

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII NOVEMBER, 1907 NO. 5

Marx's Historical Method.

(Continued.)

III

VICO'S "HISTORICAL LAWS."

Vico, scarcely ever read by the philosophical historians, although they play with a few of his phrases, which they interpret badly as often as they repeat them, formulated in his *Scienza nuova* certain fundamental laws of history.

He lays down as a general law of the development of societies that all nations, whatever their ethnic origin and their geographical habitat, traverse the same historic roads: thus, the history of any nation whatever is a repetition of the history of another nation which has attained a higher degree of development.

"There exists", he says, "an eternal ideal history traversed on earth by the histories of all nations, from whatever status of savagery, barbarism and ferocity men set out to civilize themselves", to domesticate themselves, ad addimesticarsi, according to his expression. (*Scienza nuova*; libr. II, §5)*.

Morgan, who probably had no knowledge of Vico, arrived

* The verb *civilisation* probably did not exist in the Italian language in Vico's time; it is not until the eighteenth century that it was used in France to indicate the march of a nation along the path of progress. The sense was so recent that the French Academy does not include the word *civilisation* in its Directory until the edition of 1835. Fourier employed it only to designate the modern capitalist period.

We meet again in natural science the "ideal eternal history" of Vico. It is curious and interesting to note that parallelism of thought in

at a conception of the same law, which he formulates in a more positive and complete fashion. The historic uniformity of the different nations which the Neapolitan philosopher attributed to their development according to a preëstablished plan the American anthropologist assigns to two causes, to the intellectual resemblance of men and to the similarity of the obstacles which they have had to surmount in order to develop their societies. Vico also believed in their intellectual resemblance. "There necessarily exists", he said, "in the nature of human affairs, a universal mental language, common to all nations, which designs uniformly the substance of the things playing an active part in the social life of men and expresses it with as many modifications as there are different aspects which these things can take on. We recognize its existence in proverbs, those maxims of popular wisdom, which are of the same substance in all nations ancient and modern, although they are expressed in so many different ways". (*Ib Degli Elem. XXII.*)*

"The human mind", says Morgan, "specifically the same in all the tribes and nations of mankind, and limited in the range of its powers, works and must work, in the same uniform channels, and within narrow limits of variation. Its results in disconnected regions of space, and in widely separated ages of time, articulate in a logically connected chain of common experiences. † Elsewhere in this book Morgan shows that

the natural and historical philosophies. Aristotle and the deists admit the existence of a preëstablished plan, by which God creates animal species and which man can discover by the study of comparative morphology. "He thus thinks over again the divine thought." The philosophers of Nature, submitting this for God, attributed to it a sort of unconscious plan or rather a model, a type immaterial and unrealized according to which the real forms realize themselves; for some it is a **prototype**, an original form, upon which the real beings are gradual improvements, for others it is an **archetype** of which they are varied and imperfect copies.

* Aristotle likewise attached great importance to proverbs; several writers speak of a collection of popular maxims which he had composed and which is lost. Synesius mentions it in his "Panegyric on Baldness": "Aristotle," he says, "considers proverbs as the debris of the philosophy of past ages wrecked in the revolutions which men have passed through; their piquant conciseness has saved them from the shipwreck. Proverbs and the ideas which they express thus carry the same authority as the ancient philosophy from which they have come to us, and whose noble imprint they preserve. for in the centuries which have rolled by, the truth was grasped far better than to-day." The Christian bishop, nourished on Pagan authors, reproduces the opinion of antiquity, which thought men degenerated instead of improving. This idea, contained in Greek mythology and reproduced in many passages of the *Iliad*, was shared by the Egyptian priests, who, according to Herodotus, divided past age into three periods: the age of the gods, of heroes and of men.

Man, since he emerged from the communism of the **gens**, has always believed that he was degenerating, and that happiness, the earthly paradise, the age of gold, was in the past. The idea of human perfectibility, of social progress, took shape in the eighteenth century, when the bourgeoisie was approaching its power, but like Christianity it relegated happiness to Heaven.

Utopian socialism made it descend to earth. "Paradise is not behind us but before us," said Saint-Simon.

† Lewis H. Morgan.—Ancient Society, Part II. Ch. IX, P. 262. —

like successive geological formations the tribes of humanity may be superimposed in successive layers according to their development: classed in this way, they reveal with a certain degree of exactness the complete march of human progress from savagery to civilization; for the paths of human experiences in the several nations have been almost parallel. Marx, who studied the path of economic "experiences", confirms Morgan's idea. The country most developed industrially, he says in the preface to "Capital", shows those which follow it on the industrial ladder the image of their own future.

Thus, then, the "ideal eternal history", which according to Vico the different peoples of humanity must traverse each in their turn, is not an historic plan preëstablished by a divine intelligence, but an historic plan of human progress conceived by the historian who, after having studied the stages traversed by every people, compares them in progressive series according to their degrees of complexity.

Researches, continued for a century on the savage tribes and ancient and modern peoples, have triumphantly proved the exactness of Vico's law. They have established the fact that all men, whatever their ethnic origin or their geographical habitat, had in their development gone through the same forms of family, property and production, as well as the same social and political institutions. The Danish anthropologists were the first to recognize the fact and to divide the prehistoric period into successive ages of stone, bronze and iron, characterized by the raw material of the tools manufactured and consequently by the mode of production. The general histories of the different nations, whether they belong to the white, black, yellow or red race, and whether they inhabit the temperate zone, the equator or the poles, are distinguished from each other only by Vico's stage of ideal history, only by Morgan's historic stratum, only by Marx's round of the economic ladder to which they have attained. Thus, the most developed people shows to those which are less developed the image of their own future.

The productions of intelligence do not escape Vico's law. The philologists and grammarians have found that for the creation of words and languages men of all races have followed the same rules. Folklorists have gathered the same tales among savage and civilized peoples. Vico had already recognized among them the same proverbs. Many of the folklorists instead of considering the similar tales as the productions of nations which preserve them only through oral tradition think that they were conceived in only one center, from which they were scattered over the earth. This is inadmissible and contradicts what has been observed in the social institutions and other productions, intellectual as well as material.

The history of the idea of the soul and the ideas to which it has given birth is one of the most curious examples of the remarkable uniformity of the development of thought. The idea of the soul, which is found in savages, even the lowest, is one of the first intellectual inventions. The soul once invented, it was necessary to fit it out with a dwelling place, under the earth or in the sky to lodge it after death, in order to prevent it from wandering without domicile and pestering the living. The idea of the soul, very vivid in savage and barbarous nations, after having contributed to the manufacture of the idea of the Great Spirit and of God, vanishes among nations arrived at a higher degree of development, to be reborn with a new life and force when they arrive at another stage of evolution. The historians, after having pointed out in the historic nations of the Mediterranean basin the absence of the idea of the soul, which nevertheless had existed among them during the preceding savage period, recognize its rebirth some centuries before the Christian Era, as well as its persistence until our own days. They content themselves with mentioning these extraordinary phenomena of the disappearance and reappearance of so fundamental an idea, without attaching importance to them and without thinking of looking for the explanation which, however, they would not have found in the field of their investigations and which we can only hope to discover by applying Marx's historical method, by seeking it in the transformations of the economic world.

The scientists who have brought to light the primitive forms of the family, property and political institutions, have been too much absorbed by the labor of research to have time to inquire into the causes of their transformations: they have only made descriptive history and the science of the social world must be explanatory as well as descriptive.

Vico thinks that man is the unconscious motive power of history and that it is not his virtues but his vices which are the active forces. It is not "disinterestedness, generosity and humanity, but ferocity, avarice and ambition" which create and develop societies; "these three vices which lead the human race astray produce the army, commerce and political power, and consequently the courage, wealth and wisdom of republics: so that these three vices, which are capable of destroying the human race on the earth, produce civil felicity."

This unexpected result furnished to Vico the proof of "the existence of a divine providence, a divine intelligence, which, out of the passions of men, absorbed entirely by their private interests, which might make them live in solitudes like fierce beasts, organizes civil order, thus permitting us to live in a human society."

The divine providence which directs the evil passions of men

is a second edition of the popular axiom: *man proposes and God disposes*. This divine providence of the Neapolitan philosopher and this God of popular wisdom who leads man by the aid of his vices and his passions, what are they?

The mode of production, replies Marx.

Vico, in accordance with the popular judgment, affirms that man alone furnishes the motive power of history. But his passions, bad and good, and his needs are not invariable quantities as the idealists suppose, for whom man has remained always the same. For example, maternal love, that héritage from the animals, without which man in the savage state could not have lived and perpetuated himself, diminishes in civilization to the point of disappearing in the mothers of the rich classes, who from its birth relieve themselves of the child and entrust it to the care of hirelings; — other civilized women feel so little need of maternity that they make vows of virginity(*); paternal love and sexual jealousy, which cannot show themselves in savage and barbarous tribes during the polyandrous period, are on the contrary highly developed among civilized people; — the sentiment of equality, vivid and imperious in savages and barbarians, who live in communities, to the point of forbidding any one the possession of an object which the others could not possess, has become so fully obliterated since man has lived under the system of individual property, that the poor and the wage workers of civilization accept resignedly and as a divine and natural destiny their social inferiority.

Thus, then, in the course of human development, fundamental passions are transformed, reduced and extinguished, while others arise and grow. To seek only in man the determining causes of their production and evolution would be to admit that although living in nature and society, he does not submit to the influence of the surrounding reality. Such a supposition cannot arise even in the brain of the most extreme idealist, for he would not dare to assume that we should meet the same sentiment of modesty in the respectable mother of the household and the unfortunate earning her living with her sex; the same swiftness of calculation in the bank clerk and the philosopher; the same agility of the fingers of the professional pianist and the ditch digger. It is thus undeniable that man on the physical, intellectual and moral sides is subject unconsciously, but profoundly, to the action of the environment in which he moves.

* The same phenomenon is observed in the insects which have succeeded in creating for themselves a social environment: the queen bee, who is the mother of the hive, does not concern herself with her progeny and kills her daughters provided with sexual organs, whom the neuter workers are obliged to protect from her maternal fury. Certain breeds of domestic fowls have lost the instinct of maternity; although excellent layers, they never sit.

IV.

THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND THE ARTIFICIAL OR
SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT.

The action of the environment is not merely direct, it is exercised not only upon the organ which functions, upon the hand in the case of the pianist and the ditch digger, upon a part of the brain in that of the bank clerk and the philosopher, upon the moral sense in that of the honest woman and the prostitute; it is again indirect and reacts upon all the organs. This generalization of the action of the environment which Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire designated under the characteristic name of *subordination of the organs* and which modern naturalists call *Law of correlation*, Cuvier explained thus: "Every organized being forms a whole, a unique and closed system, whose parts correspond to each other and contribute to the same definite action by a reciprocal action. None of these parts can change without the other parts also changing". For example, the form of the teeth of an animal cannot be modified for any cause whatever without involving modifications in the jaws, the muscles which move them, the bones of the skull to which they are attached, the brain which the skull encases(*), the bones and muscles which support the head, the form and the length of the intestines, indeed in all parts of the body. The modifications which are produced in the fore limbs as soon as they have ceased to serve for walking have led to organic transformations which have definitely separated man from the anthropoid apes.

It is not always possible to foresee and understand the modifications involved by the change which has occurred in any certain organ: for example, why the breaking of a leg or the removal of a testicle in the stag family causes the atrophy of the horn on the opposite side; why white cats are deaf; why mammals with hoofs are herbivorous and those with five toes armed with claws are carnivorous.

A simple change in the habits by subjecting one or more organs to an unaccustomed use sometimes results in radical modifications in the whole organism. Darwin says that the

* Anatomists hold that the temporal muscles—crotaphite—which in the carnivora and many apes unite at the base of the skull and envelope it like a strap, obstruct by compressing the cranial envelope the development of the brain, which is thus relatively reduced as compared with animals which, like man, have a less developed masticating apparatus and less powerful crotaphite muscles. R. Anthony, by taking away from two dogs at the moment of birth one of the temporal muscles, demonstrated some months after that the half of the brain corresponding to the suppressed muscle was rounded out more, and that the cerebral hemisphere had increased in volume.—*Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 23 novembre, 1903.

mere fact of constantly browsing on steep slopes has occasioned variations in the skeletons of certain breeds of Scotch cows. Naturalists agree in regarding the cetacea, — whales, cachalots and dolphins — as former terrestrial mammals which, finding in the sea food more abundant and easier to procure, became swimmers and divers: this new sort of life transformed their organs, reducing to a rudimentary state those no longer used, developing the others and adapting them to the needs of the aquatic environment. The plants of the Sahara Desert, to adapt themselves to the arid environment, have been obliged to dwarf themselves, to reduce the number of their leaves to two or four, to take on a layer of wax to prevent evaporation, and to prolong their roots enormously in search of moisture: their periodic changes come counter to the ordinary seasons; they are dormant in summer during the hot season and vegetate in the winter, in the season relatively cold and moist. Plants in other deserts present analagous characteristics: a given environment implies the existence of beings showing a combination of definite characteristics.

The cosmic or natural environments, to which vegetables and animals must adapt themselves under pain of death, constitute, like the organized being of which Cuvier speaks, combinations, complex systems without precise limits in space, the parts of which are: the geologic formation and composition of the soil, nearness to the equator, elevation above the sea level, courses of rivers which irrigate it, quantity of rain which it receives and the solar heat which it stores up, etc., and plants and animals which live in it. These parts correspond to each other in such a way that one of them cannot change without involving change in the other parts: the changes in the natural environment, although less rapid than those produced in organized beings, are nevertheless appreciable. The forests, for example, have an influence on the temperature and the rains, consequently on the humidity and the physical composition of the soil. Darwin has shown that animals apparently insignificant, like the worm, have played a considerable part in the formation of vegetable mold; Berthelot and the agricultural experts Hellriegel and Willfarth have proved that the bacteria which swarm in the protuberances of the roots of the leguminosae are active in fertilizing the soil. Man by tillage and cultivation exercises a marked influence over the natural environment; forest clearings begun by the Romans have transformed fertile countries of Asia and Africa into uninhabitable deserts.

Vegetables, animals and man in a state of nature, all of which are subject to the action of the natural environment, without other means of resistance than the faculty of adaptation of their organs, must end by differentiating themselves, even though

they might have a common origin, if, during hundreds and thousands of generations they live in different natural environments. The unlike natural environments thus tend to diversify men as well as plants and animals. It is, in fact, during the savage period that the different human races were formed.

Man does not merely modify by his industry the natural environments in which he lives, but he creates out of whole cloth an artificial or social environment, which permits him if not to remove his organism from the action of the natural environment, at least, to reduce this action considerably. But this artificial environment in its turn operates upon man as he comes to it from his natural environment. Man, like the domesticated plant and animal, thus undergoes the action of two environments.

The artificial or social environments which men have successively created differ among themselves in their degree of elaboration and complexity, but environments of the same degree of elaboration and complexity offer great resemblances among themselves, whatever may be the human races which have created them and whatever may be their geographical habitats: so that if men continue to undergo the diversifying action of unlike natural environments, they are equally subject to the action of similar artificial environments which operate to diminish the differences of races and to develop in them the same needs, the same interests, the same passions and the same mentality. Moreover, the same natural environments, as for example those situated at the same latitude and altitude, exercise an equal, unifying action on the vegetables and animals which live in them; they have an analagous flora and fauna. Like artificial environments thus tend to unify the human species, which unlike natural environments have diversified into races and sub-races.

The natural environment evolves with such extreme slowness that the vegetable and animal species which adapt themselves to it seem immutable. The artificial environment, on the contrary, evolves with an increasing rapidity, thus the history of man and his societies compared with that of animals and vegetables is extraordinarily mobile.

The artificial environments, like organized being and the natural environment, form combinations, complex systems without precise limits in space and time, the parts of which correspond to each other and are so closely bound together that one alone cannot be modified without all the others being shaken and being compelled to undergo retouchings in their turn. The artificial or social environment, of an extreme simplicity and consisting of a small number of parts in savage peoples, becomes complicated in proportion as man progresses by the addition of new parts and by the development of those already

existing. It has been formed since the historic period by economic, social, political and legal institutions, by traditions, customs, manners and morals, by common sense and public opinion, by religious literatures, arts, philosophies, sciences, modes of production and exchange etc., and by the men who live in it. These parts, by transforming themselves and by reacting on each other, have given birth to a series of social environments more and more complex and extended, which, in proportion to their extension, have modified men; for, like the natural environment, a given social environment implies the existence of men presenting a certain combination of analagous characteristics, physical and moral. If all these corresponding parts were stable or varied only with excessive slowness, like those of the natural environment, the artificial environment would remain in equilibrium and there would be no history; its equilibrium, on the contrary, is extremely and increasingly unstable, constantly put out of balance by the changes working in one or another of its parts, which then reacts on all the others.

The parts of an organized being, like those of a natural environment, react upon each other directly, mechanically, so to speak: when in the course of animal evolution the upright posture was definitely acquired by man, it became the point of departure for transformations of all the organs: when the head, instead of being carried by the powerful muscles at the back of the neck, as in the other animals, was supported by the spinal column, these muscles and the bones to which they are attached became modified, and with their modifications modified the skull, the brain, etc. When the layer of vegetable soil in a locality increases through any cause whatever, instead of bearing stunted plants, it nourishes a forest, which modifies the rainfall, which again increases the volume of the water courses, etc. But the parts of an artificial environment can react on each other only through the intermediary of man. The part modified must begin by transforming physically and mentally the men whom it causes to function, and must suggest to them the modifications which they must bring to the other parts to put them on the level of the progress realized in it, in order that they may not hinder it in its development, and in order that they may again correspond to it. The parts not modified manifest their inconvenience precisely by the useful qualities which formerly constituted their "good side", which by becoming superannuated are hurtful and then constitute so many "bad sides". They are the more insupportable according as the modifications which they should have undergone are more important. The re-establishment of equilibrium in the parts of the artificial environment is

often accomplished only after struggles between the men particularly interested in the part in course of transformation and the men concerned in the other parts.

A few historical facts, too recent to be forgotten, will illustrate the interplay of the various parts of the artificial environment through the medium of man.

When industry had utilized the elasticity of steam as a motor power, it demanded new means of transportation to carry its fuel, its raw material and its products. It suggested to the interested manufacturers the idea of steam traction on iron rails which began to be practiced in the coal fields of Gard in 1830 and in those of the Loire in 1832; it was in 1829 that Stephenson's first locomotive drew a train in England. But when it was desired to extend this mode of locomotion, active and various opposition was encountered, which delayed its development for years. M. Thiers, one of the political leaders of official capitalism, and one of the authorized representatives of its common sense and public opinion, opposed it energetically, because, he declared, "a railroad can not work." Railroads, indeed, upset the most reasonable and established ideas: they required, along with other impossible things, grave changes in the mode of property serving as a basis for the social edifice of the bourgeoisie then in power. Till then a capitalist created an industry or a mercantile establishment with his own money, increased, at the most, by that of one or two friends and acquaintances, who had confidence in his honesty and skill; he directed the use of the funds and was the real and nominal proprietor of the factory or the commercial house. But the railroads were obliged to amass such enormous capitals, that it was therefore necessary to induce a great number of capitalists to confide their money, which they had never left out of their sight, to people whose names they scarcely knew, still less their ability or morality. When they let go of the money, they lost all control over its use; they had no personal proprietorship in the stations, cars, locomotives, etc., which it served to create; instead of pieces of gold and silver, having volume, weight and other solid qualities, they received back a narrow, light sheet of paper, representing fictitiously an infinitesimal and intangible morsel of the collective property, the name of which it bore, printed in big letters. Never in bourgeois memory had property taken on so metaphysical a form. This new form, which *depersonalized* property, was in such violent contradiction with that which summed up the joys of the capitalists, that which they had known and handed down for generations, that to defend it and propagate it no one could be found but the men charged with all crimes and denounced as the worst disturbers of social order, — the socialists. Fourier

and St. Simon welcomed the mobilization of property in paper stock-certificates. We find in the ranks of their disciples the manufacturers, engineers and financiers who prepared the revolution of 1848 and were the plotters of December 2: they profited by the political revolution to revolutionize the economic environment by centralizing the nine provincial banks into the Bank of France, by legalizing the new form of property and causing it to be accepted by public opinion, and by creating the network of French railways.

The great mechanical industry, which must draw its fuel and its raw material from a distance, and which must scatter its products widely, can not tolerate the parcelling of a nation into little autonomous States, with tariffs, laws, weights and measures, coins, paper currencies, etc., of their own; it requires on the contrary the development unified and centralized nations. Italy and Germany have met these requirements of the great industry, but only at the cost of bloody wars. MM. Thiers and Proudhon, who had numerous points of resemblance, and who represented the political interests of the little industry, became ardent defenders of the independence of the States of the Church and of the Italian princes.

Since man successively creates and modifies the parts of the social environment, therefore in him reside the motive forces of history, — so Vico and popular wisdom hold, rather than in Justice, Progress, Liberty and other metaphysical entities, as the most philosophical historians stupidly repeat. These confused and inexact ideas vary according to the historical epochs and according to the groups or even the individuals of the same epoch; for they are the mental reflections of the phenomena produced in the different parts of the artificial environment; for example the capitalist, the wage-worker, and the magistrate have different ideas of Justice. The socialist understands by justice the restitution to the wage-working producers of the wealth which has been stolen from them, while to the capitalist, justice is the conservation of this stolen wealth, and as the latter possesses the economic and political power, his notion predominates and makes the law, which, for the magistrate, becomes Justice. Precisely because the same word covers contradictory notions, the capitalist class has made of these ideas an instrument of deceit and of dominance.

That portion of the artificial or social environment in which a man functions gives him a physical, intellectual and moral education. This education by things, which engenders ideas in him and excites his passions, is unconscious; so when he acts, he imagines he is following freely the impulses of his passions and ideas, while he is only yielding to the influences exercised

on him by one of the parts of the artificial environment, which can react on the other parts only through the intermediary of his ideas and passions. Obeying instinctively the indirect pressure of the environment, he attributes the direction of his actions and emotions to a God, a divine intelligence or to ideas of Justice, Progress, Humanity, etc. If the march of history is unconscious, since as Hegel says, man always finishes with a result other than that he sought, it is because thus far he has been unconscious of the cause which makes him act and which directs his actions.

What is the most unstable part of the social environment, that which is changed oftenest in quantity and in quality, that which is most apt to disturb the whole?

The mode of production, answers Marx.

By mode of production Marx means not what is produced but the way of producing it; thus there has been weaving from prehistoric times, but it is only for about a century that there has been machine weaving. Machine production is the essential characteristic of modern industry. We have under our eyes an unparalleled example of its terrible and irresistible power to transform the social, economic, political and legal institutions of a nation. Its introduction into Japan has lifted that country in one generation from the feudal state of the middle ages into the constitutional state of the capitalist world, and has placed it in the rank of world powers.

Multiple causes unite in assuring to the mode of production this omnipotence of action. Production absorbs, directly or indirectly, the energy of an immense majority of the individuals of a nation, while in the other parts constituting the social environment (politics, religion, literature, etc.,) a slender minority is occupied, and even this minority can not but be interested in procuring the means of existence, material and intellectual. Consequently all men undergo mentally and physically, more or less, the modifying influence of the mode of production, while but a very small number of men are subjected to that of the other portions: now, as it is through the intermediary of men that the different parts of the social environment act on each other, that which modifies the most men possesses of necessity the most energy for moving the whole mass.

The mode of production, relatively unimportant in the social environment of the savage, takes on a preponderant and ever-growing importance through the incessant incorporation into production of the forces of nature, in proportion as man learns to know them: prehistoric man began this incorporation by using stones for weapons and tools.

Progress in the mode of production is relatively rapid, not

only because production occupies an enormous mass of men, but again because, by enkindling "the three furies of private interest", it puts in play the three vices which, for Vico, are the moving forces of history, — hardheartedness, avarice and ambition.

Progress in the mode of production has become so headlong for the last two centuries, that the men interested in production must constantly remodel the corresponding parts of the social environment to keep them on the level; the resistances which they encounter give rise to incessant conflicts, economic and political. Thus, to discover the first causes of historic movements, we must seek them in the mode of production of material life, which, as Marx says, dominates in general the development of the social, political and intellectual life.

Marx's economic determinism takes away from Vico's law of the unity of historical development its character of predetermination, which would carry the idea that the historic phases through which a nation passes, like the embryonic phases of an animal are as Geoffrey Saint-Hilaire thought indissolubly linked to its very nature and determined by the inevitable action of an inner force, an "evolutionary force", which would conduct it along pre-established paths toward ends marked out in advance; whence it would follow that all nations must progress, always and whether-or-no, at an equal pace and along one and the same path. The law of the unity of development, thus conceived, would be verified by the development of not one nation.

History on the contrary shows nations as they are, some limping through certain stages of evolution, which others traverse like race-horses, while others again go back from stages already reached. These delays, progressions and recessions are explained only when we examine the social, political and intellectual history of the several nations in the light of the history of the artificial environments in which they have evolved: the changes of these environments, determined by the mode of production, determine in their turn historic events.

Since artificial environments are transformed only at the cost of national and international struggles, the historic events of a nation are thus subjected to relations which arise between the artificial environment to be transformed and the nation, fashioned as it has been by its natural environment and its hereditary and acquired characteristics. The natural environment and the historic past have impressed upon each nation certain original characteristics; so it follows that the same mode of production does not produce, with mathematical exactness, the same artificial or social environments, and consequently does not occasion historical events absolutely alike in different nations and at all moments of history,

since vital international competition increases and intensifies in proportion to the growth in the number of nations arriving at the higher stages of civilization. The historic evolution of nations, then, is not predetermined, any more than the embryonic evolution of individuals: if it passes through similar organizations of family, property, law and politics, and through analagous forms of thought in philosophy, religion, art and literature, it is because nations, whatever their race and geographical habitat, experience in their development material and intellectual wants which are substantially alike, and must inevitably resort, for the satisfaction of these wants, to the same processes of production.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

Translated by Charles H. Kerr.

The Political System of Social-Democracy.

Memorial presented to the International Socialist Bureau and the Interparliamentary Commission.

The increasing development and influence of the socialist movement, brings more and more into evidence an existing gap, which, if not filled up in the course of a few years, will prejudice the unity and the strength of this movement and may stand in the way of further progress.

Already we may witness symptoms pointing in this unfortunate direction.

The action of the social-democrats in Parliament, the usefulness and necessity of which has never been doubted by me, has nevertheless given rise everywhere in the masses to a real disappointment, because of its lack of positive results on behalf of the working class. As long as the party is only represented in Parliament by a small minority, this disappointment affects the middle-class, the unwillingness or impotence of whom, to comply with the desires of the laborers, is clearly proved. But as soon as the socialist minority increases or the mass of outsiders who stand behind this minority grows more important so as to represent a considerable fraction of the nation, the unsuccessfulness of the proceedings of Parliament is used as an argument against the socialist movements itself. And when socialist ministers, with the coöperation of their party or without the same, share the responsibility for the political system of the "bourgeoisie", the party is still further held responsible for the errors and faults of the said system. It matters but little with what kind of government we have to deal.

The German system of semi-absolutism has no worse influence than the democratic parliamentary one of the French Republic. We might even ask whether the first, with its greater stability and perseverance, has not met with greater success than the latter, where the constantly varying alignment of the parties, as well as the sensibility of the machinery of the state to constant modifications of the governing powers, greatly interfere with the legislative proceedings. It is no mere accident that amongst the French labourers indifference and even disgust with parliamentary politics are very strong and that among the German workmen antiparliamentarism is continually increasing during the last years.

Everywhere, that socialism has passed through the stage of pure and simple propaganda and of common opposition, and where it has to face the necessity of making use of the political system of the middle-class, in order to further its own direct wants, the insufficiency of the said system will become more evident and will be revenged on the social-democracy itself, if the latter should not, in using it, take up a critical position toward the system and disown every responsibility for the same.

I expect to hear the objection that the scarcity of results I have pointed out, is not to be imputed to the political but rather to the economical system and the political supremacy of the middle-class. But those two elements cannot be separated. Each economical system has its own political regime. It is evident that under the sway of capitalism, which submits the mass to a heavy daily labour in order to earn their living, we cannot imagine any other system than that of representation. Parliament, the historic manifestation of the rising economic power of the middle-class and recognised as such by the sovereigns themselves, was the essential organ of the system. It can easily be proved that, in its practical results and development, it is unable to outlive capitalism; its faults will even be seen more clearly, in proportion as in the period of transition in which we live, social interests and arrangements become of more importance to legislators. In various countries the rights of Parliament towards the Crown and the government may differ, but they all have one thing in common, viz. that laws are framed and the system is discussed by ministerial bureaux and that Parliament has nothing but a correcting and completing influence on law. As long as there are in Parliament only two important parties, representing political thought and political life of the nation, our objection has no very serious character. Each of these parties will alternately hold the reins of government and each will alternately be at the head of the ministerial bureaux.

But if the middle-class is going to divide itself and the laborers are becoming a separate party, we are face to face with quite another case. The original condition for the Parliamentary system falls away. The temporary governments become, owing to antagonism in Parliament and by the lack of a sufficient majority, either powerless or almighty. Powerless inasmuch as they are prevented by the divergence of political opinions, from carrying out a well-framed system. Almighty because the lack of a conscious and unanimous opposition gives them an opportunity for realising certain schemes.

The division of the middle-class is one of the principal reasons of the modification in the nature of the parliamentary system and it causes a continuous change in the alignment of

fractions, with the result that, in democratic countries, government and legislation are not to be relied upon, and become ever more the prey of the politician. In less democratic countries this offers an opportunity for the Crown, to unite several groups of the opposition into one coalition, favorable to the government, a step that becomes more frequent as the fear of socialism eclipses the different groups of the middle-class. It is but natural, that a change in the character of the middle-class causes a similar modification in its chief political institution.

But the institution itself, as part of the middle-class organisation, to which it is peremptorily attached, can no longer satisfy the needs of modern legislation. It is based upon a fiction, that the whole nation is represented by Parliament, but even with manhood suffrage this is not the case; only part of the nation is represented and we must not forget that this always remains mere *representation*. Intellect, knowledge of business, practical experience of groups and organisations, all those categories are only represented by accident, which nobody is able to foresee. The choice of persons is more decided by political considerations than according to personal value. All questions concerning government are continually treated and decided by the same persons, which causes a vast amount of superficiality and red tape and consequent deterioration of the laws that are passed. This is especially evident where legislation loses its administrative and periodical nature, and enters more into the domain of social conditions.

The logical and historic complement of parliament is a middle class ministerial bureaucracy. If up to the present the social-democrats have been compelled to confine their influence to the state, and if they have been the strongest force for the extension of state intervention, this does not signify that by those means they could found their system. On the contrary, their theory teaches us that the victory of the proletariat attacks the very foundation of the state, which afterwards may be "stored away in a museum of antiquities." And the foremost theorists who have discussed the future régime of social-democracy, have concluded that its greatest duty should be to systematically convert the existing state into an organization leaving free course to trade-unions.

If this idea is not given greater emphases in the practical propaganda within the existing régime, this can be explained by the fact that even its partial realization is only possible within the limits of socialism itself. Suppose for example the nationalization of railways, mines, etc. In contrast with the system according to which the government should take the railways *in their own hands*, and manage them the same way private business is managed, through ministerial bureaux, proceeding

from the top to the bottom, the socialists would be compelled to recommend working by those who are interested in the concern, under the control and on behalf of the whole nation. But there is a lack of any organization for this purpose so that, if it were possible to convert the several unions of laborers or others, who have an interest in the concern, into one organization, there would be no link between this organization and the central organization of the nation, whilst there are no rules by which the proper degree of public authority and autonomy could be transferred to the organization, which would be necessary to any effective operation.

The official control and the limitation of the rights and duties of laborers under the régime of capitalism are more to be feared than to be desired by the laborers. Germany, France and England have sufficiently proved this fact. It seems that the most favorable condition for the trade-unions is the absolute liberty of proceedings. This makes it impossible to compel the adhesion of all the laborers to one and the same organization. The working class cannot permit their rights to be determined by a party they are fighting. The full development of the task of trade-unions is only possible under a social-democratic system.

We believe we have said enough to point out, why the socialists, even if they make use of the bourgeois political system to further their strife and their purpose, must more and more recognize its insufficiency in proportion as they become stronger and as they lay more emphasis upon the positive results of their work. Until now this critical point of view has revealed itself either insufficiently or in a wrong way.

In its attitude toward anarchism and anti-parliamentarism, the movement of the laboring-class has been insufficient in that it has too often emphasized exclusively the uncontested necessity and advantage of parliamentary action, whilst neglecting the proletarian standpoint and its present problems. Perhaps in theoretical publications this has been done occasionally in an excellent way, but in practical strife, while propagating the cause, this has been too much neglected. No wonder, where the program of the social-democrats opposes no system of its own to that of the bourgeoisie, and where it demands nothing but a more logical application of the parliamentary system of the "bourgeoisie."

These critics have also neglected to consider the historic necessity and the urgency of not only using the system as the theatre of action but as well for the sake of its direct results.

All these movements, which have called attention to the vices of parliamentarism, from the German "Independents" to the "syndicalists" have displayed these same defects. But what must doom their criticism to ineffectiveness is that either they have no proletarian system of their own to contrast with the system they

condemn, or that, moved by vague notions about the function of the labor-unions, they wish to see the same act a part, which could only be reasonable under a régime of the proletariat and even then only after due preparation and development.

In both cases however this lack of a political system of their own, is injurious to the unity of the Party and the strength of the propaganda. If we contemplate the social-democracy of every country, we find everywhere two different views about the suitable tactics. One of those considers the parliamentary method of ever increasing importance, and wishes to carry it through even to the extent of affiliation with middle-class democracy, while the other seeks to get rid of the consequences of the system, without altogether condemning it, and is accordingly forced into a purely oppositional position to the party; and by national and international verdicts, seeks to put a stop to the "parliamentarisation" of the movement, and to find fresh weapons, which shall put the mass outside of Parliament into action against the whole bourgeoisie.

However important this struggle may be, the question arises whether its importance is not exaggerated. Let us first acknowledge, that not every struggle which causes much noise in literature, is of equal importance in practical life. Without denying the exceptions in which this strife has affected serious interests, it may be said that, both in France and Germany, the party's representatives are accustomed, even when following different tactics, to unite in all matters of vital interest. And it may be stated as well, that many questions, which attract much attention at the moment of their origin, only concern political convenience, caused by the party's tradition and are of importance only for the sake of propaganda. Furthermore every deviation from the really imperatively prescribed line of proletarian action shows its results within a short time, by rousing the inevitable reaction and by providing the laboring class with the real experience, without which it will be impossible to find the right way. The struggle of the proletariat contains in itself the chief conditions, under which it must and can be fought. Whosoever accepts this combat honestly and frankly, whosoever remains animated by its true spirit, will hear the voice of a conscience when making use of certain methods, a conscience which no doubt will end by showing him the path of duty. The middle-class itself, justly understanding that the progress of the social-democrats means a menace to their own position, show more and more their character as capitalists and even on their left wing we see them together with a small number of democrats, who have accepted democracy for emergency's sake, attempt a revival of the capitalist reaction

even among the most democratic elements, as soon as the proletariat manifests its revolutionary character.

Within these limits we will most probably soon witness the phenomenon, that in different countries and at various moments one or the other method, often the one after the other, will be brought into practice. Both fractions, if they are wise, will try to correct and not to kill each other.

Meanwhile this struggle amongst the members of the Party themselves suffers from the want of a proper socialistic political system. The actual program for which they struggle, in its political part, is essentially the fulfilment of the system of the middle-class. Adult suffrage for both sexes is its first and last word. Extension of governmental intervention on every domain is a continual desire. In their political program the social-democrats are only the logical conclusion of the democracy of the middle-class; as it contains no points except those which are to be realized by Parliament. Really, those who reproach the revisionists and the reformists with their exaggerated expectations concerning the democracy of the middle-class, might do well by asking themselves whether the fault does not lie in their own program.

A government, seriously desiring to do something in the way of meeting our wants, raises *ipso facto* the hostile feeling of middle-class reaction and *must* be supported by us; we may frame as revolutionary a program as we wish, but finally we are compelled to content ourselves with the half or the fourth part of reforms, exactly as the parliamentary outcome may give us. Parliamentarism has its own rules, to which every party, making use of this institution, must conform. Therefore it is bad policy to confine the tactics and the character of the party to the limits of the question, what must be the attitude towards the political system of the middle-class. Within the limits of this system every social-democratic action must needs be unprincipled and opportunist. The real struggle concerning politics must remain on the outside. It may only be asked, what system the social-democrats intend to substitute for that of the middle-class. And as the more radical fraction of the party has no answer to this question, it tries to find its principles where they do not exist. Not until the party has formed an exact idea of the political organization that is to be established, will it be possible to decide the direction in which its positive task has to be achieved. Its views about trade-unions, about the rights and duties of officials, etc., cannot remain free from the influence of the above mentioned question. Towards the middle-class there will be a fixed standard which may be of the greatest use in answering the question in how far it will be possible temporarily to co-operate with one or more

of these groups, in special circumstances. And besides many misconceptions about the importance of state and Parliament *will disappear for the social-democracy*, when the question has been settled, misconceptions which are found not only within the limits of our party but as well amongst outsiders and which can only be got rid of in this way.

If we have demonstrated above the necessity of elaborating a political system for the social-democracy, chiefly for its value to the party itself, this question has also a larger scope. The fear of middle-class utopianism has until now withheld our best thinkers from exerting themselves in this line. When Kautsky ventured a very modest step in this direction, he only wished to give a scientific completeness to his work. Works like those of Menger and Deslinière could only emphasize the opinion that every effort to give birth at the present time to the political system of the social-democracy, would suffer from the sterility of middle-class utopianism.

This however is not the case. It all depends on the method. If we follow the course, indicated by Menger and seek for the ideas or moral principles of the social-democracy, and if we make a juridical application of these, we remain within the limits of the utopian point of view. But if we appeal to history and consider which social organisation we are facing and what part of the same can be transferred to the regime of the proletariat, if we examine the growth and constitution of these social organs, if we deduct therefrom the general rules, the result can be very real and without suffering from more fancy, than we witness in every scientific work.

Furthermore at what distance do we suppose the victory of the proletariat over the middle-class to be, if the time has not yet come to state to the world by what means the social-democrats intend to make their victory correspond to their ideals? The Socialists have already admitted the impossibility of establishing the complete socialistic state by any artificial method.

At this moment this party has in some countries millions of partisans, and when everywhere the masses are organising themselves more and more against the existing economical and political system, is it too much to ask the party to do something more than walk about in the dress of the middle-class, patched up with red, and if we want it to show itself in its own garb, and to possess a scheme of political organisation of its own, subject to discussion?

By what means are the social-democrats to convert the middle-class into their own society? This question must be answered by the political system. We take for granted the economical and industrial action towards socialism. We ask however,

what political superstructure could be solid and elastic enough, so to correspond and to enforce every fresh growth.

When the middle-class fought their own fight, they were able to answer this question. The instructions of the Third Class' representatives contained the political system of this group. Parliament had been existing for some centuries and, by generalising its character, elaborating its principles, and applying the same, the middle-class have given to themselves and to the world what they wanted.

The proletariat has no more need to mount in the air, to elaborate their political system, than the middle-class had. They develop their own organization due to their rising political power, enforced and developed by the struggle, in the same way that we have seen that the middle class developed their parliamentarism. But it will prove much more difficult to generalize this organisation and to endow it with public authority, to adjust it to the social and political unity, than it was for the political institutions of the middle-class to be developed.

The base for this political system can be no other than an organisation on the base of a community of economic interests, among which the labor-unions occupy the first place. This organisation must needs dispose of a certain public authority, with compelling force over minorities. Above this organisation there must be the organ, expressing the entire interest and desire of the people.

As the prototype of this system we may quote an organization, already known for centuries in the middle-class system of Holland viz. the "waterschap" (polder-system). The land-owners in a certain part of the country have one common interest, to protect themselves against the sea and to assure the gauge. This work requires dikes, sluices, ditches, bridges, mills, etc. The minority might by refusing to give their consent, hinder the common establishment, the defrayment and the achievement of these works. But the State has given the right, to the willing majority, under certain conditions concerning the general interest, to compel the minority to join the majority, in order to create the above mentioned works as a public duty. The State delegates a part of its powers to the corporation; in so far as concerns the punishment, police and taxes, necessary to secure the performance of this public function,—the "waterschap" is substituted for the State. And by doing so, there has been made a tie between the special organisation and the general one.

I quote this instance to show that the method, by which the State regularly delegates its power, to maintain a more harmonic unity, is not based merely upon fiction. We witness the same fact in the inner constitution of the several organisations;

the experience acquired by British and German labor-unions provides sufficient material on this point.

I believe I have said enough to prove my point. I should like to call the attention of the International Socialist Bureau and of the Interparliamentary Commission to the necessity and the opportunity for starting the study which needs must precede the framing of a political system. This task is too heavy to be achieved by one single person but if it is desired to entrust one person with this work, he ought to get the co-operation and advice of many. The work in itself must have a collective character. The best thing would be if some prominent members of the party were appointed to take part in this work; amongst them a reporter might be chosen to frame a general report concerning the results of the committee's proceedings. I think it would be possible to bring the results of this work before the next international congress, by publishing the same in due time.

I expect much from this work for the growth, the unity and the consciousness of the party and for the practical results, to be obtained by the social-democracy of all countries.

Sheveningen, Aug. 5th. 1907.

P. J. TROELSTRA.

Max Stirner: Reincarnated Spook.

"It is the unexpected that always happens" proves true once again. Writing some six months ago I spoke of Max Stirner's *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* as a book which has been forgotten amid the growing consciousness of the organic solidarity of society." But soon afterward the irrepressible and talented philosophical Anarchist, Mr. Benjamin R. Tucker, published a brand new English translation of this forgotten work under the title of "The Ego and his Own". The translation has been made with the utmost industry and sympathy by Mr. Stevens T. Byington, and mechanically the book is an excellent specimen of modern book-making.

Mr. Tucker has advertised it widely as "the book that banishes all spooks forever", and Mr. Huneker, one of the cleverest of American journalists, has sought by curiously arranged mosaics of heterogeneous quotations from all sources, ancient and modern, in the Saturday Supplement to the New York Times and in the North American Review, to prove it "the most revolutionary book ever written". This is very amusing to those Socialists who have learned from Plechanoff that what Stirner really did in philosophy was simply to substitute for Feuerbach's spook, Man, that thinnest and most elusive of all spooks, the individual in general, the much vaunted "Ego".

But in these days when the decadent bourgeoisie are raising altars to the mad Polish-German, Friedrich Nietzsche, it is just as well that the master-piece of Nietzsche has given literary form and charm to the spook philosophy which Stirner first expounded. But Nietzsche is on the whole a saner and more optimistic thinker than Stirner for he has his prophetic gaze ever on the future. To him Man, as he is, is never anything but "the bridge to Beyond Man." But Nietzsche is just as unable as was Stirner to see Man or the individual in his dialectic inter-relation to the Cosmos. They both try to banish spooks and end up by worshiping the spookiest of spooks.

George Plechanoff answered the philosophy of Stirner once for all in his most valuable little book, "Anarchism and Socialism" more than a quarter of a century ago, and if further answer were needed Eugene Dietzgen gave it to us two years ago in his paper on Max Stirner and Joseph Dietzgen published in the Philosophical Essays of Joseph Dietzgen.

Marx, Engels, Bruno Bauer, Feuerbach, Max Stirner (Caspar Schmidt), and all the young Hegelians impelled by the re-

volutionary dialectic method of Hegel were trying to escape from the sterile idealism of Hegel. Feuerbach may be said to have led the revolt, but he merely apotheosized a new abstraction, Man. Stirner could see this and criticised Feuerbach with great acumen, but proceeded to bow to the altar of his own pet spook, The Ego.

The only way to "banish spooks forever" is to explain their birth and development. The men who did this were Karl Marx and Joseph Dietzgen. We now know that spooks will live just as long as do the economic conditions that breed them, and we smile at the self-appointed spook-banishers, the Don Quixotes of the Twentieth Century.

But the Socialist, who will keep in mind the relationship of Stirner to Hegel and Feuerbach on the one hand and to Marx and Dietzgen on the other, can derive much profit from a thoughtful perusal of "The Ego and His Own." In reading the Communist Manifesto we are too prone to attribute all the truths it contains to the mighty brains of Marx and Engels. It is impossible for anyone to read Stirner without seeing that many of these ideas, such as the class-character of the great French Revolution and the historic role of the bourgeoisie were common to Bruno Bauer, Stirner and the whole Young Hegelian school, and it is in accord with Marxism that this should be so.

The spook of Natural Rights, Rights of Man, &c., has more lives than a cat and keeps reappearing in one form or another. It has crept into the platforms of both our American Socialist parties. It is the product of handicraft industry—the period when a man's property was in fact the fruit of his own industry. As a spook it is made to defend the system under which property is usually the fruit of the industry of the non-possessors. As Marx put it, "Political economy confuses on principle two very different kinds of private property, of which one rests on the producers' own labor, the other on the employment of the labor of others. It forgets that the latter not only is the direct antithesis of the former, but absolutely grows on its tomb only.' Thus the dialectic movement of social development converts this spook, born to defend private property, into its subtlest enemy. But a spook, even though it comes to fight on our side, remains none the less a spook; and Right minus Might is a spook—the purest and most unsubstantial moonshine. To Stirner's everlasting credit, he mercilessly pricked this most beautiful bubble.

Socialists to-day may well ponder such sentences as these:

"The Communists affirm that "the earth belongs rightfully to him who tills it, and its products to those who bring them out." I think it belongs to him who knows how to take it, or who does

not let it be taken from him, does not let himself be deprived of it. If he appropriates it, then not only the earth, but the right to it too, belongs to him. "He who has might has—right; if you have not the former, neither have you the latter. Is this wisdom so hard to attain?" "Whoever knows how to take and to defend the thing, to him it belongs till it is again taken from him, as liberty belongs to him who *takes* it."

What could be more acute than this criticism of Proudhon? "Proudhon (Weitling too) thinks he is telling the worst about property when he calls it theft (vol). Passing quite over the embarrassing question, what well-founded objection could be made against theft, we only ask: Is the concept "theft" at all possible unless one allows validity to the concept "property"? How can one steal if property is not already extant? What belongs to no one cannot be *stolen*, the water that one draws out of the sea he does *not steal*. Accordingly property is not theft, but a theft becomes possible only through property."

No one has put more strongly than Stirner the truth that the Proletariat must depend solely upon their own MIGHT, and expect nothing from the love of the upper classes. It is true he sometimes gives his statements an extreme individualist form at which it is possible to cavil, but there is more truth than error in such statements as these:

"Only when I expect neither from individuals nor from a collectivity what I can give to myself, only then do I slip out of the snares of—love; the rabble ceases to be rabble only when it *takes hold*... Only the dread of taking hold, and the corresponding punishment thereof, makes it a rabble." Only that taking hold is sin, crime — only this dogma creates a rabble. "If men reach the point of losing respect for property, every one will have property, as all slaves become free men as soon as they no longer respect the master as master." "All swan-fraternities, and attempts at making the rabble happy, that spring from the principle of love, must miscarry. Only from egoism can the rabble get help and this help it must give to itself and—will give to itself. If it does not let itself be coerced into fear, it is a power." Hence the exact point is that the respectful "rabble" should learn at last to help itself to what it requires." "The poor become free and proprietors only when they—*rise*. Bestow ever so much on them, they will still always want more; for they want nothing less than that at last—nothing more be bestowed." "Free competition is not "free", because I lack the THINGS for competition." "Proudhon calls property "robbery" (*le vol*). But alien property—and he is talking of this alone—is not less existent by renunciation, cession, and humility; it is a *present*. Why so sentimentally call for compassion as a poor victim of

robbery, when one is just a foolish giver of presents? Why here again put the fault on others as if they were robbing us, while we ourselves do bear the fault in leaving the others unrobbed? The poor are to blame for there being rich men."

The brilliant James (Huneker) and others will fail in their attempts to create a Stirner cult among the bourgeoisie because the soul-sick and decadent bourgeoisie seeking for philosophic defense for morbid and perverted sensuality find their purposes much better satisfied by Neo-Nietzscheanism with its pleasing delusion that the abandoned voluptuary is a Superman. But the virile proletariat will draw fresh virility and self-reliance from the still-burning words of Max Stirner.

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE.

Agricultural Development in Hungary.

POOOR little Hungary, the land of the Magyar, the land of Petöfi, Jokai and Louis Kossuth, the land of daily revolutions in parliament which only end in a free for all fight, is indeed as it were a "part of Asia." Of course Hungary a Kingdom of Francis Joseph of the Hapsburg house of Austria lies in the south-eastern portion of central Europe between 44° 10' and 49° 35' N. lat. and between 14° 25' and 26° 25' E long., and yet in its industrial and agricultural as well as political life it is thoroughly "asiatic." It covers about 5 degrees of latitude and 12 of longitude, and contains an area of 124,234 square miles, being larger than the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and less than half the size of Texas. The Kingdom of Hungary comprises "Hungary Proper" or the "Crown Realm of St. Stephan", with the former grand principality of Transylvania, the town and district of Fiume, Croatia and Slavonia, and the Military Frontier; Dalmatia sending her representatives to the Austrian parliament.

Advanced thinkers call Hungary "Part of Asia", because feudal lords, counts, barons, bishops and abbots reign supreme. The average Magyar patriot will feel highly insulted when told that he is "asiatic," but that does not alter the case. A government where the church and state are united to tax the people out of one half of all they get as wages over and above what the land-lord and employer have already taken, is not a land of freedom. A country where over 14 million people are engaged in agricultural pursuits, and yet more than one half of the agricultural area is in the possession of 13,000 proprietors is not a land of freedom. A country where only 6 per cent of the population are entitled to vote is surely "asiatic." A country where education is so backward that 49 per cent of its population cannot read or write is surely "asiatic." Hungary, instead of being a government of, for, and by the people, is a government of feudal lords, by feudal lords, and against the people!

In the light of statistics, the economic, social and political structure of the land of the Magyars is a remnant of feudalism. Counts, barons, knights, bishops, feudal lords and abbots long ago obtained grants of land and special privileges from Hungarian kings and Austrian Emperors for so-called "good services" to the state and church. In every instance however these "services" were in the interest of the autocratic powers and against the common people and the liberty of the nation. Such lands ob-

tained by grants, or confiscated through violence were cultivated by serfs and slaves until 1848 the year of the revolution headed by Louis Kossuth, and since then by miserably paid "free laborers." Serfdom of course was abolished, but the land remained in the hands of land-lords, bishoprics, and abbeys, and as the government is founded on land-property, all the political powers of the state remained in the hands of the land-owners. The agrarian aristocracy and bishops, allied with the small commercial plutocracy which is just developing, combined to exploit Hungary to their hearts' content.

The greater part of the national income i. e. 52 per cent is expropriated by 20,000 families, and they only bear 20 per cent of the public expenses; while three and a half million families bear 80 per cent of the public burdens and get only 48 per cent of the total income. Wooden plows with steel edges, pulled by teams of oxen, the hand scythe, the flail and other ancient agricultural implements are almost universally used, although steam plows, threshers, American reapers and binders are coming into use now. Out of 19 million inhabitants, about two thirds of the population is still directly engaged in agricultural pursuits, and chiefly on large estates who maintain the peonage system of miserably paid and over-worked laborers, instead of the northern European system of small peasant proprietors who maintain themselves on the produce of their land employing little labor outside of their own families. The result is that the peasantry is leaving Hungary at the rate of 300,000 a year. They cannot get a living from the land, so they are obliged to cross the Atlantic and try the United States or Canada.

And why is the peasant leaving his native land? Is it because the country is too densely populated? Not at all. The number of persons per 1000 acres is 239 in Hungary; 235 in Scotland; 298 in France; 432 in Germany; 665 in Holland; 894 in England and Wales, and 948 in Belgium. Therefore we might say that Hungary is sparsely populated; yet her population is emigrating in such vast numbers (over 300,000 a year) that population is on the decrease in spite of the high birthrate. The reason is plain! There are in Hungary none of those very large manufacturing or mining industries which account for such an important proportion of the population of England, Germany or Belgium, therefore the disemployed agricultural laborers cannot be absorbed by industries.

The principal occupation is agriculture, and out of a population of 19,254,559 persons, 14,400,000 people are engaged or indirectly working in the line of agriculture. Unlike the western countries of Europe, the cultivated area is neither owned by the millions of diligent peasants, nor cultivated by petty tenant farmers. The best and most productive part of the country,

namely the great lowland of Hungary, is occupied by the large land owners and the churches.

Single magnates, bishopries and abbasies occupy as large estates as a German principality. One third, or 33 per cent of the whole area is owned by single aristocratic families or churches, and they were granted with the understanding that they "might neither be sold nor mortgaged." These immense estates help the agrarian aristocracy to expropriate the few single peasant proprietors and every year the land is concentrating into fewer hands.

Nearly 19 million holds (27 million acres) of the land under cultivation is owned by 13,432 proprietors who own nearly one half, 45.41 per cent, of the total, while the 1,838,000 tenants or peasant proprietors own only 54.59 per cent.

Is it a wonder that the Magyar peasant wanders away from his native land, "anywhere, anywhere out of the world"? Common sense will dictate, that such a distribution of land is not compatible with social justice or love of country. It is only natural that people should leave a country, even the land of their fathers and loved ones, where 14 millions of people out of 19 millions are attached to the soil, and yet 13,000 people own one half of the land. Where manufacturing is yet in a primitive stage; where the annual wages of agricultural laborers average 300 crowns (\$60.00) a year; where the chief income of the government is from direct taxes and indirect taxes on meat, beer, spirits, petroleum, oil, wine, sugar and even bread is extorted with harsh brutality from the poor millions; where the poor who bear the burdens of taxation have no right to vote, have no voice, no influence in public affairs; where the public press is controlled by the police, and where justice is in possession of the landed aristocracy through its judges. In the Hungarian lower house of parliament there are 50 counts and barons, 160 large land-owners, over 100 lawyers, 30 priests and so on, but not a single person to voice the cry of the bleeding workers. It is therefore only natural, that the powers of the state should be administered for the best interests of the oligarchy.

The total number of Hungarian land proprietors and tenants in 1870 was 1,973,400 and in 1900 was 1,855,190; the decrease being 118,210 representing the independent peasant proprietors who have gone to wreck and joined the workers. The change has been visible in the decrease of the size of small properties and in the increase of large estates, especially those great aristocratic family and church estates that "could be neither sold nor mortgaged." The greatest decrease has been in the size of properties under 5 holds (7 acres.) The size of peasant properties of from 5 to 30 holds decreased from 16 million holds (22.9 million acres) in 1870, to 10 million holds (14.3 million acres) in 1900. The size of medium holdings between 200 and 1000 holds (286 to 1430

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN HUNGARY

acres) decreased during the same period from 6.6 million holds (18.5 million acres) to 5.6 million holds (7.1 million acres), or 1 million holds decrease (1,430,000 acres.)

During this same period the large estates have increased sixfold from 463,000 holds to 2,400,000 holds, and the church estates have doubled from 1,288,000 holds to 2,500,000 holds. These estates are in the hands of a few owners, who exact a good income, and they mainly hold such properties as are "limited" forever to single families and churches and cannot be sold or mortgaged. The whole area of these "limited" estates owned by corporations or aristocratic families are 18.8 million holds (34.9 million acres) or 35 per cent of the entire cultivated lands.

The consequence of this system of large estates the greater part of which is "limited" and can never be sold, is that agriculture is undeveloped in Hungary. The large land owners do not grow vegetables, fruits, poultry or truck; they do not raise cattle or hogs, or engage in flower gardening, but prefer to produce corn, the price of which is low. This extensive farming needs less work and is therefore much cheaper because of fewer laborers being necessary. Gardening industry would need more work days, better work and more workers, but it would not pay for the present large estates. Therefore the landlords stick to corn-growing; the consequence being that large numbers of agricultural laborers cannot find employment eight months out of the twelve.

The large estates being "limited," cannot be sold to peasants, nor can they be leased. The consequence of this fact is that even the peasant properties though few in number, follow the model of their superiors and do not attempt to introduce market gardening; the entire farming population hinders the growth of intensive farming, thus impeding to a great extent the development of industry. Market gardening and manufacturing would raise the present low wages; and the higher the wages, the lower the profits of the landlord. The decrease of their profits would disturb their powerful reign and would ultimately force them to give up their lands which in Hungary, like all other countries, is the very structure and foundation of the rule of the aristocracy and the churches. Millions can perish, millions can emigrate, millions can hunger and thirst for justice, but the church and the aristocracy will not give up one jot or atom of their privileges because it would mean the destruction of their feudal regime.

By this method they are able to prevent the development of the small peasant proprietors, of higher wages, of intense agricultural or manufacturing industry; all for the sake of their economic class interest. Thus Hungary, although a part of Europe, is really an "asiatic province."

The difference between Hungary and other countries, where

land-lords own immense tracts of land, for instance Great Britain, is that Hungary is an agricultural and not an industrial country, and that the system of land tenure is as feudal to-day as it was a century ago! The only change being the nominal destruction of serfdom; and even this change was of greater benefit to the landlords than to the serfs, for it gives them cheaper labor power and at a cheaper price on the whole; there being no necessity for the landlord supporting the new serf who is without land:—i. e. the means of life. The political, economic and industrial structure of Hungary is that of a small and ignorant leisured class ruling by power of their privileges alone over the great majority of modern serfs, who are "dead to rapture and despair, a thing that breathes not and never hopes, stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox."

In Germany the transition from large extensive farms to intensive gardening by small peasant proprietors has taken place. Although we hear so very much of the great landlords of the country east of the Elbe, yet the latest statistics of 1895 show that although relatively large estates prevail, yet, 56 per cent, or more than one half of the area under cultivation is owned by the peasants. Taking the whole area under consideration, according to the most reliable data, the farms between 2 and 100 hectares (a hectare is nearly 2½ acres) occupy more than two thirds of the agricultural area of the entire country. And what is more, 89 per cent of the land that peasant farmers occupy, is owned actually and directly by them. This system of alteration in the land tenure of Germany took place between 1880 and 1895. The Occupation Census of Germany in the years 1882 and 1895 gives the following results in the increase of peasant properties viz:

TOTAL NUMBER OF MEN ABOVE 20 YEARS.

According to the direct income tax paid.	I.		II. Having a vote.	III. Per cent of Classes voting.	IV. Number of voters (II) in the per cent of total (I).
	Total number of Classes.				
	No.	Per cent.			
I. Wealthy Class Having 5 or more holds of land paying more than 10 Kronen tax on income.	1,370,060	31.7	795,628	82.0	18.4
II. The petty burghers, and officials, having 2 to 5 holds land. Taxes on income 6 to 10 Kronen.	773,492	17.9	127,102	1.1	2.9
III. The Working Class, mostly without property. Only 300,000 having garden or cottage — all poor.	1,179,408	50.4	48,111	4.9	1.1
Totals . . .	4,322,960	100.0	970,841	100.0	22.4

The results of these 13 years, though unexpected by many economists, show that during this period the peasant properties between 2 and 20 hectares (5 to 50 acres) have come to occupy both a larger amount and a larger proportion under cultivation. They actually occupied 659,258 hectares more land; the proportion of cultivated land held by the peasant class having increased 1.26 per cent. Of course during this same period the petty holdings under 2 hectares (5 acres) had slightly fallen off; while what is of greater importance, all the larger holdings, save the very largest, have fallen off considerably, namely: 1.33 per cent. The great estates, one tenth of all, have grown very slightly during this period. These tendencies towards the increase of farms of peasant proprietors from 2 to 50 hectares (5 to 125 acres) have since been well marked, especially in the Prussian provinces, Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg, and Alsace-Lorraine.

The contrary is true of Hungary. The petty farms have decreased one half—not in number, but in size. The farms of the petty owning class, that is to say farms between 2 and 50 hectares, have decreased by 6 million¹ holds. The small peasant owners, who are so powerful in Germany, Denmark and France, have lost more than a million holds in Hungary during this period of a few years, while the landed aristocracy and the churches have increased by sixfold; and doubled the latter's holdings.

In Germany of the land under cultivation; taking in consideration estates of over 500 hectares, we find that these large owners own only 10 per cent of the land, while in poor Hungary it is 35 per cent! To go further:

We find that in France the distribution of land is so well balanced, that the peasant proprietors who occupy under 2 hectares, own 10 per cent of the land:—the proprietors who own between 2 and 50 hectares own 55 per cent of the soil, and the estates above 200 hectares² occupy but 16 per cent of the land under cultivation.

In Denmark, where 70 per cent of the entire population depends on the soil, we find that 30 per cent work their own farms against the miserable 10 per cent in Hungary. And it must also be noted here that 67 per cent of the cultivated surface of Denmark is in farms under³ 100 holds. In Hungary it is only 54 per cent of the total.

In the United States in 1880 farms under 100 acres covered an area of 2,208,374 acres, or 55 per cent of the cultivated surface, and in 1900 the figures changed to 3,297,404 acres, or 58 per cent of the whole, an increase of 1,089,030 acres. But what is more important the large estates in the United States of over

¹ In Hungarian, 5 to 100 holds.
² 494 acres.
³ 147 acres.

1000 acres covered in 1900 only 0.82 per cent of the entire cultivated surface, as against 35 per cent in Hungary of this same size.

In all countries of the West, except Great Britain, land legislation has always sought to transfer the land to the real cultivators. Here in Hungary no efforts have been made in this direction. The effect of this system of expropriation on the part of the relatively small privileged class is to reduce agriculture, industry and finance to an "asiatic state of affairs." The peasant is attached to the land. He does not own it. The aristocrat owns the land. He does not work it. The aristocrat can only use the services of the peasant when it means profit, and this is only four months a year. The result being that the peasant is in a state of want, degradation and insecurity, in a country capable of supporting easily ten times its present population, where nature has given man such abundance of gold, ore, salt, lumber and land that if it were properly cultivated for the benefit of the people instead of for profit, it would yield more than enough for all the inhabitants of Europe.

As the normal development of an exploited class under the present system reflects the political power they possess, it would be well to investigate the electoral system of Hungary. Under the new electoral laws of Russia about one per cent of the total population is entitled to a vote. According to the census returns of Japan there are in round numbers some 47,200,000 people in 1905, of which only 757,000, or about two per cent are entitled to a suffrage. Great Britain with a restricted electorate and a population of 41,000,000 persons, has 7,200,000 eligible to a vote. France with a population of 40,000,000, has 10,000,000 voters. Germany with a population of 60,000,000, has 12,000,000 voters. The United States with 80,000,000 population has about 22,000,000 persons entitled to a vote. Now let us look at Hungary! In 1900 Hungary had 16,721,574 persons; Croatia and Slavonia 2,400,766 and a military force of 132,219, making a total population for Hungary proper of 19,254,559. In the election of 1905 just 1,056,818 persons were eligible as voters or about 6 per cent of the population!

There is no manhood suffrage in Hungary, only those who pay direct taxes on house property or land or an income varying with occupation being allowed to vote. The only exception being the intellectual class comprising 79,438 persons, such as teachers, physicians and all high school and university graduates who can vote, even if they are not in the tax-payers list to the necessary amount. The reason for this is apparent, as the government fear the intellectuals and tries to satisfy them with this morsel! The entire government is in the hands of the privileged class, who use the powers for their interest as is only to be expected.

The working class if they got possession of government, would also use it to their own interest as a class. The following figures produced from the official statistics of the Interior Department for 1905 is self explanatory:

Size of farms in hectares (h = 2.47 acres)	Area under cultivation		+ Increase or Decrease	Percentage of the total area under cultiv.		+ Increase or Decrease
	1882	1885		1882	1885	
Under 2	1,825,938	1,808,444	- 17,494	5.73	5.60	-0.13
2— 50	19,524,730	20,121,090	+596,360	61.27	62.00	+0.73
50— 100	2,732,041	2,756,606	+ 24,565	8.57	8.48	+0.09
100— 200	1,521,191	1,545,245	+ 24,054	4.77	4.75	-0.02
200—1000	5,556,971	5,484,441	- 72,530	17.44	16.87	-0.57
1000 and over —	708,100	802,115	+ 94,103	2.22	2.46	+0.24

Thus we see, that in Hungary according to the statistics of 1905 there are but 22.4 per cent or 970,841 persons out of a grown up population of 4,332,960 (excluding women) who are allowed to vote. The overwhelming population of grown up men 3,352,119 or 77.6 per cent, are deprived of citizenship! This in face of the fact that every grown up man is compelled to be a soldier. Every man, even the poorest, is contributing to the military budget, the principal income, it will be well to state once more, coming from taxes on meat, sugar, oil, wine and beer. Although the poor worker bears nearly all of the public expenses, directly or indirectly, and is part of the military for 12 years, yet he has no influence in public affairs, he cannot consent or object to these high-handed proceedings—he is dumb—merely a blind man groping in the darkness. Out of 2,179,408 workers (50 per cent of the total) there is scarcely 4 per cent with a ballot. On the other hand the rich, who comprise only 18.4 per cent of the total number of grown up men in the above table, have 82 per cent of the votes of Hungary. It is no wonder that parliament is afraid to introduce universal suffrage although they have often promised this! Real manhood suffrage would mean the death of feudalism and the selfish regime of the aristocrats and the church, and it would be the birth of a new epoch in the life of Hungary. Have not the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister openly expressed it as their opinion that parliament, "should not qualify the enemies of the country, of church, and the sacred institution of private property?"

Hungarian schools are directly in line with agricultural progress! Count Apponyi, minister of education, declared before parliament that the most important part of the elementary in-

struction is the religious instruction. The Count therefore takes the stand taken in the middle ages; namely that sectarian instruction is more useful than knowledge. Out of the 19,866 elementary schools, more than 10,000 are in possession of the different churches. In these schools the catechism is not only taught, but it really dominates the entire course of instruction.

A good idea of the condition of the agricultural serf in Hungary can be had from the report of Dr. Ignatius Daranyi, Minister of Agriculture, in what is known as the "Act of 1898." He says in part:

"The agricultural crisis, which sprang from the general decrease of prices of agricultural produce, has been acutely felt by the agricultural laborers. This depression was increased by a combination of unfavorable circumstances. In the first place following a scarcity of agricultural labor for more than a decade, a great quantity of labor saving machinery was introduced and all the laborers, who were engaged on river improvements, were without employment as a result of the discontinuation of this work. The demand for labor being thus greatly decreased, and the supply proportionally increased, the wages and earnings of agricultural laborers were greatly reduced. This led to general dissatisfaction and finally to such a point that disturbances took place, which gradually increased to such an extent that the present existing order of society was threatened.

Of course Minister Daranyi took special precaution by strengthening the police and military force of these special districts to prevent the laborers from organizing for higher wages. The government went so far in an effort to protect the landlord's profit, as to organize a reserve army of laborers* on the State Farm at Mezöhegyes, and a supply was furnished on short notice by telegraph or telephone to any landlord, who was menaced with a strike. Extra precautions were taken to get the strongest laborers, who could be armed, and these were sent on a special government train. The Home Secretary ordered the military authorities to obey the county officials and to send troops wherever needed. The entire force of government was used to crush the workers. The daily papers were placed under the control of the Attorney General, who at once confiscated all those who alluded to higher wages, or even strikes. In order to make all their acts lawful or rather to give them a lawful character, the government passed what is known as the "Slave Act," or the 2nd act of 1898. This act tries to regulate the relations between employer and employee, and had the effect of preventing the laborers from raising their wages or improving their conditions.

* Strike breakers.

According to this law, the landlord and the worker should make an individual contract in winter for the following summer, in which the wages are stipulated. Of course the laborer has no idea in the winter of how the crop will turn out during the following summer. All the contracts are "percentage of crop" contracts and in case of rain or unfavorable weather it may cost the laborer double pains in harvesting. But he must live up to his contract or go to prison!

Section 37 of the 2nd Act. "If a workman does not arrive punctually without just cause, or leave his work without previously having asked permission to do so, the *first authority is obliged according to the contract of both parties to lead the workman immediately to his work, even should violence be necessary."

"The workman cannot appeal against this law."

Section 62. "The workman, who offends this law or breaks any part of his contract, is to be punished with 60 days imprisonment."

Section 66. "He, who does not appear by free will on the field, or he who has been violently brought to his work and does not continue his work without interruption or he who purposely executes his work imperfectly, shall be punished according to Section 62."

A. Sec. 66: "He who misleads an agrarian workman so as to cause him not to procure certificates as a workman, or causes him to commit a breach of contract, or incites workmen, not to follow a contract regardless of under what conditions it was made."

C. Sec. 66: "He who openly praises one who interrupts work or he who makes a collection to aid or assist such a person shall be punished by imprisonment for 60 days and shall be fined not to exceed 400 crowns."

The above are a few of the striking paragraphs of this infamous law which makes a strike impossible and places the agricultural laborer in the hands of the landlord.

Only last summer 2,000 laborers refused to work for starvation wages. The summer's crop had grown exceedingly tall and later on was laid very low by heavy rains, therefore costing double pains and time to harvest; but the contract was made a winter before, so the then Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Home affairs ordered the starving laborers "numbering 2,000 imprisoned in store houses." "The contracts must be obeyed", declared Mr. Darnyi before parliament. Feudalism is not very dead in Hungary.

The daily wages of a Hungarian agrarian laborer are as follows: Springtime 23 cents (116 filler); summer 36 cents (182

* A young man chosen by the landlords.

filler); during the winter season 21 cents (108 filler), or an average of sixty dollars (300 crowns) a year.

The agitation caused by the infamous "2nd Act" caused the government to pass what is better known as "The Charity Law" or in other words, the XVI Act of 1900:

"In order to assist and relieve agricultural laborers and servants, each landlord must pay *1 crown 20 filler a year for each worker or servant in his employment, while the poor workman or servant must pay yearly 10 crowns 40 filler to the government, same to be used for the benefit of the laborers. The state paying 100,000 crowns yearly to this fund.

In case of an accident the worker receives during the space of 60 days one crown daily. Should he be unable to work at the end of this period, he receives 10 crowns a month. Should he die as a result of such an accident he is to be buried. If he is married and is the father of a family at the time of his death his family receives a lump sum amounting to 400 crowns.

When a worker reaches the age of 65 years, he receives once for all a sum amounting to 100 crowns. In case of the death of such a person (over 65 years of age) his family receives, should he have been a member of this fund for 5 years, 200 crowns, for 10 years 250 crowns, and for 15 years 270 crowns.

There are in Hungary about 4,500,000 agricultural laborers and servants (without women or children) and although for years the provisions of the oppressive laws were obeyed and harshly enforced, thereby preventing organizations, yet the reaction has set in lately and the agricultural laborers are now organizing with a rapidity that is astonishing. It is a great task to organize agricultural laborers, who cannot read or write, who are subject to every oppressive law of the landlords and who often, very often, receive punishment from the master in the form of a chastisement which means a week in bed. This is styled "home discipline" and the landlord cannot be brought to trial for this. Hungary is "Asiatic," but is awakening with a rapidity that will startle the world in a few years. The cry for political enfranchisement is the main issue now—then will come the land question. Hungary cannot remain half slave, half free.

NICHOLAS KLEIN.

* 24 cent.

Dietzgenism.

THE attempt to present a view of Joseph Dietzgen's philosophy within the limits of a magazine article is almost hopeless. His own writings are clearer and simpler than any digest of them can be made. But they are too little known. No one who has read the two volumes of his works published in English translation by Charles H. Kerr & Co. can fail to wish that others too could feel the elevating power of his grand conceptions.

The scattering passages on philosophy and religion which are to be found in the workshop of Marx and Engels are too meager to carry the average reader over into monism, particularly if he is suffering under the disability of a good training in bourgeois schools and churches. In fact these fragments are more apt to work antagonism than conviction. But with Dietzgen it is different. He presents his views with such good humor, such perfect mastery of the subject, such frequent repetitions in different forms, adapted to different habits of thought, such knowledge of his predecessors and cheerful recognition of their services, that you not only learn to love the man, but find in his comprehensive system ample room for both the idealist and the materialist, provided they are willing to be a part of nature only and not the whole thing. His philosophy might be well characterized as the philosophy of the Whole and of the Parts.

It is for this reason that the former religionist finds perfect satisfaction in the monism of Dietzgen when properly understood. The great trouble is the quarrel over the name. It is commonly called by Socialists materialistic monism. Dietzgen himself refuses to suggest any name, wisely recognizing that our present language has no accurate name for an idea heretofore unknown. We will call it Dietzgenism, and try to explain one or two points of it, chiefly for the purpose of getting others interested. But it must be borne in mind that any attempt to condense Dietzgenism into a few paragraphs leaves broad openings for attacks and misunderstandings which can only be removed by going to the lucid writings of the master himself.

Dietzgen recognizes that matter is prior in time to mind; but when mind has once made its appearance in human life it takes its place as a factor of the Universe coordinate with matter. In fact its reaction on matter is constantly increasing. Ponderable and tangible matter is not matter *par excellence*. Sounds, colors and smells are also material. Forces are not mere

appendices or predicates of matter, and tangible matter is not "the thing" which dominates over all properties. Our conception of matter and force is, so to speak, democratic. One is of the same value as the other; everything individual is but the property, appendix, predicate or attribute of the entire nature as a whole. The brain is not the matador, and the mental functions are not the subordinate servants. The function is as much and as little an independent thing as the tangible brain mass. (Dietzgen, *Essays*, p. 301.)

The Universe embraces everything conceivable both in mind and matter, and thought itself becomes cosmic substance,—subject matter for investigation and consideration. The phenomena of mind must be studied objectively with the same methods as those used for physical science, not by boring into the brain as an anatomist, but by an examination and comparison of intellectual products as a historian and philosopher. Mind must be studied inductively, as matter itself can only be studied with induction. Though matter and mind both belong to the Universe they cannot be reduced to one common, homogeneous element, except perhaps to the extent of saying that tangible matter contains the germs out of which the brain and the mind are subsequently developed. But properly speaking mind and matter find their unity in nothing short of the infinite and eternal Universe, which is the only genus high enough to include them both.

This Universe is not the physical Universe of astronomy, but the Universe of both mind and matter, comprising things which are not seen and houses not made with hands. It is not created but is self-existent. To demand a creation is to assume that the natural state of things is nothingness, which is absurd. The natural state of affairs is positive, not negative, a something, not nothing. Nothing is only a relative term. There is no absolute nothingness.

The law of cause and effect which applies to the different parts of the Universe as among themselves has no application when applied to the totality of all things, or the Universe itself. To assume a cause for this is to deny its infinity. All thoughts, philosophies, religions, deities etc., are only parts of the Universe, fractions of a Unit. There cannot be two infinities; they would coincide with each other and be one. To speak of an infinite god is wrong. Anything less than the whole cannot be infinite. The totality of all things both mental and physical is the only infinity. All gods are idols in that they are only fractions of a whole and the whole is greater than any of its parts.

This gives the bourgeois ample scope for idealism, spirituality etc., because these are not excluded from Dietzgenism as they were from the old materialism; but they must come in as

parts of the Universe, like everything else and not as superior to it. Inclusiveness, not exclusiveness, is the characteristic of this philosophy.

The Universe is not only self-existent, it is self-everything, automatic in every respect. It is even self-understanding, for it is conceived and understood only by the mind itself, which is one of its own parts. What is meant by the word "dialectic," which occurs so often in Dietzgen? Those who have had a smattering of Greek have an advantage here; they know what is meant by the "middle voice" in Greek grammar. Something analogous to it, the reflexive verb, is very common in German, far less so in English. The Germans are everlastingly saying that something "does itself." English speaking people are so accustomed to "doing" others that it strikes them as funny that a person or a thing should do itself, and hence it is difficult for them to grasp this idea. In the middle voice the subject acts on itself, the subject and the object are one and the same thing. I move myself, a thing moves itself, the Universe moves itself or a part of itself and thus changes itself. It acts in the middle voice, its parts interact on each other dialectically; in other words, it is self-acting, automatic. It is analogous to a democratic commonwealth which has no government except a self-government. So the Universe is self-governing.

Dialectics is the science of the general self-movement and self-development of nature, of human society and of thought; the science of the eternally changeable diffusion of things, of the constant interaction and interrelation of all things in the Universe. For, as a person has two relatives, the individual and the social, so in the Universe all things have two aspects,—first their relations with each other in which some are subordinate to others; second, their relations to the Universe itself in which all things are coordinate and of equal importance; for the real tangible things to which others are subordinate are themselves only fleeting and evanescent attributes of the one unvanishing Universe.

This enables us to explain the difficulty raised by Kant, when he says, "Where there is an appearance there must be something which appears," (appearance here meaning a physical object. We reply no, not in the middle voice; not where the appearance and the appearing are one and the same thing; it is then a self-appearance, a self-manifestation, and there is nothing behind the appearance except the Universe itself of which the appearance is only one form of manifestation. There is nothing behind phenomena except the Universe and the Universe itself is a phenomenon,—a self-phenomenon. There is no "thing-in-itself" when applied to a fraction of the whole. There is only

one "thing in itself" and that is the Universe, the totality of all things conceived as a Unit.

Dietzgen has much to say about cognition. What is it to *know* a thing? To know a thing is to perceive it with the senses. And if there is only one specimen of the thing in existence, unrelated to anything else, our knowledge is practically nothing. Where there are a number of similar things which can be put into one or more classes or species and compared and related with each other, our knowledge amounts to a power to classify, to unite and then also to separate, to distinguish. It is common to speak of a *discriminating* mind. It would be just as proper to speak of a *unifying* mind. Dietzgen had a wonderfully unifying mind, as well as a discriminating mind.

Our knowledge of things, though entirely superficial and empirical and confined to phenomena only, is sufficient to enable us to subject them to our use and to calculate in advance what effect certain actions will have on certain things. Of course the deep metaphysical philosopher will tell us that this classifying knowledge is no knowledge at all. But we go right on just the same, regulating our lives, marrying and giving in marriage, rearing our children, accumulating and spending our wealth, burying our dead, in fact basing our whole existence on this self-same superficial knowledge. It is sufficient for these purposes. It is as real as our life and as real as our death. We ourselves are nothing but a phenomenon.

Readers who approach Dietzgen from different directions differ in about the same way as do Socialists, some of whom reached socialism by the way of political democracy or religious conviction, others by the way of economic development or evolution. One is the ideological route, the other the materialistic. They reach a common point in socialism and Dietzgenism. The old style materialist is pleased to find in Dietzgen so much that conforms to his previous views; another who has a sentimental nature and has gone through a religious experience finds in Dietzgen a satisfying enlightenment which surpasses anything that he has had from supposed revelation. He finds all of his delicate feelings recognized at their full value as component parts of the all-parent Universe, related to matter, it is true, yet not in a degrading or humiliating way, but as fellow citizens of the cosmic commonwealth. Dietzgenism in solving the problems of the present life where religion is a self-confessed failure, merits greater confidence than religion in questions of the future life of which religion makes a specialty.

"If he is an atheist who denies that perfection can be found in any individual, then I am an atheist. And if he is a believer in God who has the faith in the "most perfect being" with which

not alone the theologians, but also Cartesius and Spinoza have occupied themselves so much, then I am one of the true children of God." (Dietzgen, *Positive Outcome of Philosophy*, p. 244). The difference between this method of putting it and that of some others, say Bebel's for instance, or Blatchford's, or Plechanoff's is very marked, though it is a difference in form rather than substance.

What Dietzgen is NOT may be well shown by the following quotation:—"An exposition of the structure, the physical forces and the *intellectual operations* of man must be founded on anatomy. . . Believing that in the present state of science doctrines in psychology, unless they are sustained by evidence derived from anatomy and physiology are not to be relied on, I have not thought it necessary to devote much space to their introduction. They have not taken a part in the recent advances of humanity. They belong to an earlier social period and are an anachronism in ours. . . The time has now come when no one is entitled to express an opinion in philosophy unless he has first studied physiology. It has hitherto been to the detriment of truth that these processes of positive investigation have been repudiated. If from the construction of the human brain we may demonstrate the existence of the soul, is not that a gain? Why should we cast aside the solid facts presented to us by material objects? In his communications throughout the universe, God ever materializes. I am persuaded that the only possible route to truth in mental philosophy is through a study of the nervous mechanism. The experience of 2500 years and the writings of the great metaphysicians attest the vanity of all other means. How many of these made themselves acquainted with the structure of the human brain? Doubtless some had been so unfortunate as never to see one. Yet that wonderful organ was the basis of all their speculations."

Draper: *Intellectual Development of Europe*. Vol. II, p. 343.

This is certainly a very bad case of *materialism on the brain*.

As we are writing for English speaking readers we must of course refer to Spencer or we shall be counted out. If Spencer and his followers are correctly called agnostics, then we should call Dietzgen a *panagnostic*. He knows it all. This may seem to invite ridicule, but we may just as well have it out first as last. This is only taking the same position in philosophy that the socialists take in politics, and unless we do get to the point where we know it all (in Dietzgen's sense only) our philosophy would not fundamentally differ from those of the past. As the working class in achieving its supremacy abolishes all classes including itself, so Dietzgenism abolishes all philosophies including itself, so far as the same can be called a special system.

In chapters II and III of Spencer's *First Principles*, entitled "Ultimate Religious and Scientific Ideas" will be found Spencer's objections to a philosophy which explains everything. His objection is that the human mind cannot conceive of infinity, of an infinite Universe, self-existing during a period of infinite past time; hence in spite of the utmost progress of science there remains something mystical, divine, unknown and unknowable, which is the legitimate domain of the supernatural, in short of religion.

Students of mathematics seem to have no difficulty in dealing with infinities. However, we cannot go into this matter here, but merely wish to stimulate the reader to compare those chapters of Spencer with Dietzgen's works and see how small the "Perplexed Philosopher" looks by the side of the mind-taming tanner.

Comrade, get a volume of Dietzgen and give your mind a thorough shaking up. You will feel a new life in you.

MARCUS HITCH.

The Co-operative Movement in Russia.

THE Russian Revolution has quickened not only the political life of the country, but also economic organization among the lower classes. Unions in great numbers have arisen which continue their many-sided activities (there are even electoral societies) irrespective of all reaction. Associations, particularly *co-operative stores*, have existed for a long time, but they have not attracted the attention of the leading circles in the liberal movement. In the cities, under the pressure of absolutism, they have not attained to any great significance; but in the villages they have been of great material advantage to the peasants.

Consequently the rural *co-operative stores* make up nearly one half of such associations, the whole number of which now exceeds 1000. They count, in all 300,000 members. About one half of these are workmen; nearly 100,000 are peasants. But the peasant co-operative stores, often founded by teachers, are now much restricted in their intellectual activity (the opening of reading-rooms, etc.) by the government. At present there is more freedom for the movement in the large cities where the governmental eye is fixed upon the labor unions. All the Russian co-operative stores are strictly neutral in order to give no cause for persecution.

On the other hand, the advance in the price of the necessities of life which began in the cities in January 1907, so stimulated the co-operative activity of the workmen, that the government dared not suppress the co-operative stores lest the working people should be driven to hunger riots.

The rise in prices in Russian cities is so marked, that one must now pay more for all products than in the summer of 1906. Not only bread, meat, vegetables, but also clothing, household stuff, etc., have advanced in price. The Russian manufacturers say quite openly that *they* will not pay the new advance in wages.

Under these circumstances in the autumn of 1906, in St. Petersburg, owing to the fiasco of the Syndicalists helped by the factory hands, a co-operative store was founded; and with it a new epoch in the association movement begins.

The co-operative store, "Trudowej Ssojuss," is organized after the Belgian model. In the beginning, the suspicious attitude of a part of the social Democracy—the so-called "majority"—checked its development. It had scanty funds besides. Nevertheless, from the month of March and thence forward, the association developed very rapidly. At the same time the "minor-

ity" of the Social Democrats helped on the work without touching the political neutrality of the association. One factory after another combined with the "Trudowoj Ssojuss." The Social Democrats were the first who advised against the founding of other co-operative stores. At the end of March the association had only 1000 members; by the middle of July it had 6000. It had a fund of 50,000 rubles and 12 shops for selling goods distributed throughout the factory quarters of the city. Of the search for dividends, such as we see in many Russian and sometimes in German associations, there is not a trace. The members of "Trudowoj Ssojuss" renounce not only the interest on the money invested, but dividends as well. All revenue must be used for the development of the society, and for the support of the unemployed. At present the association is beginning to found lecture courses for working men and schools for their children. At the meetings of "Trudowoj Ssojuss" the enthusiasm of the workers is so great, it reminds one of the days of Gapon.

But along with its advantages, this co-operative store has also its dark sides. In the first place, it is still in debt to a rich member who has bought well-equipped bakeries and leased them to the society with the right to purchase. Now, in the beginning the feeling of solidarity was so strong in many of the members that they worked for the society without pay. For that reason the demands of the organized union bakers appear to them to be selfish. "The bakers want higher wages," say many of the members, "but we work for the good of the society for nothing, and what's more, the bakery at present is run at a loss."

But much more dangerous under present political conditions than this already settled contest with the bakers, is the enmity of the shopkeepers. The newly founded society by its economical activity has intensified class separation and class struggle more than a thousand orations could have done. The petty trading class separated itself from the working class—or rather the laborers deserted the traders. The Petersburg shopkeepers fell into a rage and founded in June 1907, the "traders alliance." The aims of the alliance were, from the start, a matter of course: In the first place it would ruin the co-operative store by lowering prices—the resulting losses to be paid out of a common fund. Furthermore the "alliance" would spy upon the Society wherever it sold goods, and denounce its probable abuses in the press. But as all this did not avail, the shopkeepers resorted to denunciation. They informed the police that the society transported bombs along with bread, that its neutrality was only a pretense, and that one day it would prove a danger to the state. The story of the bombs was so absurd, that even the government did not believe it.

Such is the co-operative outlook in Petersburg. In other cities a movement of the same sort may be observed. In Moscow, in the Government of Perm, etc., the factory co-operatives are emancipating themselves from the factory bosses; and following them in other places are the railway co-operatives who would throw off the yoke of bureaucracy. In Baku in Charkow, it is the merchants' employees who wish to organize co-operative unions.

Other unions in Warsaw, Ekaterinoslav, Tula, Astrachan, etc., greet enthusiastically the new co-operative idea. The idea of union co-operation gains ground, and in Petersburg the organized merchants' employees have founded (beginning of August 1907) a co-operative kitchen where they take their meals. The association of printers also have opened a kitchen, and intend shortly to open a retail shop and a printing press.

The inclination toward co-operative production is very strong in Russian workingmen, perhaps because the obsolete, original "Artel" was nothing else than a band of co-operative producers. The leaders have much difficulty in weaning the workingmen from this idea. Isolated, unconnected with co-operative stores, these productive associations are seldom profitable.

In Petersburg, in July, a tailors' association was formed. The hat-makers intend to form a productive association. The sausage-makers, in connection with "Trudowoj Ssojuss" have the same intention. In the Government of Ufa the workmen were actually desirous of leasing a mismanaged and bankrupt government mine; but the government would not listen to the request. Co-operative mines and factories seem to them dangerous, as being "socialistic experiments." "The workers"—they think—"cannot conduct a business without the undertaker; if they should succeed, the belief in the indispensability of the capitalists would be shattered."

We have said that the labor leaders [Arbeiterführer] hold themselves aloof from the idea of the production association. As we have seen, this is not their attitude toward the co-operative stores. Especially the trade union leaders [Gewerkschaftsführer] lay great stress upon the organization of the co-operatives, in connection with production. The Moscow workingmen have called upon the coming labor congress to give the co-operative stores organized help: Otherwise their delegates will leave the congress. But this threat is superfluous. The Petersburg unions have already (end of July) prepared a resolution in favor of the co-operative stores for the approaching congress. According to the resolution, both sides must unite, and submit all possible differences to a commission of delegates from both organizations. Curiously enough, the unions ask in this resolution that

the co-operative stores shall render them financial aid. But at present this is impossible, not because the Russian co-operative stores lack means, but on other grounds. In 1904 the association expended nearly 30,000 rubles for education and for relief work.* But the immaturity of many of the co-operative stores and the political situation, put many obstacles in the way. There are some members who denounce every "political" step. The great factory co-operative stores in Sormovo was suppressed because of taking part in the "armed uprising" in December 1905, and has only recently got permission to re-open. The largest Russian co-operative store, that of the railway employees in Perm, which counts 12,000 members, was in the spring of 1906 openly denounced in the press. It was said that it sold weapons in order to organize the uprising. Then, too, many were displeased because this co-operative store at the end of 1906 contributed for the families of members ordered to strike, 100 rubles out of the surplus fund. The sending of two cartloads of wheat to the starving peasants in 1907, was the only thing that received a unanimous vote.

Taken all in all, the co-operative movement has a future in Russia. In 1904, two hundred and ninety-one unions out of the thousand made a yearly output of nearly 37,000,000 rubles, and had almost 1,700,000 rubles surplus. One hundred and eighty co-operative stores are establishing a promising wholesale concern in Moscow. For a new movement which dates only from the end of the seventies, when it was begun by the well-known Marxist, N. Sieber, these are significant figures.

BY DR. TOTOMJANZ,

(St. Petersburg.)

(Translated from the Neue Zeit.)

* From the author's latest statistics of the co-operative stores.

EDITORIAL

The Panic.

By far the most important event of the month has been the financial disturbance. It is rather interesting that the ink was scarcely dry on the editorial in this magazine last month, questioning whether there would ever be another panic than we seemed to be launched full into the midst of one,

To be sure there is still some question of whether all the phenomena of an industrial crisis will follow, or whether, after a brief period of financial upheaval, there will be only a steady industrial depression, or possibly a revival. It is certain that never before has there been such a conscious control of affairs by great industry as has been shown during the past few weeks, but it still remains to be seen just how effective that control is in the deeper industrial phases of the subject.

It would seem that the industrial up-sweep had reached its greatest height, and that the income of the future had been mortgaged by the inflation of securities to such an extent as to produce, in the financial world at least, all the phenomena of over production.

Then came the battle between Heinze and the Standard Oil crowd, upon the one side and the conflict between some of the great trust magnates and the Roosevelt trust-busting crusade. These disturbances were enough to give the final touch that set the whole structure tumbling.

The first sign of any trouble was a decline in the price of certain stocks. This called for more margins, or increased collateral, from speculators and borrowers. The money needed for this purpose was not at hand, and the towering mass of credit that had been pyramided upon the small amount of actual currency began to totter. A money stringency occurred in New York. A frantic effort was made to quarantine the trouble in the city of its origin. If the New York banks could withstand the strain it was thought that the remaining financial institutions of the country would be safe. So money

was poured into the metropolis from all directions. At almost the first call for help from the gamblers, the national government forgot its trust busting and rushed to the rescue. The United States treasury was swept clearer than it has been for years in the hope of stemming the tide. More than \$100,000,000 was supplied by the national government, leaving a scant \$17,000,000 in the national treasury,—a sum that would ordinarily be considered far below the safety point.

This vast sum of money was still all too little. It was secured by deposits of government bonds, and it was then proposed that ordinary securities be substituted for these, in order that the government bonds might be released to form a basis of national banknote issues. This is now being done and several million dollars more will be added to the currency in this way, and the national government will have loaned to the great capitalists of this country, without interest some two or three hundred millions of dollars at a time when money was worth from six to one hundred per cent in the market.

But all these efforts did not succeed in preventing the escape of the panic germ from New York. But when the disease spread to the remainder of the country it found the financial institutions of other cities already beggared for the assistance of the eastern banks. This process had been made all the easier by the fact that the law permits the banks in the small cities to keep the amount which they are required to hold in reserve against possible demands of their depositors, in certain great banks located in financial centers, and particularly in New York. So it was that by the time the panic had spread outside New York, the money had already been withdrawn from the banks outside that city.

There was no possible way by which the money of the depositors could be paid out if they demanded it,—and it soon became evident that they were going to demand it. The money was not there and the only thing the banks could do was to give an exhibition of a magnificent bluff. By a concerted agreement the banks of the United States quietly informed their depositors that they could not have their money. There is no question but that such action is illegal. We are not raising any question of its desirability. It is easily possible that in this crisis it was the best thing for all concerned, although we will by no means grant this without argument. But it is absolutely certain that if this power is to be exercised, if all laws are to be swept aside at certain times, if the right of private property is to be abolished or suspended in certain things at certain periods, that some one ought to exercise this power besides a body of bankers who are mightily interested in the financial results of such action. It may be, on the other hand, that the precedent thus established will prove to be a handy thing at some future time. If a victorious laboring class should decide to take a few laws into its own hands

without stopping to use the legislative machinery it can always point to the action of the bankers in 1907 as a precedent for such action.

Wherever necessary the state as well as the national government was placed at the service of the banking rulers. In Illinois it appears that the state treasury was swept a little cleaner than the national one had been in order to save the crumbling banks of the state. In several states the governors declared repeated holidays, and thus relieved the banks from all obligation of doing business.

In a number of cities the banks deliberately usurped the function of creating a legal tender and issued "scrip" in place of currency. When it was pointed out that this was illegal, and directly contrary to law, it was replied that there was no penalty provided for violation of the law and that therefore there was nothing to hinder the insurance of such "scrip".

For several years the banks have been asking for a law authorizing "asset currency". They wished to be permitted to deposit industrial bonds and issue money upon them in the same way that national bonds are now used. Since even the national bond provision has long been a sore spot with Populistic orators and small capitalist critics of the banking system, there has been considerable hesitation in enacting such a law. But while no law to this effect has been enacted, yet much of the same result has been achieved by the executive ruling referred to above, by which industrial bonds have been permitted to be substituted for government bonds as collateral for money loaned by the national treasury. This permitted the withdrawal of the government bonds previously required as such security and their immediate redeposit as security for the issuance of banknotes. The consequence of all this is that the United States government has loaned some \$100,000,000 upon the industrial security, whose inflation is claimed by bourgeois critics to have been one of the causes of the panic.

Another illuminating side of these recent events has been the sudden taming of President Roosevelt. As soon as the panic was well under way he was at once charged with having been its cause. He was told that his speeches attacking the trusts had undermined confidence and caused the fall of credit. That he really had anything to do with the matter is very doubtful, but one thing is certain, and that is that he has given every evidence of being one of the most thoroughly scared politicians occupying official position at the present time.

This fright has succeeded in accomplishing something that a few weeks ago would have been declared impossible. It has made him keep his mouth shut for nearly two weeks. The only exception was a mildly congratulatory note addressed to the very men whom he has been supposed to be so violently fighting, praising them for their action during the panic.

It is announced that he has rewritten his message and cut all the "dynamite" out of it, and that he has abandoned his trust busting campaign entirely. He has also agreed to permit the passage of a bill through Congress legalizing the asset currency so long asked for.

All talk about collecting that famous \$29,000,000 fine against Standard Oil has been carefully hushed up, and no more criminal proceedings are being heralded in the press. In short, Roosevelt has been made to eat dirt in a most humiliating manner, and is being thoroughly taught the very important lesson that while capitalism lasts capitalists must and will rule, and that the only result of meddling with their rule, while leaving them in power, is to bring the whole structure rattling about the heads of the meddlers.

Still another interesting feature of the matter is the sudden and complete conversion of Wall Street to the Populistic doctrine of cheap money. The "Wall Street Journal", "Bankers' Magazine", "Journal of Finance", not to mention the New York Sun and Chicago Tribune of to-day read very much like the Kansas country papers of the late 80's and early 90's. All of which does not prove that either one was right in their economic reasoning, but simply that both change their economic theories and political doctrines as they imagine that their material interests dictated.

One of the first results in the industrial world was a sudden acceleration of the consolidation movement. The United States Steel Company absorbed the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Co., its chief competitor. The Trust Company of America, one of the chief financial concerns outside the Standard Oil group, is now in process of being absorbed by the Morgan-Rockefeller interests.

Thus the outcome of the trust-busting campaign is simply more and bigger trusts. It is interesting to note that all talk of collecting the famous \$29,000,000 fine against the Standard Oil Company has disappeared from the columns of the daily press and the speeches of administration speakers.

Still another illuminating phase of the situation has been the magnificent discipline which has been enforced upon the entire capitalist press. With one accord they have shouted whatever the banks thought it well for them to shout. During all the time that the panic was spreading faster and further they were repeating each day that the panic was over, that confidence had been restored, that the banks were all safe, that there was no cause for uneasiness, and so on "ad infinitum."

There has not been a break in their ranks. Not one of them dared to tell the truth. Here and there one would modify the general cry that all was well, and give the news of falling institutions, but always the burden of the song remained the same.

As usual Hearst outdid all the others. When he does get down and crawl he presses his belly so deep into the mud that he makes the other seem fairly upright in comparison. On this occasion he shrieked all over his front pages in signed statements, certifying to the strength and stability of the banks.

Throughout it all capitalism has shown a solidarity and daring that may well be copied by the working class. When Labor shall show the same uniformity of action, the days of panics will be over with forever.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

About the time this number of the Review reaches its readers the American Federation of Labor will be in session in Norfolk, Va. From a number of viewpoints this year's convention will be the most important in the history of the organization. As in former years, the interminable jurisdiction controversies between various international bodies, which have become a public scandal in some instances, will take up considerable time of the delegates.

The expulsion of the brewery workers several months ago for refusing to obey the mandate of the Minneapolis convention to permit themselves to be dismembered by three or four craft organizations has stirred up considerable discussion among the rank and file.

It is hardly probable that the brewery workers will ask for reinstatement. They are not accustomed to prostrating themselves and crawling upon their bellies to kiss the foot that kicks them. A dignified protest is about all that the convention can expect from the brewers.

Encouraged by the action of the executive council in unseating the brewery workers, it is quite likely that demands will be made for the expulsion of other organizations that refused to surrender certain of their members to rival bodies that are wedded to the narrow craft idea. For example, the longshoremen are accused by the seamen of usurping the title "transport workers" and admitting workmen who float upon the waters and who are claimed by the seamen. The controversy has been aired in previous conventions and threshed over by arbitrators, and orders have been issued to the longshoremen to confine their efforts to organizing the landlubbers, but at the recent Detroit convention of the transport workers they reaffirmed their position, defied Gompers' arbitrary decision and announced their readiness to fight to preserve their industrial organization. "We expect," said an international officer to the writer, "that the seamen will demand that our charter be revoked at the Norfolk gathering, for we are in about the same kind of a boat as the brewery workers. Let 'em take their charter; we'll go it alone rather than permit our ranks to be weakened by the seamen, who, by the way, scabbed it only recently on the dock strikers at Duluth and other iron ore ports." It is also rumored in labor circles that the carpenters will demand the expulsion of the woodworkers, the

painters will ask that the carriageworkers be unseated, and one or two other propositions to rip up things will be injected.

While these internal dissensions will undoubtedly cause considerable excitement, it is nevertheless a fact that they will be completely overshadowed by recent developments in the outside industrial and political world. Indeed the attacks of the employers' associations may prove a godsend by pounding enough sense into the thick heads of some of the "leaders" to cause them to comprehend the necessity of restoring harmony and strengthening every vulnerable spot in the ranks of organized labor. Many sympathizers not directly connected with unions marvel at these jurisdictional controversies; they wonder why there should be rivalry and in some instances bitter enmity between workingmen just because one carries a yellow card, another a blue, still another a red and so on, or some similar trifling reason. But those who are labor's friends despite its foolish mistakes should remember that workingmen also fight each other just as bitterly in the political field. They are hypnotized by the party names "Republican" or "Democrat," though both standing for the same principles and policies—that is to perpetuate the capitalist system and skin the working class. Then again the fact should not be overlooked that the educational advantages of some "labor leaders" have been sadly limited, and they lack the training, intelligence and general knowledge of the fundamental principles that underlie the labor movement of the world to appreciate the full effects of reasonable harmony, thorough discipline and compact organization.

However, as stated above, the capitalists are teaching the so-called leaders some valuable lessons that they are bound to learn. There is little jurisdictional strife between the score of national employers' associations that formed the American Federation of capitalism in New York several months ago. The one thought uppermost in the minds of those leaders on the other side was to so arrange affairs that successful war can be made upon organized labor—and, of course, if the unions can be encouraged to make war among themselves victories for capitalism will come so much the easier. The announcement of the employers that they intend to collect a fund of \$1,500,000 for the purpose of "educating labor" to know its place together with the subsequent filing of a suit in Washington to outlaw boycotting, the laying off of union men, etc., caused more widespread discussion in labor's ranks than any occurrence of recent years. There is a general demand being made that the issue be met—that the workers cease bickering among themselves, close their ranks and prepare to reply to the attack. That the Federation and its affiliated international organizations have reached a point where it will be necessary to raise a large defense fund is no longer open to doubt. The day of waging strikes of any magnitude on wind is passed. It cost the printers more than \$3,000,000 to enforce the eight-hour day it will take another million before that concession has been firmly established in every branch of the industry. To argue that it would be impossible to create a big defense fund, as some of the leaders, so-called, have done in the past, is sheer nonsense. If they would state the exact situation in the industrial and political world for the information of the rank and file, and point out the struggles that would have to be encountered (as the Socialists have attempted to do), instead of bragging and blustering in an egotistical, penny-wise manner, the membership would rise to the occasion and strengthen their organizations, financially and numerically, and rest on their

arms. The Civic Fakiration dope about mediation, conciliation, arbitration, "identity of interests," etc., has done more to woo the membership into a condition of fancied security than any other agency. Belmont, Carnegie, Fisk and the rest of the plutocrats did not furnish the funds for nothing to keep that aggregation mouthing sophistries. They know their business.

Undoubtedly the political question will be up as usual. The Gompsonian "punish your friends and reward your enemies" will be the cry of the reactionists for the great Presidential and Congressional struggle next year. Whether Littlefield, Cannon and their ilk will be boycotted again after last year's fiasco is problematical, as the open shoppers have announced that they will pour money into every district that is contested by Gompers and his assistants, and furthermore, as labor has hardly enough funds to wage its industrial struggles, it is difficult to see where the money is coming from to engage in Quixotic campaigns upon a large scale to obtain satisfactory results. Certainly the Socialists will oppose that sort of "swanz politikk," and, while they have no desire to "capture" the Federation, realizing that votes cannot be secured and the capitalists driven from power by adopting resolutions, still they will invite all earnest, clear-headed workingmen and women to join their organization, defend their principles and policies, and absolutely refuse to surrender or dissolve their party machinery simply because Gompers comes along with his fake political bushwhacking scheme that has been rejected by the working people in practically every country in the world.

In all likelihood the old officers will be re-elected (we cannot get along without them) excepting John Mitchell, second vice-president, who has announced his retirement from the labor movement on account of failing health. It is announced from Washington that Mitchell will be provided with a soft political berth by his friend Roosevelt if he will accept a position. Mitchell has repeatedly declared that he would not take a political job, but if he retires from all official connection with the miners he may change his mind. The annual rumor that Gompers would decline re-election to make room for a more militant and aggressive official and a progressive policy is mere rumor, that's all.

Mention was made in last month's Review that in a decision rendered by United States Judge P. C. Jones, of the Northern Alabama district, the court, among other things, declared as follows:

"An employer has a property right in the services of his workmen in his business. The employer can maintain an action against any one who entices his servant to leave him, or prevent the servant from working for his employer. This property right is protected by the sanction of our criminal laws also."

Quick to grasp the significance of this decision, a Wall street organ hinted strongly that employers ought to seize the club placed in their hands and enforce their "property right." That is precisely what has occurred. Hardly had the news of the Alabama decision been printed when the attorneys for the United Typothetae of America—the employers' association in the printing industry which has been practically disrupted—entered the United States Court in Cincinnati and asked for an injunction to restrain the printing pressmen and assistants from ordering a national strike for the eight-hour day and the closed shop. The plaintiffs claimed they had an agreement with the defendants and a strike would be a violation of

the contract. The court granted a temporary restraining order and ten days later made it permanent. In deciding the case Judge Thompson enjoined the officers of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union from ordering a strike or paying any strike benefits, claiming that such action would be in violation of a contract made, but conceded the right of individual members to cease work. The alleged agreement referred to, as already shown in the Review, was entered into by and between former President Higgins and the Typothetae officials and provided for the introduction of the eight-hour day in 1909. Higgins showed himself the rankest kind of betrayer. He signed the agreement at a time when the printers were battling to establish the shorter workday and when the bookbinders were preparing to make demands. The pressmen's convention of 1906 had instructed Higgins to open negotiations, in co-operation with the bookbinders, to establish the eight-hour day in a reasonable time; this year's convention repudiated the proposed long-time agreement, defeated Higgins for re-election, and instructed the new officials to demand the shorter workday and closed shop at once. It should be stated that when the old agreement that expired this year was entered into in 1902 it was by ratification of the members in a referendum vote. The alleged new agreement was not only not submitted to the membership for acceptance or rejection, but was defeated in convention, where the first steps must be taken. And yet the Typothetae claims, and the U. S. Court holds the claim valid, that the document arranged by them with their man Higgins is binding upon thousands of unionists who had no voice in the arrangements.

The action of the court in prohibiting the international officials from carrying out the mandates of their constituents and call a general strike or from paying benefits, and then patronizingly informing the defendants that individuals have a right to quit work, is farcical, to say the least. The court might as well have tied a man hand and foot and then bid him get up and run a race or placed a gag in his mouth and invited him to eat heartily. Everybody knows how ridiculous a strike upon individual initiative or without benefits would be. The chaotic situation thus created would mean an easy victory for the employers, disrupted though they are. If the pressmen inaugurate a general strike they subject themselves to punishment for contempt of court and perhaps will have their funds attached in proceedings for damages brought by employers. On the other hand, if they don't strike they are doomed to work nine hours a day until January 1, 1909, and under open shop conditions until January 1, 1912. This is only one more illustration of how the coils of capitalism are closing about labor upon the industrial field, where the workers are regarded as chattels.

The national strike of the bookbinders for the eight-hour day, which began last month, is proving quite successful. Four weeks after the contest began the international officials estimated that 85 per cent of the membership had secured the shorter workday. Nearly all the establishments in the larger cities where strikes occurred signed agreements, but in all probability there will be a long contest with some concerns that operated on an open shop basis before the struggle commenced.

In this connection it should be mentioned that about 20,000 garment workers employed in union establishments were conceded

the eight-hour day the early part of the present month. The matter was arranged through friendly negotiation. The garment workers, as well as their fair employers, are having a hard fight with the sweaters. Some of the large concerns that are running open shop are the worst among the sweaters. Huge stacks of their clothing are manufactured under the most unsanitary conditions in the attics, cellars and hovels of the great cities. The best manner to help the garment workers, who are among the poorest paid trades is to demand the union label in clothing, and take no other.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

Public interest in Germany has been revolving around two trials. The first of these was that of Dr. Karl Liebknecht, son of "Der Alte", for high treason, based upon the publication of his book upon militarism. As a result of the trial he was sentenced to one year imprisonment. This is not so bad a punishment in Germany as in some other countries, since political offenders are only confined in a fortress, and are allowed many privileges. Many of the German Socialists disavowed Liebknecht's teachings in the extreme form in which he stated them, but to an American they sound mild enough. The German movement, however, it is agreed by all observers is tending toward excessive respectability, not untinged with conservatism, and shrinks from any action that might endanger its great vote.

The other trial was that of Max Harden, editor of the "Zukunft", a radical publication. Some time ago Harden published an article that created a tremendous sensation throughout Germany. He accused a number of high officials, including Count von Moltke, Eulenberg, and other prominent officials of forming a secret inner circle, which to a large extent controlled the actions of the Kaiser. He declared that this circle not only dabbled in spiritualism, necromancy and other occult affairs, using these things as means of influencing the court, but he made far more serious charges than these.

He stated that the men composing the group were a lot of degenerates and sexual perverts, guilty of the most unnatural crimes. It is claimed that the Kaiser compelled Von Moltke to sue Harden for libel as a means of clearing the character of the court. In the trial both sides asked that the emperor be summoned, but he was not called and the verdict was a complete victory for Harden. It was shown that his charges were justified and as a result a tremendous blow was struck at the prestige of the court and its supporters.

On the 2nd of October, Julius Mottler, the "red postmaster" died. He secured his name from the fact that he had charge of the distribution of the Socialist papers during the "laws of exception", and to him, perhaps more than to any other person was due the wonderful success with which police were outwitted and workers served with their favorite journal during those years.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Demetrian, By Ellison Harding. Brentano's, Cloth, \$1.50.

For several years there has been a change in the character of the utopias produced. Formerly they were elaborate schemes to be adopted by society, often with a plea for their adoption by the reader in the last chapter. Of late years they are rather fanciful sketches of something which the author expects will be realized by natural evolution. The theme of *The Demetrian* is eugenics. In the new society foreseen, by the author, which is a sort of hybrid socialism, there is a religious cult that has charge of the breeding of its devotees. The plot of the work hinges on how "love will find a way" in spite of priestly regulations and how finally love upsets all the well laid plans, government and all in order to attain its ends. There are, as usual with such works, just sufficient references to socialism to enable the author to expose his complete ignorance of the subject.

Ghetto Comedies, by Israel Zangwill. New York: The Macmillan Company. Cloth, pp. 487, \$1.50.

Zangwill is a Jew with a sympathetic understanding of the Jewish race that never would have come to him had he not been born with a sense of humor and achieved a grasp of economic determinism. He has found both tragedies and comedies in the Ghetto; perhaps the difference between the two is rather in the way events are viewed than in the way they happen.

This is a book of fourteen short stories, mostly of London, but two or three are staged in Russia; the closing one, "Samooborona", ends tragically enough with the massacre of all the characters, but the comedy of it is in the persistent way in which, on the eve of an attack by the Russians, each petty fragment of a Jewish reform society with many initials insisted strenuously on its own panacea, and refused to co-operate in any plan for defense. However, the author makes it clear that defence would have been futile in any case.

"The Model of Sorrows" tells of a distressed Hebrew with a face like that of an ideal Christ and a tale of woe that touched the heart, and who nevertheless turned out to be a liar of more than ordinary ability. Space prevents our summarizing the other stories, but they are all social and psychological studies that are worth while.

C. H. K.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

When Things Were Doing.

How is the Social Revolution going to come? What will the Co-operative Commonwealth be like?

No socialist who has learned the most rudimentary principles of Marxian socialism claims to be able to answer these questions. All we can know is that the answers will be determined by the development of industrial processes, of the mode of production.

We can not know, but we can guess. And our guesses may be useful rather than mischievous if we put them out simply as guesses without pretending that we know what we don't know. For one trouble with the people who do the working and the voting is that they have not been able as yet to imagine how we could get along without capitalists.

Comrade C. A. Steere has made some of the most delightful guesses about the social revolution that ever happened, and he has framed them up in a story in such a way that no one will be in much danger of mistaking them for anything else.

One of the most annoying obstacles to the spread of any clear notions of socialism is a story by Edward Bellamy, a non-socialist writer, called "Looking Backward". He pictures a system under which the workers have nothing to do with controlling the conditions under which they work, but are under the control of the people over 45 years of age who have served their term as laborers and have begun to play the part of capitalists. The book is moreover steeped in capitalistic ideas in a way that makes it simply ridiculous as a statement of socialist principles. However, because "Looking Backward" is a readable story, many socialists have continued to circulate it for lack of something better.

When Things Were Doing is the something better, which has heretofore been lacking. It is a book that nearly every clear-headed socialist will enjoy, and one that can be offered to new inquirers without fear of giving them a false impression. About the only ones not

likely to enjoy the book from cover to cover are fanatical prohibitionists and those who still take orthodox theology seriously.

We expect to publish the book about the last of November in a handsome cloth binding, to retail at one dollar with our usual discounts to stockholders.

THE ART OF LECTURING.

Arthur Morrow Lewis, whose regular Sunday morning lectures crowd the Garrick Theatre, one of the largest in Chicago, has been repeatedly asked to conduct a class in lecturing. As he has no time for doing this, he has put the practical suggestions growing out of his long experience into a little book, handsomely printed, which will be ready for mailing by the time this issue of the Review is in the hands of its readers. Paper, 25 cents, postpaid.

MANIFESTO DE LA KOMUNISTA PARTIO.

Students who have gone through the **American Esperanto Book**, and would like to test their knowledge of the language on something really worth studying, will be glad to know that the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels has been turned into Esperanto by Arthur Baker, and will soon be obtainable in a neat cloth edition, with the English and the Esperanto text on opposite pages. This will be the 24th volume of the Standard Socialist Series, and will retail a fifty cents.

The books announced in the October Review, on pages 255 and 256, are either ready or soon will be ready. We have not room this time to describe them again, but we want your orders for **Marxian Economics** by Ernest Untermann (\$1.00), **The Republic**, by N. P. Andresen (\$1.00) and **Anarchism and Socialism** by George Plechanoff (50 cents). These will be ready by the time your order can reach us. A little later we shall have the enlarged and revised edition of **American Communities** by William Alfred Hinds (1.50).

THE SOCIALIST BOOK BULLETIN FOR NOVEMBER.

Probably nearly every reader of the Review has seen the Socialist Book Bulletin for June. We have just issued a November Bulletin in the same style, the exact size if the Chicago Daily Socialist. It contains descriptions of all our books, revised up to date, a leading article by Robert Rives LaMonte entitled "What's Wrong, How to Right It and Who're Going to Right It", in the course of which he outlines a course of reading; also an editorial by Charles H. Kerr on "Leaders and Followers", and a story, an article and verses by Mary E. Marcy. On the front page of our regular edition of this Bulletin, occupying the last seven inches of the three middle columns, is an explanation of our co-operative plan for supplying books at cost. We

have also printed an edition with this omitted, and can furnish copies to any socialist Local, or to any publisher or bookseller, with special printing in this space, at \$7.00 for the first thousand and \$5.00 for each additional thousand ordered at the same time; this includes prepayment of charges to any address in the United States east of Denver. We will send copies of the regular edition free to any one who will agree to distribute them to people interested in socialism and will pay the postage or expressage,—one cent each if mailed to individual addresses. Thirty-five cents will pay the expressage on from 70 to 500 copies in one package, according to the distance. Do not ask for more copies than you can put where they will be read, for we can not afford to waste them.

FINANCES FOR OCTOBER.

Last month we explained the desirability of voluntary contributions from stockholders to pay off the debt of the publishing house and thus make it safe for us to use all receipts in enlarging our work. The contributions thus far received have been as follows:

Previously acknowledged,	\$308.82
Fred Schleit, New York,	1.00
J. R. McCormick, California,	10.00
George D. Herron, New Jersey,	100.00
J. O. Duckett, California,	3.30
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois,	114.30
<hr/>	
Total,	\$537.42

The total is still far short of the \$4200 we set out to raise. Probably the small number of contributions is due to the fact that the stockholders are not seriously alarmed about the condition of the publishing house. In this they are perfectly right. Its condition is not alarming, on the contrary it is better than ever before. The manager is suggesting these contributions and is duplicating them with contributions of his own because he is convinced that the addition of a few thousand dollars to the working capital of the publishing house at this time will double its effectiveness for circulating the literature of international socialism. There are a few of the readers of the Review who could contribute from \$100 to \$1000 each to this work with less personal inconvenience than is experienced by the laborer who sends a dollar for a socialist book. The one question is whether the publishing house is using the money entrusted to it in an effective way. As to this we invite the fullest investigation on the part of any one who has money to put where it will do the most for the socialist movement.

Our main dependence however is not on the few with much money but on the many with little money. During the month of

October we received \$172.97 from the sale of single shares of stock, part of them in instalments, \$216.74 in subscriptions to the Review, and \$1530.67 from the sale of books, making, with the contributions mentioned above, a total for October of \$2148.98. With the number of new books nearly ready for delivery, the sales for November should be far in excess of those for October, but this depends on the united effort of the stockholders of the publishing house. The new Book Bulletin will almost surely make sales if brought to the attention of the right people, but whether this will be done depends mainly on the 1832 socialists who own the publishing house. If you are a stockholder, do what you can to get others to buy books, besides buying all you can afford yourself. And if you are not a stockholder, subscribe for a share now. The terms are clearly explained in the Socialist book Bulletin for November. If you have not received one, ask for it.