

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

NOVEMBER, 1905

NO. 5

Socialism and the General Strike in Germany.

As we pointed out in our last number the Congress of the German Social Democracy at Jena was by far the most important ever held in the history of the socialist movement. Affairs in Europe, and indeed all over the world, seem to be approaching a climax. The German socialists had been taunted by the workers in other countries with a caution which almost amounted to cowardice. Even their enemies had begun to mistake quiet determination for weakness and were making preparations to disarm them. All this constituted a condition which required action from the German wing of the International Socialist movement. Bebel's great speech was the answer. It is indeed in many ways an epoch making document, calm, cold reasoning through a large portion of its length, it nevertheless constitutes a warning to the encroaching capitalist class, a rallying cry to the workers of the world. As such it is one of the most important historical documents of the socialist movement. The immediate subject under discussion was the general strike, but in entering into the discussion of this new weapon and the new alignment which it presupposed and the new conditions it was intended to meet he swept over a wide ground. Following is the speech:

"Comrades: We are well nigh unanimous in agreeing that the question now under discussion is not only the most important before this congress, but one of the most important ever before the party. It is a question that has been discussed in meetings, in the press and in our scientific and propaganda literature. Undoubtedly a large portion of the comrades have already taken a position for or against it. Nevertheless it is very necessary, not only that the question should be investigated from all sides, but that we should especially determine how it came about that we were compelled at the present time to give this question a place upon our programme. What has happened that has forced us to take this position? What are the political conditions, especially those hostile to the working class and the

Social Democracy? First of all it is necessary to have a clear idea of what is to be investigated, of what this especial situation requires us to do, and whether our previous methods of fighting are sufficient, or whether we must evolve new methods, and if so what form these shall take.

The *Reichstag* election of 1903 undoubtedly brought about great changes in our political relations. The great vote of our party at this election while undoubtedly causing the greatest rejoicing among our comrades, brought forth the opposing emotions among our opponents. This one fact alone throws a significant light upon certain tendencies that have recently appeared within our party. We have said to ourselves a dozen times, when you are in doubt as to whether your actions are right or wrong, then turn to your enemies, and if they regret, fear and denounce what you are doing then you are on the right way. Accordingly there has arisen within the party all sorts of movements which, as I shall show later, in many cases had not the slightest justification. The attitude of our enemies toward the result of the election is perhaps most characteristically shown in an expression of one of the leaders of the Center, the representative Trimborn in a great meeting held at Cologne. He said: "Think of it, three million Social Democratic votes, what an enormous number! What will be the result if this goes further?" Our opponents have shown since then that this fear expressed by Trimborn concerning the result of the election has struck deep into their bodies and especially into their stomachs. Within our own ranks it was self evident that this success would have an effect. This would express itself not alone in general rejoicing, but it was very characteristic and also very natural (we would have been surprised if it had been any different) that in the most diverse wings in the party, whose existence I by no means deny, and this all the less since diverse tendencies inside the Social Democracy have existed since the very first days in which it began to be a significant force—I say also that it is natural that within these tendencies the question arose as to what the Social Democracy would now do.

In the *Neue Zeit* (and the same thing happened in other papers and in meetings, as for instance in the speech of Volmar) Kautsky raised the question as to whether this tremendous number of votes would not require us to adopt other tactics. You know that this question occupied us at the Dresden congress. It gave rise there to very violent discussions, and even today there is still a little circle in the party who think that such discussions greatly injure the party in outside circles and perhaps even in its internal management. We have indeed seen divisions in our central organ, which continued even until the last month to express regret concerning such discussions, (I do

not desire here to enter into any polemic I am only stating facts) and indeed even in the opposing press a cry was raised about the Dresden congress, as if these gentlemen were sorry that disagreement existed, while in truth they were rejoicing. (That's right.)

Now what has the Dresden congress actually done? In the course of discussion a whole row of divergent points had arisen and the congress has simply taken a clear position on these questions, and by means of an enormous majority once more established the tactics of the party with a clearness that left no doubt as to the position of the party, whether among its friends or among its enemies. That is the great historical work of the Dresden congress, in spite of all the mud slinging which occurred. That was its historical significance. No historian of the party will fail to give due weight to the actions of that congress. At one blow all the host of doubts within and without the party were settled.

I well remember with what words those of our friends were criticised who voted for the Dresden resolution, who had been expected by bourgeois circles to vote against it. It showed that these circles were fundamentally mistaken if they thought that the comrades ever intended to make a fundamental question out of such minor differences of opinion, or that it could ever lead to a division within the party.

Things have now begun to clear up in this direction. To be sure we have seen some signs of disapproval concerning the action of a few of our friends who have been furnished with much advice from bourgeois scholars. Even Prince Bülow changed his tactics from this moment. He now outlines the funeral speech of the Social Democracy. (Laughter.) It appears to me as if Prince Bülow entered upon his office with certain liberal inclinations which he had brought back from his long sojourn abroad. He seemed to believe that he could do something with the Social Democracy if he only handled them with gloves, until perhaps a portion of them would come over to him, after which the party would be broken up. When his hopes and wishes were destroyed by the Dresden Congress he sent up a wail of disapproval. (That's right.)

Even our radicals in Dresden proposed a plan for a commission which should present factory legislation to the *Reichstag* in the hopes that that body would take it up. I warned against these hopes at Dresden and have been justified by what has happened since then in the *Reichstag*. What is it then that has changed the attitude of all bourgeois parties towards our party since 1903? Our votes grew from two million one hundred thousand to a round three million, and our representatives from 51 to 80 then 81, a very significant increase. But our

votes are still only one third of the whole and our representatives make up only one-fifth of the Reichstag. We are still far from a majority. The relative strength in the Reichstag remains as before. As of old the Center is still the decisive party. It still has the power to form two majorities, either an agrarian reactionary one with the Right, or a liberal one with the Left and us.

Only yesterday Bernstein complained about the increased powerlessness of the Reichstag. That is fundamentally false, the opposite is true. I have seen the whole matter develop and I now declare that the power of the Reichstag as a whole, when it once raises its voice, obtains far more consideration, is a far more decisive force than in any earlier period. It was true to speak of the complete powerlessness of the Reichstag, under Prince Bismarck. Indeed even under the rule of Count Caprivi, and even with Prince Hohenlohe it was still true, but since then the Reichstag has gradually conquered a position in opposition to the government. In a great number of questions it leads, and after it has decided the government adjusts itself. It is only unfortunate that those who have control are not our friends, but our opponents. I need only refer to the questions of the tariff policy or of the marine or the navy. Whatever the Reichstag considers essential from the bourgeois standpoint, from the standpoint of the capitalistic economic order, that it secures. It represents its own class interest. Whoever still believes that we, the strongest party in the country, the second strongest in the Reichstag, are about to exercise a corresponding influence on the government is very much deceived, for the party so long as it is not in control cannot exercise any significant influence. If you wish to exercise any influence of this character then you must stick your platform in your pocket, forsake your fundamental positions, occupy yourself with purely practical things, and then we would be very welcome as fellow workers (loud applause) and I tell you that the best of us could then easily become secret councillors (great merriment), or indeed anything else that we wished. "Oh! Paris is worth a meal," and to win the goal of socialism is well worth a few ministerial seats. (Laughter and applause.) Do not deceive yourself on this point. I have expressed myself thus strongly in order to once for all get rid of false views on all these subjects and to show you that for us I do not see everything from so rosy a side. Furthermore, since the Dresden congress the hope of a great liberal party to be composed of the right wing of the Social Democracy, and including the National Liberals has been destroyed. You need only to ask Nauman, Gerlach and Barth what they really think down in their inmost hearts about the German bourgeoisie and German liberalism. If they tell you the truth they must say, "Hopeless, even to despair." (Loud applause.) The Liberal

party whether large or small is today only a creature of imagination. The class antagonisms have in a way sharpened since 1903—sharpened I say not grown milder (loud applause)—and capitalism and its political representative, liberalism, whenever it is confronted with the question of whether, on even wholly unimportant things, it shall go with or against the Social Democracy, always goes against it because of the fear of socialism. (Loud applause). For proof of this we have only to turn to the statement of a capitalist from Saxony in the last campaign. He declared in a meeting, "I am a National Liberal, but I vote Conservative" (laughter). How is that possible? The man said to himself, "If I should vote liberal it might easily happen that the Social Democrats may thereby win another seat and that would be such a horrible thing that I would rather vote for the Conservatives." This is how things stand, therefore it is a fact that at the very beginning of the first session of the Reichstag a regular race for the favor of the workers begun. An enormous mass of social reform schemes were brought in simultaneously,—as many as had been presented in several of the previous sessions put together. The Center especially went into this race because it saw that it must do everything possible to stop the ever increasing mass of workers from deserting its flag. Consequently it presented these schemes, which were wholly displeasing to the inmost souls of the greater portion of its representatives. If there had not been tactical reasons for these schemes a majority of the Center would certainly have been against them. (Loud applause). These schemes increased the attracting power of the city for the country worker and thereby the danger, that the Center would lose more and more of its backward country laborers.

Just a word here concerning the anarcho-socialists. It is necessary to consider for a moment the historical materialism which they have so much abused in order to understand this development. This standpoint enables us to comprehend what is otherwise unintelligible. The Center has been compelled to surrender a whole row of its positions. At the Strassburger Catholic celebration one of the speakers gave a speech so radical that with the exception of a few sentences it might easily have been given by any of us. Still further the Center has been firmly an enemy of science. The Catholics are very scantily represented in the ranks of German intellectuals. The Center has discovered at last that reforms are here necessary in the very head and members of its own ranks in order—not to fight modern science—the Center does not do that, for it well knows that victory would be impossible,—but simply to reconcile and to explain away. So it was that another speaker appeared at this Catholic celebration and said: "Make yourself familiar with science, con-

quer it, make its fruits your servants." Even Haëckel could not have given a more beautiful speech on this point. So it is that we find concessions are also made in this direction. And even if Kolb did but yesterday declare in a most indisputable manner that a situation had arrived in which we sought by means of our schemes to attract the young from the Center, this was simply because he had seen that the Center in spite of its relation to the Catholic church, which for a century has had control of the school and the church and thereby the training of the young, was not able to hold its young followers. (That's right.) This privileged position has enabled it, however, to obtain a very important position in the state.

It is this position also which causes the Center to be looked upon so sympathetically by our evangelical schools of thought, since they see in it a power, which, even if the bayonets should fail might still help the ruling classes. From this point of view also it is necessary for us to win the young to our humanity freeing ideas.

On the other hand, however, there is no doubt that especially since the protective tariff struggle in the Reichstag antagonisms have seemed to be sharpened. Those colleagues who have already been in earlier sessions know that (as is natural during long continued work together) gradually a—I will not say exactly friendly, but still a sort of relation between the different parties arises—and that the antagonism disappears in a certain degree. All this was changed in the great battle over the protective tariff. Up until the vote of 1902 the President of the Reichstag maintained a nonpartisanship which undoubtedly raised him above the rest of us. At a single blow this whole non-partisanship and good naturedness has not only disappeared, but on the contrary, in order to make the robbery as complete and as sudden as possible, it was this very same President, who, up until this time had been the paragon of non-partisanship, who led in breaking the constitution and the destruction of social order. (That's true). Since then the growing antagonism has developed in the most acute manner within the Reichstag. I certainly in no way regret this, but on the contrary consider it very desirable. (That's right). Often enough I have said to Liebknecht, that parliament might easily be compared to a sort of court parlor; as there, so also in parliament, much is glossed over. When it is possible for an observer to say that there are a whole mass of Social Democratic representatives who cannot be distinguished as Social Democrats except by the fact that the word stands after their names, and who make speeches which cannot be distinguished from those of the bourgeois opposition, and yet who seem to be of the opinion that they are the lords of the world, a sort of higher being—when people talk in this style about us I believe I would be false to

myself if I did not retort that it is very desirable that you speak evil of us. If the socialists are really the defenders of principle, the defenders of the old revolutionary tactics of the party, and as such step forward against the representatives of their opponents as they should do, then they have performed a good service for the party. It is indisputable that in spite of all the apparent eagerness for labor legislation, practically nothing has been done aside from the tradesman-like arbitration courts, but my accursed sense of justice compels me to break a lance even for the government. Are you listening carefully Comrade Friedeberg? (laughter). They were compelled in spite of the chaos of social political schemes which they have poured out upon the Reichstag to wait until they could determine for what schemes the Reichstag would decide before they themselves could take a position. The whole political situation made it impossible to act upon this basketful of social legislation. After a short time the Center saw that it was impossible for the Reichstag to do anything with these measures and consequently they transformed their schemes into resolutions. However, much we might oppose this, there was nothing else for us to do but to follow their example in order to guard against a situation where there would be nothing before the house but the resolutions of the Center, while our measures would have been put upon the table. These resolutions are now got rid of and the *Bundesrat* has the whole business before them. It is now up to them to say what they think.

Consequently it still remains true that the inclination to social reform has decreased, and this just because they are seeing that it is going to help us. They say: "If we bring in reasonable laws then the Social Democrats will vote for them and we will get no credit." This has now become very evident to them. Since 1903, however, not only has the antagonism to social reform increased,—the economic antagonisms have also become sharper. So it has come about the most reactionary representative body in the world, the Prussian *Herrenhause*, that was declared superfluous and useless and an institution injurious to the common good by so moderately liberal a man as Herr von Treitschke, has now become a shield of the bourgeoisie and capitalism. The last session has very plainly shown this. Even in bygone years, this upper house submitted resolutions to the Reichstag against universal suffrage. Then came a resolution against the imperial inheritance tax and then its position toward the new mining law where it sought to force the lower house into a position of antagonism to the laborers, and where Prince Bülow had the greatest trouble in compelling it to give up. Finally came its resolution demanding a new "penitentiary law."* and

*Name applied by the socialists to a law making striking a penal offense.

for which Count Ballestrem and the Catholic members of the upper house voted. The upper house has shown its power in that it compelled Count Bülow to promise to stop making changes in the insurance law, which increased the influence of the laborers. It was at this time that a Liberal manufacturer sent out the letter which the conservative *Reich* published, in which he said: "Thousands of the possessing class thank the Conservative party in both houses for their firm position. It was high time that the government, and their friends the Social Democrats, were given a *quos ego!* (Laughter). What shall we come to? Do people want to chase us out completely, etc." (Laughter). This is the way the world begins to look to the manufacturers. And he continues: "It looks as though it was intended to make the possessing class the slaves of the proletariat."

It is indisputable that the employers' organizations have constantly grown in significance and power since 1903. There are industrial alliances where not one single employer remains outside, while we unfortunately have hundreds of thousands of laborers who belong neither to the free unions nor to the Christians. The class character and class consciousness of the German bourgeoisie is most strikingly superior to that of the German working class. (Loud applause). We must recognize this if we are to know what we are to do. On the one side we have the most complete solidarity while the laborers are divided into various organizations. The Christian unions have been founded only for the purpose of breaking the power of the working class. If any one were to tell a Christian employer that he should belong to a Christian employers' organization he would laugh and say, "What's the matter with you? It is all the same to me whether a man is a Jew, a Christian, a heathen, or a Mohammedan, he is still flesh of my flesh, if he is a capitalist. We employers would be fools if we were to permit such differences to weaken us." (That is true).

It is only the laborers, who, because of the stupidity which has been artificially cultivated among them, divide their forces, although they are just the ones who have the greatest necessity of unity and solidarity. (Bravo).

As a result of this whole situation the pugnacity of the employer has increased. As a consequence we see lockouts in Berlin, in the Rhine province, in Westphalia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Thuringa. The outlook in Bavaria has pleased me, however much I may regret the fate of the laborers affected. In little bourgeois Bavaria the employers now have shouted from the watch towers the fact of the sharpest class antagonisms and class struggle. (That's right). It only helps us, however, when the antagonisms are thus forced to their highest degree, because this brings about a clear situation in which there can be no dodg-

ing nor covering up, nor compromising (loud applause) even the most stupid laborer is forced to recognize the class antagonism when he is locked out, and all those who live through it will be forever lost to the Liberal and the Center. This pugnacity is everywhere noticeable in an increasing degree among the employing classes. The end of the struggle is not in sight. Indeed it must naturally grow ever stronger and stronger because capitalistic development in Germany is moving in a most rapid manner toward its climax. Since 1895 we have lived through a colossal industrial revolution. The laboring class has also gained a new strength thereby, a strength that rests upon their numbers. The power of the bourgeoisie rests upon their money, but numbers will give the laboring class, as soon as they are conscious of their condition such an enormous power that the power of the bourgeoisie, though they had ten thousands of millions in their treasury will be completely overcome. (Bravo.) But all this must be explained to the working class, it must not come to such a condition that within their own ranks their power and importance are underestimated, and as yet the agitation and educational work of the press is largely wrong (that's true). It is necessary to go to the very bottom of things and this congress must clear matters up until at last we all know what we have to do. We must know that we are facing a situation that must necessarily result in a catastrophe, if the power of the working class, because of its numbers, its culture, and its strength does *not become so great as to take away all desire on the part of their opponents for catastrophes.*

It is a great error to say that the socialists are producing a revolution. We have no desire for anything of the sort, and have no interest in bringing about catastrophes in which the laborers must be the first to suffer. You need only turn to Russia to see where catastrophes are necessary. It was no other than Frederick the Great of Prussia who stated in one of his works that, "Catastrophes arise, not because the masses but the rulers make them." This is the same position that von Blüntschli took during his years as a teacher of political philosophy. Even a paper like the Catholic *Echo* wrote in May of this year that it was a completely unhistorical position to claim that revolutions were made by a few scoundrels and demagogues. "Revolutions can only occur when the historical conditions have arisen, and be successful only when evils exist that bear heavily upon the mass of the people. Such revolutions are always successful. Whatever we may have to say against the Social Democracy we can only overcome them by reform and if we do not meet the just demands of the laborers they will finally become socialists." A very intelligent view! Thoroughly correct! Just what we have always said! But it is ever the curse of a ruling class that at

the decisive moment of their own history they never have the right insight and that no one does what he should do.

We socialists find ourselves in the very favorable position, that whatever our opponents do to oppose us we grow continually larger. We must grow because the capitalist society grows and constantly creates the conditions that produce socialists. Just as little as they were able to master us under the "laws of exception," just as little will they be able to master us when some day they make new force laws. Oh! I know that there are many in our ranks who would rejoice if this should happen. (That's true). Then we would show them again what sort of confounded rascals we are! (Loud applause). What did we not show the police power during those twelve years! But it is not alone the economic class antagonisms which are increasing, but the political also.

The ruling class, the bourgeoisie, because of its power has come to look upon its social position as self evident, as something ordained by God (I say that whether you believe in God or not), as representing the state and wielding the power of the state. They consider that they, as Bismarck has said, have the key of legislation in their hand in order to legislate according to their will, that is according to their interest. They say to themselves, "We represent a colossal property interest, and pay the taxes, therefore we must also represent the state." To be sure if this property was produced in the sweat of their face, then they might talk about it, but this property is produced by your sweat, it is from the monstrous surplus which you create for them that they pay the taxes. This humbug, this hocus pocus is continually repeated and the great mass of the people do not yet understand it, else they would all be socialists.

The economic power of the bourgeoisie has increased with giant strides during the last fifteen years and especially during the last decade. You can scarcely have any conception of the amount of property which the syndicates, rings and trusts have brought to the employers during the last ten years. It is necessary only to see how the bourgeoisie of today squanders and wastes the wealth because they no longer know what to do with the money. How they do this can be seen in Berlin, and the scenes there are even worse than those of the days of decay of the Roman Empire, when men fed their guests with the eyes of peacocks. I have been repeatedly told that at the great feasts of Berlin it is nothing uncommon to spend twenty or thirty and even forty thousand marks for a single meal. (Hear, Hear). Those are sums beside which the salary of a Prime Minister is insignificant. So it comes about that the bourgeoisie simply buy the officials by paying them three or four times the salary which they once received, and as a substitute for their right to a

pension supply them with capital, the interest on which is greater than what they would have received as a pension.

Through these officials a great influence can be exercised upon their former colleagues in the service of the government and the ministry. (That's right). So it is that they have legislation completely in their hands. The great masses do not even dream of the influence of capital, which we, however, must cry out through the country, knocking at every door until the people know how hopelessly they have been betrayed and exploited.

I tell you also that the bourgeoisie do not comprehend how such class antagonisms can continue with universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage. Shall the "best of the nation" be turned over to the rough, crude, unthinking mass to have their fate determined by a mere counting of heads? In this "best of the nation" are included not simply the nobility, but first of all, our plutocracy, the aristocracy of money. It is not in vain that a Ballin or a Krupp and a whole row of similar great ones have found a more welcome entrance to the court than many a noble old lord who can look back upon an ancestral tree six or seven hundred years old, older even than the Hohenzollern. This is but another example of the power of the bourgeoisie, the power of money, which has everything in its hands. Here again are proven the words of our great leaders, Marx and Engels, as stated in the Manifesto of 1848: "The government is only a committee to represent the interest of the ruling class." (That's right). That this is the case was shown by the fact that sixteen years ago when I made a similar declaration in the Reichstag the then secretary of the state, Herr von Boetticher supported me with a low "that's right." Naturally I did not forget to announce this quiet testimonial of sympathy of Herr von Boetticher aloud to the whole Reichstag.

An agrarian policy is necessary in Germany—perhaps not so stupid and foolish a one as the present in regard to the raising of the cost of meat—but the government must be agrarian in the interest of the ruling class. Where else can the young bloods of aristocracy find the resources to maintain a suitable, social position if not from the colossal agrarian tax and the other revenues of the state. Since they can no longer compete with the bourgeois and draw out the gold fishes—especially the accursed Jewish ones, who are apt to be the most beautiful gold fish (laughter)—out of the bourgeoisie, in order to regild their old coats of armour; because they themselves no longer care anything for agriculture, and because their sons as cavalry officers are occupied with horses, beautiful women and such pretty things:—because of this we have the hatred of universal suffrage and such statements as appeared a few weeks ago in the *Kreuzzeitung*: "Now this unfortunate Reichstag is going to meet agam

and as always is incapable of any action and we shall then have the long speeches of the Social Democrats; the Reichstag is now only a necessary evil." It is to be sure untrue that the Reichstag has become incapable of any activity during late years. It was much more true in 1872. *The Kreuz-Zeitung* is also silent concerning the fact that the Prussian "three class parliament" with its "fifteen mark legislature" is permanently incapable, and that there are Prussian representatives who are shameless enough to stay away weeks and months together; as for example, during the last session when the previous head editor of this same paper, H. Wagener never set foot during the entire session in the Landtag until the last day when he went to the treasury to draw his salary for the entire session. (Hear, Hear). A National Liberal representative has himself complained to me about this act of his colleague.

For all these reasons the cry is raised, "Down with universal suffrage." Certainly there was a time when liberalism took it for granted that universal suffrage should be established. The National Union placed this demand at the head of its program, and when Bismarck was compelled by political considerations to overthrow universal direct and secret suffrage in his North German Bund the National Liberal party in 1868 sent forth a call containing the following: "In parliament we see the union of the living, working strength of the nation, and universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage must be made the foundation of public life. We do not fear the dangers which this brings with it, so long as freedom of the press, of assemblage and of coalition remain undisturbed." At that time then the danger to universal suffrage was simply that there were not enough other forms of freedom. The National Liberals at that time also referred to the non-payment of members, because the year before Bismarck had sought to take away salaries. It went on further: "The restricted class suffrage has outlived its usefulness. The next Landtag will show in what manner and under what conditions the transition can be made to universal suffrage." So spoke the National Liberal party officially and proudly in the year 1868, and up until the present time this party has in accordance with its well known Mameluke character continually trampled its own platform under foot, and worked in opposition to all extension of universal suffrage. In 1887 it used its majority with the Conservatives to extend the legislative period from three to five years. During late years pamphlet after pamphlet has been issued against universal suffrage. I would recall also how Count von Zedlitz forced the Bundeserat to oppose the extension of universal suffrage in the south German states, and how in the north they sought to make still worse the most abominable of all electoral systems. I need only refer to the attack on the electoral system in Saxony,

Hamburg, and Lubeck. I would also call attention to the fact that these attacks have been made in just those localities where the socialists are strongest, such as Hamburg and Saxony. Why the party has not taken the action in these localities that many expected from it I shall explain later. I can prove further that it has been the Liberals especially who have been engaged in these attacks upon the suffrage. In their inmost hearts nearly all Liberals are opponents of universal suffrage. The number of bourgeois who are really supporters of universal suffrage can be counted on the fingers. What then have the Liberals done in Prussia to universal suffrage? Rickert has a few times brought in schemes in this direction and as a consequence has been sharply attacked by his friends. In Nürnberg the magistrate is chosen from the majority of the Free-Thinkers party and this free thinking magistrate has misused his power in order to gerrymander the electoral district, so that 15,000 bourgeois have been able to outvote 22,000 Social Democrats. In view of all these events it is a lie to assert that liberalism is a supporter of this most important of all the popular rights.

And how is it with the Center. That Center with which our comrades of Bavaria have made a momentary alliance to secure universal suffrage? This does not in any way contradict the facts that I have set forth. If you believe that the Center has any political principles then undeceive yourself at once. It has absolutely no firm position except to strengthen the power of the church at any price. The Center stands for the "God ordained order." This divine order is always that which is useful to the Center. It is *the* order which supports the power of the church and the Center. Through thousands of years, as I have indisputably shown at Strassberg, this Center has been capable of adjusting itself to all forms of state and all economic stages and I can tell you now comrades that when it comes to the final decision and the Center says to itself, "We can no longer successfully oppose socialism," that I will bet a thousand to one that the preachers of Christian love, who now stand for bourgeois order as they formerly stood for feudal and ancient orders of society will begin to stand for socialism. (Applause and laughter). Then they will show to you with a keenness and a clearness beside of which all of you will be bunglers, that the New Testament in such and such places clearly stands for socialism. (That's right). So will the Center act on the day when it cannot act otherwise. To be sure it will then have to settle with us. Just now the Center has certainly worked to secure universal suffrage in Baden, and Bavaria. Why? In Bavaria the Center is not capable of obtaining power on the basis of the existing suffrage. It seeks a power that will give it absolute domination in the administration and the representative bodies of the state,

and since our comrades in Bavaria are interested in breaking the back of the present electoral system at any price, and since further, liberalism, true to its position as the representative of capitalism, will not yield any concession and opposes every reform, therefore a coalition between the Social Democracy and the Center becomes a necessity. The very moment that the goal of this coalition is obtained, the battle between the Social Democracy and the Center will naturally break out even sharper than it has ever been between the Liberal and the Center. The Center wishes universal suffrage in Bavaria because only in this way can it utilize the votes of its peasants and little bourgeois adherents. Things are much the same in Baden, where the power of national liberalism can be broken only by universal suffrage. Because of this, and not because of any principle the Center stands for universal suffrage in Baden and Bavaria. While in Prussia, since 1875 when Windthorst lived, it has never moved a finger in order to introduce universal suffrage. Indeed the Center has done just the reverse. In the so-called electoral reform of 1892-3 it so reformed things that it even injured itself and was crushed under the abuse bestowed upon it by the advocates of universal suffrage.

And how is it in Württemberg? There the constitution is about to be amended. It has already had universal, direct suffrage for several decades, although to be sure in very unequal and badly divided electoral districts. Now it is proposed to introduce a reform which shall throw out the twenty-four privileged members but the Center would also receive these twenty-four votes through the help of universal suffrage. But the leader of the Center in Württemberg, the Reichstag member, Grober, came forward and declared that this should not happen, for it meant the giving of great additional power to the Social Democracy. That's the tune the Center plays in Württemberg. Then it was that Grober, who is a gigantic and skillful man, painted a picture on the walls of the Chamber on the danger of the introduction of universal suffrage in Württemberg, that made the shivers run over the honorable gentlemen, saying this would enable the Social Democrats to capture twenty-four seats. Oh! if that was only true! But Grober knew as well as I that it was not true—that it could not be true, because the economic conditions in Württemberg did not yet exist.

Grober proposes to be sure, that these twenty-four representatives should be elected by universal suffrage, but in such a manner as to retain his domination in the Chamber. You see how correct I am when I say that the Center always acts in the manner that will best secure its own interest. (Loud applause). Furthermore I would refer to what the Cologne *Volkzeitung* said in April of the present year concerning the attack upon the

rights of suffrage in Hamburg. "It is proper," it wrote, "that every state, whenever it is threatened with a Social Democratic majority in its legislative chamber, which would bring the whole nation to a standstill, should prepare to introduce protective measures."

Now we see the program of the Center. It is for universal suffrage, so long as the present majority is sure, but when universal suffrage will create a Social Democratic majority then it is for something different. We would "bring the machinery of the state to a standstill." No, not at all. On the contrary we would speed it up to a hitherto unheard of speed, while we cleared away the old rubbish (very good). The Cologne *Volkzeitung* continues: "Let the social democrats cherish no illusions on this point." Make a note of that for use in your future suffrage agitations and for your whole political attitude.

There can no longer be any doubt that some day things will develop as I have pictured them here. Marxists and Revisionists have agreed that the proletariat grows ever more and more and must finally constitute the overwhelming majority of our nation. They are the foundation of our nation, they are the foundation of our wealth, the foundation of our well being, the foundation of our capacities for defense, the foundation of all and everything. This great mass forms the foundation of society, and upon its shoulders is built the social pyramid, and whoever attacks this pyramid at its base overthrows the whole. (That's right).

I am not an alarmist. The possibility of leading the development in the most peaceable possible roads depends upon us, depends upon the power that we give our organization, depends upon the political attitude which we can inspire in the German working class, who must learn to know every stage in the historical development of the country,—where they stand, what they are to do, and to leave undone. (Loud applause). In this direction there is clearness! No deceptions, no brake. Ah, seek to brake it as much as you will, the wheels will roll on over you. We see the bourgeois parties coalescing more and more as the antagonisms between them grow less and less. The bourgeois parties say to themselves, "Could we once get this horror out of our eyes, that troubles us day and night and haunts us in our dreams, it would be well worth while to unite." Consequently we see the coalition of our enemies since the election of 1903. A classical illustration of this was the Landtag election of Esslingen, where from the south German popular party, the radical wing of the bourgeois, even to the Conservative, all were of one mind as opposed to the Social Democracy, and where our comrades through their energies were able to turn both bourgeois candidates out of doors. If there was ever a time that I was sat-

ified with our Württemberg comrades it was at the time of the election in Esslingen. (That's right).

There are only the "ins" and the "outs" any more. It is no longer possible to distinguish between them, and out of this situation among the various bourgeois parties has come the imperial union for fighting the Social Democracy, which is to furnish the money to send out a Praetorian band of speakers who without regard to their political position have but the one object—to fight the Social Democracy—which means, to throw mud at them.

How false are the judgments of those who underestimate parliamentary activity was shown in the great miners' strike. The normal result was a victory for the miners and no defeat. (That's true). A victory that compelled the greatest power in Germany, the government, to deal with the miners and to introduce a reform in the mining law. But the government dared not go to a Reichstag elected by universal suffrage, but went instead to the "three class parliament" of Prussia. It knew that they could there carry through a reform that would really be no reform, but only a spoiled egg, (that's right) and in this they were supported by the Center because it desired at any price to prevent the introduction of this subject into the Reichstag. In this we have the most striking testimonial to the moral force which may be exercised by universal suffrage, and especially by the pressure of socialists elected upon the ground of this universal suffrage. The miners were betrayed of their birth right, since a plan would have been presented therein not far from what justice to the laborer demanded. It was there that we grappled with the resolution demanding a new penitentiary law, and there came Bülow's promise to reduce the self government of the insurance organizations. Another proof of what might happen if there were no socialists in the Reichstag! And in the face of such misuse of the miners people dare to demand of us that we renounce parliamentary activity.

Over in Russia a terrible struggle is going on whose primary purpose is the attainment of political rights in order to erect a modern political system! There our comrades with joyous eagerness for battle rush to the barricades while men and women offer up themselves and all that they value highest, their lives even, in order to finally obtain a modern state (loud applause).

Even the conservative General Liebert, a man who would be the last to grant any concessions to socialism, expressed himself as convinced that a war against the proletariat was impossible. Still they tell us that the proletariat has no power and no significance! It is said upon one side and that from which I had never thought such a thing possible that the power of the party has been reduced to a minimum. And that even, although years

ago Caprivi told our Comrade Grillenberger, who is now dead, that the government never presented any proposal until it had discussed what influence it might have upon the socialists. Still they tell us that we have no influence, we play no part! They tell us we have nothing to say although the whole foreign policy is determined with reference to the influence of the Social Democracy. To be sure there is an attempt to make Bülow, as foreign minister, a sort of political Pope, in that every one who attempts to criticise the foreign policy of the government is at once silenced. That happened to Jaures and to our friends in Constance, and even to me lately in Basle. The watchman had listened to a good deal and had begun to get nervous. (Laughter). He did not like what I was saying and when I began to speak on the Morocco question he refused to let me proceed. (Hear, Hear). I did not wish to bring about the dissolution of the meeting, and furthermore the interruption was the best possible thing that could happen, so I have submitted.

Look at the whole foreign situation! The struggle in Russia is causing our government to tremble much more than it admits, (that's right). They have a most terrible fear lest the fire might leap over. They say to themselves that as such a thing is possible in Russia, where there is no organization whatever, and where the proletariat is relatively small in numbers what might not happen in Germany where we have politically educated masses, an organized proletariat and where there are already whole regiments in the army composed of Social Democrats, and where if the reserve and the home guard were called into action they would be almost purely socialists. So they say to themselves, "What would they not do to us?" No, no they would be foolish indeed up there above us if they did not consider these things. This belongs also to the story of the power of Social Democracy.

The present failure in Colonial policy, the blundering foreign policy, all this, and those above, are all aware that this is material for the socialists, material that we alone know how to use. There is no denying the fact that, although we are not a majority, and still on the defensive in politics, we are able to criticise so effectively and so energetically that more than one of those in high places would be very happy if a law could be made preventing socialists from coming into the Reichstag. (Laughter).

This is the situation in which every thoughtful comrade must ask himself, since previously used methods have not been sufficient to make impossible certain attacks upon us: are the tactical and agitating means that we have previously utilized sufficient or must we create new ones?

This brings us to the proposition of the political general

strike (*Massenstreik*).* It will be foolish to attempt to avoid this discussion and to act as if we did not hear it. That is ostrich politics. (That's right). Even if this question is limited on all points as many would desire, nevertheless every thinking man, and especially every leader of the party who deserves this name must ask himself if the time is not here for the party to discuss this proposition. (Loud applause). To be sure the trades union congress of Cologne thought to get rid of the matter by the adoption of Bömelberg's resolution. They rejected the general strike in the sense that the anarchists and the anarcho-socialists desire it, and declare that they did not wish any further discussion. What did that accomplish? The exact opposite. With the adoption of Bömelberg's resolution, which in form and contents was very obscure, the discussion really began to grow in volume. How great this obscurity is, is shown by the fact that even von Elm was accused of not understanding it,—von Elm, with whom to be sure I have often had differences of opinion, and have frequently crossed swords with some violence, but whom naturally I recognize as a very able representative, especially in relation to the proceeding of trades union congresses and concerning the significance of the general strike resolution. The fact is that we must study this resolution with a microscope in order to discover that they have not really gone so far as to forbid the discussion of the general strike. The impression which is naturally gained from a reading of the resolution and from the reasons which are given for it is that the discussion of the general strike should cease. Since it can signify something else, and since we all have occasion to go into this question together with the trades unions, so we must consider the matter from a wholly objective point of view. There was still another place in Elm's article in which he spoke my thoughts. It was where he stated, that it would be far better instead of adopting so obscure and contradictory a resolution to have energetically resolved to declare to the ruling class in unmistakable terms, "If you dare to touch universal suffrage, then the economically organized workers will set their economic power in motion to prevent any such outrage." (That's right.) I believe this position of Elm's is absolutely correct.

The article goes on to say further, that the unions are even more directly interested in universal suffrage than the political party. (That's right.) For when the suffrage is threatened, the right of union, of assemblage and of organization are equally endangered. (That's right.) Elm said further, that the political leaders would be in no way embarrassed even if a law of exception was enacted, since they would simply fall back upon the

* The German Social Democracy use the word "Massenstreik" in distinction from the catastrophic "general strike" idea as advocated by the anarchists, and some socialists, to indicate the strike of a large body of men for social and political purposes.—Trans.

tactics of 1878. (That's right.) That is absolutely true. During this time secret organizations sprang up like mushrooms out of the earth. We played with the police like cats with a mouse. (Laughter.) It was a joke, a source of amusement for countless comrades (loud applause and laughter), and whenever we met together it was our greatest sport to tell the stories of our experiences in leading the police around by the nose, and to describe how we played with them. (Laughter.) And even if a few comrades should go to prison—well most of us have already sat there and it might easily happen that the time would come when, in order to make good we would have to show that we had been in prison. (Laughter.) That would be a pitiful party who could be destroyed by the power of the government and a few criminal laws. (Loud applause.) We are living in the midst of the Russian events and shall we not have the courage to endure a few months in prison, or even something worse in order to maintain the rights that we possess? (Loud applause.)

The Cologne resolution, not only arose out of obscurity and confusion, but the struggle has since then continued with even greater heat. The reason which Comrade Bömelberg gave at that time for placing the question on the program is at least interesting. He declared that it was done in order to avoid the danger of the unions adopting resolutions later which might be misinterpreted in some other place. This some other place is the party congress. They wish therefore to influence our decisions.

Now there is certainly no doubt that if there is any question which interests equally the party and the union it is the question of the political *Massenstreik*. For the union members are not simply unionists, they are also citizens and as such they have the greatest interest in the political condition of the state, and not simply in the economic conditions of society. What is then the state? Whoever wishes to thoroughly inform himself on this question can read the work of Engels on "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," and if he does not understand it when he reads it the first time let him read it two or three times. He will then discover what the state is, and that the state first became necessary when private property took the place of communistic primitive families. As soon as this development appeared class antagonisms arose, and property owners became the enemies of non-owners and *vice versa*. The possessing class constituted itself into the ruling power, which oppressed the masses and transformed the state according to its interests. In the degree that the forms of production developed the state necessarily changed until the feudal state gradually developed. Then came the antagonism between the feudal nobility and the cities, during which, as a smiling bystander, the absolute state developed. This released the modern bourgeoisie, who dur-

ing the great revolutions that overturned Europe, overthrew its united opponents. It is ridiculous to reproach *us* with desiring a revolution, when we remember that all previous revolutions were made by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie granted numerous rights to the laborers, but the most decisive right, that of suffrage, it withheld as long as possible. As a result of the same logic, according to which all previous oppressed classes have in the course of history seized upon political power in order to transform all society in the interest of their class, just so the proletariat, as the last oppressed class, must conquer political power in order, with the help of this power, to create in the social sphere the institutions which will make its power indestructible. With this, however, the last hour of the state sounds, because within the new society there will be no class antagonisms and the state will have lost its reason for existence. But until things reach this stage—when it will be I do not know,—it may be far away—we must, cost what it will, work for political power; and comrades, it would be contrary to all logic, it would be a spectacle of unheard of character, if as powerful a class as the modern working class has become, materially, physically, and intellectually should permit itself to be deprived of what all previous oppressed classes have demanded as a matter of course. (Loud applause.) We must obtain this; how, will be determined by the political situation, which not we but our opponents create. Then we can tell our opponents, "Take care, during the twentieth century, you shall finally learn from history whither it leads when you attempt to rule against the will of the great majority of the nations. That don't go."

The reproach has been thrown up to us that we have been compelled to accept as a last resort the general strike advocated by the anarchist. Anarchism is fundamentally a necessary outgrowth of the bourgeoisie liberalism and individualism. (That's right.) The classic proof of this is to be found in Stirner's book, "The Individual and his Property" that appeared in 1845 and contained within itself not only anarchy but also anarcho-socialism. (Laughter.) As a consequence we find in anarchy nearly all those ideological views which are to-day advocated by liberalism. Anarchy says: "We have nothing to do with the state: I am myself and nothing else concerns me. The state is a monster, the concentrated power which oppresses me and robs me of my individual freedom. I will not concern myself with it; just develop your individuality as a proletariat, then you will see how far you can go." But the fact is that the most valuable individual peculiarities contained in this magnificent germ of human perfection, in these countless heads, cannot develop to-day and that it is an accident if an individual is able to develop; that present society destroys individuality, and that it is the especial

task of the state to care for this suppression of individuality in the masses. "This state now," says Friedeberg, "we should leave in peace and not trouble ourselves about it." (Friedeberg, "I never said it.") I will prove that to you when I deal with you in Berlin. There we can have the greatest freedom of speech and I shall hope it will be chopped up as nothing has ever been chopped up before. (Great laughter.) So now the general strike is to be the cure all. It will overthrow the bourgeois society—just how the state is to be overthrown we need not break our heads, if the general strike is once declared the state will float in the air,—as if it would permit itself to be floated around in the air. (Laughter and applause.) The general strike will stop war, arm the military, conquer the eight hour day; general strike here and general strike there. And so they rattle on as if they had mill wheels in their heads. The end of the song is necessarily pure and simple unionism; (that's right) not that this is the object but it is the logical consequence. For the followers of this idea gradually become so full of all sorts of beliefs concerning the political powers and the necessity of political action that they naturally come to reject them and refuse to enter into the political organizations.

The general strike question has already occupied a whole list of international congresses. It first came up in 1889 in Paris. There it was that Tressaud-Marseille thought that the demonstration of the first of May would be ineffective unless supported by a general strike; the congress must declare the general strike as the beginning of the social revolution. His motion in support of this was, however, rejected by a great majority at the International congress at Brussels, Domela-Nieuwenhuis moved that the socialists of all countries issue a sort of declaration of war with a call to the people for a universal cessation of work. This motion also was defeated. The international congress of Zurich of 1893 appointed a committee to consider the general—in the sense of the world—strike. This commission submitted the following resolution, which, however, only gave rise to a discussion:

"Whereas, strikes can only be successful under certain definite conditions and with certain definite objects which cannot be determined in advance, and whereas a world strike, because of the diverse economic development of different countries is impracticable and in the moment that it would become practicable would be no longer necessary, and whereas, even in one country the limited universal strike, if peacefully carried out is hopeless, since hunger of the strikers first of all would compel their capitulation, while a violent strike would be mercilessly suppressed by the ruling class.

"Therefore the congress declares that under present social

and political conditions a general strike of individual industries may be successful in the most favorable cases and further that sympathetic strikes (*Massenstreiks*) under certain conditions may be most effective weapons, not only in the economic but also in the political battle, weapons, however, whose application presupposes an effective economic and political organization of the working class. The congress recommends therefore to the socialist parties of all countries that they further this organization with all energy and pass over the question of a world strike for the consideration of the regular order of the day."

This resolution is especially interesting (and I was myself when I studied it, convinced by its contents) in that it rejects the "world-strike" but maintains that the political *Massenstreik* is still worthy of consideration and especially under the conditions, that the corresponding organizations were sufficiently extensive. I find that this portion of the resolution is clearer than that of the Amsterdam resolution. (That's right.)

Again, in London, in 1896, the general strike came before the International Congress. In the resolution concerning the economic policy of the working class, the reporter was Molkenbuhr, we find: "The Congress considers the strike and the boycott necessary means for the attainment of the purposes of the unions, but does not consider that the possibility now exists for an international general strike. The immediate necessity is the economic organization of the laboring masses, because the extension of the strike to whole industries or countries depends upon the extent of the organization."

The International Congress at Paris in 1900 had the general strike as the last matter on its order of business. The chairman, Legien, declared: "We have brought in once more the not entirely satisfactory resolution of London in order to testify that our view concerning the general strike has not changed. . . . So long as strong organizations do not exist the general strike is not even subject to discussion. A general strike of *unorganized* masses would simply be an opportunity for the bourgeoisie. In a few days they would have overthrown the strikers through force of arms and thereby destroyed the work of decades." The Congress finally accepted, by a vote of 27 to 7, the resolution of the majority of the committee which repeated the London resolution.

We see that this question has in no way been neglected. Finally we have the resolution of the Amsterdam Congress.

Between the observations which Robert Schmidt made as representative of the unions at Amsterdam and those of Legien in 1900 at Paris there is a very significant difference. Legien said, "If you Italian and French wish to have a general strike,

then see to it that you build up corresponding organizations and then we will discuss the matter." Robert Schmidt declared, on the contrary, in Amsterdam: "The great German unions do not consider the general strike as debatable." Schmidt in no way refers to the *Massenstreik* in this connection. The position of Brians at Amsterdam in regard to the *Massenstreik* is also very interesting. He held it to be necessary as a defense against the attacks on the suffrage in Germany. The resolution was finally adopted in Amsterdam by a vote of 36 to 4. At our Bremen congress the question was also discussed. Many speakers like Mrs. Zetkin, Liebknecht, Kautsky, and Bernstein spoke in favor of further discussion of this question at other conventions. Finally came the events in Cologne where Bömelberg took the same position as Schmidt and argued against the theoreticians who lacked any practical comprehension of such questions.

Robert Schmidt compared the *Massenstreik* to a string around the neck of the working class, which the bourgeoisie were told to pull. (Shout, "That's right.") Bömelberg referred to the fact that the labor movement demanded peace in order to build up its organization, while the question of the *Massenstreik* would bring unrest into its membership and lead to divisions.

Now the question has been discussed further, especially by Comrade Heine in the September number of the *Monatshefte*. He attacked in the sharpest manner the work of Comrade Mrs. Roland-Holst on the general strike. I would have liked it much better if he had not sharpened his pen quite so often. He attacked Comrade Holst in a manner that I very much regret. (That's right.) He spoke of the high-nosed way in which such men as Jaures talked. He declared that such ideas were worthless political nonsense. If such views are held they had better be expressed only among friends. But in spite of the fact that we may object to the tone of the debate I wish very much that Heine had given a few good examples of his social attitude. I do not myself agree wholly with Comrade Holst. I have, however, read her book with the greatest interest and I can recommend its reading to our comrades. The book was written with the heart's blood of Comrade Holst. She is one of the ablest women that I have ever come to know. When the general strike broke out in Holland, with which I was not wholly in accord, she and her husband went down into their pockets far beyond their ability and have made so great sacrifices that they have very much weakened their social position. She is a tireless agitator and displays tireless energy, sacrifice, and co-operation. For these reasons it gave me double sorrow that she was so treated. (That's right.) Heine also attacks the *Massenstreik* in the sharpest way. I do not recall ever having seen as sharp a criticism or such a bitter fight against any thought as his. His

method of attack consisted in drawing upon his knowledge as a jurist for paragraph after paragraph of the criminal law and piling these up one upon the other to the height of high treason, and the threat of declaring a state of siege, so that any comrade who was not sure of his position might well feel the shivers running up his back, frightened at the great dangers that the application of the *Massenstreik* tactics in Germany might bring. He also referred to the horrible sentences that the courts, especially the military courts would give; because in his opinion it would be impossible to carry out so great and violent a movement in a peaceful manner, especially in view of the provocation of our opponents. When I spoke with my comrades concerning this article one of them said, "Heine, although not so intending, has supplied some government officials with the very best sort of material for a speech." I replied, that no public official was so stupid. They are not quite the most stupid that become public officials. (Heine, "Certainly they are not so stupid as that!—Statdhagen, "Sure, they are the most stupid of all.") (Laughter.) I am convinced, Comrade Statdhagen, that you are much smarter than all the public officials together. (Loud laughter.) No, not even the most stupid public official is as stupid as to make such use of class justice.

But the whole foundation of Heine's deduction is false. I deny emphatically that all the results which Heine foresees would follow from a *Massenstreik*. All the things that he considers as possible and probable in a *Massenstreik* can with equal reason proceed from any great strike. If anyone had asked Heine's official advice prior to the outbreak of the great miners' strike he would have had the same reason to advise against it. Now in reality the miners' strike had not the least reason for such objection. The miners conducted a magnificent *Massenstreik*, which was more significant than have been those of all other countries, and this in a marvelously peaceful manner. I traveled through there from Brussels in coming back from a conference and was astonished at the holiday like peace in the Ruhr region. Not a chimney was smoking, where previously we were compelled to close the car windows against the smoke. The land was like a naked waste. The villages lay as peaceful as if no one dwelt therein. When such a thing is possible among a class of laborers who are politically and culturally as backward as these, then we must well ask ourselves, what we might not do with our far greater means and our far more developed discipline, without any of the results that Heine has foreseen. (Loud applause.)

Finally there comes a point where we dare no longer count the cost. Schiller said, "Worthless is the nation that will not joyfully give its all for its honor." Yes, worthless, pitiable, is

a working class that will permit itself to be used like dogs, rather than dare turn against its oppressors. (Thunderous applause.) There is Russia, there is the June massacre, there is the commune! By the deeds of these martyrs, dare you not go hungry for a few weeks to defend your highest human rights? (Thunderous applause and clapping of hands.) Ah, you know little of the German workers if you cannot expect that of them. (Renewed applause.)

What had Heine to say in Wyden when I moved that the word "legal" should be struck from our platform? It was carried unanimously without debate. (Heine, "And rightly.") Then we shall do right to-day when we do the same on the next occasion. (That's right, and laughter.) We are not on the offensive; we only defend ourselves. The political *Massenstreik* is not simply a theoretical but a practical question, concerning a method of fighting that must and shall be used on occasion. Heine certainly did not intend to furnish material for the anarcho-socialists (Heine, "No"), but it is inevitable that Friedeberg and his followers would take advantage of such material and cry, "Now you see to what the German Social Democracy has come. Here we have terror material at wholesale. (Friedeberg, "We have got better material than that.") Nowhere does Heine say that we shall not defend ourselves when we are attacked. He only says that these means are useless; but he has no other to suggest. Shall we quietly stand and let ourselves be skinned alive?

They tell us that the *Massenstreik* is a useless weapon, but in 1891 the Belgians used it to obtain universal suffrage, and with relatively more success than the miners' strike, which brought only a botched-up mining law, and which was also a political strike. Our Belgian comrades have captured 33 out of 140 votes in the Chamber. In 1903 they went once more on a strike in order to completely secure universal suffrage. Then to be sure they had no success. I will not here enter upon a discussion of the tactics of the Belgians, but very significant thoughts occur to me. In 1902 the Austrian miners carried through a *Massenstreik*. They were successful, and secured the legal nine hour day, which we do not yet have. Then came the so-called sympathetic strike in Barcelona, a purely anarchistic strike. Indeed with us in Germany neither the unions or the parties ever think of declaring a so-called sympathetic strike. This so-called strike, that in order to secure the demands of a certain portion of the laborers calls out on strike the whole labor-

*During the "laws of exception" the headquarters of the German Social Democrats was at Wyden, Switzerland, and since they could have no legal existence the word "legal" was stricken from the platform.—Trans.

ing class in a great industrial circle is doomed to failure. Then came the Swedish demonstration strike. These also we will not have in Germany. This was the sort of strike in which they say, "We will have a *Massenstreik* of three days." Nevertheless this strike was not without result. Even if the Swedes did not succeed in having the Chamber pass the resolution which they demanded of the government, yet two years later a new election law was submitted. The old law, against which the strike was directed, had become impossible. Even there, where the *Massenstreik* took place under conditions which I would never endorse in Germany, it has had some success. Then came the *Massenstreik* of the Italian workers against the shooting of their comrades. That was a strike which sprang spontaneously from the masses, where 20,000 laborers laid down their work and compelled the government to declare that for the future it would prevent any such shooting of the workers. To be sure this did not prevent a similar massacre in later years. Besides this, however, this strike has caused an increase in our vote at the election which followed shortly after from 165,000 to 316,000, and must therefore have produced a by no means unfavorable impression upon the masses, as a result of this strike, although all the bourgeois parties were aroused to the highest degree and united against us.

Finally, then, came the railroad strike of last spring. I was myself a witness of this in North Italy. It miscarried, and the blame fell mainly upon our members, with I know not what justice. But no one had thought of such a strike. About seven years ago the laborers and officials of the Swiss Northeast Railroad laid down all their work at twelve o'clock in a body so that when the official in one station called to the officer at the next one, "Where is train No. 12?" The answer came, "It's staying here." (Laughter.) This decided the question. They struck for three days. The management was completely destroyed and they attained what they wished, supported, to be sure, by the bourgeoisie.

Finally I recall the *Massenstreik* in Russia. There where our comrades have no political rights and power, strike after strike is carried through, three or four at once in the same place, with an energy that calls forth the greatest astonishment. Meanwhile the conditions in Russia are so abnormal that these strikes can scarcely be offered as an example to us. It is certainly no accident that since the year 1893 these political strikes, these *Massenstreiks* have first begun to be utilized, beginning in Belgium. Then the question rested until 1902 and from then to 1905 there have been a large number of such strikes. It is also by no means true, as has been said, that *Massenstreiks* are

all failures. I question your trades unions, how many strikes did you lose even when you had a strong organization? Countless, and even to-day many are lost. Here we are dealing with wholly insufficient means, with unorganized laborers, incensed to *Massenstreiks*. To be sure, comrades, I do not ask this of you. No one asks it of you. That would be foolish. If we Germans are famous for the fact that we have philosophical heads, if we love, as Heine has rightly said, to become politicians, then we have first to organize the young, as scarcely any other nation. (That's right.) The German military power, however much we may fight it, is a masterpiece of organizing, and that is due to this German, Prussian peculiarity. Even our insurance legislation, however much we may complain of it, is a masterpiece of organization. We Germans do not so easily take a step that we have not carefully examined. The reproach is sometimes thrown to us that we are like the Austrian *Landsturm*, which always comes limping on behind. We are of the opinion that before we enter into a great battle we must first thoroughly organize and agitate until we have created the political and economic understanding, made the masses self conscious, and ready for resistance and inspired them for the moment when we can say to them, "You must throw everything into the scale now because a question of life and death for you, and for all mankind, as fathers and as citizens is now to be decided." We shall not, and my resolution says nothing of the kind, blindly drive the masses into a strike. It should be self evident that we would not permit the unorganized masses to go blindly into the strike. Heine questions, "Will you have them uncontrolled?" That simply shows that you (turning to Heine) have no close knowledge of the feeling of the working class in these things, and this is no reproach for you, for your work does not bring you in connection with them. I say that what is still lacking we must create. (Heine, "That's right.") My resolution provides for this. State that it is as yet not satisfactory, but that it can be made so. If you are all agreed to act in the sense of my resolution and go out from this congress into the country to the comrades in a solid body, acting in the sense of this resolution, and if the party press does its duty in the far higher degree, and if not only the party press, but also the trades union press explains to the masses, and proves to them that they must occupy themselves politically, and points out what is at stake for them as citizens and as trades unionists, and what tremendous significance the suffrage, for example, has, then the conditions for a general strike will be created. But if, like Robert Schmidt, they state in cold blood that the anarcho-socialists will henceforth be clung to by the trades unions—when

one gives himself up to this sort of fatalism, that is the end of the song. They will merely make the trades unions pure and simple unions.

So, for example, Comrade Bringman, in a reference to an expression of Kautsky's in the *Neue Zeit*, of which I also, when I read it, said: That is a dangerous expression, which can be easily misused; so Bringman said in his brochure, "The Fifth Trade Union Congress and the Class Struggle in Germany," in which he quoted Kautsky: "Still less than ever before can the proletariat expect anything from the imperial government. All significance and life have been taken from the Reichstag." From this he draws the following conclusion: "Parliamentarism is simply played out in Germany. The three million victory of our party in 1903 has changed nothing, but has only accelerated this process. I therefore maintain that it was absolutely correct for the fifth trade union congress to not concern itself any further with social political matters. The fact is that we cannot expect any improvement in our economic condition through legislation within any perceptible period. For the immediate future at least our attention must be given exclusively to our unions. We can improve our economic condition only through our organizations and by means of hard economic battles." (Applause.) Then, again, on page 12 of this brochure, we read as follows: "The whole political and economic situation points the German working class to the trade union movement. Under present conditions it is the only means to improve the condition of the working class. The class struggle of the future will be fought out on the economic field. The unions are the bearers of this class struggle." When he thus looks upon political activity as useless, it amounts to nothing that at the close of this speech he gives utterance to this very beautiful expression: If it should become necessary to defend political rights "then we may be sure that these laborers will be firm in their defense of political rights. When such a situation shall present itself, the economically organized laborers will know how to fight bravely, conquer manfully, and, if necessary, to die like heroes." All very pretty, to be sure, but when said in this manner by a man holding an official position in his union, and who also says: We are not in a condition to obtain anything through politics within any conceivable time, then I ask you—we have nothing to do with Bringman's *intention*—will not the unionist say, "Why should we pay our pennies to a political party?" (That's right) and the younger trade unionists will say, "Then I will not unite with the party organization!" This question will lead to a more and more one-sided activity among our trade union leaders, until at last, and wholly unintentionally it ends in anarcho-socialism. Furthermore, I

would call your attention to the fact that while the congress in Cologne was considering the question of the *Massenstreik*, in a conference between the Social Democratic organization and the trades union committee of Hamburg as to what we should do in reference to the attacks upon the suffrage by the Hamburg council, old party comrades and trade unionists said: "You have no idea how bad the situation is with many of the younger trade union leaders in that they sneer at the party, (Hear, hear) and at socialism, (Hear, hear) and the future state. They even deny that we are leading a class struggle." Comrades, I am only quoting what was said there, and those who said it are tried comrades from the trade union committee. I was simply struck dumb when I heard it. It was further confirmed by the editors of the *Echo*. When after this the opinions of Bringman find sympathy in this place even from Legien, then I am forced to say: "To your posts, consider what you are doing; you are traveling along a very dangerous road, which may end in your own downfall, without your being aware of it." (Very true.)

Of course, there can be no talk, such as we often hear, of the general strike coming, instantaneously, over night, with no chance of discussion. Such a great Democratic party as ours can have no secret politics. (Loud applause.) It must fight in broad daylight. (Renewed applause.) How shall we ever be able to direct the masses, if we do not bring them morally and intellectually within our influence, until we shall arouse their enthusiasm and their confidence, until we can say to them—now there is no other way, on to the battle, if you but do your duty victory is certain. (Bravo.)

And now to something else. We do not fight for utopias nor to demand the co-operative commonwealth. We do not believe that the general strike will transform the capitalist society into a body of angels, but we fight for very real rights, which are the essentials of life for the working class if they are to live and breathe politically. When the question of the abolition of universal suffrage comes up, it is certain that even in bourgeois circles, however corrupt they may be, there is still a large proportion of the people who will say: That must not be; a right must not be taken from the workers when they have not misused it, and we will undoubtedly receive a certain sympathy from this source. Furthermore, I have a much stronger position in defending a right that I have possessed for ten years, than as if I was seeking to conquer a new one. (That's right.) When I can say, "You are simply using brute force to take away our rights; you are brutes and tyrants!"—when I can say all this to rouse up and spur on the masses, then ten thousand devils cannot keep us from winning the masses—including even the

Christian workers. (Loud applause.) You are perfectly right, you trade unionists, in fighting the Christian unions, but when in 1899 the "penitentiary bill" was before the Reichstag, and the Christian workers saw how their head was also in the sling, they took almost as clear a position against it as we, and the Center was compelled to yield to a certain degree, as Bachem told us. Do you remember what Bachem said? He did not claim that the Center had become the defender of the right of free coalition because of a principle—not at all—he said, and that was his principal reason, that the Catholic workers were aroused over the attack upon them; and that if this attack was pushed, the Catholic laborers, to the last man, would desert them, and they could not stand that. (Hear, hear!) Just let them try to take the suffrage from us, or to abolish the right of organization! Just as during the miners' strike, the Catholic workers have fought side by side with the free trade unions, so would they range themselves with us when their vital interests as a working class are at stake. Finally, there is always a force of circumstances and conditions stronger than the strongest will. (That's right!)

Furthermore, is it not the greatest, most unheard of scandal that the party which polled by far the largest vote at the *Landtag* elections in Prussia has, because of the miserable disgraceful three-class system of elections, not a single one of the 433 representatives in the Prussian legislature? (Loud applause.) There I agree with Bernstein that we must some day ask ourselves: "Shall this continue? Shall we permanently permit aristocrats, priests and capitalists to stand with their feet upon our necks, in order to destroy the right of municipal suffrage, in order to destroy the right of assemblage and organization?" Recall to mind the coalition law of 1896! Remember the mining law, and the proposal for a new penitentiary law! I do not say that the question will actually come up to-morrow, for a public opinion is necessary, and this opinion must first be created. There will probably be first a few violent attacks to set everything in an uproar. But the question must sooner or later appear upon the program. In this connection we are far behind the bourgeoisie of the fifties: they continuously fought for their rights. But we stand like—no, I will not use the word—but like people, to whom everything is the same. (Very good.) As a consequence blow after blow falls upon our shoulders. That cannot always keep on. (Loud applause.)

While on the one side we have Heine as an opponent of the *Massenstreik*, on the other hand we have the anarcho-socialists, who have left our former position and declare we are on the wrong road. Friedeberg, who has repeatedly spoken in great

detail on this question in Berlin, has printed his first speech, and has honored me with a copy with a very flattering dedication. We can certainly say that whatever we find therein is the sentiment of Friedeberg. On page 3 we read: "The economic advantages which parliamentarianism is capable of conquering from the class state, could easily be secured by the proletariat through its own efforts within their trade unions, and by the erection of co-operatives of consumption and production. The ideal motive in parliamentarianism, the spreading of socialist thought, the increase of class consciousness, can be much more effectively accomplished through the general strike idea, and much quicker and stronger by the application of the energy, which is to-day expended in parliamentarianism, in direct and immediate instruction and agitation by word and writing among the masses of the people. We are conducting no political battle, and consequently need no political organization. Our battle is an economic and a psychological one. Therefore our weapons must be economic and psychological."

On page 15, where he criticises the party and its activity it reads as follows: "We must never forget that the state in reality is actually nothing but an abstract word, no more; that the state has a meaning, only so long as there are oppressed, and that the moment the proletarian social order is installed there will be no more oppressed, and it will therefore cease to exist. The idea of state and political power necessarily presuppose a condition of rulers and ruled, consequently it is not our object to conquer political power, but to so formulate the economic order and the industrial life of the proletariat that exploitation and slavery shall cease."

A bourgeois ideologist might use almost exactly the same words in demanding that the inner life of the proletariat be raised until they be religiously freed. (That's right.) Friedeberg thinks further that the party is in a position to prevent attack and continues: "And I can tell you that, when the attacks which are to-day being made against the right of suffrage are carried through the German proletariat will be made completely helpless." That will simply give the proletariat courage to fight. (Very true, and laughter.) "We shall shed no tears over universal, equal and secret suffrage" (loud, "Hear, hear"). "On the contrary, we cannot but marvel at the stupidity and poor tactics in our opponents in that they have at last opened the eyes of the German working class to the way that the German proletarian must go;" and on page 19: "Ninety-nine per cent of all things with which parliament is occupied are of absolutely no interest to us and will disappear the moment that the proletariat overthrows class rule."

In complete contradiction with this position, however, he complains on page 10 of class justice. Certainly, class justice does exist. To denounce it, however, we must be in the Reichstag; in our meetings the public officials stop us, (That's right.)

Once universal suffrage is gone then the right of organization and assemblage is also gone, the right of coalition is gone, all rights that we need are gone. When once our enemies have taken away universal suffrage they would be the greatest fools if they left us any other political rights, however small they might be. (Very true.) A battle will be begun to rob us of all our rights, in which we are certain to be defeated! It is self evident that in our unions, in our meetings, in the press, we would continue to fight to arouse the masses and thereby make our opponents uncomfortable. Once they have taken away the principal right, then they must take away the other rights. (That's right.) One depends upon the other. Do you think that a ruling class, who had taken away all rights of the working class would permit a strike of the working class for the purpose of overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie? How such thoughts, such confusion, such contradictions could get together in the head of an intelligent man, and that one of the clearest and most capable men that I know, is something that is impossible for me to comprehend. In Berlin Friedeberg spoke—it must be read in order to be believed—of a fifth estate. (Shout, "I never said it.") That is certainly of such colossal foolishness that it is almost impossible of belief. He said that, it is questionable if the party still stood upon the base of the class struggle. Marx and Engels had through their dogmatic teachings deadened the whole movement. When I read that I asked myself whether Friedeberg had forgotten the whole literature of the socialist party, and whether he had read the "Communist Manifesto." At the head of the Communist Manifesto is the sentence: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." That was the discovery of Marx and Engels, the discovery that signified a complete transformation of all historical cosmology. In another place in the Manifesto we read: "Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie is distinguished by the fact that the class antagonisms have been simplified and that the whole society becomes divided into two great hostile camps, into two great classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat." It goes on to show how the class state arose: "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." Then comes the proof of how the bourgeois continually creates greater and greater numbers of the proletariat and compels them to organize as a separate class, but, "This organization of the proletarians into a class and con-

sequently into a political party is continually being upset again by the competition among the workers themselves."

In short, it is only necessary to read the "Communist Manifesto!" It staggers one's intelligence to hear it said that we are not standing on the base of the class struggle. (Very true.) Even our platform, which still holds good and whose sentences in this connection have never been attacked definitely expresses our character as a class party. (The speaker then read from the Erfurter Platform, concluding with the words: "The battle of the laboring class against capitalist exploitation is necessarily a political battle. The working class cannot continue their economic battle and develop their economic organizations without political rights. They cannot bring about the transition of the means of production into the possession of society without coming into possession of the political power. To transform this battle of the working class into a conscious and united movement, and to point out its natural and necessary goal, is the task of the Social Democratic party.") How any one in view of this expression in the fundamental writing of our leaders, and in view of our platform, and in view of a whole list of statements, writings, and periodical articles, can still tell the masses that the party has ever forsaken the base of the class struggle—that is impossible to understand. Friedeberg referred to Liebknecht; but we must know that in the later editions of his writings concerning the political conditions of the Social Democracy that Liebknecht declared in plain words that the views therein contained were applicable only to the north German union. He had changed his position since the foundation of the German Empire. The question might be raised as to whether that was proper and logical, but after Liebknecht had in this plain manner rejected his old views and published the writings only as a document from an earlier period it is in the highest degree unjust, not to say disloyal, to claim to be supported by the authority of our old comrade, and go before the workers and say: "See, Liebknecht agrees with me." (Loud applause.) This whole method of fighting is absolutely monstrous. It is still more incomprehensible to me that in the principal city of the German Empire, the city of intelligence, three thousand workers, among them old comrades, could accept with shouts of applause such a hash of bald contradictions. (Very true.) If I were ever tempted to swear that we had lost our brains and that our political culture was disappearing it was on the day that I read that. (That's true.) But everything has its explanations. I am an old boy who has lived through forty years of party life and I know a few things. We had a similar experience under the laws of exception when a row broke out in a certain place and

In complete contradiction with this position, however, he complains on page 10 of class justice. Certainly, class justice does exist. To denounce it, however, we must be in the Reichstag; in our meetings the public officials stop us, (That's right.)

Once universal suffrage is gone then the right of organization and assemblage is also gone, the right of coalition is gone, all rights that we need are gone. When once our enemies have taken away universal suffrage they would be the greatest fools if they left us any other political rights, however small they might be. (Very true.) A battle will be begun to rob us of all our rights, in which we are certain to be defeated! It is self evident that in our unions, in our meetings, in the press, we would continue to fight to arouse the masses and thereby make our opponents uncomfortable. Once they have taken away the principal right, then they must take away the other rights. (That's right.) One depends upon the other. Do you think that a ruling class, who had taken away all rights of the working class would permit a strike of the working class for the purpose of overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie? How such thoughts, such confusion, such contradictions could get together in the head of an intelligent man, and that one of the clearest and most capable men that I know, is something that is impossible for me to comprehend. In Berlin Friedeberg spoke—it must be read in order to be believed—of a fifth estate. (Shout, "I never said it.") That is certainly of such colossal foolishness that it is almost impossible of belief. He said that, it is questionable if the party still stood upon the base of the class struggle. Marx and Engels had through their dogmatic teachings deadened the whole movement. When I read that I asked myself whether Friedeberg had forgotten the whole literature of the socialist party, and whether he had read the "Communist Manifesto." At the head of the Communist Manifesto is the sentence: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." That was the discovery of Marx and Engels, the discovery that signified a complete transformation of all historical cosmology. In another place in the Manifesto we read: "Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie is distinguished by the fact that the class antagonisms have been simplified and that the whole society becomes divided into two great hostile camps, into two great classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat." It goes on to show how the class state arose: "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." Then comes the proof of how the bourgeois continually creates greater and greater numbers of the proletariat and compels them to organize as a separate class, but, "This organization of the proletarians into a class and con-

sequently into a political party is continually being upset again by the competition among the workers themselves."

In short, it is only necessary to read the "Communist Manifesto!" It staggers one's intelligence to hear it said that we are not standing on the base of the class struggle. (Very true.) Even our platform, which still holds good and whose sentences in this connection have never been attacked definitely expresses our character as a class party. (The speaker then read from the Erfurter Platform, concluding with the words: "The battle of the laboring class against capitalist exploitation is necessarily a political battle. The working class cannot continue their economic battle and develop their economic organizations without political rights. They cannot bring about the transition of the means of production into the possession of society without coming into possession of the political power. To transform this battle of the working class into a conscious and united movement, and to point out its natural and necessary goal, is the task of the Social Democratic party.") How any one in view of this expression in the fundamental writing of our leaders, and in view of our platform, and in view of a whole list of statements, writings, and periodical articles, can still tell the masses that the party has ever forsaken the base of the class struggle—that is impossible to understand. Friedeberg referred to Liebknecht; but we must know that in the later editions of his writings concerning the political conditions of the Social Democracy that Liebknecht declared in plain words that the views therein contained were applicable only to the north German union. He had changed his position since the foundation of the German Empire. The question might be raised as to whether that was proper and logical, but after Liebknecht had in this plain manner rejected his old views and published the writings only as a document from an earlier period it is in the highest degree unjust, not to say disloyal, to claim to be supported by the authority of our old comrade, and go before the workers and say: "See, Liebknecht agrees with me." (Loud applause.) This whole method of fighting is absolutely monstrous. It is still more incomprehensible to me that in the principal city of the German Empire, the city of intelligence, three thousand workers, among them old comrades, could accept with shouts of applause such a hash of bald contradictions. (Very true.) If I were ever tempted to swear that we had lost our brains and that our political culture was disappearing it was on the day that I read that. (That's true.) But everything has its explanations. I am an old boy who has lived through forty years of party life and I know a few things. We had a similar experience under the laws of exception when a row broke out in a certain place and

one or another of the comrades failed to agree. In Berlin we had the localists who were mad because we made no progress. They could naturally not overthrow the Centralists, and so they were angry at the unions, angry at the party officials who should have taken them across their knees and spanked them. So long as old Kessler lived, who in spite of all his failings was still a strong Social Democrat, he was able to hold them within bounds. But old Kessler is dead, leadership has disappeared, and now Friedeberg comes and raises an opposition against the party and the unions, and at once the cry is raised, "Friedeberg is our man!" (Great laughter.)

So much for the psychology. But to be sure there are comrades who said, "Hold on, that smells too much like anarchism; they sit down together and talk very wisely and give you resolutions with interpretations, which it is self evident that no one else in the world can read out of it, but the condition may possibly develop further." I have often stated that the subject had no great significance. We have had plenty of such instances. We had an outbreak of anarchy once in St. Gallen, then came the *Volkstribune* with its battle against the Reichstag members. Then the *Jungen* were born (laughter) and Robert Schmidt became so famous in speaking about them that now he seems to have joined them himself (great laughter). He is once more back in the sheep-fold. I mean that only in the biblical sense, since in Heaven there is more rejoicing over one repentant sinner than one hundred righteous ones. (Continued laughter).

The movement of the *Jungen* soon broke up, and I believe that anarcho-socialism will do the same thing.

My further reply to Friedeberg will be postponed, and I will only make a few remarks concerning the 99 per cent. of the questions discussed in the Reichstag that are of no interest to the workers! So the freedom of union and assemblage, class justice, education, punishment, condition of the prisons, taxation, navy and military questions, colonial policy, tariff and commercial policy, abuses against the workers, world politics, labor legislation, workingmen's insurance, freedom of industry, freedom of migration, right of co-operation, public health, in view of all these questions and many others comrades still comment, "Humph! 99 per cent of all the questions discussed in the Reichstag have no interest to the proletariat."

Certainly when such things can be said and be applauded by our comrades then it is time that we went to our posts and question whether we were not in some way to blame. (That's right). During the last few years we have discussed all possible things theoretically, and the final result has not been a clearing up but ever greater confusion. (Loud applause). Seeds have

grown up in this ground that we must now pull out. Such a complete confusion concerning fundamental principles has never existed in the party as it exists today. If this was only true of comrades who had just come into the party, then I would not wonder. But it is partly old comrades who have taken to this way of thinking, and so contribute to the corruption which has arisen in regard to the fundamental principles of the party. It necessarily follows that it is our task from now on to work more energetically than ever before to educate the comrades. I was criticised yesterday for my position with regard to neutrality and I hope that Robert Schmidt will give different references to the places to which I refer in my pamphlet. I have never stood for a neutrality of the trades union in political questions, but only said that a union should not be considered as an appendage to the political party, because it is necessary that they should include all laborers and not make adherence depend upon political belief. The trades union papers and speakers all have the same duty to continually repeat to their members: "You are laborers and as such, citizens, and as citizens you are interested in all great questions of state and of legislation."

When such an educational work is carried on among the workers then I will guarantee to edit a trades union paper a whole year without using the word "Social Democracy," and yet the readers will become socialists. (Loud applause and laughter). That is one of the riddles and that is a form of agitation that must be carried on. When along with this the party press devotes itself much more than previously to party organizations, when most of all the work of organization is undertaken in the sense of my resolution, then it will be no great task to double the membership of our unions in the course of a year, until the union shall rise to at least 25 per cent and the readers of our organs to 50 or 100 per cent of the workers. Thereby we will obtain a mass of means for the education of the party-members, and a preparation for the magnificent battles that are to come, such as we had never dared to dream of.

In this sense I ask you to vote for the resolution; in this sense we shall battle until the victory is ours fully and completely. (Stormy and long continued applause).

Translated by A. M. Simons.

AUGUST BEBEL.

The resolution, in support of which Bebel made his speech, printed herewith, and which was adopted by a vote of 288 to 14, reads as follows:

"Because of the efforts of the ruling classes and powers to deprive the working class of a legitimate influence on the public order and the things of common concern, or to rob them of this in so far as it is obtained through representatives in parliamentary representative bodies and thereby to deprive the working class of all political and economic rights, the congress feels itself called upon to declare that it is the im-

perative duty of the whole working class to resist all attacks upon their manhood and their rights of citizenship with all the powers at their disposal and to continuously demand complete equality of rights.

"Experience has especially taught us that the ruling parties, including even the extreme bourgeoisie left, are opponents of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage and that they attack the same or seek to abolish it or to restrict even the existing backward forms whenever their domination is threatened.

"As a consequence we note their opposition to any extension of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage in the separate states (Prussia, etc.) and even a reduction of the existing outgrown electoral law from fear of even the very small influence of the working class in parliamentary representative bodies.

"Examples of this are to be found in the robbery of the suffrage by a dominating and cowardly bourgeoisie and an ignorant little capitalist class in Saxony and in the so-called Republic of Hamburg and Lübek, and the attacks upon the municipal suffrage in the various German states of Baden and Saxony, and in such places as Kiel, Dresden, Furth, Chemnitz, etc., by the representatives of the various bourgeois parties.

"In consideration of the fact that universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage is the special pre-requisite to a normal political evolution of society, just as the freedom of coalition is the essential of the economic elevation of the working class:

"And in further consideration that the working class, through their ever increasing numbers and intelligence and their labor for the economic and social life of the whole people, as well as by the material and physical sacrifice which they bear for the military defenses of the country, constitute the principal factor in modern society, they must demand not only the maintenance, but also the extension of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage for all representative bodies in the sense of the Social Democratic platform, and the guarantee of complete freedom of coalition.

"Therefore the Congress declares that it is especially the duty of the whole working class in case of any attack upon universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage, or the right of coalition, to utilize every apparently valuable means in defense.

"As one of the effective methods of fighting in averting any such political outrage upon the working class, or in order to conquer such an essential basis for its liberation the party considers under certain conditions the comprehensive utilization of the stoppage of work by the masses.

"The application of this method of battle is only possible with a great extension of the political and economic organization of the working class, and the continuous education of the masses by the labor press and the oral and written agitations.

"This agitation must set forth the importance and necessity of the political rights of working class and especially the right of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage and the unrestricted right of coalition, with regard to the class character of the state and society and the daily misuse which the ruling classes and powers perpetrate upon the working class by means of their exclusive possession of political power.

"Every party member is in duty bound whenever an economic organization of his trade is in existence or can be formed to enter into it and to support the aims and purposes of the unions. But every class-conscious member of a union has also the duty of uniting with the political organization of his class—the Social Democracy—and to work for the extension of the Social Democratic Press.

"The conference urges the Central Committee of the party to prepare a pamphlet founded upon the above resolution and its demands and to arrange for its distribution throughout the whole German working class."

The Historical Development of the American Proletarian.

THE POLITICAL POSITION OF THE WORKER.

I N the following section I shall attempt to explain the peculiar conditions under which the American Proletariat lives and which give rise to the fact that there is "no socialism in the United States."

In the first place, however, I must mention some considerations which one ordinarily meets in the discussion of these facts. For instance, the opinion is often expressed that the absence of socialism in America is not because of any peculiarity in American life but is rather explained by the peculiar attitude of the Anglo-Saxon race, from which the American proletariat is descended. From its very nature, however this idea is impossible of consideration by those who proceed from the socialist standpoint. This reasoning is two-fold false: In the first place the "Anglo-Saxon" race is by no means naturally unreceptive of socialist ideas, as is shown by the strongly socialistically colored chartist movement of England of the thirties and forties, the development of the Australian colonies, and even of the mother country in recent years. In the second place the North American proletariat is by no means exclusively nor even mainly composed of members of the Anglo-Saxon race.

* * *

There are millions of people in America who have immigrated during the last generation in whom socialism has been bred in the blood. The Germans alone, together with descendants of German parents, amounted to 3,295,350 in 1900, of whom 1,142,131 were engaged in industry, mostly as wage workers. Why are not these millions socialists, even if we are willing to accept that the Anglo-Saxon is immune against the socialist bacilli?

II.

In modern states as the public life becomes more and more complicated and the democratization of institutions becomes more extensive it is ever more difficult to present political ideas apart from party organizations. For no other community does this hold so closely as for the United States. It is as yet the only great nation in which actual democratic institutions find a still further complication by their relation to a federal organization.

In this great nation, twenty times as large as the German Empire, actual democratic institutions prevail, as the following shows: universal suffrage exists as a rule in every state in the union (present restrictions are unimportant); by this, universal suffrage is chosen, however, not as in the European states (with the exception of Switzerland) only a law-making body, but also—and this is the main point—nearly all the higher administrative officers and judges. Most important of all, the higher officials of the states—the governors—are elected for terms of from two to four years.

* * *

Taken in connection with the numerous city and county elections the electors of some cities in such a state as Ohio are required to choose twenty-two different officials on an average each year.

* * *

These demands on the capacity for action of the ordinary citizen need only to be stated to make evident the impossibility of their fulfilment. Consider, for instance, that a considerable number of the elections take place simultaneously over a large territory—the majority of the American states are larger than Bavaria, Baden, and Wurttemberg together, some exceed the extent of the Prussian kingdom and indeed the whole German Empire—remember also that if there is not to be complete confusion there must be some sort of an understanding between the citizens of a city, a county or a state (and in presidential elections of the whole union) concerning the candidates who are nominated, and that votes must be gathered for the candidates. When these things are considered it does not need an argument to show that it is impossible to leave these things to the voters directly, and that as a result there must be many people who make it their life business to occupy themselves continuously with the problems of election, either in selecting the proper candidates, in arranging the various tickets, or in securing the election of the nominated candidates.

In the beginning, while the number of voters, as well as the number of officials was still small (up until about the year 1824) the American democracy directed the mass of the voters through the legislative bodies. These formed committees of their members, such, for example, as the legislative caucus of congress, who nominated the candidates to be elected by the people.

When at the beginning of the third decade of the 19th century the flood of democracy came, these functions (the guidance of the mass of voters) were “democratized,” that is, they were handed down to be operated from beneath. There were in the

beginning a few demagogues in the rapidly growing city of New York, with its many colored diverse population, who began to grasp the election machinery. Aaron Burr was one of the best known of these who with the help of a swarm of followers organized a notorious guild of professional politicians, in whose hands the "business of politics" in the United States has remained since that time, and whose domination over the mass became the firmer as the election machinery became more complicated and the decent portion of the population withdrew itself more and more from participation in politics.

* * *

If these gigantic machines are to operate effectively they must have a great organized body of skilled professional politicians at work. There must be a staff of trained workers in every district at the disposal of the professional wire pullers, who in turn are kept in order by the heads of the machine, and just as the mass of men grows, so must the financial resources which makes possible the perfect operation of machinery. . . . This has now reached a point where in the last presidential election the total campaign expenses of each party were estimated to be over five millions of dollars. These are the tasks that a party must accomplish which wishes to fight for its "ideas" in America. It must be evident to any one what difficulties such a situation constitutes to the foundation and building up of a labor party such as the Social Democratic. This would be true even if we were dealing with the beginning of the political life. But the fact is that the political machines have for years been in the hands of shrewd leaders. This doubles the difficulties before a new party, in that it has to enter into the battle against old parties who are already in possession. Some of the especial obstacles to the development of an independent socialist party organization which arise from this condition deserve closer consideration.

III.

From the very beginning of the Republic two great parties of almost equal strength have, with occasional change of names, dominated the public life of the United States. I wish to deal first with the reasons which have given rise to the monopolistic position of these two ruling parties and also the sources of their drawing power.

In the very beginning it is necessary to consider the sources of the financial means by which these gigantic political machines are kept in operation. The money with which the parties in America work springs from three different sources.

1. Free will contributions of rich party members and general public subscriptions as is the case with us in Germany.

There is this difference that in America capital, because it sees direct results ahead of it, is much more inclined to give great sums to the support of the party, of which in turn they are able to make great demands. From the very nature of party organization in the United States, sometimes one and sometimes the other of the great parties receive support from one and the same capitalist power. The great trusts finance first of all the general party organization, but the Standard Oil Company and similar great corporations will give money in New York to the Democratic Party, in Pennsylvania to the Republican,—always to the one which happens to be dominant, or which has the best prospect of immediate victory.

2. The assessment of party officials supplies the party organization with a great source of financial income.

3. The taxation of the candidates for the various offices often brings in rich returns. It is the custom for every one who seeks a nomination to make a "contribution" to the party. This contribution is generally of considerable size. It ordinarily amounts to at least a full year's salary, and more in the case of many offices. Indeed in many cases it is higher than the whole regular income which the official receives during his term of office.....

The election purposes for which this money is used are, in the first place, for the pure and simple purchase of votes. A large portion of the negro vote, as well as that of many uneducated immigrants and of the slum proletariat of the great cities is notoriously purchasable and is notoriously purchased. The great mass of the electorate of the poorest portion of the population is naturally not to be secured in such an easy fashion, but throughout broad strata of the poorer population the party leaders know very well how to gain favor by the distribution of gifts to the needy in time of necessity and trouble. Here a dollar is lent, there a railroad pass secured, another receives fuel on some cold morning or a turkey on Christmas day; medicine is bought for the sick, or a coffin secured for the dead. Along with all this goes generous distribution of liquor in the saloons, where perhaps the most important portion of the whole political activity is carried on..... Or the case is approached from the other side: the party holds the threat of punishment over an obstinate voter and thereby brings him back, or at least frightens others. It has him discharged if he is in any way connected with the municipal government, or if he is an employer the factory inspector gets after him. The assessor looks much closer at the books to see that full taxes are paid. The saloon keeper who has not kept the exact hours of the police regulations finds himself arrested, etc.

The foregoing considerations enable us to complete the circle in which party existence in America moves. Because the great parties have the money with which they can directly or indirectly buy votes, with which they can pay the great staff of workers and the whole apparatus of the political machine with which the electorate can be influenced, and because they utilize all methods to benefit their followers, and to injure their opponents, therefore they have this great throng of followers, therefore they possess the great attractive power, therefore they have the political monopoly whether this be domination or good prospect of gaining victory the next time. And *because* they occupy this position, because they are in possession of the *power*, therefore they have the means at their disposal to bless and to damn, therefore they are able to obtain the necessary financial contributions to keep the political machine in motion.

This circle, so fateful to all who stand outside of it, has still more significant appearances in other connections.

In the first place the dominant party has a tremendous advantage in the offices it is about to offer to its followers.

The significance of this close connection between political parties and distribution of offices can not be too highly estimated in considering the development of American party conditions. It deserves especial consideration when examining the conditions which make possible the development of a socialist movement. It is just this movement which suffers most under the dominant system. It is easy for a laborer to be a socialist when he knows that even though he be in a governmental position he can still express his social democratic inclinations without any great probability of losing his position.

In America the condition is wholly different: here the way to the higher offices leads always beneath the yoke of party adherence and all who desire a position in the state or municipal services must support the party, not simply on election day, but for a long time previous, as an active party worker. This places a hard test on "loyalty" which the majority cannot meet. This is especially true with the labor leaders of the great trades unions since a still richer reward beckons to them if they will but swear allegiance to the dominant parties. They may receive anything from a well paid office of factory inspector up to secretary of state, according to the influence that they have been able to wield. It is a well recognized fact that the ruling parties have for years had great success in rendering influential labor leaders "harmless" through the bestowal of political positions. It would be easy to give a long list of instances of this emasculating process. At the present moment it is stated that the President of the American Federation of Labor (a man occupying the same

position as Legien in Germany) is to be the successor of Carrol D. Wright as director of the department of Commerce and Labor, while John Mitchell the leader of the miners, has been offered a position in the administration at Washington.

It has been asserted that within the last few years that thirteen such leaders in Massachusetts and thirty in Chicago have been placed in official positions.

It is not so easy to be a socialist and to demand "the overthrow of the existing social order," when the picture of such a fat plum is continuously hung before the eyes. Few therefore have the independence to point out to their followers the hopelessness of the ruling policy and the necessity of a socialist movement in the evening, if during the afternoon a boss of one of the great parties has been offered the candidacy for a lucrative electoral position or a "fat share of the spoils" at the next electoral victory. When, however, the influential leaders are secured and their strength and influence among their comrades thereby lost to an independent labor movement, this does not mean simply a direct gain for the great parties so far as the personality of the leaders and the little circle of the laboring class in which they have been trusted but in a much more significant manner an indirect strengthening of the existing order in that this bait of office has caught the possible leaders of an oppositional independent labor party, which has thereby suffered a painful loss. In other words the great parties kidnap the officials who would assist in the formation of a socialist party organization.

But it is not alone personal motives which hold the great mass to the old parties. Along with these there are certain ideal motives which must be considered.

In the first place there is the universal political interest in the form of the public life which in America often leads the individual to unite to the "great party" just *because* it is the "great party." That is, just because he can expect assistance from it for some pet reform of his by which he hopes to abolish some oppressive condition. In order to understand this it is necessary to explain the fundamental difference which exists between the institutions of European states (always with the exception of Switzerland) and those of the North American Union. In European nations the course of political life can best be influenced through the long roundabout way of parliamentary machinery. Representatives are elected to parliament with the hope that they will sometime become a majority who can overturn a government, certainly a very slow and by no means radical proceeding.

While this transformation process is being fulfilled, beautiful speeches are made in parliament, in order to give expression

to the principles of the party, and these beautiful speeches have a significance almost in direct inverse ratio to their actual influence upon the governmental machinery. So it has come about that the German Reichstag, whose conclusions are almost irrelevant, so far as the general course of public life in Germany is concerned, has become the most favored spot for minority parties in the world.

While this transformation process is being fulfilled, beautiful speeches are made in parliament, in order to give expression to the principles of the party, and these beautiful speeches have parties with fine orators. Everyone knows that what Stadthagen says might just as well be left unsaid so far as having the slightest effect upon any important political measure, but the Social Democratic voter rejoices when he reads these blood thrilling speeches in his leaflets and says with a satisfied smile, "Didn't he give it to them though." It is just this lack of "political sense," that is, of the sense of direct influence and conquest of power, which leads to this form of expression. If we wish to express it politely we call it "idealism" and naturally it is most highly developed in the land of "*Dichter und Denker*." Because of this we are born minority politicians.

Exactly the opposite conditions prevail in the United States. Here the purely democratic institutions are close to the masses, and they make possible direct results. Because not only the representatives in parliament, but even judges and administrative officials are chosen by popular election, interest has been transferred from the legislative body to the administrative office. For reasons already considered, the legislative bodies, especially the House of Representatives, play largely insignificant roles in comparison with the parliaments of West European nations including even such an unimportant one as the German Reichstag. Accordingly there is great interest in the administrative elections. This is just because much quicker results can be secured. To remove a disliked governor or judge is much more satisfactory to the Americans, in proportion to the trouble necessary, than the sending of a fine speaker to Washington. As a matter of fact it does have greater immediate effect and it would have in Germany. Consider for example what would have been the result if the laborers of Berlin, during the time of the "laws of exception" could have turned Tessedorf out of his official position.

* * *

The American laborer can do these things, to be sure at a price that may well seem too high, since he must give his adherence to the great parties just because they are great. For

it is only with their assistance that such a successful influence can be exercised upon the electoral result.

A striking example of what could be done in such a case was offered by the events of the last elections in the state of Colorado. In the election of 1902 the socialist candidate received a very respectable vote. Then came the great strike of 1903 which took on almost the form of a civil war. . . . According to German ideas it would seem certain that the socialist vote would have received an enormous increase. But what was the actual result? The socialist candidate in 1904 only received half the vote of two years before. The explanation of this result is very simple when we remember the political conditions in the United States. The previous socialist vote had gone over into the camp of the democratic party in order to assist it in its fight against the hated Gov. Peabody. And behold, it was not without success. The Republican governor was not re-elected, but was supplanted by a democrat. Even if the actual conditions are not changed under the government of the new man, still the sentiment of revenge is satisfied and the hated enemy has received a blow. And this always does one good. At least more than a song of Ludwig Thoma.

Along with these rational practical considerations there go many indifferent sentiments, which unite the American to the great parties.

In my introductory chapter I have referred to the high degree in which the sense of measurable statistical greatness is developed in the American, and especially to the over-valuation of "success." Now such an attitude predestinates "majority" politics. It is an unbearable feeling for an American to belong to a party that always and forever comes out of the election with small figures, and which can apparently attain no visible success within an immediate period, and which because of this is subject to the stigma of ridicule. A member of a minority party finds himself on election day, when the ecstasy of the statistical success of the great party reaches its highest point, when all the newspapers are displaying the electoral success of their candidates in giant letters, when the figures of the presidential election are thrown upon gigantic transparencies, compelled to stand at one side with martyr-like resignation,—something which in no way accords with the American temperament.

Furthermore this sense of measurable greatness in connection with the radically democratic foundation of their institutions has created among Americans a blind worship of majorities. These must be on the right road he reasons, otherwise they would not be in a majority. How can the great mass of people be wrong? It is this that Bryce has characterized with the striking

expression, "the fatalism of the multitude." Along with this respect for great numbers of voters as such, there goes the inclination of the American to desire to work in common with many others, a characteristic which has already been designated as their gregariousness. This characteristic, which leads to the formation of all parties, whether large or small, works especially to the advantage of the great parties, because it gives rise to a strong feeling of faithfulness and loyalty to the chosen herd. This expresses itself in a fanatical party loyalism. In order to fully realize this blind enthusiasm for party membership it is necessary to attend some "great" mass meeting. Ostrogorski has expressed this as follows: "Like an ancient Greek, who found in the most distant colonies his national deities, and the fire from the sacred hearth of his *Polis*, the American finds in his nomadic existence everywhere, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Maine to Florida, a Republican organization or a Democratic organization, which recalls him to himself, gives him a countenance and makes him repeat with pride the cry of the New York politician, "I am a Democrat," or "I am a Republican."

So it is that many motives both of a materialistic and idealistic nature work together for the same result,—to maintain the size and power of the great parties and thereby to secure their political monopoly: they have this monopoly because they are the "great" parties, and they are the great parties, because they have this monopoly.

(To be Continued.)

WERNER SOMBART,

Translated by A. M. Simons.

in Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft.

The Labor Theory of Value in the Light of Recent Criticism.

I N the introductory article of this series, in speaking of the criticism and the critics of the Materialistic conception of history, we have observed that the discussion of the subject was very much obscured by certain prejudices existing against the theory, which prevented any unbiased examination of the subject on its merits. This must be repeated and even emphasized with reference to the criticism of Marx's theory of value and surplus value. It is safe to say that at least one-half of the adverse criticism of this theory contained in the literature of the subject is due to prejudice which obscures the vision of the critics and puts their thinking apparatus out of joint. This prejudice is not confined to any particular category of critics. It affects the dignified scholar and the fighting publicist alike. The great Böhm-Bawerck, head and front of the "scientific" Austrian school of political economy, and the prating "popular" Professor Masaryk are both fair specimens of it. In his great work on capital and interest, where more than one hundred pages are devoted to the criticism of this theory, Böhm-Bawerck starts out his examination of the theory by characterizing it as the theory of exploitation, and the whole trend of his argument is directed towards one objective point:— to prove that the supposedly main thesis of this theory, that the income of the capitalists is the result of exploitation, is untrue; that in reality the working-man is getting all that is due to him under the present system. And the whole of his argument is colored by this conception of the discussion as a controversy relative to the ethical merits or demerits of the capitalist system. The same is true of Masaryk. In his bulky book on Marxism the examination of the problem of value and surplus value starts out with the following introductory remarks:

"Sociologically the conception of surplus-value stands foremost. Surplus-value is the economic expression of the social conception of the classes and their mutual relations,—of their struggle. The expression Surplus-value is intended to characterize and *condemn* the whole capitalistic order and civilization. It is obvious: *Das Kapital* is not a positive theory of economy, but, as is indicated by the sub-title, a critique of the science of economics to the present time. *Das Kapital* presents the theory of capitalistic exploitation. It is a text-book of capitalistic ex-

tortion, and at the same time its vehement denunciation. *Das Kapital* is therefore at the same time the theory of the Socialist revolution,—yes, it is the revolution itself.

“As already stated, we will concentrate our criticism on the conception of value and surplus-value. We will investigate whether or not, labor, the labor of the proletarians, is the only source of economic value and surplus-value. Such an investigation squarely presents the question whether or not the social order of civilization really means the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalist class—the criticism of Capital will resolve itself into a further investigation of the doctrine of the Class Struggle.”

We therefore advisedly stated in the last article that in employing the adjectives “necessary” and “surplus” in connection with labor or value, it is not intended to convey any meaning of praise or justification in the case of the one, nor of condemnation or derogation in the case of the other. As a matter of fact, Marx repeatedly stated that the capitalist was paying to the workingman all that was due him when he paid him the fair market value of his labor-power. In describing the process of capitalist production Marx used the words, “necessary” and “surplus” in characterizing the amounts of labor which are necessarily employed in reproducing what Society already possesses and that employed in producing new commodities or values. He intended to merely state the facts as he saw them, and not to hold a brief for anybody. If his theory of value and surplus value and his condemnation of the capitalist system stood in any causal relation, (and the determination of this question we will leave for the future) his theory of value and surplus value was the cause, and his condemnation of the capitalist system the effect, rather than the reverse. The statements of many of his critics, that Marx was influenced in his examination of the question of value and surplus value by a pre-determined thesis in favor of which he intended to hold a brief, is absolutely false, and the writings of these very critics contain abundant proof of this assertion. At some future time we will discuss the so-called ethical theory of the Socialist movement which is so much in vogue among many of the latter-day Marx critics, and it will then appear beyond the possibility of a doubt that it was only his intense craving for the absolute and unalloyed truth that guided Marx in his examination of the subject which led him to the formulation of his theory of value and surplus value.

We saw in preceding articles what the problem which confronted Marx at the outset of his examination, and which required solution at his hands is,—Is his solution a true one? That is, or at least should be, the only question before us. Is Marx's theory of value and surplus value viewed without any

bias or prejudice correct? It is very much to be regretted that we cannot, for the lack of space, preface our examination of the Marxist theory of value and surplus value with an examination of the other theories of this subject. Such an examination and a juxtaposition of the different theories would be an invaluable aid in the arriving at a true answer to the question before us, and it is the fond hope of the present writer that he will at some future day be able to do this work, so that the relative position of the Marxian theory may be fully appreciated. In this present discussion, however, we will have to be guided by, so-to-speak, absolute standards rather than relative ones, and other theories of value will only be gone into in so far as is absolutely necessary to the discussion of the main criticism leveled against the Marxian theory. This particularly applies to the so-called "modern" theory of value familiarly known as the Austrian, although by origin and popularity England has as much claim upon it as Austria. This "honorable mention" of the Austrian theory of value is due not so much to its own originality or importance, as to the fact that it seems to be the prevailing one among the latter-day Marx critics, Böhm-Bawerck himself taking the lead in the particular field of inquiry now under discussion.

While, as we have already stated in the introductory article, each tub of anti-Marxian criticism lays claim and is entitled to stand on its own bottom, in the discussion of the Marxian theory of value and surplus value, we will, to a great extent, have to limit ourselves to the arguments advanced by Böhm-Bawerck. The reason for it is two-fold: first, because Böhm-Bawerck is so far superior to his comrades in arms, and his authority on the subject is acknowledged by them to such an extent, that it can hardly be claimed to be unfair to these critics, to pick Böhm-Bawerck as an example of them all. Second, because there seems to be quite a good deal of unanimity among these critics on this particular point, and the arguments advanced by the others are either directly borrowed from Böhm-Bawerck, very often with an acknowledgment of receipt, or are variations on the same tune deserving no particular attention. Where the variation is sufficiently distinct to make a difference, it will be duly noted, as will, certainly, all those arguments which have any claim to an independent source.

Böhm-Bawerck starts out by stating that all the predecessors of Marx who have adhered either in whole or in part to the labor theory of value, including such great lights of the science as Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Rodbertus, have really "assumed" the labor theory of value without even as much as attempting to prove it. It was pure assertion on their part, without the semblance of an argument to support it. Karl Marx

was the first one who not merely asserted the labor theory of value, but also attempted to prove it. In this Böhm-Bawerck recognizes Marx's superiority to the great luminaries of the science of political economy who have preceded him on this subject. But he does not like the way Marx did it and is not convinced by the proof offered by Marx in support of his theory. Böhm-Bawerck, like the good professor that he is, instructs us as to how Marx should have gone about the job of proving his theory of value and puts his emphatic disapproval on the way Marx is supposed to have actually gone about it. He says that there were two ways open to Marx: first, to analyze the "psychological motives," to which the process of exchange is due; or, second, to examine the actual "experiences" of the relations of exchange. Instead of adopting either of these two courses, he says, Marx adopted a third rather peculiar one for the subject of this inquiry, namely, that of purely logical deduction and dialectic argumentation.

That Marx did not go about the task of discovering the true laws of exchange-value by way of an analysis of the "psychological motives" of exchange is perfectly true. And we have already seen in the preceding article the reason for it. The problem by its very nature showed that its solution lay in some social phenomenon and not in any attribute of the individuals entering into the relation of exchange. The "psychological motives," therefore, of exchange, could not possibly have anything to do with the problems that confronted Marx. Aside from that, it was very evident that "psychological," as well as other "natural" motives or causes which remain unchanged throughout the history of mankind, could not be the cause, nor offer any explanation, of the phenomena of capitalist production and distribution which are not common to all human society, but are strictly limited in time as well as in place to only a small portion thereof. It is the same thing that we have already observed in discussing the Materialistic Conception of History:—a constant factor cannot possibly be the cause of a change in the result of an operation.

It is not true, however, that Marx did not adopt the course of examining the actual experiences of exchange relation. Nor is it true that the course he did adopt was that of purely logical deduction. Marx did go about by making a thorough examination of the actual happenings and "experiences" of the exchange relation as Böhm-Bawerck would have him do, although this job did not prove so very "simple" as Böhm-Bawerck imagined it would. In order, however, that he might learn something that was worth while from the actual "experiences" of the exchange relation, he had to put these "relations" to a very careful analysis.

In doing that he was certainly guilty of using some very sharp and pure logical reasoning. In this he could not help himself, as he was "naturally" so constituted that to whatever task he applied himself, he could not help but use his logic. And that was of the very purest sort. There were, however, no purely logical constructions or abstractions used by him in order to prove his theory of value or surplus value. Those abstractions which he did make, and they will be duly noted, one by one, in the course of these articles, were not only justified, but required and demanded by the subject matter itself. But he did not start out with any purely logical notions or abstractions, nor did he proceed to any purely logical constructions. On the contrary, he kept to his base all the time, and that was the solid ground of the facts of capitalistic production and exchange. It is very significant that in the whole volume of Marx's economic writings there is no mention of the "economic man" or of his supposed attributes, "psychological" or otherwise. Nor is any kind of an abstract man part of his discussion. Throughout his entire work he keeps strictly to his problem, and that is the doings of the real, live man in the real historic situation known as the capitalistic system. In this connection it is more than a mere curiosity to compare the opening passage of Capital with the opening passages in the works of some of his illustrious predecessors and contemporaries.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Owing to the space required for Bebel's speech much of the current installment of Comrade Boudin's article has been crowded out, but will appear next month. — Ed.

EDITORIAL

Conditions in Germany and America.

The speech of August Bebel at the Jena Congress, published elsewhere in this issue, is a sign of a new epoch upon which we are just entering. The conditions which he there describes, although so apparently local in names and geographical position, yet are really international in their character. The fundamental facts there set forth are that we are in the midst of a general re-action, that the great bourgeois liberal movement has reached its limit, and that as a consequence new tasks and new duties devolve upon the socialist movement, which in turn demand new tactics and new methods of fighting. Upon the Socialist party from now on must rest the burden of social progress. Capitalism seems to have reached its limit, to have perfected society as far as its social mission will permit. As a consequence it is now caught in the back-wash of re-action.

All over the world comes the same story of a stoppage in all reformatory liberalizing movements. We venture to suggest the following as a possible explanation of this, in accordance with the doctrines of the class struggle. As long as any ruling class feels perfectly secure in its position *as a ruler* it can still afford to grant concessions in order to prevent the rise of any effective opposition, but as soon as its actual domination is threatened, and then its existence as a class, it looks upon every position which it occupies as of probable value in its coming conflict for life,—consequently it is not disposed to yield even the apparently most unimportant outpost. So long as the socialist movement was still too weak to constitute an effective threat its every increase only caused the capitalists to look with greater favor upon reforms which might be expected to stay its progress. But when that socialist movement has reached a strength where a struggle for existence is imminent then the ruling class is no longer disposed to yield even the slightest concessions..

The facts bear out the theory. In America, as in Europe, the last three years have been marked by a more stubborn resistance on the part of the plutocratic rulers of society. It has become a common-place to say that the trades unions have failed to accomplish anything during the last three years. Almost every strike has been a failure and this in the face of the fact that during these years we have been in the midst of

what is probably the greatest "prosperity" that capitalism has ever known. It has been a time of rising prices, of expanding industries,—an upward swing of the industrial pendulum. Every other such period in our history has been marked by a rapid growth of labor organizations and by continuous concessions wrung by them from the capitalists, who were willing to grant these slight concessions rather than suffer a complete destruction of the enormous profits which such a period brings to an exploiting class. In the period which has just passed, however, the reverse has been true, even governmental statistics concede the fact that a period of rising prices has been accompanied by a stationary, if not a receding wage rate. Everywhere employers' associations, citizens' alliances, and similar organizations of the exploiting classes have grown stronger in numbers, more defiant in resistance, more aggressive in attack.

Such a condition, presenting new problems, demands new weapons on the part of the working class. Realizing the fact that we are now about to enter upon the beginning of the end it behooves us to become more constructive in our propositions, more thorough in our education, more perfect in our organization, more active in our agitation. These, however, are commonplaces, which, however, lose nothing of emphatic necessity by reason of their familiarity. But capitalism reaches ever backward into its armory to bring forth new weapons in support of the power of entrenched wealth. They have added new weapons, drawn from political institutions depending for their effectiveness upon the ignorance of the workers. To the black list and the lockout they add the injunction and the brutal force of military and police power.

Moreover this wave of reaction has extended also to the legislative chambers. A slight examination of the legislation of the last three years will show that the gains which have been made along lines usually looked upon as reformatory in their character, such as factory legislation, or the democratization of institutions, have been almost *nil* and certainly in no way comparable to the similar gains made in the same number of years a decade or so ago. Moreover there seems to be a tendency to destroy the power of governmental institutions in those departments which are most accessible to working class influence.

As yet, however, this movement has not proceeded to a point in the United States where it requires any immediate action but it is well to be warned in time and the working class of America should show its determination to prepare for the new problems which will be presented. It, too, must be ready to use every weapon at its disposal. In no way relaxing the emphasis to be laid upon political action, it must be prepared to strengthen its activity in other directions. I say in no way relaxing its political activity; on the contrary there is still every reason to believe that in the United States the political field must still be the one on which the great battles will be fought. The political organization is the only one which can embrace all workers. It is the only one which is in any way prepared to "take and hold" the titles to the means for the production and distribution of wealth. It is the only one which

in any way can represent all the producing classes and it is essential at this time that this fact be recognized and that the workers be not led away with anarchistic or demagogic denials of this position. At the same time as the most powerful auxiliary in the fight must stand the economic organization of the working class and it is easily possible that when the fight reaches a climax the decisive blow may be struck with this weapon. Above all it is essential that the two weapons should be wielded with the same object in view. If, as is too often the case at the present time, the economic organization is paralyzed either by ignorance or treachery, then it is easily possible that the political fight may be so hampered in the battle as to be incapable of gaining a victory.

In Germany this situation has convinced practically the entire German Social Democracy of the necessity of utilizing the great organizations of labor as a means of battle. We shall need to do the same before long. To do this demands two things; first the organization of the working class along industrial lines permitting immediate and wide spread, united action; and second, close co-operation between the political and economic movement in order that the two forces may work in harmony. This is the strongest argument in support of the Industrial Workers of the World and the one which is bound to give it increasing strength and power with every passing day. If however, this organization accepts the ridiculous anarcho-socialist position advocated by De Leon and Haggarty and which is so well satirized in Bebel's great speech, then it will soon degenerate into a mere caricature of a labor movement.

However, we can assure our readers that there is no danger of such a thing taking place. The Industrial Workers is growing and developing among genuine working men far faster than among the mere praters of phrases and intriguing schemers. The power of the intelligent constructive portion is already so great that it is only a question of a short time when the element which now retards its progress will be scraped off.

There are other lessons regarding party organization and activity to be drawn from this same situation, but these we reserve for a later time.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

NORWAY.

The Norwegian socialists continue to carry on an active campaign for a Republic. They are demanding that the form of government be submitted to a referendum. The capitalist parties very naturally are opposing this, but the popular demand is so great that it is quite probable that they will have to yield. A provision to this effect has already been introduced into the Storting and large meetings are being held throughout the country to arouse enthusiasm.

SWEDEN.

It is impossible to give exact figures concerning the recent parliamentary elections, because of the fact that in several cases alliances were made with other parties. Vorwaerts however, estimates that about 30,000 socialist votes were cast, 14 socialist candidates were elected; three years ago there were only 10,000 votes cast and 4 representatives elected.

HUNGARY.

The agitation for universal suffrage proceeds with ever increasing vigor. The Kossuth party, which was elected under a pledge to work for universal suffrage, has broken its pledge and joined the coalition of capitalist parties in fighting to the utmost the popularization of suffrage. As a result the class lines have become much sharper than ever before. Popular uprising, strikes, mass meetings, and demonstrations have reached a point where the country is not far from open revolt.

RUSSIA.

Events are happening so fast in Russia that it is impossible to give any real news in competition with the daily papers. So far as the general situation is concerned the government of the Czar has practically disappeared, and has been followed by chaos, politically and socially. A careful examination of the situation makes it seem probable at least that events are proceeding somewhat as follows:

There will probably be a year or two of practically continuous revolution, much as is being carried on at the present time. This is only possible in a country, which, like Russia is really a great political jelly fish, with no particular head either to direct its rule or to be crushed. Some time in the midst of this chaos the autocracy will probably be formally abolished as it now is in reality. The next most coherent body in the empire is still the capitalist class and these, with some such men as

Witte at the head will be apt to form a capitalist "liberal" government. But at the same time the proletarian element is too strong to permit this stage to be in any way permanent and it is probable that revolution will succeed revolution until Western Europe is involved, probably through a revolt of Russian Poland, affecting the German portion of Poland. It is easily possible that Russia may prove the spark that will set off a proletarian revolution throughout the world.

Meanwhile the socialists of Russia are certainly showing a remarkable coherence and power of organization, considering the backward state of the country and there is at least a strong probability that somewhere in the midst of the resulting chaos a proletarian government may be established.

The above was written before the granting of a "constitution", and the assumption of power by Witte, but we let it stand as justified by these events and as a probable outline of future happenings.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

When this number of the REVIEW is being printed the American Federation of Labor is assembling in Pittsburg. While no advance information has been given out other than the proceedings of the quarterly sessions of the executive council, it is probable that the officers' reports will show that the Federation has held its own during the past year, although some of the fiercest struggles in organized labor's history have been waged. Certainly some of the affiliated bodies that were on the firing line have been hit hard, but others have enjoyed a slow steady growth that has offset the losses so that the membership remains pretty close to the two million mark. In at least one particular the Federation has made a marked gain, and that is in the greater solidarity that has become manifest among the rank and file, while the spread of knowledge upon economic and political questions has also added strength to the movement. It follows as a matter of course that some unions are bound to lose members, especially after an organization boom has spent its force, where the new converts remain ignorant of the principles, tactics or mission of the body they have joined, and where their sole ambition and expectation is to pay in fifty cents and receive a five-dollar raise in wages or a reduction of hours handed out on a silver platter. The time is past when such bonanzas are struck, and nowadays it requires mighty hard fighting and considerable sacrifice to gain concessions, to say nothing of holding fast to what has been gained. This fact is appreciated by the active men in the ranks—leaving the "leaders" entirely out of the calculation for the time being—and personal investigation will prove that there is a distinct improvement in the intellectual tone and the spirit of class-consciousness. One don't hear that old piece of stereotyped sophistry that "the interests of labor and capital are identical," or that "capital and labor are brothers," in the lodge rooms or in the labor press as often as formerly. Such expressions are now the exception rather than the rule. The members are gradually but surely obtaining a clearer conception of things as they are; they have learned by bitter experience, and are still in school, that capital is adamant when labor demands more of the wealth it produces, and consequently threatens to cut into dividends. And so it has come to pass that those among the membership who wandered in the wilderness and preached economic truths, and who were denounced and ridiculed until many gave up the struggle in despair, are now listened to gladly and in many industrial centres they are trusted and honored by their fellow-workmen. In other words, the trade union movement, in spite of opposition without and reaction within, is undergoing a perceptible change, and the evolution is all in the direction of socialism. That there will be internal wars between factions, disorganization and reorganization, and bitter contests with capital, in the future as in the past, goes without saying, but throughout it all the clarifying process will go on and the general enlightenment that is bound to follow will result in

the unions being found in the vanguard of the fight for labor's emancipation. This is not idle speculation, but views based upon careful study of the situation and everyday contact with actual conditions. Old ideas and methods and leaders are being superseded, and every progressive worker who hopes and struggles for a better day for his class can afford to regard the future with confidence and satisfaction, and his optimism will be well-founded. The intellectual proletariat is coming in a mighty army of conquest.

The overshadowing question in trade union circles at present is the threatened suspension of work in the anthracite and bituminous mining districts next spring. This cloud on the industrial horizon is growing in proportion as the weeks and months pass, and there is no longer any doubt that the struggle will come on schedule time. The officers and organizers of the miners are working feverishly, night and day, to thoroughly unionize the various districts and to strengthen every weak point. During the past few months President Mitchell has taken personal control of the field work and appealed to the men who have become careless and lukewarm in their unionism to flock to his standard and prepare to resist the encroachments of the combines of capital that are thirsting for greater profits, no matter how deep into poverty and misery they force their workers. On the other hand the coal barons, who now possess the power to raise and lower prices at will, are making their usual excuses that the market is overstocked with coal and prices are too low. Some of them even go so far as to insult the miners, as well as the intelligence of the rest of the people, by claiming that their employes are the only ones who are making money and ungratefully refuse to accept wage reductions, and thus are forcing a general stagnation in the industry. Therefore, the operators declare, they are compelled to make a cut of 25 per cent in wages or close their mines to save themselves from ruination. Meanwhile, however, the poor, unsophisticated mine owners, who are forced to live in mansions and clip coupons and make trips to Europe as a penalty for their extreme generosity, are piling up mountains of coal in anticipation of the shutdown, and, by arbitrarily raising prices because of the "scarcity" of coal, they will fairly revel in prosperity next year, while the dear people, who vote for private ownership of mines, dig deeper into their jeans if they would keep from freezing a year hence and while many a miner makes side jumps toward the poorhouse. So once again there is coming a great crisis in the class struggle, and while the suffering will be severe in some quarters it is likewise certain that the unbridled plutocracy, which appears to have become afflicted with a mania to "teach the people a lesson" ever so often, while on its periodical drunks, will only hasten its own downfall.

Whether or not the forcing of a great coal strike next year is part of a widespread conspiracy or an understanding among certain groups of capitalists to raid stocks, produce a financial panic, crush small competitors and then confiscate the securities they have managed to hang to just as drowning men clutch at straws, is not quite plain: but it is significant that the monarch of the financial world, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, who can smell an honest dollar at a greater distance than any captain of industry that ever stood in shoe leather, has confided to Col. W. H. Moore, of Chicago, president of the National Good Roads Association, the information "that America's greatest panic was coming in 1907 and 1908." Col. Moore is an enthusiastic agitator for improved highways, and would have the United States government engage in the paternalistic undertaking of employing thousands of men to provide good roads upon which "the

people" can speed their fast horses and faster automobiles, while at the same time his philanthropic soul yearns to create work for the working-man. The colonel differs from the famous Coxe in that the latter waited until the panic of 1893 was upon us, and then marched the wrong class of people to Washington to demand relief from Congress in the shape of good road building, and, as history records, Mr. Coxe was arrested for walking upon aristocratic grass and after being released hiked back to Ohio, ran for governor and dropped into political oblivion. Col. Moore has started to march upon Washington before the storm breaks, and his "commonweal" army will be composed of a class of men who will be greeted with the glad hand by the politicians. With the irrepressible Coxe appealed for non-interest-bearing bonds with which to make public improvements, and which would have been nothing more nor less than irredeemable paper money, or greenbacks, the Moore crowd will demand the genuine article in the bondage game, the kind that stipulates that interest must be paid in gold. The whole scheme will work out automatically, and those in on the ground floor will be enabled to kill three or four birds with one stone. When the panic comes a year or so hence the plutocrats can easily embrace the opportunity to deal organized labor a smash by blaming the hard times on the tyrannical strikers; then they can "bear" the market, call in loans and tighten money, and drive the small-fry into bankruptcy; then along comes obliging Uncle Sam and issues tens of millions of bonds, and our patriotic Rockefeller and Morgan bankers will do a fine business by selling the bonds to themselves at a big profit and providing safe investments for part of their hoardings, while with their surplus and profits and interest they can go into the market when the lowest notch has been reached and gather up the wreckage at their own price and sit back and wait for a rise later. There's millions in it; heads we win, tails you lose. Every business man in the country knows (whether workingmen do or do not is immaterial) that when Rockefeller discusses industrial affairs he speaks with authority, and whether or not the financial king understands the Socialist philosophy regarding the cause of panics or it is mere instinct cultivated by long experience in chasing the almighty dollar is also immaterial at this juncture. The fact remains that this shrewd and coldly calculating genius has confided to his friend Moore that another crisis may be looked for in a year or two. He bases his statement, so we are informed, on the view that there is overproduction in all lines. "Where there were 3,000,000 men out of work in 1893," Mr. Rockefeller is quoted as saying by Col. Moore, "there will be from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 in idleness when the next siege of hard times is upon us." This is a calamitous prediction, surely; and if it should be realized how many labor organizations, no matter upon what lines they may be formed, could safely ride the waves of the oncoming storm? And what guarantee is there that the whole system of capitalistic exploitation will not go by the board during this threatened catastrophe? It is interesting to note, too, that after capitalism is unable to extricate itself from the depths of iniquity into which its own stupidity, planlessness and criminal system has plunged it, the governmental machinery is called to the rescue. Now if the powers of government can be utilized to enrich a small class and impoverish the working class, and then can be further employed to provide soup-houses or temporary jobs for millions of men and thus prolong the existence of an unjust, inequitable system, why cannot the working masses arise in their might and throw off the shirking classes and run their own government for their own welfare? This can and undoubtedly will happen when the trade unions, who have an advantage in being already organized, and the working people generally accept the Socialist program.

The struggle between the printers and their organized employers

has been raging with considerable bitterness during the past month. The men have been making steady gains despite the support that has been given the bosses by pretty much all the employers' association in the country. Upward of 300 local unions, almost one-half, have either succeeded in enforcing the eight-hour day or obtained agreements to introduce the shorter workday on January 1. It is only fair to say that the boss printers were not as thoroughly organized as are the capitalists in some other branches of industry, but on the other hand all the resources of the Parry Manufacturers' Association and Post's Citizens' Alliance have been thrown to the support of the master class in the printing trade. The International Typographical union officials are not inclined to underestimate the forces that confront the printers in their fight for the eight-hour day, and it is expected that the battle will continue for weeks and perhaps months before their demands are won. It is quite probable, too, that many offices and a number of cities and towns will be lost, at least temporarily, but the campaign will go on despite those obstacles, and where there are losses the lines will be reorganized and the battle begun anew. All eyes of the labor world are now upon the Typographical Union, and for that matter the capitalists of the country also regard the present contest as being of far-reaching effect.

BOOK REVIEWS

TEXT BOOK OF SOCIOLOGY, by James Q. Bealey and Lester F. Ward. The Macmillan Co.. Cloth 326 pages \$1.30.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY, by Edward A. Ross. The Macmillan Co. "Citizens' Library," Half leather, 410 pages. \$1.25 net.

These books are illustrative of the progress which is being made in the creation of a science of society and are but two out of a large number that have come from the presses of the world during the last year. Both are still characteristic of the undeveloped stage of the science. They do not seem to be sure of their right to exist as yet and are still largely on the defensive. A considerable portion of their contents is taken up with an explanation of what sociology is, and in discussions of such fundamental principles as in text books of other sciences are taken for granted.

The positions of Prof. Ward are already so well known to our readers through reviews of his previous books as to require no extensive summary of the present work. This is all the more true since this book is but a compilation of his previous writings. On the whole he seeks to analyze society as a biological organism, although in no way following and seldom agreeing with Spencer. He finds the motive force of society in feeling and the desire for social achievement. Although avowedly psychological, yet the materialist will find few things to quarrel with in his position.

He recognizes the existence of exploitation in our present system and states that "those artificial social inequalities which enable the prosperous class to thrive at the expense of the proletariat, and of the less favored classes where no true proletariat exists, are maintained through the systematic deception of the latter, and the inculcation through religious beliefs, when not otherwise possible, of the doctrine that the existing social conditions is not only natural and necessary but divinely ordained." He says that, "the less favored classes are beginning to learn the power of their ballots and are casting them in increasing numbers for collectivism." He is sharply differentiated from Herbert Spencer in his recognition of the fact that "collectivism is not the opposite of individualism," but on the contrary this "whole movement" may almost be described as a growth of individualism.

Here and in various other places he has borrowed directly from the socialists and indeed much of his fundamental position is to be found in the writings of Marx, Engels and Ferri. It is noteworthy, however, that, although he gives a very full bibliography none of these names appear in it. It would seem about time that Prof. Ward woke up to the fact that common scholastic honesty requires that he state the fact that he has been anticipated in many of his positions by these writers.

Prof. Ross's work is very strikingly different in its treatment of the subject. This again is significant of the still unsettled state of sociology. His book is largely a summary of the positions of other writers and as such is of peculiar value in bringing together the various contributions

so far made to the subject. Along with this, however, goes much valuable original matter. He looks upon social psychology as an outgrowth of mob psychology and discusses the evolution of this incoherent mind into the more organized forms of social unity. His chapter on the "Factors of Social Change," while containing much of value is on the whole decidedly weak. He seems to be seized too much with the ultra-scholastic position that it is absolutely necessary to find a multitude of causes for every phenomena and to avoid drawing any general conclusions. Indeed he warns against this latter repeatedly throughout his work, yet is not himself averse to making such generalizations at times as is especially evident from the last two chapters. Among the factors of social change he finds no fundamental motive force and absolutely ignores the only philosophy which has in any way studied into and described the existence of such a motive force, the materialistic interpretation of history.

The charge against him with regard to the socialist writers is in some ways even worse than with Ward, for while Ward ignores them entirely and pretends to have re-discovered anew things that have long been familiar in socialist literature it remains for Ross to make the astounding statement that "To Italians like Loria, and Vaccaro, to the German Ratzenhofer, to the Austrian Pole Gumplowicz and to the Russian Novicow belongs the credit of first setting forth the forms, phrases and laws of the struggles that persist in the interior of society." Is it possible that a man who has read so widely as Prof. Ross is not aware of the exposures of the dishonesty of the writers named which have been made by the socialists and which show that they have simply stolen wholesale and sometimes verbatim from the socialist writers, and especially from Marx and Engels. He certainly must have read Seligman's "Economic Interpretation of History" which would have shown him how false is the statement he makes. A fundamental weakness which is closely connected with the defect just mentioned is seen in the lack of any consistent social philosophy. They absolutely refuse to notice the existence of the socialist school, and up to the present time this is the only school which offers any coherent evolutionary social philosophy, whether true or false.

Notwithstanding these criticisms which we feel bound to make, since the time is now past when ignorance of socialist doctrines may be pleaded as an excuse by men of the wide reading of the authors of these two books, nevertheless they have done work which no socialist can afford to neglect. Both of them have made themselves dangerous to plutocracy and both of them have made what are by no means unimportant contributions to the socialist doctrines. It is well worth the while of any socialist to familiarize himself with their writings as a valuable help to the understanding of his own doctrines, as well as to show how thoroughly our philosophy has permeated into the intellectual life of even those who shut their eyes to its existence.

THE NAPOLEON MYTH, by Henry Ridgely Evans, *The Open Court Publishing Co.* Cloth, 65 pp.

"By looking only at the beginning and at the end of his career, and by disregarding all the intermediate period, an imaginary Napoleon has been created, who is a republican, not a despot; a lover of liberty, not an authoritarian; a champion of the Revolution, not the destroyer of the Revolution; a hero of independence, not a conqueror; a friend of the people, not a contemner of the people; a man of heart and virtue, not a ruthless militarist, cynic and Maciavellian." This imaginary character has become a legendary hero, a demi-god, in which truth and myth are so confused as to be almost impossible of separation. Some phases of this myth are considered in this little work, which is rather a study in higher criticism than an historical contribution.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION.

This new book by Ernest Untermann, the fourth volume of the Library of Science for the Workers, is one of the most important works yet produced by the American socialist movement. The author has made a thorough and exhaustive study of the development of scientific thought from the dawn of literature to the present day.

He recognizes frankly that no thinker can escape the subtle influence of industrial conditions and class environment. Therefore while showing how previous thinkers have consciously or unconsciously shaped their philosophies in the interest of ruling classes, he openly admits that he writes as a proletarian and a socialist.

The earlier portion of the book is with some modifications made up from the articles published in the International Review from March to September. The concluding chapters are a clear and adequate statement of the socialist interpretation of the latest facts of science.

"Science and Revolution" is thus an indispensable help to an understanding of the relations of the sciences to each other and to the socialist movement, and it thus adds immensely to the propaganda value of the Library of Science for the Workers.

THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.

Of this illustrated work, translated by Ernest Untermann from the German of Wilhelm Boelsche, 3500 copies have already been sold, and another edition is now in press. It contains in simple language and attractive style enough evidence to convince any open-minded man that the evolution theory has been absolutely proved, and that the idea of special creation rests on nothing but inherited prejudice. This is volume I of the Library of Science. The second volume is

GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS,

translated by A. M. Simons from the German of R. H. Francé. This book is a simple record of observed facts which prove to any logical reader that "mind" is only another form of "life" and is subject to the same laws as the rest of the universe. This thought is developed still further in the third volume of the library,

THE END OF THE WORLD.

by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Margaret Wagner. Dr. Meyer shows that worlds and suns are organisms like plants and people, having their birth, growth, maturity, old age and death, only that the periods of time involved are vastly longer.

Fifty cents a volume is the price of these books, postage included, and they are sold to stockholders at thirty cents if we prepay postage or expressage; twenty-five cents if called for at this office or sent by express at purchaser's expense.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE FOR STOCK NOW?

A share of stock in the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company costs ten dollars, payable all at once or a dollar a month as the subscriber prefers. When the share is fully paid for, the subscriber has no further liability of any kind. No dividends are paid, but stockholders have the privilege of buying books at cost. The money received from the sale of stock is used to publish more books. Ernest Untermann is now translating the later volumes of Marx's "Capital" which have never yet appeared in English. To publish them will take an investment of three thousand dollars. That means 300 new subscriptions for stock at ten dollars each. And it means that both new stockholders and present stockholders will get Marx's great work complete at a small fraction of what it would cost through capitalist channels.

Meanwhile we shall be making rapid additions to our list of books by American and European socialists. Several more volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers will be definitely announced next month. Two handsome five-cent pamphlets are in press, "Science and Life," by Enrico Ferri, and "A Socialist View of Mr. Rockefeller," by John Spargo. The first edition of 800,000 propaganda leaflets by Charles H. Kerr is sold out, and another edition of 800,000 more is just ready. This includes a new leaflet, "Free Americans," which will be mailed for 6 cents a hundred and sent at purchaser's expense for 30 cents a thousand, and the set of five leaflets "What Socialists Think," mailed for 30 cents per hundred sets or sent by express for \$1.50 per thousand sets. The New York state committee alone has used 40,000 sets of these leaflets and Local Cleveland has used 30,000 sets. Samples will be sent free on request.

THE DEBT-RAISING FUND.

On pages 255 and 256 of last month's Review it was explained that the offer of Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of other stockholders for the purpose of putting the publishing house on a cash basis was addressed rather to those who could give money more conveniently than they could give active work in the circulation of socialist literature. It naturally happens therefore that the number of contributions to

acknowledge this month is smaller than before. It is a matter for congratulation on the part of all stockholders that the amount received is larger, as will be seen from the following list:

Previously Acknowledged	\$ 920.36
John R. Haynes, Calif.	20.00
Thomas C. Hall, New York	25.00
Fred R. Bennett, Maine	2.00
L. K. Hill, Ohio56
A. F. Simonds, New York	1.00
Harry T. Smith, Illinois	2.00
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania	1.00
N. O. Nelson, Missouri	100.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	151.56
	<hr/>
Total	\$1223.48

It is particularly gratifying to be able to report that the receipts of the International Socialist Review for the month of October were \$233.56, an amount which comes so near to covering the expenses for the month that if this average can only be maintained the slight deficit can readily be taken care of out of the profits on the sale of books.

The moral is, not that, nothing more need be done for the Review, but that, it is possible for its friends by reasonable efforts to assure its future publication.