

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

NOVEMBER, 1902.

NO. 5.

## The Western Labor Movement.

**T**HERE seems to be considerable misapprehension, especially among Socialists, in regard to the trades-union movement of the Western States, whose delegates, recently assembled in National convention, adopted the platform of the Socialist Party and pledged the support of their organizations to the International Socialist movement. This radical departure from the effete and reactionary non-political policy of the American Federation of Labor, so long and so earnestly striven for by the Western leaders, and so entirely compatible with the Socialist conception of class-conscious and progressive trades-unionism, should have been met with the prompt and hearty approbation of every unionist and every Socialist in the land. That such was not the case, the luke-warm comment and the half-approving, half-condemning tone of the Socialist party press, with but one or two exceptions, bear convincing testimony, while the uncalled for, unwise and wholly unaccountable official pronouncement of the St. Louis "Quorum," purporting to speak for the National Committee, capped the climax of unfairness and injustice to the Western movement.

Stripped of unnecessary verbiage and free from subterfuge, the Socialist party has been placed in the attitude of turning its back upon the young, virile, class-conscious union movement of the West, and fawning at the feet of the "pure and simple" movement of the East, and this anomalous thing has been done by men who are supposed to stand sponsor to the party and whose utterance is credited with being *ex cathedra* upon party affairs.

They may congratulate themselves that upon this point at least they are in perfect accord with the capitalist press, and also with the "labor lieutenants," the henchment and heelers, whose duty it is to warn the union against Socialism and guard its members against working-class political action.

The writer takes issue with these comrades upon this vital

proposition; and first of all insists that they (including the members of the Quorum) speak for themselves alone, as they undoubtedly have the right to do, and that their declaration in reference to the American Labor Union is in no sense a party expression, nor is it in any matter binding upon the party, nor is the party to be held responsible for the same.

As a matter of fact the rank and file of the Socialist party, at least so far as I have been able to observe, rejoice in the action of the Denver convention, hail it as a happy augury for the future and welcome with open arms the Western comrades to fellowship in the party.

"Why didn't they stay in the Federation of Labor and carry on their agitation there? Why split the labor movement?" This is made the burden of the opposition to the Western unionists who refused to be assimilated by Mark Hanna's "Civic Federation"—the pretext for the scant, half-hearted recognition of their stalwart working-class organization and their ringing declaration in favor of Socialism and in support of the Socialist party.

And this objection may be dismissed with a single sentence. Why did not those who urge it remain in the Socialist Labor Party and carry on their agitation there? Why split the Socialist movement?

It is not true that the Western unionists set up a rival organization from geographical or sectional considerations, or to antagonize the Federation; and they who aver the contrary know little or nothing about the Western movement, nor about the causes that brought it into existence. A brief review of these may throw some light upon the subject.

In 1896 the annual convention of the Federation of Labor was held in Cincinnati. The Western Federation of Miners, at that time an affiliated organization, was represented by President Edward Boyce and Patrick Clifford, of Colorado. The strike of the Leadville miners, more than 3,000 in number, one of the bloodiest and costliest labor battles ever fought, was then in progress and had been for several months. The drain and strain on the resources of the Western Federation had been enormous. They needed help and they needed it sorely. They had always poured out their treasure liberally when help was needed by other organizations, East as well as West, and now that they had reached their limit, they naturally expected prompt and substantial aid from affiliated organizations. Boyce and Clifford appealed to the delegates. To use their own language they were "turned down," receiving but vague promises which, little as they meant, were never fulfilled. At the close of the convention they left for home, disappointed and disgusted. They stopped off at Terre Haute to urge me to go to Leadville to lend a helping hand to

the striking miners, which I proceeded to do as soon as I could get ready for the journey. It was here that they told me that the convention was a sore surprise to them, that three or four men had votes enough to practically control the whole affair and that the dilatory and reactionary proceedings had destroyed their confidence in the Federation.

Afterward I was told by the officers in charge of the strike that no aid of the least value, or even encouragement, had been rendered by the Federation of Labor and that the financial contributions were scarcely sufficient to cover the expense of the canvass for same.

It was not long after this that the Western miners withdrew from the Federation and a couple of years later, conceiving the necessity of organizing all classes of labor in the Western States, which as yet had received but scant attention, the American Labor Union was organized, the Western Federation of Miners being the first organization in affiliation with the new central body.

But notwithstanding the withdrawal of the Western Miners from the American Federation they continued loyally to support the Eastern boycotts levied by the Federation, and it is a fact not to be gainsaid that while some of those boycotts were so feebly supported in the East, where they had been levied, as to be practically impotent, the union men of the West recognized them as scrupulously as if imposed by their own organization, and in Montana and other States drove the boycotted Eastern products out of the Western markets.

So far as I am able to inform myself there is no instance on record where the American Federation of Labor, or any organization affiliated with it, ever sanctioned or supported a boycott levied by the Western unions.

On the contrary, cases can be cited where the Eastern organizations bluntly refused to recognize boycotts declared by the Western organization.

Not only this, but the Western unions have always contributed promptly and liberally to the financial support of all labor unions, East and West, North and South, affiliated and otherwise, Butte leading with thousands of dollars in support of all kinds of strikes, in all sections of the country, the liberality and loyalty of the Western Federation of Miners in such cases being proverbial—and yet I have never heard of an instance where the Western unions received a dollar from any Eastern organization since the withdrawal of the Miners' Federation.

At this very time, while the miners of the East are making a desperate struggle against starvation, the miners of the far West, affiliated with the tabooed American Labor Union, are

contributing from their hard earnings to the support of the Pennsylvania strikers, though they never expect to receive a penny from the East; and President Moyer of the Western Federation of Miners is sending messages to President Mitchell of the United Mine Workers. Still more—notwithstanding the bituminous miners of the Middle States, members of the same organization as the anthracite strikers, decided not to strike in support of their anthracite brethren, President Moyer and Secretary Haywood of the Western Federation wired President Mitchell that in their judgment all the miners in the country should stand by the Pennsylvania strikers and that the coal miners of the Western Union were ready to a man to lay down their tools until the anthracite strike was won.

This is the militant, progressive, liberal spirit of Western unionism—now re-enforced with a class-conscious political program—that could not brook the ultra-conservative policy of the Eastern movement, and seceded from it with motives as loyal to labor as ever prompted men to action.

The opponents of the Western Labor Union may search the annals of organized labor in vain, all the circumstances considered, for as noble an example of fidelity to the principles of union labor, as that of President Moyer and Secretary Haywood of the Western Federation, speaking for the coal miners of the Western States, having no grievance of their own and belonging to another organization, to which the East, if not hostile, was at least not friendly, voluntarily agreeing to lay down their tools, and give up their jobs to help their fellowmen more than two thousand miles distant whom they had never seen and never expected to see.

Had the situation been reversed and the miners of Montana had gone on strike, would the Eastern unions have sent any money out there, or would the Eastern miners have volunteered to strike in sympathy with their Western brethren?

The conventions of the Western Labor Unions, the Western Federation of Miners and the Hotel and Restaurant Employes' Union, held simultaneously at Denver in May last, attracted wide attention chiefly because of their declaration in favor of Socialism and their adoption of an independent political program. Prior to this these organizations were rarely mentioned, in fact almost unknown in the Eastern and Middle States and no reference to them was ever made by the capitalist press outside their own immediate jurisdiction. But the very moment they declared in favor of Socialism, the capitalist press, the "pure and simple" union element and, strange to say, some socialists, "Cry Havoc, and let slip the dogs of war." As for the socialists who joined in the outcry, or "damned with faint praise," they

were perhaps persuaded, after a survey of the East and then the West, that it was wiser policy to curry favor with numbers than to stand by principles.

The impression prevails in some quarters that the American Labor Union was first instituted at the convention in Denver last May. This is erroneous, as the organization has been in existence several years, and at the late convention simply changed its name from the Western Labor Union to the American Labor Union to more properly describe its expanding jurisdiction.

Fault has been found because of the rival disposition shown by the convention to the American Federation and the purpose to invade other sections and organize rival unions, thereby dividing the movement and precipitating a factional labor war.

The delegates to the Denver convention considered this phase of question in all its bearings; they did not propose to antagonize the American Federation, nor to invade its jurisdiction, nor set up rival unions, they simply proposed to protect their own movement in the Western States and they did not propose to allow attacks to be made upon it without resenting them; and when they finally took action, even in the matter of changing their name, it was in self-defense, for from every quarter, even some of their own disgruntled element who sought to defeat the proposed adoption of Socialism, came the threat that if the Western Union did not return to the American Federation, the latter would send a corps of organizers into the Western States to institute rival unions and "wipe the Western movement off the earth."

The "pure and simple" element in Denver and vicinity, affiliated with the American Federation, and not a few of the local politicians, who saw their doom in the Socialist tendency of the convention, were loud and persistent in the threat of "annihilation" if the delegates refused to vote for affiliation with the American Federation. While there I heard it frequently upon the street and elsewhere and in fact Secretary Morrison, who, with Thomas I. Kidd, of the Executive Council, represented the American Federation at the convention with the purpose of inducing the Western Labor Union to dissolve, and its affiliated organizations to join the American Federation, gave it out that if the delegates declined their overtures, the American Federation would proceed to organize in all the Western States, as it acknowledged no boundary line to its jurisdiction in the United States.

The charge, therefore, of "invasion" and "rival unions" against the Western movement, falls to the ground. It can be proven beyond doubt that the Western movement acted upon the defensive in this matter and that only when the threat to "wipe them out of existence" in their own territory was made, did they conclude

to extend their jurisdiction to such sections as desired to embrace their organization.

If it is held that the American Federation had prior jurisdiction, it may be answered that George the Third and Great Britain had prior jurisdiction over the colonies, and that the jurisdiction of the Knights of Labor antedated that of the American Federation, and the National Labor Union that of the Knights of Labor and so on back without end.

Whatever difference may have prompted the separation several years ago—and whether it was wise or otherwise, I shall not now consider, having no share in the praise or blame, as the action was taken by the Western miners upon their own motion and they are entirely willing to accept the responsibility—it is certain that there is to-day a radical fundamental difference between the Eastern and Western wings of the American Labor movement and that in their present state and with their present conflicting policies and tendencies, they can not be united and even if they could be, factional and sectional strife would be at once engendered and disruption would be inevitable.

The Western movement could only have consented to go *back and backward* to the American Federation by stultifying itself and betraying and humiliating its thousands of progressive members who are far enough advanced to recognize the futility of labor organization without class-conscious political action and who will never retrace their steps to the fens and bogs of “pure and simple” unionism.

The Western men want unity and they want harmony, but they will not go backward, they will not sacrifice progress to reaction to secure it.

They have declared their class-consciousness and they can not and will not snuff out that beacon light to emancipation.

They have committed their organization to the Socialist Party and they can not unite with an organization that is hostile to independent political action by the working class.

There is one way and one only to unite the American trades-union movement. The American Federation of Labor must go forward to the American Labor Union; the American Labor Union will never go back to the American Federation of Labor. Numbers count for nothing; principle and progress for everything.

When the American Federation of Labor sheds its outgrown “pure and simple” policy, when it declares against the capitalist system and for union, class-conscious action at the ballot box, as the supreme test of union principles, as the American Labor Union has done; when it relegates “leaders” to the rear who secure fat offices for themselves in reward for keeping the rank and file in

political ignorance and industrial slavery, when it shall cease to rely upon cringing lobbying committees, begging, like Lazarus at the gate of Dives, for a bone from a capitalist legislature and Congress it helped to elect, and marshals its members in class-array against their exploiters on election day to vote their own class into power, then unity will come and the Western men will hail with joy that day. And it is coming. It is simply bound to come.

In the meantime there need be no quarrel between the East and West and there will be none unless the threatened attempt to "snuff out" the West should materialize, in which case the "snuffers" will be entitled to the credit of having inspired a refreshing exhibition of the "staying" qualities of the class-conscious trades-union movement of the Western State.

The speaking tour of the national officers and executive council of the American Federation, in the mountain States, following the Denver convention, and widely heralded by the capitalist press as an "uprising of the conservative element of organized labor to squelch the Western radicals" can claim anything but a victory if that was the program of President Gompers and his colleagues. Some of their meetings, with all the advertising they received, scarcely amounted to a "corporal's guard," and where they had hundreds, the meetings held under the auspices of the Western Union had thousands in attendance without the aid of capitalist newspapers and in spite of the opposition of capitalist politicians.

As to whether the Western movement is growing or declining since the Denver convention, it is sufficient to say that the reports show that during the month of September the organizations affiliated with the American Labor Union added more than four thousand new names to their rolls of membership.

Passing through Denver recently I noticed by the papers of that city in scare-head articles, that the organizer of the American Federation, who had just been interviewed upon the subject, declared in emphatic terms that he had been instructed from headquarters at Washington to organize rival unions at every available point and where there was even one applicant, to admit him, totally regardless of the American Labor Union. If this is to be the policy of the Eastern Federation it will have to be that of the Western Union and as a result we shall have an era of unprecedented activity in the work of organizing the trades-union movement of the country.

One thing is noticeable in this connection and that is that the American Federation has evinced a greater interest in the Western States, spent more money and worked harder to organize

them in the comparatively short time since the Western Union is in the field than in all previous years.

The rise of class-conscious trades-unionism in the West was not the result of mere chance or personal design, but obedient to the rising tide of the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat of the rugged and sparsely settled mountain States, a composite population composed of pioneers, the most adventurous, brave and freedom-loving men from all States of the American continent, and it is impossible that they, with their keen instinct and revolutionary tendency could be long content to creep along in the creaking chariot of conservatism, even though it still bear traces of the union label.

The class-conscious union movement of the West is historic in origin and development and every Socialist should recognize its mission and encourage its growth. It is here that the tide of social revolution will reach its flood and thence roll into other sections, giving impetus where needed and hastening the glorious day of triumph.

I am the friend, not the enemy of the American Federation of Labor. I would conserve, not destroy it. I am opposed, not to the organization or its members, many of whom are personal friends, but to those who are restraining its evolution and preventing it from fulfilling its true mission.

I would not convert it into a political organization, but simply bring it up to date and have it, as it must become if it is to survive, a class-conscious industrial union, its members recognizing the Socialist ballot as the weapon of their class and using it accordingly, thus escaping the incongruities and self-contradictions of the present "pure and simple" union, whose members strike against and boycott the effects of the capitalist system while voting industriously to perpetuate the system.

It is true that there are elements of progress at work within the organization. Let them continue their efforts. Such men as Max S. Hayes, J. W. Slayton, J. Mahlon Barnes and many others who have done and are doing excellent work on the inside have all help and no hinderance to expect from the Western movement.

Certainly Max Hayes, elected delegate to the approaching convention of the American Federation of Labor by a popular vote of his organization, the International Typographical Union, upon the issue that he was a Socialist, and now muzzled by an order of a delegate convention instructing him to vote against Socialist measures, will not object to a little help from the outside.

In time the two progressive forces will meet and the work of redemption will have been accomplished.

Until then, as in the past, I shall support every boycott and



every strike of the American Federation of Labor, and every organization affiliated with it, to the best of my ability, and when they lose in any of these struggles, no disheartening word from my lips shall darken their counsels or add to the bitterness of their defeat.

I have been plain and unreserved in my criticism as I have a right to be. For many years I have been an unofficial organizer for the Federation of Labor, and for all the trades-unions connected with it, and in my travels, especially the past seven years in which I have been almost continuously traversing the country, I have organized and been the means of organizing hundreds of unions of all kinds. In the Southern States I held the first great labor meetings when there was little or no trace of organization, in many places not even a single member, and I at once set to work organizing each point with the result that when I covered the same territory shortly after, there were unions everywhere and the movement spread rapidly over that section of the country. In view of these facts I think I can consistently assert the right of candid criticism.

The attitude of the Socialist Party toward the trades-union movement broadly endorsing and commending it, but stopping there, and allowing it to manage its own internal affairs is, without doubt, the correct one, as any intermeddling must result in harm with no possible hope of good. The party, as such, must continue to occupy this friendly yet non-interfering position, but the members may, of course, and in my judgment should join the trades-unions East and West and North and South and put forth their best efforts to bring the American labor movement to its rightful position in the struggle for emancipation.

*Eugene V. Debs.*

## A True Philosophy of Fashion.

---

**T**HE truth is always a very simple thing when we once get at it, and our true philosophy of fashion can be stated in a few words. Briefly it is this: The tyranny that fashion exercises over men, like all other tyrannies, is a result of inequality of condition, and originates in the desire of the more fortunately circumstanced to emphasize their superiority and differentiate themselves as conspicuously as possible from their less fortunate fellow creatures in the cut and material of their clothing. Remove the cause and you get rid of the evil.

The truth of this proposition may not be apparent at first sight, but if the reader will have patience to glance back with me a moment at the origin and history of dress, he will see that there is nothing new or strange in the view propounded, but that it rests on foundations as old as human nature itself.

Ethnologists are pretty well agreed that dress had its origin in love of adornment, and not, as might be supposed, in native modesty, or a utilitarian desire to keep out the cold. The traditional fig leaf which does such conspicuous service in modern museums of sculpture as a *lucus a non lucendo* to the innocent, may have had some reference to that virtue in the beginning, but the first naked savage that ran a brass ring through his nose, or daubed himself with red clay, was thinking, not of hiding his nakedness or warming his bones, but of exciting the admiration of his harem or inspiring terror to his enemies. From these simple beginnings vanity and love of display would in time develop all the marvels of toilet, savage and civilized. The habit of covering the body, for whatever purpose, once formed, the sense of modesty would next be developed. So long as man goes naked he is not ashamed, but clothe him and he learns to blush.

That dress originated modesty and not vice versa, is evident from the conventionality of its requirements. In some countries delicacy forbids a woman to uncover her face in public. With us of the west, not only the face, but arms and shoulders, and under certain conditions appalling expanses of bare back and bosom also, may be displayed with impunity, while no form of dress is tolerated which suggests the faintest suspicion that women may be possessed of such useful and necessary appendages as legs. Even the very word is included in this conventional taboo, as are the feet also, to some extent; she would be a bold woman who should venture to appear on the streets of some of our American cities, even in a February slush, with skirts up to her ankles. On the other hand, we are so accustomed to seeing the waist and bust outlined by what are considered well-fitting garments that any loose drapery which conceals the waist line is thought inelegant, if not

immodest, as witness the disgust excited in the average masculine breast by a loose Mother Hubbard gown some years ago, when that comfortable garment made an effort to assert itself for house wear. But I am getting off the track; let us return to the "previous question."

As the first rude attempts at ornament were gradually developed into what we know as dress, the covering for the body would naturally take, in warm climates, the form of loose, flowing draperies, which would screen the person without confining it, and hence the Greek peplum, the Roman toga, and the Arab burnouse. By degrees, as the slowly evolving *homo sapiens* pushed his way, or was pushed by others, toward the inhospitable regions of the north, the desirability of clothing as a protection against cold would suggest itself, and the bifurcated garment, so necessary to comfort in cold climates, would speedily be evolved.

Thus far the art of dress has been developing along strictly natural and healthy lines. Trousers and petticoats, or whatever primitive patterns took their place, the two distinctive types of dress, have come into existence not in response to sexual, but to climatic differences. Men and women alike clothed themselves rationally, according to the climate they lived in or the work they had to do. Loose, flowing robes met the needs of the people along the sunny shores of the Mediterranean, while close-fitting leggings warmed the limbs of the dwellers on the stormy Baltic. And so the human race might have gone on, clothing itself rationally and comfortably, to the great advantage of both sexes, had not fashion interfered with a senseless decree condemning the civilized world to an arbitrary distinction in the dress of the sexes that has worked great detriment to both. No matter what the condition in which he may be placed, whether amid the scorching sands of Sahara, the steaming jungles of India, in the negligé of his own chamber, or the festive graces of the ball room, Caucasian man must encase himself in the compact, double-barreled garments that were devised primarily as a defense against wind and cold. On the other hand, civilized woman, just because she is a woman, regardless of climate or occupation, whether riding horseback, pedalling a bicycle, or heading her way against a March wind, has no choice but to encumber herself with the flowing draperies fit only for repose and sunshine. Even the plainest teachings of hygiene cannot free her from the necessity that fashion imposes of sweeping up the filth of the streets with her skirts and conveying it, with all its possibilities of infection, into her home.

If we look a little deeper into the matter, we shall see that this primal absurdity of fashion is, as our philosophy teaches, but the natural result of inequality of condition. Dress having originated, as already remarked, in the love of adornment, would soon become

a symbol of rank and distinction, and the king, and the great man generally, would be known by the gorgeousness of his attire. As long as the human race was confined to the warmer regions of the earth, in which it probably had its origin, there would be no marked differentiation of male and female dress, both men and women adopting, as a matter of course, the loose, flowing style that nature and common sense would alike dictate as suited to the relaxation of a southern clime. The rich and great would signalize their importance by arraying themselves and those belonging to them in jewels and costly stuffs, but there would be little change in the cut of their clothes from generation to generation. In primitive civilizations differences of rank are so clearly defined and so universally acquiesced in that its peculiar style of dress is prescribed by immemorial custom to each class, and the rich dandy need have no fear that the cut of his gorgeous mantle will be duplicated in cheap material and vulgarized by some aspiring plebeian; hence there is no need for him to be continually changing it in order to defeat the misplaced ambition of the vulgar.

But when the restless sons of the north come upon the scene, we have a different story. The narrow bifurcated garment, so well adapted to utilitarian purposes, is ill-fitted, by its narrowness and general paltriness of appearance, for the display of ornament. The man in breeches has no chance to cut a figure in dress compared with the wearer of the graceful bornouse or the stately toga. But it is human to take pride in whatever advantages we may possess and to desire to impress others with a sense of our superiority; and so, when the man in breeches began to prosper and grow rich, as he did by and by, to a degree never attained by man before, he naturally looked to splendor of costume as a means of signalizing his importance and prosperity. But the rational bifurcated garment, with the freedom of limb it allowed, was too comfortable and convenient, too well adapted to the needs of a busy, restless race, to be discarded for the graceful, but cumbersome robes of the south, so man kept his comfortable trousers for himself and put his women folk into petticoats, to wear his finery for him, and make his display by proxy. In proportion to the splendor in which he arrayed his womankind he could afford to neglect display in his own person, and so comfort and utility came to be consulted more and more in male attire and ornament in female, until the woman of modern western civilization has come to outdo all the rest of the world in the extravagance, the irrationality, and the inutility of her costume.

Another means for exhibiting the power and importance of the great man—chief, king, nabob, millionaire, whatever name he may be called by in the different phases of his evolution—is by the number of idle and useless people he can afford to keep about

him. Slaves, vassals, men-at-arms, followers and flunkies of all sorts, and in some stages of society, wives galore, have surrounded the man of power like satellites and added to his splendor by the luster of their reflected light. Solomon's three thousand wives were as much a part of his glory as his "forty thousand stalls of horses for chariots" and his "twelve thousand horsemen." The poor man's wives being objects of use rather than adornment, he is not likely to take more of them than he can find profitable employment for in cooking and washing and other household drudgery, and their dress is not devised for show. But the rich man reflects distinction on himself by keeping his women in idleness and luxury. Hence, incapacity for serving any useful purpose becomes the ideal of the fine lady in all lands, and the more obvious her purely ornamental function can be made to appear, the more completely does she subserve the purpose of her existence. Among the Chinese this object is attained by maiming the feet of their women of quality and making them cripples for life. Western nations accomplish the same result by compressing their waists and putting them into straitjackets of various kinds, called corsets, or by encumbering them with bustles and crinoline and long trains and high-heeled shoes, and other devices for making useful occupation of any kind impossible to a "well dressed" woman.

But the western nations are democratic. They do not acquiesce in distinction of rank as quietly as their less aspiring eastern brethren. They have a theory that one man is just as good as another, and all women a little better, and theoretically they will not allow distinctions in dress any more than they will acknowledge distinctions in rank. It is not that the bulk of mankind are snobs, as Mr. Thackeray would have had us believe, and try to imitate the rich for the mere desire to be like them, but they resent having the cut of their clothes made the badge of an inferiority which they do not admit to exist. They feel an instinctive desire to break through the artificial barrier of fashion, the most conspicuous of all the barriers that wealth has sought to raise about itself. Hence the wives and daughters of working men, and men of moderate means everywhere, endeavor to follow the fashions set by the rich, at what cost of misery and discomfort to themselves, most of us know only too well. For fashion takes no note of the working classes. She never busies herself inventing pretty and convenient costumes for them; and ten to one they would not adopt them if she did, for such a dress, under our present social conditions, would be the mark of an offensive distinction quite out of keeping with democratic theories.

However this may be, fashion has never yet succeeded in devising any mode so ugly or uncomfortable as to hinder the average woman from trying to follow it if she can get hold of a piece

of cloth and a pair of scissors. It is not that she loves the fashion for its own sake or takes pride in aping those who invented it, but that she would escape the imputation of inferiority which being out of the fashion implies. Wealth and privilege, then, must resort to a fresh device for balking the ambition of the "vulgar," and hence those sudden changes of style that so often frustrate the labor of the industrious matron, after she has, with infinite pains, changed a last year's gown to look like the latest model in the shop windows, only to find that this, in turn, has been superceded by a newer fad. The more complete the success of these imitators, the more certain their discomfiture, for no sooner has a style been "vulgarized" by general use, than whist! your arbiters of elegance cast it aside as common and unclean, and straightway seek for new inventions to distinguish them from the unregarded throng of the "*ignobile vulgus*."

With such a function to fulfill, it is not to be expected that fashion should concern itself about the comfort or the utility of clothing. On the contrary, these qualities are rather to be avoided as commending a mode too readily to the common herd whose imitative propensities it is fashion's chief aim to foil. Its regulations, framed as they are in the interest of a privileged class, must, from the very nature of the case, bear hard upon—I will not say the poor merely, but upon those in moderate circumstances. The unwritten law which declares it bad form to appear upon the street with the smallest parcel in your hand was not framed for the convenience of the woman with six children at home and only a single hired girl to help; and the abolition of short skirts for street wear would most assuredly never have been sanctioned by a convention of women who do not have carriages always at their command. Dress it regards chiefly as a medium for display, a part of the insignia of wealth and position, by which they distinguish themselves from the rest of the world. Hence it has an eye rather to what is new and fantastic and difficult of imitation than to what is convenient or becoming, or even to what is intrinsically beautiful. We need not be surprised therefore to find that its decisions are influenced by neither reason nor good taste, and that life is made a burden to the rank and file of womankind, who feel that they must keep up with the fashion, though the effort exhausts their powers for more useful employment, and the mode itself may be singularly unsuited to their means and occupation. This vulgarizing of the public taste through cheap imitations of styles devised exclusively in the interest of the rich is one of the worst effects of the tyranny of fashion as it now exists.

And is there no power strong enough to break the yoke of this slavery that humankind has imposed upon its own neck? Men have bowed to the yoke of fashion so long that they seem to have

fallen into a superstitious acquiescence with it as a sort of divine necessity inherent in the nature of things, against which it is useless to strive. They accept its wildest decrees with a sort of fatalistic resignation to the inevitable, and regard any proposal to substitute reason for caprice in its realm as the dream of a crank, impracticable as the discovery of the philosopher's stone or the invention of a Keeley motor. While the prevalence of law and order is admitted in every other province of life, the self-evident fact seems to have escaped observation that it is just as much the nature of fashion as of any other human creation to be rational and sensible if evolved by rational and sensible beings. It is just as natural that our dress and mode of living should be governed by reason and common sense as that our civil and political institutions should be so. There is no more reason in nature why a man, or a woman either, for that matter, should clothe themselves uncomfortably or inappropriately than that they should cultivate thorns in their orchards or plant a garden with thistles. The trouble is not with nature—unless it is human nature—but with the unnatural social conditions under which we are living. Once remove the artificial inequalities which are leading one-half the world on a wild chase after novelty in order to distinguish themselves from the other half, and reason and good taste will at once take the place of caprice and extravagance in setting the fashions.

This brings us back to our starting point, namely, that the tyranny of fashion is a result of inequality of condition; and as economic inequality is the root of all other, it is clear that if we remove this, the arbitrary function of fashion as it now exists will at once disappear. When dress comes to be the index, not of a man's power and importance, that is to say, of his economic superiority over other men, but merely of his individual taste and refinement, then fashion will no longer have for its chief object the invention of fantastic modes for the distinction of their wearers from the rest of mankind. It will seek rather the beautiful, the comfortable, the appropriate. If all were equally free to indulge their individual taste or convenience, fashion in dress, by a natural process of evolution, would soon become synonymous with propriety and good taste. We might still be led to imitate others, but it would be only when they invented something especially beautiful or appropriate, and the whole feminine world would not go into hoop skirts because some royal personage happened to be enceinte, or fetter itself in skin-tight sleeves because some popular actress had a pretty arm. Splendor or novelty in dress would no longer mark its wearer as in any way distinguished in fortune above his fellows, but would merely indicate that he chose to spend his share of the common revenue in a way that might, or might not reflect credit on him, according as his costume was graceful and

appropriate or the reverse. The attempt to distinguish oneself by wearing what was ugly or fantastic or uncomfortable, would probably meet with the ridicule it deserved, for there would be no distinction in doing what all others were equally free to do if they chose.

Nor is there any reason to fear that the absence of a conventional standard of fashion would cause all the world to sink down to a dead level of monotony in dress. On the contrary, our conventional standard is a great cause of uniformity. Take your stand on Broadway any fine morning and watch the procession go by, all got up on pretty much the same pattern; all in big hats or little hats, full skirts or scanty ones, round capes or long coats, as the prevailing mode may be, without regard to the requirements of the different forms and features of the wearers. But where each one is free to follow his or her individual taste and convenience, we may be sure there will be no lack of variety; and the province of fashion no longer being to seek out fantastic and irrational modes to distinguish the privileged few, we may trust the innate love of beauty that dwells in every human heart to provide that only such inventions as are intrinsically beautiful and graceful will be generally adopted. Above all, the vulgarity of making cheap imitations of the finery of the rich will disappear. This is at the bottom of nearly all the bad taste we see displayed in the dress of the poor, and this temptation removed, each will feel free to choose among the variety of styles prevailing, what is personally becoming, without regard to what a richer neighbor may wear. Everybody having to do some part of the world's work, comfortable and appropriate business costumes will be invented for each trade and profession, and what is more, nobody will be ashamed to wear them.

To sum up: when it ceases to be anybody's interest to invent ugly and irrational costumes; when nobody's pride can be flattered and nobody's importance enhanced by mere extravagance in dress, then, and then only, may we expect to see intelligence and good taste take the place of the pride and selfishness that now regulate the fashions of the civilized world. Make men, and women, too, economically equal, so that there will be no room for one class to set themselves above their fellows on account of mere adventitious distinctions, and dress will become simply a matter of taste and convenience, as it ought to be. This is the only way to free mankind—or perhaps I ought to say womankind, as they are the chief sufferers—from the tyranny of fashion, and until this is done, philosophers may rail, moralists may groan, reason and common sense may protest, but we shall never get the human race to clothe itself rationally.

E. P. ANDREWS.



## Begging!—for Work.



MAN beseeching fellowman for work, for a chance to earn the means to keep the life within his frame, within the form of him or her he loves!

What curst conditions cause such scene and fact to be?

O sight more fit to stir Omnipotence on High to slaying-wrath than all the wars or brothels, thefts or lies, murders or suicides from time of Cain till now!

Here is the war, in guise of peace, that slaughters, hour by hour, its unreported hecatombs—and leaves the widows pensionless;

Here is the prostitution (of the Soul)—more damn'd than harlotry's most damn'd and unrestrained debauch;

Here is the theft that beggars world-accumulated theft—the theft that makes the victim cringe low to the thief;

Here is the lie all lies above: "*This work is mine to give, withhold,*"

Here is the murder of a MAN—how insignificant the slaughter or mutilation of the body now appears;

Here is the suicide of many souls,—asphyxiated by a sophistry of thieves: "'Tis in my purse—'tis *therefore* mine!"

A man beseeching work from fellowman?

O ye beguifiable humanitarians, still striving to stop leaks when bottom's out, unstop the ears,—hark to the sounds; tear open eyes,—behold the sights, and know the hour for patching's past.

O ye Peace-pleaders, painstakingly persistent, spending strength and skill in striking plumes, gold-lace and epaulettes from much be-Captained and be-General'd rampant murderers,—strike at the steed, strike at the steed! and level all.

A man beseeching fellowman for work.

Come! Gaze within the crowded room where hundreds slave with feverish speed past strength's exhaustion point.

Come! Gaze where they find rest—the asylum for insane,  
the unmarkt grave.

My brother has been sent away with harsh reply: “WE  
HAVE NO WORK FOR YOU.”

Great is thy patience O Omnipotence, that sends not Death  
—most sudden Death—to devastate this world to bring relief to  
poor whom life brings naught; to bring the end of much-prized  
life to rich whom it gives all—*but love for fellowman.*

*Edward Arnold Brenholts.*

## Individualistic Survivals Under Socialism.



ONE of the most striking truths disclosed by the doctrine of evolution, is, that the entire complex mechanism of modern industry and all the diversified economic activities which civilized men engage in, have grown by slow degrees out of the few simple biologic or vital activities carried on by the animal organism. Primitive life is essentially individualistic. The purely physical needs of the brute, can, in almost all instances, be fully satisfied by its own unaided physical powers, but as man, the "tool-using animal," appeared upon the stage, his gradually increasing wants made necessary more elaborate methods of meeting them. Thus arose production, or the conscious and planful transforming of raw material into objects of utility, and thus by a further step arose the system of the division of labor and the separation of the workers into the different trades. With the continuous development of industry and the discovery of the advantages of association and of co-operation, the factory system and later the trust system arose and hundreds and thousands and then hundreds of thousands of men became co-workers in the same establishment or under the same corporation.

In this manner at successive periods successively more advanced and more effective methods of satisfying wants became predominant, but be it noticed that during each of these periods of higher development the characteristic forms of economic activity of the preceding periods did not become entirely extinct but were merely greatly restricted in their range. At the present time, for example, when we have reached the highest of the above mentioned stages of industrial development there still survive in abundance and at the very heart of our civilization types of all the past economic forms.

It must not be supposed, however, that these necessarily represent in every case an instance of arrested development. Various needs of the individual and of society can only be satisfied by methods that do not allow of the use of mechanical devices or large scale production, and just as the physiological functions such as digestion, respiration, etc., which although they represent the most fundamental of these needs have remained and must always remain individualistic because inherently so, so must there also remain economic functions or occupations that are inherently individualistic.

On the other hand, we notice in the case of the animal organism, which is the prototype of the social organism, that the

higher the degree of development the more numerous and important become the functions of the organism as a whole, the functions under the control of the center of consciousness, and that chief among such functions are those corresponding to production as, for example, the obtaining and storing up of food, the building of nests, etc. What is more logical, then, than to suppose that as the social organism develops, production must here also become a function appertaining, in general, to the whole, instead of to the parts? At any rate, whatever our *theories* may be, the logic of *facts*, the facts unfolding in the industrial world, points indisputably to co-operation, co-operation to the furthest possible degree, as the coming rule in the economic life of society. The existing trusts represent but a passing stage of development the outcome of which must be the establishment of a trust of trusts comprising as equal shareholders every man, woman and child in the land and undertaking in the interest of the whole of society and in so far as is practicable all economic activities.

What, then, is the boundary line between, or the distinguishing feature or features of that class of occupations which we may expect under Socialism to continue to be carried on, and quite properly so, by private individuals, or even groups, for their own private gain and independently of the central and collective industrial administration, and that far wider field of industrial effort which will in the future be wholly controlled and occupied by the community in its corporate and economic capacity?

The answer to this must seem clear when we consider the genesis of industrial activities in general and of any given economic occupation in particular.

Primitive man emerging from the state of animality knew no other form of co-operation than that carried on within the family circle. Before men learned that to labor for each other was the better way to satisfy their own individual needs every man labored for himself and by himself. But the increase of population, making it impossible to subsist by the chase, forced men into a more intensive and economical utilization of the resources of nature and of their own energy by the practice of agriculture and the mechanical arts. Through the gradually increasing division of labor which this involved it became more and more difficult and finally impossible for any man to supply all his needs directly by the labor of his own hands and men were thus impelled with ever greater force towards the system of informal and limited co-operation prevailing to-day. Where in the beginning every one produced by himself all that he required incipient civilization forced men to produce, for the larger part, not directly for their own consumption but for the purpose of

exchange, while at a still later period, as at the present time, most workers do not individually produce even the whole of any one article, whatever it may be, in the exclusive manufacture of which they have now come to be engaged, but only a part of it. This advance from the direct to the indirect method of satisfying wants has been the characteristic feature of industrial progress. A like increasing indirectness may be noted in the application of the mechanical aids to production where hand labor, that is, direct labor, is constantly making way for machinery, that is, indirect labor, and where the machinery itself is becoming ever more and more complicated.

Now no one prefers, and there is no reason why any one should prefer, to do a thing by an indirect and roundabout process when he can accomplish his purpose *as well* in a direct manner. Primitive individualistic production for use is obviously a more direct process of satisfying wants than is the system of associative production for sale or exchange, and it is only as in the course of the progress of society the superior economy of the latter method of production comes to be daily demonstrated over an enlarging area of the field of industry that men are forced to abandon economic independence for economic interdependence.

Collective production, then, is not an end in itself, but is a means to an end, the greater happiness of the individual. Since men seek to satisfy their desires with the least exertion, whatever method of satisfying a given desire requires the least exertion, the least expenditure of energy, is the best method for that particular purpose, whether it may or may not be the best for other purposes.

Now just as labor in all its forms, whether collective or individualistic, is, as we have seen, only a development of those physiological functions automatically or semi-automatically carried on by every animal organism, so are the wants of civilized men which this labor is occupied in satisfying an extension and elaboration of the simple needs of our sub-human ancestors, and as these wants attain different degrees of development so also must the organization of labor required to supply the demand thereby called forth for the particular commodities or services wanted attain different degrees of development.

Between the point in the development of a want where it can be fully satisfied or even where it can only be fully satisfied by one's unaided bodily organs to the point where an elaborate and centralized organization of labor becomes necessary to most economically and satisfactorily supply the particular commodity or service wanted there are many stages. Hence the determination of the question whether any given field of economic effort is fit or can be fit for social and collective administration must in chief

measure depend upon the degree of development that has been reached or that under the conditions of the case and the state of the arts can alone be reached in the methods and the organization of production in the particular industry and upon the position which the industry occupies in relation to other industries.

Bearing in mind the fact, that production, considered as a distinct form of human activity becomes differentiated from human activities in general, including the activities involved in consumption, by a slow process of evolution, and that all the time the appearance of new wants and their development to the point where they can only be satisfied by distinctly economic action, gives rise in this manner to new occupations and industries that only in given instances and usually by slow stages attain that degree of importance and integration or capacity for integration which makes necessary and desirable their social control, it must seem to the thoughtful student of human affairs and it will so seem under the Collectivist State to be quite as unwarrantable and illogical to arbitrarily prohibit *all* private economic transactions, all services performed by one individual for another for an economic consideration, as it would to prohibit the individual from performing for himself such operations, as, for example, the repairing of clothes, shaving, hair dressing, shoe polishing, etc., which the individual now sometimes performs for himself when he requires it done and sometimes for a stipulated compensation delegates to another.

The primary object of Socialism is the abolition of exploitation, the exploitation of the laborer by the capitalist and of the consumer by the producer or those controlling production. In order to eliminate the former of these two methods of exploitation, society must assume the function of the capitalist, the function of ownership and accumulation of the capital required to productively employ the labor of the people, the function of ownership of the land and the machinery of production. By thus rendering the laborer independent of the capitalist, by thus guaranteeing to the laborer employment and the means of employment, capitalistic exploitation of labor becomes impossible and the capitalist class ceases to exist.

But a state of things is conceivable and might under certain conditions of industry be desirable in which collective ownership of capital might be accompanied with the private use thereof. Where the methods of production and communication are but little developed, and where all industrial undertakings are in consequence necessarily carried on on a small scale and by a large number of independent and competing establishments, economic justice might be fully secured by guaranteeing to all equal rights

and opportunities to the soil and to the use of the implements of industry while leaving the administration of industry as a private function in the hands of the people as individuals and in their capacity of private citizens.

Under such an arrangement of things the exploitation of the laborer by the capitalist or landowner would indeed be impossible, nevertheless such a system is not adapted for the conditions of modern industrial society. Modern methods of transportation and communication and the marvelous technical development that has taken place within recent periods both in the field of extractive and manufacturing industries have made it necessary that in such industries and in others that are connected with and dependent upon these, labor to be most effective should be consolidated and operated under a unified management.

The progress of events in the industrial world affords convincing proof that consolidation to the point of monopoly is the normal, inevitable and logical outcome of industrial evolution and that there is, therefore, no choice but between a system of private monopoly for the benefit of the private monopolists, whether the latter be few or many, and one of public monopoly for the benefit of all. Competition in so far as it is still possible, is, in most instances, merely a waste of human labor and of resources of nature and society, the cost of which must be borne by all.

The interests of the people, as consumers, therefore, demand that society, in its corporate capacity, shall assume not merely the passive function of ownership of the land and capital but also the active function of administration of all such industries as the technical development of the age has converted into what we may properly denominate as natural monopolies, using the term to include all those industries which can more economically and productively be carried on under unified than under separate management.

In so far, however, as no advantage can be derived by the consumer from the performance of any particular industrial function by communal action there can be no reason why such function should be so performed. Private production in itself and under conditions where it can involve no exploitation is no evil any more than is private consumption, and as the object of production is consumption, that is to say, the satisfaction of the desires of the individual, it is but reasonable to suppose that unless artificially restrained the form of production will in many instances and with advantage ever coincide with or closely approach the form of consumption. As it is the needs of the consumer which set in motion the efforts of the producer then it would be a gratuitous injury and wrong to the former if when

his requirements are of such a nature as can best be satisfied or as can only be satisfied by individuals working independently, the voluntary performance of such services were prevented by the coercive power of governmental authority.

It is unfortunate that in the reaction from the present economic chaos some Socialists should have been carried into the advocacy of the opposite and almost equally undesirable extreme of universal and compulsory centralization of all economic power under collective control, the doctrine that every individual, whatever his occupation, and whether he be a farmer or a bishop, a tailor or a magazine editor, a barber or a novelist, must be a public employe drawing his salary from the national treasury and subject to the orders of some superior official or administrative committee.

As we have seen, however, the protection of the producers or laborers from capitalistic exploitation, does not in itself require the taking over by the community of a single economic function except that of banking and landowning, and that the real justification for the socialization of any industry or form of service is that the interests of the people as consumers can best be promoted thereby.

The co-operation of all for all in the production and distribution of the objects that minister to the ordinary material needs of life is without doubt a superior and more effective method of satisfying the economic wants of the people than the system of private and competitive or private and monopolistic production affords, but it can easily be shown that in certain branches of economic effort more satisfactory services could be obtained by the consumer from private individuals or associations than from the collective body of society consciously organized for such economic purposes.

Will any one seriously maintain, for example, that a government department or bureau would be as successful in catering to the diverse religious needs of the population as the present independent and specialized armies of priests and clergymen of the various denominations, including Christian Science readers and healers, Spiritualistic mediums, Mormon apostles, Dowieite missionaries, Salvation Army street exhorters, Theosophical adepts, Ethical Culture lecturers, etc., etc., together with the constantly arising new prophets and founders of religions who, by their very success in making converts, prove their fitness for partaking in the task of supplying the demand for religious ministrations?

Or again, would it be carrying to an unreasonable extreme the principle that religion is properly a private matter to question the wisdom of a policy of State administration of theological seminaries and to condemn the establishment of a government mo-



nopoly in the training of students for the ministry? Would it not, on the contrary, be clearly a backward step in historical development, an atavistic return to a more primitive social stage to thus bind together church and state by amalgamating their functions?

Or to take an example from another field of economic effort, let us ask ourselves how the benefits of a multiform free press, representing all shades of public opinion and every sect, school, organization and interest, political, industrial, religious, scientific, literary, artistic, local and miscellaneous, dealing with all manner of topics and freely commenting from all points of view upon men and events; admonishing, guiding and influencing the actions of individuals, organizations and governments; the bulwark of democracy, the champion of popular rights and without which government must inevitably relapse into a despotism; let us ask ourselves how the advantages of this great and beneficent modern institution could be retained by the people if journalism in all its forms is itself to become a department of the government and if editors are to be the appointees of the very officials or bodies whose actions and policies they are to review.

It is plain, therefore, that there must be some exceptions to the rule that every economic function shall be socialized and that all capital shall be held in common. Just as Socialists of all schools agree that municipalities and other local bodies should share with the central government in the control of industry, on the ground that the municipal administration of enterprises of a local nature would be for the best interest of the municipalities concerned, so should it logically be also conceded that occupations of an individualistic nature, that is, occupations that must naturally be carried on by individuals or even, in some cases, by groups of individuals working by themselves, should be carried on by them as private undertakings for themselves. As there is a proper sphere of economic activity for society as a whole and another also for municipalities and local government bodies, so likewise should it be recognized is there a proper field for the independent economic activity of private individuals.

The precise bounds of the economic sphere that must be thus reserved wholly or in part for private effort can not of course be definitely outlined. The question whether any given industry at any given stage of its development shall be considered as lying within the proper field of collective administration, must in each case be decided on its own merits. It does not follow, however, that even within the economic area at any time embraced by collective action the field must be entirely closed to private individuals, that is to say, by means of legislation.

If, notwithstanding the possession of the advantage of unlimited capital upon which no interest or profits need be earned, and

of having by the right of eminent domain the use of the best points of natural productivity for which no rent need be paid, the State as producer can not so satisfy the requirements of the consuming public as to displace by mere superiority of service and not by the exercise of political authority all private production within a given industry, then to the extent that private production thus succeeds in maintaining itself it thereby demonstrates its superiority for such forms of economic activity over the method of collective or socialized production and should therefore, if only in the interest of the consumer, be permitted to retain free of legislative interference its occupancy of such portions of the economic domain.

The common or joint rights of all in the natural and social means of production must no doubt in diverse instances require and justify restriction of the private use of such means of production. Such restriction, however, while fatally handicapping private industry for the larger part, should not be imposed as the act of a hostile government, seeking by the arbitrary exercise of its legislative power to stifle private competition, but should come only as part of the necessary communal administrative duties and in the exercise of just and impartial communal property rights in the communal property.

But now, if the prohibition of private competition, *per se*, where the latter is possible, is undesirable, and if where competition is impossible legislation is unnecessary, then it follows that practically no legislative action on the matter would really be required at all, and that there would need to be almost no interference whatever under Socialism with the industrial liberty of the individual. Given public ownership of the natural resources and of as large a fund of capital as is required to most fully and productively employ the labor power of the people, then exploitation of man by man being thus rendered impossible, labor will flow towards the collective or individualist form, as either is most profitable to itself and the community.

Of course, the recognition of the right of individual liberty in production, subject to the ownership by the whole of society in the major portion of the means of production, must be coupled with a recognition of the right of individual liberty in consumption, and such individual liberty in consumption must include not only the liberty of demand and the right to have the demand supplied in the case of objects produced or that may be produced by collective agency, but also the right to avail one's self by means of a universally accepted medium of exchange and token of value of the services voluntarily offered by private individuals, and to use such medium of exchange for any other purpose or transaction of a private character not opposed to the public welfare.

When money will have lost the power to breed money, that is, when interest on capital will have fallen to zero, and surplus profits will have become impossible, as a result of the socialization of as large a portion of the field of industry as would be required to absorb all the labor seeking employment free of exploitation and supply in full the public demand for goods and services at cost; then, as the mere accumulation of money by a private individual beyond an amount reasonably required for purposes of consumption would no longer avail as now to bring in a revenue of itself, or, rather, out of the labor of others, all such private accumulations, representing, as they would then, the product of the labor and abstinence of the owners, would be as socially harmless as they would be unusual.

The objection will perhaps be made to this that the liberty to accumulate capital which may be used for private purposes must give it an income bearing power when employed at least within the economic domain reserved for private enterprise, for example, when employed as the plant of a college of phrenology, or, say, of a magazine devoted to the advocacy of the doctrine of reincarnation, and that, therefore, nothing less than the absolute prohibition of all gainful private economic activities and of all private property in objects available for productive and money making purposes will suffice to permanently and completely eliminate the possibility of the recurrence under one form or another, of the evil of usury or capitalistic increase.

To this, the reply that must be made is, that where the income that might be thus derived from private sources would exceed the value of the labor expended, manual and intellectual, and include the equivalent of what would now be called the interest upon the capital, then the fact that capital could thus command interest would indicate that society had been remiss in the performance of one of its necessary economic functions, namely, that of supplying *at cost* and free of interest the capital required by the people for their private use, where such private use could not detrimentally affect the capital in public use. Private capital could not command interest in the presence of a fund of public capital sufficiently large to supply the full private demand and available to all under such terms and regulations as would merely secure its maintenance and replacement. In the absence of an exploiting class to abstract from labor the larger part of its product, the earning power of the citizens mutually guaranteed, would afford a perfectly safe and ample basis of credit upon which to secure all loans that might be required by them for private purposes, industrial or otherwise.

Thus there is no reason to fear that the liberty of individuals under Socialism to remain outside the bounds of the collective or-

ganization of labor, in those isolated instances where such a proceeding would be profitable to them, would be attended with evil consequences to the remainder of the community. On the contrary, in making it optional with the individual whether he shall avail himself of the advantages of associative labor, trusting to the coercion of self-interest rather than of political authority to force men into the necessary state of economic integration required by the development of production, and in providing an opportunity for the eccentric and unruly as well as for those who really have a service to perform for the community or any portion thereof which society has failed or can not undertake to perform for itself; in providing an opportunity for all such to seek if they will economic autonomy, much will be gained in the lessening of social friction and the avoiding of a spirit of discontent.

The changes passed through by the social organism in its development from a lower to a higher type, like the changes passed through by the animal organism in the development of a new species, follow the law of least effort and leave outstanding and transmuted as little as the new conditions allow, all organs and functions appropriate to the preceding type. This parsimony of nature's efforts at progress is very strikingly illustrated in the survival in higher forms of life, individual and social, by inheritance from long extinct lower forms, of organs and rudiments of organs which under the new conditions of existence of the species or society, have become not only completely useless but even positively harmful, as in the case of the appendix vermiform in the human body and of the effete and parasitical ecclesiastical organizations in the body politic. Now, as society is an organism, the evolution of which must follow the connected and orderly method of natural law, we can not expect, judging from analogy, that the change from the capitalistic to the collectivist economy and from competition to co-operation will involve so tremendous a break with the past as to result in the complete disappearance and exclusion from all departments of the economic life of the nation of that principle of private effort which to-day is almost the sole form of economic activity.

Just as the coming of Socialism and in a remote future of an all-embracing Communism is foreshadowed in the Socialistic and Communistic institutions already prevailing and which color present day capitalistic society, as for example, the institution of a nationally owned and nationally operated postal department, of public schools, government lighthouses and life-saving stations, national and municipal parks, etc., so must there be a survival of certain phases of the modern individualistic economy in the midst of collectivism.

The matter assumes, however, a very different aspect, if we

ask ourselves whether these survivals of individualism are likely to continue throughout all future stages of social development.

When we measure the progress that has been achieved by man, since the time, ten thousand years ago, when by the banks of the Euphrates and the Nile, he first awoke from the racial sleep of savagery; when we remember that the period which has since elapsed is but as a moment compared to the ages during which the earth has been in a habitable state, though inhabited only by our kindred of lowliest forms, and but as a moment compared to the ages that are still to pass during which it will continue to provide a home for the countless generations of our successors and descendants; and when we reflect that the forward and upward movement of progress must continue in the future with a never-diminishing and ever-accelerating speed as man rises to the consciousness and the dignity of his position as master of nature, sovereign and supreme on a planetic domain; we are overcome by the conviction that, in the course of this progress, political, economic, ethical and intellectual, our race will cast away, one by one, the institutional swaddling clothes of its infancy, and arrive at last at that exalted and divine social and ethical condition in which there shall be neither money nor private property, whether in objects of production or of consumption, and in which men shall nobly live and faithfully labor without constraint or authority and without a thought of emolument or wage; a social and ethical condition which shall bind every man in love to live for all and in liberty to serve all, every man finding the reward of his labor in the common gain and in the joy of his work the only incentive.

*Raphael Buck.*

## Kautsky on the Trade Crisis.



**W**HATEVER may be thought of Kautsky's political tactics, with which it may as well be said the writer of this is in complete disagreement, it must be admitted ungrudgingly that he is far and away the best economist in the Socialist movement at the present time. His ability has never been more clearly shown than in the remarkable series of articles which he has recently published in the "Neue Zeit" under the title of "Krisentheorien" (Theories of the Trade Crisis).

The immediate reason for the production of these articles is the industrial crisis which has been showing itself in Germany and is still depressing trade in that country. A certain Russian professor, M. v. Tugan Baronowsky, has published a new work upon the subject of "English Crises," and this work is made by Kautsky the peg upon which to hang his argument.

Kautsky speaks in high general praise of the book. He calls the author a "Revisionist"—that is, a modified Marxist, and recommends him as a patient student and one who spends his time seeking to acquire positive scientific information, rather than in mere destructive criticism.

According to Kautsky, Tugan is a supporter of the Marxian theory of value, but an opponent of the theory of surplus value. He bases his opposition to the surplus-value theory upon what he calls the tendency of the rate of profit to fall.

It is well known that the capitalistic method of production has a tendency to increase the quantity of constant capital (machinery, buildings, etc.) more and more in comparison with variable capital (wages). Technical advance and competition bring it about that the former increases continually, the mass of raw stuffs which are turned into commodities becomes larger and larger, while at the same time the number of workmen employed by no means increases proportionately. From this the conclusion is drawn by Marx that the profit-rate has a falling tendency.

Tugan disagrees with this conclusion, and says:

"The substitution of the laborers by the machine must increase the productivity of labor. The labor-value of each particular portion of the product must sink. But since all products sink in value the value of constant capital must also go down with them.

\* \* \* \* A true explanation of the problem is therefore by no means as simple as Marx assumes."

Tugan's fundamental mistake in this line of argument is, as Kautsky cleverly points out, his failure to separate the individual endeavor from the social process—he mixes the known trade-

object of the individual capitalist with the unknown effects of his acts upon society. Therefore he makes merry over the Marxian profit theory in the following language:

"Machines, the mightiest weapon of the manufacturers in their fight against the working-classes, appear, according to this theory, the most dangerous enemy of the capitalists themselves. Until this secret in the theory of Marx is explained the manufacturer cannot achieve the downfall of his own class by the displacement of the laborer by the machine."

"As if," says Kautsky, "manufacturers were aware of the social consequences of their acts!" That manufacturers are interested in the raising of the profit-rate, and that in their hunt for technical improvement they lower the profit-rate, is not more contradictory than the fact that they are interested in high prices for their wares and by technical improvements work their hardest to pull these prices down, or than in the fact that they are particularly interested in an increase in consumption and yet do their utmost to keep wages down. If what manufacturers work for and what they achieve were identical, then there would have been no crisis, and Tugan would not have needed to write his book. What is the use of economic knowledge if the best guide is the manufacturing expert?

Kautsky shows that there is an increase of profit as a result of an increase in the amount of constant capital, but this only holds good as long as the means of production so improved remains the private property of a single individual capitalist, that is, as long as the increased productivity of labor has no influence upon the price of the commodity produced by him. So long as this price remains the same as it did under the earlier and less developed powers of production, so long the capitalist gains an extra profit, and hence an enhanced profit-rate.

However, this extra profit induces other capitalists to use the improved means of production, and the rate of profit drops. The individual capitalist would undoubtedly be a fool to lay out capital with the purpose of diminishing his rate of profit, but this is the necessary consequence of his innovations, a consequence which develops without any conscious action on his part and against his will.

Each capitalistic entrepreneur is compelled to get his profits just as much from the constant, according to the Marxian terminology, as from the variable part of his capital. The capitalist contends, and in this matter finds himself in complete accord with the bourgeois economists.

"Here," says Kautsky, "we get the upshot of all this revision of the surplus-value theory by one of the cleverest and deepest of the revisionists."

The result of the attack upon the Marxian theory simply leads the attackers back to the bourgeois economists.

Kautsky says of the explanation of the crisis, as caused by over-production, which is the commonplace solution, that it brings the problem no further under our control, in face of the glaringly obvious extremes of wealth and poverty. By over-production is meant production beyond the needs of the market, but this is only relative, for the needs of the market are very elastic, expanding to-day and contracting to-morrow, so that it is impossible to predicate anything certainly of them under a system of happy-go-lucky individual production.

Under-consumption on the part of the proletariat has been seen from the beginning of capitalist production to have been the cause of crises; Robert Owen and Sismondi both assigning it as such. Marx and Engels also see it as the final cause, but not the immediate reason of them. Engels shows that under-consumption cannot be the sole cause, for crises are only about one hundred years old, while under-consumption is as old as the antagonism of the classes of the robbers and the robbed, and goes beyond the limits of recorded history.

He sums up the differences between earlier modes of robbers and modern industrial capital as largely consisting in the fact that in the former under-consumption on the part of the robbed was compensated for by over-consumption on the part of the robbers, for consumption in one form or another kept very close behind production, which was carried on by very slowly improving methods. Under-consumption in pre-capitalistic times is followed by deterioration both of the land and the peasantry, such as occurred in and brought ruin upon ancient Greece, the Rome of the Empire, and feudal France and Spain.

Capitalistic production is quite different from that form of production preceding its advent. It is for the market, and not for the individual, and in the market, everything else being equal, the cheapest wins. It is impossible for the modern capitalist to hold his own in the market if he uses up all that he makes. He must accumulate and increase his capital in order to remain in the ring, so that under-consumption on the part of the laborer is no longer compensated for by over-consumption on the part of the master. In this fact lies the evil consequences following over-production in our present system. The fact is that under existing conditions the market is not sufficiently elastic. Production expands more rapidly than the market. With the opening of new markets we get periods of prosperity, followed shortly afterward by crowding out of the newly-expanded market, and consequent depression and crisis.

Tugan finds the explanation of the crisis in the planlessness of



modern production. General over-production is not necessary; over-production of one staple commodity is sufficient. Kautsky finds much truth in this statement and illustrates it by the textile industry, which reacts upon the iron and other industries.

Agreements between manufacturers to limit production when intended as a remedy fail to meet the case, for the result of such agreements is only interference with free competition, which is the only regulator of the anarchy and confusion prevailing at the present time. On the contrary, the stronger the association of manufacturers for the purpose of limiting over-production, the more accumulated stocks pile up, and thus their very agreement constitutes a new element of crisis.

Under the head of "Change in the Character of the Crisis," Tugan says in the work under consideration: "Many fancy that the crises will be done away with by the growth of trade associations, combinations (for the purpose of regulating production), syndicates, and trusts, since these have all a direct or indirect tendency to limit economic production. We are not inclined to underestimate the significance of such associations, for their universal extension is in our eyes the best proof of the bankruptcy of free competition, and of the necessity of the regulated organization of social production."

He then arrives at the gist of the whole matter—"Limitation of production is as far as the laborer is concerned tantamount to deprivation of work."

With regard to the question of the intensity of the crisis, whether it is milder or more severe than the crisis of fifty years ago, Kautsky declares that in his opinion this is all a matter of the point of view. Associations to limit production have made them milder for the manufacturers, but they are harder upon the laborer. These associations not only make it harder to procure work in times of depression, but they keep wages down in times of prosperity. In times of prosperity the margin is so slight that neither the individual workman nor his association (benefit society) is able to save anything, and so when the period of depression comes furniture and clothes find their way to the pawnbroker's and nothing is left to the laborer but the almshouse or the jail.

Kautsky refers to the effects of a period of depression upon the relations of employer and employed in the following language: "As long as English trade controlled the market, English workmen might convince the capitalist that to live and let live was the best policy. This has come to an end through the competition of Germany and America. Hence the fight against the unions has now begun there, and this fight will grow all the keener with the increase in intensity of the commercial struggle between the

powers. This will drive the English working classes into politics and to a closer affiliation with the proletarians of other countries."

Crisis, conflict and catastrophe of every kind—the future has these in store for us during the next ten years. It is not the crisis alone which lies at the foundation of the struggle between capital and labor, but the growing robbery of the masses with the continually increasing accumulation of capital as a result of that robbery.

Such is a brief examination of the line of argument pursued in Kautsky's articles which, short as they are, still show a greater comprehensiveness of grasp and cogency of reasoning than anything which has yet appeared upon the subject. The shelves are cumbered with books the sum total of which do not enable the reader to comprehend the fundamental and unavoidable causes of the trade crisis with anything like the accuracy and ease which Kautsky's marvelous powers of analysis have placed at our disposal.

AUSTIN LEWIS.

## A Defense of the Old Law.

---

Upon the receipt of the August number of the REVIEW, the first article, "Wanted; a New Law of Development," arrested my attention. The very thought that the law of evolution was insufficient was startling. After reading the article it seemed to me that what was wanted—in Jack London's case—was not a new law, but rather a fuller appreciation of the law.

What I may have to say is not intended to be received as coming from an authority, but as one who views the law of development from a different point of view and wishes to point out the differences, and, if possible, to be relieved of any error he may have had in his mind concerning the "Law."

With Jack London, I accept as true the law of development as quoted by him, viz.: "That in the struggle for existence, the strong and fit and the progeny of the strong and fit have a better opportunity for survival than the weak and less fit and the progeny of the weak and less fit."

After having made this statement he goes forward and defines what he conceives to be meant by "strong," and reaches the conclusion that "In this struggle, which is for food and shelter, the weak individuals must obviously win less food and shelter than the strong."

It seems to me that he here reduces the whole of development of man to the plane of animal existence; to a plane where the ultimate goal is food and shelter; to the plane of the muscular or avoirdupois; where the effort is only that stimulated by hunger and exposure; where instinct is the highest guide.

I do not for one moment accept man as an animal—per se—man is all that the animal is, plus his mental and spiritual qualities, and I take it that it is these qualities that make him better and nobler only in proportion as he develops those higher qualities, and that man will never reach his full development until he has arrived at the fullness of all possible development of the mental and the spiritual qualities with which he is endowed; that his upward growth has been along the line of the mental and spiritual in harmony with the law as given; only as he comes to a place of consciousness does he or has he really made any real progress. It is a certain stage of consciousness that is now being reached that is the mighty propelling force that is about to usher in the new era that will give to humanity economic freedom, that is rallying under the banner of Socialism, but as the economic question is the one which is the next in order for settlement, it does not necessarily follow that that would be man's final goal of development;

it only settles the grosser material question and makes possible man's freedom from the domination of the animal and opens freely the door to the development of those qualities in man which are the distinguishing characteristic differences between him and the animal. It has been these higher qualities in man that have raised him from his lowest estate to his present plane, and which are his element of strength, rather than his physical prowess.

If this were not so, then the man with the club—the master, being the strong (physically), he and his progeny would have remained in power to this day, wielding the same club—physical force—in the same manner as of yore.

The thought that the law applies to physical strength is what he bases his article on; his final conclusions are based on the same idea; yet in the body of his essay he gives what are, to me, results that have come about in spite of mere physical force. If the master held his place because he was strong and fit and his progeny were also the most fitted to survive, how comes it that the slave and the progeny of the slave, the unfit (?) has changed his relation from that of slave (the chattel) to serf, to wage-earner? This very fact carries with it the refutation that it is the strong in a physical sense only that survive, and at the same time it proves that there was some power, some strength, that raised the slave from that of a chattel to that of serf, and whatever the source of strength, it was greater than that form held by the master.

If there is any one thing that a review of man's development does show it is that the growth of man has always been from below upward, never has that been reversed, and it was only after facts sufficient had been gathered to see that there was an inevitable direction which mankind had always pursued under many varying forms, that it became possible to formulate the law. It was not possible to arrive at this law until there were data sufficient from which could be deduced the law. There was no new law invented, it was simply our development in other than a physical sense that made the recognition of it possible. That once recognized, the theory of social growth changed from the field of speculation to the domain of science.

This is the true reason why all the philosophies of all the philosophers prior to the time that there had been sufficient data to draw conclusions from were, necessarily, incomplete and necessarily Utopian.

While all the earlier philosophies were short of a complete recognition of the law, yet each added something that was true and eliminated something that was false as held by his predecessors. So on the material plane, each movement upward was a growth which had all the strength of previous movements plus what it may have developed and made manifest.

Every movement forward was a movement that gave evidence that strength was something more than physical force, and while each step was made and demonstrated a superior power on the physical and material plane, it yet demonstrated that the individual as such was less important than he had been. The proof of this is in the fact that individuals combined and used a collective power as such, rather than a mere individual personal force.

It is true that man began to rise by using his personality as seemed to him best, and while his efforts and his successes in the upward climb were made under the idea of antagonism to his neighbor, to tribe, to nation, he was as yet not developed to the place where he recognized clearly the value, the strength, of collectivism which he employed; hence, while holding the idea of the importance of the individual, he attributed much of his success to particular men who occupied positions that gave direction to the collective effort. Out of this grew hero-worship, more particularly that which was manifested on the field of battle, and which has so largely made so-called history an account of the exploits of generals and placed them high in the minds of men, rather than regarding them as mere incidents and the expression of the collective thought of the time made manifest through them.

The same thought of individual right held on the purely economic field as to the right of the fruits of labor, the individual learned to combine his efforts with other individuals and to appropriate to himself an undue share of the collective labor. This misappropriation has gone on to this hour, but there has also grown with it in the minds of men an ever-increasing demand for better conditions, until to-day the world stands in about this condition. All our governments recognize a divine right in the rulers to rule. The idea of the "Divine right of Kings" has not yet been eliminated. It has changed form, but the essence of it still remains. To-day in this so-called land of freedom, all the power that ever rested in any king is now represented in "The Almighty Dollar," and not until humanity reaches a place where it is *conscious* of its idolatry, will it or can it be free. We must cease to worship the king, not only in the individual, but in its modern representative, the dollar.

With the growth of man from the individual through tribe, and clan, to nation has been a sense of antagonism. This has grown until to-day all the nations of the earth are in a state of preparedness to resent encroachments on their so-called "rights." The collective social growth has been so great that in reality there are now no territorial bounds that separate one people from another. That the antagonisms have grown to such a degree that they are destructive of the antagonistic system, is beginning to dawn on the minds of those who direct it and are its representatives,

as shown in peace conferences, international courts of arbitration, schemes for disarmament, etc. Thus we have a paradoxical condition in the fact that, while we have grown on the industrial and material plane to a wonderful degree by the natural and evolutionary growth of the *collective* tool in ability to produce those things which make for the betterment of life, we at the same time permit the ownership and control to be from an *individual* basis, because we have not yet, as a people, become free from the belief in the "Divine right of the King." The rule of the strong we yet believe to be in the individual, while we have actually outgrown it in fact.

It is the recognition of this paradoxical condition which distinguishes the Socialist from the individualist, and when clearly comprehended renders him, on the material plane, what we term "class-conscious," and it is this consciousness that is his strength, it is in harmony with the law. It is this that, as I view it, Jack London is not yet wholly conscious of, and for lack of which induces him to have such a pessimistic outlook when humanity will have succeeded in settling the bread-and-butter question—the economic question.

Upon our growth to a state of *consciousness*, which makes us "strong and fit," we cease to revere the king in any form, to acknowledge the individual, as such, supreme; we cease to think *antagonistically*, we begin to think *altruistically*.

This is the very core of Socialism.

How is it demonstrating itself? Listen: "Workingmen of all countries unite, you have nothing to lose, but your *chains* and a *world* to gain." That is the international watchword; the individual is lost in the collectivity; the antagonistic is superseded by the altruistic. The strength is in the thought. When the thought becomes the international thought it will manifest itself in the breaking of the "*chains*."

It is yet quite a distance economically from the point where the weekly wage of an "Italian pants finisher in Chicago is \$1.31;" where "there are seven people living in one underground kitchen, and a little dead child among them;" where a "man fifty years old, who has worked all his life, is compelled to beg a little money to bury his dead child;" where men are compelled to work as they have been in the anthracite mines for an average of \$1.25 per day to support a family; where women are compelled to enter the store, shop, factory and mine; where children by the thousands are sacrificed to the greed of profit; to a place where the wage system will be abolished, and where there will be economic freedom, where women will be free from drudgery and free to live free lives and to develop such healthy bodies and minds that they can be the mothers of *strong*, healthy progeny that will be "fit to sur-

vive;" to the place where children, instead of being crushed physically and mentally, will be allowed to exercise their inherent right to grow into true men and women, "strong and fit," as no preceding race has ever seen or dreamed of. It is quite a step and it will be taken as soon as *man* arrives at the point of consciousness of his strength. He is gradually awaking, it is giving him strength, and because he is "strong and fit" will he survive and conquer the profit master and make possible a free life economically, and because of his strength, both physically and mentally, will his progeny be strong and fit to still climb up to higher developments in the mental and spiritual planes to a perfect man—and always in harmony with the law.

No, we do not need a new law.

*W. H. Miller.*

Canton, Ohio.

## The Theological Dogma of a Cause World.



SOCIALISM lays claim to being a science on the ground that it is the philosophy of fact in the field of social economics. The first duty of the Socialist, then, is a faithful and unbiased observation of the facts and factors bearing upon economic and social development. In the matter of classification the Socialist is but following in the footsteps of the philosopher of science, and he who would deny us the right to classify would simply deny the right of having any definite knowledge or rational understanding. Without discrimination or classification there can be no knowledge. All that is known, and the faculty of knowing can be traced back by analysis to a sense of the likenesses and differences of things.

Socialists should take care, however, to draw no line of distinction between the world of causes and the world of effects, for there are no known causes not themselves effects. Just so all known effects, or facts, must necessarily stand as causes to further effects. No more serious blunder could be made than to confound cause and effect in any particular instance, yet between the world of cause and the world of effect sound philosophy can establish no line of distinction.

This is the principal reason why many people (including the writer) are not satisfied with a purely materialistic philosophy. We observe facts in human existence that we cannot satisfactorily recognize as being materialistic in their nature. It appears to some of us that life has a material and a spiritual side. The thoughts, desires, loves, hopes, fears, etc., of human beings we cannot recognize as being material facts. The materialist, of course, sees these facts that I refer to and can understand the distinction that we make. He regards them as being the effects of material causes and lets them go at that. Now the contention that I make here is that if they are effects—if there are such facts—then they must necessarily in turn be causes, and have their effects.

Whether one assumes that existence is wholly materialistic, or wholly spiritualistic, or that it may, perchance, partake of the nature of both, makes no difference in the above argument. If we recognize the existence of the facts—effects—we must recognize them as causes. Otherwise we have assumed a "cause world" as distinguished from the world of effects. We have simply taken the theologian's "cause world" out of the metaphysical skies and buried it in the ground, thereby simply reversing the relation of the "cause world" to the world of effects.



I am not, however, making an argument here for any particular school of ultimate philosophy, except as a means to an end. What I am really contending for is the right to be a Socialist on a question of economics, without being forced to accept a particular view on a question of ultimate philosophy, which might, perchance, happen to appear to me as being unsound and untenable, and without being baptized into a particular theological belief, in which I might, perchance, happen to have no faith. My contention is not that some certain particular view on ultimate assumptions is essential to Socialism, and that materialistic Socialists have assumed the wrong assumption, but that no such assumption is the essential of Socialism. That is, assuming that Socialism is a question of economics, and not a theological bone of contention.

Now "we" Spiritualists have the same horror of things "theological" that "we" Socialists have, and pride ourselves upon our rationalism and scientific method of thought. Your materialistic conception of history carried to the extreme that some Socialists see fit to carry it—apparently thinking the more extreme the more scientific—looks from our point of view very much like assuming a materialistic "cause world." If there is a co-operative commonwealth we shall all be in it, and I for one shall still be disputing with you these questions of ultimate philosophies. What shall we have to argue about, I should like to know, when the "war" and the state of "trade" no longer furnish a topic? What a fix we should be in, indeed, were we to allow the Socialist—the only Socialist—to settle them at once for all time! Shall we not be discussing questions of philosophy and religion when the towers of the co-operative commonwealth are gray with age? Let us hope. Then *broaden* the skirts of your tents, oh Socialism, in this matter of mere philosophies, and *narrow* down to the matter in hand—social economics.

Z. C. Ferris.

# EDITORIAL

## The Coal Strike.

The coal strike is now practically over. After one of the most heroic struggles ever made against exploitation, a struggle which has shaken the foundations of capitalism as they have never been shaken before and that leaves behind it a trail of wrecked prejudices, overthrown ideas and exploded beliefs, the principals in that struggle, whose solidarity and sacrifice alone made it possible, find themselves forced to accept arbitration by a tribunal of their opponents.

Whether the continuance of the struggle would have secured better terms or not we shall not attempt to discuss. This is a question which could only be decided by those most closely concerned, and they have made their decision, whether wisely or not no one can say who was not in close touch with conditions. It is significant, however, that there was a strong sentiment against any compromise which involved the recognition of capitalist judges as arbitrators.

In so far as it is a victory, in so far as the operators were forced to make any concessions whatsoever, it is due to the power presented by the miners. No thanks are due to the "statesmanship" of a Roosevelt, the "intervention" of a Platt or Quay, the "championship" of a Hearst, or, least of all, to the pressure of "public opinion." Roosevelt, Platt, Quay, Hearst and the public move in exact ratio to the strength and solidarity displayed by the laboring class. They moved to the assistance of the miners when their individual and class interests were assailed and not before, and they moved no further than was necessary to safeguard those interests. The mine owners did the same and are entitled to equal credit.

In the same way the personnel of the committee of arbitration is equally unimportant, for no matter who they might be or what may be their individual inclinations, they would not and could not give to either contending party anything more than what the strength of the party is able to take and hold.

If the miners obtain anything beyond the mere subsistence which must always be granted to the slave if production and profits are to continue, it will be because of their strength and the intelligence of their organization; that they receive so little is due to the weakness of their ignorance and disorganization.

Had they been completely isolated from the laboring class and fought as individuals, they would have received nothing. As they were organized economically and fought as a trade, with the partial

support of the laboring class, they received something. Had they, with all other laborers in the country, been organized politically, with an intelligent understanding of their class rights and duties, they could have taken all and asked no favors.

The election which will have been held in Pennsylvania by the time this reaches our readers will have shown whether the miners have recognized the need of this wider organization. The report which comes from the coal field seems to indicate that they are wakening to a political class consciousness as strong and deep as the economic class consciousness which has enabled them to make their recent magnificent fight.

A great opportunity lies before those who have been chosen to lead them at this time. On the economic field John Mitchell has gained the admiration of every fair-minded person who watched the struggle. It remains for him to decide whether he is now at the pinnacle of his career or whether he is going on to greater victories. If he goes to the New Orleans convention and casts his vote for Gompers and the remainder of the reactionary gang that are now doing their best to wreck the American Federation of Labor by attaching it to the broken-down chariot of capitalism, then he is signing his own death warrant so far as the struggle of labor is concerned. If he has the foresight to go there and stand by those who stood by him in his battle in the coal fields, and gives his aid to those who would infuse the new life of Socialism into the trades union movement, then the height to which he may attain is measured only by the height of the movement with which he will thereby cast in his strength.

When our readers see this the decision will have been made and he will have started on the road to oblivion or to a share in the leadership of the last great world-wide battle of labor.

The Socialists who stood by him in the time of battle are the only ones who have any right to criticise him now: When he took up the cause of labor in no matter how limited a field, he enlisted in the army fighting for the emancipation of the workers. He cannot now turn back. He can give no sympathy or support to any portion of capitalism without thereby stamping himself a traitor to the cause in which his action and those of the workers with whom he has cast in his lot have enlisted him.

In the meantime the friends of the miners in the Democratic and Republican ranks are doing all they possibly can to make the public forget that such a thing as the coal strike ever took place. During its continuance it proved to be the hottest proposition that the defenders of capitalism have ever tackled. In their efforts to utilize the tide of public indignation for partisan purposes they were driven to continuously challenge the institution of private property, and to say numberless things which now they wish very much to unsay.

It is needless to point out to Socialist readers that all of those declarations were made only for the purpose of getting into office, and that once the pressure upon public opinion which was created by the lack of coal has disappeared, every effort will be made to wipe out the remembrance of this great struggle from the minds of the workers. However, the impression has sunk too deep to be thus lightly effaced, and

there is good reason to believe that this great battle has in many ways marked the beginning of the end of capitalism in America.

---

### International Socialist Congress.

---

The International Socialist Bureau has just sent out a notice requesting suggestions for the order of the day at the International Congress to be held in Amsterdam next August. It is to be hoped that some action may be taken to raise the standard of the proceedings of this congress above the level of the last one at least. It must always be with a feeling akin to disgrace that the Socialists of the world will look back upon a gathering of men from all over the world at an expense of thousands of dollars, spending their time discussing a *cas Millerand*. Worst of all, this discussion has settled absolutely nothing, as must necessarily be the case with such discussions. An International Congress is ill fitted to consider questions of local tactics and has no power to enforce its decisions when made. Furthermore, such discussions render its proceedings when published practically valueless save in the country whose problems were particularly discussed, and in most cases they have little effect there.

An International Congress of Socialists is like any other international gathering of specialists, primarily a congress of experts. When an International Congress of criminologists, chemists, or scientists of any other kind meet they do not discuss questions involving the personal relations of its members, but discuss those questions that will add to the knowledge of the branch of thought in which their members are interested. Socialism lends itself especially to such a discussion. There are within the Socialist ranks at the present time a large number of experts upon various economic and sociological questions, and if the order of the day were made up of such topics as Socialism and Trade Unions, Socialism and Criminology, Socialism and Art, Education, Municipal Affairs, the proceedings would constitute a volume which would be absolutely indispensable to every student of economic questions. The Socialist movement has within its membership men who are able to speak with authority upon every one of these subjects, both as Socialists and as specialists in the topic itself. If some Socialist could be selected to prepare a paper in each of these departments, reviewing that subject in the light of Socialist philosophy, and one or two others, also specialists in the same line, selected to open the discussion to be followed by general discussion by all those present, the proceedings would at once gain immensely in value.

By this means the congress would be engaged in a consideration of principles and not the application of these principles to local conditions. The subjects could be considered in a scholarly manner, but free from the partisanship and personality which is bound to intrude into any such discussions as those which occupied the attention of the last congress. When these principles have been thoroughly worked out they could be made the basis of local action and could be discussed in their local application only in those places where the questions of application were the mooted ones.

Some of these points were discussed by Comrade H. M. Hyndman in one of our recent issues, and he also called attention to another point of importance in this same connection, and that is the need of taking some action to make the work of the International Bureau somewhat more effective. It should be said, however, in justice to the comrades who are at present conducting the work of the bureau that the parties of the various countries have by no means accorded them the support to which they were entitled. A large number of national parties are still delinquent in the small dues which were pledged to the international organization at the Paris congress. Again, it must be remembered that the difficulties incident to the installation of the necessary machinery of an international organization, however simple that machinery may be, is great. Several of the countries have been slow to elect their delegates to the international council. There seems to have been no attempt to keep up the system of international bulletins on any efficient scale, and in general there has been great looseness and lack of interest.

At the same time the Belgian comrades have been engaged most intensely in their local affairs, and this has tended to weaken the work of the local bureau.

These are all defects that time, tact and experience can remedy, and by the time the Amsterdam congress meets a practicable plan of avoiding the most of these difficulties should have been evolved, and steps can then be taken toward the more systematic and effective co-ordination of international effort than has been hitherto possible.

One of the things which should be done by the bureau before the meeting of the next congress is to prepare an exhaustive report giving the exact strength of the Socialist parties in the various countries, a statement of the particular problems upon which they are engaged, the methods of party organization and the outlook for the immediate future. Such a report would prove one of the most valuable historic documents ever issued, while it would also be of great propaganda and educative value at the present time.

---

This number goes to press some days before election, and hence we can say nothing as to the Socialist strength save that the vote is certain to show a very great increase over that of 1900. In our next number, however, we shall seek to give complete tabulated comparative results for the whole country, and would ask the co-operation of our readers to this end. After the votes are counted, send us the result on a postal card, together with the vote for Debs and Harriman in 1900.

---

Our table of contents contained two rather confusing errors last month. The article, "Kautsky on Trade Crises," was announced, while it did not appear, having been crowded out after the first "make-up." The second was when the editorial, "A Discordant Note," was ascribed to Ernest Untermann. All matter appearing in this department is written by A. M. Simons, unless signed by some one else.

# SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

## France.

The twentieth national convention of the Parti Ouvrier Français, held at Issoudun on Sept. 21, unanimously condemned the anticlerical brutalities of the liberal government and adopted a resolution declaring them simply "a new trick of the capitalist class for the purpose of drawing the attention of the working class away from the fight against wage slavery. . . . Economic emancipation must precede religious emancipation." The same government that persecutes the religious orders at home voted millions to reimburse them for their losses in China and sent an armed force to the far East for the purpose of convincing the Chinese that the priests have a divine mission to fulfill.

The delegates of the Parti Ouvrier met a few days later, on the 26th to 28th of September, with the delegates of the other factions of the Unite Revolutionnaire at Commeny (Allier). It will be remembered that this unity had been formed at Ivry in November, 1901, and a transition program adopted which should make the final amalgamation of the revolutionary elements, as opposed to the ministerialists (Jauresistes), possible. The main purpose of the convention was the perfection of a solid organization. The representation, apportioned on the basis of one delegate to each 5,000 members, consisted of 186 delegates, of which the Parti Ouvrier held the majority.

Thanks to the judicious methods of the central committee and to the good will of the comrades in all parts of the country, the steps toward the final consummation of a united revolutionary party were quickly made. Among the thirty-four federations of the party there were twenty that existed before the Ivry convention and belonged only to one single organization; fourteen of them belonged to the Parti Ouvrier in the departments of Ain, Alpes, Aube, Dordogne, Drome et Ardeche, Gironde, Isere, Loire, Lozere, Marne, Nord, Pas de Calais, Basses-Pyrenees and Pyrenees Orientales; three belonged to the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire in the departments of Cher, Correze, and Indre-et-Loire; and three were autonomous in the departments of Lot, Haut-Rhine, Deux-Sevres, and Vendee. The amalgamation of these caused no difficulty. But there was some delay in perfecting arrangements in those departments where two federations belonging to different organizations existed. This was the case in the departments of Allier, Gard, Haute-Garonne, Rhone and Var, where Guesdiste and Blanquiste federations existed side by side; in the department of Seine-et-Oise, where Guesdiste

and autonomous groups worked simultaneously; and in the departments of Indre, Oise and Seine, where all three factions were represented. However, within three months after the Ivry convention things worked smoothly. Only in Lyon (Rhône) a split has again taken place and remains to be settled. No definite data concerning membership and other organization points have been published so far. A rough estimate gives about 1,200 groups with a membership of 23,000 to 24,000. A table of votes by departments in which departments with less than 1,000 votes are omitted, gives the party 351,144 votes in the last general elections. The names of the fifteen representatives in the Chambre des Deputés were given in our issue of July, 1902. The party press consists of eighteen weeklies and the "Bulletin Officiel" of the central committee. Resolutions were adopted regulating the tactics in election campaigns and declaring for independent political action.

The coal miners have declared a general strike, many districts walking out without awaiting the decision of the national committee. Of 47,000 miners in the Pas de Calais, 36,000 quit work before the central committee had announced its decision.

The first rumors of a general strike were heard in the beginning of 1901 during the high tide of prosperity in coal mining, when the miners of Montceau-les-Mines walked out. Three conventions in Lens, Allais and Commentry each declared in favor of a general strike during the course of the succeeding period. The following demands were to be enforced: A legal eight-hour day; 2 francs of old-age pension after 50 years of age and thirty years of employment, and a minimum wage. These demands could not be enforced, because the strike in Montceau-les-Mines was lost, before the referendum on the general strike was taken. But the threat of an impending general strike sufficed to pass the eight-hour law in the Chambre des Deputés. This success gave a fresh impetus to the convention of Allais, which voted the general strike with 124 against 105 votes. No action was taken, because the preparations for the general strike had not been completed. But the convention of Commentry finally made the general strike a fact.

The immediate cause of this step is a reduction of wages in the Pas de Calais and in the Loire district, after a short period of increased wages. In 1900, the total wages of all miners, including a total increase of 21,852,000 francs, amounted to 215,878,000 francs, or a yearly wage of 1,333 francs, or an average daily wage of 4.66 francs per miner. This constituted an increase of 28 centimes (5.6 cents) per day over the former wage. In some districts there was a further increase, in others a reduction took place. The dividends of the companies have been enormous, and although there was no sign of their being threatened, a new reduction of wages was lately announced. A committee of the miners protesting against the reduction received a similarly conceited reply as the American miners did. Troops were at once sent into the strike districts. The strikers have posted the following proclamation: "Sons of the people! Remember the recent occurrences in the Bretagne. Remember the attitude of Colonel de Saint-Remy, who refused to obey the orders of his superiors that were opposed to the dictates of his conscience. Soldiers! If you meet us, who are unarmed, with your rifles and bayonets, remember that you may meet the same fate

to-morrow, after your return to the ranks of the civilians. Miners! Do not provoke the soldiers. Remember that we are all brothers and that we have been soldiers the same as they! Hurrah for the emancipation of the proletariat!" Another proclamation, addressed to the miners of all countries, reads as follows: "Comrades of Belgium, England, Germany, Austria, the United States and all other countries! The cause for which the miners of France are fighting is also your cause. The purpose of our fight which we, forced to extremities, have begun, is to ameliorate our desperate condition, to obtain a more just and equitable wage, a better adjustment of hours for the present, and legislation securing us against want in old age. It would be superfluous to dictate to you what to do, for you will know yourself how to act. Counting on your support, we leave it to you to take the necessary steps to help us in this fight. Hurrah for the International Union of Miners!"

No one wishes the miners success so sincerely as the Socialists. But we cannot help regretting the shortsighted policy that imposes untold sacrifices on men with insufficient wages for the purpose of wresting those petty and insecure concessions from the bosses, when a unanimous vote for Socialism would suffice to give them all they produce and emancipate them forever from wage slavery. We cannot help pointing with disapproval to the tactical mistake of refusing to reinforce the economic pressure on the bosses by a sympathetic strike out of reverence for an enforced contract which the bosses have always broken when it suited them. And we cannot help shrugging our shoulders over the simplicity of appealing to the international solidarity of the miners and remaining blind to the international solidarity of all workingmen in a Socialist party. How long will working men prefer to wage the unequal struggle on the economic field instead of ending all strikes forever by a strike at the ballot box?

In the meantime, Prime Minister Combes is copying Teddy the Strenuous in the popular character, "Friend of Labor." He has already received the regulation affront by the coal barons in his attempts at mediation. The "dignity" of his office, so conveniently ruffled and slighted on the eve of the general elections, will have to be vindicated by a popular verdict at the polls. The settlement of the strike by an arbitration committee appointed by Combes will be the next number on the program, and the radical party will extol Combes as the settler of the strike and make political hay while the conciliation sun shines. In the final act, Capital and Labor, hand in hand, will appear in the lime light, and the background scenery will represent the "triumph of arbitration"—republican Teddy, republican Hanna, and democrat Saint Baer, patting the shoulders of the giant Labor and leading him back to the full dinner pail. The vulture of Capital will continue to eat away the liver of Prometheus Labor in perfect friendship, all for the benefit of Labor.

The death of Zola has deprived France of one of its greatest sons. An inspired poet, a fighter for truth, and a prophet of freedom, he had gradually approached the Socialist position and would, perhaps, have found his way into our ranks, had he been spared. His funeral was attended by a hundred thousand friends. Jaures, Anatole France,



Colonel Picquart, and Alfred Dreyfuss were present, and the Belgian comrades had sent the deputies Demblon and Fournemont as delegates. Zola will rank in the minds of the coming generations by the side of Dumas and Rousseau, when the bigots of the "Academy" will long be forgotten.

---

### Switzerland.

---

Some of our friends who have such an exalted opinion of the value of direct legislation as an aid in the proletarian class struggle, will find food for reflection in the following report. At the first meeting of the new cantonal council, to which, in spite of the fervent prayer of the divinely appointed Swiss Baers, twenty-seven Socialists were elected, the president of the council, a dyed-in-the-wool bourgeois, felt his fine-strung soul stung by some remarks of the Socialists. He arose in righteous wrath and delivered himself of a thundering speech against the disreputable enemies of law and order. And when a Socialist speaker, who took the floor in a vigorous rebuttal, was cheered by the people in the galleries, the president sent twenty policemen among the free men of the most democratic republic in the world. The "Volksrecht" says in a biting comment: "The next step will probably be the use of police on the floor of the council to keep the tongues of unruly speakers in check."

The employes of the government-owned railway in Zurich received still a warmer dose of Swiss democracy. During the passage of the King of Italy through Zurich on his way to Germany it was feared that some Italians would try to approach him in the uniform of railway employes. The federal attorney simply ordered the imprisonment of the entire railway force in their offices and baggage rooms. Most instructive of all was the general strike of the street railway employes in Geneva. When the movement became general, the cantonal "radical" council called out the militia and expelled hundreds of "agitators" from the state. It is hinted that anarchist and conservative politicians were the instigators of the strike for the purpose of creating a public sentiment against the radical administration in favor of a still more reactionary government. The militia refused to fire on the strikers, but as the scabs were protected, the strike was lost. Twenty years of direct legislation have not been able to educate the proletariat to an understanding of the class struggle. Direct legislation is all right, in the hands of class conscious workingmen. See?

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The great struggle in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania is over. After weeks of conferences between politicians, capitalists and officials of the strikers, it was finally decided that a commission should be appointed to investigate the mining conditions and make an award at the conclusion of its labors. The miners unanimously resolved to return to work, but they cannot secure their old positions with the same degree of unanimity. Reports from the district state that hundreds of the active unionists have been blacklisted and thousands of others will lose their jobs to the scabs who took their places. This is one of the tragedies of a great battle when organized capital and labor come in deadly conflict on the industrial field. Besides victimizing the brave men who struggled heroically on the industrial field for better conditions, the coal barons do not intend to foot the expense of their attempt to break up the union and enslave the workers more thoroughly than before. Headed by Baer, they have sent word down the line that the price of coal has been advanced 50 cents a ton, so they will probably make good their losses and a handsome profit besides in a very short time. Moreover, the dealers are given to understand that if they follow suit and raise prices "exorbitantly," retail agencies will be established and coal will be sold to the people direct. Thus the little parasites will be forced to be content with their fleecings obtained during the strike. A Boston dispatch also announces that the coal combine is to be reconstructed and made a close corporation like the Standard Oil Octopus, and that the retail dealers will merely "occupy the position of clerks in the new combination." No one will weep any tears for those petty robbers, who surely waxed "prosperous" while the fight was raging. Another significant statement is the one that appeared in the New York organs of the operators immediately following the end of the strike. It was to the effect that mining would be rushed on a gigantic scale just as soon as the properties were placed in condition with a view to accumulating a large enough surplus by the end of next summer to last for several years in case of a further stoppage. This declaration seems to indicate that the mine barons are determined on destroying the workers' organization despite the fact that they were checked this year, temporarily at least. But the manner in which the propaganda for Socialism has been disseminated in Pennsylvania this year may cause the operators a surprise before they are ready to carry their conspiracy into execution. The seed of Socialism has been sown and has taken root, and it is only a matter of a few years at the outside when the old Keystone State will be under the control of the working

class, and then there will be no more armies of coal and iron police and militia and other imported thugs to overawe and bully the honest producers of wealth. All things considered, however, the strike was a victory for the workers, in the double sense of solidifying our ranks, nationally and internationally, without regard to the question of whether we are thoroughly federated, or are "autonomists" or "industrialists," and in demonstrating the correctness of the position of the Socialists, who point out that the class struggle exists and must be met boldly and unitedly.

In a recent issue of the Review it was mentioned that Wall street and the daily newspapers were discussing the enormous capital that had centralized in the hands of J. P. Morgan. It was stated that the great trust monarch controlled no less than \$6,500,000,000 in railway, steamship and industrial stocks and bonds. It was also pointed out that his power was constantly increasing by leaps and bounds, and at the present rate of economic development he would control the entire country in less than a dozen years. Now the news comes from Washington that the Interstate Commerce Commission is about to investigate charges that have been made that Mr. Morgan, who is organizing the Southern railway merger, is gaining possession of immense territory by his cleverness in combining industries. The commission is called upon to inquire whether or not Morgan has obtained control of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, the Louisville and Nashville, the Southern Railway, the Southern Railway in Kentucky, the Southern Railway Company in Indiana, the Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company, the Cincinnati Southern Railway Company, and the Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railroad Company. These roads cover all important railroad points and all railroad lines in a territory aggregating 25,000 miles, with an operating income of over \$30,000,000 annually. They control the commerce of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia and Maryland. Their capitalization is stated to amount to at least a billion dollars. They control the business and products of over 16,000,000 people in 422,000 square miles of territory. This octopus will doubtless teach the reactionists and Bourbons of the South a lesson that they will not be able to forget easily, and Morgan's total capital will have increased to \$7,500,000,000. Probably he will bring the grand total up close to eight billion before the end of the year, as it is announced that the great organizer is combining the lighting industries of the various cities. One almost becomes dizzy in contemplating the mighty power wielded by this one man, and if capital continues to centralize under his control as rapidly during the next two years as in the last two the country will be rotten ripe for Socialism about 1904. Those careless Socialists who talk about "Socialism for our children" ought to revise their views and guess again. Socialism is knocking at the door.

That the employers of the country are preparing to make an organized attempt to check the growth and power of trade unions is becoming plainer each day. In a dozen different cities strong local employers' associations exist, and in times of strikes and boycotts they have been a unit in resisting the demands of the workers—in supplying

each other with scabs and money, in swinging the blacklist lash, in hiring and sending spies into unions, in securing injunctions from their servile courts, in having labor laws declared unconstitutional, in instituting damage suits against unions and their members, and in using other methods to defeat labor. At its convention in Indianapolis several months ago the National Association of Manufacturers issued a circular to employers all over the country urging them to "inject business into politics," and aid to destroy or defeat the eight-hour bill in Congress, which was classed as "revolutionary." Now a second circular has been issued, signed by President Parry, inviting manufacturers everywhere to join the association. Mr. Parry again says that the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills in Congress must be killed and asks: "Shall there not be in this country one great, compact organization of diversified manufacturing interests, which shall stand together as a man against the encroachments of organized labor?" He adds that "the time has come in the United States when we have reached the parting of the ways. You are either to have the mastery of your own business or you must turn part of its administration over to your employes." Doubtless Mr. Parry's appeal will have a marked effect, as it is said of him that he is a man of great ability and push in the matter of organization. So well does he stand among the capitalists of the nation that some of the more enthusiastic have started a boom for him as a candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket. Probably now that the organized employers come out boldly into the open and declare that they are going to "inject business into politics," some of those workers who have been crying to "keep politics out of the union" will have another think coming. There is one thing that President Parry and the National Association of Manufacturers can be thanked for, and that is their declaration that a class struggle exists, and that they will protect their interests "against the encroachments of organized labor," and will do it politically, too. That statement disarms the old-style, conservative trade unionist pretty thoroughly.

While the November number of the Review is being printed, the American Federation of Labor convention will be in progress in New Orleans. The situation in the organized labor movement that has developed from the jurisdiction struggle is one of extreme gravity. At the session of the executive council of the Federation in Washington last month the Rubicon was crossed by the "autonomists." They are apparently in control of the council; at least they expelled the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, one of the pioneer organizations of industrialism. As explained in a previous number of the magazine, the "autonomists" and "industrialists" have been at swords' points during the past four years. The former largely constitute the smaller organizations, and those that advocate organization along strictly craft lines, with complete independence or autonomy for each branch of industry, while the industrialists, so-called, favor combining all branches in one organization. The struggle is progressing along about the same lines as the contest between the advocates of state rights on the one side and those who favored a strong, centralized government during the past two generations in statecraft. In the labor movement, as in national politics, we have had our compromises and decisions that have proven just as

unsatisfactory as the temporizing in ante-bellum days, and affairs are rapidly reaching a climax. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers incident may be the Bull Run in trade union history. The society is a great international organization in every sense of the word. It numbers close to a hundred thousand men, is composed of a dozen merged crafts and has \$2,000,000 in its strong box. It has a beneficial system that is ideal and scientific and its members pay higher dues than nearly all other unions. The "mals," as they are familiarly known, have a method of equalizing their funds, so that the poorest union in point of membership is at once made as strong as the most powerful in financial matters, and local strikers can be supported for an indefinite period. Furthermore, by referendum vote they have decided to assess themselves for the purpose of taking political action along with other unions and Socialist parties in Europe, Australia or America, and at present General Secretary George Barnes, a pronounced Socialist, is a candidate for the British Parliament from a Glasgow district. The reason given for the withdrawal of the charter of the amalgamated engineers is that they refused to yield jurisdiction to the machinists, blacksmiths and patternmakers in trade affairs, to do which would simply have meant their complete effacement on the Western hemisphere. The position taken by the Federation executive council will no doubt tend to settle the jurisdiction controversy, although it may be accompanied by bitter strife for some time, for if the Amalgamated Society of Engineers can be expelled, the brewers, the longshoremen, the printers the amalgamated carpenters, the woodworkers and other national bodies, including even the miners, must be treated in the same manner if the council is consistently upheld. That several other national unions are utterly indifferent as to whether they lose their charters or not is generally known. Their national officers are quoted as saying that they will advise their organizations to join the new American Labor Union. However, that is another story, which may be discussed in the future. The attitude of those delegates who are Socialists on the jurisdiction fight will be to stand with the "Industrialists" almost to a man. Indeed, the Socialists are accused of having "captured" the Federation conventions before on this particular question, and whether they did or not is immaterial at present. The Socialists are "Industrialists" because they have studied the development of capitalist production and know full well that the enemy must be met as a disciplined, compact army, instead of a straggling, heterogeneous, anarchistic mob captained by a lot of quarreling, jealous and egotistical "leaders," whose time is largely taken up not in educating their followers relative to the real principles of trade unionism, but in drawing fine lines of distinction between crafts and preventing harmony and union. As before stated, this jurisdiction question may cause some bitter contention for a few years, especially among swell-headed officers, but the movement will be all the better for it, because the outcome will be the triumph of organization on broad lines, the clearing away of the debris and waste of "autonomy" for every worker who carries a different jack-knife or wears a different necktie, and the toilers will compose a mighty and conquering army that will understand its class interests and fight for them industrially and politically.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Social Revolution. Karl Kautsky. Vorwaerts Publishing Company. Paper, 100 pp., 1.50 mark.

From very many points of view this book is the most important contribution made to Socialist literature in the last decade. It is in one sense the final word on the Bernstein question, although there is not a line in the book that is distinctly controversial nor a reference to the author's noted opponent. He simply sums up the facts that have evolved during the time that this controversy has gone on; these speak so loudly as to absolutely drown the peevish criticisms that have been made of the Socialist philosophy and movement.

The book is divided into two parts; the first is entitled "Social Reform and Social Revolution;" and the second, "The Day After the Social Revolution." He first takes up the idea of social revolution and shows that force or violence is not part of this idea, and that it is distinguished from reform by the fact that revolution implies "the conquest of political power by a new class," while reform applies to changes made without such a transfer of power. Evolution and revolution are then discussed and the danger of biological analogies is pointed out, although it is shown that in the natural sciences the catastrophic theory is by no means abolished. But "the necessity of revolution cannot be determined by biological analogies, but only by the investigation of the facts of social development."

A study of antiquity and the Middle Ages shows that revolution in the sense described could not take place so long as the center of economic and political life was the community and the states were only conglomerates of communities. While this condition existed, peculiarities and individuals predominated over the general, hence uprisings were directed against specific abuses or personalities. There was no recognition of the deeper social relations; the political life was divided into countless small communities and, moreover, the universal practice of carrying arms led to violent uprisings, which, although frequently very bloody, had very small results.

But when we come to the capitalist period things are wholly different. We now have a strong modern state controlled by a governing class and with extensive unified powers, so that the social struggle becomes a struggle for the mastery of the state. Instead of individual movements, we now have the movements of great bodies of the people. Economic evolution is rapid and the science of political economy begins to rise, encouraging a social consciousness and the possibility

of a social goal. All these things tend to make social revolution a natural mode of progress.

The opponents of the revolutionary position claim that class antagonisms are moderating in present society. An examination of the basic economic facts shows that while wages are probably increasing, their rate of increase falls far behind that of capital. Consequently the exploitation of the proletariat is continually increasing. At the same time the proletariat is rapidly rising in its moral and intellectual relations. "The intellectual class is seen not to constitute a buffer class or a new middle class which will prevent class antagonisms; but, on the contrary, is itself rent with a class struggle and tends to aggravate rather than soften class antagonisms." Neither is there any sign of the small bourgeois or the farmers paving the way to a reconciliation of class antagonism as the class struggle rises in their midst as in other classes, and they have long ago cast in their lots with the parties to which their dominant economic interests inclines them. The question then rises as to whether the capitalist class themselves are not becoming more friendly to labor. The fact is that the corporation has almost entirely supplanted the individual employer and wiped out all personal relations, while the trust is more and more bringing the financier to the front, who knows no motive save profits and has no direct connection whatever with the laboring classes. Others claim that democracy offers a promise of a "gradual imperceptible transformation from capitalism to socialism with no violent break with the existing orders, such as the conquest of political powers by the proletariat presupposes." On the contrary, democracy has simply cleared the ground for the battle and offers no means for the avoidance of that battle.

The co-operatives are also offered as an example of a transition state to capitalism. But these are really expropriating only the little merchants and a few small hand trades, such as bakeries, and in no place have as yet affected great capitalists. In consequence they are rather sharpening class antagonisms than otherwise. The unions are of much more importance than the co-operatives for the battle of the laborers; they are actually fighting organizations, and not organizations for "social peace." All of these points are illustrated by numerous examples, especially from English history.

Even the political field is seen to offer no stepping stones to a gradual transition from capitalism to socialism without the necessity of revolution. While in 1847, under the influence of the Chartist movement, the ten-hour day was secured for women and children, in 1900 Millerand was able to carry through only a much more limited ten-hour measure. The eight-hour day was declared by the "International" Congress at Geneva in 1886 to be a preliminary condition to any essential social reform. "Thirty-six years later, at a French Socialist congress in Tours, a delegate declared that the next demand must be for an eight-hour day, and instead of laughing him from the hall, they nominated him for office at the next election in Paris." The disappearance of any strong Parliamentary party has rendered impossible any decisive social reform, while at the same time that Socialists are gain-

ing power in parliaments, parliaments themselves are losing in power and importance.

Concerning the exact nature of the coming revolution, all that can be said of it is that it will be different from all its predecessors. But the great distinguishing factor of the present revolution will be the high organization attained by both contending parties. It will not necessarily be a sudden revolution, but rather a long drawn-out civil war, using the words "civil war" not in the sense of an armed conflict, but in the sense of a continuous fight with a variety of political and social weapons. Among the means which he indicates as possible is the strike, although, of course, he does not share any of the anarchist ideas as to the efficacy of a general strike.

Another force of which he takes note and which has roused the most furious denunciation by the capitalist papers of Germany is the possibility of action by the proletariat during an international war between contending capitalist governments. So far, however, from the proletariat acting as an incentive to such a war, he points out that "the only security for peace at present lies in the fear of the revolutionary proletariat by the capitalist governments."

The second half of the book, which he calls "The Day After the Social Revolution," while extremely suggestive and probably the best thing yet written on the subject, is not quite so successful as the first. Perhaps this is because the description of a future society calls for an imaginative rather than a scientific mind, such as characterizes Kautsky. His discussion of the "expropriation of the expropriators" is extremely ingenious, to say the least, as he suggests the issue of a sort of bonds which will gradually lose their value as the power of exploitation disappears. He admits that this is somewhat in the nature of a deception, but suggests that it may smooth the way.

Another subject, the discussion of which is bound to attract a great deal of attention, is the question of the attraction of the laborers to labor. He points out here the great power of custom and of the discipline which would come from a social organization, the high wages, and the shortening of the hours of labor. He also mentions the attractiveness of labor itself, but does not seem to really catch the full strength of this point, as it has been evolved by the followers of the arts and crafts movement. Some very interesting calculations are given as to the increased productivity of labor in Socialist organizations, showing how great economies can be made by centralization alone. There will be quite a large remnant of private ownership under Socialism, according to Kautsky, as he considers it impossible to socialize those industries which social production has not yet entered. He concludes with an extremely interesting analysis of the "psychological conditions essential to the domination of the proletariat," where he points out the necessity of transforming the capitalist mind into what might be called the Socialist mind.

The book as a whole is bound to have a profound influence on Socialist thought at this time, and it has already been translated into French and is announced for appearance in "Justice," of London. An English translation is also being prepared for publication in this country, and we have no hesitation in predicting for it an extremely wide



circulation, as it will be absolutely indispensable to any one who wishes to be able to grasp the latest developments in Socialist theory as well as to gain a thorough understanding of the basic principles of Socialism.

The Collapse of Plutocracy. Henry Boothman. For sale by the author at Libby, Mont. Cloth, 271 pp., \$1.

To some extent this work is a reconciliation of the administrative side of Socialism with a modified Single Tax. But it is at once more and less than this. It is more in that it presents one of the most thorough and logical analyses of the processes of capitalist concentration ever published, and it is less in that it misses the fundamental fact that Socialism is not an administrative scheme at all, but is rather a philosophy of social evolution. The author holds that since there are certain industries which have not reached the monopoly point, therefore public ownership is not applicable to the whole productive field. But where competition still exists, the principle of the Single Tax may be applied to tax out all the element of exploitation pending the time (if such time ever arrives) when the monopoly point shall have been reached, when it will be necessary to resort to public ownership. He seems to be blind to the philosophy of the class struggle, although he admits (p. 147) that the interests of the proletarians are in accord with the Socialist position. But he considers this a narrow point of view, not seeming to realize that this class contains all that is essential in our present society and all that is hopeful for the future. Aside from this defect, the book is one of the most stimulating and suggestive that has appeared for some time. There is tendency to consider social evolution as more symmetrical and uniform than it really is, and hence to disregard some very important social factors, which somewhat impairs the accuracy of the conclusions, but adds to the interest of the book.

La Cite Future. E. Tarbouriech. Stock, Paris, publisher. Paper, 484 pp., 3 fr., 50.

In our last issue, attention was called to the fact of the appearance of a new type of utopias. The above work is another example of this, as is also, to some extent at least, the latter portion of Kautsky's "Social Revolution." These new utopias are elaborate studies of a possibly immediate future, rather than dreams of impossibly perfect societies. La Cite Future is by far the most elaborate and most valuable of the works of this sort yet published. As working rules for the new society, he adds to the well-known saying: "From each according to his strength; to each according to his needs," the following as essential maxims for the founding of a future society: "To each group of producers an interest in production; to each member of a group an interest in the prosperity of the group; men and women to share equally and without distinction of sex in domestic labor and social production, and finally the commonwealth to become identical with the political nation." An extremely centralized government is presupposed and an elaborate system of bookkeeping is suggested for keeping the accounts

of each producer. An elaborate bureaucracy is described, with departments having charge of almost every function of human life.

As a general thing he endeavors to confine himself to the scientific method and studies what will happen rather than what should. He sees that future evolution will demand a more near approximation of country and city, and will cause something of a breaking up of the great centers of population and a transference of many forms of industry to the country. In the question of the housing of the populace, for example, it seems evident that a great diversity will prevail. Many great industries will have their local villages for the housing of social employes, as is now the instance with many of the great capitalists, save that housing as well as industry will be controlled by the workers. A portion of the population will desire to be relieved of all responsibility of housekeeping, and for these great communal boarding houses can be erected. Others occupied with hand work will want their shop and house together and to some degree isolated.

Production will be carried on by various bodies, such as co-operatives and individual associations, in addition to the great fundamental state shops. Just as many survivals of earlier systems still exist under capitalism, so we may expect that these will not wholly disappear under Socialism. The smaller industries will be largely carried on by private co-operative associations, who will obtain their material from the collectivity and in general be under social control. Artistic production will be largely confined to individual shops, who will, however, be so completely dependent upon the general socialized industry that exploitation will be impossible and control easy, while individual initiative will still have full play.

In the discussion of the training of children he seems to forget what he has said before—that there will be nothing of military discipline in the future society, and lets his imagination run riot in a most pernicious manner, evolving a most fantastic and tyrannical interference with individual liberty, which it is probable will soon be seized upon by some antagonist of "State Socialism" and used as if it were an authoritative pronouncement. This same defect of making the child practically an automaton in the hands of officials runs all through his discussion of education, which is otherwise most valuable and suggestive.

The one great service which the author has performed is the working out of a multitude of details which have been overlooked by the previous and more imaginative writers of utopias. That he has probably come nearer to telling what will be done under Socialism than any previous writer is certain. That he has also made many guesses which will prove to be far from the mark is also probable, but in any case he has made an extremely valuable contribution to Socialist literature.

There was a time not so very long ago when the appearance of a new Socialist pamphlet was an event to be heralded with long reviews by every Socialist publication in the country. To-day it is physically impossible for us to even mention all the excellent pamphlets that come to us for review. One, however, that deserves a little more than a pass-

ing notice is "Good Times," by Comrade George T. Millar, of Chicago. This little book of fifty-one pages, selling at 10 cents, is filled full of good arguments telling why laborers should be Socialists, and will prove a valuable weapon for any Socialist armory.

The Craftsman comes out enlarged to nearly twice its former size and improved and bettered in every way. It has also issued a bound volume of the first numbers, which is a masterpiece of good workmanship, and should be seen by those who are interested in the original and genuine of that which Elbert Hubbard is the cheap imitation and fake.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### Books for the Holidays.

December is the great book-buying month of the year. It is becoming more and more a regular custom for friends to send each other books at the Christmas season, and Socialists can do some very effective propaganda work by using Socialist books for their presents. Most of the books issued by our co-operative publishing house are printed and bound in as inexpensive a style as possible, to suit the slender purses of the people who do useful work. We are, however, issuing a few books in dainty holiday style to make them acceptable gifts for those who must be pleased with the appearance of a book before they will open and read it.

First. *The Communist Manifesto*. This is the most important political pamphlet ever published, and hundreds of thousands of copies have been circulated in many languages, but to the average American, especially the "well educated" American, it is still an unknown book. One reason may be that it has invariably been published in a most unattractive form. We are now trying the experiment of issuing it in two really beautiful editions, from new plates. One is a dainty pocket edition with embossed scarlet cover stamped in gold, and the price is 10 cents—just what the inferior editions are selling for. The other is a library edition printed on antique laid paper of extra quality, with wide margins and exquisitely bound in cloth. This will make a beautiful gift well worth preserving in any library. Price 50 cents.

Second. *Walt Whitman, the Poet of the Wider Selfhood*. By Mila Tupper Maynard. Mrs. Maynard is more than ordinarily qualified to interpret Whitman. She was educated for the Unitarian ministry and unites the liberal culture of that church with the wider outlook of the Socialist fellowship, since she is now an active worker in our movement in Denver. The thoughtful essays which make up this book will bring lovers of Whitman into Socialism, and will bring a needed uplift of poetry to the Socialists. Mechanically, the book is more artistic than anything we have yet attempted. Cloth, 145 pages, \$1.

Third. *Gracia, a Social Tragedy*. By Frank Everett Plummer. A story in blank verse, varied with lyrical passages. It is rarely that poems sell outside the circle of the author's acquaintance, but this poem has already gone through two editions, and the third is now ready. It is beautifully illustrated with twelve half-tone engravings, most of them photographs from life of a model who entered into the spirit of the story. The plot is full of the lesson that capitalism degrades and bru-

talizes the lives and loves of its victims. The moral is pointed out in a 10-cent booklet entitled "Was it Gracia's Fault," of which 75,000 have been sold. The price of the holiday volume is \$1.25.

Fourth. *Resist Not Evil*, by Clarence S. Darrow, is an original monograph on the relation of organized society to those whom we call criminals. He shows the fatal defects of present methods of dealing with crime, and gives the reader the clue to the real remedy. Printed in large, clear type that will rest tired eyes, and daintily bound in silk cloth with white stamping. Price, 75 cents.

Fifth. *Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. By Professor Werner Sombart, University of Breslau, Germany. Translated by Anson P. Atterbury. With introduction by John B. Clark, Professor of Political Economy in Columbia University. This work, by a famous scholar, who is not actively identified with the Socialist movement, is accepted by both the friends and opponents of Socialism as a fair statement of actual facts. It is a book that no Socialist speaker or writer can afford to overlook, and its dignified and dispassionate treatment of the subject fits it especially for reaching professional people and others who might not be attracted by our ordinary propaganda literature. The book is printed in large, open type, on the best of paper and bound in silk cloth, with gold lettering. We have reduced the retail price from \$1.25 to \$1.

Sixth. *The Social Revolution*, by Karl Kautsky, an extended review of which appears on another page, is one of the most important Socialist works that has appeared for many years. A translation of this book by A. M. and May Wood Simons will appear in the Standard Socialist Series the first of December. It will be uniform in outward appearance, with "The Origin of the Family," but will be printed in larger type and will be an attractive and readable volume, that every Socialist will want. Price 50 cents.

Seventh. *Oratory, Its Requirements and Its Rewards*. By John P. Altgeld. Few men have had a clearer understanding of the art of oratory than the late Governor Altgeld. This book, published a few months before his death, gives in condensed form a great number of really practical suggestions to the public speaker. It ran rapidly through two editions, and the demand for it has been so great that a third edition is now published. The book is handsomely printed and daintily bound in cloth. Price 50 cents.

For other gift books see our alphabetical list on another page. Remember that any of these books will be mailed to any address on receipt of the advertised price, but that if you are a stockholder they will be mailed for three-fifths of the retail price or sent by express at purchaser's expense for half price. Any one can become a stockholder by sending \$10 or by sending \$1 and promising to pay \$1 a month for nine months.

---

### Why We Need Your Stock Subscription.

The business on its present basis is paying expenses. But more Socialist literature is needed than the capital at our disposal will supply. Socialist sentiment is spreading in this country at a rate that is simply

startling, and if serious errors are to be avoided, education in the principles of Socialism must keep pace with the growth of sentiment. The most important text-book on Socialism is Marx's "Capital." Only one of its three volumes has yet been translated into English. We have imported and sold several hundred copies of this since June. The other two volumes contain about 1,500 pages, and to translate and publish them will involve an outlay of over \$2,000. To raise this will require 200 stock subscriptions at \$10 each. The money can be paid at the rate of \$1 a month. As soon as the 200 subscriptions are pledged, the work will begin.

---

### Socialist Literature for Striking Miners.

---

Although the coal strike is settled, its lesson has not been lost among the coal miners of Pennsylvania, and it is far easier for them than before the strike to grasp the idea that they should vote to put their own class in control of the government. The result of the November election will be known by the time this number of the Review reaches our readers, and the election returns will undoubtedly show that something has been accomplished by the Socialist literature circulated in the coal region. The contributions made by the readers of the International Socialist Review toward the circulation of literature among the strikers have been as follows:

Previously acknowledged .....	\$55.15
Mrs. S. D. Whitney, Petaluma, Cal. ....	.50
A friend, Chicago .....	1.25
T. J. Maxwell, Topeka, Kan. ....	2.00
C. C. Reynolds, Los Angeles, Cal. ....	5.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$63.90</b>

---

### Just Published—Capital and Labor.

---

Few books have an origin and history like this one. It is nothing more nor less than the combined note-book and scrap-book of a Socialist workingman.

Blacklisted and searching with bitter experiences for a market in which to dispose of his labor-power, then toiling long hours at the most exhausting labor when that market was found, he learned the philosophy of Socialism at a school whose lessons make lasting and vivid impressions. Co-operating with events in the work of teaching these lessons there were certain things that he read or heard spoken.

When he came to see the truth of the Socialist position, he saw that the only way to escape from the life in which capitalism doomed him to live was by helping other working men to see the same truths. Hence this book.

It is a record of the things which made him a Socialist, and of the things which he found most effective in teaching his fellow-workers to become Socialists. Along with these things he has put the arguments

and thoughts which arose from his experience as laborer and Socialist agitator.

Such a book, gathered, published and sent forth in this manner, should certainly not be without effect upon the class for whom it was written. It should challenge the attention of every producer of wealth, and we believe its reading will compel him to see that his place is beside the author and the millions of other workingmen who are seeking to hasten the progress of social evolution toward the time when the conditions portrayed in this book and endured by the writer and his class shall have forever passed away. Paper, 204 pages, 25 cents; to stockholders, 13 cents by mail, or 10 cents by express.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,  
56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.

# Socialist Books at Cost

The condensed list on this page includes nearly every socialist book of first-class importance in the English language which is for sale anywhere, and yet it includes nothing but books published or imported by the co-operative publishing house of CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY.

## Socialist Books in Cloth Binding.

AVELING, Edward. The Student's Marx.	\$1.00
BADEN-POWELL, B. H. Village Communities in India	1.00
BAX, E. Belfort. Outlooks from the New Standpoint	1.00
—The Ethics of Socialism	1.00
—The Religion of Socialism	1.00
BERNSTEIN, Edward. Ferdinand Lassalle	1.00
BLATCHFORD, R. Britain for the British	.50
BROOME, Isaac. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association	.50
CARPENTER, Edward. Love's Coming-of-Age	1.00
—England's Ideal	1.00
—Civilization, Its Cause and Cure	1.00
DARROW, Clarence S. Resist not Evil	.75
DAWSON, W. H. Bismarck and State Socialism	1.00
—German Socialism and Lassalle	1.00
ENGELS, Frederick. Condition of the English Working Class in 1844	1.25
—The Origin of the Family	.50
—Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	.50
HINDS, Wm. A. American Communities	1.00
KAUTSKY, Karl. The Social Revolution	.50
LAFARGUE, Paul. The Evolution of Property	1.00
LIEBKNECHT, Wilhelm. Memoirs of Karl Marx	.50
LORIA, Achille. The Economic Foundations of Society	1.25
MARX, Karl. Capital	2.00
—Revolution and Counter-Revolution	1.00
MARX and ENGELS. The Communist Manifesto	.50
MASSART and VANDERVELDE. Parasitism, Organic and Social	1.00
MAYNARD, Milla Tupper. Walt Whitman	1.00
MORMAN, James B. The Principles of Social Progress	.50
MORRIS and BAX. Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome	1.25
PERSINGER, C. E. Letters from New America	.50
ROBERTS, Evelyn H. The Pure Causeway	1.00
RODBERTUS, Karl. Over-Production and Crises	1.00
ROGERS, J. E. Thorold. Work and Wages	1.00
SCHAEFFLE, Dr. The Quintessence of Socialism	1.00
SIMONS, A. M. The American Farmer	.50
SOMBART Werner. Socialism and the Social Movement of the 19th Century	1.00
VANDERVELDE, Emile. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution	.50
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, Vol. I	2.00
Volume II	2.00

## Socialist Books in Paper Binding.

ALLEN, Henry E. A Study in Government	.05
BLATCHFORD, Robert. Britain for the British	.25
—Merrie England	.10
BLISS, H. L. Plutocracy's Statistics	.10
BOUROFF, Basil. The Impending Crisis	.35
DARROW, C. S. Crime and Criminals	.10
—In Memory of John P. Altgeld	.05
ENGELS, Frederick. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	.10
KAUTSKY, Karl. Life of Frederick Engels	.10
LAFARGUE, Paul. Socialism and the Intellectuals	.05
LIEBKNECHT, Wilhelm. No Compromise. Socialism; What it is and What it Seeks to Accomplish	.10
MACHINIST, A Black-Listed. Capital Against Labor	.25
MARX and ENGELS. The Communist Manifesto	.10
MILLER, George McA. Uncle Ike's Ideas (Poems)	.10
—The same in leatherette covers	.25
NEWSPAPER MAN, A. Man or Dollar, Which?	.25
PERSINGER, C. E. Letters from New America	.25
PLATO. The Republic. Translated by Alexander Kerr. Book I	.15
—The same. Book II	.15
—The same. Book III. (Ready in Jan.)	.15
QUINN, C. F. Under the Lash, a Socialist Drama	.25
ROBERTS, Evelyn Harvey. The Pure Causeway	.50
SIMONS, A. M. The Economic Foundation of Art	.05
SOCIALIST Campaign Book	.25
SOCIALIST Songs with Music	.20
VAIL, C. A. The Socialist Movement	.10
VANDERVELDE, Emile. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution	.25
WATERS, Robert. Career and Conversation of John Swinton	.25
WOOLDRIDGE, Dr. C. W. The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand	.10

## Pocket Library of Socialism.

Five cents each, 6 for 25 cents, 14 for 50 cents, 30 for \$1, \$2.25 per 100, postpaid.

Thirty-five numbers now ready. Descriptive list of these and other publications sent free on request.

In addition to these books we also publish the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, a monthly magazine of 64 large pages, edited by A. M. Simons and giving each month contributions from the leading socialists of the world, together with complete news of the Socialist movement. \$1.00 a year, 10 cents a copy.

The great work done by our company has only been made possible by the co-operation of nearly 600 socialists, each of whom has subscribed for one share of stock at \$10.00. We need more stockholders to enlarge our work. No dividends are paid, but stockholders get our books at cost. Particulars free. Any book in this list mailed promptly on receipt of price. Address

**CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers**  
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago