

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

AUGUST, 1905

NO. 2

Industrial Workers of the World.

THE convention which met at Brand's hall, Chicago, from June 27th to July 8th, in spite of all the denunciations of the opponents and the strictures of critics, in my opinion marks a decisive turning point in American working class history. It means the formation of a nucleus of those who are determined that organizations of the working class shall reflect the industrial facts. It marks the beginning of the end of Civic Federationism and craft war in the American labor movement.

No attempt will be made to give a detailed account of the debates and general proceedings. These have already been published from various points of views and with varying accuracy in numerous socialist papers.

The signers of the original call for the convention were confronted by a dilemma from which it can not be said they were wholly successful in extricating themselves. They desired to bring together for conference all those who were ready to adopt the principle of industrial unionism. It was recognized that very many individuals connected with the old trade unions were incapable of bringing the unions along with them. Even those unions which were most favorable to the organization did not wish to take a leap in the dark into an organization which did not yet exist. Therefore the call was so worded as to permit of individual delegates.

The proceedings of the convention showed this to have been a mistake. It was taken advantage of to create paper organizations and to admit all sorts of persons representing nothing on earth but themselves. Many of these were diligent workers with the weapon with which we have Biblical authority that Sampson created so much slaughter among the Philistines. As a result there was much ground for calling the first few days of the session a *talkfest*. However, this time was not really wasted. The talk

gave an opportunity not only to blow off steam and thus relieve the pressure during the rest of the convention, but it also placed many individuals on record in such a way that the bona fide trade unionists who did the actual work of the convention, and by whom it will be conducted in the future, were enabled to determine the real value of this class.

MAKE UP OF CONVENTION.

The convention was made up of seventy delegates representing 51,430 men ready to be installed in the new organization. In addition there were 72 delegates representing 91,500 men, who, while sympathizing with the new organization did not have authority to install, and 61 individual delegates. While all of these will not join the new organization in the immediate future yet a large percentage of them will and the absence of those who will not join has already been offset by the adherence of organizations which were not represented at the convention. It is a very low estimate of the strength of the new organization to expect that within six months it will have one hundred thousand members.

In spite of all the reports that have been sent out the gathering was far more harmonious than any socialist or trade union convention that has been held in recent years. There were plenty of oratorical fire works, some rather disgusting personalities from a few individuals who have become notorious for their records along these lines, but all of these things were confined to the little group of jaw smiths described above. Men who really represented anything and who really will do the work in the union, as they did in the convention were far more harmonious than might have been expected when it is remembered that they were called together to formulate new principles of organization. The only line of cleavage between bodies representing any strength was over the method of organization. Even here the difficulty was much less fundamental than the heat of debate would indicate.

The constitution committee brought in a report arbitrarily dividing the industrial field into thirteen departments. Delegate David C. Coates sought to amend this so that each industry would form a union on an equality with every other union. As might have been expected both sides were inclined to exaggerate their own position and sometimes it appeared as if the Coate's amendment was seeking to restore trade rather than industrial autonomy. The matter was finally settled by the adoption of a compromise in the form of an amendment to the original report reading as follows:

"The International and National Industrial Unions shall have complete industrial autonomy in their respective international

affairs, provided the executive board shall have power to control these industrial unions, in matters concerning the interest of the general welfare." Before the vote was taken on this amendment Chairman Haywood gave it as his opinion that this meant that charters for each industrial union would be given directly by the general executive board. None of the members of the constitution committee who were present objected to this interpretation.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Invitations had been sent by the secretary of the parliamentary committee to the various European countries asking for their co-operation. Since there has been some misrepresentation concerning the replies received we include translations of the principal portions of the replies from Germany and France.

The German letter was as follows:

"After mature consideration the commission has concluded to refrain from sending fraternal delegates to this congress, although they fervently hope that a better connection may be created between American and German unions than has hitherto existed. The reason we do not send delegates to the Congress is, not that we do not sympathize with the movement in America, but we do not think it advisable to enter actively into the fermenting process (*gährungsprozess*) through which the union movement of America is now passing. The sending of delegates to your Congress would amount to active participation, since these delegates would not only be expected to represent the German unions in Chicago, but they would also be in duty bound to give the benefit of their experience and thus participate in the construction of a new organization. The central administration of the German unions has always held to the principle that it is not advisable to interfere in the development of a movement of any country from outside, since this development must proceed unhindered by outside interference. So we consider that the time has not yet come for us to send delegates to our comrades in America. But we hope that there may soon be a purification (*klärung*) in the American union movement and that an organization may appear that will correspond to modern ideas. As to whether this organization will evolve from those existing or will be a new creation we will not attempt to judge. At any rate we shall strictly keep from any external influence. We beg the comrades to consider these reasons for not sending a delegation and to assure them that we are in full sympathy with the struggle of the laborers of America for emancipation. I would request further that you send me some of the plans of organization, in German, since some of our unions have expressed a desire to receive these plans. In

the hope that we may soon see complete fraternal co-operation with the organization work of your country, I am,

Yours fraternally, C. LEGIEN."

The French comrades wrote as follows :

"Although we are not able to participate directly in this union movement we are in full sympathy with you and we hope that your consolidated method of uniting the workers may develop your movement on a solid economic and social foundation and never deviate from the platform of the class struggle, a platform that is the reason for existence of union organizations, having for its aim the actual betterment of the conditions of the workers and also the disappearance of the capitalist class in order to bring about the complete emancipation of the working class.

Yours fraternally, E. POUGET."

OUTLOOK FOR NEW MOVEMENT.

What then, does this organization present that is new and better than what has previously existed in the industrial field. Even its enemies must admit that it has been successful in devising a plan of organization that provides for democratic management and control without in any way restricting effective centralized administration. The election of the General Executive Board by each Department separately will make impossible any such ring rule as now prevails in the A. F. of L., as it is inconceivable that a central machine could control as many separate electorates, or even a majority of them, and this granting that there would be any object in organizing a ring to capture a body so thoroughly subject to the control of the rank and file.

But the most distinctive feature of this organization, even more important than the "Industrial" form from which it takes its name, is that it is organized in accordance with, and for the definite purpose of waging the class struggle. This does not mean, as some critics would have us believe, that the delegates to that convention did not know that whenever and wherever man met master in conflict over the conditions of the wage-bargain, that the class-struggle was present. But with the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. the class struggle has been waged in spite of the form of organization, and only because that struggle, like the air around them, was a part of their environment and could not be avoided. Nominally they shut their eyes to its existence and at Civic Federation banquets and mutual admiration conferences prated of the unity of interests between the master and the wage-slave. It is probably true that the first man that asked his boss for more wages was engaged in the class-struggle,

in the same way that it is also true (at least physicists assure us of the fact) that every time a handful of dirt is moved the most distant stars swerve in their courses to readjust the balance of the material universe. But we are not dealing with metaphysical gymnastics. When we speak of a labor organization being founded upon the class-struggle we mean that those who formulate its principles and direct its policies are *consciously* so doing, and that the organization which they are directing and of which they are a part does not claim to be able to ignore that struggle.

The subject of the industrial form of organization has been so frequently discussed in these columns and in the labor press in general as to need no further elaboration. There seems to be an almost universal agreement, among socialists at least, that industrial organization is desirable, and that it is the future form under which labor must unite on the economic field. But, *but*, BUT—we are told, with all sorts of variations, the A. F. of L. is going to be transformed into an industrial organization within a few years. It is going to endorse socialism and then you will have received all that you want without any fuss or disturbance. You will have made an omelet without injuring the eggs. First, last, foremost and hindmost, this is the sum, substance, shell and kernel of all that has appeared in the Socialist Party press in opposition to the formation of this new industrial union. To be sure this has been concealed under considerable personal abuse, some shallow ridicule, a good deal of ignorance as to what has really been done by those concerned in the new movement, and a little, just a *very* little, (?) downright lying about the proceedings of the convention. Let us then see what there is in this argument. What signs are there that the A. F. of L. is moving towards industrialism? Let us have some definite evidence. It will not do to point to the U. M. W. or the Brewers that have succeeded by virtue of pure brute strength in swallowing all allied crafts, for neither of these unions look with any great favor upon the A. F. of L. or consider that it has in any way helped them in securing what industrial features they now possess. But such a swallowing process as the carpenters are anxious to practice on the wood-workers is not a step toward industrialism. Industrialism is not “benevolent assimilation” of the weaker by the stronger unions, but implies the co-operative interdependent organization of all crafts in one unified body, yet with equal protection for all trades.

But we are told of the marvelous progress that is being made toward bringing the A. F. of L. to socialism. I would be the last to deny that the “boring-from-within” tactics have not educated a vast number of the rank and file to the truths of socialism. I have seen too much of this to be blind to its existence. Nor would I want to see such work hindered for one moment. But the A. F. of L. is something almost wholly distinct from the

rank and file of the membership. Indeed it is practically outside their control, and the general effect of educating any man to socialism has been to educate him *out* of the A. F. of L., that is out of the official Gompers machine. So far as that machine is concerned, no one dare deny that it is further from Socialism than at any time in its existence. At one time it was rather inclined to play with socialist phrases. Today, under the inspiration of scab banquets and Civic Federation oratory it declares open war on socialism.

Furthermore I believe it to be a fact of such general validity as to be almost a law of social evolution that no voluntary association, having as changeable a social base as the modern trade-union can be altered in any essential manner without complete disruption. I have given considerable investigation to this particular point and have searched quite closely in the history of organizations and I have yet to find an instance where an organization was "captured" and effectively utilized for a different purpose than that which brought it together. I know that this is contrary to all popular ideas on the subject, but I believe that, as is frequently the case, the popular opinion is wrong. Certainly there is no instance of such a fundamental change in a militant fighting organization as that which would be implied in changing the A. F. of L. to the industrial form. Whoever, therefore, advocates such a change from within the A. F. of L. is pursuing a course which will certainly end in the destruction of that organization. It has been to no small degree due to such work that there is now a large body of men ready to leave the A. F. of L. and unite with the Industrial Workers of the World.

Different stages in industrial evolution in America have produced different forms of labor organizations. The National Labor Union, the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor were each suited to the stage in which they appeared. Today when competition has given way to monopoly, when the trust has superseded the corporation, when Citizens' Alliances and Employers' Associations have united previously competing purchasers of labor power, and when the personal relation of employer and employe has been supplanted by the carefully planned, and cold-blooded, merciless class-war, the A. F. of L. is as hopelessly out of date as the stage-coach and the flint-lock musket.

Finally, the A. F. of L. has not only proved itself incapable of effectively fighting the battle of those who are included within its ranks, it has also shown that its organizing ability is inadequate, or its principles too unattractive, or its benefits too uncertain to enable it to reach whole armies of the working class who are in need of, and who are ready for organization. More significant still the A. F. of L. and its constituent unions close their door to large bodies of workers whose organization is

demand, not only in their own interest, but as a part of the whole great working-class phalanx. From all these sources the new union, can, and will, recruit its forces.

THE CONSTITUTION.

The constitution as adopted lays the foundation for a strong, effective, compact fighting organization. It is too long to be given in full here, and much of it concerns matters of detail that are common to all organizations. Moreover a copy of it can be obtained by addressing the Secretary-Treasurer, Comrade William E. Trautman, 148 W. Madison St., Chicago, Ill. The following summarizes its principal features and includes all that are peculiar to it.

The first article provides for the division of the field into thirteen "International Industrial Departments," with the amendment given elsewhere in this article. It also provides for the internal organization of these departments and for other general bodies. The second article provides for the election of the President and Secretary-Treasurer by referendum of the entire membership from the three who shall be nominated for each of these offices by the general convention. This section also provides for the General Executive Board, the real governing power of the organization, next to the general membership, and defines its powers and duties. This board is to be composed of one member from each of the industrial departments. This board has general supervision of all matters, such as agreements between unions and employers, levying of special assessments, control of the official organ, and the calling out of any organizations aside from those directly involved in the original struggle.

The articles dealing with finances are as follows:

ARTICLE III.

"Section 1. The Revenue of the Organization shall be derived as follows: Charter fees for International Industrial Departments shall be \$25.00. Charter fees for District Councils and Local Unions shall be \$10.00.

Sec. 2. International Industrial Departments shall pay as general dues into the treasury of the Industrial Workers of the World the rate of 8 1-3 cents per month per member; Industrial Councils shall pay a flat rate of \$1.00 per month for the Organization; Local Unions shall pay 25 cents per member per month, together with such assessments as may be levied as provided for in Art. II, Sec. 4.

Sec. 3. Individual Industrial members may be admitted to

membership-at-large in the Organization as provided for in Art. I, Sec. 2 (d), on payment of \$2.00 initiation fee and 50 cents per month dues, together with such assessments as may be levied by the General Executive Board as provided for in Art. II, Sec. 4, all of which shall be paid to the General Secretary-Treasurer, provided Members-at-large shall remain such so long as they are outside the jurisdiction of a Local Union subordinate to the General Organization; but on moving within the jurisdiction of a Local Union of the Industrial Workers of the World, or any of its subordinate organizations, they shall transfer their membership from the union-at-large to the Local Union in whose jurisdiction they are employed.

The initiation fee for members of Local Unions, as provided for in Art. I, Sec. 2 (c) and Art. II, Sec. 5, shall be \$2.00. The monthly dues shall be 50 cents per month, together with such assessments as may be levied as provided for in Art. II, Sec. 5, provided no part of the initiation fee or dues above mentioned shall be used as a sick or death benefit, but shall be held in the treasury as a general fund to defray the legitimate expenses of the Union.

All International Industrial Unions, subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World, shall charge for initiation fee in their respective Unions not less than \$1.50 nor more than \$5.00, as in their judgment the conditions will justify.

All International Industrial Departments, subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World, shall collect from the membership of their organization a per capita tax at the rate of 25 cents per member per month, provided that no part of the above mentioned monies shall be used for sick, accident or death fund, but shall be held in the treasury of International Industrial Departments for the purpose of paying the legitimate expenses of maintaining the organizations.

ARTICLE IV.

DEFENSE FUND AND HOW MAINTAINED.

Section 1. The dues received by the General Organization shall be divided as follows: 2 1-3 cents of the 8 1-3 cents per month per member received from International Industrial Departments shall be placed into a defense fund, the remaining 6 cents to be placed into the general fund.

Sec. 2. Five cents of the 25 cents per member per month received from Local Unions paying directly to headquarters will be placed into the defense fund, the balance to be placed into the general fund.

Sec. 3. Individual members receiving membership cards direct from the General Organization shall pay to headquarters

50 cents per month, all of which is to be placed into the defense fund.

PAYMENT FROM DEFENSE FUND.

Section 1. Whenever a strike has been duly and legally entered upon, in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution, the General Executive Board shall have power to order payments from the defense fund, for the purpose of conducting the same and supporting those involved, until such strike has been duly and legally declared off by the General Executive Board; but no payments shall be made from the defense fund as donations or contributions, or for any other purpose, except to conduct strikes or lockouts and pay benefits in cases where strikes or lockouts have been duly and legally approved by the General Executive Board.

Sec. 2. *Strike Pay and Rates Of.*—Strike pay shall not be allowed to strikers until they have, in each separate case, been out on a legalized strike, or are being locked out, for a period exceeding seven (7) consecutive days and the strike allowance after seven consecutive days shall be stipulated and regulated by the General Executive Board and shall be paid only to those who were actually working when the strike or lockout began and who were called out, or their lockout caused by such procedures as are in conformity with the provisions of this Constitution; providing, however, that the General Executive Board may make provisions for those who were not working at the time when the conflict started. This authority may be used to a very limited extent in extraordinary cases only.

Sec. 3. *Unions—When Suspended.*—All Industrial Departments, Local Unions and individual members of the Industrial Workers of the World that are in arrears for dues and assessments for sixty (60) days, counting from the last day of the month for which reports and remittances are due, shall not be considered in good standing and shall not be entitled to any of the benefits or payments from any funds of this Organization.”

The sixth article provides for the basis of representation at the annual convention as follows:

ARTICLE VI.

CONVENTION.

“Section 1. The Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be held on the first Monday in May of each year at such place as may be determined by previous convention.

Sec. 2. Delegates to the Annual Convention shall be as here-

inafter provided for. The General President, the General Secretary-Treasurer and other members of the General Executive Board shall be delegates-at-large with one vote each, but shall not be accredited delegates nor carry the vote of any union or organization.

Sec. 3. Industrial Departments shall have one delegate for the first 4,000, or less, of its members; for more than 4,000 and up to 7,000 members they shall have two delegates; for more than 7,000 and less than 20,000 members they shall have three delegates; for more than 20,000 and less than 40,000 members they shall have four delegates; for more than 40,000 members and less than 80,000 members they shall have five delegates; for more than 80,000 and less than 160,000 members they shall have six delegates, and for more than 160,000 members they shall have seven delegates.

Sec. 4. Local Unions, chartered directly by the Industrial Workers of the World, shall have one delegate for 200 members, or less, and one additional delegate for each additional 200, or major fraction thereof.

Sec. 5. When two or more delegates are representing any Local Union, or International Industrial Union or Industrial Department in the Convention, the vote of their respective organization shall be equally divided between such delegates.

Sec. 6. Representation in the Convention shall be based on the National Dues paid to the General Organization for the last six months of each fiscal year and each union and organization entitled to representation in the Convention shall be entitled to one vote for its first fifty (50) of its members and one additional vote for each additional fifty (50) of its members, or major fraction thereof.

This plan, while granting added power to the larger unions in proportion to their numbers, yet so modifies this as to prevent any single organization from ruling the entire convention as does the U. M. W. in the A. F. of L. conventions at the present time."

Other miscellaneous provisions of considerable importance are as follows:

"Sec. 10. There must be a Universal Label for the entire Organization. All unions, departments and individual members must procure supplies, such as membership books, official buttons, labels, badges and stamps from the General Secretary-Treasurer, all of which shall be of uniform design.

Sec. 11. There shall be a free interchange of cards between all organizations subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World and any Local Union, or International Industrial Union, or Industrial Department shall accept, in lieu of initiation fee, the

paid-up membership card of any recognized labor union or organization.

ARTICLE VII.

Section 1. The General Executive Board, or not less than ten (10) locals in at least three (3) industries, may initiate a referendum on any subject to be submitted to the Convention.

Sec. 2. A majority vote cast shall rule in the General Organization and its subordinate parts, except as otherwise provided for in this Constitution.

Sec. 3. None but actual wage workers shall be admitted as members-at-large.

Sec. 4. So soon as there are ten (10) Local Unions with not less than 3,000 members in any one industry, the General Executive Board shall immediately proceed to call a Convention of that industry and proceed to organize them as an International Industrial Department of the Industrial Workers of the World.

INCIDENTS OF THE CONVENTION.

Just a few general observations on the work of the convention. In the first place as to the part played by De Leon and his followers. So far as the "talkfest" stage of proceedings was concerned his crowd had a decided advantage. There were about thirty of his followers from organizations whose total membership even on paper would not exceed two thousand. The western delegates were inclined to look upon the trouble between the S. L. P. and the S. P. as partaking largely of a personal quarrel. They were not familiar with the years of falsification, intrigue and general crookedness that had marked the career of De Leon, therefore they could not understand why, when De Leon was ready to promise to cease fighting that the S. P. men should not be "equally generous." As the convention progressed, however, and his true character became apparent there was a revulsion of feeling which showed itself in the vote on the executive committee.

A word of personal explanation may also be worth while, with regard to the notorious "Lawyer incident," especially as the truth concerning the matter has not yet appeared in any publication.

Comrade Boudin, the well known contributor to the columns of the REVIEW had spoken to me about sending in his credentials as delegate. I told him that if objection was made on the ground of being a lawyer that I should not attempt to defend him, much as I liked him personally and thoroughly as I recognized his ability. However, I was scarcely prepared for the sort of fight the DeLeonites put up. They saw an opportunity in the attempt to

seat a lawyer to play the "holier than thou" act for all it was worth, and proceeded to express their horrible detestation at the very idea of seating a lawyer. When several speeches of this kind had been made I arose and spoke about as follows :

"I want to show the convention something of the honesty and sincerity of those who are now raving about lawyers by informing them that the only organization on the floor of this hall that admits lawyers to its membership is the S. T. & L. A. and that the very individual whom they are now fighting was not only a member of their organization, but was for one year a member of their national executive committee. However, I agree with the general principle that this organization should not accept lawyers to membership, and shall so vote."

I therefore voted against the seating of Comrade Boudin, and DeLeon's statement which was followed by several of the S. P. papers that I sought to have a lawyer seated is simply a falsification.

Many socialist papers have attempted to show that the convention was captured by De Leon. I do not care to enter into the merits and demerits of De Leon's activity in the convention, but the fact is there was but one test of the strength which he actually controlled and that was in the election of the two members at large for the temporary executive board. De Leon seconded the nomination of Thomas C. Powers and his supporters made special pleas for his election. When the votes were counted, however, they stood as follows. Each delegate voted for two and the two highest being elected :

John Riordan	40,446
F. W. Cronin	33,554
Pat O'Neill	8,278
Powers	7,189

We would also refer our readers to the communication by Comrade Debs which appears elsewhere in this number for further information on this and other points concerning which there has been considerable reckless talk.

There has been much discussion about what attitude the Socialist Party should take towards this new organization. I can not see that it is called upon to act officially in any manner whatever. While nearly every official of the new organization is a member of the Socialist Party not one of them, so far as I have been able to discover, wishes to involve the party in any way. If, however, those editors of socialist papers and officials of the Socialist Party who have organized unions for the purpose of getting themselves elected to national conventions and posing as trades union leaders, insist on waging a fierce war against the

new organization and everybody connected with it; if an attempt is made to draw up a black list of speakers and place every one on it who does not subscribe to the A. F. of L. catechism, then it is easy to see that there will be trouble ahead. The men connected with the industrial union movement have taken every precaution to avoid involving the party and if trouble comes it will be because of those who are so anxious to gain the favor of the A. F. of L. officials that they must heap their abuse on every one who does not kow-tow to their pure and simple god.

A. M. SIMONS.

Why I am Content in Journalism.

HAVING been both a minister and a socialist lecturer, I am now primarily a journalist, writing editorials for a daily paper of large circulation, and am quite content in the metamorphosis. This willingness to give up the ministry for which, even as a child I felt an impelling passion, and to lay aside, temporarily, a work which still appeals to me as the best the world offers, rests upon principles which seem to me important and interesting. The fact of the change depends on prosaic necessity, no doubt; contented acquiescence therein involves for me convictions born of slow processes, but now most inspiring.

I was ordained in 1899, after a university course in which philosophy, history and sociology took the place of theological studies. My interest in economic and social problems had been keen from childhood, but my religious interest was always in the ascendancy, so that, although a woman, I cannot remember when I did not expect to preach. It may be of interest to remark in passing, that this desire and purpose never received the slightest discouragement but was always accepted by relations, friends and teachers as quite a matter of course. The same experience met me after graduation, and I began and continued my ministry without meeting any obstacles because of sex. As good or better openings came to me always as came to young men of like experience. In the second year of my ministry, I was called to a pulpit in a Western city of about 75,000 people. Here the first outcropping of industrial issues met me. A street car strike occurred, and with the audacity of youth I opened fire on the question, preaching on the necessity of labor organization and strikes, at the height of the local excitement. A few of the members gave up attendance at church, but, as a whole, the membership and officials were patient and tolerant. Afterward, although my interest in industrial questions was always apparent and my

*The above article was sent to *The Independent* in response to an invitation to ministers to explain their position toward social and economic subjects. The editor declined it because it arrived "too late." It is noteworthy in connection with this symposium that the editor remarks that, while they expected the discussion to cover the entire field of economic subjects and their relation to the ministry they found that all the articles dealt with the relation of christianity to socialism. To the socialists this simply affords one more illustration of the fact that socialism really occupies the entire field and is the only movement really offering any "problem" in relation to capitalism or any of its phases.

views pronounced on the radical side of all issues as they then arose no crisis in my relations with my congregation came. Possibly, had no other elements entered to interfere with denominational free sailing, I might to this day have been contentedly ministering to some congregation, keeping my views all unconsciously within the limits which would have been tolerated as a harmless fad.

Fortunately a break came with my denomination on grounds neither theological nor industrial, and for eight years I continued my preaching as an independent minister, with unquestioned success in winning audiences, inspiring community activities and public recognition, but with not enough of pecuniary support to place any serious temptation in the way of free conviction and expression.

For I must confess that a close observation of ministerial human nature, as well as that in educational, political and journalistic atmospheres, has forcibly confirmed my socialist theory that with individuals, as with society, the psychological makeup is a close reflex of the underlying material interest, and I would not venture to assume positively that I would have been among the rare exceptions to this rule. As it was, few of the subtle chains which, unconsciously to their victims, bind public teachers, hindered the growth of an intense enthusiasm for industrial reforms. From the time of the Bellamy days, I called myself a Socialist, lecturing frequently on the subject as I then viewed it, but believing that reform, after the manner of Bryanism, was the necessary preparatory "evolution."

In 1900 I chanced to live in a state in which the most advanced reform movement was in official control. Several laws representing high water mark in progressive political measures were carried by the legislature and the "step at a time" process toward socialism seemed well under way. About this time I frequently gave an address at socialist meetings, trying to convince them how foolish they were to refuse their assistance to the fine reforms that were being gained. These suggestions were met in the discussions by the socialist theory that working class figs never grew on the thistles of Capitalist class rule, and events proved only too clearly the truth of their position. By a succession of delays, court decisions, corrupt elections and the most daring capitalistic lawlessness every vestige of these justly heralded reforms have been either swept away or made ineffective by the manner of their final application.

In an early stage of this process, I became convinced that the strictly Marxian Socialists were right and have since regarded nothing as fundamentally important but such illumination of economic laws as should teach co-operation with the forces pushing

toward an industry, uncursed by economic class divisions and unclogged by rent, interest and profit.

I gave up all attempts to preach to congregations from which no united economic effort could be expected, and for several years gave all my time to teaching Socialism in classes, lectures and party organization.

Although my religious interest had not ebbed and although the preacher's yearning to arouse spiritual fervor in dormant natures was as strong as ever, this socialist activity more than satisfied. My religious convictions were born of an ardent acceptance of scientific philosophy as voiced by Spencer, Huxley and Tyndall, and as interpreted by John Fiske, E. P. Powell and the more radical religious teachers of the day. My college course in metaphysics had left me somewhat supercilious regarding these men as philosophers, but the practical requirements of a rational religious ministry led me to a grateful appreciation of the cosmic truths these thinkers made real.

Into the sense of that "God of things as they are," thus gained, the socialism of Karl Marx fitted with an intellectual and spiritual completeness exultantly satisfying. The chief work of Spencer, Darwin and Marx was done in the same decade. They all breathe the same reverence for facts, the same sense of immanent and omnipotent law, the same awe-inspiring consciousness of organic unity. As Spencer swung full circle in the prophetic outline of universal law, as Darwin faithfully, slowly worked out that law in its biological minuteness, so Karl Marx discovered the same law in the complexities of sociology and its foundation science, economics.

Humanity and all nature vibrated with a divine significance for me because of the cosmic message of evolutionary law, even before I knew of Marx's gospel. This attitude made most welcome my largely Utopian conception of earlier Socialism. It required faith for its acceptance; but some goal, free from the tragedies and the dwarfings of society as I saw it, seemed a necessary postulate if the universal development were not to be proven a farce. Scientific Socialism changed this faith and hope into confident assurance based on laws indisputable and universally operative, and added inexpressible dignity and beauty to the cosmic order.

In ordinary economic instruction, the impression is given that the theory of value is the Alpha and Omega of Karl Marx's philosophy. On the contrary, this is but one phase of an inclusive teaching. The theory of value involves surplus values and the divergent interests of employer and employed. Surplus value, or profits, involves world markets, over-production, panics and the final, inevitable stoppage of capitalistic production.

The divergent interests of the two factors in productive in-

dustry, illustrate the law of social evolution as a series of class struggles, and yields the great class struggle of the present, by means of which the world's workers will be educated to the task of carrying the evolution in industry from its present status as collective production for private profit, into collective production for social need.

It is impossible to convey briefly any conception of the synthesis the Socialist doctrine reveals between the great facts and laws it discusses under the phrases "industrial evolution," "class consciousness," "class struggle" and "material interests." Suffice it to say that they constitute a whole which appealed to me as the very life of an immanent God revealing Himself and fulfilling before our eyes and in our hearts the transfiguring processes of evolutionary beatitude.

To feel oneself a part of labor's world-wide solidarity, was to be a conscious part of the divine dynamics by which the inherent potency of unity, good will and opportunity for all were to be realized at last among men.

With feelings and convictions such as these increasing daily as further study, observation of events and association with comrades enlarged my comprehension of the Socialist viewpoint, how does it happen that I am content to be out of the active propaganda? I still speak frequently for the "Local" of which I am a member. I still help as I can, financially, to keep other workers in the field. I write when I can for the Socialist press. But my bread and butter comes from another source and by far the major part of my energy must be given to using my pen upon matters which seem to me of decidedly secondary importance. The reason why I am content in this situation is rooted in the Socialist outlook. Sacrifice and martyrdom is not encouraged among us. Socialism must come primarily through economic necessity on the one hand and the intelligent self-interest of the working class on the other. To be normal, propaganda must be a part of these movements. Economic conditions turn adrift many wage slaves, both "intellectuals" and black-listed manual laborers. These are the natural material out of which Socialist agitators are produced. If they teach a clear brand of Socialism, and teach it effectively, so that it is easy to support them, they are welcomed to the ranks of Socialist workers. If their Socialism is hazy, "half-baked" or idealistic, the fact that they have made sacrifices for the cause, however heroic and honorable such sacrifice may have been, counts very little, so far as smoothing the path for Socialist propaganda is concerned. On the other hand no one is encouraged to give up a feasible livelihood for the work. There are more fine lecturers and organizers in the field than the movement can well support, and whoever can win or retain a "job" not utterly treasonous to the cause, is encouraged to do so.

It is not as if we believed that agitation was the primary causal agency for the approaching revolution. Economic forces must and will lead, and the human energy most directly part and parcel of these forces is that most to be depended upon. Therefore the propagandist who is forced into the movement by economic necessity as well as convictions, is an especially fitting instrument for the interpretation of conditions.

This sense of society as a process and organic movement is the key to most socialist ideas and especially discourages any artificial, inordinate individual efforts. Not only did this view cause me to welcome an offer to become editorial writer on a large daily paper, but it makes me appreciative of that work in its opportunities, even though direct political Socialism is tabooed. The journal for which I write is an exponent of radical Democracy with strong Public Ownership leanings. I can arraign existing conditions to almost any extent and urge "public ownership of public utilities," to any limit, even mildly suggesting public ownership of the Trusts. But, strange as it may seem, to those who regard these things as the essence of Socialism, these are not opportunities that I especially value. To arraign existing evils without pointing out the principles at fault and the remedy therefor; to help enlarge public capitalism from which the laborer will receive no appreciable benefit—these things do not appeal to the Socialist. Nothing is a part of his distinctive work but such efforts as have directly in view the employment of the last man and the elimination of all exploitation from his labor product.

No "reform" efforts can do either of these things, hence reform work will forever leave a wretched army of the unemployed and the terrible maladjustment of the surplus product. Only the complete cessation of rent, interest and profit (labor's surplus product) will solve the problem of the downmost man or the problem of world-production without panic and chaos.

Nevertheless, ceaseless arraignment may stimulate some persons to think out or to search out their own solutions, especially if the finger is placed discriminatingly as near the actual sore as possible; and Public Ownership is so entirely the common sense procedure of even a capitalistic civic order, that I find it easy and not distasteful to urge it in season and out, but never, for a moment, conveying the impression (if I can help it) that it will solve any important economic problem. I especially relish writing editorials showing (to timid readers) how far removed is public ownership of public utilities from Socialism—something I can do with all my heart and bring out some important truths in the process.

Fortunately my socialism was notorious before I was given my present position and I am not expected to write in opposition to my convictions. During a campaign I revel in attacks upon

the Republican party and principles, while leaving to others all boosting for the party of the paper's allegiance. The blue pencil of the managing editor is always alert for my documents, but it is not often used now that I have learned where to draw the line.

The opportunities I value most are in two directions, ethical and sociological. The "leader" on Sunday is always a sermon as "preachy" as I can make it and as permeated as I choose with whatever spiritual and intellectual message I have to give. This supplies the old pulpit opportunity, only with a congregation that a circulation of nearly 100,000 gives, instead of a few hundred physical hearers. There was a time when this would have seemed inexpressibly gratifying; I should have felt that I was using the fulcrum which would move the world. To-day I know that this is not the case. Moral ideals and spiritual uplifts are blessed luxuries for such as may give them room and in some measure realize them in their lives, but they put no bread in hungry mouths; they soften scarcely a whit the cruel grip of the system upon capitalist hearts; they make little appeal to the millions overworked and exhausted; they can only in rare cases free the dependent wage slave from servility and the many pits of mental, moral and physical prostitution in which thousands upon thousands are engulfed. "When men are better, systems will improve." If I still believed this, I should exult in my pulpit of printer's ink. But on the contrary and to my even greater satisfaction, I now see that economic conditions must be the source of the general moral uplift rather than the feeble sermonizing of individuals.

The God of this old world is bringing to pass mighty culminations by world-wide processes. Socialism is coming, not because men are to become so in love with brotherhood that they will demand a Utopian readjustment, but because the good old laws of self-preservation and the struggle for existence are creating a new social order as they have heretofore brought about new biological species, industrial systems and political epochs. The intelligent self-interest of capitalism has brought world production and a world market, an educated proletariat and an industrial organization ready for collective operation. It will soon bring about, also, the clogged, over-supplied world market, which is the logical and actual winding up of an impossible system of production—capitalism.

"Civilization must solve the problem of distribution or it will go to pieces," has been reiterated by economists for many years. Socialism, or distribution with rent, interest and profit eliminated, is the only solution, since this alone allows no surplus to clog the wheels of production. Capitalism is valiantly leading the world to its own doom.

Meanwhile, countless forces are educating the workers of the

world to a sense of solidarity based on intelligent collective self-interest, such as will prepare them to assert themselves when any crisis comes—if not before.

There is nothing Utopian about this. Ideals are not the dynamics of the movement. But to one who has faith in an immanent God, it is a magnificent drama to watch, an awesome and glorious process of which to be a part.

So, while I still love to preach on paper or in pulpit, I can no longer feel that such work is as fundamental as I once thought it. The art of gracious, bountiful living is the most beautiful art. To teach its principles is a privilege; but for the fulcrum upon which the world is being lifted, one must look to something more universal, more potent in cosmic impulse, nearer to the ultimate creative life. Only material interests and industrial forces are sufficiently world-wide to answer such a purpose.

Believing this, the best work I can do aside from the direct interpretation of the Socialist gospel, to fellow workers, is to give to my readers some conception of this world process in its almost infinite ramifications. More than I value the pulpit place I hold, I delight in the opportunity to put passing events in the perspective of the great Marxian laws: to show the fallacy of the President's charming theory of a moral basis for a good nation; to show the economic forces operating on the international political chess board; to trace the laws which must operate before the problem can be solved. All this I can do without meeting often the "blue pencil," and to give, from countless angles, the "Socialist *Weltanschauung*" to a few thoughtful people at least, seems to me to be a great privilege, and a privilege especially to be appreciated when it comes as a part of the work by which I earn my living as a "wage slave."

Long before I die I confidently expect a crisis to arise which will force me again into a Socialist activity inconsistent with capitalistic employment. I shall welcome the call when it comes, gladly. In the meantime it is enough to keep the pulse throbbing just to be one of the uncounted international hosts of labor upon whose shoulders rest the responsibility for ushering in a civilization of free men, women and children—free personally, religiously, politically and, most important of all—industrially.

ANONYMOUS.

The Industrial Convention.

THE delegates who assembled in Chicago last month in response to the call for the Industrial Convention were as representative a proletarian gathering as ever met in this or any other country. The task that awaited them was as difficult, all things considered, as any that ever confronted a body of workers, but they were equal to it and as the result of their deliberations and actions there is now a sound economic working-class organization in the field; and although its progress will be beset with difficulties, it will sturdily face and successfully overcome them all and fulfill the great mission for which it has been organized.

From the very first the capitalist papers misrepresented and in fact deliberately lied about the convention. I have it upon good authority that all the Chicago dailies united in instructing their reporters to "knock" the convention wherever possible and in other respects to ignore it. They did even worse than this, in that they resorted to downright mendacity to accomplish their purpose of defeating a body of men who by their records had proved that they were above the corrupting influences of capitalist bribery and whose object it was to unite the working class for their emancipation from wage-slavery.

These capitalist organs are all very loyal to the American Federation of Labor for reasons that readily suggest themselves.

To show how the capitalist press treated us it is only necessary to say that at their own solicitation I furnished a statement in regard to the convention and its objects. All the Chicago papers were supplied with a copy of it and *all of them suppressed it*. Not a single line appeared, although the statement was furnished at their own solicitation. Next, they sent reporters accompanied by shorthand writers to interview me in regard to the convention and the work it was expected to accomplish. I took the time to dictate an extended and detailed statement. *Not a single line appeared*. Then again, when I was obliged to leave the convention before adjournment to fill some speaking engagements, these same papers reported that I had left in disgust, which was an unqualified falsehood.

The work of the convention, on the whole, was and is entirely satisfactory to me. It was in point of fact, in many respects, the greatest labor convention I ever attended.

The delegates differed widely in matters of detail, which was

to be expected, but upon the great vital principle of uniting the working class upon the economic field in a revolutionary organization recognizing and expressing the class struggle they were one, and the record they made for themselves and their class was in every respect creditable to both their heads and their hearts and will bear the severest tests of time.

Of course, there is no disposition on our part to avoid criticism. We expect it and are prepared to meet it. We have taken our stand and all the capitalist class and their cohorts of whatever name cannot dislodge us.

The predictions so freely made before the convention that Debs was seeking an office and that DeLeon would show his fine Italian hand were all designed to discredit the convention, and the fact that neither the one nor the other of these "self-seekers" holds office in the new organization forces these critics to find other reasons for opposing industrial organization in the interest of the working class.

DeLeon did not "capture" the organization and Debs is not "disgusted" with it. Such silly and stupid falsehoods will have no effect on the body of men and women who met in Chicago on June 27th, and who performed their task with such ability and such fidelity to the working class that the organization formed by them, so much needed at this time, will at once appeal to the workers of the land and they will rally to its standard in ever-increasing numbers until it becomes the dominant power on the economic field in the working class struggle for emancipation.

EUGENE V. DEBS.

State Socialism and Social Democracy.

A FEW days ago one of the oldest and most active members of the S. D. F. opened an interesting discussion at that home of interesting discussions, the Central Branch of our organization, upon the question whether we should repudiate the designation of State Socialists. He was in favor of our not doing so. His reasons, briefly, were that we are constantly appealing to the State, as the organized force of the whole nation, to remedy evils engendered by our economic system. When we are calling upon the State to feed the children, to organize the labor of the unemployed, to provide better education for all, to distribute our letters and telegrams cheaply and effectively, to take control of our railroads, to set on foot a thorough scheme for the housing of the people, etc., it is a contradiction in terms to say that we are not in favor of State action, and that therefore it weakens our position to disclaim being State Socialists. Furthermore, we run no risk by accepting that designation. For what, after all, is the State? The State is the representative of the whole people, as distinguished from the various sections into which it is divided. It holds the balance between any conflicting interests; or, if it does not, this is its proper duty, and we ought not to assume it will decline to accept and fulfil this great trust. We have to look to the State as a collectivity to restrain tendencies to anarchy and to organize the forces of the nation for the increasing advantage of all. This idea of the State has been accepted by many great men in ancient and modern times, and the Greeks more particularly understood the function of the State as the ordering power of the entire people. The State, in fact, is what we choose to make it, and there is no inherent antagonism between the State and democracy. Therefore, Social-Democrats need not be squeamish about being called State Socialists. Such was the argument.

Now it is worth while to deal seriously with points of this sort when they are raised. Socialism is no cut-and-dried collection of dogmas, which are to be taken without investigation. If each successive generation of Socialists considers itself bound to argue out over again all the bed-rock principles of their creed, so much the better. The process will, as we believe, give them only a firmer grip of their entire soundness. And this of State Socialism and State Socialists is not a mere question of words.

Much lies behind it, both in the abstract and in the concrete, in theory and in practice.

To begin with practice. No Social-Democrat who works for the attainment of our "stepping-stones" through the State, regards those palliatives of existing capitalist anarchy as anything more than temporary ameliorations of unendurable conditions. The State is used for this purpose, not because we admire or even tolerate the State, but because, with all its innumerable drawbacks, it is the only machinery available for such partial improvement. We have no illusions whatever in the matter. We know and have frequently pointed out that if we realized them all as set forth above, they would, except in so far as they helped forward the breakdown of the whole capitalist system, and therefore of the State, merely furnish forth better wage-slaves and better organization for the profit-takers. That is indisputable. State departments maintain competition wage-earning and the whole of the forms of wage-slavery. Even if State employes are well-paid, and are assured of continuous employment, they are still only privileged menials, so long as they are unable conjointly with their fellows to control the entire management of the industrial community. State control of this sort may be better or it may be worse than private control, but brings with it no complete change from competition to co-operation such as we are striving for.

Moreover, there is an ever-present danger of fostering Cæsarism and crystalizing a bureaucracy, and the admission that we Democratic Socialists can be in any sense State-Socialists cannot fail greatly to increase this danger. Words still count largely in the formation of ideas. If we, as Social-Democrats, do not force into men's minds the truth that we are working and fighting for a complete social revolution, which shall abolish the present State and establish a Society in its place, we mislead our readers and hearers, and induce them to think we, too, are merely tinkerers with present forms of social development. That in itself is a great practical drawback to our allowing it to be thought for a moment that we are in any sense State-Socialists, or men and women who look to the State as a definite entity through which, without entire transformation, we can achieve our ultimate ends. The State means to the infinite majority of people a government dependent nominally upon the people, but imposing its authority from above. But that is precisely what we are endeavoring to overturn. To permit ourselves to be called State-Socialists without demur is to convey a false impression to the public mind. And all false impressions cause confusion and delay, and hamper the cause to which we have devoted ourselves.

So much for the practical and the concrete. Now for the abstract and the theoretical. We English, as a people, are terribly behindhand in all that relates to abstract thought or theo-

retical investigation. Yet it is impossible in many cases to arrive at the truth by direct concrete illustration that has no theoretical basis. Now the State, or the Civitas, as opposed to the Community, or the Societas, has always been based upon property and class interest and privilege, as opposed to kinship and common enjoyment and social equality. State rule always has meant class rule, and has involved a whole series of class antagonisms, at present in course of simplification into one great and final antagonism. The ordering of a State is through departments dominated by bureaucrats, who therefore dominate the people. The arrangement of a Society or a Co-operative Commonwealth is by a series of citizens dominated by the community, who act as functions of the society, not as controllers of the society. Private property in the powers of producing and distributing wealth having been abrogated, the State, in any intelligible sense, ceases to exist. It is no longer, that is to say, a State constituted to restrain and "hold the balance" between conflicting interests; but a co-operative Social-Democracy; instituted to produce and distribute, and to increase the general health, wealth and enjoyment by common consent for the advantage of all. There is then no State to handle and control, as the trusts virtually handle and control it in the nominal democracy of America, or as the aristocracy and plutocracy virtually handle and control it in the nominal democracy of the United Kingdom.

During the transition period, no doubt, we shall try, as we are trying to-day, to use the State against both landlords and capitalists; but we shall do so with the deliberate intention of putting an end to the State, just as we shall abolish Capital, altogether. Consequently, we are no more State-Socialists than we are Capital-Socialists. We recognize that the State and Capital are inevitable stages in social evolution, which will endure a longer or shorter time as circumstances or experience may determine. But both will have to go. So I, for one, refuse to let myself be called a State-Socialist when I am doing my best to sweep away the State.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

(From "Justice.")

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

IN ONE respect, however, Hegel stands entirely by himself as an idealist philosopher. His is the unique distinction of having elaborated idealism into a complete system of monism, by making his absolute idea the lock and key of all science and philosophy, and thus interpreting the world and its phenomena from a uniform point of view. It was this monist principle which enabled him to trace the course of history as an evolution and make a dialectic (evolutionary) method of investigation and description familiar to scientists.

It was also his monism which compelled him to take issue with Kant's metaphysical conception of "the thing itself." This metaphysical absurdity did not fit into the frame work of Hegel's monistic system. For the absolute idea was the only all-pervading reality in this system, and everything that appeared in the world was but the work of this idea. In the human mind, the absolute idea became self-conscious. It is evident, therefore, that the idea must know and understand its own nature and that of its emanations, including Kant's unknowable thing itself. And since the human mind was part and parcel of the absolute idea, it, too, must partake of this absolute faculty of understanding and must be able to learn all there is to the thing itself. Now, things reveal their nature by their qualities. Therefore, if all the qualities of a thing were known to us, we should know all that we could ever learn about the thing itself, including the fact that it existed outside of our faculty of thought. But since all things outside of us, and we ourselves, are but different expressions of the absolute idea, there can be nothing in the world that will remain unknowable to us.

Thinking and being were thus monistically united. But thinking was the only reality in Hegel's philosophy, and being merely an attribute of thought. So the idealist monism of this thinker came to this insoluble contradiction: It tried to prove the reality of the absolute idea by the identity of thinking and being, but the only reliable means by which it could accomplish this was the use of "pure" thought. It had to reject all empirical methods, and rely solely on the power of so-called innate (*a priori*) ideas for the solution of the world's riddles. But innate ideas can operate only with purely introspective philosophy for the solution

of all scientific problems. This, however, was contrary to the dialectic (evolutionary) method of research, which compelled Hegel to collect the experienced facts of history. In fact, he diligently followed the thread of evolution in all fields of science known in his day, and an objective comparison would clearly show that even the so-called great apostle of evolution, Herbert Spencer, walked but in the steps of this encyclopedic idealist monist.

Hegel's dialectic was thus perpetually at war with his system. This was the fatal flaw in his monism. The real and the unreal can never be combined into a system, any more than the something and nothing. The something is real, the nothing is—nothing, is unreal. Being and thinking can be combined only by accepting them as realities. The term "nothing" expresses merely the abstract opposite of an imaginary absolute something. It exists only in thought, it is "pure" thought, which means that it is human imagination misled by false logic. And if this abstract nothing is used as a basis for a system of philosophy, it leads to nothing, in other words, it leaves the human understanding in the wilderness without a guide.

So far as the Hegelian system is concerned, it tells us, therefore, nothing about man, life and their origins, which would improve in any way the work of the ancient Grecian philosophers, the English materialists and the natural philosophers of the 19th century, such as Treviranus and Lamarck, or which would even indicate the progress made by these men. Nor does it explain the hidden springs of the human faculty of thought. Even a metaphysical thinker like Leibniz, who tried as hard as Spinoza to find a monistic clue to the world, had given a better foundation for the study of this faculty by suggesting that so-called innate ideas might be acquired by the hereditary transmission of ideas derived from experienced perceptions. And those who went back to Kant for an improvement of the Hegelian system, for instance Schopenhauer, landed logically in the swamp of reactionary obscurantism. With all its undeniable brilliancy, Hegelian idealist monism was, therefore, a step away from a scientific understanding of the world.

Not so the Hegelian dialectic. This method developed all the hidden value of the Kantian philosophy. And when the Hegelian system failed, the dialectic survived and prepared, with the downfall of idealist monism, the ascendancy and victory of materialistic monism. It is the evolutionary thread, which runs through all of Hegel's writings, that renders a study of his works beneficial for the socialist thinker, who has learned to cull the evolutionary kernel from the idealist husks.

The immediate result of the critical study of Hegelian philosophy in Germany was a fight of the Young-Hegelians against

the system of their master. Among these progressive thinkers, the most decisive contribution toward materialist monism was to come from Friedrich Koeppen, Bruno Bauer, Ludwig Feuerbach, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

The strength of Koeppen lay in his understanding of history. The study of the official writers of Prussia had opened his eyes to the unreliability of the academic historians, whose sole sources of information were diplomatic documents and police reports. He made himself conspicuous by a very clever and clear description of the reign of terror in the French revolution, by which he demonstrated his faculty of selecting the most significant and characteristic factors out of a multitude of garbled and intentionally colored traditions. And he distinguished himself favorably from the mass of the Young-Hegelians by admitting the value of the materialists of the 18th century, although he objected to the "crude materialism" of a Holbach and Helvetius. Koeppen never divested himself fully of the bourgeois psychology, but his historical talent proved to be invaluable to Karl Marx, who was destined to become the first scientific spokesman of the proletarian revolution.

With the development of the German bourgeoisie, and its repression by the feudal nobility, the thinkers of the rising classes felt the need of finding a philosophical expression for their historical condition. In the minds of Bruno Bauer, Koeppen and Marx, this longing for self-expression found vent in a study of self-consciousness. Their starting point was Hegel's analysis of the Grecian philosophy of consciousness, particularly the development of self-consciousness in its relation to social consciousness, in the Sceptics, Epicureans and Stoics. In the Sceptics, self-consciousness had renounced all contact with the world and retreated into itself. The Epicureans had undertaken to show that the principle of individual consciousness was the compelling motive of the universe. The Stoics, finally, had emphasized the interrelation of individual consciousness with universal consciousness. Hegel had given a philosophically obscure and historically weak presentation of these three schools of Grecian thought, and the idealist nature of his system had impregnated his statements with a good deal of reactionary sentiment. It was natural that his revolutionary disciples should take particular offense at this part of Hegelian philosophy and test its soundness by probing deeper into the problem of Grecian self-consciousness and social consciousness.

The result of their studies was a peculiar contribution on the part of each one of these three Young-Hegelians to the problem of consciousness. Koeppen illustrated the significance of the three above-named Grecian schools by the concrete example of Frederick the Great. Bruno Bauer was led from the study of

these three Grecian schools to a study of their influence on the development of primitive Christian consciousness in the Graeco-Roman world. This research bore fruit in the shape of a destructive criticism of the historical value of the four gospels. Bauer struck orthodox theology to the heart by denying that the gospel accounts were based on historical facts and demonstrating conclusively that Christianity arose in the Roman empire as a product of Grecian philosophy and Roman conditions. But neither Koepen nor Bauer were able to exert a pregnant influence on the political conditions of their country by means of practical conclusions drawn from their studies.

Marx, on the other hand, probed deeper than his two companions and became an epoch-making historical figure. He first of all set out on a searching analysis of the three significant Grecian schools of thought and studied their connection with the entire Grecian philosophy. He graduated at the University of Berlin with a dissertation on the difference between the philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus. And he came to the conclusion that his purpose could not consist in anything else but in stating religious and political questions in their self-conscious human form. Religion was the all-absorbing topic in those days of political oppression, and a critique of religion an indirect way of combatting all political reaction. Marx was intimately familiar with the works of Kant and Hegel, and went into a minute study of their proofs for the existence of a God. The comical contradictions in those proofs wrung from him the amused exclamation: "What sort of clients are those, whom their own lawyer cannot save from execution in any other way than by killing them himself?"

It is out of such considerations as these that Marx felt justified in declaring that religion "is the self-consciousness of a human being that has either not yet found itself or again lost itself. * * * Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creatures, the mind of a heartless world, the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opium of the people. * * * The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people signifies their demand for real happiness. * * * The world has long been dreaming of things and has but to become conscious of them in order to possess them. * * * Just as religion is the index of the theoretical struggles of mankind, so the political state is that of its practical struggles. * * *"

The theological opponents of Marx are fond of quoting the first part of these statements in order to prove that "socialism is the enemy of religion," but they are careful to omit the other quotations, which demand that the professed principles of religion should be applied in every day human life.

The religious criticisms of the Young-Hegelians were

crowned by Ludwig Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity" and "Theses for a Reform of Philosophy," by means of which he emancipated himself and his fellow-radicals from the Hegelian system. He declared point blank: The mystery of God's nature illustrates nothing else but the mystery of human nature. The various proofs for the existence of a God are merely interesting attempts of self-affirmation on the part of the human being. The method of speculative philosophy, which attempts to deduct concrete truths from abstract generalizations, is fallacious. Nothing can be obtained in this manner but a realization of one's own abstractions. The mystery of speculative philosophy finds its logical champion in theology. Hegelian philosophy is the last resort of theology. Whoever does not abandon Hegelian philosophy, does not abandon theology. Being is the true reality, and thinking merely an attribute of being. Being is simply the existence of nature. Empirical philosophy and natural science must go hand in hand.

Theoretically, Feuerbach had thus overcome Hegelian idealism and become a materialist philosopher. But when it came to a practical application of his new understanding to social problems, he balked at the logical progress implied by his advance over Hegel and fell into meaningless ethical generalizations of love. On the field, Hegel himself had gone farther than his revolutionary disciple. Feuerbach overcame the natural and religious idealism of Hegel, but failed to even suspect the meaning of the Hegelian philosophy of state and law. When confronted with the actual problems of social evolution, he was as helpless as the French socialists of the 18th century, who were masters of philosophic criticism, but had nothing constructive to offer save Utopian abstractions.

Marx, on his part, had arrived at an understanding of the deep and significant interrelation between politics and philosophy. In Kant's philosophy, Marx recognized the German theory of the French revolution. And with a fine sense of discrimination, he pointed out the real progress of Hegel over Kant in sociology and history. While Kant had still maintained the distinction between privileged *citizens* of the state and unprivileged *members* of society, Hegel regarded the state as that great organism, in which every human being should realize its legal, moral and political liberty. And the dialectical process, as outlined by Hegel, was praised by Marx as a wonderful advance over the historical blindness of Kant.

Marx, under these circumstances, did not stop at the point where Bauer and Feuerbach had rested in their advance. He pushed ahead without them, and was gradually compelled, by the exigencies of the political situation, to combat them. In the endeavor to better understand the relation of philosophy to pol-

itics, he first undertook to submit the Hegelian legal philosophy to his scrutiny, with a view of determining the relation of political freedom to human freedom. He opened his critique with these words: "The criticism of religion ended with the statement that man is for man the highest being. This is equivalent to the categorical imperative to abolish all conditions in which man is a degraded, oppressed, forsaken, despicable being." This requires a political revolution. What are the conditions under which such a revolution can take place? In analyzing this problem, Marx discovered that the conditions for such a revolution had not yet matured in Germany. But at the same time, he answered the question in such a way that it was solved for Germans as well as for all other nationalities.

"In order that the revolution of a nation and the emancipation of a definite class may coincide, in order that one class may be the representative of the entire nation, it is necessary that all shortcomings of society should be concentrated in another class, * * * so that the emancipation of this class may be equivalent to the emancipation of humanity."

This class is the modern proletariat, recruited mainly from the ranks of the disintegrating middle class and the different strata of the precapitalist working class. This proletariat will find its intellectual weapons in philosophy. "Philosophy cannot be realized without the abolition of the proletariat, the proletariat cannot emancipate itself without realizing philosophy."

This philosophical affirmation of the class struggle was followed by a philosophical synopsis of its historical mission. Bauer had declared that the solution of the "Jewish question" was identical with that of the emancipation of mankind from religion. Marx denied this and pointed out that the question of the relation of religion to politics was different from that of political to human freedom. Even with the greatest amount of political freedom possible in a bourgeois republic, the people might still be enthralled in religious superstitions. Political emancipation is not identical with emancipation from religious dualism. Exceptionally, the struggle for political emancipation may coincide with the struggle for emancipation from religion, as it did during a certain period of the French revolution. But so long as the bourgeoisie is the ruling class, this can occur only by antagonizing the conditions of its own existence, and must, therefore, result sooner or later in a rehabilitation of religion.

Marx was incidentally led to a searching criticism of the natural rights doctrine and found that the so-called inalienable human rights were nothing but an expression of bourgeois individuality resting on an advocacy of private property and individualism. "Not until the real individual man discards the abstract citizen of the state and realizes that he, as an individual, in his

actual life, his individual work, his individual relations, is a generic being, not until man has organized his individual powers into social powers, will human emancipation be accomplished."

It was this identical conclusion at which Friedrich Engels had likewise arrived in the meantime, and which he expressed in these words, in a preliminary critique of political economy: "Produce consciously, as human beings, not as separate atoms without any generic consciousness, and you will have overcome all artificial and untenable contradictions!" And with almost the same words as Marx, Engels summed up his conclusions relative to religion by declaring that "man lost in religion his own nature, divested himself of his manhood. Now that religion has lost its hold on the human mind through historical development, man becomes aware of the void in him and of his lack of support. There is no other salvation for him, if he wishes to regain his manhood, than to thoroughly overcome all religious ideas and return sincerely, not to 'God,' but to himself."

Engels, although not on such intimately personal terms with the historically significant Young-Hegelians as Marx, had likewise taken his departure from Hegel's dialectic. He had then studied Bauer's conception of self-consciousness and Feuerbach's humanitarianism, and pushed on beyond them in search of a fuller understanding of the Grecian natural philosophers. He became aware of the great historical value of the ancient natural philosophy. Realizing that it contained much fantastic by-work, he nevertheless understood that it was the forerunner of a scientific theory of evolution. On the other hand, he did not fall into the mistake of those purely empirical scientists, who snubbed Hegel for his idealism and pretended to have explained all unknown phenomena by attributing them to some *force* or to some *substance*.

Thanks to this scientific application of dialectic reasoning, at which Engels and Marx arrived independently of one another, they were spared the mistakes of the other Young-Hegelians and the aimless wanderings of the bourgeois scientists and philosophers after them. It was due to the miserable political conditions of Germany that both of them applied their philosophical minds, not to purely academic studies, but to a deeper penetration of the sociological problems which confronted them. Marx took up the study of the French, Engels that of the English socialists. A comprehensive grasp of history, economics, philosophy and natural science was the result. Marx was the first to bring order out of that tangle of blunders known as political economy. Thanks to him, we have a complete survey of the evolution of economics as a science from Aristotle down to Petty, North, Locke, Hume, Adam Smith, Ricardo and Quesnay.

The central fact, which expressed itself especially on Marx, was that "legal relations and state institutions can neither be

understood of themselves, nor as results of the so-called "general development of the human mind, but that they are rooted in those material conditions of life which Hegel, following the example of the English and French of the 18th century, comprises under the name of *bourgeois society*; that, on the other hand, the anatomy of bourgeois society must be sought in political economy." This led him to the logical conclusion that "the mode of production of the material requirements of life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or, what is but a legal expression for the same thing, with the property relations within which they had been at work heretofore. From forms of development of the forces of production, these relations turn into their fetters. Then follows a period of social revolution."

These are the terms in which Marx formulated his conception of history in his introduction to his "Critique of Political Economy," published in 1859. But when he met Engels in 1845 for the purpose of permanent association with him, he had it already worked out in almost the same terms. Engels eagerly assented to this new and startling theory of history, which he had himself approached in his "Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844." Henceforth these two thinkers worked side by side in a fraternal co-operation never equaled before or after them. And as the first emphatic declaration of the fact that from now on philosophy, science and the proletariat were united for the conquest of society, and that no science could be monistic without this combination, they flung the gage of battle into the teeth of the bourgeois world in their "Communist Manifesto," published in 1848. Never before had the theory of social evolution been stated in such consistently monist materialist terms as in that immortal document.

Its fundamental proposition, as summed up later on by Engels, is that "in every history epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind, since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership, has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class-struggles forms a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached, where the exploited and oppressed class, the proletariat, cannot

attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class, the bourgeoisie, without at the same time, and once for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles."

The great problem of philosophy, the relation of thinking and being, was thus stated with regard to the human race in a dialectic and monistic way on a materialist basis. For the first time man understood clearly whence ideal forces come and whither they are tending. Human emancipation appeared no longer as the work of some future inspired savior, but as a historical process, whose trend was known and could be controlled by the conscious action of a historically generated class. As Engels stated later in his "Feuerbach": "The realities of the outer world impress themselves upon the brain of man, reflect themselves there, as feelings, thoughts, impulses, volitions, in short as ideal tendencies, and in this form become ideal forces."

The compelling motive for the ideal aims of the proletariat is the class struggle. The evolution of capitalist production determines the form and trend of this class struggle. And the slogan of the revolutionary proletariat is henceforth no longer "Lord help us!" but "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

In 1848, it was only a small group of proletarians who responded to this cry. The hour for the realization of the proletarian revolution had not yet come. This revolution flared up in a few fitful outbreaks, and then settled down to its logical historical course. But a few far-seeing men welcomed the new message with enthusiasm and devoted themselves to its propagation in the spirit of its authors.

One of the first to realize the importance of the Marxian theories was Ferdinand Lassalle, a German lawyer, who, significantly enough, had also oriented himself first by a study of the Grecian philosophers. He hailed Marx as a "socialist Ricardo and an economist Hegel," and sprang into the political arena of Germany with all the impetuosity of youth, to carry these theories into practice and realize the union between science and the working class. His "Open Letter," written in reply to a request for information to a group of German workmen, led to the organization, on May 23, 1863, at Leipsic, of the "*Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein*" (General Association of German Workingmen), the nucleus of the International Socialist Party, which is destined to fulfill the mission of the modern proletariat.

When the first proletarian revolts had ended in the supremacy of the capitalist class, and the historical course of capitalist development was fully understood by the proletarian thinkers, they settled down to a careful elaboration of the intellectual weapons of the proletarian advance. The crowning outcome of these labors was that series of writings by Marx and Engels, which became the

scientific fundament of the international party of the working class. The foremost of these works is Marx's "Capital," which revolutionized political economy through his theory of surplus-value, bridged the chasm between economics and politics, gave an outline of the past, present and future development of capitalist production, and thus opened an impassable chasm between bourgeois and proletarian science. Its first volume appeared in July, 1867.

It awakened a loud echo in the breast of a German tanner, who had found the way out of the labyrinth of bourgeois thought independently of Marx and Engels, by self-study. This man was Josef Dietzgen, who wrote to Marx on November 7, 1867: "You have expressed for the first time in a clear, resistless, scientific form what will be from now on the *conscious* tendency of historical development, namely, to subordinate the hitherto blind forces of the process of production to human consciousness."

Dietzgen was a natural philosopher in the true sense of the word. He realized that the Marxian conception of history stated a truth which, in its logical bearing, extended far beyond the sphere of mere social evolution. If the materialist conception of history claimed that material conditions shape human thought, then it was the task of the proletarian thinker to demonstrate, by what means material conditions were converted into human thought. And if this process was a historical evolution, then it developed upon the proletarian thinker to show by what processes the evolution of the universe resulted in the development of the faculty of human thought and how this instrument of understanding did its work.

Dietzgen, therefore, wrote in the above letter to Marx: "The fundament of all science consists in the understanding of the thinking process. Thinking means to develop from the material facts, from the concrete, an abstract generalization. The material fact is an indispensable basis of thought. It must be present, before the essence, the general, or abstract, can be found. The understanding of this fact contains the solution of all scientific riddles."

This was, indeed, the crucial point, without which the materialist conception lacked completeness. Without it, the building of materialist monism would have been imperfect. True, Marx and Engels were able to show by the data of history itself that material conditions have always shaped human thought, which resulted in historical events. Not until Dietzgen had shown that the human mind itself was a product of that greater historical process, of which human history is but a small part, the cosmic process, and that the human faculty of thought produced its thoughts by means of the natural environment, was the historical

materialism of Marx fully explained and the riddle of the universe solved so far as human thought processes were concerned.

This was done for the first time in Dietzgen's "The Nature of Human Brain Work," published in 1869.

With this work, the socialist philosophy completed in bold outlines a consistent materialist monist conception of the world, which was uncompromisingly arrayed against all bourgeois philosophy and science, because it rested for its realization on the proletarian revolution. And the test of its monism is found in the fact that none of the shining lights of bourgeois philosophy and science, with the exception of Alfred Russell Wallace, has since worked his way upward to a frank avowal of the historical connection of the proletariat with such a materialist monist conception of the world. He shall presently see that even the clearest thinkers of the bourgeoisie either denied or ignored this connection, or, if its inevitableness dawned upon them, that they bewailed it as auguring the destruction of all "civilization."

But the proletarian thinkers are calmly going their historical way, just as the proletarian revolution is doing. The socialist philosophy, with the founder of scientific socialism, can afford to adopt the motto of Dante: "*Segui il tuo corso, e lascia dir le genti*"—Follow your course, and let the people talk.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(*To be Continued.*)

Value and Surplus Value.

(Continued.)

AS was already pointed out in preceding articles, the Marxian theoretical system is one solid structure and cannot be properly understood unless viewed as a whole from foundation-stone to roof-coping. To criticize any of its parts as if it were a complete structure in itself is, therefore, a mistake which must necessarily lead to all sorts of fallacious conclusions; and to accept any one of its parts and reject the others as many of the latter-day critics do, simply betrays ignorance of the parts which are accepted and rejected alike. The Marxian theoretical system must be examined as a whole, and accepted or rejected in its entirety, at least as far as its structural parts are concerned.

It is rather the fashion among Marx critics to treat the Marxian "philosophy" and "economics" as if they had absolutely nothing whatever to do with each other, and to accept one and reject the other according to the critic's fancy. As a matter of fact, however, Marx's "philosophy" is nothing more than a generalization deduced from the study of the economic conditions of the human race during its entire course of historical progress, and his "economics" is merely an application of his general historical theory to the particular economic structure known as the capitalist system.

How Marx came to take up the studies which resulted in the formulation by him of the theoretical system which bears his name, and the course which those studies took, is very illuminating in this respect, and his own account of it given in the preface to his "Critique of Political Economy" is of more than passing interest, and we shall therefore place it before our readers.

In 1842-43, Marx says, he found himself, as editor of the "Rheinische Zeitung," the leading radical paper of the time, embarrassed when he had to take part in discussions concerning so-called material interests, such as forest thefts, subdivision of landed property, free trade, and the like, as his previous studies had been only in the domains of philosophy, history, and jurisprudence. At the same time he had to express an opinion on the French schools of socialism of those days with which he was also unfamiliar. He, therefore took advantage of his publishers' desire to pursue a less aggressive course than his, and retired to his "study-room," there to get the needed information.

"The first work undertaken for the solution of the questions that troubled me," he says, "was a critical revision of Hegel's "Philosophy of Law;" the introduction to that work appeared in the "*Deutsch Französische Jahrbücher*," published in Paris in 1844. I was led by my studies to the conclusion that legal relations as well as forms of state could neither be understood by themselves, nor explained by the so-called general progress of the human mind, but that they are rooted in the material conditions of life, which are summed up by Hegel after the fashion of the English and French of the eighteenth century under the name 'civic society;' the anatomy of the civic society is to be sought in political economy. The study of the latter which I had taken up in Paris, I continued at Brussels whither I emigrated on account of an order of expulsion issued by Mr. Guizot. The general conclusions at which I arrived and which, once reached, continued to serve as a leading thread in my studies, may be briefly summed up as follows:"

Here follows the famous passage, already quoted by us in the first article of this series, giving the whole Marxian system in a nut shell, and containing Marx's own formulation of the Materialistic Conception of History.

It is amusing to see the evident surprise of some Marx-critics at the fact that Marx, instead of writing an elaborate treatise on the Materialistic Conception of History, relegated its formulation to a short preface of a purely politico-economic work. As a matter of fact, this is very significant, but not surprising at all. This passage contains an epitome of the whole Marxian system: Historical foundation, economic structure and socialist result. The book itself was to treat the economic structure of the capitalist system exhaustively and in detail. The Socialistic conclusions were not elaborated for the reason that Marx did not believe in any Socialism that did not flow directly from an examination of the capitalist system, and therefore had to be merely indicated, leaving it to the reader to deduce his Socialism from the examination of the capitalist system contained in the book itself. If that examination did not lead to Socialism such an elaboration would be either useless or unjustifiable or both. But the historical point of view from which the capitalist system was to be examined had to be formulated, as without a clear understanding of it the examination of the laws governing the capitalist system of production and distribution would remain a book sealed with seven seals. Marx, therefore, formulated his historical theory, and settled down to the examination of the economic structure of our present society and the laws governing its particular course of evolution.

The opinions of Marx as an economist are just as many and as divergent as those of him as a philosopher. Slonimski and other critics think Marx has done absolutely nothing for the science of economics; not only are his theories false but they have not even any historical importance. From this view to that of enthusiastic eulogy the opinions run all the way. He has, of course, been denied originality. He is accused by some critics of being a blind follower of the classical English School of political economy, and particularly of Ricardo, and again that he understood neither that school in general nor Ricardo in particular. We shall not go into that, for the reasons given before, except to say that while many parts of his economic theory had been worked out before him, particularly by the English Classical school, the system as such, the combination of the parts into a systematic structure, the point of view from which the structure was built, as well as the corner-stone of the structure, the theory of surplus value, are all his own. We also wish to say right here that Marx had to construct an economic theory of his own for the reason that his historical point of view placed him in opposition to the reigning classical school which accepted our economic system as "natural," that is to say: independent of historical development in its origin, and final in its application. This offended Marx's better historical understanding, his philosophy. The classical school considering our system eternal, analyzed only the relations of its profits to one another, whereas Marx, because of his peculiar point of view, looked not only into the workings of its parts and their relations to each other, but also into the changes effected by the relations of the different parts of the capitalist system in each of those parts and the changes in the whole system flowing therefrom. In other words, Marx examined the dynamic of the capitalist system as a whole, as well as its statics examined by the classical school. His philosophy which placed him in opposition to the classical English school of political economy, also prevented him from drifting into any so-called psychological theories. The underlying principle of all of these theories, the attempt to explain social phenomena by individual motives is entirely repugnant to his historico-sociological point of view, requiring as that does, that social phenomena should be explained in such a manner as to account for their origin, growth, and decline, something which no psychologico-individualistic motivation of social phenomena can do.

When Marx came to examine the economic structure of our social system, his problem consisted in finding answers to the following questions: What are the sources of wealth of our society, that is, of the means of subsistence and comfort of the indi-

vidual composing it? How and in what manner is it produced: what factors, circumstances and conditions are necessary for its production, preservation and accumulation? How, in what manner, and in accordance with what principles, is it divided among the different groups and individuals composing our society? How does this division affect the relations of the groups and individuals participating in it, and how do these relations, and the social phenomena which they produce, react upon the production and distribution of wealth in this society? What are the resulting laws governing the direction and manner of its general movement? What are the historical limits of this economic organization?

A careful examination of our wealth discloses the remarkable fact that, whereas, it consists, like all wealth, of articles ministering to the wants of the individuals of the society wherein it is produced, of whatever nature or character those wants may be, the amount of that wealth, from our social point of view, does not depend on the amount or number of those articles possessed by the individuals separately or society as a whole; that any individual member of our society may be possessed of great wealth without possessing any appreciable quantity of articles that would or could minister either to his own wants or to those of any other member of our society; that, as a rule, a man's wealth under our social system does not consist of articles which minister to his own wants, but to those of other people, if at all; and, furthermore, that a man's wealth may grow or shrink without any addition to or diminution from the articles or substances of which his wealth is composed.

This is an entirely novel phenomenon historically considered and one showing our wealth to be radically different, and possessed of attributes and qualities entirely unknown, to wealth under former social forms. Besides, these novel attributes and qualities of our wealth are apparently in contravention of the "natural" order of things. At no time prior to our capitalistic era was the subjective relation between a man and his wealth—that is the means of his subsistence and comfort—so entirely severed as it is now. At no time prior to this era did a man and his wealth stand in such absolutely objective, non-sympathetic, relations as they stand now. At no time prior to our era was a man's wealth so thoroughly non-individual, so absolutely dependent on social circumstances, so entirely a matter of social force, as it is under capitalism.

What is the distinctive feature, the distinguishing mark or characteristic of the capitalist system of production and distribution of the means of subsistence and comfort which wrought such changes in the attributes and qualities of wealth and how were those changes brought about?

The distinctive feature of capitalist production, that which gives it its character, is that under this system man does not produce *goods* but *commodities*, that is "wares and merchandise." In other words he does not produce things which he wants to use himself, and because he wants to use them to satisfy some want of his, but things which he does not want to use himself but which can be disposed of by him to others, caring nothing whether and in what manner the others will use them. Instead of producing *goods* for his own use, as people used to do in former days, under other systems of production, he produces *commodities for the market*. Marx, therefore, begins his great investigation of the capitalist mode of production with the following words: "The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as 'an immense accumulation of commodities', its unit being a single commodity. Our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of the commodity." It is the analysis of the commodity that must furnish us the key to all the peculiarities of character which we have noticed in our wealth under the capitalist system of production showing changes which have placed our wealth in a purely objective relation to man and given it purely social attributes and properties.

The distinctive property, again, of a commodity, that quality of the thing which makes an ordinary good an article of merchandise, is its exchange-value. That is, the fact that in addition to the quality which it possesses of being useful for consumption to the one who wants to use it that way, it has the further quality of being exchangeable, that is it can be useful for the purpose of exchange by one who has no use for it as an article of consumption. The exchange-value of an article therefore, while based on the property of the article of being ultimately useful for consumption, is something entirely different and apart from this use-value and independent of it in its variations. Indeed, the two qualities might be said to be antagonistic as they exclude each other: a thing is exchange-value only to the person who has no use-value in it, and it loses its exchange-value when its use-value asserts itself. It is its exchange-value that makes a thing a commodity, it remains therefore a commodity only as long as it is intended for exchange and loses that character when appropriated for use in consumption. The use-value of a thing is, on the one hand, something inherent in its nature, in the very mode of its existence, and does not depend on the social form of its production; it remains the same use-value no matter how produced. On the other hand, the use-value of a thing is a purely subjective relation between the person who uses it and the thing, and therefore any difference in the use-value of a thing when used

by different persons is purely subjective with those persons. In neither of these aspects does it come within the sphere of political economy, whose object is the explanation of the peculiar phenomena of wealth under the capitalist system of production, phenomena which, as we have seen, are purely social in their nature. Both, the natural attributes of things and the individual uses to which they are being put, have existed long before the capitalist system of production without giving wealth those properties of the capitalist-produced wealth which we have noted above. These qualities are the qualities of the *good*, and these uses are the uses to which the *good* is being put to. They are not the qualities nor the uses of the *commodity*. They do not, therefore, in any way affect the exchange-value of the thing, that attribute which makes out of the simple good the mysterious commodity with all its peculiar faculties. Except that the good is the substratum, the material substance, of the commodity; and use-value is the substratum, the material substance, of exchange-value. Historically, therefore, the good preceded the commodity, and use-value preceded exchange-value.

Marx, says, therefore: "Whatever the social form of wealth may be, use-values always have a substance of their own, independent of that form. One can not tell by the taste of wheat whether it has been raised by a Russian serf, a French peasant, or an English capitalist. Although the subject of social wants, and, therefore, mutually connected in society, use-values do not bear any marks of the relations of social production. Suppose, we have a commodity whose use-value is that of a diamond; We can not tell by looking at the diamond that it is a commodity. When it serves as a use-value, æsthetic or mechanical, on the breast of a harlot or in the hand of a glasscutter, it is a diamond and not a commodity. It is the necessary pre-requisite of a commodity to be a use-value, but it is immaterial to the use-value whether it is a commodity or not. Use-value in this indifference to the nature of its economic destination, i e. use-value as such, lies outside the sphere of investigation of political economy But it forms the material basis which directly underlies a definite economic relation which we call exchange-value."

Our wealth, then, in those respects in which it is different from the forms of wealth which preceded it, and which distinguish it as capitalistic wealth, is an aggregation of exchange-values. In other words: our wealth, in so far as it is not merely used for consumption, but retains its capitalistic properties, is *capital*, is an aggregation of exchange-values. We have already seen that exchange-value is not something inherent in the thing itself, nor does it depend on some thing inherent in the thing itself as an element or condition of its natural existence. We have also seen

that it bears no subjective relation to the person who uses it as such, that it does not depend on anything he does or omits to do, but is an objective attribute derived from some social relation of the individuals within the society in which it is produced. We must therefore conclude that capital, which is an aggregation of exchange-values, is nothing more than a social relation of individuals, and that its properties, which it can only possess by virtue of its being such an aggregation of exchange-values, are merely the result of the social relations of which it is the expression.

What are the social relations represented by exchange-value, and its composite—capital? What are the properties of exchange-value and capital and the laws governing their existence, and how are they derived from and governed by those social relations? These are according to Marx, the object of political economy, and to their critical examination his life-work is devoted.

Before entering, however, upon this examination we must put before ourselves clearly the problem which confronts us, and define clearly the questions which we are called upon to answer. We have already pointed out some characteristics of our wealth which makes it different from the wealth possessed under any previous social system and which show clearly that our form of wealth is the product of our peculiar social relations. These characteristics are, however, not the only ones which require explanation. A cursory examination even of our economic system will reveal the fact that our value-wealth is full of mysteries which, if considered by themselves, defy all attempts at explanation.

The mystery surrounding the origin of our wealth was already indicated above in showing the peculiar property of our wealth to grow and shrink irrespective of any addition to or diminution from the material substances of which it consists. This mystery deepens the further we go into the examination of the production of wealth in our society, and even more so when we come to consider its distribution. Only some of the more characteristic phenomena which puzzle the inquirer into the nature of the wealth of capitalistic nations need be mentioned here, in order to show the nature of our problem.

While, as we have already stated, the amount of our wealth may grow or diminish irrespective of the growth or diminution of the articles of which it consists, thus showing clearly that our value-wealth is something extrinsic and independent of the nature and uses of those articles, yet there is something in the very independence of value-wealth from its material substance which shows a close connection between them. It is true that this connection is rather in the nature of a hostility, partaking of the antagonism already pointed out between use-value and

exchange-value, but the connection is nevertheless clearly defined and resembles in its character the connection of anti-polarity, to borrow an example from another field of scientific research. It has, namely, been observed that there is a tendency to a constant widening of the difference between the amounts of use-value and exchange-value, between the amounts of our value-wealth and the material substances of which it consists. That it to say, it has been observed that with the increase of the production of goods commodities diminish in value, so that the larger the increase in our "natural" wealth, that is in useful articles which go to make up the stores of our social or value-wealth, the smaller the increase of the latter. In other words the growth of our value-wealth constantly and systematically falls behind the growth of the material substances of which it consists. This shows clearly that while the value of a thing does not depend on its natural qualities or the uses to which it may be put, so that exchange-value is entirely independent of use-value, there is a certain well-defined relation existing in their production, at least. What is that relation?

While this question of our wealth-production is merely mysterious, the questions of its distribution are puzzling and perplexing in the extreme. A cursory survey of our social system will show that there are very many persons in our society who evidently do not produce any wealth and yet have it in considerable quantities. In fact, most of our wealth is found in the possession of persons who have not produced it. Where did they get it? The answer which suggests itself to this query is, that they got it from the persons who did produce it. But then the question arises: How did they get it? They did not take it by force, nor was it given to them for love. How *did* they get it?

Ever since man has kept written records of his doings there have been social classes who have neither toiled nor labored and still managed to live on the fat of the land. But the actions of these people have always been plain and above board. Everybody could see just how they managed it. There was never any mystery as to where their fat came from, nor how they got hold of it. The division of the wealth between those who produced it and those who didn't was done in the light of day and by a very simple process, so that each article produced could be traced into the hands of its ultimate possessor and each article possessed could be traced back to its original source. A child could tell the sources of wealth of an ancient slaveholder or medieval feudal baron. Not so with our non-producing classes. The sources of the wealth of our merchant-princes are shrouded in mystery. An honest merchant is supposed to, and usually does, pay for his wares what they are worth and sells them again for what they

are worth. Where, then, does he get his profit? Two men make a bargain and exchange equal values, for they are honest and would not cheat each other, and yet both make a profit! Where does their profit come from? Some foolish people think that merchants make their profits by buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest. In other words, by cheating or taking advantage of each other. This is evidently a mistake. A merchant may, of course, make an extra profit by taking advantage of his neighbor. In that event his neighbor loses as much as he has made. But the regular profits of the merchant are realized when he buys and sells goods at their fair prices. That is why all hands are making money. Otherwise the capitalists would be preying on each other and one would gain just as much as the other would lose. Wealth would merely circulate among the different members of the class but there would be no net gain. What would the merchant *class* live on? But the capitalist class *does* manage to live and thrive and even accumulate and amass large stores of wealth. Where, then, does the *capitalist class* get it?

Other explanations offered are that the merchant by buying and selling enhances the value of the article sold and that the enhanced value is the merchant's profit; or that the merchant's profit is a reward for services as middle-man between producer and consumer. This last proposition is beside the point for the reason that it is not a question of ethics with which we are concerned, as to whether the merchant deserves what he gets, but a pure question of mechanics: how, and wherefrom, he gets it. Nor does the explanation that the merchant "enhances" the value of an article, that is creates new value, by selling it, answer the question: Where and how did they get it? How is the value of a thing "enhanced" by a mere change of hands? Its natural qualities remain the same. The uses to which it can be put remain the same. Where was this value before the merchant got it? Who produced it, and why did its producer part with it? If a mere change of hands create value, why do some people foolishly toil in the sweat of their brow to produce new articles in order to get value when value can be got by the much easier process of sending the articles already on hand around the circuit? This brings us back to the question: What is exchange-value, and how is it produced or got?

We will see later in the course of these articles how Marx's theory of value and surplus-value answers all these questions and unravels all these mysteries, and that it is the only theory that answers the problem of political economy satisfactorily thus making political economy a real science. We will also see the place of our economic system in the string of economies which

go to make up the history of the human race until now and what its further development must or is likely to lead to. We will see, incidentally, how entirely puerile is the talk of Bernstein and his followers who, not understanding the essence of the Marxian theory of value, and, therefore, overawed by the volume of criticism levelled against it by the very learned economists, attempt to hide behind the contention that this theory is not an essential element of Marx's socialist system. We will see, lastly, how utterly absurd is most of the criticism of these learned critics from Boehm-Bawerck down or up.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Does God Know What a Thief Is?

THIS was my dream.

Things were rather slow. Peter had been very busy for quite a spell on account of the Japanese and Russian war. In addition to his regular business there had been times when shades of warriors had appeared by the thousands before him for guidance into their proper sphere in the spirit world. On rush days the Saint did not stop to argue, reason or debate, but as fast as the shades appeared they were railroaded into the doorway that Peter knew to be the right one for them.

But it was different now. There was a lull in the war and business was rather slow with the Saint. He jingled his keys and waited for an opportunity with some hard case to display his accumen just to vary the monotony. At that moment he noticed three shades coming towards him and he instantly prepared for the occasion for he felt the event of his career was now nigh, for he recognized in the spirits John Smith, a good Methodist, Jno. D. Feller, the first billionaire, and Taffy Evans, a thief;—all hailing from the United States of America.

Smith was the first to approach the golden gate, closely followed by the others.

“What can I do for you?” said St. Peter.

“I have tried to live according to the rules,” said the spirit of the departed John Smith, “and I therefore think I am entitled to get into heaven.”

“Tell me,” quoth the Saint, “what you think are the essentials for entrance into this realm of bliss.” And John replied:

“I tried to bear all my sufferings with great patience; when I was hungry I lifted up my eyes and praised the Lord; when I suffered from cold I tried to kiss the rod that smote me and always tried to be cheerful and contented with my condition, no matter how hard, and praised His name the oftenest when I suffered the most.”

“Did the Lord want that?” asked St. Peter.

“I was told so by his servants,” replied John.

“Yet you believe the Lord made you and gave you a desire for things to eat, provided plenty with which to fill your stomach, gave you the power to enjoy them all and nevertheless you trusted other men’s stories in preference to what your own body said. Frankly, John, if you did not have sense enough to enjoy the good things on earth, did not have energy enough to reach out

and get them, when every minute of the time your God-made body demanded that you should, you simply are not a fit subject to enjoy higher things. You practically lived in a fool's paradise down below, but we have no paradise for fools here. You can either go back to earth again and learn your little lesson or pass into oblivion, whichever you like. Stand aside and make up your mind what you want to do."

The shade of John Feller seemed highly pleased with the conversation and glided forward.

"Well, what do you want?" said St. Peter.

"Judging by all that you have said to Smith, I am fitted for a front seat in heaven, because I am not in the least indebted to my stomach or my back. Never have they asked for anything but they have got it through my efforts, and having done so well on earth for my body, I feel I could do just as well in heaven for my spirit."

"So far, good," replied the Saint. "But let me first remark that since you have no body to feed or clothe, your material success on earth is of no value in heaven. It is merely an indication of your character. But we have here a vast collection of all kinds of precious stones for educated minds to feast upon, what do you know about them?"

"Frankly, nothing," was the reply. "I was so busy accumulating wealth that I never had time to study the beauties of mineralogy, though I did have aspirations that way. You see I hired practical men to investigate all these things and I got their results in gold. In fact gold is the limit of my knowledge of natural science and I preferred it when coined."

"Well, in every direction you can see millions upon millions of shining stars. What do you know about them?"

"Nothing, in fact I refused to pay the cost of the observatory in connection with my pet University, because I could see no prospect of ultimate profit."

"We have magnificent choirs in heaven," said St. Peter. "What do you know about them?"

Again, "Nothing, I can only tell you what doubtless you well know, every minute of my time was spent in acquiring material things, and much as I frequently desired to study the beauties of nature, I never found time to cultivate my mind in this direction."

"Then," quoth the Saint. "You also are as much indebted to yourself as John Smith, in not having satisfied your natural desires in the plane below. You simply are unfit to enjoy the higher developments here for you lack the necessary qualifications. Heaven is no place for played-out physical wrecks, but like earth a place for the satisfaction of every God-given desire."

So you also must choose whether you return to earth again and learn your proper lesson or pass into oblivion. Stand aside."

"What can I do for you, Taffy?"

Now Taffy was a Thief, and he knew it.

"I suppose the best you can do for me is to send me to hell," said Taffy.

"Why?" said St. Peter.

"Because I was a Thief."

The Saint smiled.

"I believe they do use some such terms as that on earth. Tell me about it."

"Well," said Taffy. "Men like Feller got hold of a vast amount of the good things on earth, said that the Lord gave it to them, and therefore I and a host of others had to do without. I did not see it that way, so when I was hungry I took what I needed, if I could not get it any other way and that is why I am a Thief."

"You are all right, Taffy," said St. Peter. "You are the kind of a fellow God made heaven for. He makes men hungry, he gives them a stomach to enjoy good things, and provides plenty to satisfy their longings. That is the law written in their members and is the revelation he gives to everybody without any intermediary. Any man who does not get his share down below is simply a fool. Step right in and if you are as energetic in getting your share of the good things inside you will be all the better liked."

Taffy started through the golden gate, then he turned back and asked,

"But is there not a hell?"

"Oh, yes," said St. Peter.

"Well, who are in it?"

St. Peter smiled.

"It is inhabited by those who made it of course—the preachers."

DUNDAS TODD.

EDITORIAL

Work That Should Be Done.

Just at the present moment when in most of the states there is no active campaign, and no national election of any sort in immediate prospect, there is an opportunity to do some things that have been neglected and whose accomplishment is of great importance as a foundation for future work.

The last national convention assigned several tasks directly to the national committee. Up to the present the will of the convention in this respect has been almost entirely ignored. There has been much excuse for this. The national committee is cumbrously organized and has not yet found itself. It has had no definite tasks to perform, has not evolved methods of work suited to its character, and as a result has come to be looked upon by many as a sort of useless fifth wheel to the socialist chariot. We do not believe that this opinion is justified. We believe that the national committee can be made a most valuable portion of the socialist party machinery. It stands much closer to the membership than the national executive committee and if it rises to its opportunities and proves itself effective it should be the dominating influence rather than the executive committee.

One of the tasks assigned it by the national convention was the elaboration of a municipal program. There is now urgent need that this work be taken up. At the elections next spring several hundred socialists will in all probability be elected to municipal positions. At least fifty are already in office, and yet up to the present time they have accomplished very little. This is to a large degree due to lack of any comprehensible and intelligent, systematic, unified idea of their opportunities and duties. It should be the work of the national committee to elaborate a practical guide for these men. The report of the special committee as revised by the national convention affords a nucleus on which to work. This is already in the hands of all the members of the national committee. If taken up by them at once and such amendments as thought desirable forwarded to the national office with the understanding that these amend-

ments would not be acted upon until a definite time, when all could be sent out together, the work of revising by correspondence could be reduced to a minimum.

Comments on these amendments should be sent rather to the party press than to the national office. What is needed is the widest possible discussion in order to create as extensive and intelligent an opinion upon these matters as possible.

We have continuously urged in this connection that a permanent municipal committee be elected similar to that now existing in several European countries. Sooner or later the socialist party of America will do this. We believe that the time is now here to begin this work.

Another task which was assigned the national office was the organization of a socialist press bureau to supply "patent insides" or "plate matter" to papers. The national office sent out circulars on this matter but received too few responses to encourage them to proceed further. Nevertheless we believe that if the matter were properly pushed it could still be made a success. It is certain that any deficit which would result would be very much less than the expense of sending out the national bulletin and that if one column each month of this plate matter were devoted to a condensation of the matter which now appears in the monthly bulletin the educational results would be far greater.

There has been very much complaint about the work of the national office on the ground that a highly disproportionate amount of its income was expended in maintaining itself. Indeed it has reached the point where the national machinery seems to be largely in the condition of many country churches—it is spending all its energies to keep itself running. In this connection it has been suggested that the amount of dues going to the national office be reduced from five to two cents. Such a move as this would be most unfortunate as it would cripple the national machinery at times when it is sorely needed. A much better plan would be to follow the practice of many trades unions and arbitrarily apportion the dues coming to the national office to different funds. If two cents a month, for example, were segregated as a propaganda fund to be used only for the purpose of sending out organizers and paying for literature this would compel a better utilization of the money.

The Crestline Resolution.

Sufficient Locals having now endorsed the Crestline resolution it goes to a referendum of the entire membership. We believe that if it is adopted there will be few members who will not agree that it was a mistake before two years have passed by.

The Wisconsin movement is perfectly capable of taking care of itself, and to punish the innocent with the guilty by shutting all off from par-

ticipation in the National Organization until what is now a minority shall have gained the upper hands is a mistake. It can not but tend to arouse faction and bitterness within the state and to disrupt the movement now existing. Such a thing as this would be a calamity. There is no state in the Union that is distributing more sound socialist literature than Wisconsin. In the city of Milwaukee this work has been organized to an extent unknown in any other city. In many wards every house has been reached separately during each campaign. This means that a large body of workers have been drilled and organized. These men are earnest independent workers for socialism and are not responsible for any mistake that a few leaders may have made. To punish them, to undo the work that they have done, to give encouragement to the strong capitalist forces that are allied in that city for the crushing of socialism would be more than a mistake; it would be criminal.

It will show that the socialist party is not yet out of the childish stage during which it is unable to distinguish between discussion and discipline. We should be capable of settling our differences by criticism and discussion rather than by petty persecutions under the name of discipline. It will show that we are utterly lacking in any sense of proportion, if we permit a trifling detail as to form of affiliation to bulk bigger in our eyes than the great work of socialist agitation, education and organization which has been done in Wisconsin.

Such counsel as this we thoroughly realize is not popular, especially at a time when partisanship and personality are dominating so large a portion of the socialist press and party membership. The thing that gains applause now is a demagogic appeal to "smash all compromisers" and this notwithstanding the fact that the sort of smashing tactics that are advocated is very apt to excite sympathy for the compromiser and his doctrines among intelligent people.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The most important developments in the labor world during the past month were a number of far-reaching court decisions against organized labor which indicate that capitalism is insidiously striving, through its political power, to strike at the most vital and unprotected parts in the trade union armor. We have seen how the injunction has become a permanent weapon of oppression and how the damage suit industry has struck root and is growing as a sequence. Now the powers that be, conscious of their position of vantage as a class and always vigilant and loyal to capitalism when it is attacking labor, is pursuing a new tack. The union label has become a source of annoyance to those exploiters who shout loudest for open shop, "freedom of contract," etc., especially so because some of their own class have considered it good business to get ahead of competitors by making agreements with unions, so far as wages, hours and working conditions were concerned, and in return receive the right to use the labels of those organizations, to place upon their products, and thus also be guaranteed a large constituency to advertise and purchase their wares without further cost. Hence the union-busters are hailing with delight the decision that was rendered several weeks ago by the New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals, which reversed the District Court of Newark in fining a cigar manufacturer named Goldberg the sum of \$200 for violating the union label law. The upper court held that section 10 of the label law of New Jersey, which provides a fine of not less than \$200 or more than \$500 for violating the provisions of said law, is unconstitutional. The court declared that the Legislature had no power to enact a law imposing a penalty for the benefit of the plaintiff, the cigarmakers' union, which is being interpreted as a declaration that an unincorporated body cannot bring civil or criminal proceedings against a business concern. It will be readily understood that if the penalty for disobeying the label law is wiped out the statute is dead as a door-nail, and as the label laws in many other states are closely copied after the New Jersey measure this case is of great interest to organized labor the country over. The fight has now been transferred to the State Supreme Court and will be heard in a short time. It is a safe guess that the tobacco trust, which has resorted to every scheme possible to destroy the effectiveness of the cigarmakers' blue label, is in some manner connected with this case. The combine has long sought for an entering wedge to make it possible to peddle its scab-made products, bearing counterfeit labels, in the market, and thus be enabled to swing another club over the heads of independent competitors that recognize union labor.

The open shop organs are highly pleased with the recent decision of

the Massachusetts Supreme Court, in which that body follows in the footsteps of the highest court in Illinois, in declaring the so-called closed shop—or, more properly, the union shop—unlawful. In a previous number of the REVIEW I touched upon the progress of the case of Berry versus Donovan, the history of which is briefly as follows: On January 24, 1904, the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union entered into an agreement with Goodrich & Co., shoe manufacturers of Haverhill, Mass., to grant the use of the union label to said firm upon condition that the plant would thereafter be operated as a union establishment. The employees were invited to join the union. Michael T. Berry (who, by the way, is a shining light in the moribund Socialist Labor party) declined to become a member of the union, was discharged and thereupon brought suit against Jerry E. Donovan, business agent of the union, for \$1,500 damages. The lower court decided in favor of the plaintiff, and now the Supreme Court affirms the verdict. In the opinion of the higher court, written by Chief Justice Knowlton, the unions are striving to obtain a monopoly and dominate the industries. "The attempt to force all laborers to combine in unions," says the court, "is against the policy of the law, because it aims at monopoly." Similar views are expressed a number of times by the court, and one of the ablest lawyers in Massachusetts is quoted as saying that "this is the most far-reaching and important decision made in this state in fifty years." The case will be carried to the United States Supreme Court. Of course, if it is contrary to law when ALL laborers are combined, because such a union AIMS at monopoly, then every shop, factory, mine and railway operated by union labor exclusively is an illegal institution. Just how the Massachusetts jurists expect to strike the happy balance between union and non-union workers, and determine what percentage of each should be employed in establishments, we are not informed. We have been assured, however, when the courts wiped out the laws to prohibit blacklisting in recent years, that employers have the right to hire and discharge whomsoever they please; but evidently this is not the case where it happens that an employer believes that it is to his business advantage to hire ALL union workers, and the right only exists where capitalists desire to victimize organized employes. Nor do those wise gentlemen, who are regarded with such great awe by the voting yokels of the old parties, inform us whether employers who hire non-union workers are also committing unlawful acts. What with military and police bullying, injunction oppression and decisions like the foregoing, organized labor will soon be regarded as modern "runaway niggers." It's about time that those trade unionists who have any sense of self-respect give the old Gompers policies a swift kick and line up with the Socialists who will have something to say to the courts when they obtain political control.

Another case that has been watched with considerable interest in organized labor circles is that of the F. R. Patch Manufacturing Co., against the Machinists' Union at Rutland, Vt. It will be recalled that the Patch Co. brought suit against the machinists for \$2,500 damages sustained on account of striking and picketing on the part of employes about two years ago. The case was bitterly contested from the start, but judgment was rendered in favor of the plaintiff. An appeal was taken and now the Supreme Court of Vermont has sustained the lower court and awarded the damages prayed for, together with costs and interest to the Patch concern which will recover about \$5,000, and the total cost to the unionists will probably amount to about \$8,000. The plaintiff's attorneys have been busy during the past month attaching the wages, goods, chattels and estates of 23 machinists to satisfy justice, and it is expected that along in September enough money will have been earned

by the men, which, with the property that will be confiscated, to turn over to Patch and close the incident. It is related that one of the members, Charles E. Nourse, tried to save his home by transferring it to his wife through a third person, but Patch moved to set aside the deed. Several others made sacrifices to get out of town and a number who are forced to remain are hit hard by the final settlement. It wouldn't be so bad if, for instance, "Jim" O'Connell, the pure and simple (picket and strike) president of the I. A. of M. were compelled to suffer instead of a lot of poor devils who were compelled to stand upon the firing line and be mowed down by the Patch people entrenched behind their privileges and political power. O'Connell doesn't believe in working class political action, and he and his colleagues had the audacity to defy referendum instructions, at the Boston convention of the A. F. of L., commanding them to vote for Socialism and against Gompers. Just now there is a referendum election on in the national union and O'Connell is being fought hard, the opposition centering about Maurice Landers, of Springfield, Mass., a former vice-president. Of course, the chances favor O'Connell, but the outlook for some of his Federation delegation is pretty dubious. The feeling is very bitter against the administration in many of the large industrial centers and the chances are that the Boston convention of the national union next month will witness some warm sessions. At that it is doubtful whether O'Connell will propose any rational remedy to meet just such critical emergencies as that at Rutland. But the rank and file will enforce some new policies before long—you can gamble on that. There is no organization in the country that is becoming more thoroughly awakened to the methods of capitalism than the International Association of Machinists.

Speaking of damage suits, still another case has been settled to the satisfaction of the open shop fanatics. In Orange, N. J., one Frank Winkler, a hat finisher, won his action against the United Hatters for \$300 damages. Winkler had been suspended from the union for failing to pay his dues and consequently could not be employed in any union shop. His suit was undoubtedly prompted and pushed by the Employers' Association, which wishes to destroy the organization, and is reported to be behind the suits for heavy damages which were begun by the Loew concern of Connecticut against the hatters for boycotting its scab products. Some unionists are still waiting to hear some suggestion in the *American Federationist* or other pure and simple organs how to meet this new and growing danger. But do you imagine that they print a word about any of these damage suit cases? Not a line. One sheet out in the wilds of Indiana announced a couple of weeks ago that it was too busy printing accounts of the great gains made by labor everywhere to pay any attention to such little things as damage suits. And nearly every page of the organ was covered with boiler-plates regarding last year's ice crops, how to behave in society and such slush.

Readers of the REVIEW will remember that I mentioned a recent case in New Orleans in which a court handed out damages against a union in favor of two expelled members and ordered their reinstatement. In New York City a court forced a union to do the same thing, and now in Rochester it is announced that Judge Nash granted a mandamus ordering that a musician named Bachman, who had gone wrong, be admitted to the union. The organization's officers and members refused to obey the edict whereupon the same court issued another ukase ordering that the president and secretary be arrested, which was done. They gave \$500 bail and will have to show why they should not be punished for contempt of court. Some of these attacks upon organized labor through one branch of the government would be more or less humorous

if they did not have a very serious side. The craze to drag labor into courts is growing, and every new decision made serves as a precedent to establish custom and usage, law or no law. And with every new burden that is heaped upon the patient back of organized labor, along comes the cheerful idiot and bawls louder than ever, "keep politics out of the union!" But the c. i. is losing his prestige and influence, though it required a long, hard fight and no small amount of sacrifice and suffering. The rank and file are beginning to recognize the fact that while they have been perfectly satisfied to accept the advice of the great leaders (who are followers), yet the capitalists are forcing politics into the unions without as much as asking permission. They "butt in" through courts, legislative bodies and administrative agencies. They won't let us alone as individuals or collective bodies, and for that and other reasons a revolution of thought is sweeping through the organizations that will make some of the old back numbers hump themselves in the not distant future.

One of the surprises in the labor world was the defeat of E. J. Lynch as president of the metal polishers and brassworkers by A. B. Grout at the recent referendum election. Lynch is quite an able fellow and at times was inclined to be truly progressive, but he would hesitate and chase off after the exploded theories of the old school and line up with the Gompers bunch. Grout, on the contrary, is a Socialist, who knows what it means to pit an empty stomach against an employers' association. He was a central figure in the great Chicago strike last year, for which he was blacklisted and had to flee to the woods of Wisconsin to live. I am willing to wager that Grout, in his new position, will strike straight from the shoulder and call a spade a spade, no matter whether he is confronted by an audience of common workmen or great labor leaders. Theodore Shaffer has also been succeeded by P. J. Mc-Ardle, of Muncie, Ind., as president of the iron and steel workers. No sooner was that matter settled at the Detroit convention when Shaffer breaks out into a wild, weird song of praise for Carnegie, in which it was recited that the Canny Scot had nothing to do with the Homestead strike and is a real, good man. McArdle can do no worse than his predecessor and he has certainly inherited plenty of trouble. The trust not only beat back the demand for an advance, but forced the union to remove its rule restricting the output, and next year the open shop system is to be enforced in all mills. However, Carnegie may provide a job for Shaffer, now that he has been given a liberal dose of white-wash, to help give away his money.

There is going to be a hot time in the Pittsburg convention of the A. F. of L. on the jurisdiction question, as usual. Besides the old grievances that will be warmed over for the occasion, the little unpleasantness between the longshoremen and seamen, which began in San Francisco last year, has become aggravated. The seamen, who are Republicans and Democrats as a rule, are openly helping to smash the longshoremen, who are also Republicans and Democrats for the most part, out on the Pacific Coast. Now the longshoremen demand that the sailor men be kicked out of the Federation, as they also threaten to scab it on the land lubbers along the lakes. The seamen declare on the other hand, that the longshoremen have broken the laws of the A. F. of L., and they are industrialists who would organize everybody on and along the waterways and wouldn't hesitate to reach into a corn field and grab the man at the plow. Therefore, they should be expelled. Meanwhile Sam Gompers isn't saying a word about this family quarrel among the Republican and Democratic brethren. His winning specialty is smashing *the Socialists*, vide his pronunciamento relative to the Chicago convention to organize the Industrial Workers of the Whole World—and Timbuctoo.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

By far the most striking incident in international politics (aside from events in Russia, with which, however, it may take equal rank) was the refusal of Count Von Buelow to permit Jaures to speak at a peace meeting to be held in Berlin. The most remarkable thing about this was the fact that it was almost if not quite the first time in European diplomacy that an individual was treated exactly as if he were an independent nation. Buelow's note was addressed to Jaures through the German minister at Paris. The text of this note is in itself interesting and we give it here-with:

“BERLIN, July 5, 1905.

“The press has announced the appearance of Mr. Jaures at a social democratic meeting in Berlin for July 9th. I have not the slightest objection to the personality of Mr. Jaures, I value Jaures as a speaker, I honor his views in regard to foreign politics and find myself not infrequently in agreement with him. I rejoice that he has many times stood for friendly relations between Germany and France.

“We are not dealing, however, here with the personal valuation of Mr. Jaures, but with the political role which has been ascribed to him. The leading organ of the social democracy in Germany, *Vorwärts*, has announced that this meeting will be the beginning of a direct influence of social democracy on external politics and of the propagation of the class struggle on international foundations. Even plainer is the irritating position of the German managers of the meeting in an organ of the so-called scientific socialism, the *Neuen Gesellschaft*, which says among other things: ‘Revolution has dynamited the Russo-French alliance. Now it is the historical purpose of the German Social Democracy to afford the French Republic what they have sought in vain from the Russian rulers: protection from the provocations and excessive dominations of an imperialistic German policy.’

“In this we are plainly told in what direction the proposed meeting will be lead. The German social democracy will utilize the presence of Mr. Jaures in Berlin to further their hostile efforts against national interests while concealed by his person. The imperial government can not therefore refuse to utilize whatever means are at its disposal to oppose such actions. It would otherwise contribute through its dispensation to the growth of a party which seeks to overthrow the constitutionally established existing order in Germany.

“The government of the French Republic has always maintained its right to forbid speakers the right of speech whenever such refusal appeared desirable. They have at one time refused the German Reichstag members, Bebel and Bueh, from speaking on French ground concerning

their political activity in Germany. In years gone by they have also refused to permit the German Reichstag member, Delsor, from appearing in Luneville. In both cases the French people have endorsed the actions of the French Government. This was especially true in the case of Abbe Delsor. If my memory does not fail me, even the French socialists did not find themselves in opposition to their government on the subject.

"Even if we were certain that the tact of Mr. Jaures would be such that to lead him to avoid anything that might embarrass the German or the French government the same security unfortunately can not be offered for the German representatives at the meeting. Mr. Jaures, scarcely a year ago, in Amsterdam has testified as to how far the German social democrats have gone in their purely negative doctrinarianism and backward position, from the practical and patriotic position of their French comrades in thought.

"I think, therefore, that it is no more than proper that the public presence of Jaures in Berlin be denied. You are instructed to convey the sense of this communication to Mr. Jaures in the most convenient manner and to seek to prevent his journey to Berlin. (Signed) BUELOW."

It is now generally admitted by friends and foes alike that the sending of this letter was about the most foolish thing that Count Von Buelow could have done. Although *Vorwärts* denounces him in unmeasured terms and holds up to ridicule his attempt to pose as the avenger of Bebel, whom the French government refused the right to speak, yet through it all there runs a vein of sarcastic congratulation and we are not surprised to find the article concluded as follows:

"Count Buelow has become the foremost agitator of the social democracy. He compels the most innocent to recognize what a powerful task is laid before the social democracy in the effort to transform the German government now founded on violence and police domination into a government of political culture and freedom."

Someone, we think it was Marx, said: "A new 'power' has been added to the 'great powers' of Europe, the proletarian power of socialism." We believe, however, that this is the first time that this "power" has been recognized in diplomatic intercourse as entitled to rank with the other great powers in Europe.

HOLLAND.

The general election has just been held in Holland. The coalition of all the anti-socialist parties was much closer than ever before and for the first time the socialists made no alliances with any other party. The result of the election is that the socialist vote was increased from 38,270 in 1901 to 65,743 in 1905. Only eight socialists, however, were elected to parliament, but when the failure of the general strike and the activity of the anarchistic movement are considered the election was looked upon with great satisfaction by the socialists.

RUSSIA.

It is almost impossible to obtain any clear idea of what is going on in Russia today. There are a large number of movements, mostly violent and apparently not closely related or carefully organized. Just how long this can continue without a revolutionary movement is impossible to tell. Meanwhile the revolutionary parties remain divided. The social democrats have

“united” into two divisions seemingly more hostile than the various ones that have previously existed. However, Comrade Kautsky in an article in the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* seems to think that this presages an actual unity. Bebel on the other hand considers the situation so serious as to call for a special session of the International Socialist Bureau. Meanwhile the Semstvos are meeting in Moskow in spite of the orders of the Czar and the efforts of the police. They are supposed to be discussing a national constitution, the general features of which are reported to be modelled after the English constitution. The Czar is to retain the control of the army and the right to veto any bills passed by the National Congress which it is proposed to establish. The Congress is to have control of finances and general legislative power.

ARGENTINE.

The following has been received from the International Socialist Bureau:

The Argentine socialist party, which has hitherto been free from any interference on the part of the government, is now confronted by unforeseen difficulties, which must be studied in order to find the most efficient means for their solution.

These difficulties have created a situation full of uncertainty and well-founded apprehension. For this reason we have decided to familiarize you with the circumstances and to ask you whether the steps which we will suggest to you are timely and possible.

The Argentine Republic is essentially an agricultural country. Of our five million inhabitants, scattered over a territory of about three million kilometers forty-two per cent. live in cities and fifty-eight per cent. in the rural districts.

From the economic point of view, a few words will describe our country. It produces cereals, wool and cattle, which are taken to the ports and shipped to Europe. Industrial development, which has reached a certain point in two or three large cities, has not affected the essential character of the country in the least. This characteristic feature of Argentine implies logically an intermittent economic and commercial activity.

In the summer, when the crops are harvested and shipped to Europe, the economical and commercial activity reaches its climax. In the winter, when the work of agriculture is ended, this activity is at its lowest ebb. The demand for laborers is naturally directly dependent on the economic activity of these seasons.

In the summer the laborers easily find employment in the field work. In the winter the majority of them pass their time in the great cities.

From the foregoing it follows that, for the majority of the laborers of Argentine, the only season in which they can demand any improvement is that in which hands are demanded for the harvest, that is to say, in the summer time.

Ever since a small labor organization has existed in our country we have great strikes every year, beginning in the month of November and ending in the month of March. In the first years in which the working class followed this strike tactics during harvest time the capitalist class of Argentine was taken by surprise and had to acquiesce to the demand of the laborers. But when these strikes continued and reached their climax in November, 1902, especially in the capital, the capitalist class quickly brought pressure to bear on the government and at the end of the year had a law passed exiling all strangers who had taken a conspicuous part

in those strikes. And when this did not suffice to break the strike of 1902, the government declared martial law and crushed the movement.

In the beginning of February, 1905, military revolts broke out in different parts of the republic. These were suppressed by the government and the opportunity grasped for the purpose of prolonging martial law for three months more for the avowed purpose of insuring not alone "law and order," but also the gathering and exportation of the crops.

Several strikes which were about to be declared had to be suspended on account of martial law, which is identical in our country with a suppression of all constitutional guarantees.

We have now reached the most important point of our subject. The working class of Argentine fears, not without good reason, that the government will adopt the policy of declaring martial law every year, for the purpose of anticipating the strike movement during harvest time; and if this assumption should prove true, the working class would be in a very difficult position, seeing that its organization is not strong enough at present to exert enough power to overcome the effects of such a measure.

With a view of heading off such a policy, or of preparing eventually a defense on the part of the working class, we have decided to turn to you and ask you to negotiate by means of your socialist parties with the longshoremens of the principal ports of England, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany and Italy and to ascertain whether they would not be disposed to boycott all steamers coming from Argentine in case the government of our country should declare martial law or undertake to decree arbitrary measures against the strike movement, which our class inaugurates every year as a weapon of the class struggle during harvest time. Mark well that the boycott should extend only to steamers carrying a cargo of harvest products, that is to say, it would be in force for a definite period of the year (from January to April).

We hope, comrades, that you will give us all the support necessary under these trying circumstances. If the longshoremens of the ports mentioned are willing to perform this beautiful act of solidarity, which we are asking of them, be so kind as to let us know as soon as possible.

Buenos Ayres, April, 1905.

ALEJANDRO MANTECONHIJO,

General Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

FREEMAN OR SLAVE, by *Fred D. Warren*. *Appeal to Reason*, Girard, Kansas. Paper, 64 pp. 10 cents.

This is a handy little compilation of the matter contained in the 18th National Report of the Commissioner of Labor which has been practically suppressed within six months after its first appearance. It is one of the sort of books that every working socialist ought to carry around in his pocket to use when facts are called for to back up any position.

HOW TO KNOW THE STARRY HEAVENS, by *Edward Irving*. *Frederick A. Stokes Co.* Cloth, 313 pp. \$2.00.

The author announces that: "This volume is not so much a text book on astronomy as an invitation to read books on that subject." It would be presumptuous on our part to attempt to give a technical opinion on the scientific side of this work. However, we have been assured by some persons who are supposed to know, that it represents the latest and most authoritative positions in astronomy. We can testify, however, that it is most interestingly written with striking illustrations and not a little humor, things which readers seldom look for in works on astronomy. Throughout the work astronomy is related to other sciences and to general facts of knowledge in a way that emphasizes once more the old truth of the unity of all truth. Numerous colored illustrations, charts and reproductions of photographs add to the interest and assist in comprehending the text.

WOMEN IN THE PRINTING TRADES, by *J. Ramsay McDonald*. P. S. King & Son, London. Cloth, 206 pp.

This is one of those detailed studies and compilations of facts such as we usually associate with government enterprise. It shows that women have entered into a great variety of trades and discusses the conditions under which they work. The totals show that in the several industries studied, which are quite comprehensive, embracing most of the manufacturing factory trades, there were 68,318 women employed in 1895 and 76,203 in 1897 showing that the increase in female labor still continues. In considering "Women's Work and Organization," only the printing trade is treated and it is pointed out that here organization has been very weak and ineffective, and some general conclusions are drawn as to women and trades' unions that seem scarcely justified from this one trade, especially as the experience in other lines would show that women are capable of effective organization. Other chapters compare "Men and Women as Workers," or treat of "Industrial Training," "Legislation," "Women and Machinery," "Home Work," "Married and Unmarried" and "Wages." As a compilation of facts the work is very satisfactory and will save the student of this subject much weary search through less accessible documents. We are rather surprised however that the socialist author is so careful to avoid all conclusions.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS.

This recent illustrated work by R. H. France, translated by A. M. Simons, will be ready for delivery by the time this issue of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW is in the hands of its readers. It is the second volume of the *Library of Science for the Workers*, of which the opening volume, "The Evolution of Man," has scored so prompt and complete a success.

"Germes of Mind in Plants" is no less interesting and important. The author's central thought is that a careful and sympathetic study of plant life shows forces operating in the plants which correspond closely to some of the operations of the human mind. This is brought out not in an abstract and theoretical fashion, but by means of graphic descriptions of the actions of particular plants, showing how each one responds to impressions from the outside, and acts on those impressions in ways that will benefit itself.

The conclusion from these facts is one that is of the utmost importance in laying broad and deep the foundations of the socialist philosophy. It is that mind is not something apart from the rest of the universe, to be explained only by the assertions of theologians or mystics; it is on the contrary an outgrowth and an expression of the universe itself. This little book brings the facts to prove that mind is only another form of "life," and "The Evolution of Man" gave us the evidence that "life" is but a form of that "energy" that is never separated from we will call "matter."

THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.

This work by Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by Ernest Untermann, was published by us in May. The first edition of 2,000 copies was exhausted by the first week of July, and the second edition of 1,570 copies is already more than gone. Comrade Arthur Morrow Lewis of San Francisco, who has been selling this book in connection with his lectures at Pacific coast cities, has broken all records by ordering 700 copies of "The Evolution of Man" in a little over a month. The moral is that the book is one that appeals to new converts and to non-socialists as readily as to party members. While it is strictly scientific and up to date, so that it wins praise from the severest critics, it is also so simple and entertaining that those who have been defrauded of an education can read it with pleasure. It does not contain the word socialism except in the ad-

vertising pages at the end, but it establishes by ample proofs the scientific theory of evolution of which socialism is the logical outcome.

"The Evolution of Man" and "Germs of Mind in Plants" are uniformly bound in cloth, and sell for fifty cents each, postage included.

LATER VOLUMES OF THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE.

We had intended publishing in this number a full outline of the work by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer entitled "The End of the World," a translation of which by Margaret Wagner will be the third volume of the library. The publication of this volume is, however, unavoidably delayed for another month, and we will therefore reserve any full description for our September announcement. It will be an illustrated volume describing the forces which will at some future time bring an end to human life on this planet. It will be followed later, probably in 1906, by a companion volume by the same author entitled "The Making of the World," which will treat of the constructive forces which in the never-ending cycles of the universe, bring new worlds into being to take the place of those that die.

The fourth volume of the Library of Science will probably be "Science and Revolution," by Ernest Untermann. In this book he will use some of the material in the series of articles now appearing on the Evolution of the Theory of Evolution, but the form will be recast so as to present this difficult though important subject in a style that will be readily grasped.

The fifth volume will probably be "The Triumph of Life," by Wilhelm Boelsche, author of "The Evolution of Man." This is now being translated by Mrs. May Wood Simons, and we expect to issue it in the early fall. Other volumes will be announced in the near future.

NEW PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS—"WHAT SOCIALISTS THINK."

Our recent publications have been in the line of education rather than propaganda, but we realize that both are needed. And just at this time there seems to be a special demand for leaflets cheap enough to give away, which give some idea of the principles of socialism. To meet this want we are now publishing under the general title "What Socialists Think" five leaflets by Charles H. Kerr, the sub-titles of which are as follows:

1. How we Explain People's Actions.
2. How the Laborer Makes Surplus Value and How the Capitalist Gets it.
3. The Class Struggle between Workers and Owners.
4. The Co-operative Commonwealth.
5. The Socialist Party of America.

One set of these leaflets will be mailed free of charge to any one asking for it and mentioning this notice. A hundred sets will be mailed to any address for thirty cents. A thousand sets will be sent by express at purchaser's expense for \$1.50, and more at the same rate. We are supplying these leaflets at cost to every one, so that there is no discount on them to stockholders. The first edition is 150,000 sets, and we hope to announce soon that the supply is exhausted and a new lot ordered.

RAISING THE DEBT.

We are trying to get the publishing house on a cash basis. We have a capital stock of \$11,860. But we have put a great deal more than this

into books and electrotype plates, into advertising and into the International Socialist Review. So there is a debt. There was a large debt to printers, paper makers and bankers, but that is paid off, except \$400 to one bank, on which we are still paying seven per cent. We are also paying one stockholder six per cent. on \$1,500, and this ought to be paid as soon as possible. The rest of the debt, including \$8,427 to Charles H. Kerr, draws only four per cent. His offer, as published last month, is that for the rest of the year 1905 he will contribute out of the balance due him an amount equal to the contributions of all other stockholders for the sake of putting the company on a cash basis. The contributions so far received on this offer are as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$454 00
Dr. H. Gifford, Nebraska.....	5 00
Martin Nelson, Arizona.....	4 70
B. F. Gayman, British Columbia.....	5 00
Austin Boudreau, Rhode Island.....	3 00
P. R. Skinner, Oregon.....	30 00
J. E. Lehner, Missouri.....	5 00
George D. Herron, New York.....	50 00
W. S. McLean, Washington.....	2 00
Dr. Heinrich Stinnes, Germany.....	8 36
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania.....	1 00
Innes Sigler, Texas.....	1 00
A. E. Schuttenhelm, Ohio.....	2 00
Joseph Remelsbecker, Ohio.....	5 00
A. F. Simmonds, New York.....	1 00
Dr. H. W. Wilson, Pennsylvania.....	7 90
Alex. Contner, Washington.....	2 00
John Gibson, Kansas.....	1 00
Fred R. Barrett, Maine.....	1 00
Fred M. Landis, Kansas.....	5 00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois.....	139 96
Total.....	<u>\$733 92</u>

Apart from this we are glad to announce that the book sales for July amount to \$787.62 as compared with \$562.70 for the corresponding year. The margin on these sales will pay all expenses and leave a considerable sum to apply on the debt. A united effort will soon put the company in a position where every dollar that comes in can be used to bring out the new publications that the movement needs. But the first thing to do is to get the publishing house in such shape that it will be in no way dependent on the life of any one man. If your name is not in the list of contributors, how about putting it there next month?