

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. V

MARCH, 1905

NO. 9

## Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.\*

**H**UMAN history is not only economic history, but also natural history. The economic history itself would not be possible without the foundation which is the special domain of natural history. The study of human evolution, therefore, requires an analysis of the biological development of mankind as well as of its economic development. From this point of view, man's development in society and his general position in the universe appear as parts of the entire world-process.

My method of investigation is that of historical materialism. Just as in the study of economics and politics we trace certain ideas, and their application in practice, back to economic facts, so in biology we trace certain ideas back to the material facts of the earth and of the rest of the universe. In this way, we obtain a universal key to the entire intellectual activity of mankind, and a sound basis for the solution of all the riddles of the universe.

I speak as a proletarian and a socialist. I make no pretense to be a scientist without class affiliation. There has never been any science which was not made possible, and which was not influenced, by the economic and class environment of the various scientists. I am, indeed, aware of the fact, that there are certain general facts in all sciences which apply to all mankind regardless of classes. But I am also aware of the other fact, that the concrete application of any general scientific truth to different historical conditions and men varies considerably, because abstract truths have a general applicability only under abstract conditions, but are more or less modified in the contact with concrete environments. I make this statement in order to anticipate the criticism that there can be no special science for the proletariat different from any other science. Of course, a propo-

\*A lecture delivered at the Institute of Social Studies, Chicago, Ill.

sition in Euclid is true, whether demonstrated by a proletarian or by a capitalist. But it is true in theory and in practice only so long as the practical application of the general conclusion of any Euclid proposition does not interfere with the interests of the ruling class. If it did and a proletarian mathematician were to argue that what is true for the capitalist class must also be true for the working class, the capitalist class would speedily reply that it was not at all a question of 'abstract truth, but of concrete power to demonstrate this truth.

Moreover, I am also aware that all my ideas are tinged by my past and present environment. I cannot speak, therefore, without showing in all I say, that I am a member of the class-conscious proletariat, a member of that part of the proletariat which has escaped from the spell of capitalist thought. I realize that a science, however true may be its theoretical conclusions, does not exist for that part of mankind who cannot apply its abstract truths in their practical life. The proletariat has no science unless science steps into its ranks or develops out of its very life, for the purpose of combining scientific theory with proletarian practice.

In this sense, then, I declare that my science is a proletarian science. Not that I do not appreciate what the bourgeois scientists of the past have accomplished, or what the bourgeois scientists of today are doing in the way of accumulating material for the storehouse of human knowledge. But proletarian science is the expression of the revolutionary fact that the proletariat has learned to think for itself, that it refuses to accept the teachings of members of other classes without critical reservation, that it prefers to think for itself in all other sciences as it does in economics and politics, that it interprets the facts of its terrestrial and cosmic environment as it sees them from its own standpoint.

Proletarian science is the Declaration of Independence of the proletarian mind from the control of the capitalist mind. And since the proletariat is historically the most revolutionary class in society, and the future man in embryo, proletarian science is the most revolutionary science and the embryo of the future world philosophy. If this science finds that its conclusions agree with those of the bourgeois scientists so much the better for their science. If the two do not agree, then let the best science win.

Since economic activity is based on biological necessities—primarily on food, clothing, and shelter—we must understand biological facts as well as sociological ones in order to obtain a full understanding of our nature and development. Bourgeois statistics tacitly acknowledge this by dwelling on biological facts, such as births, marriages, diseases, deaths, crime, prostitution.

But bourgeois scientists conveniently overlook the revolutionary suggestions which come from their tacit combination of sociology and biology.

The proletarian scientist, on the other hand, recognizes the vital connection between economic and biological facts. He understands that the very consciousness of his own class interests, and of the historical mission of the proletariat, is not only a sociological, but also a biological problem, and that his proletarian environment molds his physical qualities and brain processes differently from those of a prosperous and well-fed bourgeois living in a beautiful home and standing aloof from the uncouth impressions of a slum environment.

It is important to emphasize this, because attempts have been made by certain bourgeois scientists to justify the existence of different economic classes, and the rule of privileged masters, on the ground of biological evolution. But the formation of economic classes is not a biological necessity. It results originally from economic changes. The economic advantages then produce biological advantages, and the interaction of these two causes then continues to favor the economically ruling class, up to the time when excessive wealth leads to the atrophy of essential organs and functions, partly from disuse, partly from physical excesses.

In order to present the subject as a part of the entire world-process, and constantly keep in mind the universal application of our method, I shall discuss everything under the aspect of environment. We then see that the world process consists in a struggle of various parts of the universe against one another, and in the gradual ascendancy of certain parts over all the other parts of their environment. And since man is to us the most important part, we shall observe HIM in his struggle for the control of his environment.

"Definition is the rock upon which seventy-five per cent. of the system of isms fail to pass." Thus Mr. Mangasarian, a teacher of indefinite, but by no means undefinable ethics pretended to demolish a certain kind of socialism of his own construction which he did not define. Let us, then, above all start from a secure foundation by defining our terms, before entering into a discussion of man's conquest of his environment.

What do I mean by man? What do I mean by man's environment? In attempting to answer these questions, we must have a definite point of departure. The navigator who heads his vessel for the open sea, traces his first course on his chart from some lighthouse, cape, or other prominent and well-known point, the exact latitude and longitude of which are known. We, too, are setting out on a voyage into the open sea, the sea of un-

known ideas. Where is the first point from which we can take our departure?

Man is body, mind and soul, so we are told by those who claim to have received this revelation direct by wireless message from the unknown. But if we are trying to locate the exact bearings of either mind or soul, we soon discover that the experts disagree about the latitude and longitude of these two points. However it is generally admitted that the brain, the organ of the intellect, is their headquarters.

The human brain, then, is our point of departure. It is tangible and its location is fixed. About its internal processes, we need not trouble ourselves for the present, any more than the navigator requires a knowledge of the internal nature of the lighthouse from which he marks his first course. The brain and its location are definitely known quantities, definite enough to make good points of departure for our inquiry.

We know that this brain is a part of man's anatomy. It has for its immediate environment all the other parts of the body. It is, for instance, directly connected with the central nerve system, and through this system with the heart, the lungs, the liver, the stomach, with the muscles, the connective tissue, the bony skeleton, etc. The physical brain, and the other physical parts of the human body, constitute the individual man with whom I am here dealing. And this individual and all his fellow-men, are the collective man whose conquest of his environment I undertake to study. Only this physical man and no other.

Now, what is the environment which this physical man is to conquer? In explaining this I must mention a few things which may seem trivial. But there is nothing that is trivial in this study except the things which science cannot grasp by inductive and analytical methods. The most trivial things in the environment of man have a greater influence than most of us realize.

Man's environment, then, consists of the clothes that cover his skin. The house in which he lives and its furniture and fittings. The food that sustains him. The other men, women and children that live around him. Further, the village, town or city where his house stands, and all the inhabitants and their houses in the same locality. Then the county, state, nation, with their entire population, their social organization, their historical conditions. Furthermore, the air which man requires for breathing, the climatic conditions of his locality. the soil, grass, flowers, trees, animals, springs, lakes, rivers, seas, mountains, not only those near him, but on the entire surface of the globe; the cosmic conditions immediately surrounding this globe; then the moon, the planets, the sun, the fixed stars, the Milky Way, the comets, and all the rest of

the universe, whether he perceives it or not. All these things, always considered as physical things, form the environment of the physical brain.

On the other hand, my brain is a part of the environment of any or all these things. Each part belongs to the environment of all the other parts of the universe, and neither would be just what it is without all the others.

But, some one may say, mind and soul and all the rest of the unknown things of the world are also parts of the universal environment of our brain. True, even if mind and soul were but imaginary terms, they would still be parts of our brain's environment. But so are the unknown quantities  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  parts of the environment of some algebraic formula. And in attempting to find the value of the unknown quantities of any algebraic formula I must rely on the known quantities for a solution of the problem. And frequently it is found in the process of the solution that one or all of the unknown quantities are equal to zero. It is not at all improbable that in solving the equation of man and his environment I may find that the so-called mind and soul, as currently conceived, spell zero.

At all events, in the attempt of solving my equation of man and his environment I must operate with the quantities which are known. And if I use the terms mind and soul occasionally I refer to them simply as brain activities, identical so far as our discussion is concerned with any other brain activity connected with thought. Whether mind and soul are anything else but brain activities we shall be better able to tell at the end of our journey.

With man's material brain for a starting point we now set out on our discussion of the evolution of theories of evolution.

Three great riddles have from time immemorial puzzled this brain. These riddles are the origin of the universe, the origin of life, and the origin of man. And the solution of these riddles is supposed to answer the questions: What will be the fate of the universe? What part is death playing in relation to life? Does individual life imply individual immortality? And the efforts made in the ages past to solve these problems constitute the essence of all theories of evolution.

Evolution means development. It is frequently understood to signify development in a forward direction, progressive advance in a straight line. But the movement of universal evolution does not proceed by uninterrupted steps of all forms of matter. It is rather made up of advance and retreat. At any stage of the world-process, certain parts of the universe are on the upward grade of their career, while others are on the downward grade. But out of the general interaction of the sum of for-

ward and backward movements, there seems to develop a gradual supremacy of one part of the universe over another, so that things which were the controlling element at one epoch are gradually superseded by others, until the concentration of the control of the entire process by one factor changes the anarchic interaction of apparently aimless elements into a consciously directed and organized movement toward a preconceived aim.

This interaction of two movements, of progress and reaction, pervades every particle of the universe. It is going on in conglomerations of masses as well as in the most minute particle. Is it a wonder, then, that the same fluctuations are also observed in the ideas of mankind, as we find them registered in the pages of history?

Birth, growth, decay, and death, are the great stages in the existence of all things of this world. This observation was the basis for the early ideas on transformation. But these ideas were vague and crude, as vague as the natural history and as crude as the tools of early man. A glance at the maps of ancient Greek and Roman geographers shows that their knowledge of the surface of this globe was very limited. Astronomy was then still in its swaddling clothes. Its scientific instruments consisted of sand glasses, astrolabes, sun dials, and the like. General education did not exist. Means of communication and transportation were in an embryonic state. The intercourse between nations through navigation and commerce was never very extensive, even at the most flourishing period of ancient history, compared to modern standards. Men, animals, and plants, and their products, seemed to be the only things of a passing nature, while all other things seemed imperishable and eternal.

At this stage, the three great world problems could be answered only in a speculative way. Positive facts bearing on them had not yet been collected. And since man's thoughts were naturally centered on himself, nothing was more logical than that he should consider his temporal abode, the earth, as the center of the universe and himself as the center of all life. This earth was to him a flat disc, bounded on the West by the Pillars of Hercules (the Straits of Gibraltar), and later, with the extension of Phoenician commerce and the Roman empire, by the Atlantic Ocean; in the East by the fabulous Cathay (India), which was supposed to extend no farther than about the 75th degree of longitude east of Greenwich; on the North by the 55th degree of latitude; on the South by the Sahara desert. What lay beyond these boundaries was never heard of, except in fables and legends. To this primitive knowledge of the earth's surface corresponded the Ptolemaic system of the world, conceived toward the end of

the Grecian period by Ptolemy of Alexandria. The heavens, according to the current conceptions before him, were placed over the disc of the earth like a section of a hollow globe. The stars were fixed to this globe, or were steered across it by heavenly pilots, as were the sun and the moon. The origin of life and of the universe was darkly hinted at in mysterious legends or religious phantasies. The Grecian legends of gods and demi-gods, as well as the Buddhist legends, and later the German and Norse legends, reflect this stage of human philosophy. Man was dominated by mysterious forces, and his fate after death was as mysterious as the unknown forces themselves. Whatever men could not explain in their environment, they translated into objects of worship and awe. Ptolemy attempted a scientific solution of astronomical problems, and did remarkable work for his time, the period following the death of Alexander the Great. But historical conditions were against him.

When familiarity with iron, bronze, and wood work led to a perfection of tools and to a greater division of labor, when the ancient gentile groups with their simple blood relationships were undermined by these economic changes, when local division and property distinctions appeared in the place of the fraternal relations of the former members of a tribe, when the means of life became abundant and a class of leisure freemen thrived on the shoulders of a working population composed of slaves, then the study of world problems entered a new stage. The evolution of the tools profoundly influenced the evolution of man's ideas, in those primordial days as well as ever after.

We then find growing up, simultaneously with the gradual disintegration of the old faiths, schools of thinkers who base their ideas on a closer observation of tangible facts. The correctness of the current conception of the world is then doubted. With the growing tendency to solve the riddles of the universe by inductive methods and experienced facts, there also develops a critique of human relationships, a probing into the meaning of right and wrong, good and bad. When polytheism becomes pantheism, materialism meets idealism on the field of thought. And this growing materialism is but the first faint reflex of a class struggle in ancient society. And all philosophies of the world, no less than all sciences, have ever worn the imprint of this struggle. It is seen in the writings of Confucius. It cries out from the mouths of the Jewish prophets. And it has left its mark on the philosophies of ancient Greece and Rome.

In ancient Greece, it is the time from about 750 to 450 B. C., which gives expression in philosophy to the transition

from gentile brotherhood to early class rule. And among the materialist philosophers of those 300 years of primitive Grecian history, none are more interesting for the modern proletarian than Anaximander, Heraklitos, and Empedokles.

These philosophers were the first among ancient Greeks to seek for a natural explanation of the universe. Their philosophy was a natural philosophy and was logically limited by the scientific knowledge of their period. This knowledge, in its turn, was limited by the development of the tools and the corresponding process of production. With the tools of that period, and with slave labor for a basis of society, natural philosophy quickly found that its powers of perception were very limited. Hence none of the early Grecian philosophers could offer any other solution of the world problems than very daring hypotheses. It is characteristic of all these thinkers that they complain about the untrustworthiness of human sense perceptions.

Anaximander assumed that innumerable world bodies developed by the rotation of matter and by condensation of gaseous substances. The earth, according to him, came into existence in the same way. Thus he anticipated the nebular theory of Kant, who 2,400 years later, in 1755 A. D., published his "Natural History and Theory of Heaven." And Anaximander is not only the prophet of Kant and Laplace in cosmogony. We also find him hinting at biological ideas, which were later developed by Lamarck and Darwin. He asserts, for instance, that the first living beings of the earth were produced by the influence of the sun on water, and that animals and plants gradually evolved out of those primitive living forms. Man, according to him, developed out of fish-like animals.

About 100 years after Anaximander, similar thoughts were expressed by Heraklitos. He claimed that a continuous process of development pervaded the entire universe; that all forms were in constant flow, and that "struggle is the father of all things," thus expressing the idea of Darwin in regard to a struggle for existence.

A little later, Empedokles developed these ideas still more. In his didactic poem, he sings: "Long, long ago, whether boy or girl, I may have been in a flower, a bird, or a fish . . ." Hate and love were to him the two active principles which determined the evolution of all things. This is an embryonic conception of the subsequent theory of atomic interaction by attraction and repulsion. And it is remarkable that Empedokles believed in a development of all forms by purposeless interaction and thus indicated the problem, which Darwin solved in his "Origin of Species," the problem: How can pur-



poseful forms arise mechanically without the control of some universal guiding mind?

With the victorious conclusion of the Persian wars, the industries and wealth of Athens grew apace. With them grew also the distinction of classes and the intensity of the class struggles. The small property owners, representing the principles of "Democracy" (only among freemen, however), opposed the aristocratic tendencies of the wealthier freemen. And these struggles are reflected in the ideas of the sophists following those early natural philosophers, more especially in those of Demokritos, Epicurus, and their reactionary opponents, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.

In the ideas of Demokritos, the influence of the early materialist philosophers is still plainly visible. According to him, nothing exists but atoms and empty space. The atoms are infinite in number and in form. They are in constant motion, falling through space the faster the larger they are. In their fall, the larger atoms strike the smaller ones. These are thrown aside by the force of the contact and continue in their whirling motion, thus forming the beginning of the first globes by gathering other atoms in their revolutions. The atoms, according to Demokritos, do not experience any internal changes. They react upon one another only by pressure or shock. The soul of man is composed of fine, smooth atoms, similar to those of fire. These atoms penetrate the whole human body and produce the phenomena of life.

The theories of Demokritos contain in the germ all the fundamental principles of modern materialism. And just as he represented the evolutionary element in the society of Athens, so in later historical periods the revolutionary elements of society have always found in materialist science their strongest weapons, while reaction has ever relied upon idealist and metaphysical philosophies. And be it said at this point: It is not at all necessary that the individual idealist or metaphysical philosopher should have consciously aimed at reactionary political results by means of his philosophy. The mere presence of idealist and metaphysical ideas suffices to make them useful in the interest of reaction, whether the philosopher intends it or not.

Socrates, for instance, who developed out of the ranks of the sophists and opened the attack on them when the aristocratic counter-revolution in Athens grew apace, was not conscious of the fact that he was attacking the intellectual props of democracy by attacking the humanitarian and natural philosophy of the sophists. And while in his teachings, he ostensibly sought to reform the moral life of his countrymen by *true* science, he was in reality, by means of this meta-

physical conception of science, furnishing the aristocratic reaction with its intellectual weapons against the empirical science of Athenian democracy. But neither Socrates nor the sophists could get out of the vicious circle of their ideas, because both Athenian democracy and its aristocratic enemy were based on slave labor and sought to derive absolute concepts, true for all time, out of relative conditions which were based on a fundamentally unethical principle, slavery. The internal contradictions of this economic structure of democracy and aristocracy in Athens caused the downfall of both of them, and with them fell also the philosophies of their times.

So much is evident from the testimony of history. Whenever any proletarian movement attempted to steal the reactionary thunder of supernatural philosophies or religions, as the early Christian movement seems to have done, it fell so much the quicker under the blows of reaction, for it carried within itself the historical weakness of the ruling class mind. On the other hand, a rising class other than proletarian that takes recourse to materialism in its political struggle against a declining ruling class quickly drops materialism and espouses idealism, when materialism threatens to further the interests of the proletarian revolution. This is true, for instance, of the modern capitalist class. At the beginning of its struggle against feudal rule, it was compelled, by the historical connection of the medieval church with feudalism, and by the requirements of its own commercial interests, to call in the help of empirical science and materialist philosophy. But now that this same philosophy is becoming the weapon of the rising proletariat, capitalism once more allies itself with metaphysical philosophy and mystic religion. Materialism is the handmaid of revolution, and without it no proletarian movement complies with the historical requirements of its evolution.

The reactionary character of the anti-sophist philosophies became very plain in the further evolution of the followers of Socrates. While the Cynics and Cyreneans strayed into practical ethics and neglected the speculative side of the Socratic philosophy, Plato, and later on Aristotle, gave to this philosophy its typical character of speculative metaphysics. This philosophy marks the complete downfall of Athenian democracy, the failure of the early attempts at a materialist monism, and the temporary victory of the metaphysical conception of mind and of idealist dualism over empirical science. And the reactionary character of Plato's philosophy is stamped on every page of his utopian "Republic," which he intended to realize by the help of foreign tyrants without asking for the co-operation of his fellow-citizens. The

political pupils of Socrates went the whole length of their reactionary logic, and names like those of Xenophon and Alkibiades were execrated by the Athenian democracy, because their bearers allied themselves with feudal Sparta against the onward march of democratic industrialism.

Aristotle, in his works on natural history, was led back to nature. This contact with natural things compelled him to recognize, in his philosophy, the interaction of mind and matter. Therefore he sought to reconstruct the dualism of Plato, who had placed mind entirely outside of matter, by making mind the superior and essential principle of matter. In thus combining natural science and philosophy Aristotle became the *beau ideal* of all subsequent apostles of reaction, who are compelled, by the onward march of empirical science, to adjust their metaphysical beliefs to the facts of experience. The Platonic-Aristotelean philosophy, by its pseudo-scientific character, became the pet of the Constantinian reaction against proletarian Christianity and the legitimate boon companion of the scholastic thinkers of medieval feudalism.

With Epicurus, materialist monism made one last great effort to rehabilitate itself in the Grecian world. But at his period, this world was already in the final stages of disintegration, as a result of the conquests of Alexander the Great. Epicurus tried to represent the mind as a part of the atomic world, as a tangible object. Here we also find a first faint attempt to check the crude fatalism and predestinarian logic of Demokritos by giving to this materialist mind a limited scope of free will through the admission of the possibility of accident. While Demokritos believed in merely two primitive movements of his atoms, a falling and a rebounding motion, Epicurus introduced the idea of a deviation of the atoms from the straight line. But his philosophy, as well as that of all his predecessors, suffered from the insufficiency of empirical data for the substantiation of his theories. And with the dissolution of Grecian civilization, Grecian philosophy fell into the hands of men representing other classes and other environments. The result was an adaptation of Grecian philosophy to the requirements of these new men and conditions.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(To Be Continued)

## Socialism and the Negro.

By E. F. Andrews, of Montgomery, Ala.

THE sensible article on "Negro Locals," by Comrade Vidrine, in the "INTERNATIONAL" for January, emboldens me to touch upon a subject which I have heretofore thought it wise to avoid, inasmuch as it does not properly belong to the Socialist propaganda. Socialism is primarily an economic and industrial movement, the object of which is to secure to every man, white and black alike, economic justice and equality in the full enjoyment of the product of his labor. It has no direct concern with questions of social equality, whether between individuals or races. If I object to associating with a person because he has blue eyes or red hair, I may be acting foolishly, but nobody has a right to compel me to do otherwise so long as I accord my blue-eyed or red-headed brother the economic justice that Socialism claims for him. Similarly, if I object to consorting with a man because he has a black skin or a red skin or a dirty skin, nobody has a right to coerce me, so long as I leave him in undisturbed possession of the fruits of his labor. And by parity of reasoning, it seems to me that any interpretation of the national constitution of the Socialist Party which would make it infringe upon the right of every individual to choose his own company, by making a mixture of the races in the locals obligatory, would be as unsocialistic in principle as it would be disastrous in effect to the interests of the party in the South.

Socialism has made headway slowly in the Southern States, not because our people are lacking in intelligence to appreciate its claims, but because of the prevalence of conditions which have forced the whites into an iron-bound political solidarity that left no room for independent initiative and held it fast in blind allegiance to the only party which seemed to offer aid in a situation of peril so imminent as to thrust economic and industrial questions into the background. But the collapse of the old Democratic fetish in the last election has cleared the way for other gods. The farmers, left helpless by the downfall of their old political Baal, and their precious panacea of "restricting production having worked itself out to the logical absurdity of making themselves rich by burning their cotton, are running hither and thither, vainly inquiring "What shall we do to be saved?" Socialism alone can point out to them the true way of political salvation. There never was such an opportunity offered to any party for the success of its propaganda as is opened to the Socialist Party to the South today, and it would be the height of polit-

ical folly to choose such a moment for flaunting the red rag of "social equality" in its face; for nothing is more certain than that neither Socialism nor any other philosophy will ever make headway at the South which seems to carry with it the menace of a repetition of our terrible reconstruction experiences.

It is difficult for a Southerner to discuss the social phase of the race question intelligibly with our Northern comrades, on account of the difference in the point of view. When a Northern man talks about the negro, he too often means Booker Washington, or some other distinguished member of the race, who is perhaps the only negro that he knows anything about. When a Southerner talks on the same subject, he means some eight millions of more or less civilized people, belonging to a race in a stage of evolution so far removed from our own that for aught we can see at present, assimilation must be impossible for an indefinite period. Now, it would seem but reasonable to suppose that people who have lived in actual contact with eight million negroes all their lives are better qualified by experience to establish the social relations of the races on a satisfactory working basis, than those of our comrades whose ideas are influenced by what they have heard about some few exceptional negroes. It would be just as reasonable to attempt to measure the average white man by the standard of Shakespeare or Victor Hugo. It is not a question here of dealing with a few picked individuals of either race, but with the rank and file of several millions of ordinary human beings in widely different stages of evolution, and the feeling that induces two races so distinct to seek separate social relations is not a mere local or transient prejudice, but a biological fact as old as the first dawn of life. "Each to its kind," is a law of nature so rigidly adhered to throughout the whole scale of animate existence that it must have served some useful purpose in the scheme of evolution, and we have no reason to infer that it can be violated by us with impunity.

This social cleavage along the lines of ethnical cleavage is not necessarily an expression of antagonism or contempt on the part of the dominant race towards the people so segregated. The Jews, for instance, the most gifted race the world has ever known, are today, even in civilized countries, living in a state of more or less complete segregation from their gentile neighbors, and yet, whatever stupid and wicked prejudices may have led to this separation in the first place, no one will claim that there is, in any civilized community deserving the name, any vestige of ill-will between the two peoples. The Jew regards the descendants of his mediæval persecutors without bitterness, and certainly no modern man in his senses, least of all a Socialist, would dream of looking down on a race that has given to the world three such names as Moses, Jesus and Karl Marx. Such being

the case, we may regard the sentiment that still keeps Jew and Gentile two separate groups in civilized America, as an inherited survival from the ages of superstition. Now, if a purely psychological impression of this kind, which we know to have been artificially acquired within historic times, can be so persistent that generations have not been able to efface it, how can we expect to extinguish at will that inveterate biological law of like to like which nature herself has interposed between widely differing races, and without which the evolution of life as we now know it, would have been impossible?

The moral of all this is that the Socialist Party keep itself free from unnecessary complications with the race question and all other side issues that do not immediately concern it. Its duty to the negro is to insist that he gets full economic justice. If he prove as efficient a laborer as the white man, he will get under Socialism, the same reward; if he prefers to be idle and inefficient, he will get precisely the same treatment as the idle and inefficient of the white or any other race. But his social status is not a proper subject for legislation any more than it would be to legislate you or me, or our friends Tom, Dick, and Harry, into the society of the Astors and Vanderbilts by an act of congress—a step that would prove as little acceptable to you and me, no doubt, as to the Vanderbilts and Astors themselves. Matters of this kind can be settled only by the free will of the parties concerned, and so the question of mixed or separate organization for locals of different races should be left entirely to the option of the locals themselves. If a community in Wisconsin or Massachusetts desires to have a mixed local of whites and blacks, that is their affair; and if a community in Alabama or Louisiana prefers to have mixed locals, that also is their affair; and if a community, in Alabama or Louisiana prefers to have separate locals, that also is their affair, and nobody has a right to coerce them. If the national constitution should be held to take any other ground than this, it must be frankly admitted that the effect upon the prospects of Socialism in the South would be disastrous. As one who has long been working for the cause in this section, I will state that I have met with more opposition on this one point than all others. There is a fear—in many cases, a settled belief, that the Socialist Party stands committed to a repetition of the Republican blunders that have proved so fatal in the past, and it would greatly strengthen the hands of Southern workers if the National organization would convey some explicit assurance that it will not commit itself to anything so contrary to the principles of Socialism as would be an attempt to coerce the people of any race or section in matters that should be left to the social conveniences of the communities concerned.

*Montgomery, Ala.*

E. F. ANDREWS.

## Socialist Unity in France.

ONE of the most important fruits of the Amsterdam Congress is the unification of the Socialist parties and autonomous federations of France, now approaching consummation. It is interesting to note that the reasons stated for this unification by the Amsterdam Congress are as applicable to the United States as to France. The Amsterdam resolution said, that "in order to give the working class its full strength in its struggle against capitalism, it is indispensable that in every country, standing opposed to all bourgeois parties, there shall be only one Socialist party as there is only one proletariat." Any one who will read the industrial organization manifesto, recently issued from Chicago, and signed by many leading members of the Socialist party, and then read Daniel De Leon's "Burning Question of Trade Unionism," which may fairly be taken as stating the position of the Socialist Labor party on the same subject, will find it hard to believe that the chasm between the Socialist party and the Socialist Labor party is any wider than that which has hitherto yawned between the *Parti Socialiste de France* (Guesdists) and the *Parti Socialiste Francais* (Jauresists).

In *La Vie Socialiste* for January 5, 1905, Comrade Pierre Renandel gives the text of the declarations of all the various Socialist bodies adopted as a basis for the proposed union, and also the text of the proposed joint declaration drawn by a joint commission and submitted to the various organizations for ratification. Of the preliminary declarations, the only one of special interest to us is that of the *Parti Socialiste Francais*. It has been obvious all along that the rest of the French Socialists were ready to act together along the lines of revolutionary Marxian Socialism, but the opportunist, reform, fusion tendencies of Jaures and other deputies of the *Parti Socialiste Francais* have presented serious obstacles to Socialist solidarity. The declaration will show us how much the Jauresists have learned by bitter experience of ministerialism and opportunism, and how much they are ready to concede for the sake of unity of Socialist action. Here it is:

### *Declaration of the Parti Socialiste Francais.*

The *Parti Socialiste Francais* declares that it is ready to conclude with the *Parti Socialiste de France* (Guesdists), the *Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionnaire* (Allemanists), and the autonomous federations, a treaty of entire union, of complete fusion, of definitive unity.

The *Parti Socialiste Francais* intends to conform with the most entire good faith to the resolution of the Amsterdam Con-

gress relative to unity. It is thus that it has always observed the decisions of the General Congresses of the Socialist organizations of France and of the International Congresses as mandatory rules of action; that it has never, for its part, aggravated differences; that it has always regarded the cordial agreement and union of all Socialists as the most sacred of duties.

In giving importance to the immediate demands of the proletariat, in defending public liberties, the acquired rights of citizens and workingmen, the *Parti Socialiste Français* has never put means and tactics above principles, above the final goal and the future of the labor movement. Always, on the contrary, the *Parti Socialiste Français* has regarded party unity as a primordial necessity, as a principle which eliminates all divergence in action, which must be accepted as a measure of public safety.

The fact is that the unity of the proletariat results from the very evolution of modern society, from the increasing socialization of the means of production, from the class struggles which opposes the proletariat sometimes to a fraction only of the bourgeoisie, but more often to the whole capitalist class. This unity of the proletariat as a class implies a collective economic and political action, a mass mode of defense and aggression, it requires complete unity of organization.

The *Parti Socialiste Français* declares then that the unification of all the forces of the Socialist party in France may be accomplished with little delay, on the following bases:

First—The Socialist party is a class party. It has not for its object the reform of the present society; it proposes to itself on the contrary to socialize the means of production and exchange, to transform capitalist society, as rapidly as possible, into a collectivist or communist society. It organizes the workers for their emancipation and for the conquest of political power. Thus, by the goal which it pursues, the ideal at which it aimed, by the means which it employs, the Socialist party is not a party of reforms, but, in the exact sense of the word, a party of revolution.

No alliance is therefore possible between the Socialist party and any faction whatsoever of the capitalist class. If, under exceptional circumstances, coalition may appear necessary, the party will have to apply the resolution of the International Congress of Paris in 1900:

Resolutions—1. Alliances—The Congress reaffirms that the class struggle interdicts every species of alliance with any fraction whatever of the capitalist class.

"Though it is admitted indeed that exceptional circumstances render necessary, in places, conditions (it being clearly understood without confusion of programme or tactics), these coalitions, which the Party must strive to reduce to their minimum, until they shall be completely eliminated, can be tolerated only in so far as their necessity shall have been recognized by the local or national organization to which the groups engaged are responsible."

<sup>1</sup>This resolution was proposed in the Paris Congress by Jules Guesde.



Second—The (deputies) elected by the party form in Parliament a unique group, distinct from all the groups of the bourgeois parties. They must meet together and plan together, in order to realize, so far as possible, unanimity in voting and to inspire themselves, under all circumstances, with the principles of the party and the decisions of the Congresses (French and International).

The (deputies) elected by the party must refuse to the government all means which assure the domination of the bourgeoisie and maintain it in power. If certain budgets, as those for public instruction, for social assistance, for public productive services, are of particular interest to the proletariat, it is not the less true that these particular budgets have, as well as the others, a class character, and that the budget, in its entirety, is the affair and the instrument of the dominant class.

As a consequence, the (deputies) elected by the party will refuse to vote for the budget as a whole, for the war and naval budgets, for credits for colonial conquest and for secret appropriations.

The refusal to vote for the budget is especially a vote of opposition; yet it is rather a question of tactics than a question of principle. The general political situation, the reforms incorporated in the budget, if they assure to the proletariat decisive advantages for its organization and its development, may authorize exceptions. These exceptions can be admitted only when decided upon by a three-fourths majority of the parliamentary group.

For the party political and parliamentary action has not for its only object protestation and agitation, it must also preserve and extend the political liberties and rights of the workers, must accomplish by a constant and methodical effort reforms which ameliorate the conditions of existence, of struggle and of progress of the working class.

But the activity of the party cannot confine itself to the pursuit of reforms, even the most profound, of the economic and political organization of the workers. While putting forward the immediate interests of the proletariat, the party must always push its propaganda for the final goal of Socialism, the transformation of private property in the means of production and exchange, into social property, must constantly strive toward its ideal, not utopian, but real, since it results from the evolution of capitalist society itself.

Those elected by the party to Parliament, to the general and municipal councils, are placed under the control:

First, in the case of each person elected, of his Federation: second, in the case of the parliamentary group and the general the municipal councillors as a whole, of the Congress.

The Congress examines the report of the parliamentary group and of those elected in the departments and communes; to it belongs the general direction of the party.

The *Parti Socialiste Français* declares, moreover, that the delegation of the Left (a coalition of Jauresists and non-Socialist Radicals) has been, on its side, only a temporary practice, which has seemed to it to be useful and necessary in a given political situation; that, in fact, this delegation has ceased to function and will not be renewed; yet, in a political crisis which should threaten the interests of the proletariat, the Socialist party should not interdict itself from a momentary coalition against reaction.

Third—(This plank, devoted to the press, merely approves the resolution of the Congress of Paris in 1899.)

Fourth—The *Parti Socialiste Français* deems finally that it is indispensable to co-ordinate organization, propaganda and parliamentary action. For this reason it believes that it would not be well to exclude absolutely the parliamentary fraction, as such, from the general political direction. \* \* \* Nevertheless, the parliamentary fraction shall be represented in the deliberations of the Central Council only by a delegation, which cannot exceed the third of its members, and the third of the members of the Central Council.

Such are the necessary bases, according to the *Parti Socialiste Français* for the complete and definitive unification in the state, the department and the commune of all the Socialist forces.

It is most refreshing to read so clear a proletarian and revolutionary declaration as this from the French party, which is notorious for ministerialism and opportunism, and for its frequent coalitions with various bourgeois elements. If the Jauresists will live up to this declaration, French Socialist solidarity is assured. I confess the declaration would inspire me with greater confidence were it not for the phraseology in which it is couched. Such phrases as "the most sacred of duties" remind me unpleasantly of some of the masterpieces of some of our own Intellectuals and heaven-sent leaders.

The proposed declaration drawn by the joint commission, to be submitted to all the organizations for ratification follows:

#### *Project of a Declaration.*

The delegates of the French Socialist organizations: *Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionnaire*, *Parti Socialiste de France*, *Parti Socialiste Français*, the autonomous Federations of Bouches-du Rhone, of Bretagne, de l'Hévault, du Nord, de la Somme et de l'Yonne, empowered by their respective parties and their federations to bring about unity on the bases laid down by the International Congress of Amsterdam, declare that the action of the

unified party must be guided by the principles which have been established by the International Congresses, particularly the more recent, *i. e.*, those of Paris, in 1900, and of Amsterdam, in 1904.

"They hold that the divergent views and the differing interpretations of tactics which have manifested themselves up to the present time are due especially to circumstances peculiar to France and to the absence of a general organization.

"They affirm their common desire to found a class struggle party which, even though it utilizes to the profit of the workers the secondary conflicts of the possessing classes, or chances to combine accidentally its action with that of a political party in order to defend the rights and interests of the proletariat, remains always a party of fundamental and irreducible opposition to the whole of the bourgeois class and to the state which is its instrument.

"Consequently the delegates declare that their organizations are ready to co-operate immediately in this work of the unification of the Socialist forces on the following basis, fixed and accepted by a common agreement:

"First—The Socialist party is a class party, which has for its goal the socialization of the means of production and exchange; that is to say, the transformation of our capitalist society into a collectivist or communist society, and for its means the economic and political organization of the proletariat. By its goal, by its ideal, by the means which it makes use of, the Socialist party, while pursuing the immediate attainment of the reforms demanded by the working class, is not a party of reform, but a party of class struggle and revolution.

"Second—The (deputies) elected by the party to Parliament form a unique group standing, opposed to all the bourgeois political factions. The Socialist group in Parliament must refuse to the government all the means which assure the domination of the bourgeoisie and its maintenance in power; must refuse, consequently, military credits, credits for colonial conquest, secret appropriations and the budget as a whole.

"Even in case of exceptional circumstances, the deputies cannot bind the party without its assent.

"In Parliament the Socialist group must devote itself to the defense and the extension of the political liberties and rights of the workers, to the pursuit and realization of reforms which ameliorate the conditions of existence and of conflict of the working class.

"The deputies, like all elected by the party, must hold themselves at the disposition of the party for its activity in the country, its general propaganda for the organization of the proletariat and the final goal of Socialism.

"Third—The (official) elected is subject individually, just as every militant Socialist is, to the control of his federation.

"The whole number of those elected as a group are subject to the control of the central organism. To all cases the Congress judges sovereignty.

"Fourth—Freedom of discussion is complete in the press on all questions of doctrine and method; but concerning action all Socialist journals must conform strictly to the decisions of the Congress interpreted by the central organization of the party.

"The journals which are or shall become the property of the party, either as a whole or in the Federations, are or will be naturally placed under the control and inspiration of the permanent organism, established respectively by the party or the Federations.

"The journals, which, without being the property of the party, proclaim themselves Socialist, will have to conform strictly as regards action to the decisions of the Congress, interpreted by the federal or central organism of the party, and they will have to insert the official party communications.

"The central organism will have power to recall these journals to the observation of the policy of the party, and, if there is cause for it, to propose to the Congress to declare broken all relations between them and the party.

"Those elected to Parliament cannot individually be delegated to the central organism, but they will be represented there by a collective delegation equal to the tenth of the number of delegates, and which will not be in any case less than five.

"If there is an executive commission, they cannot form part of it.

"The Federation can send as official delegates to the central organism only militant members living within the limits of the Federation.

"Sixth—The party will take measures to assure, on the part of those elected by it, obedience to the Imperative Mandate. It will fix their obligatory assessment.

"Seventh—(This plank gives the basis of representation for the proposed Unity Congress. It is rather complicated, providing that the number of votes cast may increase the number of delegates to which the number of dues-payers would entitle a given organization.)"

The result of the vote of the various organizations on this declaration was to be announced by the International Bureau on the 13th of January. While the writer has not chanced to see this announcement, it is safe to assume that French Socialist unity on a most satisfactory basis is now an accomplished fact.

It is noteworthy that both of the declarations here translated

make the economic organization of the proletariat part and parcel of the business (one of "the means") of the Socialist party.

The example of our French comrades should inspire us in America with a determination to put an end to the scandal of the continued existence of two Socialist parties in America. The separate existence of the S. L. P. in the past may have (in the opinion of the writer, it has) served a useful purpose, but the day has surely now come when, in the words of the Amsterdam resolution, "it is indispensable that standing opposed to all bourgeois parties, there shall be only one Socialist party, as there is only one proletariat."

Comrades of the S. P. and of the S. L. P., be honest and candid. Is it not a fact that when you chance to meet one another, it is rather a matter of difficulty for you to rake up points on which you honestly differ today? Past quarrels are a matter of history; it is ours to live and work in the present and the future.

ROBERT RIVES LAMONTE.

## Religion of Science—Science of Religion.

FROM the point of view of to-day's civilzarian it is very desirable that all of us should be taught to regard life as a struggle for existence, and not for mind or manhood or social conscience and cosmic unity. And so long as we consent to limit life to a struggle for itself, we may be sure that the dark intellectuals will keep the majority of us in hopeless ignorance and indifference to the possible glories of the present world and its democracies, and we may be sure we shall be trained into the graves of untasted and unfinished lives by the sacrifice of man to a struggle among ourselves for the lowest standard of living, and for the insanity of seeing who shall resist least, give most and get nothing.

When live men are disputing what is best for them as men, live men should always be understood; just as in a conference of lawyers, clergy or doctors the men conferring begin with a professional status, they do not abdicate the diploma or the ordination and consent to remain struggling for the recognition of that status by virtue of which alone they are in conference. It is not sane and it is damnably wicked to hold a grown up world still in the struggle for physical existence. But this is the savage and amazing religion of bourgeoisie political economy with a dash of the athanasian creed in it, with the prayer books and churches handed down from past ages and man murder in their hearts, the creed of limitless giving inculcated to the people by parasitism, the creed of blood redemption, blood-shedding, blood thirstiness, more blood and more brutality. This is the religion which the requirements of the topmost class of world market merchants require today, and to this Bloodyard Kipling and William Booth respond; the one with a poetry and the other with a soldier sect all dripping red. These men stand, the two representative men of today, because they breathe in heaven through the nostrils of battle, and imperialism, and then exhale only heaven to the people keeping with much content the whole imperialism for themselves. No religion can be scientific by falling short of, or going beyond religious requirements. If religion is human it must stand for all that is human. If it falls short in its measures it falls short in its men; if it falls far in its measures it falls short of its men. In these respects the Bloodyard Kipling-Booth combination, in which the whole of the Christian churches are so admirably summarized, has come in response to the market, and they shall go out with the demand, leaving the bruised democracy the unquenchable question of the soul, to be settled by democracy only and by no other power; for there is no other soul but the soul of

democracy. And no class religions on earth can survive the states of fraud and force which nourished them apart from democracy. When they are all gone, like phantoms hideous of the night, humanity will remain and humanity will be its own religion.

The science of religion must be that of a great conservatism, its conservatism will be that of emotions, intentions and means to one end, the humanization of knowledge and of all social forces, a conservatism to this world and the life inhabiting it. The wild idealists may soar to imaginary regions but scientific religion will stay at home, considering only the affairs of man and his fellow creatures on the earth, a science of human utility and the involution of all things upon manhood. For a long time to come such a religion will consist of resistance and of giving. Of the religion of resistance I have written in a former issue of *THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW*. Concerning that of human giving, and its corollaries of receiving, the best thought of socialists is now called for. What we give we can know, what we receive will be quite as real, but not so necessary to know. The new and all self-conscious ego so made, will never be greatly concerned to define itself or its increases.

Granting "the cause" of religion to be found once and for all in the cause of the world's workers, socialism becomes, with all its developments, the religion of humanity; and the externalization of self's activities in this cause is to be forever the spiritual program of the religious man.

Labor is the ground and pillar of truth during the transitional period between false and true religion; and upon this cause must be expended all the giving power of the man who is to be sanctified and made part of the wholeness of humanity and of his universe.

Fellowship is the aim of all created things; and in them all, as well as in human beings, desire is the working power for its accomplishment. The trees are blindly stretching out their arms looking for other trees. The eyes and ears of all animals are their extensions, their outgoers and seekers outside for this thing of fellowship. The birds, the insects, the winds, the flowing waters are but couriers of fellowship, and all the sounds of nature are desire songs for fellowship. The intellect and the words of man are but instruments for its accomplishments, and money, though for a season it tends only to degrade and shatter the race by becoming an end in itself, is in its true self only the sacrament and vehicle of fellowship. Governments by which men are now forcibly yoked together in slavery or mastery is but the germ of a loyal hand grasp of communities in fellowship. Commerce, though now a despoiler, is but the opener of highways, and labor, though now only the despoiled, is to be the ligature of

human fellowship. And all the varieties of the so-called mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms are but the stepping points in the realization of cosmic fellowship. Religion, though it has hitherto, for the most part, been a divider and an assassin of commonality, has hitherto endured only by the fellowship of men which priestcraft has invoked for the benefit of priestcraft's masters. Yet the means so invoked shall survive the ends of its invocation and itself become the religion to which it has been forced to play the part of an auxiliary. The desire for fellowship, the great seed which initiates all life, is itself to be the last and best product of all life. Fellowship is the cause and effect of life. I will not strip myself of the universe, neither will I strip the universe of me, for I believe there is a whole universe, and an I; and that between these there is humanity, the wedding ring of Cosmos and me.

We are familiar with the devices of the mind by which each one investigator seeks to get out to the universe by logical structures of words by intellectual verbalisms, which we call laws of nature, laws which, whether invented by Aristotle or Darwin, have no such place in the universe as they have in the inventors' minds. Yet between us and nature they are thus far true that they bespeak a mutual approach, which is ever in activity between man and his universe; between universe and its man. The thing used, whether it be a balloon, a thermometer, a telescope, a quadrant, an acid or a syllogism, is a vehicle or motograph by which the traveler mind seeks a way out to its universe, and the effort is its science. I believe that humanized knowledge and effort constitute the science of religion; and that knowledge is scientific only so far as it is humanized. The way to get to science is through humanity and back. What other knowledge is there that is not waste of thought? What is science? What religion but that which serves the yet unserved humanity. Unserved humanity has been waiting for ages to be brought into spiritual intercourse with its wholeness, without which intercourse it is a cripple and even so Cosmos has been in the birth throes of struggling ages to be brought into spiritual acquaintance with all its persons without which it is a cripple. Each part and all the rest are in labor to take up the mind and impart the will of each to each. This is the burden and the satisfaction of all life; this is the true program of science, religion, monism.

Questioning the validity of the word program, as just used, may help me to better get in rapport with monism; which is about all I hope for, as I never expect to get Cosmos, with its humanly expressed monism so deftly at my finger tips as to, become a literary critic of all that is not monistic.

What is not monistic will be very hard for a monist to declare without setting a limit upon monism itself, so far as human



words may do that. Any limitation would obviously be that of the verbalists' own consciousness of monism. Out of the "all things" that work together as monism, how far goes our ability to observe and appreciate the monistic relation? And this answered gives the intellectual basis for the positive religion of the future. The thing for us to know and have is our part of the Cosmic urge. It is in human affairs or it is nowhere; to us as human beings it must be more in human affairs than anywhere. It is but scientific foppery to be "stuck" on Cosmic "processes" and "laws" that are not obviously relevant, or on the way to structure and use, in human affairs. Just as capitalism includes and uses for its own nourishment the activities of every man and body of men, whether we like it or not, whether we know it or not, for the nourishment of its own system; so monism includes all. But just as there is one thing which capitalism cannot include; that is, the desire, the protest, the resistance of its own begotten proletarian mind; so there is something which the sum of Cosmic and long historic human experience begets to work out its own progress of salvation, apparently and consciously apart, that something is Cosmos itself expressed in human desire for structure. The structural mind, the desire, will or spirit of man for sociality on the one hand, and the antagonism to what appears destructural on the other. This desire, the psychology which runs counter to undesirable conditions and is begotten of them, is the nemesis of capitalism and sure hope of the laboring class; it is a condition of the soil of the mind. Desire for structure takes in the greater part of all human activities. As an animal instinct it procreates the species; not that the instinct goes to bed with thoughts of structure, but of the many active desires into which the soul of structure runs. Some are so much more directly essential and justified to the whole race than others, that they become the elected and the delectable desires. Unconscious of their purpose, but because of the delight they have in their own function, these structural forces or instincts forming the subconscious energies of man are going on forever. Corresponding to them are all the armed defensive forces of fatherhood and motherhood set up against that which seems to them destructive of them and theirs. So far then as we carry a monistic program, it is the desire for all that pertains to and defends the structural life of man as a person or a society. I do not deny that these human dynamos may become subjects of logical statement and disquisition; but I have no doubt that the pen of the philosopher, the literary monist and critic plays a smaller part in monistic determinism than many things that look as insignificant as a lady's hair pin beside a gilded volume. The man who balances on his head a monistic philosophy like a ten-foot griddle had better let it drop and carry it home in pieces. Let us be content to do our end of the monistic relation, and as we

go we shall know. No true science is ever very much ahead of the times, and a monistic philosophy too much extended by the brain of a writer may easily stultify the man and not so easily help practical Socialism.

During the whole historic property period the private life has been opposed to the social so that there appears in the mind an antithesis between the whole and the part. This dual psychology of a prolonged crime has to be changed before philosophy can make monism all clear. Those who religiously skein the threads of science for human use, those who religiously will to know the universe, that knowing it, we may make things more effectually and consciously relateable to man; those who religiously ignore the vertebræ of science until they have found the human bread and butter of it; those who are resolute to decline and resolute to resist unsocial, nonstructural or neutral knowledge; those who enlist themselves to fight in the ranks of the present day proletarian class struggle, which has for its end the elimination of class conflicts in society over the possession of bread and wealth, such are the men who are doing the seasonable and, therefore, reasonable work of monistic philosophy. Until the struggling brain of the race is extricated from the debris of the class struggle, no great books can be written on this philosophy, but books on practical Socialism. The thing of interest and value in the two relations consists in knowing that there is and must be a continuous approaching, with effect, between the person and Cosmos, and between Cosmos and the person, and that there are ways of approach peculiar respectively to the greater and lesser lovers. The motographs of Cosmos and of the man may differ in form, while they are becoming similar. Whatsoever they be like their likeness is outlived and limited by their purpose in this—they are one religion. On man's side it is the science that enables a person to contain the world will; on the Cosmic side it is the science that enables nature to take up the person's wont and will. In accomplishing this the universe has acquired a habit or way of moving towards man which is its religion. This, as a whole, is not known to man, but its intent may be secretly known. Man, in the same journeying, consciously or unconsciously, has formed certain habits, ways and wills of thinking which, on the surface of them, may change often, but behind them there is being steadily formed the outlines of the best way, whose keeper is democracy. Behind in the deeper subconsciousness of the person there is humanity, wherein is being formed a permanent will, experience and habit of the best. Science stands for no other accuracy than its fitness to serve this purpose of mankind; it is an effort only put forth to humanize persons and their knowledge and their will. Is your science an effort to so accomplish? Is it a deliberate strain to humanize knowledge? Has it motive? Has it this motive?

If not, it is not science; it is not religion. Is it an endeavor to enclose nature and the larger life of humanity into, for the use and in behoof of every person? If so, it is science, it is religion; for science can surely be nothing else than the humanization of knowledge, and this can be no other than religion. The link between the person and Cosmos is humanity; the link between Cosmos and the person is humanity. There is no other way, oh, ye squirrels of the race; there are no parasitic holes for you in the walls of the human homestead; only as part of the human homestead itself can you think at all. Only thus can you learn to become humanity.

There is a man who thinks that the single mind is a foundation for science; that the personal mind has of itself all the required parts and fittings which is completeness put together; that if the instruments were as good as his mind, he could see all things by the complete single mind, that he could summon to his sight and service a complete science and a complete universe, and yet have not a care for man. But what is the single mind? Is it not a patchwork of other people's experiences? What is the human intellect? What but a number of vitally human points observed in others, and thus become common to many persons? What is the private understanding? A highway and a will acquired and trodden by many persons together. The best thought is a human contact. Next below that is the thought which is an effort after such contact, and next is that which shows the means of contact. This knowledge is science; the life ensuing is religion. Science first, because its means are practical humanic; and religion, because its facts are willed out and correlated for humanity. Thus in its last stage and in its intervening intent, true science is religion, and no part of true religion can be separated from this sort of science. The religion of earthly wings bound for somewhere superhuman is but a farce and a famine of the soul.

Not by piecing my own mind together, but by appreciating that which is largely vital in all other minds; not by drawing in diversities and harmonizing them with myself, but by going out to diversity and harmonizing myself together with them am I built up. For the true mind is outside; it is not personal, but human; it is the wedding ring of thought, which marries us all together. When the single mind has brought forth its form or expression of this unit of experience, it has but attained to one of the myriad blossomings of the experience it presumes to comprehend, and from the moment its blossom is finished it begins to cast off for a new and another flower. But the day approaches when the intellect of man shall no longer be a slave to its words; when it shall itself be the bloom of the whole man. Then will we be no longer under the necessity of modeling our snow flowers in the night, only to see them melt into the undefined and forgotten

with the sunshine experience of another day. When the intellect of man is a vital desire; when it is more than single mind, more than words, more than dead and doomed petals; when speech is the flexible and faithful expression of our feelings and will, the full weight symbol of our whole life story,—then the blossoms may not change so often, but shine out, illuminating the night with its white splendor as the Agave of many ages. Mind, emotion and world will shall then be one and one in every man. as each person receives he gives, as he is created from the historical and physical sources of experience he renders the essence of himself into that larger life of himself—humanity—and as he gives on the man side of his existence, he receives from nature. Nor am I presuming too much upon the dignity of man when I say that in the act of receiving from Cosmos he is no parasite, for there is no giver which does not get more, and the universe is enriched by the emotion of every man who kisses the grass.

Here, then, have we in sight two cables of the double circuit, whereby is led the mutually responsive life of man and nature, nature and man, *via* humanity.

There is to me a great, deep and lovely lake, of most fragrant essence, into which constantly trickles the last corrected and essential moment of each life. I think of it as a lake surrounded by the entire universe of time and space; I think of the glistening starlight of time and all the moon-bathed nights of the world that ever man or beast or flower saw or felt; I think of all the music thrills of great instrumental and natural concerts, of bird songs, of the love whispers of all times, of the lispings of baby lips just opening, of the scibbilant insects and the infinite music of rustling leaves; I think of the color glories, the rapture of sunsets, the tender heart-healing green of the springtimes, the mel-low, motherly hues of autumn, the white, waiting austerity of winter, the ravishing glories of all the royal and courtly birds; I think of the bloom of all the flowers that ever saluted the soul of man or paid solitary homage to their mother sun; I think of the various tones of heart-speaking voices, articulate and non-articulate; I think of all the various speech that never spoke to ears; I think of the grand procession of the seasons through times eternal and their responses all trickling down into the great reservoir of earth's elected essence, *humanity as a whole*. If you think of that whole thus accomplished, you will, like me, be feeling after the way of humanized knowledge.

I have said nothing of sorrow, of agony, of horror; I have said nothing of woeful heartaches and the shrieks of worlds wronged, of lacerated slaves under great avalanched rocks of mastership, of the many unconsecrated forces rolling down like bloody boulders; nothing of the soul-rending episodes of secret and open battle. Only here I suggest them because they, too,

for weal or woe, have been and must be found in the mixed chalice of humanity. Whatsoever I am is there; whatsoever all man have been is there and there is nothing, nothing, nothing lost. Now let us make this pictured summary of an eternity of cause and effects bound into life as it really is, and we see humanity, which you and I are feeding out of Cosmos; which is feeding you and me back again out of other selves of ours, and out of ourselves and back again out of a Cosmos, which means all of the feeders and all of the fed; the ever-moving whole.

Or will you have for a unit picture of this great humanity a great, round, lovely peach. You know what an organism for sipping flavors and colors and fragrances out of the sunbeams and the darkness; and the insipid things around it is this lovely peach. You know that nothing escapes it, and that it escapes nothing. And yet what a sweet summary it is of sour, clammy earths and gravels and all the things most dissimilar which surround it. It is no game of chance which is played by the myriad atoms on that surface of honey makers. It is not all out of the earth nor all out of the air that these cunning chemists make their sweetness and send it in and draw it out. And what that peach is to the tree and to the lips that taste it, humanity, as the resultant unit of common experience is to all nature and to me. But now you may say enough of metaphor, what is the practical message of all this to me? And your challenge is most lawful, for that which is not translatable into the very body, blood and bloom of man is not worthy of reading.

The only generally admissable formulæ for the control of human thought known to me is a simple, practical ethic of cause and effect, viz., *private cause, public effect; public cause, private effect*. Unconsciously, whether we will it or not, these two in alternate and succeeding continuous order is the history of everything personal and public which we do. And the business of the moral philosopher is to make that a matter of intention and will, which is anyhow a matter of destiny. Whatsoever a man or a community sows that shall men and communities reap. The public character and will is the combined result of each man's doing; the private character and will is the local result of the doings of the larger public units; the man is a state maker, the state is a man maker, and there are no other makers to be considered but these two; there is nothing else in process of formation by human and physical forces but man and state.

The state or nation for the time being is the practical objective upon which the man operates, just as the person is the practical objective upon which the state operates. If with a single eye upon their proper objectives these two perform their daily functions, the state shall at last form a will for the private life, and the person shall form a will for the public life. Behind the former

there shall abide that great spiritual reservoir, the unit of common experience, behind the latter that great spiritual reservoir, the altruistic will.

We have been much exercised in these, our juvenile days of moral thinking, by the apparent irreconcilability of selfishness and altruism, a difficulty which has arisen out of the unmanageably small ego which ages of private property have left us. But it was always easy for the single intellect to enlarge that self to the great advantage of self; it was intellectually easy, and it was practically easy.

First let us have integrity of faith that self and its preservation are sacred and right (and nothing but the perverse confusions of propertyism could ever have led mankind to think otherwise), and it only becomes a question as to the best method of self-preservation. During this present time man's willing mind—that is, his morals—is a hybrid of feudalism and the predatory anarchy of the jungle, both depraved by a ravenous disregard for aught but private property. To save self from the turbulent vicissitudes of such a reign of riot is impossible. There is no stability for any self, good or bad, to be found in a life whose energies are spent in dodging catastrophes. In such a world of violent negations the first thing to be done for the salvation of self is its formation.

Laying aside the property pack of cards in which the so-called self has been supposed to win out, one day king and the next day knave, the self is to be found outside of self; not in a pack of cards or in bundle of dollars, but in *a cause*. Be sure, oh, brother man, yourself is not enclosed by your possessions, but your cause. The shrine, the holiest shrine for your pilgrim feet and your pilgrim heart today is the cause, and if you are to save yourself and stand self-balanced forever with the unit of human life, you must take scrip and staff and scallop, or sword or ballot, and go forth to find yourself as it is most surely enshrined in some one cause, to-day, outside of you.

The process of translating yourself into a cause is both philosophically and administratively the most potent thing that you can do for and with yourself, specially is it most practical in an age of nebulous egos like our own.

A good example of the success of this method may be taken out of the history of the man called priest. First he has faith in the validity of himself. He erects his cause and believes it to be the pillar and the ground of truth in a world which can only live by truth. Putting himself forever aside, he devotes everything that he can cozen or control to a cause which calls the church, *and to that cause only*. He plays politics, he plays business, he plays war, he plays philanthropy in the ways peculiar to each nation, but only that he may render them all tributary to the

strengthening of that one cause which he believes to be in the last analysis the cause which will be practically found, and now does spiritually include them all. His present interest is logically to individualize everything else human and prevent formidable organizations until his cause is strong enough redemptively to enclose them all. His process is logical and humanly scientific, whatever we may think of his cause, and I think on the whole that mankind has gained more by the method than it has lost by the cause; and may yet gain still more by discarding the cause and faithfully pursuing the method.

In an age of nebulous egos, any well-formed film will gather and keep millions around it by mere virtue of its formation. This is a sure postulate in the science of structural humanics. The way to find self is to go outside—the way to keep it is to keep it in a cause outside; and the way to strengthen and establish it forever is to identify it with the largest cause.

Bearing in mind that nothing else in human life is so dominantly so fatefully true as cause and effect, and nothing else is in course of formation but ego and humanity—absolutely for this science nothing else—a man's energies should be directed above all to public human affairs, and to any and to every other so-called science, only as they are subsidiary to this.

Need I say that we have not far to look for the all inclusive cause—the cause of labor. Here self may find its roots and here out of this soil the superman shall bear his fruits at last. Labor is the present sacred conservator of all this; it is to yet generate the assured and unsullied self. Here into this chalice of history the essentials of all morality have been from everlasting distilling. Shut your eyes to the clamors of all politicians. Turn away from every other trail. Root and settle yourself deeply in the mother soil of labor. Follow the example of the church, and know no country, no cause, no righteousness but that of labor. Join yourself in life-long wedlock to this one only cause and you will save your selfishness and all that is worth saving for all other men in the world.

PETER E. BURROWES.

## The Miners' Strike in Germany.

THE strike of the coal miners in the Ruhr district, begun January 9, came to an end February 12. At one time during this period there were 200,000 miners not working. But the strike was in no way so general that all mining operations ceased in all the mines. In fact, the number of organized miners was so small in comparison with the unorganized mass, that the more far-seeing of the organized men warned their impetuous comrades not to precipitate the strike at this time. But the conditions had become so unbearable that the strike developed almost spontaneously and simultaneously in the entire district, even without being organized. It is little short of marvelous, and speaks volumes for the good nature of the working men, that there was very little friction between the organized and unorganized men, and that few of the unorganized went back to work after they had once joined the strikers.

It was a universally understood fact, which was commented upon even by fair-minded reporters of the capitalist press, that there was more discipline and good nature in districts under the control of socialists than in others. It was there, also, where the organized and unorganized workers were on the best of terms. On the other hand, the clerical papers sought to prevent a co-operation between the catholic unions and the socialist unions, and the liberal and radical bourgeois press tooted into the same horn and sought to divide the strikers by religious or sentimental ideas even while they were lined up against a common enemy.

In this strike, as in all others, the socialist press stood uncompromisingly on the side of the strikers and espoused their cause, and only theirs. And representatives of the German Social Democratic party in various municipalities moved that the public treasury grant assistance to the strikers. Wherever the socialist aldermen were in the majority money was voted to the strikers out of public funds. *Vorwärts* reports that the curator of the university of Bonn, who appealed to the public for funds to aid the strikers, was disciplined by the minister of public instruction for his humane action. The class character of the Prussian government showed itself in many ways. For instance, the strikers, as usual, were willing to arbitrate the matter. The mine owners insolently refused to negotiate with any representatives of the miners' organization. The emperor expressed his wish that the mine owners show a willingness to settle the difficulty amicably. With due regard for his fairness, the socialist press as well as the leaders



of the strikers nevertheless recognized that the emperor's wish to blind the workers as to the class character of his government had as much to do with his public expression of sympathy for the strikers as his desire to appear as a fair and unbiased ruler. Anyway, words are cheap and do not mean anything without deeds to back them up, as Roosevelt has so well said and demonstrated by his actions on a similar occasion. The mine owners paid no attention to the emperor's wish at all, and this worthy evidently did not expect that they would. And we have not yet heard that he fulminated against them for disregarding his authority, as he would have done had the strikers, or the socialists treated him in the same way.

The strikers had elected a committee of seven to act as their representatives during this strike. Two members of this committee belonged to the organized miners. Shortly after the emperor had expressed the wish that the warring parties should settle their differences amicably, the committee of seven informed the prime minister that they had telegraphed to the mine owners, expressing the willingness of the strikers to return to work immediately on condition that the following demands should be granted to them in place of the demands first made by them: A 15 per cent increase of wages; in case no agreement should be made with the organizations, an average daily wage to be paid uniform for all classes of laborers; no discrimination against strikers after return to work; good coal free to miners, also to needy invalids and widows of miners; humane treatment. The prime minister replied that he would be pleased to act as mediator, provided the strikers first returned to work. That is always the "fairness" of the public spokesmen of the masters. "First produce profit for us, and then we will talk to you." This is the method pursued by Roosevelt in the Pennsylvania coal-strike. And it always ends in the same result for the strikers: A practical defeat, so far as an improvement in their condition is concerned. The only tangible result of this strike, as of all others fought under similar conditions, is a better organization of the miners, and a better understanding of their class interests. And the increase of class-consciousness and class solidarity is after all the only gain which will at last turn defeat into victory.

When the feeling and resentment against the brutality of the mine owners and the impassiveness of the Prussian government ran high among the strikers, a statement was launched in the capitalist press to the effect that the government would present to the Prussian parliament a bill for the protection of the miners and for the reduction of hours of la-

bor, and another defining more clearly the civic rights of labor organizations. Nothing definite was made known about the content of these bills, but from the scant hints which leaked out through official channels it was very evident that these bills were nothing short of deliberate attempts to pacify the workers by a trick. *Vorwärts* ridiculed the idea of the government of trying to ameliorate the condition of the workers by asking a capitalist parliament for legislation in the interest of the class that was just then striking against those same capitalists.

One of the mine owners pretended not to know what grievance the strikers had against him, and boasted that he would pay three shifts' pay, held back by him, and an extra bonus from the benefit funds (maintained by stealing whole carloads of coal from the miners) to any striker who would tell him frankly why he went on strike. *Vorwärts* advised the strikers to frankly state their reasons and asked the mine owner to write down the statements of the strikers and publish them.

The police created much trouble by interfering with strikers' meetings, trampling down school children, and standing by strike breakers who tried to incite the strikers to violence. But the strikers remained peaceable in the face of all provocation. If there was no bloodshed, little thanks are due to the guardians of "Law and Order," for they tried their best to precipitate it.

The strike had to be called off, because there was not sufficient organization to carry it through, and funds were lacking for the support of the strikers. No sooner did it become evident that the strikers would return to work when the government seemed to become less interested in the pending mining legislation, and the "Herren Haus" (Upper House) closed for a vacation. The miners will not be very much disappointed if it should take several years more before that legislation is realized, perhaps at some future strike when the government wants to express its sympathy for the working class.

While the capitalist papers are jubilant over the "defeat" of the strikers, *Vorwärts* encourages the workers to organize better and renew the battle when they are strong. For "working men will not get justice until they chase the arrogant lords out of the temple. Down with your assumed class superiority! Down with class parliament! Down with all class rule! This is what we shall shout into the ears of the working class, now and all the time, till some day they will listen to us and will use their power in the right way.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

## The Woman Question.

THE bourgeois has thought and still thinks that woman ought to remain at home and devote her activity to supervising and directing the housekeeping, caring for her husband, and manufacturing and nourishing children. Even Xenophon, at the time when the bourgeoisie was newly born and was taking its shape in ancient society, traced the main outlines of this ideal of woman. But if through the course of centuries, this ideal may have appeared reasonable, because it corresponded to economic conditions which prevailed, it is no longer anything more than an ideological survival, since these conditions have ceased to exist.

The domestication of woman presupposes that she fulfills in the household certain numerous functions which absorb all her energy; now, the most important and the most exacting of these domestic labors,—the spinning of wool and linen, the cutting and making up of clothing, laundry work, baking, etc.,—are carried on by capitalistic industry. It furthermore presupposes that man by his contribution to the family capital and his earnings provides for the material needs of the family; now, among the comfortable bourgeoisie, marriage is as much an association of capitals' as a

(1) The dowry has played an important role in the history of woman: at the beginning of the patriarchal period the husband buys her from her father, who has to refund her purchase price if for any cause whatever he repudiates her and sends her back to her family; later this purchase price is returned to him and constitutes her dowry, which her relatives are accustomed to double. From the moment when the wife enters into her husband's house with a dowry, she ceases to be a slave whom he may dismiss, sell and kill. The dowry, which in Rome and Athens became a legal charge upon the property of the husband, was, in case of her repudiation or divorce, to be restored to her in preference to any creditor. "No pleasure is derived from the riches which a woman brings into the household," says a fragment of Euripides, "they only serve to render divorce difficult." The comic authors ridiculed the husbands, who as the result of a suit over the dowry, fell into dependence upon the wife. A character in Plautus says to a husband who is talking against his wife, "You accepted the money of her dowry, you sold your authority—*imperium*." The wealthy Roman matrons carried their insolence to such a point that they did not trust the management of their dowry to their husbands, they gave it over to stewards, who sometimes fulfilled with them another service, as the evil-speaking Martial states.

Adultery on the part of the wife involved a legal divorce and the restitution of the dowry, but rather than come to this painful extremity, the husbands preferred to close their eyes to the foibles of their wives; at Rome and at Athens the law had to strike at them in order to recall them to their marital dignity; in China a certain number of bamboo strokes were applied to the soles of their feet. The penalties not being sufficient to encourage the husbands to repudiate their adulterous wives, the law, in order to prop up masculine virtue, permitted those who denounced the infidelity of the wife to retain a part of the dowry; there were then men who married only in prospect of the adultery of the wife. The Roman women evaded the law by having themselves enrolled in the censor's book on the list of prostitutes, to whom it did not apply. The number of matrons inscribed became so considerable that the Senate, under Tiberius, passed a decree forbidding "women who had a patrician for a grandfather, husband or father to traffic in their bodies." (Tacitus, *Annals* II., 85.) Adultery on the part of the wife in the patrician society of antiquity, as well as in the aristocratic society of the eighteenth century, had become so general that it had so to speak entered into the social customs. It was looked upon lightly as a corrective and accompaniment of marriage.

union of persons and often the capital contributed by the wife exceeds that from the husband, and in the small bourgeoisie the gains of the father of the family have fallen so low that the children,—girls as well as boys,—are compelled to earn their living in business, railroad offices, banks, teaching, civil service positions, etc., while it often happens that the young wife continues to work outside in order to help out the resources of the housekeeping, when the earnings of the husband do not suffice to cover the expenses.

The daughters and wives of the small bourgeoisie, as well as those of the working class, thus enter into competition with their father, brothers and husband. This economic antagonism, which the bourgeoisie had prevented from developing by the shutting up of the wife into the family dwelling, is becoming general and is intensified in proportion as capitalistic production develops; it invades the fields of the liberal professions—medicine, law, literature, journalism, the sciences, etc.,—where man had reserved for himself a monopoly, which he imagined was to be eternal. The laborers, as is always the case, have been the first to draw the logical consequences of the participation of woman in social production; they have replaced the ideal of the artisan,—the wife who is nothing but a housekeeper,—by a new ideal,—woman as a companion in their economic and political struggles for the raising of wages and the emancipation of labor.

The bourgeois has not yet succeeded in understanding that his ideal is already long since out of date and that it must be remodeled to correspond to the new conditions of the social environment; nevertheless since the first half of the XIX century the ladies of the bourgeoisie have begun to protest against their inferior position in the family, so much the more intolerable in that their dowry places them on a footing of equality with the husband; they rebelled against the domestic slavery and the parsimonious life to which they were condemned, as well as the deprivation of intellectual and material enjoyments which was imposed upon them; the bolder ones went so far as to demand free love and to ally themselves with the utopian sects which preached the emancipation of woman.<sup>1</sup> The philosophers and the moralists had the simplicity to believe that they would stop the woman movement by opposing to it the sacred interest of the family, which they declared could not survive without the subjection of woman to the labors of the household, the sewing on of shirt buttons, the mending of hose, etc., her duty was to devote herself to these obscure and thankless labors, in order that man

(1) The Saint Simon manifesto of 1830 announced that the religion of Saint Simon had come "to put an end to that shameful traffic, that legal prostitution, which under the name of marriage often blesses the monstrous union of self-surrender and egotism, of light and of ignorance, of youth and decrepitude."

might freely unfold and display his brilliant and superior faculties. These same philosophers, who lectured the rebellious ladies on the cult of the family, sang the praises of capitalist industry, which, by forcing the wife away from the domestic hearth and her child's cradle to condemn her to the forced labor of the factory, destroys the working-class family.

The bourgeois ladies laughed at the sermons, equally imbecile and ethical, of these solemn philosophers; they kept on their way and attained the end they set for themselves; like the patrician lady of ancient Rome and the countess of the eighteenth century, they threw off the cares of housekeeping and of the nursing of the child upon mercenaries, that they might devote themselves wholly to the toilet, that they might be the most luxuriously arrayed dolls in the capitalist world and in order to make business move. The daughters and wives of American plutocracy have attained the extreme limits of this sort of emancipation; they are transforming their father and husband into an accumulator of millions, which they squander madly. Since the toilet does not exhaust the entire activity of the ladies of capitalism, they find amusement in defacing the marriage contract with strokes of a pen-knife, in order to assert their independence and improve the race. The Communist Manifesto remarks that the innumerable divorce suits in which adultery is alleged are indisputable proofs of the respect inspired in the bourgeois of both sexes by the sacred bonds of marriage which the "licentious socialists" talk of loosening.

When the daughters and wives of the small bourgeoisie, obliged to earn their living and to increase the resources of the family, began to invade the stores, the offices, the civil service and the liberal professions, the bourgeois were seized with anxiety for their means of existence already so reduced; feminine competition would reduce them still further. The intellectuals who took up the defense of the males, thought it prudent not to start afresh with the ethical sermons which had miscarried so piteously in the case of the wealthy bourgeois ladies;—they appealed to science; they demonstrated by reasons which were irrefutable and loftily scientific that woman cannot emerge from the occupations of housekeeping without violating the laws of nature and history. They proved to their complete satisfaction that woman is an inferior being, incapable of receiving a higher intellectual education and of furnishing the combination of attention, energy and agility demanded by the professions in which she was entering into competition with man. Her brain, less voluminous, less heavy and less complex than that of man, is a "child's brain." Her less developed muscles have not the strength for attack and for resistance; the bones of her fore-arm, her pelvis, her femur, and in fact all her osseous, muscular and nervous system do not

permit her to undertake more than the routine of the household. Nature designed her in all her organization to be the servant of man, just as the ugly god of the Jews and Christians marked out the race of Ham for slavery.

History contributed its startling confirmation of these ultra scientific truths; the philosophers and the historians affirmed that always and everywhere the wife, subordinate to the man, had been shut up in the house, in the woman's apartments: if such had been her lot in the past, such was to be her destiny in the future, was the positive declaration of Auguste Comte, the profoundest of bourgeois philosophers. Lombroso, the illustrious comedian, went him one better: he seriously declared that social statistics proclaimed the inferiority of woman, since the number of female criminals is below that of male criminals; while buried in these figures, he might have added that the statistics of insanity demonstrate the same inferiority. Thus we see that ethics, anatomy, physiology, social statistics and history riveted forever upon woman the chains of domestic servitude.

## II.

Bachofen, Morgan and a crowd of anthropologists have revised the opinion of the historians and philosophers upon the role played by woman in the past. They have shown that everywhere the paternal family, which subordinated woman to man, had been preceded by the maternal family, which gave the first place to woman. The Greek language contains the record of her two conditions: while the Spartans, among whom matriarchal customs persisted, still continued to call her *despotina*, the mistress of the house, the sovereign, the other Greeks gave to the wife the name *damar*, the subdued, the vanquished. The Odyssey, in characterizing Nausicaa, says that she is *parthenos admes*, the girl not subdued, that is to say, without a husband, without a master. The modern expression "yoke of marriage" preserves the ancient idea.

Hesiod, in opposition to Homer, who tells only of patriarchal customs, preserves precious recollections of the matriarchal family; he tells us that when it existed man, even if he were a hundred years old, lived with his prudent mother,—he was fed in her house like a great child. (Works and Days, V. 129-130.) It was not the woman who then had the "child's brain," but the man: everything seems in fact to prove that her intelligence was the first to develop. This intellectual superiority caused her to be deified before man in the primitive religions of Egypt, the Indies, Asia and Greece, and caused the first inventions of the arts and trades, with the exception of metal working, to be attributed to goddesses and not to gods. The Muses, originally three in number, were in Greece, even in preference to Apollo, the goddesses of poetry, music and the dance. Isis, "mother of corn ears and

lady of bread," and Demeter, lawgiver, had taught the Egyptians and Greeks the tillage of barley and wheat and made them renounce their anthropophagic repasts. The woman appeared to the free patriarchal man, like the Germans whom Tacitus knew, as having within herself something holy and providential, a *liquid sanctum et providum* (Germania VIII). Her prudence and foresight gave her this divine character. Must we conclude that this intellectual superiority, which manifested itself when the economic environment is rudimentary, is a natural phenomenon?

But, in any case, it may be asserted that the vitality of woman is superior to that of man. The life insurance companies of the United States, England and Holland, which do not base their calculation upon scientific fairy tales of the intellectuals but upon mortality tables, pay woman an annuity below that which they give man, because her probabilities of death are less. Here for example is the annuity paid for a capital of \$1,000 by American and Dutch companies:<sup>1</sup>

Age.	NEW YORK.		HOLLAND.	
	Men.	Women.	Men.	Women.
50 years.....	\$ 78.47	\$ 69.57	\$ 76.80	\$ 73.60
60 years.....	97.24	88.03	98.50	93.50
70 years.....	134.31	122.48	142.00	136.70
80 years.....	183.95	168.00	222.70	211.70

It may be objected that man, leading a more active life, is more subject to accidents, diseases, and other causes of death, and that consequently the prolonged life of woman does not prove the higher vitality of her organism, but the advantages of a life less subject to accident.

The answer to this objection is found in the statistics of the various nations. There is in no country a perfect equilibrium between the number of women and that of men: for 1,000 men there are in Belgium 1,005 women, in France 1,014, in England 1,062, in Scotland 1,071 and in Norway 1,091. Nevertheless in these countries with the feminine preponderance there is an excess of masculine births: of the whole of Western Europe for every 1000 girls there are born from 1,040 to 1,060 boys. If, in spite of this excess of masculine births, more girls survive, it is because the greater mortality of the boys shows the balance in favor of the girls; and this higher mortality cannot be explained by the life of man being more subject to accident, since it is observed at an early age, notably during the first two years. All the diseases of childhood, with the exception of diphtheria and whooping cough, are to a perceptible extent more fatal among boys than among girls; from zero to five years the male sex is particularly frail; at all

(1) The French companies make no differences between the sexes because they pay very small annuities. La Générale, the most important one in France, gives for \$1,000 at the age of 50 years an annuity of \$64.20; at 60 years \$80.80; at 70 years \$118.50; at 80 years \$143.70. Thus it realizes immense profits; its shares which in 1819 were worth 750 francs each were quoted last January at 31,300 francs.

ages, except between ten and fifteen years, the male mortality is in excess of the female.

The superior vitality of the female sex is also noticeable in the greater ease with which it builds up its organism. M. Iribe, superintendent of the sanitarium of Hendaye, to which are sent Parisian children from three to fourteen years of age, who are afflicted with anaemia, incipient tuberculosis, scrofula and rickets, reports that at the time of their dismissal, at the end of six months, the progress in weight, girth and chest development is incomparably higher in the girls than in the boys, the increase in weight is double and often more.

The same statement has been made by other superintendents of sanitariums. (Bulletin Medical, No. 81, 1903.)

Woman undeniably possesses a greater vitality than man. M. Gustav Loisel has made inquiry "as to whether this difference existed in embryonic life, and what may be its cause?" He has communicated the results of his inquiries to the Biological Society of Paris, which published them in its Bulletin of November 6, 1903.

M. Loisel availed himself of 792 weights and measurements made upon 72 foetuses at the Maternity Hospital of Paris by M. E. Legou;<sup>1</sup> from the following weights of the foetuses at three, four, five and six months he obtains the following figures:

	MALES.	FEMALES.	DIFFERENCES.
	Grammes.	Grammes.	Grammes.
Total weight	1908.18	1708.11	200.07 in favor of males
Kidneys	16.87	17.19	0.32 in favor of females
Suprarenal glands	5.15	6.48	1.28 in favor of females
Liver	88.35	96.31	7.90 in favor of females
Spleen	2.59	2.38	0.21 in favor of males
Thymus	3.89	3.97	0.08 in favor of females
Heart	10.97	12.60	1.63 in favor of females
Lungs	47.29	44.62	2.67 in favor of males
Brain	236.04	235.17	1.17 in favor of males

"These figures thus show us," says M. Loisel, "a preponderance already existing in favor of the females as regards the kidneys, the suprarenal glands, the liver, the thymus and the heart; this predominance is the more noticeable since the total weight of the body is larger in the male than in the female."

If now we take the relation between the total weight and the weight of the organs which are heaviest in the male, we find that the proportion is still in favor of the female:

	PROPORTION OF TOTAL WEIGHT.	
	Males.	Females.
Spleen	1 to 736	1 to 718
Lungs	1 to 40	1 to 38
Brain	1 to 8	1 to 7

The organs here examined, brain included, are thus absolutely or relatively heavier in the female foetus than in the male foetus.

(1) E. Legou. "Some Considerations on the Development of the Foetus." Paris, 1903. The weights and measurements of M. Legou were made for official use.



M. Loisel has also examined into the proportion of the weights of the different organs to the total weight according to the age of the foetus. He has prepared a table, from which I take only the figures concerning the brain:

AGE	TOTAL WEIGHT		Proportion of weight of brain to total weight.	
	Males Grammes	Females Grammes	Males	Females
3 Months.....	58.33	65.96	$\frac{1}{6.5}$	$\frac{1}{7}$
4 Months.....	167.25	182.58	$\frac{1}{7.3}$	$\frac{1}{6.6}$
5 Months.....	336.33	295.00	$\frac{1}{7.6}$	$\frac{1}{7.5}$
6 Months.....	732.58	636.00	$\frac{1}{8.3}$	$\frac{1}{7.3}$

The weight of the male foetus, which is below that of the female foetus, at three months, when the sex has just been determined, grows more rapidly and the proportion between the weight of the brain and the total weight is always to the advantage of the females from the fourth month on.

"To sum up," says M. Loisel, "all the organs are heavier in the female foetus than in the male foetus up to about the fourth month. The predominance then passes over to the male, but only for the lungs and the organs for sex-union, thus the cardiac muscle always remains heavier in the female. The organs which are of real service to the individual during the embryonic life always remain more developed in the female sex.

"If now we consider that the differences in favor of the females are especially in the liver, the heart, the suprarenal glands and the kidneys, we shall come to the conclusion that the greater vitality of the female organisms corresponds to their being better nourished and better purified."

### III.

The superior organization possessed by woman at birth assuring her throughout her life a much greater vitality, is probably demanded by the part she plays in the production of the species, a part altogether more prolonged and exhausting than that of the man who, when fertilization is accomplished, has no more to do, while then the travail of woman begins, to continue during long months, through pregnancy and after birth. The women of savage tribes suckle their children for two years and more. It sometimes happens that the male pays dear for his inutility; after

(1) The latest observations upon ants and bees tend to prove that the fertilized eggs would give birth to females and to workers; and the non-fertilized to males, which consequently would be born from eggs that are less complex.

union, the bees kill the males, and the male spider must hastily take himself off that he may not be devoured by the larger and stronger female. Among the Sakawas, at the annual feast of Mylitta Anaitis, they sacrificed at Babylon the handsome slave who had just united with the priestess who incarnated the Assyrian goddess. This bloody religious ceremonial must have been a reproduction of an Amazonian custom.

The life of savagery and barbarism permits woman to develop her superiority from birth; each sex there has its special function; it is the division of labor in embryo. The man, whose muscular system is more developed, "fights, hunts, fishes and sits down," according to the Australian native, he regards all the rest as under the jurisdiction of woman, whose function puts brain activity into play at an earlier epoch. She has charge of the communal house, which often shelters a clan of more than one hundred individuals; she prepares clothing from skins and other raw materials; she charges herself with the cultivation of the garden, the rearing of domestic animals and the manufacture of household utensils; she preserves, economizes, cooks, distributes the provisions, vegetable and animal, which have been gathered during the course of the year; and like the Valkyries of the Scandinavians and the Ceres of the pre-Homeric Greeks, she accompanies the warrior on the field of battle, aids in the fray, raises him up if he is wounded and cares for him; her assistance is so appreciated that, according to Tacitus, the barbarians who under the leadership of Civilis revolted against Vespasian, were seized with pity for the Roman soldiers because their wives did not accompany them when they marched to combat. Plato likewise who, like the chosen ones initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries, was more informed regarding ancient customs than is supposed, makes the women to be present in the battles of the warriors of his republic.

These multiple and diverse functions, which obliged woman to reflect, to calculate, to think of the morrow and to look ahead at long range, must necessarily have developed her intellectual faculties; thus the craniologists say that only a slight difference exists between the cranial capacity of the two sexes in the negroes, the Australians, and the red skins, while they find that it goes on increasing among civilized people. Woman is for the careless and improvident savage, a providence; she is the prudent and prescient being who presides over his destinies from birth to death. Man, making his religions with the events and the intellectual acquisitions of his daily life, was thus obliged to begin by deifying woman. The pre-Homeric Greeks and Romans had placed their destinies under the control of goddesses, the Fates—Moirai, Parcae—whose name signifies in the Latin language

“sparing,” “economic,” and in the Greek the part which falls to each one in the distribution of food or of booty.

If we relieve the rich and poetical Greek mythology of the symbolical, allegorical and mystical lucubrations with which the philosophers and the poets of the classical epoch and the Alexandrine period have overloaded and complicated it, and which the German mythologists, servilely copied by those of France and England, have carried on to their own more perfect confusion, it becomes an inestimable storehouse of prehistoric customs which preserves the memory of the manners which travelers and anthropologists now observe living again among the savages and barbarous nations of Africa and the New World. The mythological legend furnishes us with information of the relative value of feminine and masculine intelligence among the Greeks, before they had entered upon the patriarchal period.

Jupiter the “father of the gods,” as Homer, Hesiod and Aeschylus call him, after having driven the feminine divinities from Olympus, enthroned there the patriarchate, which for some generations had been established upon earth, the religious heaven always reflects terrestrial manners as the moon reflects the light of the sun. But Jupiter, who like every barbarian, knew how to use his fists (*Iliad* XV. 228), who boasted that he was the strongest of the gods, and who to dominate the others kept next his throne two servants, Force and Violence, always ready to obey his orders, was inadequately prepared by his intellectual qualities to replace woman in the government of the Olympian family; in order to supply the capacities which were lacking to him, Hesiod tells us that he married Metis, “the wisest among mortals and gods.” The savage and the barbarian, that he may take into himself the courage of a fallen enemy, devours his throbbing heart; Jupiter carried off Metis to assimilate her cunning, her prudence and her wisdom, for her name in the Greek language has these diverse meanings; these qualities were considered as belonging to woman.

But the assimilation took time for its processes, if we may judge from the rascally farce played upon him by Prometheus. The latter killed and butchered an enormous ox, in one pile he placed the flesh which he covered with the skin upon which he deposited the entrails; in another pile he put the bare bones which he adroitly concealed under heaps of fat. “You have divided the parts very badly,” said the father of gods and men. “Most worthy Jupiter, greatest of living gods, take the part that your wisdom counsels you to choose,” replied the astute Prometheus. The ruler of the heavens, listening only to his gluttony, laid both hands upon the heap of fat amid the laughter of the Olympians; his wrath was terrible when he saw the bare bones. (*Theogony* 435 *et seq.*) Such a farce would hardly have been played in the Olympian

heaven had it not been that on the earth similar tests had been required to prove to the Father that his intellectual faculties did not justify him in taking the place of the Mother in the leadership of the family and the management of its property.

The higher position in the family and society, which man conquered by brute force, while it compelled him to a brain activity to which he was little accustomed, at the same time put at his disposal opportunities for reflection and development which constantly increased. Woman, "subdued," as the Greek expression has it, shut up in the narrow circle of the family, the leadership of which had been taken from her, and having little or no contact with the outside world, saw on the contrary a reduction to almost nothing in the means of development which she had enjoyed, and to complete her subjection she was forbidden the intellectual culture which was given to man. If in spite of these fetters and these disadvantages, the disastrous effects of which cannot be exaggerated, the brain of woman continued to evolve, it was because woman's intelligence profited through the progress realized by the masculine brain; for one sex transmits to the other the qualities which it has acquired; thus pullets of certain varieties inherit the spurs which are highly developed among the cocks, while in other varieties they transmit to the males their exaggerated crests. "It is fortunate," says Darwin upon this point, "that the equal transmission of the characteristics of both sexes has been a general rule in the whole series of mammals, otherwise, it is probable that man would have become as superior to woman in intellectual power as the peacock is to the female in ornamental plumage." (Descent of Man—Sexual Selection, VIII and XIX.)

But defects as well as valuable qualities are transmitted from one sex to the other: if woman has profited by the brain-growth of man, he has in his turn been retarded in his development by the sluggishness in the development of woman's brain, produced by the reduction to the smallest minimum of intellectual activity to which he has condemned her. The breeders who seek the choicest results are as careful to have irreproachable females as males; amateur cockfighters attach as much importance to the selection of the pullets as to the cocks, they produce only from those which are armed with spurs and which have the fighting spirit. It may be said that humanity, since it emerged from communism of the clan to live under the system of private property, has been developed by the efforts of one sex alone and that its evolution has been retarded through the obstacles interposed by the other sex. Man by systematically depriving woman of the means of development, material and intellectual, has made of her a force retarding human progress.

In fact if we study and compare the different periods of savagery and barbarism, we cannot but observe the continuous and re-

markable progress in human mentality, because women and men, exercising freely their physical and mental faculties, contribute equally to the evolution of the species; this has been retarded ever since humanity entered into the period of civilization and private property, because then woman, constrained and confined in her development, cannot contribute to it in so effective a way. The senile stagnation in which China has vegetated for more than a thousand years can only be attributed to the degradation of woman, which has gone to the point of the cruel mutilation of her feet that she may be imprisoned the more closely in the woman's quarters. Europe also suffers from the degradation of woman, since in spite of the extraordinary material progress of these last two thousand years and the increasing and no less extraordinary accumulation of human knowledge, it cannot be maintained that the brain of the civilized modern exceeds in power and capacity that of the Greeks of the classic epoch, which extends from the seventh to the fourth century before the Christian era. It is certain that a Victor Hugo, a Zola, or any university graduate or doctor has stored in his brain an abundance of positive and various conceptions not possessed by Aeschylus, Anaxagoras, Protagoras and Aristotle, but that does not prove that his imagination and his intelligence, or that of his contemporaries is more rich, more varied and more vast than that of the generations of Ionia and Attica, who were the artificers of that incomparable budding and blossoming of science, philosophy, literature and art at which history marvels and who reveled in that subtle and paradoxical play of sophistical philosophy, the like of which has not again been seen. The sophists—Protagoras, Gorgias, Socrates, Plato, etc., stated, discussed and solved the problems of the spiritualistic philosophy and many others besides: yet the Hellenes of Asia Minor and of Greece had emerged from barbarism only a few centuries before. Many reasons may be cited to explain this arrest in human development, but the principal one is the subjection of woman.

#### IV.

Capitalist production, which takes charge of most of the labors to which woman devoted herself in the gentile house, has levied into its army of wagers in factory, shop, office and school-room, the wives and daughters of the working class and of the small bourgeoisie, in order to procure cheap labor. Its pressing need of intellectual capacities has set aside the venerable and venerated axiom of masculine ethics: "to read, write and count ought to be all of a woman's knowledge;" it has required that girls like boys be instructed in the rudiments of the sciences. The first step once taken, they could not be forbidden to enter the universities. They proved that the feminine brain, which the intellec-

tuals had declared a "child's brain," was as capable as the masculine brain of receiving all scientific instruction. The abstract sciences (mathematics, geometry, mechanics, etc.), the first whose study had been accessible to woman, were also the first in which they could give the measure of their intellectual capacities; they are now attacking the experimental sciences (physiology, physics, chemistry, applied mechanics, etc.), in America and Europe there arises a throng of women who are marching on a level with men in spite of the inferiority of the conditions of development in which they have lived since their first infancy.

Capitalism has not snatched woman from the domestic hearth and launched her into social production to emancipate her, but to exploit her more ferociously than man, so it has been careful not to overthrow the economic, legal, political and moral barriers which had been raised to seclude her in the marital dwelling. Woman, exploited by capital, endures the miseries of the free laborer and bears in addition her chains of the past. Her economic misery is aggravated; instead of being supported by her father or husband, to whose rule she still submits, she is obliged to earn her living; and under the pretext that she has fewer necessities than man, her labor is paid less; and when her daily toil in the shop, the office or school is ended, her labor in the household begins. Motherhood, the sacred, the highest of social functions, becomes in capitalistic society a cause of horrible misery, economic and physiologic. The social and economic condition of woman is a danger for the reproduction of the species.

But this crushing and pitiful condition announces the end of her servitude, which begins with the establishment of private property and which can end only with its abolition. Civilized humanity, oppressed by the mechanical mode of production, turns its face toward a society, based on common property, in which woman, delivered from the economic, legal and moral chains which bind her, may develop freely her physical and intellectual faculties, as in the time of the communism of the savages.

The savages, to forbid primitive promiscuity and successfully restrain the circle of sexual relations, found no other means than to separate the sexes; there are reasons for believing that the women took the initiative in this separation, which the specialization of their functions consolidated and emphasized. This was manifested socially by religious ceremonials and secret languages peculiar to each sex and even by struggles; and after having taken the character of violent antagonism, it ended in the brutal subjection of woman, which still survives, although it is progressively attenuated in proportion as the antagonism of the two sexes

(1) A. W. Howit, who observed among the Australians a species of sexual totemism, says that it often happens that the women and men of one and the same clan fight, when the animal that serves as the totem for one sex is killed by the other sex.

becomes more general and intense upon the economic field. But the modern antagonism will not end with the victory of one sex over the other, for it is one of the phenomena of the struggle of labor against capital, which will find its solution in the emancipation of the working class in which women as well as men are incorporated.

The technique of production which tends to suppress the specialization of trades and functions and to replace muscular effort by attention and intellectual skill and which, the more it is perfected, mingles and confounds man and woman the more in social labor, will prevent the return of the conditions which in savage and barbarous nations had maintained the separation of the sexes. Common property will put an end to the economic antagonism of specialization.

But if it is possible to catch a glimpse of the end of female servitude and of the antagonism of the sexes and to conceive for the human species an era of incomparable bodily and mental progress, brought about by women and men of a high culture in muscle and brain, it is impossible to foresee the sexual relations of free and equal women and men who will not be united nor separated by sordid material interests and by the gross ethics engendered by such interests. But if we may judge by the present and the past, men, in whom the genetic passion is more violent and more continuous than in women—the same phenomenon is observed in the males and females of the whole animal series—will be obliged to play the part of exhibiting their physical and intellectual qualities to win their sweethearts. Sexual selection, which, as Darwin has shown, fulfilled an important role in the development of the animal species and which, with rare exceptions, has ceased to play this part in the Indo-European races for about three thousand years, will again become one of the most active factors in the perfecting of the human race.

Motherhood and love will permit woman to regain the higher position which she occupied in primitive societies, the memory of which has been preserved by the legends and myths of the ancient religions.

PAUL LAFARGUE (Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)

## Thank God for Dreams.

Thank *God* for Dreams! For dreams when wide awake—  
Delightful banishers of those that quake  
The slumbering body with earth's horrors shown  
Thrice magnified, and made so much our own  
That slumber from our senses cannot shake.

These dreams of happier days soul's thirst shall slake  
These dreams, from happiness of man shall take  
No atom. Ah! if such thou yet hast known,  
*Thank God for Dreams.*

Long may we dream!—till dreams come true and make  
This earth the spot where hearts need never break.  
Wide-eyed, while dreaming, see! our fears have flown  
Swift-winged beyond our ken; our heart's high throne  
Is tenanted by Hope. For mankind's sake—  
*Thank God for Dreams.*

—*Edwin Arnold Brenholtz.*

---

## Hymn to Peace.

Abide with us, O Peace! Consign black War  
To deep oblivion. Heal thou the scar  
Left by his wild dominion over us.  
With thee our queen, the memory of loss  
Through ages past will perish at thy feet.  
Allure us to a worship that is meet  
For thee, whose wondrous beauty holds the eye  
Of even those who, frantic, seek to die  
By horrid hand of War. Rule thou our hearts  
With thy sweet will, and save us from the arts  
Of the great tempter, Greed. Awake in us the love  
Of noble things. Raise thou our thoughts above  
The vain advantages of strife, and lead  
Us on through furrowed fields to cast the seed.

H. DUMONT.

101 Sansome St., San Francisco, Cal.



# EDITORIAL

## The Revolution in Russia.

The eyes of the revolutionary world are just now turned on Russia. There is no doubt but that we are here witnessing the birth of a new era. As is pointed out by Th. Rothstein in the *London Social Democrat* it is one more tremendous demonstration of the truth of the Marxian position. A few years ago the Russian revolutionists were rather inclined to sneer at Marxism. They were certain that the *Mir* with its collectivist form was going to offer a means of transition directly from primitive communism to socialism. The peasant was going to rise as soon as he heard the new gospel and overthrow autocracy and establish a co-operative commonwealth. The autocracy was supposed to be really superimposed upon this collectivist base. If given a few blows it would tumble over and leave room for the new society or rather for the re-assertion of the old freedom. Out of this philosophy sprang first, the peasant movement (a semi-Populist agitation), and second, terrorism. By the beginning of the 80s this philosophy had run itself out. The peasants showed no disposition to rise. Terrorism had spent its force and autocracy still reigned. Then it was that the Marxians pointed out that socialism must, whether or not, enter into the promised land of the co-operative commonwealth by the hideous doors of capitalism. For a few years the Marxian movement spread rapidly among students but the true Marxian realized that this too was an artificial movement and that if anything really effective was to be done a factory proletariat must be the motive force. This was the situation in 1898. Here a quotation of Comrade Rothstein is enlightening.

"Yet it was precisely at that very moment that the bastard movement called the Revolutionary Socialist Party first made its appearance. These were the old familiar 'Populists' still enamoured of the peasantry and the village community, who, being no longer able to dispute the existence of capitalism or the strength of the proletariat, conceived the happy idea of combining all the three things that were "good" in the programmes of the preceding three revolutionary parties in Russia, viz., the ideal of peasant communism of the Land and Liberty Party, the idea of the revolutionary proletariat of the Social-Democracy and—the ingenuity of it!—the conception of terrorism as the means of the revolution, of the people's Will Party! How these three things, so logical, taken by them-

selves, in their original respective programmes, were in practice to be amalgamated into one mixture; how, for instance the proletariat could be made revolutionary on behalf of the ideals of the peasantry, or how the conspirative exercise of terror could hang together with a class movement, all this remains a mystery to this day; the only practical solution which the Revolutionary Socialists have given to the difficulty was by establishing a separate organization (alas in many cases, mythical!) for carrying on terrorist acts (thus making the revolution doubly sure!), by instigating the peasantry to riots in the name of Land and Liberty, whilst at the same time preaching to the proletariat the class war. As a result we have a double or even treble system of revolutionary book-keeping, which finds its counterpart in the language which they speak to European and Russian audiences respectively, and a continual spasmodic oscillation, now towards terror, then towards peasants' riots, then again towards propaganda among the proletariat, and last, but not least, towards compromises with bourgeois parties."

Such a condition as this was but indicative of the economic confusion from which it sprang. Soon capitalism, however, brought about modern class divisions. Then a social democracy based on proletarian and Marxian philosophy could and did arise. In an article by Th. Dahn in the last issue of *La Vie Socialiste* (which number is given up entirely to a symposium on the Russian situation) the duties and present attitudes of the Russian Social Democratic Party are sketched. It seems that the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Russia, about which we hear so much, has been very bitter toward the Social Democrats because they refused to completely merge their existence in the conglomeration. When, however, we learn that at the conference where unity was proposed and where many of the organizations did join the question of universal suffrage was carefully shoved in the background and the whole movement was directed toward an effort to obtain an aristocratic bourgeois government, the attitude of the socialist is understood. When the actual fight began, however, it was no longer the Revolutionary Socialist party who led, but the Social Democracy. The reason for this is evident. The fighting here as everywhere had to be done by the proletariat and in this case the proletariat proposed to fight for themselves and not merely for a change of masters. The Social Democracy by its attitude has made impossible the proposed compromise with bourgeois principles. Comrade Dahn declares that "The Social Democratic Party has held firmly from the beginning for these things; the calling of a legislative assembly, based upon universal, equal and direct suffrage with secret ballot and this has now become a national demand accepted even by those portions of the progressivist parties which not long ago were still hostile or indifferent towards them."

Comrade Ferri has a short article in this same number of *La Vie Socialiste* which sums up in an eloquent yet scientific way the striking features of the present situation:

"When some years ago I saw in a great factory in Belgium machines,

tools and locomotives being manufactured for Russia I thought to myself, These are the revolutionary microbes that old Europe is injecting into the veins of the feudal Russian colossus.

"The events of these last few days at St. Petersburg and elsewhere tell us that the revolutionary microbe of capitalist industrialism is beginning to do its work.

"In the culture medium that the previous generation of students and nihilists have prepared, this proletarian microbe—the inseparable product of industrialism—gives a revolutionary character to the manifestations which would otherwise have been isolated and sentimental.

"The heroism of the individual gives way to the collective heroism. The intellectuals unite with the workers. The hour of deliverance is sounding.

"The barbarous and shameful ferocity and bloody suppression is but a sign of the social daybreak, even though the rays of the sun are still touched with the color of blood.

"The protestations of the whole civilized world against the disgrace of bloody and fratricidal Czarism goes out to our brothers in Russia to encourage them in their supreme struggle to realize that regime of liberty already attained by other European nations. This in turn will be but a necessary step for the preparation and organization with accelerated speed, of the socialist regime, the final object of all popular agitation.

"Perhaps for a little time the military bureaucracy of the Russian empire may be able to resist the revolutionary microbe. But this will be only for a moment. The condemnation of the feudal regime is irrevocable."

---

In the very excellent survey of French socialist unity by Comrade La-Monte which appears elsewhere in this issue, there is one sentiment expressed with which we wish most emphatically to disagree. This is the proposal for unity with the S. L. P. based on the supposed identity of the proposed industrial organization, the manifesto of which appeared last month, and the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance. We have no desire to enter into a detailed discussion of the demerits of the latter organization. We believe, however, that its unsavory name has been deserved and is not due to its socialistic character, but to the personal make-up of those in control and the methods which it has pursued. Nothing would more thoroughly damn the work of the conference which meets in Chicago next June than the prevalence of the idea that it was an attempt to revive the S. T. & L. A. That conference is not called for the purpose of inviting labor men, either in or outside of existing unions, to unite with some already existing organization. It is for the purpose of founding a new industrial organization. Those who have issued the call will be nothing more or less than members of the conference once it has been called to order. The conference is not for the purpose of uniting the A. L. U. to the S. T. & L. A. and then asking the rest of the trade union world to accept the domination of those now in control of these organizations.

If this were the purpose there would be no need of such a conference. The A. L. U. has certainly played a valuable part in the trade union movement, but it was because it was felt that it was inadequate for the work before it that the conference was proposed. The S. T. & L. A. has never proved itself anything but a nauseous nuisance in the labor movement. As a labor organization, it has never had any existence; as a convenient annex to De Leon's work in the S. L. P. it has played a part, and a by no means admirable one, in socialist and trade union discussion. Nothing shows the correctness of our position on this point more fully than the eagerness with which every enemy of the proposed industrial organization has circulated the statement, as evolved by the capitalist press, that the object of the Chicago conference was to organize a socialist trade union to fight the existing unions, and that it was to be simply another S. T. & L. A.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The Hon. David M. Parry, president of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Citizens' Alliance, has issued another confidential circular letter to leading capitalists inviting them to step up to the captain's desk and plank down their initiation fees and dues and save the country from going to the demnition bowwows. The cause of the Hon. David's alarm is the contemplated "destructive and revolutionary labor legislation at Washington and at the different state capitals." He boasts that "nobody has ever questioned that it was the National Association of Manufacturers that beat the eight-hour law and anti-injunction bill at Washington last winter," and adds that the fight must be kept up against "such revolutionary schemes," which are "subversive of the very principles of our government," and that "the whole tendency toward collectivist and paternal legislation needs to be stopped." When he speaks of "paternal legislation," Parry, of course, does not refer to tariff pap and subsidies, land grabs and financial jugglery, railroad grants and river and harbor grafts, salary boosts, pensions, junkets and the hundred and one schemes that are worked by the political bunco-steerers for the benefit of themselves and their capitalistic masters in the game of separating the people from the wealth they produce. The Parryites are howling "stop thief" against organized labor to cover up their own wholesale grafting, although the laborers are only asking for a few little crumbs of justice—an eight-hour law on government work and the muzzling of injunction-throwing courts that are ushering in a new slavery with their jug-handled justice and autocratic mandates. It is unlikely that the eight-hour bill will be considered for some months—probably not until autumn—as the Bureau of Commerce and Labor is killing time in preparing data, and then several miles of red tape will have to be unwound to learn what the courts think about the constitutionality of the government designating under what conditions its work shall be done. Where legislators are naturally hostile toward a measure, no matter how meritorious it may be, there are always plenty of schemes to be worked to delay action. The anti-injunction bill that the union-haters are making so much fuss about will quite likely be abandoned by the politicians and a gold brick administration measure substituted. From descriptions sent out by Washington correspondents the proposed anti-injunction bill that is said to have received Roosevelt's stamp of approval, and is also endorsed by certain "labor leaders" whose names are not given, has nothing "anti" about it. Stripped of all its husks in the form of the usual legal verbiage, this administration measure simply proposes to prohibit courts from issuing injunctions without giving the labor side in a controversy an opportunity to be heard. In other words, the secret, dark-lantern methods that are at present practiced by employers in procuring temporary injunctions are to be abolished. But judges whose instincts and interests are capitalistic—who uphold the present system of private ownership of the means upon which the people must depend to live—will continue to grant temporary injunctions, after going through a more or less farcical hearing, just as they now issue permanent in nearly

every instance, even though labor is given a voice in the final hearing. No intelligent workingman will be deceived by this transparent political trick that is to be turned by Roosevelt despite the o. k. that may be given it by "labor leaders" who hide their names. An anti-injunction measure can only be considered satisfactory that will give labor the same rights as the capitalists, that will give the workers the right to enjoin the employers from doing certain things, or that will compel the courts to keep hands off entirely in industrial disputes unless both sides are agreed to allow interference, as in arbitration cases. Such even-handed justice, however, will not be established so long as workingmen weekly vote capitalists or their agents into office on Republican and Democratic tickets.

In discussing the evil of government by injunction and other oppressive methods that are used against organized labor by the capitalist class, the politicians and lawyers and editors and others of the tribe who delight to rub close against the fat men and their money bags declare with one accord that if unions would incorporate, so that they could sue and be sued, all would go well with labor. The unions, they say, are irresponsible and cannot be compelled to carry out their contracts and consequently have no standing in court. If that is true, why do they drag unions into court? In injunction proceedings organized labor has been compelled to face a sort of drum-head court martial. Sentences are promulgated before trials take place, a la Russia. In strikes men are gagged by court decrees and then imprisoned and fined for contempt if they make the least effort to stand up for their constitutional rights of free speech and assemblage, and no questions are asked whether their organization is incorporated. They are prosecuted as criminals, just like escaping slaves. Moreover, the unions are being proceeded against in civic cases, as has already been shown in the REVIEW upon a number of occasions, without regard as to whether or not they are incorporated. A friend in Vermont has sent me an abstract of the decision recently rendered by the Supreme Court of that state which is of vital importance as showing that organized labor is considered entirely responsible for damages sustained by employers even where no contract exists and the employers make use of their right to quit work and inform their friends and sympathizers of the unfairness of any concern. It will be recalled that something like two years ago the machinists employed by the Patch Manufacturing Co., of Rutland, Vt., went on strike. Shortly after the trouble began the company went into court and prayed for damages alleged to have been sustained because of the strike and boycott. A bitter legal battle was fought, and, although the union was unincorporated, and for that reason "irresponsible," the Patch company was awarded \$2,500 damages. The case was appealed, and last month the Supreme Court upheld the actions of the lower court and instructed the defendants to pay the money. Now Mr. Patch threatens that, if the union does not satisfy the judgment, he will attach the property of the individual members, one after another, until he secures the amount. A few of the men have their own homes, and if the organization refuses to settle the sheriff will swoop down upon them. This case has been closely watched by the unionists, employers and legal fraternity in the eastern country, and there is no disguising the fact that it establishes a dangerous precedent so far as organized labor is concerned. The Vermont decision will serve to greatly strengthen the plaintiffs in the case of the hatters, who have been sued for something like \$340,000 damages by a Connecticut concern, and it might be stated that the hatters have already lost several points in the preliminary court skirmishes. In the West also the damage suit industry is taking roof. A couple of weeks ago a case was fought out in the courts at San Jose, Cal. A lumber company sued the Building Trades Council in the foregoing city for damages sustained because of a boycott and also asked for a perpetual injunction. The defendant organization is not incorporated, but nevertheless it was permanently enjoined from boycotting and assessed

the nominal damages of \$1.00 and costs. Thus a precedent was also established in California that may soon come to be regarded as good law. The cases against the United Mine Workers brought by the Victor Coal and Iron Co., in Colorado, in which a total sum of about a million dollars is wanted by the latter concern, have been followed by the filing of twenty-one suits in Alabama by non-union workmen for a total of \$147,000 damages. The plaintiffs inject a brand new wrinkle into legal warfare. They claim that because the union made certain demands of the Alabama Consolidated Iron & Coal Co., they were turned out of their homes and many of them deprived of the necessities of life. As the Democratic politicians of Alabama have made boycotting a misdemeanor, the miners' union can look for no more justice or sympathy in that state than in Colorado, where the Republican union-smashers are in control of the legal machinery. As I have said before, the studied silence of our so-called trade union leaders relative to this new method of attack is beyond my understanding. Perhaps our officials fear if the question is discussed generally it will tend to further weaken their wornout policies and encourage the rank and file to clamor for political action along class-conscious labor lines, just as the Taff Vale decision is causing the British workers to declare for socialism and go into politics *en masse*. Perhaps also our great and conservative labor leaders are waiting for the National Civic Federation brethren, two of whom are said to be stockholders in the Victor company, to harmonize these cases and call off the dogs of law. But while our dignified leaders may loftily wave aside every suggestion of grappling with the new danger, or entirely ignore it, in their ignorance and conceit, they can rest assured, nevertheless, that capitalism's sappers and miners will continue to perfect schemes, lay traps and steadily encroach upon our organizations until we are hemmed in on all sides and have our backs to the wall and are forced to meet oppressions such as the devil himself is able to concoct.

Speaking of the National Civic Federation, it looks as though that grotesque body has come to regard the industrial questions that it set out to settle with a blare of trumpets, as of secondary importance, and that its chief mission, after all, is to smash socialism some more. Whether the leading spirits have been seeing handwriting on the wall, and the scheme, is to rally the capitalists of the nation to the support of and grant temporary concessions to those labor officials who attack the socialists, is not as yet thoroughly established, but all signs point in that direction. At the late convention in New York the socialistic spectre haunted some of the principal speakers, the official call issued prior to the assembling of that very distinguished body sounded shrill notes of warning against socialism, and subsequent issues of the official monthly organ of the N. C. F. contained ill-tempered denunciations of socialism and its adherents. One of the latest methods of propaganda against the growing new movement is to circulate a little leaflet among those capitalists who are likely to come under the spell of the civicers by being properly alarmed and then assured that their privileges will be properly safeguarded by the great N. C. F. The leaflet is entitled "Socialism and Its Ablest Foe." On one page it contains excerpts of the views of Jack London, expressed in a magazine article, and on the opposite page is printed the "stinging blow" administered to socialism—by whom, do you suppose? Kaiser Wilhelm, Czar Nicholas, or some recognized capitalistic political economist? No! The "ablest foe" is none other than our good old friend, Sam Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor and vice president of the National Civic Federation, and the "blow" delivered is the paragraph so widely quoted in the capitalist press, and plastered upon dead walls by politicians in some sections, from Gompers' speech in the Boston convention (before the returns came in last November), which reads as follows:

"I want to tell you, Socialists, that I have studied your philosophy; read your works upon economics, and not the meanest of them; studied your standard works, both in English and German—have not only read, but studied them. I have heard your orator, and watched the work of your movement the world over. I have kept close watch upon your doctrines for thirty years; have been closely associated with many of you, and know how you think and what you propose. I know, too, what you have up your sleeve, and I want to say that I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. I declare it to you, I am not only at variance with your doctrines, but with your philosophy. Economically, you are unsound; socially, you are wrong; industrially, you are an impossibility."

That's the "blow" of the "ablest foe." I have watched you; I know what you have up your sleeve; I have heard you; I have read something; I am a mind reader and know what you think; I am the great I am; I'll slap you on your wrist, so there! Isn't it a singular thing that, after all the years of attacking and denouncing, the "ablest foe" has never attempted to discuss the principles of socialism, which he claims are unsound and impossible? Mere assertion, unaccompanied by tangible evidence, cannot be accepted as proof of the unsoundness of a cause in any court. To declare that the earth is flat as a pancake requires demonstration before intelligent people believe the theory. I have heard Gompers speak on the political question in half a dozen conventions, but never once has he touched the fundamentals of socialist philosophy. Indeed, he usually disclaims any intention of discussing the principles of socialism, just like many other opponents who still have the cheek to pose as knowing all about it, but contents himself with showing to his own satisfaction what a lot of bad boys those trade unionists are who believe in socialism. If the "ablest foe" really has studied socialist philosophy and discovered that Marx and many of the master minds of the past and present have been and are wrong, why in the name of common sense doesn't he do the world a favor by exploding the fallacious principles of socialism that many millions of people imagine are fundamental? If the centralization of wealth, modern production, capitalistic exploitation, unequal distribution and other indictments brought by the socialists who point out the logical tendencies and finality of the competitive system—in a word, if social evolution is unscientific—why doesn't the "ablest" court undying fame by sweeping back the tide, instead of singling out some individual here or there for attack, because he may happen to be bow-legged or cross-eyed or belong to some secret society or church, or have some new thought or idea that may not square with fossilized opinions? There is not much profit in indulging in personalities, or even finding fault with tactics. Let us have at least one speech or one article confined strictly to the principles of socialism from Mr. Gompers. I am sure that his capitalistic friends of the National Civic Federation would be very glad to have him point the way out of their dilemma to destroy socialism, root, as well as branch.



# SOCIALISM ABROAD

## Russia.

The executive committee of the International Socialist Bureau has issued the following proclamation:

"An inexpiable crime has been committed against an entire people. "Thousands of laborers, still believing in the feeling of humanity of him whom they call Father, and who has been called the 'Czar of Peace' and upon whom they have set their hopes have arisen. They demand the conclusion of an unholy war, the betterment of their miserable condition; the introduction of elementary political reforms such as all western lands have already obtained.

"Nicholas II and his advisers have given them bullets for their answer. On a day of blood and sorrow men, women and children, a peaceful and unarmed body sunk down beneath the shots of a barbaric soldiery, the ignorant tools of the most horrible of tyrannies. Today, 'order reigns in St. Petersburg.' The imitator of Abdul-Hamid rules now upon the corpses of his people.

"But between Czarism and all those who from now on this common feeling of unconquerable resistance unites, an abyss has opened which new oppression can but widen. Those who have not drawn back before murder in order to maintain an accursed system of government will find themselves deceived in the hopes of damming up the movement that has now seized upon all classes.

"In vain have they added to the horrors of massacres, the injustice of wholesale arrests. From now on a decisive battle has begun and the heroic courage of the Russian proletariat,—this advance guard of the Revolution—is a security that it will be carried to the bitter end until the overthrow of a government which is today a hideous anachronism and a most dangerous menace to the freedom of all Europe. In this battle our Russian brothers must be able to count upon the support not only of our moral solidarity but the actual cooperation of the Socialist Parties of the whole world.

"The battle in which they lead is ours also. The enemy that oppresses them is the enemy of mankind.

"To all those who can contribute by whatever means of immediate action whether of influence or agitation, for the work of freedom and the realization of one of the greatest and most fruitful events of history, the International Socialist Bureau issues a warm appeal.

"When Nicholas II ordered the massacre of St. Petersburg he signed the death-warrant of Czarism.

"Down with autocracy; hurrah for international socialism."

The executive committee of the International Socialist Bureau, Emile Vandervelde, Edourd Anseele, Victor Surwey.

## France.

On another page of this number Comrade LaMonte gives the details of the unification of the French socialists. It is specially noteworthy that

this new formation practically marks the disappearance of the opportunist phase of the movement in France, which has so long been a source of disorganization throughout the whole International Socialist movement. This is confirmed by a dispatch which appears in the Berlin *Vorwaerts* to the effect that the executive committee of the united organization has now forbidden the delegates in the Chamber of Deputies to act with the Ministry. This is the end of the famous *bloc* which has been second only to the question of the ministry as a source of dissension. The only disagreeing voice that we notice is that of Comrade Lagardelle in the *Mouvement Socialiste* which has lately been taking a somewhat antagonistic attitude toward political action and an impossibilist position in general as to socialist tactics. He thinks that the reform wing is not sincere in its conversion and that a unity which unites as diverse elements as he believes compose the present organization is not a suitable or desirable one. He thinks "that we shall see new formations until finally there will be a socialist unity which will be definitely parliamentary or revolutionary." He seems to mean, by these terms and others which he has used, to consider a revolutionary party one which entirely rejects parliamentary action and relies either upon revolt or a general strike.

#### MANIFESTO OF THE FRENCH SOCIALISTS.

"Czarism has been stricken unto death. The Russo-Japanese war, criminally begun and disastrously conducted, has already shaken its very foundations, and roused the whole Russian nation to the vices and treason of an incapable and corrupt bureaucratic despotism.

Now Czarism and the Czar are threatened in the very heart of the empire by a people, awakened at last to the necessity of freedom and the possibility of its attainment.

The revolutionary action of the organized proletariat has decided the fate of the autocracy. In lending its support to the more or less definite demands of all the liberal forces of the nation, the working class gives a new impulse to the liberating movement and at the same time stamps it with a new character.

Thanks to them it is now certain that the revolution will not stop until the day when democratic liberties are assured, and when the workers will have the means with which to push on in their struggle, side by side with the proletariat of other countries, to final emancipation.

Neither wholesale arrests, nor Cossack charges, nor volleys of rifles that cover the snow of the streets with thousands of corpses, nor systematic violence decimating strength and intelligence, can prevent the downfall of Czarism.

The proletariat of the whole world must now unite in an international movement for the support of the Russian proletariat in the struggle for freedom.

This is especially true of the French proletariat, where successive governments of the bourgeois republic have pretended to form a reactionary alliance, of which neither the nation nor its representatives, have ever known the terms or lent their approval, and this proletariat feels itself united heart and soul to the working class of the empire of the Czar.

What is demanded is not simply protestations against the massacres, but an energetic determination to break an odious alliance, which places the capitalist forces of France at the disposal of Czarism for the suppression of a Russian revolution. We must undertake to prevent at any cost and by all means any violation of neutrality by France, or any entrance into an armed conflict. We must maintain a continuous activity and unbroken solidarity with our brothers in toil and misery and against the governmental allies and reactionaries of both Russia and France.

*Comrades:* The proletarians of Russia fight not for themselves alone, but for us also.

When Czarism is overthrown, the great strength of counter-revolution is broken in every country; and the era of socialist activity unhampered by frontiers will begin.

Let us not permit ourselves, comrades, to be deceived by the tricks of a lying press, or the schemes of a servile diplomacy, but let us by an incessant agitation, show our hatred of our oppressors and murderers, and fight with revolutionary solidarity for our freedom.

There must not be a single commune in France, where there are either workers or socialists which remains silent. By resolutions and meetings, show your sympathy with the socialists and laborers of Russia, and your detestation of the murderous Czar.

**A BAS L'AUTOCRATIE! VIVE L'INTERNATIONALS OUVRIERE!**

*Le Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Révolutionnaire.*

*Le Parti Socialiste de France.*

*Le Parti Socialiste Français*

*Les Fédérations Socialistes Autonomes.*

---

## Japan.

It is items such as those below that speak most eloquently of the Internationalism of socialism. What would Marx and Engels say could they rise today and know that the words which they penned in Germany a half century ago had already become the rallying cry of a people then living in another historical epoch?

Sunday, January 29, 1905.

### FAREWELL OF THE HEIMIN SHIMBUN.

This is the last issue of the *Heimin Shimbun!* We have now preferred to stop intentionally the publication of our paper by this number rather than to wait to be suppressed by the government, although the trial is still going on at the Supreme Court.

We now recollect the well known "*FAREWELL OF THE NEW RHEINISH GAZETTE*" of Marx and Engels. "Farewell, but not forever farewell! They can not kill the spirit." "We will rise on the field where we fell, more boldly to fight out another."

Fortunately some of our comrades are publishing a weekly paper entitled "*Chokugen,*" which means 'speaking straight-forwardly.' It should be looked upon hereafter as the central organ of Japanese socialists.

Now, we will throw away our pen for a time, but a few words more we should like to proclaim. "Japan is a highly civilized country making war against the barbarous Russia for the sake of Justice and Humanity. Yet, no freedom of opinion is here enjoyed!"

A few months ago, we had received many hundred copies of socialistic pamphlet from the Russian comrades in Switzerland and America. They were intended for the distribution among the war prisoners in this country. And we, after a long delay from several reasons, recently succeeded the purpose. We hope that the prisoners may return some day to their country well versed with socialistic ideas, and may come to add great impetus to the revolutionary spirit prevailing through all the Russia.

Who would have even predicted five years ago that socialism would reach Russia via prisoners of war taken by Japan?

## BOOK REVIEWS

**A Soul's Love Letter.** By Mabel. The Ariel Press, Westwood, Mass. For sale by Charles H. Kerr & Company, Chicago. \$1.00.

It is easy to see why the author's full name is not on the title page. For the story is obviously fact rather than fiction. Many would call it a common-place story; it certainly contains not one incident that seems improbable. Yet there is something about the book that lifts it out of the commonplace,—and that is that the unknown author combines two qualities of mind that as yet are rarely found together; she has a clear scientific insight into the historical and economic forces that mold human motives, and she has the warm, vital, versatile human sympathy that can transmute the prose of life into poetry. "A Soul's Love Letter" is not a great book; it is distinctly amateurish if judged by literary standards, yet it is better worth reading than many of the successful novels of trained writers, and it is in a sense a prophecy of great books that will be written in the eventful, inspiring years that are just ahead.

**Problem of Monopoly.** By John Bates Clark. The Macmillan Co. Cloth, 128 pages, \$1.00.

This work consists of a series of lectures first delivered at Cooper Union, New York. The titles of the chapters give the scope of the book very well: "The Growth of Corporations," "The Sources of the Corporations," "Power for Evil," "Great Corporations and the Law," "Organized Labor and Monopoly," "Agriculture and Monopoly," "Governmental Monopolies." On the analytic side there is much of value in the work and its reading would give a better understanding of the trust problem. On the whole the attitude is that of the ordinary radical reformer and as such really presents little that is new.

"History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850," Vol. V. James Ford Rhodes. Macmillan Co. Cloth, 659 pages, \$2.50.

Few things are more instructive of the changed historical point of view, brought about fundamentally by industrial evolution, but secondarily largely through the influence of socialist doctrine, than is presented by a comparison of this volume with the four preceding ones of the same work. The previous volumes are almost wholly political history. Yet one who looks through them sees a constantly increasing importance paid to the industrial and social factors. In this last volume politics, diplomacy, and military affairs are relegated to the background, notwithstanding it was the Civil War period which is being discussed and main emphasis is laid upon social factors. Sherman's March to the Sea is treated not simply as a brilliant military exploit, but as a tremendous engine of industrial destruction and the picture which is given of the effect of the March to Savannah and the almost equally important, but ordinarily neglected, march northward to Columbia and Charlestown, is treated primarily from the side of its industrial effects. But the two chapters of greatest value are the ones on Society at the North and at

the South respectively. There is nothing in the whole field of historical literature in any way comparable to these two chapters, treating of these very important subjects. In the North the war opened with the panic of 1857 still casting its shadow over industrial conditions. For a time the greatest suffering prevailed. Then about 1862 the effects of army contracts began to be apparent, simultaneously with the beginning of the new cycle of capitalist prosperity. The carnival of fraud and corruption which reigned throughout the North is described. Especial emphasis is laid upon the illicit cotton trade with the enemy and its effect in prolonging the war. In this chapter as also in the one on Society at the South he has made extensive use of the "Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies." This mine of information has never before been utilized on these points and the students of industrial evolution during the Civil War owe a debt to the author for his work. In Society at the South we see the slow death of an industrial community insufficient in its organization and unable to exist when cut off from the outer world.

It becomes evident that the South was defeated not so much by the killing of its men on the field of battle as by the complete breakdown of its industrial organization. This was due not alone to the blockade of the southern ports and the raids through southern territory, but also to the form of industrial organization which was unable to adjust itself for the production of the necessities either of its people or its armies. The North on the other hand grew constantly stronger, wealthier, more compact and self-sufficing as the years of war passed by. These things which were really the fundamental features of the great struggle are usually almost completely neglected by historians.

The chapter on Reconstruction is much less satisfactory. This is largely because the author really has no grasp of the great class struggle which was finding expression in these events. He does not see that reconstruction was simply capitalism in the saddle running amuck. Indeed this criticism would apply throughout the work. He does not analyze northern and southern society back to the industrial elements of its organization, to discover therein the sources of their respective strength. To him the war was fought over slavery. He is blind to the class interests that were really battling for supremacy. Nevertheless the work is one for which nothing there is in print can in any way be substituted, unless perhaps it might be that Schwab's work on the Southern States to some degree covers the same matter as in his chapter on society at the South, yet the present work is, although briefer in its treatment, many times more satisfactory than the earlier volume.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### Towards Democracy.

Edward Carpenter has thus far been known to American socialists mainly by his masterly treatment of the sex problem entitled "Love's Coming-of-Age," his keen satire called "Civilization, its Cause and Cure," and his group of essays collected under the title of "England's Ideal." But his fame as a writer rests mainly on his volume of poems, "Towards Democracy," a work begun in 1883 and enlarged with successive editions until it makes a book of 507 large pages. We have just imported an edition, and now offer it for the first time.

Carpenter's literary form resembles that of Whitman, yet Carpenter is no mere imitator; he has improved the instrument he borrowed, and his free rhythm is in many ways the most satisfying of poetic forms.

A few extracts will give a clearer idea of the book than pages of description:

You cannot violate the law of equality for long.

Whatever you appropriate to yourself now from others, by that you will be poorer in the end

What you give now, the same will surely come back to you.

If you think yourself superior to the rest, in that instant you have proclaimed your own inferiority.

And he that will be servant of all, helper of most, by that very fact becomes their lord and master.

\* \* \*

Believe yourself a Whole.

These needs, these desires, these faculties—

This of eating and drinking, the great pleasure of food, the need of sex-converse and of renewal in and from the bodies of others;

The faculty of sight, the wonderful panorama of the visible, and of hearing;

The inquisitive roaming brain, the love of society and good fellowship;

The joy of contest, the yearnings of Religion, the mystic impulses of night, of Nature, of solitude;

All these and a thousand other impulses, capacities, determinations, are indeed Yourself—the output and evidence and delineation of Yourself. They cannot (in any permanent sense) be peeled off and thrown away;

They spring inevitably deep down out of yourself—and will recur again wherever you are.

There is no creature in the whole range of Being from the highest to the lowest which does not exhibit these and similar capacities, or the germs of them, in itself.

You are that Whole which Nature also is—and yet you are that Whole in your own peculiar way.

This complete edition, including Part IV, "Who Shall Command the Heart," is now for the first time offered to American readers. Our price is \$2.50 postpaid; to stockholders \$1.50 by mail or \$1.25 by express at purchaser's expense.

**The Recording Angel.**

In a previous announcement of this forthcoming novel by Edwin Arnold Brenholtz, we promised to publish the opinions of George D. Herron and of A. M. Simons, both of whom had the privilege of reading the manuscript. Comrade Herron writes from Locarno, Switzerland, as follows:

"I am glad you are to publish Brenholtz's novel. He writes because he has deep and urgent things to say, which we socialists as well as all who set their hopes beyond the great human wrong, would do well to read for our enlargement and purification. The spirit and purpose of the novel are nobly and beautiful, and can do only good."

Comrade Simons says: "In reading the manuscript of "The Reecording Angel," I was struck, first with the novelty of its plot, second with its power in arousing and sustaining the interest of the reader, and third, with the skill with which the author has permeated the work with the Socialist philosophy, without doing any preaching. Whoever reads the opening chapter will finish the book, and when he has finished it, if a socialist he will have enjoyed a rare treat, if he was an opponent of Socialism he will be one no longer than it will take for the thought of the book to produce an impression upon his mind."

Up to the time of going to press we have received advance orders for 334 copies of "The Recording Angel." This is exceptionally encouraging in view of the fact that March 15 has been named in our advertising as the date of publication, and many intending purchasers are doubtless waiting to take advantage of our special offer at the last minute. This special offer is that for one dollar received before the book is issued we will send the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW one year and a copy of "The Recording Angel." The printing of the book is nearly completed, but on account of the large number of advance orders, it will be impossible to fill all of them by March 15, and we will therefore extend the special offer to March 25. After the latter date, there will be no discount on the book from the price of one dollar, except to our stockholders.

**The Finances of the Publishing House.**

Just before going to press we have received five hundred dollars from Comrade James C. Wood, of Illinois as a loan at four per cent. This money has been used to take up a corresponding sum on the Wisconsin bank loan previously referred to, leaving only three hundred dollars on which the company still has to pay seven per cent. This amount should be paid off by special contributions during March. The offer of Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of all other stockholders is limited to March 31, 1905. The contributions to the end of February have been as follows:

Previously acknowledged (from January 1, 1905) .....	\$ 45.00
Jacob Bruning, Illinois .....	8.00
Daniel Kisner, Kentucky .....	2.00
Alexander Schablik, Washington.....	2.05
P. R. Skinner, Oregon .....	10.00
Mrs. K. L. M. Meserole, New York.....	2.00
Dr. H. Gifford, Nebraska .....	10.00

William E. Russell, Cuba .....	\$ .40
Elgin Branch Local Kane County, Illinois .....	2.00
"T," Oregon .....	2.27
D. A. Hastings, Wyoming .....	2.00
John D. Ortilip, Pennsylvania .....	1.00
T. J. Maxwell, Kansas .....	2.00
Local Alameda, California .....	2.50
James M. Young, Missouri .....	2.00
E. F. Everitt, California .....	2.00
R. A. Huebner, Ohio .....	2.00
L. Rahlmeyer, Nebraska .....	1.72
R. S. Dickerson, Florida .....	5.30
C. Kessler, Kansas .....	10.00
T. J. Lloyd, New York .....	5.00
Gus Weiss, California .....	5.00
Local Sawtelle, California .....	1.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois .....	80.24
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$205.48</b>

Alexander Kerr and Charles H. Kerr have voluntarily reduced the rate of interest on money due them from the co-operative publishing house from five per cent to four per cent. The only loan of any size on which a higher rate than four per cent is still being paid is \$1,600 due to Comrade Becker of Wyoming. He is so situated that he could get a higher rate than this for his money where he is located. He is leaving it with us for the present because he does not wish to embarrass the publishing house by withdrawing it, but it is desirable on both sides that this loan be paid off as soon as possible. When our whole debt can be placed on a four-per-cent basis, we can safely use any new capital that may be subscribed for publishing new and important works that the socialist movement needs. Plans in this direction are developing rapidly, and we expect to make important announcements in the next issue of the REVIEW.

Meanwhile we desire to remind several hundred readers who have long been intending to take stock in the company that, in the words of the old-time country editor, "Now is the time to subscribe." A thousand socialists have already put their resources together and have accumulated the largest and best stock of the literature of international socialism to be found in the English-speaking world. A new stockholder gets an immediate return in the shape of exceptional discounts on the books he needs. And what is more important, he helps make it possible for the co-operative publishing house to expand at an ever-increasing rate its work of making clear-headed socialists.



## A SOUL'S LOVE LETTER

BY MABEL

We do not publish this book, but we recommend it. That we should not do if it were not a great deal better than its title.

It is not one of the world's great books, but we recommend it because it is one of the first books we have seen telling of life and emotion with a frank and clear recognition all the way through of the socialist principle of historical materialism.

If any one fears that socialism will take the poetry and romance out of life and leave nothing but plain prose, he should read this book.

It is published by the Ariel Press, Westwood, Mass., in cloth at one dollar. We have copies for sale and will mail the book promptly on receipt of price; our stockholders can have the same discount as if we published it ourselves.

See review on page 572.

Charles H. Kerr & Company

(CO-OPERATIVE)

56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago

## The Christian Socialist

Class-conscious,  
Revolutionary, Religious

---

Aims to win the 7,000,000 church votes to  
Socialism, without which true religion is  
impossible.

Semi-monthly, eight pages, 50c per year.  
Sample copy 2c. In bundles of ten or  
more, 1c each.

Address, Danville, Ill.

# Standard Socialist Series

*Classics of Socialism in Permanent Library Form.*

- 1. Karl Marx: Personal Memoirs** by William Liebknecht. Translated by Ernest Untermann.  
This book is thoroughly charming in the simplicity of the true story it tells of the private life of Marx in his home and among his friends during the years of poverty and exile when his greatest works were written. It is full of side lights on the origin and growth of the Socialist movement.
- 2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution**, by Emile Vanderveide. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.  
On the whole the best book yet published for putting into the hands of an inquirer who wishes to get in one small volume a systematic explanation of the whole Socialist philosophy and program. The author starts out with a survey of modern industrial conditions. He then shows the economic necessity of Socialism, and discusses the possible means by which the working class through its elected officers may acquire the means of production.
- 3. The American Farmer**. By A. M. Simons.  
The pioneer book on a subject of immense importance to the Socialist movement of America. It is needed by city wage-workers to show them that the vast majority of the American farmers are closely bound to the proletariat by their material interests. It is needed by the farmers to show the absurdity of the dread that Socialists upon coming into power might want to confiscate the small farms.
- 4. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association**. By Isaac Broome.  
This narrative is an excellent illustration of what modern Socialism is not. It is a graphic account of the last conspicuous attempt to start an earthly paradise on a small scale, with the usual result.
- 5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State**. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Ernest Untermann.  
The progress of the modern working class toward emancipation from class rule is greatly hampered by the current ideas concerning the stability of the present social and political institutions. This book shows how closely a people's methods of race propagation and political organizations are connected with the way in which they produce the material requirements of life. Whenever there occur essential changes in the modes of production, corresponding changes are perceived in the form of sexual relationship and in the political organization.  
This is a standard work of the highest value to any one desiring to understand and apply the Socialist philosophy. Our translation is the first that has ever been made for English readers.
- 6. The Social Revolution**. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.  
The first part of this book, "Reform or Revolution," draws a distinction which needs to be kept clearly in mind by every Socialist who has to explain the difference between our party and any of the other parties which take up certain portions of our program. The second part, "The Day After the Revolution," is one of the ablest answers yet given to the difficult question of what the proletariat could do with the resources at its disposal after first getting control of the public powers.
- 7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific**. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.  
This work ranks with the Communist Manifesto as one of the original statements of the central Socialist principle of Historical Materialism. Those who imagine that Socialism is nothing but a vague yearning for a time when selfishness will disappear, or who suppose that Socialists have a ready-made scheme for making society over, should study this work of Engels.
- 8. Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy**. By Frederick Engels. Translated, with Critical Introduction, by Austin Lewis.  
This work of Engels is an indispensable contribution to the development of the theory of Historical Materialism, and it also deals with the relation of the Socialist philosophy to religion.
- 9. American Pauperism and the Abolition of Poverty**. By Isador Laddoff.  
This book is a thoroughly satisfactory answer to the widespread demand for an analysis of the last United States Census in the light of the Socialist philosophy. It is full of just the facts that the Socialist agitator needs.
- 10. Britain for the British (America for the Americans)**. By Robert Blatchford.  
This is one of the most valuable propaganda books in the literature of Socialism. It has the charming style of the author's earlier book, "Merrie England," but it has the further merit of showing the reader that no substantial relief for the working class can ever be reached through the old parties controlled by the capitalist class.

*These ten books are handsomely bound in cloth, uniform in style, and are sold at \$5.00 a set or 50 cents each, postpaid.*

**Charles H. Kerr & Company**  
PUBLISHERS

56 Fifth Avenue

Chicago



# The International Socialist Review

DEVOTED TO THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEMS INCIDENT  
TO THE GROWTH OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

EDITED BY A. M. SIMONS

## FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS:

ENGLAND—H. M. HYNDMAN, WALTER CRANE, SAMUEL HOBSON,  
H. QUELCH, J. KEIR HARDIE, J. R. McDONALD. FRANCE—PAUL  
LAFARGUE, JEAN JAURES, JEAN LONGUET. BELGIUM—EMILE  
VANDERVELDE, HENRI LAFONTAINE, EMILE VINCK, MME. LALLA  
VANDERVELDE. DENMARK—DR. GUSTAV BANG. GERMANY—  
KARL KAUTSKY. ITALY—DR. ALESSANDRO SCHLAVI, PROF. EN-  
RICO FERRI. SWEDEN—ANTON ANDERSON. JAPAN—T. MURAI.

Contributions are solicited upon all phases of Socialist thought, and all problems of modern social organization. No alterations are made in accepted manuscript, but the right of editorial comment is always reserved. The absence of such comment, however, is to be in no way construed as editorial endorsement of the positions in any published communication. No rejected manuscript will be returned unless accompanied by stamps for return postage.

This magazine is copyrighted for the protection of our contributors. Other papers are welcome to copy from our editorial departments provided credit is given. Permission will always be given to reproduce contributed articles, provided the author raises no objection.

The subscription price is \$1.00 per year, payable in advance, postage free to any address within the postal union. Editorial communications should be addressed to A. M. SIMONS, 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago; business communications to CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

\*\*\*\*\*

**TYPE  
TELLS  
ALEX** You Will Find

**"THE WORKER"**

**BEST SOCIALIST WEEKLY  
BRIMFUL OF INTEREST**

It is Published Exclusively in the Interest of the Working Class; It Stands for True and Loyal Trades Unionism and the Interests of the Tollers

Every Workingman Should Subscribe to it.—50 cents per year; 25 cents for 6 months; 15 cents for 3 months.

**SAMPLE COPIES FREE!**

**THE WORKER**  
184 William St., N. Y.

\*\*\*\*\*

## MAILED FOR 25 CENTS

This important work, applying the theory of the class struggle to American conditions, has hitherto been sold only in cloth at \$1.25.

We have placed a large order with the New York publishers for a paper edition, and by this special arrangement we are enabled to supply copies while they last at 25 cts., postage included. No discounts. Address,

**Charles H. Kerr & Co.**  
56 Fifth Ave., Chicago