

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. I

SEPTEMBER, 1900

No. 3

OUTLOOK FOR SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

The sun of the passing century is setting upon scenes of extraordinary activity in almost every part of our capitalistic old planet. Wars and rumors of wars are of universal prevalence. In the Philippines our soldiers are civilizing and christianizing the natives in the latest and most approved styles of the art, and at prices (\$13 per month) which commend the blessing to the prayerful consideration of the lowly and oppressed everywhere.

In South Africa the British legions are overwhelming the Boers with volleys of benedictions inspired by the same beautiful philanthropy in the name of the meek and lowly Nazarene; while in China the heathen hordes, fanned into frenzy by the sordid spirit of modern commercial conquest, are presenting to the world a carnival of crime almost equalling the "refined" exhibitions of the world's "civilized" nations.

And through all the flame and furore of the fray can be heard the savage snarlings of the Christian "dogs of war" as they fiercely glare about them, and with jealous fury threaten to fly at one another's throats to settle the question of supremacy and the spoil and plunder of conquest.

The picture, lurid as a "chamber of horrors," becomes complete in its gruesome ghastliness when robed ministers of Christ solemnly declare that it is all for the glory of God and the advancement of Christian civilization.

This, then, is the closing scene of the century as the curtain slowly descends upon the blood-stained stage—the central figure, the pious Wilhelm, Germany's sceptered savage, issuing his imperial "spare none" decree in the sang froid of an Apache chief—a fitting climax to the rapacious regime of the capitalist system.

Cheerless indeed would be the contemplation of such san-

guinary scenes were the light of Socialism not breaking upon mankind. The skies of the East are even now aglow with the dawn; its coming is heralded by the dispelling of shadows, of darkness and gloom. From the first tremulous scintillation that gilds the horizon to the sublime march to meridian splendor the light increases till in mighty flood it pours upon the world.

From out of the midnight of superstition, ignorance and slavery the disenthraling, emancipating sun is rising. I am not gifted with prophetic vision, and yet I see the shadows vanishing. I behold near and far prostrate men lifting their bowed forms from the dust. I see thrones in the grasp of decay; despots relaxing their hold upon scepters, and shackles falling, not only from the limbs but from the souls of men.

It is therefore with pleasure that I respond to the invitation of the editor of the *International Socialist Review* to present my views upon the "Outlook for Socialism in the United States." Socialists generally will agree that the past year has been marked with a propaganda of unprecedented activity and that the sentiment of the American people in respect to Socialism has undergone a most remarkable change. It would be difficult to imagine a more ignorant, bitter and unreasoning prejudice than that of the American people against Socialism during the early years of its introduction by the propagandists from the other side. I never think of these despised and persecuted "foreign invaders" without a feeling of profound obligation, akin to reverence, for their noble work in laying the foundations deep and strong, under the most trying conditions, of the American movement. The ignorant mass, wholly incapable of grasping their splendid teachings or appreciating their lofty motives, reviled against them. The press inoculated the public sentiment with intolerance and malice which not infrequently found expression through the policeman's club when a few of the pioneers gathered to engraft the class-conscious doctrine upon their inhospitable "free born" American fellow citizens. Socialism was cunningly associated with "anarchy and bloodshed," and denounced as a "foul foreign importation" to pollute the fair, free soil of America, and every outrage to which the early agitators were subjected won the plaudits of the people. But they persevered in their task; they could not be silenced or suppressed. Slowly they increased in number and gradually the movement began to take root and spread over the country. The industrial conditions consequent upon the development of capitalist production were now making themselves felt and socialism became a fixed and increasing factor in the economic and political affairs of the nation.

The same difficulties which other countries had experienced in the process of party organization have attended the develop-

ment of the movement here, but these differences, which relate mainly to tactics and methods of propaganda, are bound to disappear as the friction of the jarring factions smoothens out the rough edges and adjusts them to a concrete body—a powerful section in the great international army of militant socialism.

In the general elections of 1898 upwards of 91,000 votes were cast for the socialist candidates in the United States, an increase in this “off year” of almost two hundred per cent over the general elections of two years previous, the presidential year of 1896. Since the congressional elections of 1898, and more particularly since the municipal and state elections following, which resulted in such signal victories in Massachusetts, two members of the legislature and a mayor, the first in America, being elected by decided majorities—since then, socialism has made rapid strides in all directions and the old politicians no longer reckon it as a negative quantity in making their forecasts and calculating their pluralities and majorities.

The subject has passed entirely beyond the domain of sneer and ridicule and now commands serious treatment. Of course it is violently denounced by the capitalist press and by all the brood of subsidized contributors to magazine literature, but this only confirms the view that the advance of socialism is very properly recognized by the capitalist class as the one cloud upon the horizon which portends an end to the system in which they have waxed fat, insolent and despotic through the exploitation of their countless wage-working slaves.

In school and college and church, in clubs and public halls everywhere, socialism is the central theme of discussion, and its advocates, inspired by its noble principles, are to be found here, there and in all places ready to give or accept challenge to battle. In the cities the corner meetings are popular and effective. But rarely is such a gathering now molested by the “authorities” and then only where they have just been inaugurated. They are too numerous attended by serious, intelligent and self-reliant men and women to invite interference.

Agitation is followed by organization, and the increase of branches, sections and clubs goes forward with extraordinary activity in every part of the land.

In New England the agitation has resulted in quite a general organization among the states, with Massachusetts in the lead; and the indications are that, with the vigorous prosecution of the campaign already inaugurated, a tremendous increase in the vote will be polled in the approaching National elections. New York and Pennsylvania will show surprising socialist returns, while Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri and Kentucky will all round up with a large vote. Wisconsin has already a great vote to her credit and will increase it largely this year.

In the west and northwest, Kansas, Iowa and Minnesota will forge to the front, and so also will Nebraska, the Dakotas, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Colorado. California is expected to show an immense increase and the returns from there will not disappoint the most sanguine. In the southwest, Texas is making a stirring campaign and several papers, heretofore Populist, will support our candidates and swell the socialist vote, which will be an eye-opener when announced.

On the whole, the situation could scarcely be more favorable and the final returns will more than justify our sanguine expectations.

It must not be overlooked, however, when calculations are made, that this is a presidential year and that the general results will not be so favorable as if the elections were in an "off year." Both the Republican and Democratic parties will, as usual, strain every nerve to whip the "voting kings" into line and every conceivable influence will be exerted to that end. These vast machines operate with marvelous precision and the wheels are already in motion. Corruption funds, National, state and municipal, will flow out like lava tides; promises will be as plentiful as autumn leaves; from ten thousand platforms the columbian orator will agitate the atmosphere, while brass bands, torch-light processions, glittering uniforms and free whiskey, dispensed by the "ward-heeler," will lend their combined influence to steer the "patriots" to the capitalist chute that empties into the ballot-box.

The campaign this year will be unusually spectacular. The Republican party "points with pride" to the "prosperity" of the country, the beneficent results of the "gold standard" and the "war record" of the administration. The Democratic party declares that "imperialism" is the "paramount" issue and that the country is certain to go to the "demnition bow-wows" if Democratic office holders are not elected instead of the Republicans. The Democratic slogan is "The Republic vs. the Empire," accompanied in a very minor key by 16 to 1 and "direct legislation where practical."

Both these capitalist parties are fiercely opposed to trusts, though what they propose to do with them is not of sufficient importance to require even a hint in their platforms.

Needless is it for me to say to the thinking working man that he has no choice between these two capitalist parties, that they are both pledged to the same system and that whether the one or the other succeeds, he will still remain the wage-working slave he is to-day.

What but meaningless phrases are "imperialism," "expansion," "free silver," "gold standard," etc., to the wage-worker? The large capitalists represented by Mr. McKinley and the small

capitalists represented by Mr. Bryan are interested in these "issues," but they do not concern the working class.

What the workmen of the country are profoundly interested in is the private ownership of the means of production and distribution, the enslaving and degrading wage-system in which they toil for a pittance at the pleasure of their masters and are bludgeoned, jailed or shot when they protest—this is the central, controlling, vital issue of the hour, and neither of the old party platforms has a word or even a hint about it.

As a rule, large capitalists are Republicans and small capitalists are Democrats, but workmen must remember that they are all capitalists and that the many small ones, like the fewer large ones, are all politically supporting their class interests, and this is always and everywhere the capitalist class.

Whether the means of production, that is to say, the land, mines, factories, machinery, etc., are owned by a few large Republican capitalists, who organize a trust, or whether they be owned by a lot of small Democratic capitalists, who are opposed to the trust, is all the same to the working class. Let the capitalists, large and small, fight this out among themselves.

The working class must get rid of the whole brood of masters and exploiters, and put themselves in possession and control of the means of production, that they may have steady employment without consulting a capitalist employer, large or small, and that they may get the wealth their labor produces, every bit of it, and enjoy with their families the fruits of their industry in comfortable and happy homes, abundant and wholesome food, proper clothing and all other things necessary to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It is therefore a question, not of "reform," the mask of fraud, but of revolution. The capitalist system must be overthrown, class-rule abolished and wage-slavery supplanted by co-operative industry.

We hear it frequently urged that the Democratic party is the "poor man's party," "the friend of labor." There is but one way to relieve poverty and to free labor, and that is by making common property of the tools of labor.

Is the Democratic party, which we are assured has "strong socialistic tendencies," in favor of collective ownership of the means of production? Is it opposed to the wage-system, from which flows in a ceaseless stream the poverty, misery and wretchedness of the children of toil? If the Democratic party is the "friend of labor" any more than the Republican party, why is its platform dumb in the presence of Coeur d'Alene? It knows the truth about these shocking outrages—crimes upon workingmen, their wives and children, which would blacken the pages of Siberia—why does it not speak out?

What has the Democratic party to say about the "property

and educational qualification" in North Carolina and Louisiana, and the proposed general disfranchisement of the negro race in the southern states?

The differences between the Republican and Democratic parties involve no issue, no principle in which the working class have any interest, and whether the spoils be distributed by Hanna and Platt, or by Croker and Tammany Hall is all the same to them.

Between these parties socialists have no choice, no preference. They are one in their opposition to socialism, that is to say, the emancipation of the working class from wage-slavery, and every workingman who has intelligence enough to understand the interest of his class and the nature of the struggle in which it is involved, will once and for all time sever his relations with them both; and recognizing the class-struggle which is being waged between producing workers and non-producing capitalists, cast his lot with the class-conscious, revolutionary, socialist party, which is pledged to abolish the capitalist system, class-rule and wage-slavery—a party which does not compromise or fuse, but, preserving inviolate the principles which quickened it into life and now give it vitality and force, moves forward with dauntless determination to the goal of economic freedom.

The political trend is steadily toward Socialism. The old parties are held together only by the cohesive power of spoils, and in spite of this they are steadily disintegrating. Again and again they have been tried with the same results, and thousands upon thousands, awake to their duplicity, are deserting them and turning toward socialism as the only refuge and security. Republicans, Democrats, Populists, Prohibitionists, Single Taxers are having their eyes opened to the true nature of the struggle and they are beginning to

"Come as the winds come, when
Forests are rended;
Come as the waves come, when
Navies are stranded."

For a time the Populist party had a mission, but it is practically ended. The Democratic party has "fused" it out of existence. The "middle of the road" element will be sorely disappointed when the votes are counted, and they will probably never figure in another National campaign. Not many of them will go back to the old parties. Many of them have already come to Socialism, and the rest are sure to follow.

There is no longer any room for a Populist party, and progressive populists realize it, and hence the "strongholds" of populism are becoming the "hot-beds" of socialism.

It is simply a question of capitalism or socialism, of despotism or democracy, and they who are not wholly with us are wholly against us.

Another source of strength to socialism, steadily increasing, is the trades-union movement. The spread of socialist doctrine among the labor organizations of the country during the past year exceeds the most extravagant estimates. No one has had better opportunities than the writer to note the transition to socialism among trades-unionists, and the approaching election will abundantly verify it.

Promising, indeed, is the outlook for socialism in the United States. The very contemplation of the prospect is a well-spring of inspiration.

Oh, that all the working class could and would use their eyes and see; their ears and hear; their brains and think. How soon this earth could be transformed and by the alchemy of social order made to blossom with beauty and joy.

No sane man can be satisfied with the present system. If a poor man is happy, said Victor Hugo, "he is the pick-pocket of happiness. Only the rich and noble are happy by right. The rich man is he who, being young, has the rights of old age; being old, the lucky chances of youth; vicious, the respect of good people; a coward, the command of the stout-hearted; doing nothing, the fruits of labor." . . .

The great Frenchman also propounded this interrogatory which every workingman will do well to contemplate: "Can you fancy a city directed by the men who built it?"

With pride and joy we watch each advancing step of our comrades in socialism in all other lands. Our hearts are with them in their varying fortunes as the battle proceeds, and we applaud each telling blow delivered and cheer each victory achieved.

The wire has just brought the tidings of Liebknecht's death. The hearts of American socialists will be touched and shocked by the calamity. The brave old warrior succumbed at last, but not until he heard the tramp of International Socialism, for which he labored with all his loving, loyal heart; not until he saw the thrones of Europe, one by one, begin to totter, not until he had achieved a glorious immortality.

Eugene V. Debs.

COMPARISON OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PLATFORMS.

The National platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties are so wordy that a reproduction of them would require more space than is herein available, and yet there is an abundance of room for the consideration of all the points worthy of notice.

When reference is made to these parties it will be understood to include only the authors of the platforms and their associates rather than the rank and file of the voters. It will be interesting to note the compliments each party pays to the other; their vociferous professions of their own sincerity; the contradictions contained in each platform; how the platforms conflict with the acts of each party; their feigned love for the workingman; their professed loyalty to the flag, to the Constitution and to the Declaration of Independence; their "noble responsibility" (?) for the Porto Rican, Cuban and Filipino; their hatred for corporate "conspiracies and combinations," and their effort to keep the producing class divided by riveting their attention to these superficial declarations while the capitalist class holds the scepter and reaps the harvest.

The Republican platform compliments the Democratic party in the following language: "Under Democratic administration business was dead, industry paralyzed, and the national credit disastrously impaired"; "capital was hidden away, labor distressed and unemployed"; "the menace to prosperity has always resided in Democratic principles and in the general incapacity of the Democratic party to conduct public affairs"; "the Democratic party has never earned public confidence." Meanwhile the Democratic platform compliments the Republican party as follows: "The Porto Rico law enacted by a Republican Congress is a flagrant breach of the national good faith"; "the Republican carpetbag officials plunder the revenues (of Cuba) and exploit the colonial theory, to the disgrace of the American people"; "the declaration that the Republican party steadfastly adheres to the policy announced in the Monroe doctrine is manifestly insincere and deceptive"; "the Republican party supports the trusts in return for campaign subscriptions and political support." Thus the one is said to be incapable and the other dishonest; and who is there that would dare dispute such high authority? Indeed, upon reflection one is inclined to be even more liberal and to concede that what each party says is not only true

of the other, but is also applicable to themselves. The logic of events has driven both parties from the issues of the last presidential campaign; the tariff and the money question are buried, and the respective planks in the platforms only serve as headboards to their graves.

The Democratic party has openly confessed that the issue of 16 to 1, upon which only four short years ago the institutions of this country were to eternally stand or fall, is now of minor importance, and the question of imperialism has taken its place. Thus the burial ceremonies were said; while the Republican party insists that their legislation on money and tariff has been followed by "prosperity more general and more abundant than we have ever known." And this claim is made in the face of the facts that a high "tariff" and a "gold standard" prevailed under Cleveland at the time when the Republicans insist that "Business was dead," "industry paralyzed," "credit impaired," "money hid away," "labor distressed," and also in the face of the facts that they made no material change in the tariff and the gold-standard laws, and the slight alteration in the currency law was not made until the last session of Congress, after the "wave of prosperity" had passed. Priding themselves upon the "wisdom of the gold-standard legislation of the Fifty-sixth Congress," passed after the boom was over, they proceed to bury the tariff, with the following inscription upon the tombstone: "We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor," "whose constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world." Thus they paid tribute to the dead issue, for of what value is a tariff if we are able to "enter the markets of the world"? But since that is a fact, could protection have caused the boom of which they boast? Surely this will need no argument. These issues buried, they take their respective position upon the new issues of imperialism, of the trust and of expansion, with a bait on the side for labor. The Republican party, in its efforts to justify imperialism, declares that the "war was for liberty and human rights," and that "ten millions of the human race were given a new birth of freedom and the American people a new and noble responsibility." If these men are free, are we responsible for them? Is it really freedom or slavery into which they have been born? The Republican party says the "largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be given them." What right have we to determine upon the measure of self-government consistent with their welfare? Was this not precisely what England said of us when we were weak? Is this not always the excuse of the powerful when they are unscrupulously forcing tribute from the weak? Thus our Constitution and Declaration of Independence are trampled under foot,

and taxation without representation becomes the policy of the Republican party.

The Democratic party, being ever watchful for political advantage, perceives this flaw and promptly declares "that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny . . . and is a substitution of the methods of imperialism for those of a republic," "and that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Indeed! and did the Democratic party disfranchise the colored people of North Carolina because "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"?

The Democrats assert that "no nation can long endure half republic and half empire." Can any state long so endure? Look again at North Carolina. Again they warn us that "imperialism abroad will lead quickly and inevitably to despotism at home." Has not despotism already followed imperialism in North Carolina? Were the Democrats in power, would they be more just to the colored Porto Rican than they are to the colored Carolinian? Is not Democratic imperialism and tyranny as hateful in North Carolina as Republican tyranny and imperialism is in Porto Rico and the Philippines?

The Republicans are doing in Porto Rico and the Philippines precisely what the Democrats are doing in North Carolina, and there is no reason to suppose that either would change their conduct if they were to exchange their places. Give them power, and they will both be imperialists. The Democratic platform declares that "the burning issue of imperialism grew out of the Spanish war," and yet they declare that "Trusts are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few, at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiate greed is checked all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the republic destroyed." Is not this imperialism? Does not imperialism reign in all our industries? Did it grow out of this Spanish war? Can a nation long exist half republic and half empire? Can imperialism continue in our industries and democracy in our politics?

The Democratic platform says that "Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material, and of the unfinished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer." While the Republican platform "Condemns all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices, and favors such legislation as will effectually restrain and prevent all such abuses."

Since they are both agreed upon this proposition, and since they are the only parties represented in Congress, it is pertinent to ask why they did not do something toward carrying out their

professions? Each blames the others, and again they are both right, for they are both at fault. The proof is to be found in the fact that they are agreed upon two still more fundamental propositions, from which the other issues arise. They indorse the wages system, and uphold the rights of capital. The Republican platform says, first: "We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor," by which "the wages in every department of labor has been maintained at high rates." Second: "We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest co-operation of capital to meet new business conditions."

The Democratic platform says, first: "We favor arbitration as a means of settling disputes between corporations and their employes." Second: "Corporations should be protected in all their rights and legitimate interests."

Upon these two propositions they are certainly agreed. But the wages system means that one man employs another for a part of his product and keeps the rest. It also means that the employer will keep more of the worker's product than is sufficient to live upon; otherwise he would do as well to work for a wage. But since the workers produce more than enough to pay themselves and to keep their employers, where is there to be found a market for the rest? Evidently there will be no home market for such products. That which is left over will first become capital. The aggregation of this capital will grow into corporations with their alleged "legitimate interests." The aggregation of these corporations means trusts. In proportion as the number of trusts increases the number of employers decreases. As the machinery of production is improved in its efficiency, so also can fewer men perform the task and at the same time live on a smaller proportion of their increased product. Thus is the surplus for which there is no market constantly and necessarily increased.

It is for this reason that the Republican platform says that "new markets are necessary for the increasing surplus of our products," and the Democratic platform says "we favor trade expansion."

It was this surplus that caused our war with Spain, under the pretext of freeing the suffering Cuban. Yet the Republican party claim that the war was "unsought and patiently resisted." It is also this surplus which is causing the war with China, under the pretext of saving the missionaries and legations. The Republican platform says that "Every effort should be made to open and obtain new markets, especially in the Orient." And those markets or people which are conquered will be given that "measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties." And thus is political imperialism becoming established as a result of our industrial imperialism, and taxation without

representation is the ruling policy. But it is to be expected that this will be the political policy when every industrial establishment in our country is a little empire, with an employer as absolute monarch, "protected in his legitimate interests," and where the workers are his subjects. Nor should we be surprised at the policy of taxation without representation in the colonies, for this is our custom in our industries.

Have the workingmen any voice in the management of the industry in which they are employed? In this respect their voice is as silent as the tomb. Is it not their labor that produces the products, the profit, the capital, the surplus which is kept from them? Is this not taxation without representation?

The reason why neither the Democratic or Republican parties ever propose to abolish this wages system, this system of taxation without representation, is because those who frame the platforms are the representatives of the capitalist class who do the taxing. The power derived from taxation is to them sweeter than justice. They blindfold the working class by referring to the little business flurry just past as a wonderfully prosperous period, but they never mention the fact that the government wasted about 1,000,000,000 of dollars in prosecuting the war and the boom only lasted while we were spending it. It was only an opiate which stimulates for a moment, but leaves a wreck of its victim.

Instead of reminding us that they have thrown away 1,000,000,000 of dollars, which the working class must pay, with interest; instead of reminding us of the fact that expansion is only an extension of the American capitalists' power of taxation without representation; instead of telling us in so many words that they love the workingman for what they can get out of him; they "renew their faith in protection of the worker," while they renew their gatling guns in protection of the "legitimate (?) interests of the corporations"—that is, of themselves. The injunction sets the law in operation, and the standing army is sent to the Coeur d'Alenes, the state militia to Croton dam, the United States marshals to St. Louis and Hazelton. The capitalist class, with the machinery of government, protects their interests against the working class, who produced the capital. The Democratic platform condemns government by injunction and declares for government by arbitration. Were arbitration made binding by law, there is no reason to believe that the arbitrators would show any more interest in behalf of the working class than do the present injunction judges. In such case the arbitrators would set the law in motion, the terms would be binding, and the capitalist class, being in possession of the powers of government, would enforce these terms at the point of the bayonet, and the last vestige of the workingman's liberty would be gone.

Both protection and arbitration are but baits on the capitalist's hook to catch the worker's vote.

It is apparent that the live issues of this campaign have been forced to the front by our industrial development. Starting with the wages system, the first result is a surplus which develops the autocratic employer on the one hand and the workman as his subject on the other. As the surplus increases the employer develops into a capitalist, then into a corporation "without a soul," but with "legitimate (?) interests," while the workman remains a subject with no voice in the management of affairs. When the surplus grows still larger it represents more power with which the trust is organized and the prices to some degree controlled, with the working class still in subjection.

As the trust becomes more powerful the surplus seeks foreign markets and the workers in foreign lands who are being fleeced are considered even less capable of acting intelligently than are the American workers, and thus political imperialism abroad is added to industrial imperialism at home. Instead of compulsory education, with state support, both the Republican and Democratic parties favor educational qualification, and in some states agitation is being made for property qualification. As the surplus product increases beyond the market, men are thrown out of work. As men are discharged, competition for positions begins among the workers and wages go down; as wages go down the worker is less able to own property or to school his children, and thus a process of disfranchising the working class begins, imperialism rears its head from the industrial into political affairs, and taxation without representation becomes the political as well as the industrial policy of our country. The capitalist will diligently support the wages system and loudly declare that capital, though the product of labor, has "legitimate interests" antagonistic to labor, because it is by this process that they gain their power. They will multiply the issues and magnify their importance in their mad greed for power. A vote for either the Democratic or the Republican parties is a vote for the trust, for expansion, and for imperialism, because these issues are the logical and inevitable result of the wages system, which they both support. Not until the working class organize a political party, managed by and for the interests of their class, and through the instrumentality of that party, conquer the powers of government, and reorganize the industrial institutions, to the end that each producer shall have an equal voice in the management thereof, and that all productive capital shall be owned in common and that the wages system shall be abolished, and that each worker shall receive an equivalent for his total product, will the problems of imperialism, taxation without representation, expansion, trusts, corporate greed, and labor wars, be set-

tled, and the two now warring classes be united into one fraternal bond of fellowship, making war upon nature for her fruits instead of upon each other.

This devolves upon the working class. It is to their interest. They have the votes, the power and the intelligence, and it depends upon the concerted action of the Socialists to deliver to them the necessary information as to its exercise.

Job Harriman.

THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECT OF THE TRUST QUESTION.

The trust question has become prominent in the last few years, owing to the rapid organization of industry. Probably no natural movement ever brought out such widespread protests as this tendency of capitalistic combination. So important has the question become that the great political parties could not ignore the issue. Naturally the position taken by the three respective parties, on the trust question, reflects the material interests of the classes they serve.

The Republican party represents the interests of the large capitalistic class—the plutocracy. It declares in its platform: "We recognize the necessity and propriety of honest co-operation of capital, . . . but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business or control prices." This declaration is somewhat ambiguous. It does not inform us what is meant by "honest co-operation of capital" or what combinations are considered conspiracies. Some one has suggested that only such combinations are conspiracies as refuse to contribute liberally to the Republican campaign fund. If this is the right inference, then all must have contributed in 1896, for the administration has not condemned any of the combinations.

Of course the declaration is a mere subterfuge. It is well known to-day that the Republican party represents the interests of the trust magnates, but there has been such a hue and cry raised against the trusts that the party did not dare to openly defend these combinations without a pretense of antagonism. Consequently it inserted a cleverly drawn "plank" that can be interpreted according to circumstances. It is evident that the administration does not consider any of the existing combinations "conspiracies," for the Republicans have been in full control of all branches of the National administration, and have failed to enact any legislation designed to curtail concentration or even to enforce the anti-trust laws already in existence. In face of the fact that more trusts have been formed during the McKinley administration than during all the preceding administrations combined, their pretense of opposition to any kind of combination is ludicrous. Should the Republicans again be successful they would undoubtedly gain courage and throw off the mask and come out openly for the trust policy. There are many

indications that such would be the course pursued—individuals and papers, here and there, even now openly champion the cause of concentrated capital. Of course, they would rely, as in the past, upon deceiving the working class as to its interests. Were it not for this wholesale deception, the present system could not long be maintained.

The Democratic party represents the interests of the middle class—the class of small capitalists, small producers and traders. Its platform declares that “Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material and of the finished product, thus robbing both producers and consumers. . . . We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, state, and city against private monopoly in every form.”

The Democratic party thus pledges itself to an unceasing warfare against private monopoly, but it fails to point out just where the monopoly exists. It relies upon the popular prejudice against so-called trusts to identify all such combinations with private monopoly! But as a matter of fact there are no absolute monopolies in the industrial field. The Standard Oil Company comes the nearest to being an industrial monopoly, yet there are some 25 or 30 independent companies, 15 of which have a capital of from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000. In the paper combine some 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the productive capacity of the country is represented, but there is vigorous competition outside. The same is true of other industries where organization has been effected—no line of industry has yet been completely centralized under one management. Of course there are businesses such as railroads, trolley companies, electric and gas supplies, etc., that are absolute monopolies. As the Democratic party does not declare for public ownership of these monopolies but merely for war on them, are we to understand that they desire to destroy all such monopolies and return to the old-fashioned stage coach and tallow dip? Surely they must know that competition in these fields is impossible, and yet these are the only fields where absolute private monopoly exists and so the only businesses upon which they really declare war. But this, however, is not the intention, for the party represents the interests of the middle class and so is opposed to all large concentrated capital, for it is this concentration that is eliminating the small producers in every field.

But the question naturally arises, Does the Democratic party desire to suppress all organization of industry? Evidently not, for the platform declares that “corporations should be protected in their rights and their legitimate interests should be respected.” If corporations, then, are to be protected, is there any distinction to be made between large and small corpora-

tions? If so, where is the line to be drawn? The principle of organization is the same in both instances, the only difference is in the size of their capital. Will they draw the line at a hundred millions, at fifty millions, ten millions, one million, five hundred thousand, one hundred thousand, fifty, ten, or one thousand? If a hundred millions capital aggregated into one concern is dangerous, why not fifty millions, and if fifty millions, why not one, and so on all the way down? Where is the line to be drawn? Would it not be well for those who oppose economic progress and organization of industry to point out the economic principle of discrimination?

Is it said that no distinction is to be made between large and small corporations but between the corporation and trust form of organization? But the difference between the trust and corporation is not economic but legal. There never were but few bona fide trusts and these have now—I believe without an exception—been dissolved, in order to escape adverse legislation, and converted into large corporations. The so-called trusts, being but large corporations, makes the question of drawing the line of great importance. The crusade against so-called trusts, then, is merely a crusade against large corporations, and the Democratic party ought not to expect the people to support any such movement unless they know just what is to be done. Let no one be deceived; the cry "Down with trusts" is a crusade against the concentration of capital.

The question then is this: Is the modern tendency toward greater and greater organization and centralization in industry economic, efficient, and in accord with industrial progress, and is the outcome destined to prove beneficial to society as a whole? It must be evident that the principle of combination, the concentration of capital, is economic and efficient, else it would be discarded. In fact, the principle was adopted as the result of a series of experiments which taught the capitalists the efficiency of capital in large masses. They found out that large capital could be used more advantageously than small capital—it could produce more economically and efficiently. As such experiments proved successful they were extended. Every million added to the plant increased the efficiency of both the old capital and the new, and so gradually industry was transformed. That this tendency of concentration is in accord with industrial progress is evident from the fact that the whole history of industrial progress is the history of economic evolution—the organization and centralization of industry. Without this centralization productive efficiency could not have progressed beyond the status of small individual concerns. The difference between the economic status of the individual capitalist, the corporation and the so-called trusts, is not one of principle but of size and complexity

of industrial organization. The corporation, with its greater concentration of capital, is able to organize industry on a more complex basis and on a larger scale than the individual capitalist, and for the same reason the trust is able to more completely organize industry than the corporation. While the corporation consists in the association of a number of capitalists, the trust proper is the association of corporations, the only difference being that one represents a greater aggregation and centralization of capital than the other. The organization of industry has proceeded just in proportion as capital has been concentrated, and economy in production depends upon organization—the more perfect the organization, the greater the economy. The individual capitalist is not able to organize industry on a very complex basis, but the corporation with its larger capital can more completely organize industry and specialize labor, while the trust with its still larger capital can effect a more perfect organization and better utilization of productive energy.

Here, note, that each step in the industrial evolution has been taken because conditions demanded it. The growth in mechanical inventions, the large amount of capital necessitated to utilize profitably the new methods, made it impossible for the individual capitalist to furnish the requisite means, so the corporation arose. Still further progress in mechanical improvements and the evolution in industrial methods made a greater aggregation of capital necessary, so the trusts came into existence—a step further along the line of industrial progress.

The history of economic progress, then, has been the history of the concentration of productive capital. That this concentration is necessary to the utilization of the best methods in modern industry is evident. To reverse this tendency and decentralize capital is to barbarize society. The Democratic middle class policy, then, is reactionary—it would destroy economic progress.

The character of the anti-trust movement is analogous to the anti-machinery movement of a century ago, when the hand loom weavers marched throughout England and destroyed the power looms. Hargreaves, Arkright, and Crompton were driven from their homes by howling mobs, for inventing the new methods that displaced the old. The cry of "Down with machinery" has been supplanted by "Down with trusts." The whole history of industrial progress is the history of resistance to new methods the new inventions. It is not strange, then, that the phenomenal industrial development of the last few years should meet with vigorous opposition. But the movement toward greater organization of industry is natural and consequently inevitable. The aggregation of capital is indispensable to modern progress. In those countries and in those industries where the greatest concentration has taken place, there you will find the greatest prog-

ress. The great productive economies are confined to the industries where capital is most employed.

The result of this greater organization of industry, and consequent economy of production, has been to drive the smaller and inferior competitors from the field. It is because the middle class, with its effete machinery and methods, are unable to compete with the improved appliances of the larger corporations, that they wish to destroy these large corporations or trusts and force civilization back into the competitive stage of industry out of which we are evolving. But their efforts in this direction will be futile, as were those of their predecessors who endeavored to force a return to the handicraft stage of production. Both movements are in opposition to progress and so foredoomed to failure. The so-called trust is a natural product of the industrial evolution and has come to stay.

Of course, the middle class complain that this reorganization means their displacement. This is true but it cannot be helped, for those who best serve the community are entitled to the community's support, otherwise there would be no progress. Had the opposite policy prevailed we would still be employing the stage coach, and the hand flail, etc. The improved methods have been advantageous, else they would not have supplanted the old. The general fall in prices which has taken place in the last fifty years has been greatest in those industries where concentration has been greatest. Society, then, is not interested in sustaining small capitalists as producers and distributors. If they must be sustained by society, it would be more profitable to pension them than to pay the high prices resulting from the inferior methods necessitated by their small capital. Remember, when a small industry is driven from the field by a larger one it is because the latter does its work cheaper and better.

The middle class reads its doom in this concentration of capital. Of the 14,000 failures, annually, 87 per cent are those whose capital is \$5,000 or less. Is it any wonder, then, that this class should protest against the concentration of capital? Its frantic cry "Down with trusts" is merely the cry of its class interests. Its protest is not in behalf of the laboring class,—not a protest against the exploiting system of production,—but merely against the new capitalism becoming sole exploiter. The middle class does not object to some riding on the backs of others, but it wants to do the riding.

Let no laborer be deceived by this outcry against concentrated capital. It does not mean a betterment of labor conditions but rather the reverse. The tools of production to-day are social in character and can only be operated by co-operative labor. This fact precludes the possibility of the laborers as individuals ever owning the tools necessary to their toil. To destroy these

great combinations of capital would only mean the return to inferior methods of production—such methods and tools as could be owned by smaller organizations of capitalists. But the instruments of smaller corporations and even those furnished by the individual capitalist are social in character, consequently, —unless we return to the days of hand labor,—the workers would still be absolutely dependent, as to-day, upon the owning class. The only difference would be that under the decentralized programme the number of labor exploiters would be larger, but this would be of no benefit to the laboring class. Laborers are not benefited by increasing the number of their fleecers.

The plea of the middle class for its retention is futile. The laboring class is not interested in its preservation with its absurd principle of industrial competition. That competition is injurious is evident from the fact that it has been well nigh supplanted by the principle of combination. Surely no one with economic sense wishes to return to the era of competitive supremacy. A more wasteful and absurd system could not be devised—a system which takes several dozen firms to do the work of one. To be sure we sympathize with those displaced, but the displacement is inevitable—the necessary result of economic evolution. They are sacrificed for the perfecting of society. There awaits them however, an ample compensation, if they are wise enough to accept it, which we will consider presently.

The Socialist party represents the interests of the proletariat class—the class of wage and salary workers: It represents their interests because their class interests are in accord with social progress. The class interests of both the proprietary classes depend upon maintaining present conditions, but not so with the working class. While Socialism represents the class interests of the laborers, it also represents the true interests of every member of society. It does not represent the class interests of either division of the proprietary class, for their class interests signify such policies as make for the perpetuity of their class. Socialism would abolish all classes—a step necessary to realize a true civilization. But as the class interests of the laborers are in accord with economic progress, we call upon them to unite for their own emancipation, which would also mean the salvation of society, for they cannot save themselves without abolishing the cause of all economic servitude and oppression—the private and corporate ownership of the instruments of production and distribution. While Socialism represents the personal interests of all,—for it means a higher and truer civilization,—the members of the proprietary class are so blinded by their prejudice and class interests that they are unable to see what would make for a nobler manhood and a higher order of society. We cannot hope, then, that the capitalist class, as a class, will join the forward

movement, but individual members of the class will join, and are joining by the thousands, especially, from the perishing middle class.

Socialism is in the line of progress and certain of attainment. The Socialist party points out that the tendency to concentration is natural and inevitable, and that the gradual development of competing industries into trusts is destined to realize the ideal for which they labor—the Co-operative Commonwealth. One who understands the causes which have led to the substitution of combination for competition well knows the impossibility of ever returning to the latter. Associated capital and machinery are necessary to effective and economical production. The passing of industry from the hand to the mechanical basis, meant the death of the old competitive order. A return to the days of free competition and small things would constitute a reversal of all progress. To restore this era it would be necessary to destroy all modern machinery, all new and improved methods, all large factories and stores, and punish all progressiveness with instant death. We cannot return to the past—in economic evolution there is no retrogression. The whole history of industrial development evidences the tendency in progressive society toward a greater centralization of capital and organization of industry, which the most highly developed machinery and improved methods of production make necessary. Without this concentration industries could not have utilized the most improved methods; in fact, very few such industries could now be conducted on less than a million dollars capital, and many require tens and hundreds of millions. Shall we destroy this concentration and thus make impossible the use of the most effective methods in modern industry? Such a proposition is absurd, and yet this is the policy of the Democratic, middle class, party. Centralized capital is the most effective tool in production; to decentralize it would be to destroy this effective instrument.

Of course, the concentration of capital into the hands of a few enable these few to reap the benefits of economic progress, but there must be some way by which the improved methods can be retained and the benefits reaped by all the people. Socialism solves the problem. It points out that organized capital—the results of economic progress—can be preserved, and the benefits of this organization accrue to society as a whole. If the people wish to enjoy the benefits of these great combinations, the trusts, they must own them. As long as they remain private property, the few will reap the advantage. Public ownership is the key to the solution of the problem—the only rational solution of the vexed trust question. The principle of combination is sound and ought to be extended to the whole social order. As production and distribution on a large scale are more economic

they ought to survive, but the only safety to society is in the adoption of the principle by the collectivity. When these large corporations or trusts, which embody the principle of combination, are socialized, then the evils which arise from private ownership will disappear, leaving only the benefits that result from co-operation.

The Socialist solution of this problem is in accord with economic progress. We have seen how individuals combine into corporations and corporations into trusts, and we ask that the next logical step be taken and trusts combine into a great trust—the Nation. It is only in universal combination that a complete consummation of the economic evolution can be attained.

Shall this consummation be effected?

The Republican party, representing the interests of the plutocracy—the trust owners—says no. They admit the inevitableness of the concentration of industry and its advantages of increased production and economy, but as they reap the benefits, by virtue of their ownership, they are opposed to further progress. They would forcibly check the evolutionary process and prevent its consummation for the sake of private gain. They enjoy the benefits of Socialism in production—utilizing the Socialist principles of combination, co-operation and unification—but they are opposed to Socialism in distribution. What we want is Socialism in both production and distribution that the benefits of industrial evolution, now monopolized by a few, may become the inheritance of all. The large capitalists, then, in advocating the private ownership of concentrated industry, are merely championing their class interests.

The Democratic party, representing the interests of the middle class, also says no. As the large capitalists see only good in concentration, the middle class sees only evil. It completely overlooks the great power and economy effected by unified industry, and perceives nothing but the bitterness and failures that have attended its growth. As this organization means their downfall, they naturally revolt. While their opposition to industrial progress is due to their class interests—the middle class being hopelessly doomed in competition with large industries—their opposition to the consummation of the industrial evolution is due to their ignorance. If they realized the hopelessness of their struggle and the certain bankruptcy of their whole class, they would join the party of progress and aid in bringing in the new order. Socialism is their only hope—here only can they find compensation. But, like the slaveholders of old, they are blinded by their prejudice, and so think that their interests lie on the other side. The whole policy of this class is reactionary and tends to destroy progress and civilization.

The Socialist party, representing primarily the interests of the proletariat class, but in reality the true interests of every member of society—not their class interests, as we have seen, but their interests as human beings—says yes. The Socialist party is thus the only party of progress. It points out the good and evil of concentration and shows how the good can be retained and the evil eliminated. We regret the Democratic middle class reactionary policy of “trust smashing,” also the Republican plutocratic policy of “private ownership.” We cannot return to the days of competition and small things, while to maintain private property in modern tools of production is to block the wheels of progress. The only salvation is in pushing the evolution on to its logical consummation—public or collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution. It is only thus that the outcome of economic evolution will prove beneficial to society as a whole.

The question is often discussed as to the immediate effect of these great combinations on society. Some claim that they are necessarily injurious, while others contend that they are beneficial. Undoubtedly there are instances of both results. Some combinations have shared with the community, to a limited extent, the economies which resulted from the better organization and improved methods, while others have forced prices up and “gouged” the public to pay dividends on abnormal capitalization. The latter is the usual method, and even those industries that have, as a whole, lowered prices, make use of the periods of industrial activity to arbitrarily raise prices and reap enormous profits. The Standard Oil Company, the American Sugar Refining Company, the Cotton Seed Oil Trust, the Western Union Telegraph Company, and the great railroad systems, have shared with society, although sparingly, the economies resulting from their improved methods, but, as already pointed out, some of them are unable to resist the universal impulse to make larger profits and so take advantage of improved industrial conditions to advance prices and fleece the public more than usual. Almost all industries recently organized have followed this speculative, monopolistic method. It is the piracy of these combinations, with their “corners” and “trade agreements,” etc., that has rightly aroused popular indignation. This selfish greed does not militate against the principle of combination—the economy and efficiency of the principle is beyond controversy—but it clearly shows the danger of leaving the principle in private or corporate control. Neither does the fact that certain combinations have shared any portion of the gain with society, justify private or corporate ownership. For even where this is said to have occurred, prices have been arbitrarily advanced and the public robbed of millions. But it is sometimes

argued that even with the increased price the community gains over the old competitive method—prices not arising to the former level for fear of inviting competition—but if this be true it only shows, at the most, the benefit of trust production over competition—it does not touch the question of public ownership.

It must be evident to all that as long as these combinations remain in private hands only a fraction of the benefit of improved methods will ever accrue to the community. Thus while the Standard Oil Company has greatly reduced the price of oil, it has not reduced its profits one cent, but just the reverse. In fact, the reduction in price was only for the purpose of increasing consumption and so adding to the profits. The fact that the Standard Oil Company is reported to have made \$100,000,000 last year, and the American Sugar Refining Company is now said to be making \$72,000 a day, shows that in these industries the community does not reap the full benefits of the improved methods. It is only by public ownership that the full benefits of modern machinery and methods can be reaped by all the people. In every instance where the combinations have reduced prices, the reduction has not been anywhere near in proportion to the decreased cost of production. To hope that capitalists will ever voluntarily share their gain with the public by relinquishing any part of their fleecings is truly Utopian. Whenever prices are voluntarily lowered, whether by an individual or corporation, it is not for the sake of the public, but for the sake of larger profits.

The power of capital is too great to be trusted in the hands of individuals and this power is ever increasing with the concentration of capital. There are apologists of the present order who pretend to see no danger in this condition of things. They tell us that the economic rulers would never take advantage of the people, but experience does not bear out this contention. They philosophize that the "masters" would not put up prices abnormally high for fear of inviting competition. There may have been instances in the past when this fear might have had a salutary effect, but it has evidently lost its terror, judging from the tremendous rise of prices that has taken place in the last few years. Every line of industry has vied with each other to see which could excel in fleecing the public. This fear of inviting competition by raising prices is removed as industrial organization is perfected. When a great industry is once established its laborers organized and markets developed, it can bid defiance to competitors. A new firm cannot well invade the field in opposition to the great combination, for it cannot organize its laborers, its foremen, overseers, superintendents, etc., and correlate all the vast mechanical appliances and catch up with the combination already organized which can continually improve its organization and plant and so

be able to control the market. Besides, the abnormal rise of prices is not permanent; they are forced up for a time and millions additional profits secured, and then before new capital could invade the field, prices are reduced.

While there are probably no absolute industrial monopolies as yet, still it is not necessary for a combination to own every productive plant in order to control the market. The Standard Oil Company absolutely and arbitrarily controls the oil market, although there are independent producers. The reason the Standard Oil Company can control the market is that the independent producers are unable to supply the demand. As the product of the Standard Company is necessary to meet the demand—the product of the independent refineries being comparatively insignificant—it can fix the price. The Standard Company being thus able to control the market has not seen fit to crush out all the independent producers, which no one doubts its ability to do if it so desired. The few that exist have been able to hold on only because they are favorably situated. They have been allowed to continue, probably because they are harmless and because the company does not wish to stir up new opposition—it has had its hands full warding off adverse legislation. As soon as a combination is formed controlling the larger portion of the output, although not an absolute monopoly, strictly speaking—more or less plants being outside the combine—still it is a practical monopoly for it can fix prices, raise and lower them, at will.

The outcome of this movement of concentration, however, will be absolute monopoly. As competition ends in combination, so combination ends in complete monopoly. That all competition will be finally eliminated is evident from the fact that capital is concentrating into the hands of a few. In the modern joint-stock form of ownership the great capitalists become interested in various industries and so will not invest their surplus capital in competing enterprises. John D. Rockefeller, for example, has capital invested in various and diversified industries and he is associated in these with many other capitalists, all of which have a common interest. Is it to be supposed that these men will put capital into other plants of the same kind and thus compete against themselves? Thus when capital and industry are concentrated into the hands of a few, all being mutually interested in the same productive enterprises, competition will be rendered impossible. It will then make no difference how high prices are raised or how the permanent large profits might be attractive to new capital, there will be no surplus capital outside of those who own the industries to invest in competitive enterprises. The great economic masters can then rule with a hand of iron, controlling product, prices, and people to suit their own sweet will.

There is but one escape from this condition and from the servitude already forced upon the working class. The socialization of the trusts and a democratic administration of industry for the benefit of all the people is the only solution of the problem. Socialism would secure to all the people, instead of the few, the benefits of the scientific organization of industry.

Charles H. Vail.

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT.

The first impression of Liebknecht was always a strong one, in spite of the fact that it allowed of no analysis. There was a realization of his dignity and presence though he was not a tall man; there was a perception at once of his intensity though his manner was calm and his conversation quiet. The first time I saw him he was standing at his desk in the office of the "Vorwaerts." The room itself was in some confusion of books and papers, and Liebknecht's high desk was covered with them; but after he turned to greet the two Socialists from Chicago—who came unannounced, without letter of introduction—no more thought was given to the surroundings. He appeared to be a man of sixty-five—in reality he was seventy-three. His iron-grey hair and beard did not conceal the strong lines of his face which showed a life of struggle. His features were large and somewhat roughly cut, but they were as firm as the thought behind them; his eyes were keen and clear. But, more than all else, there was a simplicity of manner which belongs only to those who have lived in the lives of other men, without compromise and without fear.

He went down to the book-room to get a catalogue and he passed through the office where twenty or thirty persons were waiting to see the advocate employed by the "Vorwaerts." They all bowed to Liebknecht with the peculiar deference which is given only to those whose work has brought them into the hearts of the oppressed. He went through the room quickly, for he avoided always the slightest possible acknowledgment of his position.

And that, perhaps, explains the love he bore to an undisturbed outdoor life. Every day when the weather permitted he and Frau Liebknecht went to Grunewald, a great pine forest just outside Berlin, and spent several hours in walking or reading in one of the gardens. It was there that he usually read the Socialist journals from other lands, and no conversation about him ever disturbed his perusal of foreign news. One morning I saw him take out of his pocket papers from France, Belgium, Italy, Denmark and England—and he read one after the other with perfect ease. In a letter written the twenty-fourth of July he said, "Until the beginning of last week, when the heat set in, we had cool and wet weather, so that it was impossible to go often to the Grunewald." And then he wrote of his extra work because of the number of vacations being taken by the staff of the "Vor-

waerts"; so that it seems as if his death might be traced to overwork and the break in his regular exercise. He was stricken with paralysis on August seventh; overcome by the burdens he had taken upon his own shoulders, after living through the persecutions and dangers of a monarchy, in the midst of which he had spent his life as an avowed Republican.

Liebknrecht's life was coincident with the German conflict from 1848 to the year of his death. He was born at Giessen, in Hesse, and spent his boyhood in an atmosphere of books and culture;—his grandfather had been rector of the University of Giessen and it was there that Liebknrecht first began to study in his rather unruly fashion, devoting much time to the things he liked, and refusing to drudge over the things he disliked. Later, he studied at the Universities of Marburg and Berlin, and among the books he read were the works of St. Simon. He was roused to such a pitch of enthusiasm that he decided to start for the land of democracy—for America.

But a Swiss teacher met him on his way to Hamburg and persuaded him to wait and watch the approaching crisis in European politics. Liebknrecht had burnt his bridges behind him before starting out by announcing to his family his dissatisfaction with the existing conditions and his interest in the new school of French economists. And he found himself obliged to study for the law as a means of livelihood when he had crossed the border. Here in Zurich he came for the first time in contact with the workingmen and those who were antagonistic to the traditional governments. He learned that as early as 1833 there had been an uprising in Frankfort on the part of those who wished political equality, and he learned that the suppression of that uprising had sent these men across the border who had had the courage in their exile to publish a paper called the "Proscribed," and to send it back to their fellows in Frankfort.

In this same year Marx and Engels—who had met in Paris three years before—converted the League of the Just into the Communist League and published the Communist Manifesto which marks the first epoch of Socialism and expressed the principles which have since served to unite workingmen of warring nations. Liebknrecht's enthusiasm had grown with his knowledge of the struggle for liberty; and he set out for Paris in 1848 ready to carry a musket with his French comrades. He was too late to fight, but he stayed in to study the methods of the Communists, and only left when he heard that the young poet Herwegh was about to strike a blow for liberty in his own country.

Then he hurried across the frontier, only to cross it again after a few weeks of futile marches and repeated calls to arms. Lieb-

knecht, as one of the most active "rebels" had naturally to seek Switzerland, but he soon returned to Baden where the ferment of discontent had been more constant. Struve was the leader, and with a disaffected army, which had found the king's rule unsupportable, he might have been successful in establishing a republic, had he not been a procrastinator. Liebknecht himself was most active and showed the executive ability which has always made his work effective. However, after a season of hopeful progress, there was strife among the revolutionists, and the government was enabled to suppress the young Republic. Liebknecht was arrested and kept in parole nine months which time he devoted to preparing a defense of himself as a Revolutionist and to courting his wife.

Much to his chagrin he was judged "not guilty" and had no opportunity of making a maiden speech in Baden and yet his popularity which had obtained his acquittal could not procure his safety if he remained longer and once again he set out for Switzerland.

In Geneva he undertook the education of workingmen's groups in the principles and concepts of Socialism, and he accomplished enough to rouse the fears of both Prussia and Austria who demanded, in 1850, that the authorities of Geneva expel him from their city. Then began the most severe time of trial for Liebknecht. He went to London, without any outlook in the way of a living. He refused the financial help of Marx and Engels, both of whom became greatly interested in him and were well able to aid him. He tramped miles to secure pupils in German, and there were times when he felt actual hunger; worst of all, his wife and child were called upon to suffer with him, and they could not know the zest of the battle in which the young German felt himself.

At last he became the London correspondent for the "Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung" and was enabled to maintain himself until 1861, when an amnesty permitted him to return to Prussia. He was made one of the editors then of the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" and as he was again given carte blanche in his work, he found himself in the most comfortable circumstances, as regarded his principles and his material welfare, that he had known since he left Giessen. His experience with English organizations led him to redouble his efforts in developing self-conscious groups of workingmen—he had lost his confidence in any effective middle-class movement years before. And he threw himself into the work with so much vigor that the rebuff which came in 1862 was almost enough to embitter him.

Bismarck had come into power and had won over the chief of the "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," who, in turn, tried to

persuade his colleague to restrain his logic and clever sarcasm to the point of meditative theorizing. This attempt at persuasion failed, and agents of Bismarck approached with offers of a brilliant sort which assured Liebknecht of a high position as the wage of compromise. The only alternative was poverty, and Liebknecht chose poverty. He resigned his position.

During this second term of financial uncertainty he was constantly persecuted by the police, who were never without hope that he might be tormented to the point of open resistance—an excuse for his arrest. But he worked on with perfect calmness, objected always to Bismarck's policy and joined Lassalle's movement. In 1865 a certificate of his good behavior in London was demanded of him, but as the English have no bureau for the investigation of peaceable individuals, he could not obtain one. He was arrested and told to leave Berlin, and his appeals to highest authorities were met by a reiterated command that he should go.

This banishment meant an acquaintance and friendship with Bebel in Leipzig. They spent a year together, and the struggle was mainly for Internationalism, which became the point of difference between the Marxists and the Lassellians. It was due to Liebknecht's efforts that there were so many converts to the Marx program.

After a time, family affairs called him to Berlin, and as there was an amnesty—understood by Liebknecht to cover his case—he returned without fear. He was in Berlin but four weeks when again arrested, and imprisoned for five months; his ban was still in force. When he came out of prison he found his wife dead; she had suffered too much, and her life was sacrificed to the work for the many sufferers.

In 1867 the Federation of Educational Societies endorsed the International platform after long, hard work done by Bebel and Liebknecht, and the founding of the Social Democratic party in 1869 marked a definite growth in the great movement. From that time on, Liebknecht's life was divided between his work as editor of Socialist papers and as Socialist member in the German parliament; first in the North German Reichstag and then in the Imperial Reichstag, where his opposition to Bismarck's policy was unceasing.

During the Franco-Prussian war he spoke constantly against the bills of appropriation as well as against the principles controlling a war-making government. His opposition brought about his arrest in 1872 for treason. For two years he was in imprisonment, and came out to find himself re-elected to his seat in the Reichstag.

To follow his activities is to trace every phase of Socialist development in Germany, from the acceptance by a united party of

the platform drawn up at Gotha (1875) to the recent discussion of measures which took the attention of the last conference in October. With the founding of the "Vorwaerts" as the organ of the party he was made its editor, and everything that he wrote hit the mark, and brought terror to the Philistines. He alternately counselled his comrades and hurled powerful invectives against compromise and capitalism.

The newspapers were suppressed in 1890 and the 67 societies in Berlin were forced to sham dead, but this martyrdom only served to increase secret activities, and at the next election there were 311,961 votes from Berlin alone. Later in the year Liebknecht spoke to a meeting of the International at Halle, at which four hundred delegates from ten different countries were present. And it seems as if this leader of men were always present at the great conferences held from year to year. At the one in Breslau in 1896 he replied to the contemptible phrase of the Kaiser, who had called the Socialists "Rotte von Menschen," and, though a man of seventy years, a leader of the people and a deputy in the Reichstag, he was sentenced to a four months' imprisonment for *lèse majesté*.

He pointed the prison out, one day last year, as we were riding out of Berlin on the elevated. "It would not have been so disagreeable if the room had been large enough to walk in, and if it had not been over the kitchen, where they were always cooking cabbage!"

Yet he spoke of his persecution in the most philosophical manner; he knew why he had experienced the blows of a monarchical and capitalistic society, and that knowledge gave him the power of repose. And besides, he could see the great results of his unremitting effort; in the immense growth of the Socialist vote, which in Germany in 1898 amounted to two millions and a quarter, in the great spread of the International principles, and in the fear of existing governments.

He lived to fulfill the words he spoke in his defense in 1872: "A two-fold ideal has been before me since my youth—a free and united Germany and the emancipation of the working people, that is, the destruction of class rule, which is synonymous with the freeing of humanity. For this double ideal I have fought with my best powers, and for this double ideal I shall fight as long as there is breath in my body. *Das will die Pflicht!* (that wills Duty!)"

Charlotte Teller.

SCIENCE AND SOCIALISM.

Until the middle of this century the favorite theory with those who attempted to explain the phenomena of History was the Great-Man-Theory. This theory was that once in a while through infinite mercy a great man was sent to the earth who yanked humanity up a notch or two higher, and then we went along in a humdrum way on that level, or even sank back till another great man was vouchsafed to us. Possibly the finest flower of this school of thought is Carlyle's Heroes and Hero Worship. Unscientific as this theory was, it had its beneficent effects, for these heroes or great men served as ideals, and the human mind requires an unattainable ideal. No man can be or do the best he is capable of unless he is ever reaching out toward an ideal that lies beyond his grasp. Robert Browning put this truth in the mouth of Andrea del Sarto, whom he makes say:

“Ah! but a man's reach should exceed his grasp.”

And Tennyson puts the same truth in the mouth of the ancient sage who tells the youthful and ambitious Gareth who is eager to enter into the service of King Arthur of the Table Round.

“the King

Will bind thee by such vows as is a shame
A man should not be bound by, yet the which
No man can keep.”

This function of furnishing an ideal was performed in former times by these great men and more especially by those great men whom legend, myth and superstition converted into gods. But with the decay of the old faiths the only possible fruitful ideal left is the ideal upheld by Socialism, the ideal of the Co-operative Commonwealth in which the economic conditions will give birth to the highest, purest, most altruistic ethics the world has yet seen. It is true the co-operative commonwealth is far more than a Utopian ideal, it is a scientific prediction, but at this point I wish to emphasize its function as an ideal.

But it is obvious that this Great Man theory gave no scientific clue to history. If the Great Man was a supernatural phenomenon, a gift from Olympus, then of course History had no scientific basis, but was dependent upon the arbitrary caprices of the Gods, and Homer's Iliad was a specimen of accurate descriptive sociology. If on the other hand the great man was a natural phenomenon, the theory stopped short half way toward its goal for it

gave us no explanation of the genesis of the Great Man nor of the reasons for the superhuman influence that it attributed to him.

Mallock, one of the most servile literary apologists of capitalism, has recently in a book called "Aristocracy and Evolution" attempted to revive and revise this theory and give it a scientific form. He still attributes all progress to Great Men, but with the brutal frankness of modern bourgeois Capitalism, gives us a new definition of Great Men. According to Mallock, the great man is the man who makes money. This has long been the working theory of bourgeois society, but Mallock is the first of them who has had the cynicism or the stupidity to confess it. But mark you, by this confession he admits the truth of the fundamental premise of Modern Scientific Socialism, our Socialism, viz., that the economic factor is the dominant or determining factor in the life of society. Thus you see the ablest champion of bourgeois capitalism admits, albeit unconsciously, the truth of the Marxian Materialistic Conception of History. This book, however, is chiefly remarkable for its impudent and shameless misrepresentations of Marx and Marxism, but these very lies show that intelligent apologists of capitalism know that their only dangerous foe is Marxian Socialism.

But just as according to the vulgar superstition the tail of a snake that has been killed wiggles till sundown, so this book of Mallock's is merely a false show of life made by a theory that received its deathblow long since. It is the wiggling of the tail of the snake that Herbert Spencer killed 30 years ago with his little book "The Study of Sociology." The environment philosophy in one form or another has come to occupy the entire field of human thought. We now look for the explanation of every phenomenon in the conditions that surrounded its birth and development. The best application of this environment philosophy to intellectual and literary phenomena that has ever been made is Taine's History of English Literature.

But while Spencer's Study of Sociology is the most signal and brilliant refutation of the Great Man theory, no one man really killed that theory. The general spread and acceptance of Darwinism has produced an intellectual atmosphere in which such a theory can no more live than a fish can live out of water.

By Darwinism we mean, as you know, the transmutation of species by variation and natural selection—selection accomplished mainly, if not solely, by the struggle for existence. Now this doctrine of organic development and change or metamorphic evolution, which was, with its originators, Wallace and Darwin, a purely biological doctrine, was transported to the field of Sociology by Spencer and applied with great power to all human institutions, legal, moral, economic, religious, etc. Spencer has taught the world that all social institutions are fluid and not fixed. As Karl

Marx said in the preface to the first edition of *Capital*: "The present society is no solid crystal, but an organism capable of change, and is constantly changing," and again in the preface to the second edition, "Every historically developed social form is in fluid movement." This is the theory of Evolution in its broadest sense, and it has struck a death-blow to the conception of Permanence so dear to the hearts of the bourgeoisie who love to sing to their Great God, Private Property, "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen." "Sarcula Sarculorum." "For the Ages of Ages."

Before natural science had thus revolutionized the intellectual atmosphere, great men proclaiming the doctrines of Modern Socialism might have been rained down from Heaven, but there would have been no socialist movement. In fact many of its ideas had found utterance centuries before, but the economic conditions, and consequently the intellectual conditions were not ripe, and these ideas were still-born, or died in infancy.

The general acceptance of the idea that all things change, that property, marriage, religion, etc., are in process of evolution and are destined to take on new forms prepared the way for Socialism. A man who has read Wallace and Darwin is ready to read Marx and Engels.

Now the story of the birth of Darwinism is itself a proof of the fallacy of the Great Man theory, and a signal confirmation of the view that new ideas, theories and discoveries emanate from the material conditions. The role of the great man is still an important one. We need the men who are capable of abstract thought, capable of perceiving the essential relations and significance of the facts, and of drawing correct inductions from them. Such men are rare, but there are always enough of them to perform these functions. And the Great Man, born out of due time, before the material and economic conditions are ripe for him, can effect nothing. When the conditions are ripe, the new idea always occurs to more than one man; that is, the same conditions and facts force the same idea upon different minds. It is true there is always some one man who gives this idea its best expression or best marshals the evidence of the facts in its support, and the idea usually becomes inseparably linked with his name. In this way does our race express its gratitude to its great men and perpetuate their memory.

Darwinism or the theory of Natural Selection was in this way independently discovered by Alfred Russell Wallace and Charles Darwin, and the popular judgment has not erred in giving the chief credit to Charles Darwin.

Wallace's paper "On the Law which has Regulated the Introduction of New Species," written by Wallace on one of the far away islands of the Malay Archipelago, where he was studying the

Geographical Distribution of Species appeared in the "Annals of Natural History" in 1855. Its resultant conclusion was "that every species has come into existence coincident both in space and time with a pre-existing closely allied species." Mr. Darwin tells us that Mr. Wallace wrote him that the cause to which he attributed this coincidence was no other than "generation with modification," or in other words that the "closely allied antetype" was the parent stock from which the new form had been derived by variation.

Mr. Wallace's second paper, which in my judgment is the clearest and best condensed statement of the Doctrine of the Struggle for Existence and the principle of Natural Selection ever written, was written by Mr. Wallace at Ternate in the Malay Archipelago, in February, 1858, and sent to Mr. Darwin. It was called "On the Tendency of Varieties to Depart Indefinitely from the Original Type." Mr. Wallace requested Mr. Darwin to show it to Sir Chas. Lyell, the father of Modern Geology, and accordingly Dr. Hooker, the great botanist, brought it to Sir Chas. Lyell. They were both so struck with the complete agreement of the conclusions of Mr. Darwin and Mr. Wallace that they thought it would be unfair to publish one without the other, so this paper and a chapter from Darwin's unpublished manuscript of the "Origin of Species" were read before the Linnaean Society on the same evening and published in their Proceedings for 1858, and thus appeared in the same year, 1859, as Marx's Critique of Political Economy. This theory of Natural Selection is, you know, in brief, that more animals of every kind are born than can possibly survive, than can possibly get a living. This gives rise to a Battle for Life. In this battle those are the victors who are the best able to secure food for themselves and their offspring and are best able by fight or flight to protect themselves from their enemies. This is called the Law of the Survival of the Fittest, but remember, the Fittest are not always best or most highly developed forms, but simply those forms best suited to the then existing environment. These two extremely interesting papers of Wallace are printed as the two first chapters of his book "Natural Selection and Tropical Nature," published by MacMillan, a book so fascinating I would beg all my hearers and readers who have not read it to do so.

This law of double or multiple discovery holds good of all great discoveries and inventions, and is notably true of the first of the three great thoughts that we ordinarily associate with the name of Karl Marx. There three are:

1. The Materialistic Conception of History.
2. The Law of Surplus Value.
3. The Class Struggle—the third being a necessary consequence of the first two.

Now the Materialistic Conception of History was independently discovered by Engels just as Darwinism was by Wallace, as you will see by reading Engels' preface to the Communist Manifesto. But just as Wallace gave Darwin all the credit, so Engels did to Marx.

I.

THE MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.

What do we mean by the Doctrine of the Materialistic Conception of History, or of "Economic Determinism," as Ferri calls it? We must make sure we understand, for there is cant in Socialism, just as there is in religion, and there is good reason to fear many of us go on using these good mouth-filling phrases, "Materialistic Conception of History," "Class-Conscious Proletariat," "Class Struggle," and "Revolutionary Socialism," with no more accurate idea of their meaning than our pious friends have of the theological phrases they keep repeating like so many poll-parrots.

At bottom, when we talk intelligently of the Materialistic Conception of History, we simply mean, what every man by his daily conduct proves to be true, that the bread and butter question is the most important question in life. All the rest of the life of the individual is affected, yes dominated by the way he earns his bread and butter. As this is true of individuals, so also it is true of societies, and this gives us the only key by which we can understand the history of the past and, within limits, predict the course of future development.

That is all there is of it. That is easy to understand, and every man of common sense is bound to admit that that much is true.

The word "materialistic" suggests philosophy and metaphysics and brings to our minds the old disputes about monism and dualism, and the dispute between religious people who believe in the existence of spirit and scientists who adopt modern materialistic monism. But no matter what position a man may hold on these philosophical and theological questions he can with perfect consistency recognize the fact that the economic factor is the dominant, determining factor in every day human life, and the man who admits this simple truth believes in the Marxian Materialistic Conception of history. The political, legal, ethical and all human institutions have their roots in the economic soil, and any reform that does not go clear to the roots and affect the economic structure of society must necessarily be abortive. Anything that does go to the roots and does modify the economic structure, the bread and butter side of life, will inevitably modify every other branch and department of human life, political, ethical, legal, religious, etc.

This makes the social question an economic question, and all our thought and effort should be concentrated on the economic question."* I am aware of the fact that in the Preface to his "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," Engels apparently identifies the materialistic conception of History with Materialistic Monism in Philosophy, but this connection or identification is not a necessary logical consequence of any statement of the Materialistic Conception of History I have been able to find by Engels, Marx, Deville, Ferri, Loria, or any Marxian of authority and to thus identify it, is detrimental to the cause of Socialism, since many people who would not hesitate to admit the predominance of the economic factor, instantly revolt at the idea of Materialism.

Let us take Engel's statement of this doctrine in the preface to the Manifesto. It is as follows:

"In every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch."

Does not that agree exactly with the doctrine as I have stated it? Or, take this statement of it by Comrade Vail, of Jersey City:

"The laws, customs, education, public opinion and morals are controlled and shaped by economic conditions, or, in other words, by the dominant ruling class which the economic system of any given period forces to the front. The ruling ideas of each age have been the ideas of its ruling class, whether that class was the patricians of ancient Rome, the feudal barons of the middle ages, or the capitalists of modern times. The economic structure of society largely controls and shapes all social institutions, and also religious and philosophical ideas."

Or, take this, by Marx himself: "The mode of production obtaining in material life determines, generally speaking, the social, political and intellectual processes of life."

Does not that again agree exactly with the doctrine as I have stated it?

The doctrine is stated in nearly the same language by Loria

*"If this be true the question naturally arises: Why do the socialists, instead of using economic methods to solve an economic question, organize themselves into a political party? To answer this question, we must first see what the State is and what relation it holds to the economic conditions. Gabriel Deville defines the State thus: "The State is the public power of coercion created and maintained in human societies by their division into classes, a power which, being clothed with force, makes laws and levies taxes. As long as the economically dominant class retain full possession of this public power of coercion they are able to use it as a weapon to defeat every attempt to alter the economic structure of society. Hence every attempt to destroy economic privilege and establish Industrial Democracy inevitably takes the form of a political class struggle between the economically privileged class and the economically exploited class."

and Ferri, though Ferri calls it Economic Determinism, which seems to me a much better and more exact name. Ferri points out that we must not forget the intellectual factor and the various other factors, which, though they are themselves determined by the economic factor, in their turn become causes acting concurrently with the economic factor. Loria deals with this whole subject most exhaustively and interestingly in his recently translated book "The Economic Foundations of Society." Curiously enough in this long book he never once gives Marx the credit of having discovered this theory, but constantly talks as though he—Loria—had revealed it to a waiting world. The method of his book is the reverse of scientific, as he first states his theory and conclusions and then starts to scour the universe for facts to support them, instead of first collecting the facts and letting them impose the theory upon his mind. And his book is by no means free from inconsistencies and contradictions. But while you can not place yourselves unreservedly and confidently in his hands as you can in those of Karl Marx, still his book has much value. He shows most interestingly how all the connective institutions, as he calls religious and legal and political institutions, have been moulded in the interest of the economically dominant class, and how useful they have been in either persuading or forcing the so-called "lower classes" to submit to the economic conditions that were absolutely against their interests. But the system of Wage Slavery is such a beautifully automatic system, itself subjugating the workers and leaving them no choice, that I cannot see that the capitalists have any further need of any of these connective institutions save the State. At all events, these institutions are fast losing their power over the minds of men. But the most valuable part of his book is the immense mass of evidence he has collected showing how political sovereignty follows economic sovereignty or rather, revenue, and how all past history has been made up of a series of contests between various kinds of revenue, particularly between rent from landed property and profits from industrial or manufacturing capital, but as this is nothing more than the Class Struggle between the lauded aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, a struggle sketched by master hands in the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, we can give Loria no credit for originality, but merely praise his industry in collecting evidence.

Gabriel Deville, who has probably done more than any one else to popularize the ideas of Marx in France, has pointed out a very nice distinction here. Man, like all living beings, is the product of his environment. But while animals are affected only by the natural environment, man's brain, itself a product of the natural environment, becomes a cause, a creator, and makes for man an economic environment, so that man is acted on by two

environments, the natural environment which has made man and the economic environment which man has made. Now in the early stages of human development, it is the natural environment, the fertility of the soil, climatic conditions, abundance of game, fish, etc., which is all important, but with the progress of civilization, the natural environment loses in relative importance, and the economic environment (machinery, factories, improved appliances, etc.) grows in importance until in our day the economic environment has become well nigh all-important. Hence the inadequacy of the Henry George theory which places all its stress on one element of the natural environment, land, and wholly neglects the dominant economic environment.

But while this economic environment, the dominant factor in human life, is the child of the brain of man, man in its creation has been forced to work within strict limitations. He had to make it out of the materials furnished him in the first place by the natural environment and later on by the natural environment and the inherited economic environment, so that in the last analysis the material and economic factors are supreme.

We Marxians are often accused of neglecting the intellectual factor and, as Deville says, a whole syndicate of factors; but we do not neglect them. We recognize their existence and their importance, but we do refuse to waste our revolutionary energy on derivative phenomena when we are able to see and recognize the decisive, dominant factor, the economic factor. As Deville says, we do not neglect the cart, because we insist upon putting it behind the horse instead of in front of or alongside of him, as our critics would have us do. Now, if the economic factor is the basic factor, it behooves us to understand the present economic system—Marx's Law of Surplus-Value is the key to this system.

II.

THE LAW OF SURPLUS-VALUE.

The second great idea that we associate with the name of Karl Marx is the Law of Surplus-Value. Curiously enough this one technical theory is the only discovery that bourgeois writers and economists give Marx credit for. If you look up Marx in any ordinary encyclopedia or reference book you will find they make his fame depend on this theory alone, and to make matters worse they usually misstate and misrepresent this theory, while they invariably fail to mention his two other equally great, if not greater discoveries, the Materialistic Conception of History and the Class Struggle. I think the reason they give special prominence to this law of Surplus-Value is that, as it is a purely technical theory in economics, it is easier to obscure it with a cloud of sophistry and persuade their willing dupes that they have refuted it.

And then they raise the cry that the foundation of Marxian Socialism has been destroyed and that the whole structure is about to tumble down on the heads of its crazy defenders, the Socialists. It is much to be regretted that many so-called Socialists are found foolish enough to play into the hands of the Capitalists by joining in the silly cry that some pigmy in political economy has overthrown the Marxian theory of Value. I suppose these co-called Socialists are actuated by a mad desire to be up to date, to keep up with the intellectual band-wagon. Revolutions in the various sciences have been going on so rapidly, they fancy that a theory that was formulated forty years ago must be a back-number, and so they hasten to declare their allegiance to the last new cloud of sophistry, purporting to be a theory of value, that has been evolved by the feeble minds of the Anarchists of Italy or the Capitalist Economists of Austria. The Fabians of London are the most striking example of these socialists whose heads have been turned in this way by the rapid progress of science. But the followers of Bernstein in Europe and this country are running into the same danger and in their eagerness to grasp the very newest and latest doctrine will fall easy victims to the first windy and pretentious fakir who comes along. Ask any one of these fellows who tells you that the Marxian theory of Value has been exploded, to state the new and correct theory of Value that has taken its place and you will find that he cannot state a theory that you or I or any other man can understand. He will either admit he is floored, or else he will emit a dense fog of words. I challenge any one of them to state a theory of value that he himself can understand, let alone make anyone else understand.

Now the Marxian theory of Value can be clearly stated so that you and I can understand it. But let us begin with surplus-value. This theory of surplus-value is simply the scientific formulation of the fact that workingmen had been conscious of in a vague way long before Karl Marx's day, the fact that the workingman don't get a fair deal, that he don't get all he earns. This fact had been formulated as long ago as 1821 by the unknown author of a letter to Lord John Russell on "The Source and Remedy of the National Difficulties." In this letter the very phrases "surplus produce" and "surplus labor" are used. You will find that Marx refers to this letter in a note on page 369 of the American Edition of Capital. The Russian writer Slegpoff quotes several passages from this letter in an article in the December, 1899, number of *La Revue Socialiste*, and it is annoying to see how near to Marx's conclusions this unknown writer had come eighty years ago, but the conditions were not ripe and his letter would to-day be forgotten if Marx had not embalmed it in a footnote. I confess I was surprised to learn that this was not a purely original

discovery of Marx's, but the fact that it is not is one more signal confirmation of the theory I have given in this lecture of the double or multiple discovery of great ideas.

But let us resume the discussion of Surplus Value and see just what it really is.

No matter where you, my workingman hearer or reader, may work, the person or corporation or trust for whom or which you work gets back more out of your labor, than he or it pays you in wages. If this is not so, your employer is either running a charitable institution or he is in business for his health. You may have employers of that kind here on the East Side of New York, but I have never met any of them elsewhere. It is impossible to conceive of a man going on day after day, week after week, year after year, paying you wages, unless he receives more for the product of your labor than he pays you in wages. Now, this difference between what you get and what he gets is what we call surplus-value.

This surplus-value is the key to the whole present economic organization of society. The end and object of bourgeois society is the formation and accumulation of surplus-value, or in other words, the systematic robbery of the producing class. Now when we say robbery, we do not mean to accuse employers of conscious dishonesty. They are the creatures of a system just as the workers are, but it is a system which makes their interests diametrically opposed to the interests of their employees. The only way the capitalists can increase their relative share of the product of their employees' labor is by decreasing the relative share of the latter.

Now, if out of the total product of his labor the workingman only receives a part, then it is true to say that he works part of the day for himself and part of the day gratuitously for the capitalist. Let us say, for purposes of illustration, that he works three hours for himself and seven hours for his employer for nothing. This three hours we call his necessary labor time, or his paid labor; and the seven hours we call his surplus labor time or his unpaid labor. The product of his three hours' labor is the equivalent of his wages or as we call it, the value of his Labor-Power. The product of the other seven hours of his labor, his surplus or unpaid labor, is surplus product or surplus-value. Starting from the fact that every workingman knows to be true, that he don't get all he feels he ought to get, we have thus, I think, made the definition of surplus-value clear to every one of you, but we have been talking of surplus-value and value of labor power and we have not yet defined Value.

When we speak of the value of an object we mean the amount of human labor that is embodied or accumulated in it, that has been spent in fitting it to satisfy human needs. And we measure

the amount of this human labor by its duration, by labor-time. You, if you are a skilled, highly-paid worker, receiving say four dollars a day, may say that it absurd to say that an hour of your labor produces no more value than an hour of Tom's or Dick's or Pete's, who get only eighty cents a day apiece. You are quite right. Your hour does produce more value. The labor-time that determines value is the labor-time of the average, untrained worker. Again, you may waste your time, spending half of it looking out of the window or carrying on a flirtation. This wasted labor does not count in measuring value. The only labor that counts is the labor that is socially necessary under normal conditions for the production of the given commodity. Again, labor spent to produce a useless article does not produce value. To produce value the labor must serve to satisfy human wants. Now, I think this is quite clear so far. We know what surplus-value is. We know what value is and how it is measured. Let us now see what is meant by the Value of Labor-Power.

To begin with, what is Labor-Power? When a workingman goes upon the market to sell something for money with which to buy bread and butter and the other necessities of life, what has he to offer for sale? He cannot offer a finished commodity, such as a watch, a shoe or a book, because he owns nothing. He has neither the necessary machinery, the necessary raw material, nor even the necessary place in which to work to make these things. These all belong to another class who by owning them, in fact, own him. He cannot offer labor for sale, because his labor does not yet exist. He cannot sell a thing that has no existence. When his labor comes into real objective existence, it is incorporated with materials that are the property of the class that rules him, and no longer belongs to him. He cannot sell what he don't possess. There is only one thing he can sell, namely, his mental and physical or muscular power to do things, to make things. He can sell this for a definite time to an employer, just exactly as a livery stable keeper sells a horse's power to trot to his customers for so much per hour. Now this power of his to do things is what we call his labor-power; that is, his capacity to perform work. Now, its value is determined precisely like the value of every other commodity, i. e., by the labor time socially necessary for its production. Now the labor time socially necessary for the production of labor-power is the labor time socially necessary to produce the food, clothing and shelter or lodging that are necessary to enable the laborer to come on the labor market day after day able physically to work, and also to enable him to beget and raise children who will take his place as wage-slaves when he shall have been buried by the County or some Sick and Death Benefit Fund.

In the example we used above we assumed that the laborer

worked three hours a day to produce a value equal to the value of his labor-power. The price of this value, the value produced by his paid labor, we call "Wages." This price is often reduced by the competition of "scabs" and other victims of capitalist exploitation below the real value of labor-power, but we have not time to go into that here, so we will assume that the laborer gets in wages the full value of his labor-power.

Well, then, if he produces in three or four hours a value equal to the value of his labor-power or wages, why doesn't he stop work then, and take his coat and hat and go home and devote the rest of the day to study, reading, games, recreation and amusement? He don't because he can't. He has to agree (voluntarily, of course) to any conditions that the class who by owning his tools own him choose to impose upon him, and the lash of the competition of the unemployed, Capital's Reserve Army, as Marx called it, is ever ready to fall upon his naked back.

Why is he so helpless? Because he and his class have been robbed of the land and the tools and all the means of sustenance and production, and have nothing left them but that empty bauble, legal liberty, liberty to accept wages so small that they barely enable them to live like beasts, or liberty to starve to death and be buried in unmarked graves by the public authorities.

The wage system necessarily implies this surplus labor or unpaid labor. So long as there are wages, workingmen, you will never get the full product of your labor. Let no reformer beguile you into a struggle which simply aims to secure a modification of the wage system! Nothing short of the annihilation of the wage system will give you justice and give you the full product of your labor.

But while wages necessarily imply surplus-labor, the reverse is not true. You can have surplus-labor without wages. Surplus-labor is not an invention of modern capitalists. Since Mankind emerged from the state of Primitive Communism typified by the Garden of Eden in the Hebraic myth, there have been three great systems of economic organization: 1. Slavery; 2. Serfdom; 3. The Wage System. It is interesting to note the varying appearances of surplus or unpaid labor under these three systems.

Under the first, Slavery, all labor appears as unpaid labor. This is only a false appearance, however. During a part of the day the slave only reproduces the value of his maintenance or "keep." During that part of the day he works for himself just as truly as the modern wage-slave works for himself during a part of his day. But the Property relation conceals the paid labor.

Under the second system, Serfdom, or the Feudal System, The paid labor and the unpaid labor are absolutely separate

and distinct, so that not even the most gifted orthodox political economist can confuse them.

Under the third system, Wage Slavery,

The unpaid labor apparently falls to Zero. There is none. You voluntarily enter into a bargain, agreeing that your day's work is worth so much, and you receive the full price agreed upon. But again this is only a false appearance. As we saw by our analysis, a part of the wage-slave's day is devoted to paid labor and a part to unpaid. Here wages or the money relation conceals the unpaid labor and disguises under the mask of a voluntary bargain the struggle of the working class to diminish or abolish unpaid labor, and the class-conscious, pitiless struggle of the capitalist class to increase the unpaid labor and reduce the paid labor to the minimum, i. e., to or below the level of bare subsistence. In other words the Wage System conceals the Class Struggle.

III.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

The third of the great ideas that will always be associated with the name of Karl Marx is that of the Class Struggle. The Class Struggle is logically such a necessary consequence of both the Materialistic Conception of History and the Law of Surplus-Value, that as we have discussed them at some length, but little need be said of the Class Struggle itself. In discussing the Materialistic Conception of History we showed with sufficient fullness and clearness that, in the language of the Communist Manifesto, "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of Class Struggles." Hence it is clear the doctrine of class struggles is a key to past history. But it is more than this. It is a compass to steer by in the present struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat, who cannot, fortunately, emancipate themselves without emancipating and ennobling all mankind.

The Law of Surplus-Value has shown us that there is a deep-seated, ineradicable conflict between the direct class interest of the proletariat which coincides with the true interests of the human race, and the direct, conscious guiding interest of the class who own the means of production and distribution. There is here a direct clash between two hostile interests. This fact has been skilfully hidden from the eyes of the workers in the past, but the modern socialist movement, aided by the growing brutality of the capitalist class, is making it impossible to fool them in this way much longer. In other words, the workmen are becoming Class Conscious, i. e., conscious of the fact that they, as a class, have interests which are in direct conflict with the selfish

interests of the capitalist class. With the growth of this class-consciousness this conflict of interests must inevitably become a political class struggle. The capitalists, the economically privileged class, struggle to retain possession of the State that they may continue to use it as a weapon to keep the working class subjugated, servile and dependent. The proletariat, the working-class, struggle to obtain possession of the State, that they may use it to destroy every vestige of economic privilege, to abolish private property in the means of production and distribution, and thus put an end to the division of society into classes, and usher in the society of the future, the Co-operative Commonwealth. As the State is in its very nature a class instrument, as its existence is dependent upon the existence of distinct classes, the State in the hands of the victorious proletariat will commit suicide, by tearing down its own foundation.

Until a man perceives and is keenly conscious of this class conflict, a conflict which admits of no truce or compromise, and ranges himself on the side of the workers to remain there until the battle is fought and the victory won, until the proletariat shall have conquered the public powers, taken possession of that class instrument, the State (for so long as the State exists it will be a class instrument) and made it in the hands of the working class a tool to abolish private ownership in the tools and the land, in the means of production and distribution, and to abolish all classes by absorbing them all in the Brotherhood of Man; until a man has thus shown himself clearly conscious of the Class Struggle, with its necessary implications, his heart may be in the right place, but laboring men can not trust him as a leader. The fact that the hearts of many popular reformers, political candidates and so-called "friends of labor," who ignore the class struggle, are on the right side, but gives them added power to mislead and betray workingmen. Workingmen, I beg you to follow no leader who has not a clear enough head to see that there is a class struggle, and a large enough heart to place himself on your side of that struggle. But remember that you are not fighting the battle of a class alone. You are fighting for the future welfare of the whole human race. But while this is true, it is also true that your class must bear the brunt of this battle, for yours is the only class that, in the language of the Manifesto, "has nothing but its chains to lose, and a World to gain!" The rich have much to lose, and this very real and tangible risk of loss not un-naturally blinds the eyes of most of them to the more remote, though infinitely greater compensations that Socialism has to offer them. The Middle Class, even down to those who are just a round above the proletarians on the social ladder, love to ape the very rich and the capitalist magnates. It tickles their silly vanity to fancy that their interests are capitalistic interests, and

their mental horizon is too hopelessly limited for them to perceive that the proletariat whom it pleases them to despise as the great army of the "unwashed" are in truth fighting their battle for them, and receiving instead of gratitude, contempt, gibes and sneers. Socialism does occasionally receive a recruit from the very highest stratum of society, but I tell you it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than it is for a member of the Middle Class to become a scientific socialist.

I have said the Class Struggle is a compass to steer by in the present struggle for the emancipation of the working class. If we steer by this compass, we will resolutely reject all overtures from political parties representing the interests of other classes, even when such parties in their platforms endorse some of the immediate demands of the socialists; we will "fear the Greeks bringing gifts;" we will not be seduced for a moment by the idea of fusion with any so-called Socialist party which is not avowedly based on the Class Struggle; especially as individuals, will we avoid giving our votes or our support to any Middle Class party which we may at times fancy to be "moving in the right direction." The history of the class conflicts of the past shows that whenever the proletarians have joined forces with the Middle Class or any section of it, the proletarians have had to bear the heat and burden of the day and when the victory has been won their allies have robbed them of its fruits.

You, yourselves, then, Workingmen, must fight this battle! To win, it is true, you will need the help of members of the other classes. But this help the economic evolution is constantly bringing you. It is a law of the economic evolution that with the progress of industrialism the ratio of the returns of capital to the capital invested constantly diminishes, (though the aggregate volume of those returns increases). You see this in the constant lowering of the rate of interest. Now, as their incomes decrease, the small capitalists and the middle class, who form the vast majority of the possessing class, become unable to continue to support the members of the liberal professions, the priests, preachers, lawyers, editors, lecturers, etc., whose chief function heretofore has been to fool the working class into supporting or at least submitting to the present system. Now, when the income of these unproductive laborers, an income drawn from the class hostile to the proletariat, shall sensibly decrease or, worse still, cease, these educated members of the liberal professions will desert the army of Capital and bring a much-needed reinforcement to the Army of Labor.

Some of the more far-seeing upholders of the present system are keenly conscious of this danger. And this danger (even though most of the expansionists may not realize it), is one of the most potent causes of the Imperialism, Militarism and Jingoism

which are at present disgracing the civilized world. England in Africa and America in the Philippines are pursuing their present criminal policies, not solely to open new markets for English and American goods, but also to secure new fields for the investment of English and American capital, and thus to stop the continuous dropping of the rate of interest and profits, for if this cannot be stopped, the intellectual proletariat will join the sweating proletariat, and the Co-operative Commonwealth will be established and then the poor capitalists will have to work for their livings like other people.

This was clearly pointed out by a capitalist writer in an essay in a recent number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, who warned the capitalist opponents of McKinley, Destiny & Co.'s policy of expansion that they were attempting to close the only safety-valve* which under present conditions could not avert but postpone the Social Revolution.*

But, friends, nothing can postpone it long, for the industrial crises and financial panics are recurring at shorter and shorter intervals, and the process of recovery from them is slower and slower, and every panic and crisis forces thousands of educated, intelligent members of the middle class off their narrow and precarious foothold down into the ranks of the proletariat, where the hard logic of the facts will convert them to class-conscious Socialism.

Workingmen, I congratulate you upon the approaching victory of the workers and the advent of the Co-operative Commonwealth for I tell you, in the language of an English comrade:

"Failure on failure may seem to defeat us; ultimate failure is impossible.

Seeing what is to be done then, seeing what the reward is.

Seeing what the terms are,—are you willing to join us?

Will you lend us the aid of your voice, your money, your sympathy?

May we take you by the hand and call you 'Comrade?'"

Robert Rives La Monte.

*The expansion policy also acts as a safety valve by promoting the emigration of the discontented and by providing employment abroad for the educated proletarians who would, no doubt, become "dangerous and incendiary Socialist agitators" in their native lands.

A BAD QUARTER OF AN HOUR.

From "Remembrances of Karl Marx," by Wilhelm Liebknecht.

It was in London, Nov. 18, 1852. The "Iron Duke" and "Victor in a Hundred Battles"—whom, nevertheless, the English people at the time of the Reform movement had made very gentle and meek—Lord Wellington, had died in Walmer Castle on the 14th of September, and on the 18th of the following November the "National Hero" was to be given a "national burial" and be laid with "national pomp" in St. Paul's Cathedral along with other "national heroes." Since the day of his death, two months before, preparations for this ceremony had been going on all over England, and especially throughout London, for since, according to English judgment the man himself had excelled all previous heroes, so all previous ceremonies must now be excelled in glitter and grandeur. And this was the day. All England was in motion, all London on its feet. Hundreds of thousands from the provinces, thousands upon thousands from foreign lands streamed by, and with these were all the millions of the metropolis.

I abhor such spectacles and have always avoided great crowds, and, like the most of my fellow-exiles, would have preferred to stay at home or spend the day in St. James Park. But two little lady friends scattered my desires to the winds. *Que femme veut, Dieu le veut*—what woman wishes, happens—and especially when they are six and seven years old, like my two little friends. And we were such good friends—the black-eyed, black-haired Jenny Marx—her father's head over again; and the fair, elegant Laura, with the roguish eyes, the very picture of her beautiful mother, who, in spite of the bitter earnestness of the exile, could laugh just as roguishly as the merry little "Lorchen"; yes, indeed, we were good friends, the little maidens and I.

And the two little girls, who from the first day we came to know each other, attached themselves to me and always clung close to me as long as I was in sight, contributed in no small degree during the time of the London exile to that keeping up of my spirits to which I owe my life. Nothing cheers and strengthens more at such critical times than the presence of children. How often, when I could no longer contain myself, I have fled to my little friends and wandered with them through streets and parks. The melancholy thoughts were then quickly scattered and I could return to the struggle for existence with renewed strength and courage.

I soon became known as the "story teller," and was always greeted with joyful cries for more stories. Happily, I knew many tales; but when my stock was exhausted I was forced to put together others—a trick at which I was soon caught, for these bright little maidens soon detected any attempt on my part to serve up a ragout composed of fragments of old stories; and so I was finally forced to invent new ones. Thus from very necessity I was forced to become, most certainly not an author, but a sort of "Storysmith," forging together stories out of bits of ancient history. Never did anyone have a more receptive, appreciative audience. But to where have I wandered? I started to tell about my bad quarter of an hour.

"Be very careful with the children. Do not get caught in the crowd!" Frau Marx had said to me as I started for the "show" with an impatient dancing maiden on either hand. And down in the hall Lenchen,* who had come to the door to see us off, called after us, "Be careful, Old Library," (the joking nickname the children had given me). Marx, who was ordinarily a late riser, was not yet visible.

I had made my plans—we had no money to hire a place at a window or on a bench—the funeral procession went through the Strand along the Thames. We must go along a street that emptied into the Strand from the north and sloped away to the river.

With a girl on either hand and the luncheon in my pocket, I made for the point of view I had selected—a spot not far from the Temple Bar—the old city gate that separated Westminster from the city. The streets, which had been uncommonly alive since morning, now swarmed with people, yet since the procession had to pass through widely separate sections of the city the millions were somewhat scattered and we reached our chosen point without any great crowding. It proved to be thoroughly satisfactory. I placed myself upon one of the steps, with the two girls clinging fast to me and I to them, one on either hand, on the step above me.

Hark! A movement in the human sea; a far away increasing roar like the dull rage of the ocean, coming ever nearer and nearer. An "Oh!" rising from thousands on thousands of throats! The procession is here, and from our excellent position we can see it as in a theatre. The children are entranced. No crowding—all my fears are banished.

Long, long continued the gold-bedecked procession with the gigantic, gorgeous catafalque, bearing the "Conqueror of Na-

*Helene Demuth, the old servant of the Marx', who shared all their sufferings with them and now lies buried with the family in Highgate cemetery, London.

oleon." Ever something new and more and still more—until at last no more came. The last gold-bespangled rider has passed.

Suddenly there came a start, a rushing forward of the masses packed in behind us. Everyone wishes to follow the procession. I braced myself with all my strength and sought to shelter the children, that the stream might roar by without touching them. In vain. Against the tremendous physical weight of this great mass no human power could prevail. It would have been as easy for a fragile skiff to have breasted the ice flood of an angry river just released from the grasp of a hard winter. I must give way, and pressing the children close to me I sought to escape from the main current. Presently I appeared to have succeeded and I drew a breath of relief, when suddenly a new and mightier human wave broke upon us from our right; we were swept out into the Strand where the thousands and hundreds of thousands who were pressed together in this great pulsating artery of a street were storming along after the procession in the hope of enjoying another spectacle. I shut my teeth together and seek to raise the children upon my shoulders, but I am too hard pressed—convulsively I seize the arms of the children, the whirlpool tears us apart and I feel that a force is pushing itself between me and the children—shoving in like a wedge, ever further and further—the children are torn away from me—all resistance is useless—I must let go of them lest I break their arms or tear them from the sockets. It was a terrible moment.

What shall I do? Before me rose the Temple Bar with its three passageways, the central for wagons and horses, the ones at the side for foot passengers. Against the walls of these openings the human stream had piled itself up like the waters of a river against the piers of a bridge—I must get through. If the children were not already crushed to earth—and the despairing cries of anguish that now rose around me testified to the extent of the danger—then I hoped to find them on the other side, where the pressure must be somewhat less. Filled with this hope I struggled like a madman with breast and elbows. But in such a crushing mob the individual is like a straw on the surface of a maelstrom. I struggle and struggle—a dozen times I think to make the entrance only to be thrown to one side. Finally a sudden shock, a terrible crushing—and I am on the other side and out of the wildest of the tumult. I rushed hither and thither looking. Nothing! My heart gave way within me—when suddenly from two clear, childish voices came "Library!" I thought I must be dreaming. It was the music of the angels, for before me stood, laughing and uninjured, the two girls. I kissed them and hugged them. For a moment I was speechless. Then they told me how the human wave that had torn them from me had borne them safely through the gate and then flung them to one side—under the shelter of the very walls which on the other side

had been the cause of this fearful damming up. There they had clung to a projecting point of masonry and remembered my old caution that if in any of our excursions we should get lost they were to remain still in the same spot and place, or as near to it as possible.

We returned in triumph to the house. Mother Marx, Marx and Lenchen received us with rejoicing, for they were much worried, having heard that there was a terrible crowd and that many had been crushed and injured. The children had no suspicion of the danger that had hovered above us and were perfectly satisfied, and I did not tell that evening through what a fearful quarter of an hour I had lived.

On the spot where they were torn from me many women were killed and the frightful scenes of that afternoon contributed in no small degree to secure the destruction of the Temple Bar, which had formed so horrible an obstacle to movement.

For me, however, that bad quarter of an hour is as vivid in my memory as if it had happened but yesterday. And since that time I have never gone with children into the midst of great crowds, and I never will again.—Translated by A. M. S.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN BELGIUM.

Brussels, August 10, 1900.

As was foreshadowed in our former letter (in the July issue of the Review), the Parti Ouvrier is preparing itself to take up the struggle which is to give it Universal Suffrage pure and simple—one man one vote. It will be the last act in a long series of efforts, the first of which dates back to the middle of the century, though they were the work of certain individuals rather than the desire to realize the programme of a party.

Our constitution of 1830, while it recognized the equality of the citizens before the law, had established a limited suffrage. The constitution left to the legislature the care of regulating the qualifications of voters, subject to certain fixed limitations. So, after various changes, the law finally reduced the rating for voters to the minimum annual property tax of 42 francs.

The next change, therefore, could only be accomplished by a revision of the constitution, and that requires a dissolution of the chambers, new elections, the meeting of the two chambers (deputies and senators), in a single convention, in which propositions can only be adopted by a two-thirds vote.

When in 1885 the Parti Ouvrier was formed, universal suffrage and a revision of the constitution were demanded by the left (progressive) wing of the Liberal army. But the bulk of the Liberal army, like the Catholic army, did not wish to hear them mentioned.

The watchword of the Liberals was "Capacity." However, as they had always failed to provide us with compulsory education, and as our economic regime prevents many children from going to school and obliges a large portion of the others to leave it at the age of ten or eleven; most of the workingmen would have been turned away from the polls.

It was really not until after the formation of the Parti Ouvrier that a serious propaganda in favor of Universal Suffrage began. We can not here retrace all the events of the struggle, among which were the rifle-volleys of 1886. Suffice it to say that it ended, so far as political results go, in the first revision of the constitution, that of 1893. The success was enormous when we consider that not one socialist had a seat in the parliament and that all the representatives except a few radicals were thoroughly hostile to the revision.

Thus they did not yield their consent except under compulsion, a general strike having been declared in the industrial Walloon districts of the country. The working class of Brussels was on

strike, and events were taking a revolutionary turn, when the reactionists thought it prudent to yield. Universal suffrage was granted in the sense that every Belgian citizen twenty-five years of age obtained a vote, but it was vitiated by the second and third votes accorded to property and education.

For the sake of completeness let us add that in the "Law Relative to Local Elections," which was directly enacted, the reactionaries found it necessary to require that the voters in the communes be thirty years of age, and they granted an additional fourth vote on the basis of property qualifications.

We consider, then, that we have long enough endured this odious and complicated system, which favors all sorts of frauds, and has no object but to assure clerical domination. To-day every one is making ready, and in October or November, when the Chambers meet, the proposition for revision will be made. The struggle will begin, and I am firmly convinced that it will finally take a turn at which we ourselves will be astonished—so strong is the desire throughout Belgium, not only in the working class but in a good part of the middle class, to be rid of the clerical reaction and at last to realize political equality. Remembering the struggle of 1893, who can doubt our victory? Then we had been established only a few years, our organizations were young, we had not a member in Parliament; we had against us the united force of the Catholics and Liberals (except a few radicals). To-day our Socialist party is most solidly organized, we have the experience of numerous struggles, we have 32 deputies and 3 senators. In the chamber of deputies about 25 Liberals are already won over to Universal Suffrage, and some Christian Democrats have pledged themselves to its support. As for the government, although it is playing its last cards, it has the discouragement of one who knows that he will be beaten, and that he will have no support in public opinion. The one feeble support it finds is given by the moderate Liberals, whose foremost thought is to act against Socialism.

The journals of the reactionary party realize that this time we do not propose to be content with a compromise, so they are attempting a diversion by attributing to us the most Machiavellian schemes; it appears that we wish to overthrow the monarchy and establish the Socialist Republic immediately. Others claim that our aim is by the aid of Universal Suffrage to abolish Proportional Representation. It is the Liberals, in particular, who are afraid of this last abolition, for it is safe to say that without Proportional Representation the Liberal party would no longer exist.

It is very probable that the recent idea of sending Belgian volunteers to China is partially inspired by the desire of creating a diversion in public opinion to take attention away from the

electoral question. The Parti Ouvrier has just put out posters to protest against this military policy which has just been inaugurated, against this sending of Belgian volunteers into China for no purpose but to protect the interests of a few big capitalists.

Emile Vinck.

SOCIALISTS AND ANARCHISTS IN ITALY.

The unfortunate assassination of the King of Italy by the anarchist Galtano Bresci has been a fine occasion for the conservative bourgeoisie to attempt fixing the responsibility upon the Socialist party, and to persecute it in consequence; while in foreign countries the event has given factitious arguments in support of the opinion that in Italy Socialism and anarchism are the same thing.

Now as for the Italian conservatives, the evidence as to the facts alleged by them against the Socialists has been so convincing that a reaction in public opinion is already manifest, while in two electoral divisions, a week after the commission of the crime, the voters named two Socialists, one of them the editor of "Avanti," whose great crime in the eyes of the conservatives was that he had shouted in the chamber of deputies, "Down with the King!"

For those outside Italy, here are a few facts which are worth more than any amount of argument. The first manifestations of socialism in Italy were anarchistic, or more properly, Bakounist. The "Alliance" of Bakounine found in Italy between 1867 and 1878 a more favorable soil than did the "International" of Karl Marx, and at Rimini in 1872 a congress was held to disavow the principles of Marx's "International" and to break off all union with the general council of London. Among the most influential men in this Bakounise movement there were in Italy Cafiero, Nabrazzi, Andrea Costa, Enrico Malatesta and Bakounine himself.

In the years which followed this period of tentative organization of the Bakounist section of the International—even then it was called "Internazionalisti"—bread riots, revolts and insurrections broke out here and there over the country, so that the government profited by them to dissolve the sections of the International and to follow up its more conspicuous adherents.

In view of these inconclusive exploits of the anarchist-revolutionary propaganda, while in Germany Marxian Socialism was making giant strides, some of the thoughtful minds of the movement became persuaded that another route must be taken. So in 1879 Andrea Costa wrote to his friends that the Internationalists were getting out of touch with practical affairs and real life, and that they were not giving proper attention to the study of the economic and moral conditions of the people nor of their immediate needs.

That was the first step toward the highway of Marxian socialism. But though already here and there an advocate of the pure socialist idea raised a clear voice above the tumultuous confusion

of the anarchist-revolutionary propaganda, there followed, before the formation of the Italian Socialist Party, a period of workingmen's associations which was the passage between anarchism and socialism. Meanwhile vigorous and genial men like Turati, and devoted, angelic spirits like Prampolini, were preparing and molding the transition for the moment of its maturity. Turati popularized the Marxian doctrines in his "Critica Sociale" with his vigorous dialectic, and Prampolini won adherents to them among the peasants by his mild and persuasive words, spoken and written.

At the Italian Labor Congress, held at Milan in August, 1891, occurred the first positive rupture between the socialists and the anarchists. An order of the day proposed by the anarchist Gori was rejected by 104 votes to 13, and they laid the foundation of the Italian Labor Party, having for its aim the emancipation of the workers from the political and economic monopoly of the capitalist class, and for its means a participation in the struggles of public life, the solidarity of labor, propaganda and co-operation.

It was the conception of the Socialist Party which took place at Milan, and its birth was at Genoa in 1892. At the same time occurred the second and last noisy and violent rupture of the socialists and the anarchists, and the Italian Socialist Party came into existence on the basis of the class struggle, the struggle for the conquest of the public powers and the socialization of the means of labor and production—that is to say, its basis and methods are the same as those of the collectivist Marxian socialist parties of other countries. And on this line and no other the Italian Socialist Party has fought ever since. Since that period the anarchists have not ventured to interfere any further with the socialist congresses, and nothing more is said of them among the socialists. They did attempt to enter the International Congress at Zurich and at London, but they were expelled as at Genoa.

But their struggle against the socialists was not thus appeased, on the contrary it became more bitter as the socialists gained ground among the working masses, and increased their parliamentary strength at each election. Especially has their hatred been shown against Andrea Costa. As soon as he entered the Socialist Party they burned him in effigy, not being able to burn him in person. Prampolini was even attacked by an armed anarchist, just like a crowned head! The anarchists reproached and still reproach the Socialists for lulling to sleep the revolutionary spirit of the people with their delusive electoral tactics, with the mirage of the conquest of the public powers, which, they say, benefits no one but the chosen officials, and corrupts them in the unsavory struggle for legislative spoils. The anarchists' attacks in their press and in their debates at meetings have always been extremely violent. Even two months ago, during the obstruc-

tionist struggle, their central organ, D'Ancona's "Agitazione," attacked the Socialist Party and its deputies. Really, one only need observe the way the anarchists have treated the socialists, in order to form a correct conclusion as to the existence of any connection between them.

The socialists have always answered these attacks with the calm energy that goes with conscious strength. Only, as they are defending the liberties of all, even of the priests, when the anarchists were arrested, sent to the accursed islands on "forced domicile," or imprisoned illegally, the socialists have protested, both in their press and in the chamber, have demanded the abolition of "forced domicile," and have helped the sufferers by sending them money and in other ways. They fought their ideas, but they defended their persons.

And on certain occasions it has happened that in an agitation for personal liberty against the tyranny of the "law of exception," the Anarchists have struggled by the side of the Socialists and Republicans in an electoral contest over the name of a man condemned by the military tribunals. But that is all. This is the extent of the relations that have existed or exist between Socialists and Anarchists in Italy.

But as to the Anarchists a word should be added. The openly individualistic tendency which shows itself in the "propaganda by deed" is done with in Italy. There is left the revolutionary type called Socialist-Anarchist, accepting the whole Socialist programme except the electoral struggle. Their aim is to prepare for the revolution, but they denounce regicide, as do also the anarchists of Russia. Although they do little or nothing, at least they fight the Socialists. Their work ends there.

The individualist-anarchist type seems to have taken refuge in Paterson, New Jersey, where it has for a leader Ciancabilla, who edits his "Aurora" there. This Ciancabilla was, three years ago, a reporter for "Avanti," the central organ of Italian Socialism. Afterwards he was in Greece during the Greco-Turkish war, and sent some very fine letters to that paper. On his return to Bologna, during the socialist Congress, he had an interview with Malatesta, the last recognized leader of Italian Anarchism, and his liking for Anarchism began. After some travels in Europe, he sailed for New York, where he began to write in "La Questione Sociale," violently attacking the Socialists, who made a vigorous defense in the "Proletario," at Patterson. Naturally, his connection with "Avanti" was cut off after his adhesion to anarchism.

As this Ciancabilla was propagating an anarchism which apparently was not that of Malatesta, the latter left London for New York and forced his retirement from "La Questione Sociale." Ciancabilla then founded the "Aurora." The struggle between

the two factions, individualist-anarchist and communist-anarchist, soon reached an acute stage.

These are the facts, which can not be confuted nor denied. And here is the conclusion: If there is any party which can regret the crime of Bresci, it is by all means the Italian Socialist Party, which after struggling for years to educate and organize the toiling masses, thus diminishing the unhappy riots due to discontent and hunger, even though the discontent has increased, this party, which has fought a brave fight for the maintenance of liberty against the attempts of the reactionaries, runs the risk of seeing its work thrown into confusion and fettered by the act of a Bresci, who gives strength to the monarchy and a pretext for persecution to the reactionaries.

But Socialism will go on all the same, in spite of Bresci's pistol shots and the expiring blows of the reaction represented by our ruling classes.

Rome, August 13, 1900.

Alessandro Schiavi.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

[This department is edited by Max S. Hayes.]

Now some genius proposes to throw the poor "white wings," or street cleaners, out of their jobs. It used to be a standing joke-let among high-priced, skilled mechanics that, if displaced by labor-saving machinery, they could as a last resort "shovel manure on the streets." New York papers make the announcement that street-sweepers, teamsters, snow-shovelers and other workers are to be put out of business by a big machine, and one that can do three times the work of the laboring brigade. This machine sprinkles, sweeps and cleans at the same time. Already it has been placed on trial by Commissioner Nagle. The device was invented in Wheeling, W. Va., and is controlled by a \$5,000,000 trust. The company that exploits the machine operates its wagons by compressed air, and electricity can also be used. The machine is so constructed as to be able to sweep the streets under all conditions. Dust, dirt and slush disappear before its onslaught. In winter an attachment is arranged by which snow shoveling can be done. So it appears that the machine-chased mechanic cannot find refuge in the laborious work of cleaning streets.

At this writing the Canadian trade unionists are preparing for their coming congress, which will be held in Ottawa on the 15th inst. Last year the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada instructed its secretary to provide for the taking of a vote of all affiliated unions on the question of taking independent political action. The secretary reports that the proposition was carried by an overwhelming majority, and there is now every indication that the workers of the Dominion will declare in favor of severing all connection with the old parties, though it is admitted that the politicians will not allow their exploited labor voters to be torn from their grasp without a struggle.

The organization boom has not lessened. Nearly all national unions report steady increase in memberships. Nearly six hundred organizers are at work. Trade, however, has not improved much, as there are still thousands idle in the iron and steel, textile, boot and shoe and other industries. Many far-seeing agitators believe the coming winter will witness a repetition of "hard times," or industrial stagnation.

The iron workers in the large blasting furnaces are greatly disturbed on account of a complete revolution that is being made in the production of pig iron. In all plants scores of laborers were employed in unloading, mixing, reloading in trucks, hoisting and dumping the ore into the furnaces. The American Steel and Wire Trust has completed a device, and placed the same in operation in Ohio mills, by the operation of which the ore on the cars is forced up an inclined plane and dumped into the furnaces at tremendous rapidity and with the aid of comparatively few laborers. Now the Illinois Steel Co., another trust plant, has completed a revolution at the other end of the industry. After the hot metal leaves the furnaces it no longer runs into troughs and molds made in the sand. Under the old system 250 men were required in the latter company's 16 blast furnaces, who worked night and day making molds in the sand for the ingots and making troughs in the sand for the beds on the open hearth in front of the furnaces, through which the molten iron could run into the molds. Besides the great expense of carrying the 250 employes on the pay roll, there was the additional disadvantage that after a run had been made there was a wait of several hours for the metal to cool, then each ingot had to be lifted out of the mold and carried by hand to trucks and afterward transferred to freight cars. The new machine does all this work. Several hundred steel mold are arranged on a long link belt; the belt is kept in constant motion and brings the molds under the noses of the furnaces. The molten iron fills the molds as they pass under and then the belt carries them down into a deep trough of running cold water. In passing through this the ingot is cooled and then is carried by the belt out into the yards, where the mold dumps the ingot into a freight car standing under it. Hardly a minute of time is consumed from the moment the molten iron leaves the furnace until it lies an ingot in the freight car ready to be dumped into the steel furnaces. The machine costs \$50,000 to construct and is operated by but six men. It is estimated that the "revolutionizer" will pay for itself in three months in the saving of wages. Yet, the capitalistic politicians and newspapers blithely inform us that the machinery question is of no importance! And while these displaced iron workers suffer and starve and vainly search for employment, they can console themselves with the thought that Mr. John W. Gates, one of our foremost iron and steel trust magnates, won added laurels unto himself the other day by standing on top of the Eiffel Tower, in Paris, and hurling handfuls of 20-cent (franc) pieces, representing wealth produced by displaced and hungry American workmen, at the applauding and struggling multitudes below. Such are the fruits of the class struggle, of capitalism, of voting for the two old parties and in favor of the private ownership of the socialized tools of production.

One of the notable events of the month was the convention of the International Typographical Union in Milwaukee. Much important business of interest to the craft was transacted. Secretary Bramwood reported that the net increase of members was 1,459, making a total membership of 32,105. Thirty-nine members, suffering from various diseases, were admitted to the Printers' Home, at Colorado Springs, Colo., of which number six died and eight withdrew again. For one day at least the I. T. U., the oldest and perhaps the most influential national organization, was on a progressive basis, when the following resolution, introduced by Delegate Bandlow, of Cleveland, was passed by a vote of 87 to 73:

"Resolved, That the International Typographical Union emphasizes that it is distinctly a class organization, embracing in its membership all workers following the kindred crafts in the printing industry, who upon the industrial field are antagonized by their employers on every occasion, which fact should impress the members of this organization that to subserve their interests as wage workers it is essential that they act as a unit upon the political field, from whence capitalism derives its power to oppress, and we declare it consistent with the ethics of unionism and the sacred duty of every honorable member of this union to sever his or her affiliation with all political parties of the exploiting class, which is constantly encroaching upon the liberties of the working people."

Although, through the manipulation of small fry old party politicians, and distinct hostility from the daily press, the foregoing resolution was reconsidered and tabled, its passage originally was a distinct and progressive forward stride, and, therefore, a big moral victory. It is believed that at next year's convention, after the heat of a national political campaign has worn off and the capitalistic system has gone on developing, the I. T. U. will be ready to define its position in the great class struggle now waging in terms that will not be misunderstood.

Two more states have been organized by the Social Democrats during the past month—Iowa and North Dakota, which, with Nebraska and Utah, make a total of twenty-five states in which electoral tickets have been placed in the field. South Dakota and other northwestern states will also nominate electors for Debs and Harriman. Reports from every section of the country state that the greatest enthusiasm prevails for the United Socialist movement. Intelligent trade unionists are particularly active in aiding the cause, and the outlook for a big vote for socialism is very promising.

EDITORIAL

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION.

The near approach of the International Socialist Congress suggests the question if the time is not now here when it is practicable and advisable to take some action looking to the organization in a tangible manner of the international solidarity of the socialist movement. There are but few socialists that do not view with regret the dissolution of the "old International." All may admit that its form had outgrown its usefulness, yet it is to be regretted that that form was not sufficiently flexible to adapt itself to the new need. At the present time there seems to be a general feeling that the time is ripe for the formation of some form of international association. It is recognized that such an organization must necessarily be a very flexible one. It could have no dictatorial or even judicial powers and the majority of its functions must be clerical.

Some of the minor arguments upon grounds of simple utility that might be offered for such an organization are that it would afford a means to secure international translations of the classics of socialism. It is a disgrace to the English speaking socialists that but a small portion of the works of Marx have ever been translated into that language, while nowhere, in any language, is there to be found anything approaching a complete and uniform edition of the works of Marx or Engels. Again, there should be a much greater interchange of workers and speakers between different nationalities and in a great many cases international lecture tours could be arranged of very great benefit both to the country visited and the one from which the speaker came. It has also been pointed out that future generations will judge the socialists of this day with harshness because there is nowhere any attempt being made on an international scale to gather and preserve the manifold historical documents that are daily issuing from the socialist presses of the world.

All these, however, are but trifling reasons why such an international organization should be formed, beside others that are now just beginning to arise. At the present time there is scarcely a country in which the socialists are not divided on questions of policy. Many of these questions are identical in principle in two or more countries. Examples of such will at once occur to every socialist. Such is the question of "Ministerial Socialism" in France, the relation of the socialist parties to the Trade Unions in America and England, the relation of the co-operatives to the

socialist movement, the question of "Municipal" or "State Socialism," etc. While it is wholly out of the question to establish a court of final appeals on such matters, or perhaps even a court of arbitration, it is not impossible to gather together the opinions of a large number of representative socialists, not only in the countries directly concerned, but in others that may have passed through similar stages, or who by the very fact of the greater distance from the scene of discussion are able to see more impartially, if less accurately, than those immediately concerned. To some extent the various Reviews and other publications will meet this need, but an official central body that would gather all facts and opinions throwing light on these disputed questions and prepare them for publication would be of the greatest service and would save an immense amount of energy now wasted in what are too often fruitless discussions.

Much more important than any of these is the need which will soon begin to make itself felt for an expression in substantial form of the international solidarity of labor at times of great need in the various national struggles. Belgium is in the midst of such a contest at present in her struggle for Universal Suffrage, and while the Belgian comrades are perhaps better able to stand alone than those of any other nation, yet it is probable they would not refuse assistance from the comrades of other lands were they in a position to give it. England will be in such a struggle at her next general election. It will not be many years before the socialists of America will be face to face with capitalism in a contest whose success or failure will mean much to socialism. With her heterogeneous population she must have workers, writers and speakers in almost every language. How much better these could be secured were there some agency through which the men who had already fought the battles of socialism in the native lands of these people could be enabled to reach them again in their adopted country.

Finally, the time is now fast approaching when the governments of some of the great nations of the world will fall into the hands of the socialists. When that time comes it is of paramount importance to the cause of socialism that as few blunders as possible should be committed. We want no more Communes. Hence it is of the greatest importance that so far as possible the combined energy and intelligence of the international socialist movement should be at the disposal of those who have gained the victory. On some small scale this same principle has been recognized in France and Belgium by the Federations of Socialist Municipal Councillors, who seek thus to bring the combined knowledge of all to the assistance of those holding municipal offices.

As to what the exact form and details of this international

organization shall be must be left for the comrades assembled at the Congress to decide. There must be at least one salaried secretary in the central office, with as many corresponding secretaries as there are countries who care to be represented. There should probably be some kind of an advisory board, the majority of whose members should be residents of the country in which the General Secretary is located. Where there are two or more conflicting parties in any country there is no reason why each should not maintain its own local corresponding secretary, who in the majority of cases would be the general secretary of that party who could perform this work in addition to his other duties. If this matter can be brought before the International Congress and discussed, it does not seem too much to expect of them to say that such details do not offer insuperable obstacles to the success of the plan.