

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. I

JANUARY, 1901

No. 7.

The Present Moral Conflict

I.

IS life worth living? If so, what quality of conduct makes life most worth? What shall we be and do in order to realize the most abundant life? What is the highest good? How shall this highest good be attained? These are questions as old as the reflective intelligence of man. And during the long past ages of the race men have ever sought to solve these deepest problems of human existence. To the solution of these problems, the greatest minds and characters of history have devoted themselves, and out of their conclusions have arisen schools of philosophy, cults, and religions. To meet these supreme issues of life Moses and Jesus taught; and Calvin and Wesley expounded; and Kant and Spencer enunciated their various doctrines. It is in the answer to these soul demands that we find our codes of morals and systems of ethics.

But the environment of man grows and changes, and human life evolves; thus each new age presents a new man under new conditions. And to this man, modified by the best and the worst through which he has passed, now living in a changed environment, the old problems are pressed home again for solution. Hence every age, period, and generation should have and must have its own answer to the old, old questions. The best of the old answers suffice not. They were uttered under old conditions to less evolved men. Change in the statement of truth and the corresponding change in conduct and in character must come, or men will seek to content themselves with half-truths, and will give themselves over to lies and hypocrisy.

This demand for a new answer to an old problem is especially felt in epochal times of social transition, such as the time of the

appearance of Jesus, the Renaissance, and the revolutionary period of the last century. The hour of transition from old to new in any case is always trying to the intellect and to the soul. Men are then in a painful struggle for freedom. A moral conflict is precipitated. The intellect seeks to interpret the significance of the new environment and to make the new statement of truth. The soul seeks to live the new quality of life which the new environment demands. And the process of adaptation is one of comparative pain. Earnest men feel and know that they cannot abandon the permanent and vital in the old, and yet they must be true to the living God, the present good, instead of being the echoists and parrots of dead men's interpretations and the victims of conventional and lifeless forms of earlier good.

Besides this inner conflict in such times of transition there is always an outer struggle. Some false ecclesiastical, political or social system sits on the back of the people. It holds them bound in an unyielding embrace. It sneers in hollow mockery at the new moral convictions of men, and becomes defiant, because, indeed, it is upheld as sacred and divine by the existing religion and its priests. It boasts of its past record and hoary age, and demands respect which it fails to inspire. Thus some form of religion and some code of morals has ever been the bulwark of despotism, feudalism, slavery, the divine rights of kings, and the divine right of property. And when men awaken under the new conscience they find themselves ever locked in a social system that makes their new religious and moral conviction the mother of a social revolution.

II.

In such a period of transition, with its accompanying moral conflict, we find ourselves to-day at the dawn of a new century. The external economic and social conditions of life have changed vastly since the days of our fathers. And the generation now living has been and is being modified in thought, conduct, and character by these changes.

The invention of machinery, with the resulting colossal development of industry, national and international, has given us a new material world to live in. Thus men have been brought into the most close and complex relations in their daily activities, and the natives and tribes of the earth are within speaking distance of one another. Railroad, steamship, telegraph and telephone systems have reduced the whole world to a neighborhood, a community, and the race is being transformed into a conscious unity and solidarity irrespective of color, creed, and custom. Mechanical invention in a thousand lines, perfected in factory and field, has produced that co-operative activity of men and of nations, making the production and distribution of all the goods of life social in-

stead of individual. Steam and electricity have ushered in the social age—the age of possible brotherhood.

A great intellectual change has likewise come over the people. Modern science investigating and criticizing, never camping except for new advances, is invading every realm of phenomena, and has bidden defiance to all kinds of authority, and logically even to its own—making its latest conclusions but data for wider generalizations. The theory of evolution has revolutionized man's conception of himself and of the universe. As a result we have a new anthropology, a new biology, a new psychology, a new sociology, and a new economics. The phenomena of the soul are being studied with scientific precision. A vast literature is appearing on the inner intuitional processes of the spirit of man, showing the rational bases of mental healing, hypnotism, magnetism, telepathy; conversion, moral transformation, regeneration; and of other manifestations of the marvelous occult powers of the soul. But all this new science and new soul study, which is the greatest intellectual product of centuries, is but the crude bases no doubt of a still newer science and a more complete philosophy under which the whole meaning of life will be read anew. Our intellectual life seems pregnant with still newer and profounder revelations touching more vitally the deepest issues of human existence.

Such remarkable changes in our material life and mental attitude must revolutionize all that stands for morals and religion. And so it is. We find ourselves in moral dilemma and spiritual conflict. The old questions are up again for answer as if never answered before. From literature of every form the old queries are voiced: Is life worth living? What is the highest good? What must we do to be saved? And the old statements of truth are utterly inadequate. The best old bread offered seems stone to the soul. The more men partake of it, the worse their moral emaciation and spiritual darkness. "Good" people appear like pharisees and hypocrites. The truths that once inspired men to heroic action and which wrought mighty transformations in human character have become now the defense of moral inertia and spiritual dotage—orthodoxy of creed supplants divinity of life. What little spiritual power remains manifest here and there seems more like the galvanic twitches of a dead body than the real vigorous movements of life. Men run hither and thither, now backward, now forward, looking for some social panacea that will heal their individual soul distress and relieve them from personal responsibility; or they seek some individual stimulant or narcotic that will help them to meet or to forget the social guilt and suffering.

This moral conflict is the deepest fact of our times. It will not be settled by the cry of some ecclesiastical body to come back to the faith. Nor will it be settled by some mere protest that the church is wrong, or by heaping all moral responsibility upon the

social systems. This conflict will continue until all its phases are met and that involves, as we shall see, a new theology or philosophy of life, a new ethics, a new character, and a new social system. And these in their entirety and significance involve the greatest revolution of all human history. For our time is the epoch of epochs, the transition of transitions, the revolution of revolutions.

The present moral conflict takes a three-fold form :

First : There is the conflict of new ideas or statements of truth with the old.

Second : There is the conflict of the new conscience and character with the old ; much of the old "good" being positively immoral to the new.

Third : There is the conflict of these new ideas and this new conscience with the present social and industrial system.

III.

In the consideration of this moral conflict we must examine it in its concrete reality, just as we find it among our friends and neighbors living their lives, and meeting their moral problems in the common life. In this paper there is no attempt to interpret the conflict from the standpoint of any particular school in ethics, religion, or of social philosophy. A moral conflict is on. The people are in it. Considering what the people have believed, and what has been their standards of morals, and what they are actually passing through now, let us watch the concrete moral conflict as it presents itself to our observation. What are the facts of the present moral struggle. Men may have believed and may again begin to believe things we don't like, but we must deal with what is, not with what we would desire to find.

Moral teaching heretofore has been largely in the keeping of the church and her priesthood. It has been only during the last century that scientists, poets, and so-called secular authors have invaded the domain of morals and asserted their right to teach with some degree of authority. Democracy of religion is a late social development. The older moral teaching obtaining in the capitalistic era which is now the conservative factor in the present moral conflict, is linked largely therefore with theological and distinctly religious dogmas. Hence the first element of the conflict is theological. The new moral teaching involves theological heresy. The philosophy of human life, whether social or theological, in which the new moral teaching roots itself comes squarely into conflict with the old theology. The good resists the better. It is of course in harmony with all evolutionary thought to state that there is a permanent element in each of the old ideas which is the stalk on which the new fruit of truth will be borne. But the new statement of what these terms

signify is vastly different from the old. It would take a volume to develop this point, but a few sentences may serve to illustrate the trend of the newer theological thought, which involves the new ethics.

Consider the terms God and Christ; sin and salvation; heaven and hell; Bible and gospel; faith and works; prayer and worship. Take these terms one by one and reflect upon the generally accepted orthodox ideas for which they stand and it will be seen how inadequate the old is as a definition of the new.

God is no longer a great monarch on a distant throne who holds "formal receptions once a week," but the immanent presence in all energy and life, co-extensive with all orders of existing and possible phenomena. Christ is not a dying mediator paying debts to offended deity, but the living revelation of the divine possibilities of every man. Sin is social as well as individual, and evil is the pain of life unadapted to environment and in violation of the common good. The pilgrim can no longer escape from the city of destruction. He is a social being and shares the social guilt and pain wherever he may be. Salvation is character here and now and everywhere. Heaven is not a distant abode of a ransomed few, but a state of the free and harmonious here and everywhere. Hell is no longer a lurid place of eternal torment, but the state of man and of men, not punished, but suffering in consequence of the violation of the laws of life's health and harmony, here and everywhere. The devil is no more, and his gruesome task, prescribed by the old theology is not eternal in any case. There is no place of eternal exile in God's universe. The children will all come home sometime, somewhere.

The Bible, though unparalleled, is not the only source of moral teaching. We have other books and all history. We have our own minds as privileged in the Spirit of Truth as those of Isaiah or Paul, and likewise as responsible. The gospel is no longer a message to sinking, dying mutineers or pirates in a foundering ship. It is the whole message of the ideal life, to a race being schooled from ignorance and limitation to divinity and completeness. Faith is no act of blind superstition but the rational attitude of the part to the whole, of the human to the Absolute Reality in which it lives and moves and has its being. Works can be no longer mere charities and fad philanthropies, but must be the heroic deeds of robust characters incarnating Justice and right in social forms. Prayer becomes more and more exactly what Jesus taught and practiced: silent, meditative, receptive, behind the closet doors of the soul, not vociferous, clamorous, noisy, talkative, and worship wearies more and more of every conventional form of any sort and rests again in spirit and truth.

The conflict between the new idea and the old, however, is not so much in the definitions of existing terms of religion as in the

treatment of human life in all of its relations. The new teaching refuses to set apart a portion of life and call it sacred and another portion and call it secular. The new truth recognizes that all human life just as we must live it is sacred and divine, and that every realm of it must be moralized. Life is religion. Every man is his own priest with an original relation to the universe. There is no higher office than that of a human soul realizing its own freedom and divinity. Every place is sacred—the home, the school, the shop, the factory, the farm, the field. Every relation of human life provides an altar where we offer and receive the sacrament. All the hopes, wishes and ideals of our daily life, small and great, become winged prayers receiving their corresponding answers. All labor and activity become our modes of worship. Loving all, at all times, in all places, becomes again what it has ever been—the fulfilling of all law, the answer to all problems, and the deliverance from all evil. This is the absolute religion still unfolding in conduct and character, without priest, without temple, without ritual, without ceremonial; for every man is a priest; and every shop a temple, and all human intercourse is ritual, and the common life is its own grand ceremonial. To seek truth and wisdom and to obey them, to perceive beauty, to produce goods on principles of Justice and brotherhood, to realize the meaning and significance of sex, to appropriate due pleasure, to enjoy mirth, to love simply in all the common facts of life—all these and others are elements of the new moral life. Thus religiousness gives way to righteousness, and human life in all of its multiplied variety becomes its own religion. The moral life shall thus be no longer superimposed; it shall be the flower of human activity growing from within, freed from priestcraft and ecclesiasticism. The new moral life is the product on character of spiritual democracy.

IV.

Again, the quality of life produced under the old teaching is inadequate to meet either the inner character need or the social need of the present hour. The "pious" life, the "saved" life, the "religious" life, the "holy" life of the best, however good, is not good enough to meet the moral demands of the new conscience. Hence another element in the moral conflict.

Consider some types of individual goodness of the capitalistic era. We have the latest pietist asking, "What would Jesus do?" the wholly sanctified Methodist; the red-hot salvationist; the rigidly moral Presbyterian; the coolly righteous Christian Scientist demonstrating salvation and wealth through "principle;" the philosophic "new thought" disciple; the new brand of mystic, trying his "unseen forces" and healing the sick; and others which this list may suggest.

Now none of these types mentioned has the moral and spiritual life which is required by the new conscience. This statement is not carping criticism. For the writer has a debt to acknowledge to each of these various schools of moral teaching. The criticism is a plain matter-of-fact analysis of the condition of morals at the close of an age of individualism and commercialism. Space will not permit a satisfactory defense of this proposition concerning the old conscience. But a paragraph at least is demanded.

It is surely a commonplace to say that old forms of good are always being outgrown. The conventional conscience has never been positive, constructive, inspiring. It grows more and more torpid at the end of an age such as the present. But specifically the supreme complaint against the old in all its forms and at its best is that it is the conscience of a narrow individualism, while the age on which we have entered is pre-eminently a social age; and all that constitutes the morals of life must be extended to include political, social and industrial morality. Of course we speak only relatively. For no morality has ever been purely individualistic. Morality is the outgrowth of social integration; and the veriest seeming individual morality of all the past has given a large contribution to social cohesion and development. But in comparison with the social demand of the present the existing conscience must be described as distinctly individualistic. Referring to this question of morals in social and economic relations, a conservative writer, Prof. Borden P. Bowne, of Boston University, says: "Our narrow individualism, combined with the torpor of the conventional conscience has produced an incredible deadness in this matter (of social responsibility). If the lives of very many persons of supposed morality and even of professed religion were openly and avowedly devoted to the materializing and brutalizing of society, they would not be more effective in that direction than they are at present."

It would be almost cruel to uncover the bald ethical ignorance of persons representing millions of the good, on whose minds it has never yet dawned, for example, that there is any moral issue involved in the relations of men in our present competitive system. The social elements of morality have not been emphasized in the capitalistic era. Take a concrete example of the point under discussion. The hymn book of the largest Protestant sect, the Methodists, contains over one thousand hymns. Of these only eighty-one are specifically under the heading "on Christ." Out of these eighty-one but eight are on the life which Jesus, their professed exemplar, lived; and of these eight not one single hymn is on the external objective life. Prof. Coe, of Northwestern University, whose figures I quote, commenting on this point says that only one and one-half per cent of the hymns of his church take up the practical problems of every-day life. Let it now be remembered

that the "practical" problems are largely if not entirely social. They involve questions of social, industrial and political morality. The hymnology deals almost exclusively with subjective morality. This concrete instance may serve to show the comparatively non-social quality of the moral life at its best as developed under the old moral teaching.

Broadly yet correctly speaking the church which is the professed oracle on moral teaching is wrong in its attitude toward the whole social problem: on wealth, on labor, on property; on our present competitive system. It continues to teach capitalistic morals. And being wrong concerning this vast economic basis of society its moral teaching and conclusions in almost every other line is vitiated, and, as we see, on every hand practically powerless. The really "good" people in the churches and cults betray the current intellectual and moral ignorance with respect to the content and implications of their own professed faiths. They do not even consider that they are accomplices in social crimes, by which multitudes are waylaid, robbed, and plundered. These good people innocently thank God constantly, and once a year formally for prosperity, social and industrial, which analyzed to the bottom is a vast "hold-up" and cunning commercial thuggery. We can keep getting these types of morals in revival abundance and all the while the social and industrial monsters will fasten their fangs tighter and tighter into the children of men; and in the jungle struggle for existence men will keep on the sanctified look while they bleed the people; and wealth, "a monster gorged 'midst starving populations," will continue to give largely to charity which has usurped the place of the love that never faileth.

V.

The third element of the present moral conflict arises from the incongruity of the new ideas and the new conscience with the present social and industrial system. The new moral idea re-reads the dignity and meaning of human life; exalts the sacredness of man above existing property rights; and gives a divine right to human need. Thus the new idea comes into a clash with a social order that degrades human life, exalts property above man, and makes man both the creator and victim in a huge mammonistic debauchery. Let a man once become awakened to the new social conscience and the present competitive system becomes to him an incarnation of social injustice. The man thus awakened finds himself a partner in social crime. He is awakened to new social duties and becomes aware of new social bonds. He is the keeper of his brothers. Wherever social oppression and suffering exist he is both inflicter and sufferer. He feels both the social pain and the social guilt. But the awakened conscience is mocked by a social

system that laughs at brotherhood, sneers at mercy, tramples elemental justice in the mire, and makes mammonism its religion.

This characterization of the system may seem to some too strong. Be it remembered, however, that the present competitive system, impeached by the new conscience, is that still remaining brute phase of the predatory struggle for existence. It is seen in its crudest form among the lower animals, and in its latest refinement in our competitive struggle which has not yielded to the intellectual genius and moralization of man. It is the next brute element in civilization to be conquered by the free spirit of human kings. Man must thus control his environment or remain slave and sinner until he does.

Prof. Hyslop, of Columbia College, New York, in his recent work on ethics, thus refers to this struggle for existence: "It represents the ghastly spectacle of universal destruction, the triumph of mere force, and the embodiment of everything which is opposed to the ideal. Under it the universe seems one vast system of shambles for the destruction of the weak and the preservation of the strong. The only right respected in such a system is might or power. But it is apparent to every one at a glance that if any morality is to be maintained at all it cannot come from the imitation or application of the struggle for existence and the indiscriminate warfare which it exhibits. Morality consists rather in putting limits to this struggle for existence, and hence cannot be derived from it. The struggle for existence is worse than a travesty of morality. It is the very antithesis of it."

Thus he writes opposing the idea that the whole progress of the world arises from this brute struggle for existence and survival of the fittest. We have nothing to do with his argument. I quote his words for a description of the competitive system and to show its relation to morality. Our industrial system is "an application of the struggle for existence;" it is "indiscriminate warfare," and morality must "put limits to this struggle;" for it is "worse than a travesty on morality; it is the very antithesis of it."

As Herbert Spencer says, "The very conception of disordered action implies a preconception of well-ordered action." When men become awakened by the new conscience they perceive a well-ordered society and see plainly the injustice of the present order. They find themselves locked in this system of warfare. The right to do right is thus denied them by the inherent wrong in a system where all are producers and consumers of economic goods, and where success is measured by power to control the production of these goods. It is said that among the Comanches a young man is not thought worthy to be counted in the list of warriors till he has returned from some successful plundering expedition. The greatest thieves are the most respectable members of society. How descriptive of our modern capitalistic age! How little adapt-

ed to survive are the men in our times who awake to the new conscience. Quoting Spencer again: "Ideal conduct is not possible for the ideal man in the midst of men otherwise constituted. An absolutely just or perfectly sympathetic person could not live and act according to his nature in a tribe of cannibals. * * * If all around recognize only the law of the strongest, one whose nature will not allow him to inflict pain on others, must go to the wall * * * a mode of action entirely alien to the prevailing modes of action, cannot be persisted in—must eventuate in death to self, or posterity, or both."

Now, while the men of the new conscience are not "ideal men, absolutely just and perfectly sympathetic," they are yet the first fruits of the new system inherent in the old. And Spencer's words holds true of them. Their economic life must accord with prevailing modes or else they must perish. In either case there is desperate moral conflict.

But since there is no individual escape there is but one thing to do, viz., to protest against the social injustice and to work with the despoiled and exploited class for the new social order. Prof. Borden P. Bowne says that "it is perfectly idle to criticize a struggle for existence by a moral standard which presupposes the possibility of friendly co-existence." This is the position taken by many people to-day. He says that "such criticism is as irrational and impertinent as a parallel series of reflections on the unaesthetic aspects of war, while the battle is on." Herein we find the roughest practical aspect of the moral conflict. The battle of the competitive struggle is on. There is no truce possible, no cessation at sundown, no relief in success or defeat. If you don't make your protest while you fight you will never make it. And so you must go in and fight for bread and family and life, and with the same brain and heart and hand that fights you must labor and struggle for the peace of the co-operative commonwealth, where, to quote Prof. Bowne's word, we expect "the possibility of friendly co-existence." The supreme criticiser against our whole social system is that it denies "friendly co-existence;" and the supreme farce of the modern church and modern moral teachers is that they exhort men to "love one another" and all the while bulwark a system of commercial warfare where "friendly co-existence" is an impossibility.


We have thus briefly attempted to show how our changed social and economic conditions have precipitated a serious moral conflict. And we have seen how this conflict involves a new theology, a new code of morals, and a new social system. To the pain of this conflict any man can testify who is really awake to the facts and forces of our times. But we believe that this pain in the struggle of the soul and of society for freedom is but the birth-pangs of a great and glorious liberty.

J. Stitt Wilson.

Decadence of Personal Property in Europe

(CONCLUDED)

II.—THE ARTISANS.

N branches of production apart from farming, handicraft industry, a dominant form of the economy of the middle ages, plays a secondary and diminishing part under the capitalist system. The artisan, proprietor of his means of production, working for the local market, himself selling to the consumer the products which he makes, is scarcely to be found any longer except in branches of industry where some obstacle exists to the extension of the market, to the development of the division of labor.

This is the case notably with rural trades, with the industries of luxury, and with those whose products are perishable and find a limited local market.

“As a general rule,” says Du Maroussem, it may be laid down that when the markets are confined, limited to the neighborhood, or to a very small class of the population (as in the case of bakeries and shops for turning out the most expensive furniture) small establishments remain in the majority; when, on the contrary, the markets increase and become national or international, the great factories and the domestic industries divide the market between them; the latter persist, as long as the hand of labor can struggle, by its cheapness, against the progress of mechanics.

“Conforming to these data, we can still find the small industry * * * in the food-producing groups, bakers, pastry-cooks, confectioners, butchers; in the groups of textile industries and cloth-making,—the lace-makers, tailors, seamstresses, linen-drappers, dress-makers, etc.; in the leather industries—moroccotanners, sheath-makers, pocket-book-makers, etc., in the wood-working industry—almost the whole group of cabinet-making, fancy turning, etc.; in a portion of metal-working, as in the precious metals.”

But in these very branches of production, personal property in the means of labor, the autonomy of the producers, the individualist organization of the factory, and oftener still of the enterprise, are tending to disappear. Sometimes it is large-scale production which encroaches; the factory which competes victoriously with the artisan, as the organized bakery supplants the baker

and the furniture factory replaces or drives out the cabinet-maker.*

Sometimes by a very frequent form of the transition to the factory system, the old processes maintain themselves by the side of or to the exclusion of the new processes. Hand labor persists; the small employer keeps his workshop, alone, or with his family, or with one or two assistants; but because of the extension of the market, an intermediary slips in between the producer and the consumer; the artisan's industry is transformed into a home industry tributary to a "collective factory."†

From the technical point of view, nothing, or scarcely anything, is changed. From the social point of view, there is a complete revolution. In place of independent producers, working for their own account, disposing of the entire product of their labor, we find ourselves in the presence of proletarians, working for the account of a proprietor—a warehouse-keeper—who centralizes the trade in their products, and furnishes them, oftener than not, with models and materials, sometimes even with the utensils, whether tools or machines, which they use. And in our days this relentless evolution of the industry of the artisan has taken on so general a character that our time has been called "the century of the factory."

It should, of course, be understood that not all home workers are former employers who have fallen into the proletariat. Schwiedland, in his numerous studies on the "collective factory," shows very plainly that the home industries can arise spontaneously, directly, without having passed through any other form, or can be derived, not only from the industry of the craftsman, but from all the previous forms of industrial production.

The absorption of independent craftsmen is, he says, generally the principal way in which "collective factories" are formed in crowded cities. But the absorption or transformation of the craftsman is not confined to the cities, any more than the successive development of home industry is confined to the transformation of the craftsman. All the forms of industrial production have undergone this transformation into collective industry. In the villages, in the hamlets, in the farms of the peasants, we see domestic labor merging into collective manufacturing. It is the same with wage labor, which equally had at one time a prime importance as a mode of production, and even the most modern sys-

**Revue de Travail*, December, 1890, p. 1293. Sorgines: "The provincial cabinet-maker complains loudly of the increase of factory competition, seeing that the furniture factories are becoming more numerous and their machinery more perfect.

†Lepay defines a "collective factory" as the organization of industry on a large scale, where the employer centralizes the trade in products which a working-class population manufactures, for the account of the employer, in separate shops or in their homes.

tem of exploitation, the factory, is being transformed, according to the best thinkers, into the collective factory.”*

The examples of this last category, which mark a step backward, a retrogression to lower forms, are at least doubtful and certainly exceptional.† It happens often, on the contrary, that the collective factory finds its origin in the capitalist transformation of home labor or day labor. That is the case, for example, with straw-plaiting in Tuscany and the Valley of the Geer, and with toy-making in Oberland von Meiningen, lace-making in Flanders, the making of wooden shoes in Waes, almost everywhere, the weaving of thread or of wool.

Thus, by the side of the “master-workman,” the cutters of Nauner, the furniture-workers of Paris, the canuts of La Croix Rousse, weaving wonderful silks on their dusty looms, the subordinate employers,—tailors, shoe-makers, weavers, cigar-makers, who still work in their own shops, but for the account of a capitalist; we find a multitude of artisans, who work in their own rooms or at home, who have been enlisted directly by the manager of the enterprise, or at least have never passed through the craftsman stage.

Moreover, whatever may be the beginnings of home industry, what always characterizes it is the dependence of the workers, for the marketing of their product,—a dependence which usually involves the economic prosperity of the entrepreneur, and the poverty, or if they have anything to lose, the ruin, of the producers whom he keeps busy.

Permanent depression of wages, enforced idleness through the dead seasons (the seasons when people die),—feverish work through the rush seasons,—such is almost always, and especially since the machine has played its part, the unhappy lot of the home worker.

He is still the master of his own time, one may say, with no regulations to interfere with him; no overseer to watch him. But what matters the absence of an overseer to those who have hunger for a prison-guard, or the absence of rules to those who work without respite, days and nights alike?‡

*Schwiedland: “La repression du travail en chambre.” (See author’s copy.)

†See, for example, Kovalewsky: “La regime economique de la Russie,” pp. 173 et seq. (Paris, Girard et Briere, 1898.)

‡Bureau of Labor: The clothing industry in Paris, 1896, page 501: “Before the law of November 2, 1892, on the labor of women and children * * * the ten-hour day very often marked the dull season and the day of twelve and a half hours the rush season. Sometimes even, owing to the urgent demands of customers, the indifference of employers and the partiality of forewomen, one might point to a record of 44 hours in three days (12 hours, 20 hours, 12 hours). The time-books, comprising the daily details of eight years’ work, enable us to get at the maximum of several well-known establishments. There are occasional days of sixteen hours, but the highest weekly record appears to be 77 hours. As to the “second shift,” the shift which certain workers can impose on themselves at their own homes, these time-books make no mention. That is an unspeakably sad feature of “home work.”

In his picture, "Summer Days," the artist Steinlein, shows us a seamstress in her room, putting out her lamp when the first rays of dawn enter her garret, and greeting the splendor of the morning sky with these bitter words: "At last the season has come when I can save three hours of kerosene a day." Would it not be far better for her to work in a factory, confined at painful tasks, but protected to some extent by the factory laws?

Nowhere, perhaps, except at the homes of the peasants who work for some commercial house, are wages so low, work-days so long, capitalist exploitation so shameless, as in these "family work-shops" of the great cities, which in our official statistics count as so many distinct and independent enterprises. We need only call to mind the horrors of the "sweating system" of the East End of London, in the sweat shops of New York,—those innumerable holes where whole families, living in promiscuity and filth, work to the limit of fatigue in a poisonous atmosphere. For let us not forget,—and this consideration may appeal to the philanthropists who admire domestic labor,—these homes of misery for the producers are also homes of infection for the consumers.

"It is certainly," says the hygienist, Tanquet, "through the medium of manufactured articles that the most constant relations are established between the different classes of society, and in view of the danger of infection, we should not congratulate ourselves that this system of work permits the father or mother of a family to watch by the bedside of a sick child and still keep at work. The isolation of these diseases becomes impossible; at the homes of these poor people the partly finished clothing is gladly used to take the place of needed bed-coverings, and this is especially suited to receive and preserve the germs of contagious diseases."

No doubt it would be blackening a picture already dark enough if we were to attribute these dangers, abuses and sad results to all forms of home work. The glove-worker, for example, protected by a rigid union organization like that of the old-time guilds, does not experience, as yet, the distress of the shoemakers and the tailors. But it is none the less true that in most cases home workers are worse treated than factory workers; and what we have just said of work in the cities applies equally, and sometimes with an aggravation of wretchedness, to home work in the country.

"It is there," said a Liberal deputy in the parliament at Vienna, "it is there that pauperism increases far beyond its increase among the small industries of the cities; it is there that the work-day reaches eighteen hours, without bringing the workers anything more than potatoes; it is there that anaemia and plagues sweep over whole valleys."

If then the collective factory, or, rather, collective manufacture, succeeds in maintaining itself, if in spite of its lower technical efficiency it resists the formidable competition of the centralized factory, it is at the cost of the deep degradation and demoralization of the workers it employs. We should therefore desire, and even favor by legislative means, the transformation of these degenerate forms of individual production into the higher forms of social production.

Those inclined to optimism may hope that this transformation will be the work of co-operative societies, grouping the home workers and finally acquiring sufficient machinery to compete successfully against capitalist industry. But in the cases which are unhappily of such infinite number where such a hope seems altogether chimerical, it should still be regarded as a real advance, technical and social, if the exploitation of home workers by the capital of the merchant can be replaced by the exploitation of laborers in the workshop or factory by industrial capital.

III.—THE SMALL RETAILERS.

In spite of the growth of the department stores, which Zola describes in so masterly a fashion in "*Le Bonheur des Dames*," in spite of their disastrous encroachment on the surrounding shops, the number of the small retailers, of all kinds, far from declining, seems, according to recent census reports, to be constantly increasing.

At the last meeting of the Verein für Sozial Politik (Breslau, 1899,) W. Sombart stated (and supported his position by figures) that their number is increasing more rapidly than the population. For one that disappears, ruined by the capitalist bazars, ten appear in other branches of trade on other places, in the country, or in the suburbs of large cities. They are ordinarily old servants or workingmen who have saved up something, or else artisans whose situations have become intolerable, and in the villages farmers who have wholly or partly given up farming.

To these must be added a great number of clerks and salesmen who, finding themselves out of a situation, or desiring to marry, establish themselves on their own account, often with manifestly insufficient resources. The possibility of supplying themselves too easily, in consequence of competition, with merchandise on credit, leads to the invasion of certain branches of trade by establishments with nothing solid about them, which appear especially in times of depression like mushrooms after a rain, only to disappear in the course of a year or two when inevitable ruin overtakes them.

In short, small trade is the special refuge of the cripples of capitalism, of all who prefer, in place of the hard labor of production, the scanty gleaning of the middle-man, or who, no longer

finding a sufficient revenue in industry or farming, desire to add a string to their bow by opening a little shop. This is in particular what explains the multiplication of saloons and taverns of all sorts—the easiest and least costly enterprise to start—in all the communes.

But it would be a serious mistake to suppose that these miniature establishments, which the census officials characterize as distinct enterprises, can be generally regarded as the personal property of those who carry them on. A great number of them, and a number constantly increasing, as capitalism develops, have only a phantom of independence, and are really in the hands of a few great money-lenders, manufacturers or merchants.

With rare exceptions, almost all the important breweries, with a view to extending their market, own a greater or less number of saloons; and as experience quickly showed that to make these saloons prosper, the sale of gin was much more advantageous than that of beer, a number of brewers have made themselves wholesale dealers in liquor.

It is this which explains the fact, apparently paradoxical, that recently, at Bruges, the brewers energetically demanded the abolition of the license fee imposed only upon the retailers of distilled liquors, whereas they seem at first sight to have every motive for supporting measures which tend to restrain the consumption of gin and consequently to increase the consumption of beer. The contrast between the real situation and the apparent situation which exists for the liquor trade, considered with reference to the degree of capitalist concentration is found likewise in many other branches of retail trade.

In the cities of Holland, for example, most of the bakeries are only depots supplied by the capitalist factories. At London, Macrosty, in an article in the *Contemporary Review*, March, 1899, shows that the cheap restaurants are found to be in the hands of four or five firms. The milk trade is in the same condition. The drug and the cigar business are undergoing the same fate; a single company owns a hundred cigar stores.

To sum up, then, the countless business enterprises which figure in the census reports can be grasped in three classes:

1. Those which, while they count as statistical units, are nothing but agencies,—branches of large capitalist or co-operative enterprises.
2. Those which furnish the manager only a supplemental income, helping out his wages.
3. Finally, those which really constitute independent enterprises, of which the stock in trade belongs to the little retailer.

Now if the total number of commercial establishments is certainly increasing, it is much less certain that the profits of this

last class, the only one which interests us from the point of view of the union of property and labor, are tending to multiply.

True, their number is increasing, with the specialization of trades, in fields where the economy of exchanges is developing at the expense of the domestic forms of production. A village, once purely agricultural, whose inhabitants baked their own bread and traded their butter and eggs for merchandise at the store in the next village, now possesses its bakery, its grocery, or at the very least, one of those miscellaneous stores where they sell yardsticks and colonial goods, saucepans and almanacs, blacking and red herrings, corsets and straw hats. But if, in rural neighborhoods, commercial concentration operates to increase the number of shops; in the cities, on the contrary, the development of the co-operatives and especially of the department stores, some of which, like the Bon Marche on the Louvre, employ several thousand people, inflicts upon the small retailers a damage which is measured first by the reduction of their profits and later in some branches of trade by a reduction in their numbers.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt, and it is one of the most serious defects of the present system, that the small retailers retain a numerical importance out of all proportion to the services that they render the community. Many striking examples have been given of what the parasitism of middle-men costs the public, from the Normandy apple, selling at Paris for seventy times what it costs where it is grown, to the litre of wine from the south, which brings fifteen centimes to the owner of the vines and is sold for seventy or eighty centimes at the wine-shop. [This is about fourteen cents a quart. By the time the same wine reaches America, the retail price is a dollar a quart.—Translator.] Again, we learn from the *Economiste Francais* that the average price for fifty kilograms of coffee, which reached 103 francs in 1893, had fallen to 39 francs in 1899; now, this reduction of two-thirds has had no effect on the retail price; only the middle-men have profited by it. Brazilian coffee, which does not cost in France, all charges paid, more than 2½ francs per kilogram (25 cents per pound) is currently retailed at 4 to 5 francs, while its purity is not always absolute. Those who profit by trading in this article tax it more heavily than does the custom house.*

Moreover, in spite of these profits, so burdensome to their customers, the small retailers are so numerous that, especially in the branches invaded by large-scale business, there are thousands on the verge of bankruptcy. It has been well remarked by Charles Gide that if every baker baked but one sack of flour a

*For the existing relations between wholesale prices and retail prices see Newman's "Wholesale and Retail Prices," in the *Economic Journal* for September, 1897.

day and if on that sack he had to live and pay his rent, his taxes and his helpers, he would have to raise the price of every loaf and still he would live most cheaply. All this proves that our machinery for distribution is detestable and justifies the severe condemnation pronounced years ago by the Utopian socialists against the useless multitude of petty retailers.

"Commerce," said Considerane, "is useful only to serve the needs of production and consumption; it should be the servant of the other two branches. * * * Its role is subordinate. Un-productive in its nature, it adds nothing either in quantity or quality to the objects which pass through its hands; its operations ought to be conducted with the smallest possible number of agents. Now, this is realisable only by means of an administration which puts the producer directly in touch with the consumer and suppresses all the intermediate robbers and parasites."

IV.—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.

In spite of the growing predominance of the capitalist organization, we still find, in existing societies, numerous and important survivals of former social organisms, of ante-capitalist forms of production.

Peasant proprietorship, the industry of the artisan and the little independent business are not on the eve of disappearing, and wherever they survive, realizing the union of property and labor, socialism has no thought of using compulsion to socialize them.*

But however numerous the relics of ancient epochs may be in certain countries, certain regions or certain branches of industry, it is none the less true that as a general rule the development of capitalism tends to eliminate the independent producers, to take away their capital, or, at least, to take away their former independence.

From the moment when the market reaches out to a sufficient extent, the advantages of the master's eye, of manual skill, of zeal for work stimulated by the direct and personal interest of the producer, no longer suffices to compensate for the superior productive advantages of the division of labor, of the exact knowledge of the outlets for the product, and of the use of a more abundant capital. Still more is it so in those branches of produc-

*Cf. Kautsky: "Das Erfurter Programm, pp. 150 et seq., (Stuttgart, 1892.)
 Friedrich Engels: "Die Bauernfrage in Frankreich und Deutschland" (neue Zeit, 1894-1895, No. 10). "It is evident that if the public powers came into our hands we should not think of expropriating forcibly the little peasants (with or without compensation) as we should be obliged to do with the large proprietors. Our opinion, in what concerns the little peasant, is that he should be induced to transfer his enterprise and his private property to co-operative associations, not by force, but by the influence of example and with the aid of the public authorities."

tion, always growing in number, in which technical progress has prepared the way for the reign of the machine.

Nothing is more striking in this regard than the valuable American investigation of 1898 on the comparative productivity of hand and machine labor.* These researches, truly admirable for their precision, have borne on 672 kinds of products, industrial or agricultural. Each kind is minutely analyzed in Carroll D. Wright's report, from the quadruple point of view of the number of workers, number of operations, hours of labor and dollars paid for labor, necessary to produce the same product, first, by hand; second, by machine.

Let us limit ourselves to quoting a few typical examples which show in a striking manner the overwhelming superiority of the machine:

1. Making of ten carts.

By hand: 2 workmen performing 11 distinct operations and working in all 1,180 hours, paid \$54.46.

By machine: 52 workmen, making 97 operations and working in all 37 hours 28 minutes, paid \$7.90.

2. Making of 500 pounds of butter:

By hand: 3 workmen, 7 operations, 125 hours, \$10.08.

By machine: 7 workmen, 8 operations, 12 hours 30 minutes, \$1.78.

3. Making of 1,000 watch movements:

By hand: 14 workmen, 453 operations, 341,896 hours, \$80,822.

By machine: X workmen, 1,088 operations, 8,343 hours, \$17.99.

4. Making of 500 yards of twilled cottonade:

By hand: 3 workmen, 19 operations, 7,534 hours, \$135.61.

By machine: 252 workmen, 43 operations, 84 hours, \$6.81.

5. Making of 100 pairs of cheap boots:

By hand: 2 workmen, 83 operations, 1,438 hours, \$408.50.

By machine: 113 workmen, 122 operations, 154 hours, \$35.40.

6. Making of 1,000 pounds of bread in one-pound loaves:

By hand: 1 workman, 11 operations, 28 hours, \$5.80.

By machine, 12 workmen, 16 operations, 8 hours 56 minutes, \$1.55.

7: Making of 12 dozen men's jackets:

By hand: 1 workman, 4 operations, 840 hours, \$50.40.

*Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, 1898 (Washington, 1899).

By machine: 11 workmen, 8 operations, 97 hours 15 minutes, \$12.80.

Such figures need no comment; they trace in letters of fire the inevitable destiny of the master-tailors, shoe-makers, bakers, watch-makers, who do not produce specialties or articles of luxury.

In spite of the desperate efforts of the small middle class to preserve even a shadow of independence, hand labor for producing all the objects of current consumption is disappearing more and more before machine production, subjugating an increasing number of wage laborers.

In Germany, for example, from 1882 to 1895, the number of independent producers in the manufacturing industries diminished by 139,382, while the total number of industrial laborers increased by 861,468.

If now we reckon all the professions, industrial, commercial and agricultural, there is, since 1882, an absolute increase in the number of producers who are independent or call themselves so, as well as of employes and laborers, but while this increase is only 5 per cent for the independent producers, it is 20 per cent for the laborers and 100 per cent for the employes. More than three-fourths of the newcomers in the world of labor belong to the wage-working class, and even in the total of the professions, the proportion of those working for wages is sensibly increasing at the expense of the independent producers.

This is shown by the following table, which we borrow from M. Rauchberg:

Out of every hundred persons at work in the German empire in 1882 and in 1895, the count shows:

	Independent producers.		Persons working for wages.	
	1882.	1895.	1882.	1895.
Agriculture	27.78	30.28	72.22	69.02
Manufacturing	34.41	24.90	65.59	75.10
Commerce	44.67	36.07	55.33	63.93
Totals	32.03	28.94	67.97	71.06

Thus, in spite of the reduction in the number of farm laborers, of permanent day laborers, drawn in by the tentacles of the cities, the relative importance of the proletariat goes on increasing.

Must we then say that fatally, inevitably, all the independent producers are condemned, in a future more or less near, to be transformed into wage-workers.

We have said elsewhere that a very different evolution may

be conceived, that personal property may be transferred into co-operative or social property, without necessarily passing through the capitalist stage.* On the other hand, it appears clearly that in a great number of cases, if personal property tends to disappear, the higher forms of capitalist production, in spite of the advantages which they offer from a rational point of view, are scarcely at a stage to eliminate the lower, stagnant, miserable forms of home industry, of small farming, of retail trade.

The parasitism of middlemen, the sterile profusion of trades catering to luxury, the horrors of the sweating system, the working of petty tracts of land with their "proprietors" with five-cent incomes, all these are products of capitalism, and it seems as if they might have to last as long as capitalism itself.

Perhaps, also, certain branches of independent production, some relics of peasant proprietorship, are destined to survive it. Nothing hinders us, indeed, from imagining a socialist state in which individual property and labor should coexist with collective property and labor.

But however that may be, the certain fact is that in the principal industries, those which answer to the most general and the most extended needs, the superior productivity of machinery and exploitation on a large scale tend to the extinction of personal property and isolated production. And the same causes bring their consequences; the capitalist forms of production and exchange, which characterize the present organization of labor, manifest an ever-growing tendency toward concentration and socialization.

Emile Vandervelde (translated by Charles H. Kerr).

*See a report presented to the agricultural congress of Waremme on small rural proprietorship, in Vandervelde and Destree's "Socialisme en Belgique," pp. 359 et seq. (Paris, Glard Briere, 1898.)

Evolution or Revolution?



It has often been pointed out, and I repeat it once more, that the socialist movement is essentially a proletarian movement. No man belonging to the privileged classes or brought up in their views of life can discuss socialism and its possibilities in an unbiased way, unless he first removes the contagium of class-prejudice from his system. Those who have what they do not need will otherwise not be able to know and appreciate the sensations of a man who has not even that which he needs.

The article of "Marxist" in the October number of the International Socialist Review is admirable from the point of view of a man who, in comfortable circumstances, can sympathize with the gloomy apprehensions raised in the breasts of stock and bond-holders by the growth of socialism. It is delightful reading for the scientific economist who loves a brilliant display of quotations from the galaxy of professional lights. It is extremely gratifying to the philosopher educated to the belief that the free play of evolution's laws will in due time land the world in a paradise of perfection without the assistance of the "conscious mind."

But from the standpoint of a Marx-socialist, a class-conscious proletarian, the article is entirely unsatisfactory. As a disciple of Marx, I respectfully decline to associate with "Marxist" under the same label. A Marxist who in the discussion of economic questions emphasizes the necessity of justice for capitalists while gliding serenely by the proletarian's right to justice; a Marxist who tries to outmarx Marx and to lead us astray from the straight path of class-conscious socialism into the "misere de la philosophie"; such a Marxist is not our comrade. "The indefiniteness of the conception of socialism," about which he complains, is indeed the main difficulty under which he labors.

Permit me to supplement his article from the standpoint of those who are not beset by this difficulty.

"Marxist" smiles a superior smile, because to Marx "competition appears to be the only lever" which sets capitalistic evolution in motion; and he informs us that it did not seem to occur to Marx "that competition itself is but a transient phase in the development of capitalism." Then he goes on to demonstrate what Marx told us long ago, viz: that capitalist production will finally lead to nationalization of industries. He applauds Bernstein, because this writer was the first to point

out the failure of Marx to give industrial monopoly (trusts) its proper recognition in the development of capitalism, but thinks it wise to explain in a foot-note on page 221 of his article that Marx uses the term monopoly only in a "colloquial sense," not in the sense intended by "Marxist."

That the transformation of capitalistic private property into socialized property assumes before the vision of the author of "Capital" the outlines of a violent revolution, is exceedingly regretted by "Marxist," and he gives Bernstein another pat on the shoulder for pointing out that this "sounds a discordant note in Karl Marx's theory of economic evolution." How violent this revolution must have appeared to Marx is evident from the fact that he describes it as "the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people" and thinks the conflict will be settled by the state, the "midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one."

Further comment on this side of "Marxist's" article would be waste of time. I do not wish to make an idol of Marx; that would be contrary to the tenets of socialism, and Marx himself would be the first to resent it, were he alive. But I would earnestly request Bernstein, "Marxist," et al, to consider the following statements:

"To quote disconnected passages from the works of different authors and construct them in a sense contrary to the intention of the authors shows neither great learning nor deep sagacity."

"To point out certain sentences of an author's work, which happen to be not quite so precise as might be desirable, as defects in the fundamental logic of the work, is idiocy."

"To invite strife and schisms in a party by continually shaking its foundations with worthless discussions actuated by superficial understanding is criminal."

"To create the impression that we don't know ourselves what we want and cannot be taken seriously is suicidal."

Remember further that "Capital" and "Critique of Political Economy" are not the only works written by Marx. Before finding fault and indiscriminately criticizing him, read his other works first; read "Capital" and "Critique of Political Economy" after them. Then, if you have a new message to bring to the party, come forth with it. But I am inclined to think that you will rather, if you are sincere and a true socialist, prefer to do what Hitch would have all other socialists do, viz: "re-examine your position and admit that you have made a mistake."

"Marxist" makes this passage from Marx the pivot of his theory of capitalistic evolution: "It is not the conscious mind of man that determines the form of his being, but quite the reverse." Hence he concludes "that capitalistic society must grow into socialism as the outcome of the free play of economic

forces, without the intervention of the conscious mind, as embodied in the socialist party platform."

It is remarkable that the author recognizes the law of evolution in economics, but entirely overlooks the fact that the conscious mind also is subject to evolution. Marx did not overlook it, however. With the Communist Manifesto and his conscientious application of the materialist conception of history he started the mind of the proletariat on a course of evolution that has long distanced the slow course of economic evolution and will soon prove that, thanks to Marx, the statement truthfully applicable to the mind of man fifty years ago is no longer true of his disciples.

It is the merit of the Communist Manifesto, edited by Marx and Engels and styled "completely obsolete" by "Marxist," of being the first to emphasize the fact that the "labor question is a political issue." Through it the development of order in social economy has become the mission of the working class. No amount of development in industrial monopoly will free a nation, if the proletariat is not educated to such an extent as to understand the laws that "determine the form of its being." No degree of nationalization of industries will produce anything else but capitalistic socialism, if the proletariat is not a class-conscious body. Industrial monopoly, so far from tending to socialization, will only create a class of tyrants who will assume the character and claims of feudal nobility. Even in a republic where direct legislation with all its accessories is in full practice, the system of capitalistic monopoly—whether nationalized or not—can still be upheld by bribery, intimidation and fostering of ignorance in school, church and press, as long as the mass of the people are not sufficiently educated. Lack of education is precisely the reason why socialism is making slow progress, wherever it is first taught.

Given a thoroughly educated nation and we could have had socialism long before the progress of invention and science had made private monopoly possible. Suppose, for a moment, that the nations of the world had had the necessary intellectual enlightenment at Christ's time, and socialism would have been established then and there. Economic evolution, instead of being the means of enriching the few at the expense of the many, would then have resulted in shortening the hours of labor and creating better surroundings for all. But the people were too ignorant to grasp the import of Christ's doctrine, and the ruling classes held them down under the iron rods of religious superstition and military force—as they do now, with the added force of economic pressure, fallacious science and a lying press.

In spite of all difficulties, the intelligence of the masses is rapidly receiving enlightenment. But for this fact we socialists

would be roasted alive *ad majorem dei gloriam*, like the 'cranks' of old; but for the spread of modern intelligence, Hanna and Co. would use us for candles to light up the lawn parties of Washington "society." If it were not for the intellectual progress of the age, it is doubtful whether such little eggs as "Bernstein, Marxist and Co." would even care openly to discuss social economy, let alone trying to gain notoriety by pretending to know more than their intellectual fostering hen, Marx.

Nationalization of monopolies without abolition of the capitalist system will not benefit the proletariat. The directors, inspectors, chiefs, etc., would still claim superior salaries and the "voting cattle" would have to be content with living wages and long hours of labor as before. The policy of expansion would provide a market for surplus products and the "slush-fund" would grow proportionately. "Marxist" himself very aptly illustrates this: "Public ownership of railways, telephones and other public utilities is bright with the promise of new political jobs by the hundred thousand." It will still be the old drama of a proletariat exploited by a ruling class.

What good will "government directors upon the board of directors of every trust," elected on a Democratic or Republican ticket, do the people?

A state of society acknowledging "the interests of stockholders and bondholders, regulating the rate of interest and the rate of dividends, rate of profits, scale of wages and so forth," and realizing Fourier's dream of "social production with the division of the product among Capital, Labor and Talent," is a rather grotesque outgrowth for the brain of a man who signs himself "Marxist." It would be a credit to the brain of an old party boss. And the prerogative of the stockholders,reduced to drawing an annuity fixed by the state and voting at elections for directors," is a worthy pendant to the suspension for several years with full pay of a certain army official under the present administration. How delightful to be "expropriated" under such circumstances! No more business-worry, no more apprehensions for the safety of your wealth, only a regular salary—just because you happen to be alive and to find human society in a lower state of intelligence than bees that will not keep drones in their hive!

A little less science, please, and a little more common sense!

What are we to think of a socialist writer who can have the heart to talk learnedly of a gradual process of evolution, while millions of his fellow-citizens are forced to starve, to live by stealth, to strike, to fawn, to sell themselves into lifelong bondage? When children of tender years and women pregnant with growing life are forced into the ranks of wage-slaves, has not the capitalistic system reached that point in its evolu-

tion where the conscious mind should assert its sovereignty and hurl the defenders of this moloch into the abyss of eternal oblivion?

What do those comrades, whose wan faces greet the dawn of every new morning with the consciousness of another day's slavery in store for them, think of waiting patiently, until the gradual process of evolution has changed the basis and superstructures of society so that they will get the full product of their labor? How will those, who with a long look of helpless compassion at their invalid wives and their offspring doomed to perpetual drudgery, starvation and want, start off to their daily tasks, not with full dinnerpails, but with the adulterated food bought at prices "the traffic will stand," like to await the days when their great-grand-children's children, slaves no longer through the gradual evolution of economic conditions, will play around the May-pole in the shade of the trees nursed to full growth by the decaying bones of their ancestors?

"Modern political science can conceive of a similar process of evolution in the working out of Industrial Democracy," but happily it cannot force our conscious minds to wait for that process. Unless something more satisfactory is offered to us than the mouldy husks of dried and shriveled philosophy, I shall rely on two more powerful factors in social economy, viz: hunger and love, to fulfil Marx's prophecy of the expropriation of the expropriators long before anyone will have time to consider the question of providing a sinking fund for the "claims of capital."

You invalid, exhausted by excessive exertion in the service of soulless corporations, and unable to counterbalance the waste of your tissue by regeneration of healthy molecules—for want of means of subsistence—let it be a consolation to you that science can estimate to a nicety the rate of progress in the chemical dissolution of your body. It will be the only consolation you will get from science, if "Marxist" is right in his prophecy. Society will regulate the "claims" of capital, but the surplus values you contributed literally with your own flesh and blood, and might have used to save your life had not competition deprived you of them, will not be restored to you.

You young girl with traces of former purity and loveliness in your face, now degraded and vulgar beyond conception, who will compensate you for the loss of your purity, your happiness, your worldly and eternal possibilities, Society must not recognize any claims of similar nature.

You young toiler at the plow who might have been "a kingly growth," to whom Life gave to beget "the thought that will redeem and lift Man higher yet," but who is now dwarfed and crippled physically from premature hard work beyond the endurance of his growing body and mentally from lack of

culture, "Marxist" does not emphasize your birthrights. Look at the picture of the Man with the Hoe! You will be like him, if a merciful fate does not relieve you of your burden in time. You are not concerned in the trust question. Society owes you no debt; it has no sinking fund for your claims.

You young artist, haggard and crushed and doubtful of your own talent, who, lacking social patronage and political pull, missed your one chance out of a million to become great, give up your ideals. Society has no use for an art like yours. It wants docile and soulless tools. Kill your feelings, even if it will burn your soul and degrade yourself in your own eyes forever. Souls and lives will not weigh in the scale of Society when the day of reckoning arrives; they are in commensurable quantities, but gold and silver are not.

Is it necessary to increase this list?

I am well aware that many scientists whose pulse beats only with the two cold throbs "facts and figures, facts and figures," will at once sneer at my pathos and call it scornfully "sentimental trash." Their scorn is wasted on me. If this is sentimentality, make the most of it! You cannot deny the facts and their intimate bearing on the economic question.

Until better proofs are furnished that it is unnecessary to educate the proletariat into class-consciousness for the purpose of voting itself into political power, I shall do my share to repeat the cry of my economic teachers: "Workingmen of all countries, unite!" Until assurance beyond doubt is given that the capitalist class has "changed its human nature," I should hold Marx fully justified in conceiving of the transformation of capitalistic private property into social property as a revolution. I doubt that the capitalists will part with their spoils without a struggle.

I wish to lay great stress on the fact that socialists are striving for a peaceful conquest of the powers of government by the ballot. If any violence is connected with this process, it will be started by the class which now controls the legislatures, the army and the navy. Socialists have profited by the history of the French Revolution of 1792, the German and French crises of 1848 and the Paris Commune of 1871. They have still more profited by the lessons of American history. We are peaceful men. Universal brotherhood is our slogan. But such names as Chicago, Brooklyn, Hazleton, Wardner and others remind us that we must not look for justice to the capitalist class.

We are determined not to give up our inalienable rights to life, liberty and happiness. The attitude of the present privileged classes will determine ours. We want peace on earth and good will to all men; but we shall not give up our right to

justice for the sake of them. Whatever the form of the coming struggle, the responsibility for the solution of the problem by blood and iron will not rest with the socialists.

E. Untermann.



The International Congress of Socialist Students and Graduates

THE first international congress of socialist students and graduates was held at Brussels in 1891, and its proceedings were published in the *Avant-Garde* of Brussels. The second congress took place at Geneva in September, 1893, on the day after the great international socialist congress at Zurich. The proceedings appeared in the *Etudiant Socialiste* of our Belgian comrades and in the *Ere Nouvelle* of Paris.

The third congress was held at Paris this year, just before the international socialist congress, at the Hotel des Societes Savantes, on the 20th, 21st and 22d of last September.

There were represented the socialist students of the Universities of Paris (group of Collectivist Students of Paris) and socialist students of Russia, Poland, Bulgaria, Armenia, the West Indies, Lyons, Montpellier, Nancy, Caen and Aix. Germany was represented by socialist students from the universities of Berlin and Munich, Belgium by delegates from Brussels and Liege, Holland by Utrecht, Amsterdam, Delft and Leyden, Italy by Rome, Denmark by Copenhagen, Hungary by Budapest, Bulgaria by Sofia. Most of the Russian and Polish universities and the Armenian socialist students were equally represented. The socialist students from the universities of Vienna (Austria) and Cambridge (England), who could not be represented had sent reports, and the socialist students of Belgrade (Servia) had delegated our comrade, D. Popovitch, to represent them.

On the other side, the socialist students of the great American universities, Harvard, Columbia, Brown and Chicago, had joined the congress. These comrades showed great activity through several months and even established an inter-collegiate socialist bureau. For reasons unknown to us they could not as expected be directly represented. The congress was opened by Enrico Ferri (University of Rome) assisted by Borghjerg (Copenhagen) and Lagardelle (Paris). Ferri brought out forcibly the reasons for a congress of socialist students; just as in organic life the cerebral cells have an organization of their own, distinct from yet dependent upon the rest of the body of which they form a part, so there is in the socialist life a necessary division of labor. At the same time Ferri asserted, amid general applause, the solidarity which unites the socialist students to the organized proletariat of the whole world.

I.

THE PROPAGANDA WITHIN THE UNIVERSITIES.

Jean Longuet outlined in a few words the significant history of the Group of Collectivist Students of Paris. The delegate of the socialist students of Budapest presented a thoughtful report analyzing the reasons why, contrary to what might have been expected from their past, and in spite of their liberal phraseology, most of the Hungarian students have allowed themselves to be carried away by their low nationalist passions.

The congress then opened for discussion the question of how and by what methods we might bring into socialism the greatest possible number of students. Three currents of opinion on this subject took shape.

1. Some delegates, especially Belgians and Hollanders, supported to some extent by Tarbouniech, maintained that it was useless to try to gain over to socialism the purely bourgeois students. Supporting their arguments by the example of their own countries, they showed that there can be no socialist students except where there exists—and to the extent that there exists—an intellectual proletariat. It is then upon the economic interests of the intellectual proletariat that our propaganda must exclusively—or almost exclusively—rest.

Many delegates exposed the inefficacy and the danger of this mode of propaganda. The students, they said, are not intellectual proletarians, they are would-be doctors, would-be engineers, etc.; it is not until later that they will be doctors without patients, engineers without employment; we can not then appeal to economic interest before that interest arises. Moreover it is dangerous to attract the intellectuals by the promise of better situations. Whereas class interest is an altruistic interest, so to speak, which reaches out in time and space—what most of the intellectual proletarians ask for is a situation for themselves, and right now. To appeal to the economic interests of the intellectuals is then to awaken hopes which will be deceived; it is moreover to introduce into the socialist movement a number of dangerous arrivals, coming to seek at the hands of the working class material advantages (positions as deputies, municipal councilmen, city clerks, managers of co-operatives, etc.) denied them by bourgeois society, and thus preventing the proletarian from educating itself in administration.

2. Ferri, relying on his personal experience as a professor, maintained that the best method of propaganda was science. If so many young men who are socialists in the university become reactionaries later, it is perhaps because nothing has been awakened in them but the enthusiasm of youth, which disappears quickly. We should, on the contrary, introduce social-

ism into their minds as a part of science, as the logical and necessary culmination of the biological and sociological sciences. No need of making a direct propaganda, which, on the other hand, would frighten many of the listeners,—enough to explain the whole of science, without the mutilations inflicted on it by the bourgeois orthodoxy, of their own accord the listeners will draw socialist conclusions. “Without pronouncing the word socialism once a year,” said Ferri, “I make two-thirds of our students conscious socialists.” Among workingmen, it is necessary to add the socialist conclusions to the scientific premises, because the workingman’s psychology permits it, and indeed requires it; before an audience of bourgeois intellectuals, it is necessary to give the scientific premises alone, and let each mind draw its own conclusions.

3. To this scientific or rational propaganda, Lagardelle adds a propaganda sentimental or moral in its character. In fact almost all the socialist students have come into socialism through moral motives. It is not till later that their readings and studies confirms their spontaneous feelings by scientific reasons.

The following resolution, presented by Lagardelle, was adopted by a unanimous vote of the nationalities except that Holland and Bulgaria dissented.

“The Congress holds that while appealing to the class interests of the future intellectual proletarians, the socialist propaganda in university circles should be addressed more particularly to the scientific spirit, to the moral sentiments, and to the democratic aspirations of the students.”

At the request of a professor in the primary Normal School, the Congress calls on the groups of socialist students to make an active propaganda among Normal School professors, who will, in turn, transmit their socialist convictions to the teachers they will have to train, and who thereby may do a work of capital importance throughout the country.

On motion of the delegate from Munich, the following resolution was then adopted:

“The Congress is of the opinion that the best means of propagating socialism in the universities is to organize, along with clearly socialist circles where they are possible, neutral circles for the study of the social sciences.”

II.

ROLE OF SOCIALIST STUDENTS IN THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT.

Lagardelle attempted to define what that role should be. He held that the socialist students should not elaborate theories in their class-room, but should aid the proletariat to develop

the theory from itself. Marx said at the Congress of Lausanne: "The role of the international is not to dictate formulas to the proletariat, but to aid it to find its own proper line of conduct."

The question of the "people's universities" occupied an entire session. Only one delegate, Comrade Polack (of Paris) showed himself hostile to them in principle. He proposed the following resolution:

"The Congress, although recognizing that the class struggle is but a means and not an end, declares that the intellectual emancipation of the workers must be, like their economic emancipation, wrought out by the workers themselves, and it encourages the socialist students to create socialist universities more popular and fuller of the university spirit than the bourgeois 'people's universities.'"

It should be noted that this resolution only obtained the vote of its author.

Several speakers opposed this proposition, among them Jaures, who pointed out that it was as absurd to advise the proletarians to educate themselves as to advise them to enrich themselves; the intellectual capital of mankind ought to be taken by them, like the economic capital of the bourgeoisie. No great revolutionary movement has hesitated to avail itself of all the intellectual forces of the past. And if there are snobs in the "people's universities," that is only a sign of growth and of vitality. Moreover, with the people's universities as with parliament, as with the labor unions, as with the co-operatives, it shows a want of faith in socialism to dread that it will dissolve on contact with reality; on the contrary, far from infusing their prejudices into the socialist movement, the intellectual bourgeois converts will lose them in it.

Boucher, in a report presented in the name of the Group of Collectivist Students of Paris, contrasted with the old socialist method, which required nothing but disciplined sharpshooters, the socialism of to-day, which calls for intelligent men. He attempted to trace a course of study for the socialists of the people's universities, insisting upon the necessity of a unified programme and of the co-ordination of the efforts of the professors. He concluded by inviting the socialist students to enter the people's universities, either as professors or as voluntary critics; there is, apparently, the real battle-field for the socialist students, there is the role which is most suitable to them in the whole range of the movement; that which will excite the least antagonism, and where they will be the most useful.

Comrade Ivanowski explained quite fully the work of the people's universities in Austrian Poland. The delegate from Munich, replying to criticisms against the people's universities,

and to the special charge that they attract none but the bourgeois, declared that in southern Germany 30 per cent of the attendants upon the people's universities are manual laborers.

The delegate of the socialist students from Moscow and St. Petersburg, replying to certain unjust criticisms which a Russian delegate had incidentally made, explained the deplorable situation of the Russian socialist students. Fifteen hundred to two thousand are arrested every year for socialist propaganda work, and hundreds and thousands are sent to Siberia.

Soldi, a private tutor in the University of Rome, explained what had been done in the way of higher popular instruction in Italy, where several people's universities are in process of formation, especially in northern Italy.

Comrades Andre Hesse and Jean Louguet proposed the following resolution:

"Whereas, The question of the people's universities should be examined in the light of the general conceptions which direct the action and the propaganda of modern socialism, and

"Whereas, It is for the interest of the whole proletariat to participate in science, while on the other hand it should never forget its mission as a class party,—

"Resolved, (1) Wherever a people's university is formed, socialist or non-socialist, it is the duty of socialist students to enter it.

(2) Wherever the working-class members of a people's university are sufficiently class-conscious, it is important that it be made a socialist university.

(3) Wherever a people's university is established with aims hostile to socialism, it is important and obligatory to oppose it."

The first two resolutions were adopted unanimously; the third was rejected, as implying dangerous reservations, and it was replaced by the following resolution by Comrade Uhry (Paris):

"(3) The socialist students are invited to take part, if need be, even in universities that are purely bourgeois."

IV.

INTERNATIONAL REPORTS.

Comrade Tordeur (Brussels) announced the forthcoming appearance of the "Socialist Student," edited by our Brussels comrades. This journal is designed as the international organ of socialist students, and its editor is at the same time the international secretary of the socialist students.

The following resolutions were then adopted:

On motion of a delegate from Berlin—

"The Congress expresses the warmest sympathy for the comrades of Russian universities who in the struggle for the

cause of the proletariat and the defense of scientific researches are victims of the Czar's oppression."

On motion of Lagardelle—

"The Congress expresses the hope that following the example given by the municipality of Lille, the socialist municipalities may extend the practice of loans on personal credit to poor students."

On motion of Comrade Staneff (Bulgaria)—

"The Congress protests against the support given by foreign governments to the Turkish satrap, and sympathizes with the nations oppressed by his tyranny."

The Congress voted:

"The next international congress of socialist students shall take place not later than the time of the next socialist international congress. The general secretary shall consult the different nationalities on this subject."

The Congress closed with an address by the president of the session, our friend Vandervelde, who called to memory the modest circles of socialist students started about 1888-1890, and the pardonable suspicions entertained by the proletarians of the time against the intellectuals. He reminded the socialist intellectuals that they came into socialism for work, not for honor, and declared the Congress adjourned in the midst of shouts of acclamation, "Vive l' Internationale."



American Federation of Labor Convention

THE twentieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor is now a matter of history. It is doubtful if any delegate present remembers much that was done outside of smashing trade autonomy, turning down socialism, and having a running fight over the question of putting the initiative and referendum into practical operation and demanding a Cabinet position for a trade unionist.

The latter proposition was one of the first to come up. Down in Washington, and occasionally in the daily newspapers, a bouquet with a string attached is thrown toward the merry workman. It contains a billet doux promising a new Cabinet position, to be known as Secretary of Commerce and Industry. Several resolutions bearing on the subject were before the house. A resolution was introduced reciting that nothing could be hoped for from a politician in such a position and demanding that a trade unionist be appointed. And then the "good" trade unionists waxed wrathily, declared with deep emotion that the U. S. Supreme Court would label such an act unconstitutional, and suggested that after the position is created the powers be petitioned to appoint a union man. The "bad" Socialists demanded that a trade unionist be specified, that the Supreme Court be given the opportunity to pass upon the law after it is enacted, and that no compromising and weakening should be manifested at this time. The Socialists were defeated.

The first couple of days the initiative and referendum was glorified in many resolves and speeches. But finally when a proposition came in to elect Federation officials by the initiative and referendum it was suddenly discovered that the plan was "impractical." The Socialists held that consistency ought to be displayed occasionally, that the present method of electing officers gave rise to charges that a few delegates absolutely control the Federation, and that the present monarchical system should be supplanted by a democratic plan. The conservatives made their strongest point by claiming that direct election would be too expensive and too cumbrous, and by a vote of three-fourths to one-fourth the Cleveland resolution was killed.

The heavy work came on the Socialist resolutions. The Cleveland delegate introduced a resolution bearing on the trust and monopoly question, and the committee recommended changes that were really a backward step from the position taken in Detroit a year ago. The A. F. of L., however, is on record as declaring that "the movement of capital to concentrate and co-operate has not

lessened, but, on the contrary, nearly all productive industry, outside of agriculture, is now controlled by trusts and monopolies, which have the power largely to lower wages on the one hand or raise prices on the other, thus enforcing great hardships upon the working people." The non-unionists are warned to organize into unions and to study the development of trusts and monopolies. The substitute, although striking out the words: "with a view to nationalizing the same," was acceptable to many of the progressists, who voted for it.

Four other socialistic resolutions were reported, but the constitutional amendment from Cleveland was withdrawn in order that all effort might be centered upon a plain declaration in favor of the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, fathered by Delegate Slayton, of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters. Delegates Kleffner of Omaha, and Bracken of the Lathers, refused to withdraw their resolutions, and, therefore, the committee bunched the three, reported adversely and submitted a substitute, which was adopted by 4,169 to 685, though the vote is incorrect, some voting in the negative having been unwittingly counted in the affirmative or not at all. The substitute reads in part:

"We cheerfully accept, and desire, all the assistance and usefulness which may or can be given the trade union movement by all reform forces. The aspirations, hopes and aims of the members of trade unions are very similar to the expressed wishes of the greater body of Socialists, namely, that the burdens of toil may be made lighter, and that each worker shall enjoy the complete benefit of that which he or she produces."

The report goes on to say that all worship the ideal of greater liberty and brighter life, but that the workers reach different conclusions as to the method of gaining the desired end. The trade union movement is held to be the true and legitimate channel through which the toilers should seek present amelioration and future emancipation, and it is claimed that the unions do not now and will not in the future declare against the discussion of economic and political questions in their meetings. In conclusion, it is declared to be the inherent duty of affiliated unions to publish in their journals, to discuss in their meetings and the members thereof to study in their homes all questions of a public nature which have reference to their industrial or political liberty.

This, then, is the Federation's latest political stand. It is practically meaningless, and the only commendable thing about it is that it guarantees political and economic discussion in the unions. This concession, if it can be called such, caught many sentimentalists, and even delegates who took the floor and called themselves Socialists and were so regarded. Quite a few representatives from the larger bodies claimed they were thoroughly in sympathy with

the resolutions declaring for the collective ownership of the tools of production, but they feared the rank and file would not approve their action if they voted for their personal convictions. As a matter of fact, nearly one-half the vote in the convention was pledged in favor of a declaration for socialism, but when the conservatives opened fire many ran to cover for fear of arousing antagonism for their organizations. As it is, one-third of the delegates (fifty-two) voted against the committee's substitute and for the Slayton resolution.

As to the debate, probably the less said about it the better—probably if the rank and file, who had no axes to grind, had been present and gave an impartial verdict, the roll call would have been more equally balanced. The Socialists took their stand upon principles and discussed actual, existing facts. The anti-Socialists indulged in personalities, juggled with deileonism and appealed to prejudice. Indeed, President Gompers frankly declared that he would not discuss the principles of socialism, but instead he proceeded to knock the stuffing out of several straw men. Messrs. Duncan, Lennon, Mitchell and others pursued the same tactics, and visitors and newspaper men voluntarily expressed the opinion that the debate was farcical and unfair. Of course, the "antis" carried many votes with them—they possessed power—and it occurs to the writer that if certain so-called Socialists had in years past consumed one-half the time in educating trade unionists that they did in damning them no such ridiculous debates would take place. However, the tide of socialism continues to rise, and in another year or two ultra-conservatism will be forced to the rear, just as was fanaticism in the Socialist movement.

Trade autonomy was next in importance to socialism. The fight between the autonomists and industrialists, or centralization and decentralization, or unconscious socialism and individualism, as you please, became quite bitter, and threats of secession and the disintegration of the Federation were made on numerous occasions by intemperate autonomists, but they will probably take a more sensible view of the situation henceforth. The onslaught made against the Brewery Workers was the test. Various small unions attempted to secure jurisdiction over craftsmen employed in breweries, but it was finally decided by an overwhelming vote that the Brewers' Union should control all workers employed in brewing establishments. The printers'-machinists' struggle has been practically settled in favor of the former, who were lightly censured, but will control all machine tenders in printing offices. On the question of autonomy the Socialists were a unit in favor of centralization, contending that as capital becomes more compact it is necessary for labor to also become more closely federated and combined, and that collectivism is steadily superceding individualism.

The Federation took a decisive stand in favor of municipal ownership of public utilities and against compulsory arbitration. Many questions relating to various unions, but of no general importance, were cussed and discussed. Excepting McQuire, the old officers were re-elected, D. A. Hayes, of the glassworkers, filling the vacancy in the Executive Council. The "slate" went through without a break. Many delegates were incensed and declared with emphasis that next year the "slate" will be broken into smithereens, and, indeed, from dark hints thrown out by a miners' official in the presence of the writer, "new blood" will be injected into the Federation at Scranton.

Max S. Hayes.



Reply to Mr. Stone



IN the November Review Mr. Stone answers our article on money in the July Review. The powers have limited us to a brief space for our reply. A brief space will be sufficient. The discussion involves the following points, all of which are successfully dodged by Mr. Stone:

1. The labor theory of value is subject to certain exceptions; it does not apply to monopolies, articles produced under patents, copyrights, rare works of art or genius, antiquities which cannot be reproduced, etc. Marx himself raised the question whether gold and diamonds do not belong under the exceptions (*Capital* p. 4).

2. Admitting for the sake of argument that gold does not belong to the exceptions, Marx's reasoning holds good when gold by weight is the exclusive currency with no credit. No such condition exists in civilized communities, and Mr. Stone does not claim it.

3. With the introduction of credit money Marx's reasoning no longer holds good, as we claim. Marx ridicules this claim on page 193 of *Critique*. Mr. Stone fails to join issue with us on this point.

4. Out of credit money and also out of the stoppage of the free coinage of silver grew fiat money, which is a public utility manufactured by the state in limited quantities as a monopoly. Marx says it represents gold or silver. We say it does not, and again Mr. Stone dodges the issue. We cited India as proof. Dodged again by Mr. Stone. He cites worn coins under William III. which would not pass for their face value. We cite our own gold coins, which, if worn, do not pass for their face value, while our fiat silver coins pass for face value.

Mr. Stone says we are frank, bold and logical in stating the quantity theory under limited coinage; in the next sentence he tells how the miners would rush their metal to the mints after the mints were closed against them. Economic agnosticism covers a multitude of sins, but we still insist that the socialists are not doing justice to themselves on this question. They are neither frank, bold nor logical. We again repeat, "Aussprechen das was ist."

We have sent to Mr. Stone our pamphlet entitled "Money, Metalism and Credit." It is as frank as we could make it. If we are wrong we wish to make the error as plain as possible so that it can be pointed out, and we will then change our views. This pamphlet mailed free to any address and criticism invited.

Marcus Hitch, Reaper Block, Chicago.

[With this communication this discussion must be closed for some time at least as matters of more pressing interest demand our space. Ed.]

❁ SOCIALISM ABROAD ❁

BELGIUM.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU.

The following announcement has been issued with the request that all socialist papers copy the same :

“Up to the present time only a few countries have appointed the delegates to the International Bureau. Germany has named Auer and Singer ; France, Jaures and Vaillant ; England, Quelch and Hyndman ; Belgium, Anseele and Vandervelde, Austrian Poland, Bolestas, Jedizejowski and Wojnarowska. Carl Kautsky has been chosen by the Germans as corresponding secretary. It is desirable that all socialist parties not having as yet appointed their delegates should do so that the correspondence may not be delayed. In those countries where there are various factions it is urgent that they hold a meeting to confer upon the various questions.

Finally we ask the secretaries of the various socialist parties to send us the following absolutely indispensable facts : (1) Address of the seat of the party ; (2) Name and address of the secretary of the party ; (3) Name and address of the treasurer of the party ; (4) Name of the official organ of the party or of the principal socialist organs.

The International Secretary will begin to act from the first of December.

Le Peuple, of Brussels, announces that the Pope has an encyclical in preparation treating on socialism, the principal points of which, it is claimed, are already known. It is said to be addressed directly to the Christian socialists whose work in general is rather favored, but they are warned to abstain from all political action and to give their support to existing governments, whether democratic or not. It is possible that the full text of the encyclical, when published, will modify these points somewhat, but it is generally admitted in European Church circles that the Vatican is now engaged upon an encyclical on socialism.

A special convention of the Belgium socialists was recently held to determine the position of the party regarding proportional

representation. Although there was considerable objection it was decided not to oppose it and to continue the efforts for universal suffrage. The convention also appointed Victor Serwy as secretary of the International Socialist Bureau.

The Belgian government has been making an inquiry into the extent to which the army has become "contaminated" with socialism. The Minister reported that "in general our militia are imbued with the idea that they are the victims of an unjust law of recruiting." He also admits that socialism has still made great inroads, but nevertheless concludes that "without doubt they may still be depended upon to defend our soil against invaders."

The socialists have just introduced a bill into the Chamber of Deputies providing for an old age pension for laborers of 600 francs a year. In the case of miners the pension is to begin at the age of 50 and with other workers at 55.

* * *

FRANCE.

The storm of dissension in the socialist ranks seems to have spent itself and everything now looks like a speedy union of the socialist forces: A debate was recently held at Lille between Jules Geusde and Jean Jaures, the two most prominent men in the opposing parties. This debate was marked by the best of feeling, and both speakers expressed the hope of an early union. *Le Mouvement Socialiste* gives it as its opinion that: "The time of the realization of socialist unity is approaching. The pressure of the masses has been strong enough to conquer the resistance of individuals and to force unification, with little delay upon all the socialist forces. Until very lately the idea of unity has encountered only opposition among the leaders, but now there seems to be a jealous emulation among them to translate the will of the militant proletariat into deed." As a result of this movement two projects for unity have been submitted, one by the *Parti Ouvrier Francais* or Guesdists in connection with the *Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire*, led by Vailliant, and the other by the old *Comite General*, containing representatives from all the organizations except the Guesdists. These two plans differ only in minor details of organization and government, and both declare for organization of the proletariat as a class into an uncompromising political party, using almost exactly the same words. Under these circumstances it is difficult to see how the divisions that have hitherto exhausted the French comrades can longer endure.

An interesting item in *Le Socialiste* tells of the recent Socialist

Congress held in the French colonies in the West Indian Islands. It was reported that receipts and membership had more than doubled during the past year. There was also a report of an active movement among women socialists. Several municipalities are in the hands of the party and a committee was appointed to determine a municipal program in accord with the one of the Parti Ouvrier, of France, with whom the West Indian French socialists are affiliated. Two delegates were appointed to go to Paris, one of whom, Ceran Tharthan, is one of the strongest figures in the international socialist movement. He was the founder of the socialist party in Guadeloupe and was elected a municipal councillor in 1897. Since that time a campaign of reaction and persecution against the socialists has been conducted by the French government and he has been repeatedly imprisoned. At one time while he was mayor he attempted to prevent a wholesale election fraud, but was himself instead arrested and thrown into jail, and condemned to six months' imprisonment and a fine of 500 francs. Meanwhile the actual criminals were set free. Tharthan has now gone to France, where, with the assistance of the French socialists, he hopes to force the French government to right the wrongs inflicted upon him and his comrades.

Millerand has just introduced a bill into the Chamber of Deputies providing for compulsory arbitration. The bill is very elaborate and provides for the election by ballot of representatives to an arbitration council, and also arranges that no strike can be declared except it has been voted for in secret ballot and carried by a majority of the men concerned. This vote must be repeated every eleven days during the strike. The bill is only to apply to establishments having over 500 employes. The bill is meeting with considerable opposition among the socialists, as well as from the large capitalists.

Emile Zola is about to publish the second of his four "Evangiles." The first of these was "Fecondite" (Fruitfulness), and dealt with the population question. The second one is entitled "Labor," and is to deal with the social organization of the future.

* * *

GERMANY.

The two most significant events of the past month in the German socialist movement were the speeches of Bebel on the Chinese question and of Auer on the subject of the Bueck-Posadowsky letter. The speech of Bebel constitutes perhaps the greatest document yet issued on the Chinese question. With a wealth of detail he pointed out how the whole history of China with the outer world had been a story of criminal aggression on the part of the

capitalist powers involved. He quoted from the letters from German soldiers in China that the *Vorwaerts* is now publishing each day, and that are creating such a sensation, detailing the outrages committed by the present allied forces. He called attention in a most dramatic manner to the famous "no quarter" speech of the German emperor, and in general so routed the defenders of the government that they took an entire week in which to reply to him. The occasion of Auer's speech was the writing of a letter by a high state official to a German capitalist asking him for campaign funds to assist in getting the notorious "Penitentiary Bill," forbidding laborers to organize under pain of imprisonment, through the Reichstag. Com. Auer seized the occasion to point out the fact that capitalist governments are simply committees to carry out the will of the capitalist class, and made a speech that will constitute a powerful means of propaganda.

In the first ballot for the Wurtemberg Lantag the socialists succeeded in electing two members and will have the right to contest ten seats in the final ballot, of which they are certain of carrying two more. They had but one representative in the previous house. Four socialists were elected to the municipal council of Dessau with an increased vote. On the second ballot the socialists succeeded in electing Com. Quark to the municipal council of Frankfort on the Main. This is the first socialist ever elected to this body.

The socialist members of the municipal council of Offenbach have recently established a municipal drug store and arranged for the free service of competent mid-wives, while a measure has been introduced providing that the city shall purchase the coal needed by its citizens and deliver the same at cost.

* * *

AUSTRIA.

In Marburg ten socialists were elected to the council in the recent municipal elections, and in Graz the socialist members of the council were increased from one to seven, with four seats to be contested on a second ballot, of which the socialists feel sure of gaining three.

* * *

ITALY.

A governmental commission is now engaged in trying to "whitewash" the work of the Neapolitan boss, Casalle, whose exposure by the socialists was described in our last number. It

has been proven that he was the head of a band of secret political assassins, the Camorra, who, in Northern Italy, act much the same part as the Mafia in the South. High officials in the national government are involved, and the administration is bending every energy to break the influence the exposure is having in favor of socialism.

* * *

HOLLAND.

In the discussion during the last month upon the conditions of suffrage, Herr Kerdyk, the leader of the Free Thinkers Party in the parliament, declared that from now on he should ally himself with the socialists in their struggle for universal suffrage.



THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes

It is daily becoming more generally believed that another great strike is coming in the spring. The United Mine Workers are becoming too powerful, and the operators fear that their class interests will be disturbed by the organization. Contracts and agreements for the year end the first of April, and a pessimistic view is being taken of the future by many of the workers regarding renewals of agreements on present or better terms. It is all but certain that the anthracite miners will have to make their fight over again, and the chances are that diggers in bituminous fields will also be forced to go out. J. Pierpont Morgan, the king bee of the hard coal field, is organizing his forces, and where independent concerns cannot be controlled they are bought outright. Thus Morgan and his friends purchased the Pennsylvania Coal Co., in the scheme to perfect an air-tight anthracite trust, and paid \$276 for shares having face value of \$50, or \$226 bonus per share for labor power applied to land. It is stated that the Pennsylvania Co. stockholders, when bought out, also divided \$10,000,000 accumulated surplus—\$100 per share, or 200 per cent—among themselves. And yet less than two months ago these magnates claimed they were being “ruined.” Other coal and railway companies in the anthracite and bituminous fields are being quietly absorbed. “I realize we are up against a hard proposition,” said one of the miners’ officials, who was active in the Pennsylvania strike, to the writer recently. “The bosses are going to make a stand from present appearances, and, as there will be no important political campaign on next year, we will not have the support of certain interests that were so solicitous for our welfare last fall. Our main dependence will be in holding our people together if the fight comes, and in receiving aid from our fellow-workers, for, God knows, the miners are not able to accumulate much of a strike fund from the small wages that they average. Of course, we will also have the sympathy of the public on our side, but unless that takes some substantial form it does not amount to very much.”

The big strike of iron workers at Mingo Junction, Ohio, is off after many months of hard fighting. As at other points, the men

were compelled to accept a reduction averaging about 28 per cent. This unexpected reduction in the iron industry throughout the country, immediately following the "fool dinner pail" campaign, has created an upheaval in organized circles, and the air is rife with secession talk. In Pennsylvania there is especially bitter talk among the workers and disorganization is following.

Eastern railways are experimenting with an invention to increase the power of steam. It is claimed that trains will be run from New York to Buffalo without taking on coal or water by the new system, and that the saving will be immense. The demand for cheaper locomotive power is encouraging hundreds of inventors to exploit various theories. One of the latest schemes is to harness the ocean. The National Sea Power Co. has been incorporated in New Jersey, and the purpose of the concern is to "own wave motors and to operate wave motors by ocean power," to build and operate all sorts of machinery, to gather from the sea power "by which machinery, railroad cars, or any other apparatus can be moved or operated." The idea of utilizing the waves of the ocean is not a new one, and the probability of transmitting electricity over long distances is by no means a dream.

Mining machinery continues to steadily encroach upon the pick miners. Last year fully 25 per cent more coal was mined by machinery than in the year previous, and operators declare that this year the showing will be still better.

Martin Irons died in Texas recently in poverty. He will be remembered as the chief official in the big Southwestern railway strike, when the K. of L. was in its prime, and when Jay Gould and several of the then large magnates made up their minds to smash the noble order, just as they later destroyed the A. R. U., when it became a menace, and just as they will attempt to do the same thing to other organizations in the future when their interests are even only slightly jeopardized.

Just after the Supreme Court of Ohio decided that the miners' anti-screen law was unconstitutional, along comes the Illinois Supreme Court and picks up the law to protect wage-workers from discharge for belonging to labor organizations and dashes it to smithereens, declaring that it is "special legislation" and gives some employers undue advantages over others. More good union

money gone—spent in lobbying for laws with which capitalistic judges may amuse themselves. And while the Illinois court followed the Ohio court in pitching brickbats at our unions, the leadership was reversed on another important matter, i. e., no sooner had the Illinois court given the State anti-trust law its quietus, by deciding that trusts are not illegal institutions, thus setting all the corporation lawyers and their corpulent employers dancing for joy, than the Ohio court decides that the Standard Oil octopus, after seven years of open defiance, bribery and boodling, is not guilty of contempt of court, and Attorney-General Sheets throws in a Christmas present by declaring that the trusts cannot be prosecuted because of "insufficient evidence," and, anyhow, they are really not trusts, but merely large corporations, and, therefore, not illegal! Let those who voted the ticket of one or the other of the old parties, with the expectation that the trusts would be wiped off the earth instantler and the workingman made happy by favorable legislation and consideration at the hands of courts, view this contrast.

In the month of November the total capital incorporation amounted to \$148,150,000, bringing the grand total for eleven months in the year up to \$2,217,550,000. Nearly twice as much capital was incorporated in West Virginia as in New Jersey. Since the publication of the former figures it is announced that the independent telephone and cable companies are being merged into a \$50,000,000 trust, that British capitalists absorbed the Cramps' shipyards and organized a \$20,000,000 shipbuilding trust, that a \$25,000,000 Carolina pine trust is being formed, and that Rockefeller's copper interests are to be combined with independent concerns and a huge trust to be launched.

The big molders' strike in Cleveland continues, and the foundrymen of the nation and the journeymen in the local unions are aiding their respective sides with all the moral and financial aid possible. The Chicago building trades struggle also continues, and both sides are straining every nerve to secure temporary advantages. The New York cigarmakers are winning their strikes, as several more firms yielded during the past month.

The cotton mill operators of North Carolina have won their lockout, and 5,000 men, women and children are driven back to work, while their officers and all active agitators are blacklisted and driven from the State. The cause of the strike was the quiet attempt of the operatives to organize for the purpose of securing

the abatement of intolerable conditions. Men were bullied, women insulted, and in some instances even robbed of their virtue by disreputable overseers, and children were flogged and overworked. The bosses understood the situation, but when the employes in one mill in Burlington demanded the discharge of a particularly obnoxious overseer, the former quickly combined and locked out the workers, evicted them from the company houses, and actually starved them into submission. It is hardly probable that any reforms will be inaugurated. Russia can boast of no more slavish conditions than the "red shirt," disfranchising, Bourbon State of North Carolina.

The "free" silver smelters of Colorado are reported as having given their employes notice of a New Year's present in the shape of a reduction of 75 cents to \$1.00 a day. The workers declare they will not submit, as the price of necessities of life have been and are still raising. On the other hand, it is announced in Wall street that several large independent concerns will be taken into the silver smelters' trust, and after the reorganization the price of silver will be advanced. It's 16 to 1 that the capitalists will come out on top, no matter which game they play.

A bolt occurred in the convention of the Ohio Federation of Labor last month. The seceders claim that Republican officials control the body and that they will perfect a new organization. Trouble has been brewing for some time, and the split came when the printers attempted to secure the adoption of a resolution condemning the State administration for patronizing notorious non-union printing firms.

Another batch of new Social Democratic papers: Idaho Area, Stuart, Idaho, formerly Democratic; New Era, Sargent, Neb., formerly fusion; Workers' Gazette, Omaha; New Dispensation, Springfield, Mass.; Justice, Evansville, Ind.; The Propagandist, Central City, Col.

Forty large brickyards in New England States will be combined with the New York brick trust, operating thirty-five plants, controlled by Standard Oil capital. Small yards will be closed and prices will be raised.

A machine has been given a successful trial in a plant at Hartford City, Ind., which, it is claimed, will displace all boys engaged in shuttling molds in bottle factories.

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

Professor George D. Herron

I.

THE word religion, when hunted back to its source, means relations. In its genesis, before it becomes official and authoritative, every religion is the search of some man or men for more harmonious relations with our human environment. To find out what sort of a universe we live in and effect a mutual adaptation between ourselves and it,—to learn just what facts and forces we have to deal with and then work with them,—this is the hidden meaning of all religions, no matter how ignorant or tyrannical their historical development. And the world will never be without a religion; for, in its last analysis, religion is simply a science of life, a finding out how to live. Life cannot get on without religion; that is, it cannot get on without self-knowledge. To say that life depends upon religion is merely to say that the quality of life depends upon the quality of our knowledge of life. To live at all, in any worthwhile sense, is to be religious.

II.

If we had a real science of society, we should have therein a statement of religion. But we have not; there is yet no sociology worthy of the name, or deserving of man's intellectual or moral respect. We have a lot of academic jargon, wrought out upon foundations capitalized by the existing society, but no honest or intellectual account of what society is, or of what it ought to be. We can expect a free science and a free religion, and a free art and free literature as well, only when we have a free society. For the noblest thinker is more or less directed by the economic sources from which he draws his sustenance.

III.

Socialism will have a religious outcome, depend upon that. Socialists cannot prevent it, nor can any materialistic philosophy. Indeed, materialism is but the recrumpled soil from which a nobler and honester spirituality is yet to spring. I do not mean that socialism will take on a religion; that would be fatal. Nor do I mean that it will become religious, in the usual

sense of that word. I mean that it will generate a religion from within itself. In its essence, socialism is a religion, with a very pronounced faith. Elementally, it is identical with the idea and faith which Jesus proclaimed—not the church. That is, it believes that co-operation, fellowship, brotherhood, mutuality of interest and responsibility, freedom and friendship as social order, to be more practicable and trustworthy in world-organization and administration than competition, economic and social enmity, and the struggle of each man for himself. Precisely this is involved in what Jesus meant by the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of the universally good, although He spoke in oriental terms, and made no application of His idea to the problem of social organization. Not that Jesus was a socialist; that He was not, and it is wholly incorrect to call Him such. If we were obliged to catalogue Him by modern terms, we should have to call Him a communist-anarchist in His philosophy. But the elemental faith on which Jesus rested is identical with the elemental faith of socialism—one expressing that faith in terms of spiritual principle, and the other expressing it in terms of materialistic philosophy. Each expression comes to this: That a co-operative or harmonious organization of life is more practicable and liberating, more productive of the common good and of great individuality, than a competitive and individualistic organization. Jesus would call this the law of love. In modern economic terms, it is socialism. However widely apart their outlook and spiritual philosophy, Jesus and socialism affirm the same organizing life-principle. And that which Christ and socialism affirm, the institution of Christianity garbles or denies. What the church at best presents as a mongrel sentiment, socialism presents as a scientific fact.

IV.

The capitalistic society is ethically bankrupt. A large part of human activity is now without any guiding and liberating principle of conduct. Standards of moral value which served very well in the past, during the centuries when society was slowly emerging from slavery, are valueless and vicious now. Moralities of yesterday are immoral to-day, and destructive of the liberty and integrity of the soul. Some of the sternest virtues of the past are to-day prostituting and disintegrating to human life. We forget that there is no such a thing as a fixed ethic, but that human society must constantly enlarge its experience and thought of the good; constantly transvalue its spiritual values; constantly widen the sphere of individual choice. We see the approaching economic crisis of society, but do not so clearly see its nearing religious and ethical crisis—a crisis which will take the word of custom for nothing, but will examine clean to the roots every received notion of right and wrong.

We face the future with heaviness of spirit, and without faith or fervor, because we do not see that new standards and a new spirit are required to create a new order. We cannot win the battle for a free society with the ethics and weapons of a slave society. We cannot keep up our courage, and sing with the joy of battle, if we repeat the tactics and morals of the exhausted civilization from which we seek escape. We have ethics and religions that answered during the long evolution from slavery; but we have no religions or ethical synthesis fit for the inspiration and practice of free men. Unmindful of this, socialists themselves are constantly and vainly seeking to advance their cause by the most vicious capitalistic and ecclesiastical ethics of the system they seek to overthrow.

V.

Let us consider, for instance, our behavior in controversy. We must confess that we sometimes outdo our capitalistic enemy in the use of his evil weapons of attack and defense. One of these is intolerance. Now intolerance is a capitalistic habit of mind. It grows out of the evil notion that truth is the private property of vested interests, and that it is forged for their defense. The result is that nearly all so-called truth is subsidized truth. Religion, political economy, literature, education, all have to pay their tribute of blood money, and submit to the marks of ownership. The church, which not only depends upon the existing system, but is itself the private capitalization and monopolization of common spiritual rights, defends its spiritual and material possessions with an intolerance as militant as that of the monopolist of production and government. Indeed, religious intolerance is but the ecclesiastical form of a capitalistic habit of mind. All intolerance springs from the defense of some sort of possession resting upon doubtful foundations. Every expression of intolerance shows an unfaith or uneasiness about that which one attacks or defends. If one is absolutely sure of his ground, he can be boundlessly patient and tolerant towards those who stand upon some other ground. Truth is always weakened and obscured by intolerance. If we trust what we call truth, we will trust it to be its own best defense, and give our time to affirming it and making it clear. If socialism is to prove itself worthy of human confidence and support, it must carry on its propaganda in a spirit that will show forth the tolerance and patience, the sweetness and beauty, that belong to all real strength, and that will be the atmosphere of a free and noble society. If we as socialists undertake to succeed by the capitalist tactics and ethics of brute authority, of intolerance and word-slugging, of crushing out independence of thought and inquiry, then we shall fail, as we ought to fail; for we are then but capitalistic spirits

masquerading in socialistic clothes. And the people will not follow us; for they will not again be led out of one house of bondage merely to be driven into another.

VI.

We especially need a better ethic of controversy in its more personal aspects. Sometimes I think the capitalistic world is getting a little more civilized in this direction than the revolutionary world, though that is not saying much. In any case, there is nothing we stand in such sore and immediate need of, just now, as a little human decency in controversy. The habit of personally assaulting those who differ with us in opinion or tactics, whether they are among our own comrades, or the capitalist ranks, is not only brutal and indecent, but it is thoroughly capitalistic in spirit and method. Besides, it is the greatest enemy of socialism. We socialists ourselves, by the practice of this capitalistic method of personal attack, do more to drive people from socialism and to aid and comfort and uphold capitalism than the whole capitalist host of politicians, preachers and scribblers. If we wanted to deliberately create suspicion and distrust toward socialism we could do it in no surer way. If we wanted to be traitors we could find no more certain way of betraying and misrepresenting the socialist movement. How can we possibly win the people to our cause, if we present the spectacle of villifying each other, and settle our discussions by contests of word-slugging? How can we bring a man all the way to socialism, if, when we see him half the way, we immediately fall upon him with bludgeons of personal abuse, instead of rationally and tolerantly seeking to lead him the whole way? It is not our business to judge men personally, but to affirm and interpret principles. Socialists have no right to personally attack any man, whether he be in the capitalist or the socialist ranks. We only weaken our cause by so doing, and work disintegration in the socialist movement. We perpetuate the capitalist ethical system, and set at naught the whole spirit and purport of democracy. If we succeed, it must be by a spirit that promises liberty and fellowship to a world sick of abuse and strife, and brutality of spirit in the relations of men. "Does a man think he loses anything," asks Professor Sombart, "by conceding that his opponent is an honorable man, and by assuming that truth and honor will control the dealings of his adversary? I do not think so. The man who places himself really in the struggle, who sees that in all historic strife is the germ of whatever occurs, should be able to conduct this strife in a noble way, to respect his opponent as a man, and to attribute to him motives no less pure than his own."

VII.

Class struggle does not mean class hatred, or personal strife. It means the democratic solidarity of workers in a cause so just and noble, so confident of victory, that it will need no weapons of ethic or tactic from the enemy, in order to gain its great day. Rather, the socialist army can fight in the open, with the weapons of truth and justice only, and with the spirit of the new and better chivalry for which the world waits. Nor does the defense and advance of principle mean personal attack of any sort, whatsoever. Socialist ethics and tactics should rather demand the immediate, complete and final end of personal attack as a rational or worthy method of defense or progress. As an ethic or tactic, it is unsocialistic, undemocratic, irrational and destructive only to the cause that makes use of it. Above all others, socialists should give to the world the ethic and practice of a chivalrous and manly mode of propaganda. None can so consistently and effectually show forth the power and beauty of intellectual tolerance and democracy as those who stand for the co-operative commonwealth. None can so well afford to make clear that the defense and advance of principle is one thing, but personal attack and controversy quite an opposite thing. And by such an attitude, socialists will be kindling the purifying and enlightening altar-fires of the human religion that is to be.





BOOK REVIEWS



Only books touching some phase of social, educational, economic or political subjects will be noticed in this department, and publishers are invited to send such works to the editor.

Newest England. Henry Demarest Lloyd. Doubleday, Page & Co. Cloth, 380 pp.

Whatever one may think of the subject matter of this book, he cannot but admire its literary style. The author has taken what are practically the dry pages of blue books and made them throb with life and interest. So entrancing has he made this tale of facts and statistics that the reader clings to it when once begun as to a thrilling novel. And in this as well as many ways, "Newest England" is superior to some of the previous works by the same author, in that while it has all the charm of style and interest of his other writings it lacks the hyperbole and exaggerated form of speech which always served to fill the reader with a feeling of doubt as to the reliability of the facts presented. In the same way we do not have the same boundless adoration of all things New Zealand that is to be found in "A Country Without Strikes." It is admitted that there are many flies in the ointment. There is still suffering and unemployment; laborers are blacklisted and terrorized by their employers, and crime and poverty are not wholly banished. Just because of this the book as a whole is much more valuable than the first one named. And it must be said that the New Zealanders are doing many remarkable things in the realm of social and political affairs. They have broken up land speculation, done away with the contractor on all public works and permitted the men to be their own co-operative contractor: they have "quarantined their country against panics," made the state a gigantic loan and insurance agency and trust company, pensioned the "veterans of labor," and in general succeeded in averting many of the worst of the evils of capitalism. Whether they are now on the road toward a better organized society, and whether these movements will lead them into the "co-operative commonwealth" is another question, and one that the author does not attempt to answer. It would seem as if what had been done was to forfeit much of the economy of capitalism

in order to get the benefits of competition, and that this tends rather in the direction of the establishment of a sort of middle-class competitive paradise that would only be a sort of purgatory for the laborer in comparison with the capitalistic hell of other countries, but a long ways from the possible proletarian heaven of the co-operative commonwealth.

Plain Talk in Psalm and Fable. By Ernest Crosby. Small, Maynard & Co. 187 pp., \$1.50.

This is a book that will delight the heart of every revolutionist and lover of good literature. Written largely in the poetical style that Whitman and Edward Carpenter have already made familiar to the readers of revolutionary literature, it has a charm and a beauty all of its own. There is a thoroughness to its philosophy that sounds a clear note in the midst of a world of hollow shams. When he chooses to use the rhyme and rythm of conventional literature the author shows that he can wield it as well as the more untrammelled form in which his thought is generally cast. The socialist will find something to criticize in the philosophy that seems to underlie some of the poems. There is a tendency to follow Tolstoi, to whom the book is dedicated, into the darkness of reaction against all the good as well as the bad of modern society, while the influence of Henry George is seen in a tendency to lay all the blame for modern conditions upon the shoulders of the landlord. But one cannot argue with a poet nor look too close for logic in his lines, and the book is one that will live far into the time when the present revolution shall have come and gone. The author is certainly one of the prophets of to-day, and we agree with him that,

"Happy the land that knoweth its prophets before they die!
 Happy the land that doth not revile and persecute them during their lives!
 Was there ever such a land?
 We are still engaged in the ancient pastime—
 Building the monuments of the prophets of old,
 And casting stones at the seers whom we meet in the streets.
 In the world's market one dead prophet is worth a dozen of the living.
 Happy the land that knoweth its prophets before they die!"

China's Only Hope. By Viceroy Chang Chih-tung, translated by Samuel I. Woodbridge. Fleming H. Revell Company. 150 pp.

This is in many ways a remarkable book. Its author, contents and occasion of composition are all out of the ordinary, and

its reception in its native land was correspondingly great. It is stated that over one million copies were sold in China and that it was in no small degree responsible for the anti-foreign outbreak that led up to the present situation,—the “boxer” movement being a reaction against its influence. The book, while from the socialist standpoint extremely conservative, is from the orthodox Chinese position fundamentally revolutionary. It advocates the opening of China to Western influences while maintaining Confucianism, the reigning dynasty and the ancient classics. Whether the Viceroy really thought this furiously fomenting new wine of the West could really be contained in these extremely old bottles, or whether he was merely trying to keep his head on his shoulders while preaching his reforms, no one can say. He advocates the transformation of the system of education by the introduction of scientific subjects and then including these same subjects in the great so-called “civil service” examinations for official appointments. There is no doubt but what this constitutes the most powerful means with which to accomplish a sudden internal revolution ever known in any country, and could his ideas be carried out a few years would serve to make the Western learning penetrate to every corner of the Middle Kingdom. He urges that the Buddhist monks be disestablished and their lands confiscated to meet the expense of the new schools this plan will render necessary,—something that sounds very much like the procedure of the present capitalist class in their early days, save that their object was much less desirable. He strongly advocates the building of railways, foreign travel and the translation of books, and shrewdly suggests that advantage be at once taken of the similarity of the Chinese and Japanese languages and customs to first secure the knowledge already acquired by the latter for the benefit of China. He often makes mistakes of an obvious character in describing foreign institutions and customs and then again he gives expression to some very shrewd observations, as when he says: “If countries are equally matched, then international law is enforced; otherwise the law is inoperative. For what has international law to do with fighting issues when one country is strong and another weak?”

Commercialism and Child Labor. By the City of London Branch, I. L. P. 16 pp., one penny.

This is one of a series of short leaflets issued by this same branch and has very much valuable information concerning the extent of child labor in Great Britain, and suggests many improvements in existing legislation. It, however, contains nothing that could not be accepted by any bourgeois reformer and

would scarcely be called a socialist pamphlet outside of England.

The *Living Wage*, and *Real Socialism*, are two pamphlets by Robert Blatchford, published by the International Publishing Company at five cents each. The first of these shows the author at his worst and is principally rot, being based neither on socialism nor any known system of capitalist economics, while the second is an excellent little propaganda leaflet and one that deserves a wide sale. It fills that "long-felt want" which has so often been attempted,—the need of an elementary explanation, easily understood, of socialism. While there are some defects in the author's position, yet these are not of a nature to cause great injury and the charm of his style will lead on to further and more scientific socialist writings. Another pamphlet of the same price and size is "A Socialist's View of Religion and the Churches," by Tom Mann. This is a keen discussion in simple workingmen's language of the subject named and is an important addition to the stock of propaganda literature of American socialism.

Expansion Under New World Conditions. Rev. Josiah Strong. Baker & Taylor Company. Cloth, 310 pp., \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

Without any hesitation it should be said that every socialist should at once read and master this latest discussion of the most prominent phase of capitalist word politics. Beginning with the proof of the fact that American labor is the cheapest in the world, he goes on to show the burning need of world markets in which to dispose of the surplus labor extracted from that very cheap worker. On the first point he gives the following somewhat suggestive statistics: "Reducing all energy to a common standard, it is found that in the United States the productive energy of each inhabitant is 1,940 foot-tons daily, while in Europe it is only 990 foot-tons for each inhabitant. This means that the working power of 75,000,000 Americans is equal to that of 150,000,000 Europeans." He works out at considerable length the means by which the surplus labor-power of the capitalist are increased by increased hours of labor, although he neglects to give credit to Marx for the idea he is developing. "The profits are well established according to the tonnage put through. If the run is 600 tons per day the profits are \$5,000 per month. If the run is 900 tons per day, the profits are \$20,000 per month." But it is in his descriptions of the wonderful opportunities offered by the just developing trade of the Pacific that he waxes eloquent. The resources to be developed in the lands bordering this great high-

way of commerce and the conditions necessary to its development are most graphically set forth. "Since time became the measure of distance the Pacific has shrunk until now it is only one-half as large as the Mediterranean was in the days of classic Greece. For a 21-knot vessel can steam 10,000 miles, from Cape Horn to Yokahoma in twenty days, which is one-half the time it took the old Greek merchant or pirate to sail 2,000 miles from the Phenician coast to the Pillars of Hercules." He apparently adopts the materialistic interpretation of history in its entirety. "We are only beginning to appreciate that industry—the way in which people get their living—is the fundamental factor in civilization. . . . Different causes have had varying values in various stages of civilization, but there is one cause which is constant because there is one want which is absolutely universal. . . . and that is *something to eat.*" Yet after constructing his entire book on this hypothesis he has to sugar-coat it with a sort of *Deus ex machina* and talks of all this development occurring "notwithstanding human foresight" and in general using the antiquated "argument from design." So evidently is this in absolute contradiction with all else that he says that one almost wonders if the author is in earnest and really blind to these incongruities, or whether he is only dragging them in to help the bourgeois consciences of his readers.

The following books have also been received and where their importance demands will be reviewed at length in future numbers:

"Fruitfulness," Emile Zola, translated by Ernest Alfred Vizetelly; Doubleday, Page & Co.; cloth, 487 pp., \$2.00.

"The Story of Nineteenth Century Science," Henry Smith Williams; Harper & Brothers; cloth, 475 pp., \$2.50.

"The Real Chinese Question," Chester Holcombe; Dodd, Mead & Co.; cloth, 386 pp., \$1.50.

"The Ethics of Evolution," James Thompson Bixby; Small, Maynard & Co.; cloth, 315 pp., \$1.25.

"Our Nation's Need," J. A. Conwell; J. S. Oglive; cloth, 251 pp.

"Solaris Farm; A Story of the Twentieth Century," Milan C. Edson; published by the author at 1728 North Jersey avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

AMONG THE PERIODICALS

The World's Work, with only its second number yet published, has at once stepped into the very front rank of present-day

publications. Its department on "The March of Events" is certainly one of the best if not the best of the many attempts at summarizing current happenings. The article by Paul S. Reinsch on "Political Changes of the Century" is an historical sketch of the development of nationalism out of the Napoleonic era, the rise and fall of bourgeois liberalism, the origin and growth of the policy of expansion and present division between socialism and capitalism. But it is in the department "Among the World's Workers" that the socialist will find most of value. The sub-title of this gives an idea of its contents. It runs, "The Advance of American Commerce, Ship-building, Railway Consolidation, Financial Independence of Europe—The Movement of Prices—The Growth of Cities." Everything is treated with a masterly thoroughness and a clear-cut capitalist conception, that for him who can read it aright forms a wondrous picture of the continuous onward sweep of capitalism.

Articles of note in the current number of *The International Monthly* are "The International Position of Spain at the Close of the XIXth Century" by Arthur E. Houghton; "The Evolutionary Trend of German Literary Criticism," a masterly article by Prof. Kuno Franke, of Harvard University; and a most contemptible, but none the less interesting, article by Booker T. Washington on "The American Negro and His Economic Value," in which he carries his disgusting work of acting the decoy duck of capitalism to the extreme of demonstrating that his race have an economic value to their exploiters and oppressors.

The Annals of the American Academy contain one very important and valuable article,—"The Financial Aspects of the Trust Problem," by Edwin Sherwood Meade. In cold, pitiless analysis he sets forth the entire internal process of the formation of these gigantic concentrations. There is one phase which he points out that is particularly interesting. He shows that in the formation of the trust the owners of the original plants were paid with the preferred stock while the issues of common stock constituted simply an enormous mass of "gold bricks" to be disposed of on the unsuspecting lambs. He shows at great length the various ways in which this new South Sea bubble was floated. It is particularly interesting to note the classes who were caught. "Trust securities cannot be sold to the true investor." . . . "A minister or a merchant has a few thousands laid by, a woman has saved or inherited a small amount, a workman or a farmer has managed to scrape together a few dollars for a rainy day. . . . Their lives are hard, monotonous and infinitely barren. Before their eyes is constantly flaunted the seductive spectacle of leisure class consumption, spurring on their desires, which are certain in any event

to outrun their means. To such people the prospectus of a new enterprise is wonderfully attractive. In exchange for a few thousands it offers them a fortune. The offer dazzles them, Their desires benumb their small judgments. . . . The influence which can be exerted in favor of the new securities is something tremendous. There need be no direct solicitation; that would be undignified and might make trouble between friends if anything went wrong. . . . The underwriters and those who are interested in selling stock had only to let it be known that they considered the trust stock a 'good thing' to gather in the wool of the whole country. . . . The trust stock has now been put upon the market. . . . The firm owners, the underwriters and the promoters have the cash. The next thing in order is the payment of dividends. . . . Something has evidently gone wrong. . . . Not a single one of the combinations organized since 1898 has paid a good return on its capital stock. Out of seventy-eight combinations listed on the New York Stock Exchange there are only two whose common stock bears a price of over 50. Most of the others are worth less than 40. . . . Here is Empire Steel for which 3 is offered, U. S. Leather selling at 9, Natural Starch at 6, and Union Steel and Chain at 3. . . . It is the South Sea Company and the Louisiana bubble over again; the same prospectus, the same promises, the same pointing to the eminence of the promoters and their high character and financial standing. . . . So far as the preferred stock is concerned the result has borne out the representations. Preferred dividends have been earned and paid as promised. . . . The buyer of industrial common stock has been sacrificed on the altar of a new form of industrial organization. . . . The common stock, it is safe to say, will in the great majority of cases, be almost obliterated. . . . We should acquit the managers of any sinister designs on the common stock as stock. Their antagonism is only toward the holders thereof. If they were perfectly certain that the preferred dividends would be earned, and that something would always remain for the common, they would retain the common or buy it in after depressing its value. . . . The common stock buyer, at heavy cost to himself, has performed a most valuable service to the community in that he has paid off the mortgages on most of the plants, and has placed them in a condition where, with ordinary caution, they are safe from bankruptcy." These sentences, gleaned here and there through the fifty-nine pages of the article, give some idea of the valuable matter it contains for those who are looking for instances of the rapid wiping out of the small capitalist.



EDITORIAL



FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE MONTH

THERE has been a fairly regular and continuous increase in the prices of all the necessities of life during the past month as in the previous year. Trade journals and Dun's Review report an increase of from three to five per cent in all cotton goods and an average of two and a half cents each, wholesale, on boots and shoes during November and December. All kinds of meats have increased in price, pork having reached the highest price known for years. Eggs have also been at record-breaking prices, and the Philips corner in corn sent that commodity to an extraordinary height. Although fluctuations in other less essential lines have reduced the "index-number" indicating general prices, as computed by the Bureau of Economic Research somewhat below what it was a few months ago, yet it still indicates a general increase of prices of nearly 25 per cent during the eighteen months just past.

On the other hand, the Massachusetts Labor Bulletin, in a study of 72,704 of the most favored laborers belonging to unions in the skilled trades of that State, found an increase of wages during the three months ending November first (which were the months of the most rapid increase during the last year) of only a trifle over 4 per cent. Compilations from other sources show that the total increase of average wages during the past year has been from 3 to 5 per cent, which would mean a falling off in actual wages of nearly 20 per cent during this time of "unexampled prosperity." Furthermore, the papers in December have been filled with stories of widespread reductions in wages, now that election is over and laborers' votes are no more in demand.

The New York Bulletin of Labor Statistics for December, embracing 245,332 laborers, shows that the number of unemployed has increased, wages decreased and number of members of trades-unions fallen off in that state during the last three months. All these features were expressly noticeable toward the close of the quarter. Nearly all the trades show this falling

off and the report adds that "the gains are either small or else characterize trades in which the statistics are less trustworthy than the average."

This situation gives the American capitalist of to-day the cheapest labor on earth, because, while the American laborer receives a little higher nominal wage than those of other countries, he produces so much more that his relative share is much less. Says Josiah Strong, in his recent work on "Expansion," "The average American farm laborer produces four times as much of food products as the average European farm laborer. One American miner raises 400 tons of ore annually, the German 287, the English 285, and the French 210. * * * With the best tools, with the most scientific and ingenious machinery, with the most intelligent and nimble workmen, it becomes possible for us to pay higher wages and yet enjoy the advantage of the lowest labor cost." American capitalists are thus able to flood the markets of the world with the products of American laborers. German, French and English trade journals are now all complaining of a trade depression due to American competition. Many great British manufacturers are discussing the question of coming to America to share in the advantage of docile American labor.

This more thorough exploitation of American laborers is only allowed to benefit the large capitalists. The small producers are being crowded out with ever greater rapidity. Dun's Review for the month of November shows that there were 850 failures, with an average capitalization of \$14,471. As \$50,000 is the very lowest sum that can be considered effective business capital in this country to-day, it is evident that the real capitalist remains practically unscathed. The closer the figures are examined the more evident this becomes. Dividing the failures into those in trade and in manufacturing some idea is gained of the ravages of the department stores and the mail order houses. Leaving out two failures, one of \$2,000,000 in dry goods and the other of \$554,000 in liquors, and there are left for the month of November 614 failures among the trading class averaging \$2,513. That firms of this size are not even considered as constituent parts of the business world of to-day is shown by the fact that the journal publishing these comments as follows: "But legitimate business as a whole enjoyed a most satisfactory month." Poor little bourgeois, he is not even engaged in "legitimate business" if he cannot fail for more than a hundred thousand dollars. According to Bradstreets the first two weeks of December continue this tale in spite of "Christmas prosperity." In these two weeks there were 471 failures, of which not one reached \$100,000, while 416 were for \$5,000 or less. Here is a story of the slaughter of commercial innocents that should go far in convincing the small bourgeois that capitalist business is no longer "practicable" for them.

From New York, Philadelphia, Denver and San Francisco come simultaneous reports of "crusades" being waged against vice. These spasms come with about the same regularity and leave about the same results as new slang phrases, popular songs and the latest things in neckties. They are the climaxes in the great farce of enforcing capitalist morality. To be sure their uselessness is now so thoroughly recognized that even the newspapers that advocate them on the front page allow their humorists to make sport of them on the last page. Every one knows that with the approach of next season there will be more terrible exposures of what every one always knew existed; that the well-known fact will be once more discovered that the police are in league with the "criminals," and some sensational preacher will go slumming in company with the reporter for some yellow journal (who will see to it that the preacher's picture appears in the next morning's issue) and the "crusade" will be once more launched. Here and there will be found a bourgeois reformer who has sufficient intelligence to notice that it is only the vices of the poor that are to be reformed. It is the "policy shop" and not the board of trade that is to be closed up; it is the "all-night saloon" and not the all-night club that is to be suppressed; and it is the hold-up man and not the "promoter" that is to be captured. But when it comes to the so-called "social evil," which it is admitted is the one vice especially pretended to be attacked, the socialist is the only one who dares to speak a consistent word, because he alone approaches the subject in the light of the doctrine of the class struggle. He is the only one that dares to point out, not simply that the poor victims who are hounded from street to jail, and from foul dives to yet fouler police stations, in order that some notoriety-seeking reformer may pay off old political debts or create new capital, are the creatures of the capitalist system that is now persecuting them, but he also dares to call attention to the fact that prostitution itself is but the capitalistic form of the age-old tribute of virtue that the ruling classes have ever extorted from their slaves. So evident is this and so thoroughly "class conscious" are the would-be reformers that not one of these sanctimonious sensationalists has ever dared to suggest that the bourgeois men be proceeded against equally with the proletarian women. If this fact stood alone in the midst of our complex civilization with all others against it, it would still constitute an eternal and irrefutable proof of the philosophy of the class struggle.

Something over a year ago the teachers in the public schools of Chicago decided that the remuneration they were receiving for their services was altogether too small. As there was no doubt of the facts they had the "sympathy of the public" with

them at the start. So they formed a Teachers' Federation, which was much more dignified than a trade union, just the same as a "profession" is superior to a "trade" and a "position" many degrees higher than a "job." The Federation organized, asked for an increase of salary, and were met with much sympathy and encouragement but still less wages than heretofore. Mayor Harrison wrote them a very polite and encouraging note, expressing himself as being wholly in sympathy with their plans and painting some rather rosy pictures of how much it would mean to the city of Chicago and its schools and pupils if the teachers were only adequately paid. This was some time ago. The teachers began to ask annoying questions regarding the reasons why a great and wealthy city like Chicago could not afford to pay its teachers sufficient to enable them to live decently. Then they made the remarkable discovery, which almost every one has known all the time, that the wealthiest citizens of Chicago and the great corporations did not like to be bothered with such small matters as taxes and so had left their payment to the small bourgeoisie. But these latter are growing beautifully less each year and so the receipts from taxation were also diminishing. Hence the teachers set about it through their Federation to secure the taxation of this hitherto exempted property. The socialist will at once notice the line of evolution. Starting as a "pure and simple union" they were rapidly drifting into capitalist politics, and as the fight grew warmer, outlines of the class struggle began to appear. Then it was that things took another turn. The teachers secured a list of millions of dollars of property that was escaping taxation and demanded that it be placed upon the tax list. At once the attitude of the "friendly powers" underwent a change. Carter Harrison announced that he would "make it hot for any teacher that meddled too much with this taxation business." F. J. Loesch, trustee of the Board of Education, declared that the teachers had no business in politics and denounced the whole principle of a teachers' federation, declaring that "its purpose and action are destructive of discipline, good order and education." Whether any large number of the teachers will be intelligent enough to follow out the line of reasoning upon which they have entered and unite their energies with the whole great body of laborers in an effort to overthrow the capitalist domination against which they are now vainly battering their heads, it is too early to say, but the fact that it has been several times suggested that the Teachers' Federation secure a charter from the A. F. of L. and that a few were even bold enough to suggest a strike indicates that the crust of bourgeois teaching is being broken through here and there.