an engagement. Of course, there will be the

usual number of local strikes and lockouts in various branches of industry, and they will all play their part in bringing out more clearly the full meaning of the class struggle that is even now being denied by some of our alleged leaders. The rank and file is bound to become more thoroughly aroused to the necessity of continuing the battle along political lines so auspiciously begun this year, as well as making every effort economically to maintain a decent standard of living, and finally abolish the system that produces the evils of which we complain.

Right here, as we are receiving the election returns of gains for the Socialist party, the political organization of the working class, it is well to utter a note of warning. The writer has personal acquaintances with hundreds of trade unionists who voted for Socialism, not because they had a thorough knowledge of the principles, but for the reason that their sympathies were in that direction this year and they had no other choice. Many who read this can no doubt make the same claim. Now comes the task of holding that vote and adding to it, and this can only be done by pursuing a vigorous campaign of education during the next twelve months. Every union man who understands the principles of socialism ought to consider it his duty to load up with a bundle of literature whenever he goes to a union meeting and spread it among his fellows; and he ought to insist—in temperate language, of course—upon the right to discuss economic questions under the rule of “good and welfare,” not in an objectionable manner or by indulging in personal attacks, but by sticking closely to principles and bald facts. Don’t forget that the most important and effective method of spreading the light is to pass around leaflets, books and papers. Support the party press and gather in subscribers. Once a reading man becomes interested in our literature he will soon stand pat for socialism. Care must also be taken at this juncture to safeguard the locals and branches by admitting only applicants who are clear-headed, sincere workers for socialism. Better have a small branch or local of harmonious, conscientious and intelligent men than a large one composed of muddle-heads and office-seekers who would trade, fuse and confuse, and sacrifice the party to gratify their own ambition. Remember that the politician and grafter will now cast goo-goo eyes at the Socialist party. Beware of the dangers of ignorance and dishonesty within; we will have hard enough battling with the enemy outside.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Germany.

The only important event in Germany during the past month was the National Convention at Bremen. In the report which was made by the party officials to the convention we learn several interesting facts. We note, for instance, that the total punishments inflicted upon the members of the socialist party for their activity amounted to 43 years and two months imprisonment, and over \$5,000 in fines. At the present time Comrade Rosa Luxemburg is in prison for *lese majeste*.

The book-publishing department of the Vorwärts reports a business of over \$75,000 and a profit of over \$8,000. The total income of the party amounted to about \$162,000. This sum has been giving the old political parties considerable distress, as it is a larger fund than even they have at their disposal.

The Congress itself was of less pressing interest than that of last year. It was generally felt that revisionism had been so thoroughly dealt with that there was no need for further action. The most important subjects under discussion were those of the municipal programme, party organization and the Schippel case. The latter was a discussion concerning the actions of Schippel, who had been rather inclined to temporize with socialist principles, especially on the tariff. He made a very shifty defense, and while no demand was made for his resignation, yet a resolution was adopted which will leave it for him to decide whether he shall continue in his previous tactics or whether he shall give up his seat in the Reichstag.

The action on the municipal question was in many respects similar to that of our own national congress. It was felt that the working out of a municipal program was too great a task to be accomplished in a national convention and so the matter was deferred for further consideration. The proposal for a municipal program was in its details also very similar to the one which is now out for discussion in America. Just prior to the meeting of the national convention a gathering of the socialist women was held. This is made necessary in Germany, since in many of the German states women are not permitted to become members of political organizations. This meeting showed great activity among the women and many plans were laid for further work.

England.

The English socialists are somewhat aroused over the attempt of Keir Hardie and some of the other I. L. P. leaders to revise the socialist philosophy in the manner to which reference was made in our last issue. Keir Hardie has an article in the *Nineteenth Century* on the International Congress at Amsterdam which is so full of misstatements and errors, both as to doctrines and facts, that it is rousing general indignation.

Incidentally, he tells us a few things that he does not know about the origin and present condition of the American socialist movement, concerning which we may have something to say in a later issue. George Bernard Shaw could not resist the opportunity to get into such a splendid fight and so has a characteristic article full of brilliant antitheses, cutting witticisms and poor logic in the *Clarion*. This is replied to by H. M. Hyndman in a masterly exposition of the socialist philosophy. It is interesting to note the emphasis which Comrade Hyndman lays upon the movement in America as exemplifying the truth of the Marxian philosophy.

England seems to be facing one of the worst industrial depressions known for many years. *Justice* says in a late issue:

“Everything, then, betokens a terrible winter in front of us—a winter in which tens of thousands will feel the pinch of want, and when men will return, worn out by a fruitless search for work, only to find, added to the weariness of their bootless tramp, the despairing glances of their wives and families who know far too well by bitter experience what unemployment means to them all. The enormous powers of production handled by the capitalist class for their own profit, to be stopped when the wheels of their machinery no longer turn out profit for them, have brought about one of those depressions in trade which have become periodical under the capitalist system. The South African war, the Russo-Japanese war, and even the fiscal controversy, have added a few finishing touches to the somber and terrible canvas which will be exhibited to the public gaze. Many work houses are crowded to excess and accommodation had to be found for some of the applicants in the corridors.”

The S. D. F. is agitating for the calling of a special session of Parliament to legislate on the unemployed question, and is taking advantage of this question to rouse the workers of England.

BOOK REVIEWS

PAGAN VS. CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATIONS. *By S. H. Comings. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Paper, 105 pp., Twenty-five Cents. Cloth, Fifty Cents.*

This pamphlet is more a symptom of things that are doing than an accomplishment in itself. It is one of a class of pamphlets, that in plan and general character should make up a large part of the literature of social evolution during the next few years. The author concerns himself with the one problem of the relation of education to social facts and forces, and the individuals taught. He describes the advantages of combining, doing and learning in the schools, and gives many illustrations of what has already been accomplished in these directions. Yet after all he has failed to understand the real view-point of the "New Education," and especially its social position. To him the possibility of making an educational institution "self-supporting" is put forward as one of the strongest arguments for industrial training in connection with education, whereas every attempt to accomplish this result under capitalism has meant the surrender of the essential principles of freedom in constructive activity, which are fundamental in the "new education." So it is that Armour Institute, Tuskegee and other trade-schools, which are but parodies on the idea after which the author is striving, are praised as examples of its practical working out. However, the book is to be welcomed as a contribution to a field in which there is all too little, and we hope that it will help to suggest that some others follow his example rather than continue to re-write for the thousandth time the whole philosophy of socialism within the compass of a pamphlet.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, *by Karl Marx. Translated by N. I. Stone. International Library Publishing Co. Cloth, 314 pages, \$1.50.*

Four years ago the translation of one of Marx's books would have been hailed as an "epoch" in the socialist movement. Today it passes almost unnoticed in the flood of socialist literature. This work was written in 1859 and is Marx's contribution to the money question. Those of our readers who have been with us from the beginning will remember the articles which appeared in our very first numbers by Comrade Hitch and Comrade Stone on the money question in which both drew their ammunition from this book. Marx begins with an analysis of the process of exchange similar to that found in the first chapter of "Capital." He finally evolves out of this exchange the commodity, money, with its peculiar characteristics. "In the process of exchange all commodities are related to the one excluded commodity as to a simple commodity, one which appears as the embodiment of universal labor-time in a particular use-value." He falls foul of the quantity theory by declaring that it is the rise or fall of prices which determines how much money will be used and not the amount which causes the rise and fall of prices. "If therefore the value of gold—

i. e., the labor-time necessary for its production should rise or fall—the price of commodities will rise or fall in inverse ratio. In inverse ratio or corresponding to that rise or fall of prices, the rapidity of circulation remaining the same, a larger or smaller quantity of gold will be required to keep the same volume of commodities in circulation.” It is manifestly impossible to give within the compass of the space which can be assigned to a book review any adequate idea of Marx’s position. There is no writer who is harder to condense and all attempts which have ever been made at popularization are admitted failures. The latter portion of the work, dealing with the theories of the medium of circulation and of money, gives a most valuable survey of the evolution of monetary doctrines.

Whoever in reading this book omits the preface or the appendix will lose something of very great value. The author’s preface contains the classical statement of the materialistic interpretation of history which has been quoted many times and which was published in an earlier issue of the REVIEW. The appendix consists of a posthumous writing, intended as an introduction to the great work of which “Capital” was really little more than the beginning. We have no hesitation in saying that it is one of the most searching analyses of the field of political economy ever published. To one who is familiar with the economics of our universities at the present time it comes with something of a shock to see in how far Marx had anticipated all that is worth while in these later writers and in many cases how he has gone on beyond even their present position.

The translation is most carefully and thoroughly done.

THE COST OF SOMETHING FOR NOTHING. *John P. Altgeld. The Hammersmark Publishing Company. Cloth, 132 pp. \$1.00.*

We are not sure that Governor Altgeld’s reputation as a social thinker will be particularly strengthened by this book. We are confirmed in this view by the sources in which it has been most highly praised. The very daily papers which hounded him to his death have been profuse in their admiration of the book.

The central thought is that a person who seeks to get something for nothing will thereby injure himself, and that Fate visits a retribution upon those who outrage moral laws. It is hardly fair to Governor Altgeld to state the proposition in quite this bald theological form. Yet this is, after all, the impression which the book gives, and this is so at war with much of what he has said elsewhere that we cannot but feel that had he lived, there would have been some important changes and additions to the work before it reached publication. There is no doubt but that anti-social activity has a psychological reaction injurious to the individual, but to preach this as a means of securing right social actions will in the majority of cases simply cause the plotter of injurious social activity to consider that so indefinite and uncertain a penalty will probably never reach him. Anyhow it is only to be visited on later generations and one can easily say “*apres moi le deluge*” and go on.

This philosophy is applied in a series of short essays to such subjects as Railway Magnates, Standard Oil Company, Newspapers, Bankers, Lawyers, West Point, etc. Perhaps the best of these is the one on newspapers. After showing how the old system of newspaper management produced men of the Greely-Bennett type. He shows how the newspaper ceased to be an individual responsible enterprise and “became a machine, a great entity that had an existence, a voice and an influence separate and apart from the men who made it. By degrees it swallowed the men who fed it.

“From that moment it began to destroy character. It was the newspaper that talked not the man. Instead of developing strong, open-faced men, it tended to develop sneaks. Everything was anonymous. The

writer of an article felt no personal or moral responsibility. All the world despises the writer of an anonymous letter. No honorable man would think of writing one; yet, so far as the writers are concerned, the great newspapers of to-day are mostly a collection of anonymous letters, and the writers are reduced to the low level of anonymity."

Needless to say that the literary style of the book is a model of terse, expressive English. Nothing that Altgeld has ever written has been otherwise.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

The Future of the International Socialist Review.

In July, 1900, the first number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW was issued. It has long since proved itself an unquestioned success in everything except the financial side. It has, however, from the start been a heavy burden upon the stockholders of the co-operative company. This burden has been carried partly from the small margin of profit on the sales of other literature, partly by using money received from the sale of stock, and partly from direct contributions. The subscription list has increased to some little extent since the magazine was started, but in the effort to secure more subscribers we tried the unsuccessful experiment of allowing stockholders to purchase REVIEW postcards each good for a year's subscription at 50 cents instead of the regular subscription price of \$1.00. The result has been that considerably more than half of our subscriptions have been reduced to the 50-cent rate and thus the income from subscriptions has almost been cut in two. On the other hand, the increase in the number of subscribers has not been sufficient to come anywhere near making up for this loss. The reason undoubtedly is that the number of socialists capable of understanding and appreciating the REVIEW is limited and that, even if we were to reduce the price to 10 cents a year, it would be impossible to secure more than a few thousand readers.

On the other hand, the most active and best informed socialists recognize the REVIEW as absolutely indispensable to the growth and permanence of the socialist movement in the United States. Its mission is to educate the educators; to supply those who already read and talk on socialism with fresh facts and fresh ideas to be put by them into such popular form as their varying circumstances make advisable.

In view of all this, and after consultation with many of our stockholders, it has been decided to make the subscription price of the REVIEW, after December 31, 1904, \$1.00 a year, without discount to any one. It is believed that this will not materially reduce the number of readers, while it will bring financial relief in the way of increasing receipts from subscriptions.

Those stockholders who are anxious to interest a large number of new readers in the REVIEW will still have the opportunity of sending in as many new subscriptions as they choose at 50 cents each before the end of December; after that date the invariable subscription price will be \$1.00 a year to all alike.

Books of Other Publishers.

Our co-operative publishing house has thus far, as its stockholders know, been handicapped by the lack of ready money to an extent that has made it absolutely impossible to do more than a fraction of the educational work that has been needed. What we have accomplished is to put the principal standard works on Socialism within reach of the workers at the lowest possible prices, and to provide in the Pocket Library of Social-

ism a varied assortment of propaganda literature prepared on scientific lines and written in good English. What we have not yet been able to do is to carry an assortment of the books of other publishing houses more or less closely related to Socialism. The obstacle has simply been that to purchase these books in quantities large enough to get wholesale rates, more capital was needed than we have had at our disposal, while to buy the books in small quantities as ordered involves more labor than the margin on such transactions will pay for.

If we carry out our plans for putting the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW on a self-supporting basis, as explained above, and paying off the floating debt, as explained on the last page of this department, we shall for the first time be in a position where we can handle the books of other publishers to advantage. Full announcements will be made when the debt to outsiders is fully provided for.

Meanwhile we have arranged to offer two books as an experiment, and the number of orders received for these will guide us to some extent in arranging for the supply of other outside books.

Mass and Class, a Survey of Social Divisions, by W. J. Ghent, just published by the Macmillan Company of New York and London, is the first work on the class struggle from the viewpoint of International Socialism to appear from the press of a capitalist publishing house in the United States. And it is really a notable book. We will not in this department anticipate the editorial review to appear later; it is enough to say that *Mass and Class* is a new and convincing argument for Socialism, well worth the attention of every Socialist and every investigator. The price is \$1.35 by mail, \$1.25 by express at purchaser's expense, no discount.

Looking Backward, by Edward Bellamy, is a picture of the co-operative commonwealth which has had an enormous sale and is still in active demand. It is not in the least an adequate statement of the ideals of Socialism; the author was quite ignorant of Socialism when he wrote it, and into his picture of a future society he introduced various restraints upon individual liberty which are absolutely foreign to the spirit of modern Socialism. Nevertheless the book is one of immense value in stimulating the imaginations of those who can not conceive the world as being in any way different from what it is today, and it is easy reading for those who have not learned to study, so it has its value. We have made an arrangement by which we can supply the authorized paper edition, handsomely printed in large type, at fifty cents by mail or forty cents when sent with other books by express at expense of purchaser. It may be worth while to add that the Canadian edition, which at one time was advertised at a lower price, can not legally be sold in this country on account of the copyright.

Rebels of the New South.

This new novel by Walter Marion Raymond is published November 10 by our co-operative publishing house, and will be ready for delivery by the time this issue of the REVIEW is in the hands of its readers. It is a Socialist book, but that is not its only recommendation. It is a novel by a novelist who understands his trade. The movement of the story is rapid; there is action, humor, pathos all along, and the careless reader will not lose interest.

Nothing is said of Socialism till the story is far advanced, and thus there is all the better chance of getting the attention of those whose prejudices have kept them from looking into our literature.

Those who have received their impressions of Socialist views of the marriage question from caricatures like that of the Reverend Mr. Dixon will be surprised at the absolutely clean atmosphere of Mr. Raymond's book. Yet there is nothing conventional nor hypocritical about it. Neither is there any preaching; the author is no novice in fiction writing, and he understands his trade too well to let any sermons interfere with the movement of his story. The scene of the novel is in Virginia, and the people

in it are not imaginary products of a future civilization, but live men and women of to-day. It is well worth reading, merely as a story, and it gives a fairly adequate idea of the ideas and feelings of some of our American Socialists.

Mechanically the book is equal to many recent \$1.50 novels. It contains 294 handsomely printed pages, besides five half-tone engravings from original drawings. There is a unique cover design stamped in white leaf, making a most attractive volume. The price, postage included, is \$1.00.

God and My Neighbor.

"Which is worse, to be a Demagogue or an Infidel? I am both. For while many professed Christians contrive to serve both God and Mammon, the depravity of my nature seems to forbid my serving either."

This little taste of Blatchford's book, *God and My Neighbor*, may suggest why the first edition has already been exhausted and another printed. It is not a book on Socialism, but on religion, and it is not an irreligious but a religious book. Some of us may differ with Blatchford in his use of phrases; we might wish he would put a larger meaning into the word God, instead of discarding it; yet thoughts, after all, are more important than words, and Robert Blatchford is a thinker whose help is worth having. The price of this, his latest book, is a dollar in cloth, fifty cents in paper, postage included.

Raising the Debt of the Company.

Less progress is reported this month than last, but the reason is obvious. In October the presidential campaign was drawing to a close, and calls for campaign funds were urgent upon the very ones who otherwise would have contributed to the debt fund. The receipts to October 31 have been as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$2,311.74
H. A. Boyce, Oklahoma	10.00
A. Schroeder, Ohio	1.00
Frank Carrier, Missouri	1.00
George D. Sauter, Missouri (additional).....	2.00
C. J. Ericsson, Montana (additional).....	.70
Albert Smith, Maryland (additional).....	2.00
Mrs. S. D. Whitney, California (additional).....	20.00
L. P. Gage, Washington50
O. D. Teel, Oregon	5.00
James C. Wood, Illinois (additional)	5.00
T. G. Roberts, Illinois	2.00
Alexander Schablik, Washington (additional).....	2.00
L. W. Longmire, Washington (additional).....	.40
J. Stitt Wilson, California	5.00
Fred. R. Barrett, Maine (additional).....	2.00
Dr. H. Gifford, Nebraska (additional).....	10.00
C. J. Thorgrinson, Iowa	20.00
James H. Wells, California	4.00
Frank Page, Idaho	2.00
George E. A. Watson, Ontario	1.22
W. S. Burnett, California (additional).....	2.00
Philip G. Wright, Illinois	2.00
James Boyd, California	12.00
U. L. Secrist, Georgia (additional).....	2.50
T. J. Maxwell, Kansas	2.00
Thusnelda Peemoller, Indiana	2.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	119.32
Total	\$2,548.38

The offer of Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contribution of every other stockholder will hold good until December 31. By that time the contributions should be sufficient to cancel the entire floating debt to non-stockholders. Only about 12 per cent of the stockholders have as yet contributed anything, and some of the heaviest contributions thus far have come from those whose ability to pay is far less than that of others who have done little or nothing.

This appeal is no sense a wail of distress. The financial condition of the co-operative company is better than ever before. If it were to discontinue publishing the REVIEW and continue the publication of books on a "business basis," publishing such as would sell most readily instead of such as the Socialist movement most needs, it could undoubtedly "make money." But that is not what it is organized for. The need of good Socialist literature will be more urgent next year than ever before. Our stock of books ought to be correspondingly enlarged. But to do this while carrying a floating debt to non-Socialists would be to give our enemies a chance to wipe the publishing house out of existence. That is why the clearing off of this debt must come before any other advance step. A united effort will accomplish this by the end of December.

How much do you think is your share?