

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1903.

NO. 7.

Why Co-operatives Have Failed.



CO-OPERATION is to economics what democracy is to politics. The conquest of the industrial group is the most difficult task democracy ever set about to accomplish. So relentlessly does commercial absolutism repel all the encroachments of the young giant Demos, so singularly does it adapt itself to mastership and subordination that political economists throw up their hands in despair and the masses settle into a sullen belief that the democracy which is true in political life is a lie in industrial life, and that the once irresistible phalanx of the advancing people must shiver itself to pieces against the obdurate battlements of economic necessity.

More than fifty years ago men lent themselves to the hope that the launching of co-operative enterprises would inaugurate a system of industry that would drive from the world both the industrial despot and the industrial slave. Signally has this hope miscarried. It is not enough to point to isolated and exceptional examples, it is not enough to call attention to the fact that after fifty years of failures the effort to establish co-operatives is just as active, just as persistent as ever. The fact that *in so long a period and among so many industrial changes co-operation has not totally displaced the older systems*, has not even produced a tremor among so many upheavals and crashes—has not affected the course of events to the least appreciable extent, proves conclusively that its promoters were too sanguine in their expectations and too prone to underestimate the historic forces with which they had to deal.

I do not wish to be interpreted as claiming that co-operatives may not in some cases succeed in maintaining themselves in the midst of competition, as is instanced at present in England and Belgium, but the point is this: Co-operatives never have and give no evidence that they ever will become a conquering or even an

appreciable force in competition with competitive industry. The relative success of the consumptive co-operatives of Europe is due to the fact that they operate in the final stage of industry where competition is the least felt. Productive co-operatives have invariably failed because they operate in the initial stage of industry against the whole force of competition. The consumptive co-operative is an example of a number of consumers becoming their own market. This power to exclude competition from a given territory is the only power that saves them.

It only remains with us to search out the cause of this failure so that we may be able in the future to steer clear of the Charybdis and Scylla that lie at the right and the left of the course of progress. Singularly enough, the political economist flounders wretchedly on this point. But his failure is easily traceable to a well-known tendency of his to seek justification for the competitive system. The moment he admits the real cause of the failure of the co-operative, he lays bare a vulnerable point in the competitive system; hence we cannot expect light from the political economist. Nor can we expect light from the popular mind because the impossibility of co-operation and the necessity of industrial absolutism have become its habitual mode of thought.

Without digressing further I will go straight to the cause and state it dogmatically, trusting to later elaborations to make it clear: *The reason that the co-operative industrial group succumbs to the capitalistic industrial group is because the capitalistic industrial group is primarily a FIGHTING organization, while the co-operative industrial group is primarily a PRODUCTIVE organization.*

Political economists are forced to acknowledge the fighting character of the capitalistic group. Walker says, "The *armies* of industry can no more be *raised, equipped, held together, moved and ENGAGED* without their *commanders* than can the armies of war."

The capitalistic industrial group, from the owner to his least important menial, is the most efficient and relentless fighting organization the world has ever produced. It is the product of a long and precarious struggle for existence, in which its less powerful rivals have been mercilessly weeded out. Its present emergence from the struggle, a struggle in which the slightest mistake perhaps meant ruin, a struggle wherein a mere fluctuation of prices meant perhaps obliteration, is positive proof that it alone possesses those qualifications that insure its existence as long as the conditions to which it has conformed obtain.

What are the qualifications that have preserved the surviving competitive group through all the struggles of the past and give it such power and efficiency now?

First. The absolutism it confers on the head of the organization and the perfect subordination and discipline it maintains over the members. Absolutism and subordination are inseparable from war. When men are at peace with one another they can associate on terms of equality, but when they are engaged in a deadly strife whose stakes are existence, there is no room for sentiment, no place for individuality. The group must acquire directness, mobility, force. All power must be vested in the head. One mind must move the mass. The more powerful that mind and the more obedient the mass, the more efficient will be the organization. Everywhere and at all times this principle has been so clearly recognized that powers of life and death over the subordinates have always been vested in the head. In the army we have the court-martial, in the factory the discharge; one is just as potent in its power to secure discipline, just as destructive to life and liberty in the long run, as is the other. Absolutism reaches its culmination in economics. The absolutism of industry is more absolute than the absolutism of tribal militarism; in the tribe there is usually a council of justice, in the factory never. The power that confers ownership on the few is the same power that expropriates the many, brings them to the service of the few, robs them of all divergent interests and knits them into solid organizations that have the directness and force of missiles. Ownership gives the master power to augment his force on a rising market, diminish it on a falling market, disband it during a panic and re-enlist it after; it permits him to utilize it in every way convenient to himself, to meet all fluctuations of prices, to offset the counterstrokes of rivals and to engage in all that large class of "business" activities that essentially constitute *war* and not *production*. The selection of the captains of industry is the same process that selects the strong animals of the forest for survival. It is the strong man in business who wins out—the persistent, aggressive, shrewd, cold, calculating, remorseless fighting man. He is a distinct type and a successor of the tribal warrior. Democratic election would never place him in charge of industry, it would never develop him. The fighting man can only be developed and enthroned in power by ages of interminable war. As long as war is the mode of business, this type will hold the fort.

Second. Another important qualification of the capitalistic group as a fighting organization is *its power to accumulate capital*. Capital is the great conquering agency only by which the market of each group can be extended, and the great expropriating agency by which it alone can absorb the properties of its rivals. The capital of the owner of an industrial group is at once his weapon, his territory and his booty. *Capital is produced by transforming all surplus wealth into capital*. Right here where

the capitalistic group transforms as much as it can of the constructive elements of life into capital to be used as a destructive agency against all rival life, it proclaims its essentially warlike character. This organization has been perfectly adapted, by a long process of development, to accumulate a maximum amount of capital. This it does by imposing abstinence upon all its subordinates. There is but one individual, or at most but a small number, who have any consumptive capacity worth taking into account. The great mass of workers, who outnumber the owners as an hundred or thousand to one, require only the oil that lubricates and the fuel that fires the great senseless human machine which clanks interminably and relentlessly in obedience to the Gorgon of Capital. As the capitalistic group is the most efficient machine thinkable for the production of capital on account of the economy of abstinence enforced by its owner, likewise *it exists solely for the production of capital. The moment it ceases to produce capital for its owner it ceases to exist.* Let once this group start on its mad career, there can be no pause, no halting. The one condition of existence is a constant battle for the market, a constant increment of capital. Let once it weaken the capital to enrich its members or let it relax the discipline, and its doom is sealed and more remorseless rivals take its place. The stern realities of war are as true here as anywhere.

Such is the capitalistic group as a fighting organization; as an agent of production it cannot rank high. Production with it is an incidental phenomenon. While it cannot be denied that it has wonderful efficiency in developing the forces of production, it is utterly impotent to utilize them. Its absolutism, so necessary in war, works incalculable harm in the peaceful arts of production. It robs the members of individuality, individual initiative, freedom of action, and the keen joy of the master workman and the creator. It robs the workman of the advantage of intelligence and culture and reduces his efficiency far below the normal level. The ownership by the master of the enterprise and the product, so necessary to economic absolutism, alienates the worker from all interest in his work; he becomes merely a time-server and an eye-pleaser, buffeted daily between the lash of hunger and the anguish of distasteful work. The organization itself, being designed primarily to capture and hold the market, is recruited, officered and co-ordinated on a footing of war, and can never utilize more than a certain percentage of its forces for production. I leave the really vital reason of its inefficiency as a productive organization until the last. This reason is *that in order to produce capital it reduces the consumptive capacities of its members to the minimum.* The other causes of its inefficiency in production are important and entail incalculable waste, but this is the essential point—it is

the rock upon which the system breaks. Consumption is the origin and fountain of production; whatever limits consumption limits to the same extent production. *A minimum consumption unavoidably means a minimum production.* The productive system that limits consumption is a system that undermines and destroys its own efficiency.

To summarize: The competitive group fails as an efficient productive force,

First, because it reduces the efficiency of the individual producer to the minimum.

Second, because it can utilize only the minimum proportion of its force in production and must employ the major portion in competition.

Third, because it reduces consumption, and consequently production, to the minimum.

We observe that the very characteristics that make it such an irresistible fighting organization render it incompetent as a productive agency.

Now let us turn to the co-operative industrial group. The co-operative group is just as weak as a fighting organization as is the capitalistic group as a productive organization, and is just as strong as a productive force as is the capitalistic group as a fighting force. We have already noted that the essential qualities of a successful competing industrial group are:

First, the absolutism that gives complete power and discipline over the whole organization.

Second, its power to accumulate a maximum amount of capital by reducing the consumptive capacities of its members to the minimum.

The co-operative group possesses neither of these qualifications. It is an association of equals. They will not voluntarily confer powers of life and death on their head. They will not subject themselves to a subordination that robs them of dignity and manhood. They will not submit themselves to a discipline that is painful and humiliating and takes away their individuality. Their organization lacks directness and force because the management owes its position to the constituent members; it is hampered by the scruples and the divergent opinions of the latter, and has not the great personal risk that stimulates the captain of industry. The organization is immobile and moves slowly because it is composed of a mass of distinct individualities possessing equal power. It cannot augment its force, reduce its force, or disband its force, to meet the exigencies of the market, and it cannot move upon the enemy with the quickness and audacity of its rivals. On an average its management is not liable to be as strong in fighting qualities as the owner of the capitalistic group

because men's judgments are not so unerring as the natural selection of evolutionary law. But its weakness does not lie so much in these conditions as in its incapacity to accumulate capital. This alone, were it as strong as its rivals in all other regards, would render it incompetent to meet them in open battle. *The co-operative does not exist for the production of capital; it exists primarily for the production of consumable wealth.* Here at least are a group of men who refuse to surrender their bodies and souls to the devouring Frankenstein of Capital. Here is an association of individuals who have combined and refused to pay tribute to the masters, in order that each may obtain a maximum amount of consumable wealth. Each has a personal and equal claim on the wealth product that tells heavily on the capital. To surrender this claim in order to strengthen the fund of capital in the face of aggressive foes is to forego the very purpose for which the co-operative exists and to annul all the advantages it promises in comparison with the capitalistic group; to enforce these claims is to reduce the fund of capital to the minimum in the face of unrelenting foes who have methods for extracting the maximum amount of capital. Those groups that consent to enter into the strife of commercial life must accept the painful conditions of war if they would survive. They must accept the absolutism, the crushing out of sentiment and individuality, and the denial of all that raises man above the mere drudge, and subject themselves to the most cruel and onerous conditions. As well attempt to abolish war among the Dervishes of Soudan by planting in their midst a colony of non-resisting Quakers as to try to abolish competition by establishing co-operatives.

Now we come to the qualifications of the co-operative group as a productive agency. In order to understand the vast productive capacity of co-operative production we will have to conceive of the co-operative group operating in a co-operative society. The isolated co-operative, working within present society, is so handicapped by the conditions competition imposes that it is little better than the capitalistic group as a productive factor.

Co-operation is the normal mode of production:

First, because it raises the efficiency of the individual producer to the maximum.

Second, because it utilizes the maximum proportion of its forces for purely productive purposes.

Third, because it raises consumption, and consequently production, to the maximum.

Of course when I here use the term co-operation I do not use it in the sense of the vast body of co-operative labor that moves the Herculean machinery of to-day for the capitalist, but I mean democratic ownership and manipulation of enterprises and

products. Co-operation in this sense raises the efficiency of the individual laborer to the maximum because it gives to the laborer a direct interest in the enterprise and the size of the product. The co-operator will perhaps strike the normal medium of interest and effort which lies between the wage-worker on the one hand who has no interest and the individual producer on the other, who has often an abnormal interest. The full and undivided product is the natural reward of effort, the normal stimulus to exertion. It is the natural tie between mind and matter, the vital relation between the creator and the thing created. Associated enterprise is an accomplished and an immutable fact; the only stimulus that will bring from its numerous co-operators the maximum amount of exertion is the certainty of each receiving the full results of his efforts. Apart from this natural stimulus comes an added efficiency that springs from the growth of intelligence and hopefulness among the workers, the deepening of self-respect and character, the expansion of individuality, greater freedom of action, and the growth of the true Art-interest that attaches to all normal labor. The future will see singing workmen like those who built the cathedrals of mediæval times.

The superior economy of co-operative production lies in its necessary utilization of the maximum proportion of social energy in that part of production which consists essentially in the creation of wealth and the minimum proportion in that part of production which consists in the distribution of wealth. We are prepared to understand that this condition is a necessary concomitant of co-operation when we comprehend what co-operation really is. Co-operation is the return of production to its primitive simplicity, wherein the individual is never separated from the tool or the product, but creates and consumes wealth in the simplest and most direct way. Under capitalism the several productive processes are relegated to divergent classes and the individual finds himself separated practically from all the vital processes except one. This differentiation and monopoly of vital functions is the underlying cause of all the misunderstandings, miscegenations, confusions, disorders, neutralization of effort, waste of wealth, and appalling poverty that characterize competition. It necessitates the employment of vast numbers for merely protective and predatory purposes and an extravagant use of officials to keep the rank and file in subjection. Subsidiary institutions such as banking and insurance enterprises, which are the arsenals and magazines of the contending armies, multiply to an enormous extent. In the general anarchy and helplessness parasitic and exotic growths of all kinds drive down their feeders wherever they can secure a foothold and propagate themselves in the general putrescence. Every profession perforce acquires the

nature of a rank and noxious exotic, but distribution itself, the simplest of all the productive processes, develops into a huge parasitic abnormality, even tending to distention, against all the centralizing and constricting forces of the age. Co-operation—the simplification of the productive process—the restoration to the individual of all the vital processes—cuts all these evils from their Cause and they vanish like a passing nightmare. The co-operator simply has but to produce and consume his product. It is inadmissible that he can be separated from his product; to admit that he can be is to deny his essential characteristic. But the co-operator of this age of the division of labor possesses one characteristic difference from the primitive individual producer: The primitive producer produced a *thing*, while the co-operator, being able to produce only a part of a thing, produces a *value*. He perforce receives this value in the credit currency, and the actual product awaits at some convenient place the presentation of his claim. This natural and direct method abolishes at a stroke all those transactions that are termed *commercial* and trims down to their essential basis all those activities that are termed *productive*. Subsidiary and recouping institutions, soliciting and predatory occupations, supernumeraries and hangers-on, parasitic and exotic bodies, must go with that great commercial class that rides on the back of submerged labor. It is difficult to predict to what extent these changes would swell the ranks of the real producers, but it would not be unreasonable to expect a two or threefold increase.

But the really vital characteristic of the co-operative group as a productive factor is that it returns to each individual producer the *maximum product of his labor, reserving for capital only enough to sustain the normal growth and wear of the enterprise*. A fundamental reason why men co-operate is in order to retain for themselves the tribute that would otherwise go to others and secure for themselves the full product of their exertions. Men so conditioned will not acknowledge any claim capital may impose except the normal claim of sustenance and adequate growth. This raises consumption, and consequently production, to the maximum. In order to understand the co-operator as a consumer we have only to conceive of him as a producer for himself, as one who is supplying all his own needs, which in reality the co-operator does. If machinery and productive methods are inadequate, his wants are a market that cannot be supplied, consequently a glut is impossible; if productive methods are ample for all his wants, demand and supply are constant quantities and balance each other to a nicety; if they produce more than he can consume, he employs them only as he needs them, and leisure and all its concomitants fill up the lucid inter-

vals of life; in any case, overproduction cannot mean what it implies now—congestion, suspension, stagnation, starvation—it can only mean the leisure to enjoy accumulations—that ultimate desideratum for which we all struggle so desperately now.

It is often urged in justification of industrial absolutism that the arbitrary powers and disproportionate rewards of the employing class are necessary in order to secure management capable of organizing and attending to the large, intricate, and varied interests that go under the name of business. It is strange that men who pose as political economists should see any necessary intricacy or difficulty in the simple act of making an article and turning it over to its producer; it is stranger still that they cannot see that all this intricacy and all the varied duties that call for such unusual talent are phenomena that belong to competition and not to production; that the ability that they consider so necessary to success and which is purchased at such fearful sacrifices of the race is not ability to produce economically and enormously, but ability to crush active and persistent rivals—ability to fight; that this uncommon ability is destructive rather than constructive, and would have no currency in a constructive society. They place themselves in the absurd position of justifying commercial absolutism because it alone can develop the ability necessary to combat the forces it arrays against itself on account of its false ethical and economic basis.

The management of the co-operative within a co-operative society is a very different affair. The co-operative management will not be a fighting body because it will have no one to fight. It will have no market to study; the markets will rise and fall with the efforts of each co-operator; they will be comprehended in the act of production. It will have no rivals to watch, no fluctuations to guard against, no stringencies to prepare for, no advertising, no overbidding or underselling, no tricks of trade to learn, no resorts to adulterations, no deceptions to propagate, no money kings to depend upon and no stock exchange to fear; only one thing to do—PRODUCE—to produce economically and enormously; to so understand the law of average consumption, productive co-ordination and the resources of society and nature, that the forces of production can be employed most economically. Who is the man best fitted to perform this task? Unquestionably the Scientist. The day the management of business falls from the commercial warrior to the scientist industrialist will be a propitious day for the human family. Each is the logic of the system for which he stands. Only the law of natural selection operating in a warring society could have developed the characteristics we observe in the capitalist, and only such a law could have placed him in power. Only the elements of culture and civilization de-

velop the qualities which we observe in the scientist, and only democratic election can place him where he will be of most service to industry.

Such is the co-operative; so weak in all that constitutes fitness for war; so strong in all the elements that constitute fitness for peace. Before we can hope to reap the bountiful harvest promised by modern production, before we can realize the coming age of Art and Spiritual Gladness we must hush forever the strident voice of commercial war. As well try to democratize the army in the midst of war as attempt to democratize the industrial group in the midst of competition. Absolutism is inseparable from the struggle for existence. *The only path open for the advancing hosts of Democracy is the path that leads to the conquest of the Monopolistic public powers, against whose bulwarks the punitive forces of competition are powerless.* The position of the International Socialist Party is the only position that is tenable for those who would bring about industrial democracy.

Murray E. King.

Bishop Spalding and Socialism.*

OWING to the prominence which Bishop Spalding has attained in the recent coal strike and in other matters relating to labor, his recent book on Socialism and Labor is worthy of more attention than it might otherwise merit. But the book itself is well worthy of examination. The introductory paragraphs are, on the whole, a very fair statement of the Socialist argument; and we therefore quote them at length :

“The interest which all who think take in the laboring classes, whether it spring from sympathy or fear, is a characteristic feature of the age.

“Their condition seems to be the great anomaly in our otherwise progressive and brilliant civilization. Whether when compared with the lot of the slaves and serfs of former times that of the laborer is fortunate, is not the question. He is not placed in the midst of the poverty and wretchedness of a rude and barbarous society, but in the midst of boundless wealth and great refinement. He lives, too, in a democratic age, in which all men profess to believe in equality and liberty; in an age in which the brotherhood of the race is proclaimed by all the organs of opinion. He has a voice in public affairs, and since laborers are in the majority, he is, in theory, at least, the sovereign. They who govern profess to do everything by the authority of the people, in their name and for their welfare; and yet, if we are to accept the opinions of the Socialists, the wage-takers, who in the modern world are the vast multitude, are practically shut out from participation in our intellectual and material inheritance. They contend that the poor are, under the present economic system, the victims of the rich, just as in the ancient societies the weak were the victims of the strong; so that wage-labor, as actually constituted, differs in form rather than in its essential results from the labor of slaves and serfs. And even dispassionate observers think that the tendency of the present system is to intensify rather than to diminish the evils which do exist; and that we are moving towards a state of things in which the few will own everything, and the many be hardly more than their hired servants. In America they admit that sparse population and vast natural resources that as yet have hardly been touched helped to conceal this fatal tendency, which is best seen in the manufacturing and commercial centers of Europe, where the capitalistic method of production has reduced wage-earners to a condition of pauperism and

* Socialism and Labor and Other Arguments. Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria. A. C. McClurg & Co. Cloth, 225 pp. 80 cents net.

degradation which is the scandal of Christendom and a menace to society.

"The present condition of labor is the result of gradually evolved processes, running through centuries.

"The failure of the attempt of Charlemagne to organize the barbarous hordes which had overspread Europe into a stable empire was followed by an era of violence and lawlessness, of wars and invasions, from which society sought refuge in the feudal system. The strong man, as temporal or spiritual lord, was at the top of the feudal hierarchy, and under him the weak formed themselves into classes. The serf labored a certain number of days for himself, and a certain number for his lord. In the towns the craftsmen were organized into guilds which protected the interests of the members. The mendicant poor were not numerous, and their wants were provided for by the bishops and the religious orders.

"Then the growth of towns and the development of trade and commerce brought wealth to the burghers, who became a distinct class, while domestic feuds and foreign wars, especially the Crusades, weakened and impoverished the knights and barons. The printing press and the use of gunpowder in war helped further to undermine the feudal power, while the discovery of America, the turning of the Cape of Good Hope, and the Protestant revolution threw all Europe into a ferment from which new social conditions were evolved. The peasants who had been driven from the land by the decay of the great baronial houses, and the confiscation of the property of the church, flocked into the towns or became vagabonds. The poor became so numerous that permanent provision had to be made for them, and poor laws were consequently devised.

"The master-workman, who in the middle ages employed but two or three apprentices and as many journeymen, gave way to a class of capitalists, enriched by the confiscated wealth of the church, by the treasures imported from America and the Indies, and by the profits of the slave traffic, who at once prepared to take advantage of the stimulus to industry given by the opening of a vast world market. As late as the middle of the last century, however, manufacturing was still carried on by masters who employed but a small number of hands, and had but little capital invested in the business; and the modern industrial era, with its factory system, properly begins with our marvelous mechanical inventions and the use of steam as a motive power. Machinery made production on a large scale possible, and threw the whole business into the hands of the capitalists, while laborers are left with nothing but their ability to work, which they are forced to sell at whatever prices it will bring. The capitalist's one aim is to

amass wealth, and he buys human labor just as he buys machinery or raw material, at the lowest rate at which it can be obtained. It is either denied that the question of wages has an ethical aspect, or it is maintained that the competition among capitalists themselves, which under the present system of production is inevitable, compels employers to ignore considerations of equity. Hence it comes to be held that whatever increases profits is right. The hours of labor are prolonged, the sexes are intermingled, children are put to work in factories, sanitary laws are violated; wares are made in excess of demand; and in consequence of the resulting glut of the markets, wages are still further lowered or work is stopped; and the laborers, whether they continue to work or whether they strike, or are forced into idleness, are threatened with physical and moral ruin. The further development of the system is, in the opinion of many observers, towards the concentration of capital in immense joint-stock companies and syndicates, whose directors, by buying competing concerns and also legislatures and judges, make opposition impossible, and render the condition of laborers still more hopeless."

We must also recognize the fact that he has done the Socialist propaganda something of a service in giving the authority of his position as a church dignitary to the statement that Socialism and religion have nothing in common. "A Socialist may be a theist or an atheist, a spiritualist or a materialist, a Christian or an agnostic. . . . A large number of Socialists, it is true, are atheists and materialists, but the earnest desire to discover some means whereby they may be relieved from their poverty and misery, and the resulting vice and crime, is in intimate harmony with the gentle and loving spirit of Him who passed no sorrow by."

Indeed, some of his positions imply an acceptance of economic determinism, as, for example, when he says on page 11: "Events, in fact, solve the great problems, and our discussions are but the foam that crests the waves." Or on page 18, where he points out that "The social order is an organism infinitely complex, the outcome of many forces, whose action and interaction, beginning in the obscure and mysterious, where life and matter first manifest themselves, have been going on for unnumbered ages; and it has so intertwined itself with man's very nature that we may say he is what he is in virtue of the society of which he is the product."

Again, in his recognition of the class character of our present law, he comes very close to Socialism. Speaking of punishment for crime, he says: "The delinquents who are incarcerated are chiefly the poor, who had they money to pay the fines would escape punishment. The heaviest punishment is inflicted on the most helpless, and frequently on the least guilty; and thus the

morally weak, the victims of unfortunate environments, are degraded, hardened, and made habitual offenders."

I do not wish to push the matter too far and to ascribe too great a comprehension of or favorable attitude towards Socialism on the part of Bishop Spalding. But on page 58 we see something that reads very like a description of the rise of proletarian class consciousness. He says: "The laborers, who in proportion as their minds have been awakened, have become conscious of the hardships and limitations to which they are subject, feel this more keenly than any other class, and hence they have formed innumerable organizations to protect their rights and promote their interests."

Finally, we would seldom find a harsher indictment against the capitalist system than is to be found on pages 173 and 174: "The political and social conditions which involve the physical deterioration and the mental and moral degradation of multitudes are barbarous, and unless they are improved must lead to the ruin of the State. From this point of view, which is the only true point of view, our present economic and commercial systems are subversive of civilization. They sacrifice men to money; wisdom and virtue to cheap production and the amassing of capital. They foster greed in the stronger and hate in the weaker. They drive the nations to competitive struggles which are as cruel as war, and in the final results more disastrous; for their tendency is to make the rich vulgar and heartless, and the poor reckless and vicious. As stratagems and lies are considered lawful in war, so in the warfare of commercial competition opinion leans to the view that whatever may be done with impunity is right. The adulteration of food and drink, the watering of stocks, the bribing of legislators, the crushing of weaker concerns, the enforced idleness of thousands, who are thereby driven to despair and starvation, are not looked upon as lying within the domain of morals, any more than the shooting of a man in battle is considered a question of morality. The degradation and ruin of innumerable individuals are implications of the law of competition, just as in the struggle for existence there is a world-crushing and destruction of the weak by the strong."

When we come to the objections we find that many of them have already been answered by the Bishop himself in the statements already quoted and that others arise from misconception. He begins with an attack upon the economics of Karl Marx, and, as seems to be the almost invariable rule of such writers, the first thing of which he falls foul is the labor value theory, in which he imputes to Marx a position which the latter never dreamed of taking. On pages 21 and 22 he says: "The fallacy of the Socialist assumption lies in attributing to labor a value of its own,

independently of the worth of its product. The labor spent in doing useless things has no value; at least no social value. He who makes what nobody wants has his labor for his pains. The question is not what amount of labor an object has cost, but what service can it render?"

But, as has already been pointed out by the *Chicago Socialist*, Marx really anticipated this very objection in *Capital*, and specifically states that he does not mean anything of the kind. In Section 1 of Chapter 1 of *Capital*, Marx says: "Lastly, nothing can have value without being an object of utility. If a thing is useless, so is the labor contained in it; the labor does not count as labor, and therefore has no value."

In speaking of this objection it might be well to say that perhaps the most complete explanation of the necessity of utility as an essential of socially valuable labor is to be found in Marx's *Capital*, the only book of which it is most frequently alleged that it denies this position.

We next come across the old familiar objection that you must change human nature. On page 13 we learn that "a prerequisite to all effective and desirable social transformations is a corresponding change in the character of both the masses and their rulers and employers." We could easily set against this the quotation already given, where Bishop Spalding has shown that "events make men."

Although he has already told us that labor created capital, he now finds a new origin for capital by falling back on the long-exposed fallacious theory that capital is also "the result of abstinence from consumption." Marx pointed out years ago that if capital came from the abstinence of any body it was the abstinence of the laborer from the full product of his toil.

On page 165 capital becomes "largely stored ability." We do not know whether Bishop Spalding or the Rev. Hillis first evolved this remarkable definition. But again we can leave it to Marx or almost any other Socialist writer to show that Socialists have always included ability, which is but another name for skilled labor, as a part of labor, and it would be difficult for either Bishop Spalding or the Rev. Hillis to attempt to justify the separation of ability from labor.

Next we meet our old friend the enemy in the objection that Socialism would crush out individuality. Here again we simply turn Bishop Spalding against his own words, which we have already quoted, showing how thoroughly capitalism itself crushes out individuality. He tells several times that what is needed is men, not measures. Against this we can place his statements that "events made the men" and let Spalding answer Spalding.

Finally he winds up with the argument, which is as old as

human society and human principles, that economic laws which are immutable make it impossible that wages should rise above a given point or that wealth should be so distributed as to make all men rich. This is simply his *ipse dixit*, against which we can oppose the thousands of volumes now written by the ablest minds of this age, pointing out that the powers of production to-day are so great as to make it easily possible for all physical necessities at least, of all mankind to be easily satisfied.

On the whole, Socialists may well advise the reading of Bishop Spalding's book, especially if a little time is spent in pointing out how often one page answers another and explaining the one or two complete misunderstandings of the Socialist problem. Wheth-
so great as to make it easily possible for at least the physical necessities of all mankind to be easily satisfied.

A. M. Simons.

The American Labor Movement.

I

THERE seems to be considerable misapprehension, especially among Socialists, in regard to the trades-union movement of the"—United States of America, and not only in regard to the trades-union movement of the Western States, as Comrade Eugene V. Debs seems to think, according to the views expressed in his article on "The Western Labor Movement," in the November issue of the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW*.

Many years' experience has convinced me that the relationship between trades-unionism and Socialism, i. e., the attitude of the politically organized Socialists towards the Trades Union and general labor movement, is the most vital question in the American Socialist movement. The very existence of the Socialist party depends on the solution of this question, while the Trades-Union movement will be greatly benefited and strengthened and its permanent success assured by the adoption of such fundamental Socialist tactics as will guarantee the healthy co-operation between the economic and political forces of labor in the great struggle of emancipation.

It is significant to know that the Socialist movement develops in about the same manner and ratio as the Trades Unions. Compare the growth in the membership of the American Federation of Labor to the growth of the Socialist vote since 1893. The A. F. of L. had just recovered from the general reaction that followed the eight-hour movement of 1885-86, with its Haymarket and Nov. 11th tragedies. For some time the Federation membership remained almost stationary at the 100,000 mark. To-day its membership is nearly 1,500,000, or, to be very conservative, at least ten times as high as in the early '90's. The same can be said of the Socialist movement. In 1893 the Socialist vote in the United States was less than 26,000. To-day the entire Socialist vote is about 300,000. Which goes to prove that the same economic causes that produce Trades Unionism also produce Socialism. The economic truth that "Labor creates all social value" is recognized and propagated by the Socialists and Trades-Unionists; and the more powerful Capitalism, the more intense the exploitation of the masses of the people, the more hopeless the prospects for better times, the more general the unrest and the desire for economic, political and social changes, hence the more intense intellectual activity among the working class and those directly and immediately dependent on the productive labor of

others. All this tends to extend and strengthen the organization and influence of *Labor*, both economic and political.

It might be claimed that the economic organization of Labor in this country was stronger in 1885-86 than in 1893. This is not correct. With equal right we could assert that the Socialist movement of 1878-80 was stronger than in 1902, because two or more Socialists were elected to the Chicago City Council. The fact of the matter is that the Socialist movement of 1878-80 was a straw-fire of the first Socialist enthusiasm without any backbone, a political protest of Labor against the atrocities committed by Capitalism during the great railroad strike of 1877. In 1885-86 the American proletariat, for the first time in the industrial history of Capitalism, felt the general depression and the rapidly increasing misery and poverty. According to Carroll D. Wright's first annual report, that appeared in 1886, the number of unemployed had increased to over one million.

What was to be done? Reduction of the hours of labor! Eight hours! soon became the general demand of Organized Labor. After less than six months of agitation and organization on the part of a small number of American pioneer Trades-Unionists and German-speaking Socialists this country witnessed one of the most wonderful proletarian uprisings in the history of the International labor movement. From those days on, the Trades-Union movement became an important factor in the industrial and social development of this country.

Here is, in short, the historical recapitulation: The emancipation of the chattel slaves increased the desperate competition on the "free labor market." The new civil war began. While the capitalist tried to buy the commodity, labor, as cheap as possible, the wage-worker, in order to sustain life, had to demand as high a price for his labor-power as possible. These diametrically opposed class interests caused considerable friction, and soon a lively fight was begun. Seeing that the individual wage-worker was a mere straw in the wind when it came to the question of resisting the encroachments of Capitalism, the workmen united into unions—local, national and international unions—and Knights of Labor assemblies. The capitalists lost no opportunity to reduce the wages and lengthen the daily working time of their employes. Wherever human labor power did not realize the desired rate of profit for the employer, new labor-saving machinery was introduced, thousands of men being forced out of work. Women and children were hired to do the machine work, because they worked for considerably less wages. The conditions of the wealth-producing people grew worse from day to day, and this state of affairs caused general alarm. The workmen demanded higher wages and shorter hours of labor. While certain



trades unions had existed many years before the civil war broke out, and while efforts were made by these trades unions to better the condition of their members, it must be borne in mind that the modern labor movement, the struggle between Capitalism and Labor, did not amount to much until 1885 and 1886, when the general eight-hour movement was inaugurated; i. e., the movement for a general reduction of the hours of labor.

The capitalist class had never dreamed of the possibilities of such a movement. Indeed, the movement was a surprise to them, and many granted the demands of their employes out of sheer fear of an impending social revolution. However, the enemies of Labor were not resting on their oars; they soon organized for "self-defense and resistance." The struggle between Organized Labor and Organized Capitalism was on.

The Order of the K. of L. went out of existence; it had fulfilled its historical mission by demonstrating the power and solidarity of Labor. The K. of L. went down, not because Powderly was a demagogue, not because Sovereign was a capitalist politician, not because Professor De Leon tried to use the "remnants" to mend the S. L. P. coat, but because the very form of the K. of L. organization was not adapted to the modern forms of warfare in the proletarian class struggle.

II.

The attitude of the Socialists towards the Trades-Union movement during the last fifteen years furnishes a most interesting subject for the student of the American labor movement. It is a fact that the old German Socialists, most of whom were compelled to leave their country, their homes, their relatives and friends under the Bismarckian Anti-Socialist laws, became the most active pioneers of American Trades-Unionism. Hundreds and thousands of unions were organized by and through them.

When, after the Haymarket tragedy in Chicago, May 4, 1886, the capitalists seemed to have things all their own way, when the dark wave of reaction swept all over the country, threatening to destroy every labor organization, the small pioneer band of German-American Socialists once more appeared in the deserted arena of the class struggle, appealing to the wage-workers to resist the desperate attempts to crush Organized Labor, by organizing an independent political labor movement. This appeal was heeded. In the various parts of the country union labor parties were organized and thousands of votes cast for independent labor candidates. In New York 67,000 votes were polled for Henry George, and the capitalist politicians were frightened like little children overtaken by a severe thunderstorm. "Labor laws" by the bushel were passed by the different State Legislatures and

city councils and everything possible was done to check this independent political labor movement. Labor leaders were provided with political jobs, thereby mortgaging themselves, body and soul, to the old capitalist parties. Democratic and Republican politicians tried to get control over the local central labor unions, and the struggles the Socialists had to get these elements out and force them to the rear are of historical significance and importance.

In 1890 the Socialists of Germany polled about one million votes, thereby putting an end to the political life of the Iron Chancellor, Prince Bismarck, the originator of the anti-Socialist laws. This tremendous Socialist vote surprised the entire civilized world, and, naturally enough, the Socialist movement in this country, being almost exclusively German up to but a few years ago, could not escape the influence of this great Socialist victory in the old country. The Socialist Labor party decided to become an active political party and nominate straight Socialist tickets wherever possible. In 1892 the first Presidential candidate on a strictly Socialist ticket was put in the field and 21,512 votes were cast for the same.

As already mentioned, the Socialist movement of this country was almost exclusively a German-speaking movement, and with the exception of Boston, Chicago and San Francisco there were almost no native American elements active in or for the Socialist party. The conditions for a truly American Socialist movement were not yet ripe, and if a hundred silver-tongued Socialist agitators would have preached the doctrines of Socialism it would not have changed the political situation very much. In 1892 the great strike in Homestead, Pa., broke out; 10,000 State militiamen were called to arms to break this labor insurrection, after the Pinkerton hordes had been almost annihilated during the memorable battle on the banks of the Monongahela river. A decade of the capitalist reign of terror began. In Buffalo, Cripple Creek, Cœur d'Alene, Brooklyn, Tonawanda, Chicago (Pullman), Cleveland, St. Louis and other cities the militia, federal troops, police and deputy sheriffs were pressed into service against the onward march of Organized Labor. Tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of men went on strike for better conditions. While the capitalists were celebrating their World's Fair in Chicago thousands of unemployed were holding meetings on the highways and byways all over the country, and soon hungry, suffering American proletarians were marching from the Pacific coast, "On to Washington!" singing Hamlin Garland's labor hymn:

We have seen the reaper toiling in the heat of summer sun,
We have seen the children needy when the harvesting was done;

We have seen a mighty army, dying helpless one by one,
While their flag went marching on.

Oh, the army of the wretched, how they swarm the city street,
We have seen them in the midnight, where the Goths and Vandals meet;

We had shuddered in the darkness at the noise of their feet—
But their cause goes marching on.

But no longer shall the children bend above the whizzing wheel,
We will free the weary women from their bondage under steel,
In the mines and in the forest, worn and hopeless, men shall feel
His cause is marching on.

Meanwhile the capitalist system of production developed wonderfully into pools and syndicates and trusts, and the concentration of capital went on in ever-increasing rapidity. While the wage-workers were more and more pauperized, the middle class of manufacturers and merchants were driven into bankruptcy and despair.

Under such favorable economic and social conditions it was only natural that both the Trades-Union and the Socialist movement should grow. The eyes of the intelligent working class elements were gradually opened, and no longer could the capitalist politicians scare them by waving the red flag in the bull's face and by wrongfully denouncing the Socialists as the enemies of "our stars and stripes."

The Spanish-American war, with its contemptible feature of "Cuban Emancipation" by the speculators in Wall street, resulted in tearing the mask of patriotic hypocrisy off the face of our American plutocracy. This Cuban Emancipation war, followed by the "benevolently assimilating" war against the Filipinos, 10,000 miles off our shores, disclosed the imperialist secrets and desires of American Capitalism. "Our stars and stripes" were used as a means to fool the people into a patriotism of the insane and to make them fight for American capitalist expansion in Central America and in far-off East Asia. "Overproduction" at home, with thousands of working people starving, induced our industrial lords and commercial pirates to secure foreign markets, by peaceful tricks and speculations, if possible; if not, by force of arms and at the price of hundreds of thousands of human lives and the freedom of foreign nations that had been almost unknown to us five years ago.

During the last three or four years the American Trades-Union and the Socialist movements have doubled and trebled their membership, which may be mainly attributed to the above-pictured economic, political and social conditions.

In view of the fact that the German-American Socialists were ever anxious to get English-speaking elements interested in their movement, it can readily be understood how men with no exceptional or extraordinary intellectual powers or ability could play the leading roles in the Socialist movement. "We must have the Americans!" "We must reach the English-speaking elements!" were the often-repeated expressions of our old German comrades. I remember the great rejoicing of our old pioneer friends when in 1889 they succeeded in securing the services of the renowned adventurer, Professor Garside, of Baltimore. Professor Dan De Leon entered the Socialist movement (as an inheritance of the Henry George campaign) as a man of less than average intelligence; but our German comrades were anxious "to reach the English-speaking people," and so Professor De Leon was enveiled with a cloud of supernatural gift and power, was nursed and flattered until he himself got the idea of being the personification of Socialist wisdom and the incarnation of political omnipotence.

The attitude of the Socialist Labor party towards the Trades-Union movement from 1890 on to the present day has been a most unfortunate one, and we should profit by their expensive experience. While theoretically the Socialist party adopted an entirely new policy, in reality the everyday practice of many of our party members differs but little from the S. L. P. methods. Unfortunately there are still many Socialists who look upon the Trades Unions as a movement without any historical missionary and emancipating merits of its own, but which should be made the tail end of some Socialist political movement.

III.

In 1891 the American Federation of Labor met in Detroit, Mich. Our New York comrades made a serious break that caused them much trouble and finally threatened the very existence of their Socialist movement for the time. Section New York Socialist party was represented by delegates in the New York Central Labor Federation. This Federation elected Lucian Sanial as delegate to the Detroit convention of the A. F. of L. This caused a fight on the floor of the convention, and Thomas J. Morgan, delegate of the Chicago Trades Assembly, although not quite in accord with the New York move, fought a splendid battle in favor of Sanial's admission as a delegate. The A. F. of L., however, decided not to admit Sanial because he did not represent any Trades Union, but was a direct representative of a political party.

Here the trouble began. A campaign of revenge was opened against the A. F. of L., although Section New York, admitting their mistake of being directly represented in a central trades

union body, withdrew its delegates from the Central Labor Federation soon after. Messrs. De Leon, Vogt, Sanial and others continued their nefarious propaganda, and when in 1895 the A. F. of L. convened in New York, the above-mentioned "leaders of Socialism" had their plans and schemes cut and dried; they launched a Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance on the troubled waters of the American labor movement, and the birth of this "*enfant terrible*" was celebrated in grand style and with at least a dozen times more "enthusiasm and inspiration and hopes for the dawn of proletarian emancipation" than the late Denver convention of the Western Labor or American Labor Union.

The Socialist Labor party was almost a unit in indorsing the new union movement. In 1896 De Leon, Sanial and Vogt succeeded in hypnotizing and deceiving the Socialist Labor Party convention held in the City of New York and the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance was officially indorsed. De Leon, Sanial and Vogt pledged their word of honor that their new union movement was not directed against the A. F. of L. or against any of the existing labor organizations. For hours they tried to prove by statistical figures how they would get the unorganized into line, and that they had not the least intention of organizing rival unions. Poor creatures!

From that hour on the open hostilities and attacks on the American Federation of Labor began, and with this warfare of revenge and destruction on the economic field also commenced the demoralization and the suicidal work of the Socialist Labor party itself. The S. T. and L. A. got unavoidably mixed up in fights against a number of national unions, the S. L. P. could not escape the consequences, section after section of the party was suspended for violating the "Estiela" principles and tactics. Suspension and expulsion right and left, until Sanial expelled Vogt, and De Leon expelled Sanial, and Kuhn will expel De Leon, and the dog's tail will swallow the dog itself.

These are historical facts.

In 1898 the Social Democratic party was organized in Chicago after the secession from the Colonists. The S. D. P., not without considerable opposition, adopted a new policy concerning the attitude of the Socialists towards the Trades-Union movement. This attitude was re-indorsed by the Indianapolis convention a year later, and in July, 1901, the Unity convention unanimously adopted the following declaration, determining the attitude of the Socialist party of America towards the Trades Unions:

"The Trade-Union movement and independent political action are the chief emancipating factors of the wage-working class. The Trade-Union movement is the natural result of capitalist production, and represents the economic side of the working-class

movement. We consider it the duty of Socialists to join the unions of their respective trades and assist in building up and unifying the trades and labor organizations. We recognize that trades unions are by historical necessity organized on neutral grounds, as far as political affiliation is concerned.

"We call the attention of trades-unionists to the fact that the class struggle so nobly waged by the trades-union forces to-day, while it may result in lessening the exploitation of labor, can never abolish that exploitation. The exploitation of labor will only come to an end when society takes possession of all the means of production for the benefit of all the people. It is the duty of every trades-unionist to realize the necessity of independent political action on Socialist lines, to join the Socialist party and assist in building up a strong political movement of the wage-working class, whose ultimate aim and object must be the abolition of wage-slavery, and the establishment of a co-operative state of society, based on the collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution."

This resolution is characteristic of our Socialist Party movement, and sharply and strikingly draws the line between the truly class conscious Socialist movement and the misconceived, misunderstood, misinterpreted so-called class movement of De Leonism.

IV.

In his article on "The Western Labor Movement" in the November INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, Comrade Eugene V. Debs speaks of "the lukewarm comment and the half-approving, half-condemning tone of the Socialist party press and the uncalled for, unwise and wholly unaccountable official pronouncement of the St. Louis "Quorum" in reference to the action of the Western Labor Union in favor of Socialism at its Denver convention. Furthermore, Comrade Debs says:

"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 henchmen and heelers, whose duty it is to warn the union against Socialism and guard its members against working-class political action."

Having been the originator and most ardent supporter of the

above-mentioned "Quorum" resolution, I feel justified in more clearly stating my position in the matter. Some Socialist papers have printed the "Quorum" resolution in full and commented on it. Others published the resolution without comment. Again, others commented or denounced the "Quorum" without publishing a line of the resolution. One comrade editor complimented the "Quorum" members as "Happy Hooligans"—but none of the Socialist papers, with but one or two exceptions, saw fit to discuss the action of the "Quorum" intelligently, as it would have been their duty to do:

This showed a weak point in our party, a lack of clearness in the conception of the aims and objects of our movement.

The Western Labor Union convention indorsed Socialism and the Socialist party.

Every Socialist applauded this action. So did the St. Louis "Quorum."

The Western Labor Union changed its name into American Labor Union and decided to extend its field of operation to the Eastern States.

My experience prevented me from applauding this second action of the convention. I do not care what the promises or arguments of the delegates were that took the above action. Whether the comrades and brothers were actuated by a spirit of resentment towards the A. F. of L., or by the desire to build up a Socialist trades-union movement is not the question that concerns me in this case. Neither can we consider what our wishes would be. We are confronted by conditions and facts, not by theories and wishes.

What are the facts?

Comrade Debs knows the Western elements, he knows their courage, their honesty, their energy, their progressive spirit. All well and good. I have no reason to disbelieve him. But what does this prove? Does it prove that the Westerners are more honest, more sincere than the Eastern wage slaves? That they are more honest and sincere than those hundreds and thousands of Socialists who assisted in the organization of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance?

But the conditions and facts?

The American Labor Union, if it wants to carry out its program as originally planned, will have to send its organizers East, to St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, New York, Boston. Having indorsed the Socialist party, the Socialist party is expected to indorse the A. L. U. and do what?

Organize A. L. U. local unions.

Where?

In St. Louis, Chicago, Terre Haute, Milwaukee, New York, Boston, Haverhill, Brockton and elsewhere, perhaps in the mining regions of Pennsylvania.

Next?

Nearly every trade is organized in the cities and regions named. Organized under the A. F. of L. Well, we organize rival A. L. U. local unions.

What next? Will these new unions go 'way back and sit down?

No; they are anxious to expand, to grow. They will try to get new members. Where from? From the old A. F. of L. unions.

Then they will make demands on the bosses. The demands are refused. The strike begins.

What next?

The A. L. U. convention has indorsed Socialism; its members are supposed to be Socialist trades-unionists. Strikers will get empty pockets, will get hungry, their families will suffer.

Will a Socialist stomach stand more hunger and contraction than the conservative miner's stomach in Pennsylvania? Will the Socialist striker's family stand the suffering and privations more patiently than the family of the conservative?

Answer, please!

There is a limit to the sphere of Trades-Unionism. Keep this in your mind.

Well, our A. L. U. will strike at the ballot box, I hear some say.

What have we got the Socialist Party for?

The fact is this: The A. L. U. cannot expand east of the Mississippi without getting into a most disastrous fight against the A. F. of L.

Our Socialist Party movement cannot afford, has no right, to be dragged into a fight between two national Federations of Trades Unions.

The St. Louis "Quorum" took action on the A. L. U. matter after it was called upon to issue an organizers' commission of the Socialist Party to a general officer and organizer of the American Labor Union, and after considerable confusion had been created amongst our comrades in various parts of the country, which goes to show that an attempt was made to drag the Socialist Party right into this trades-union controversy and rivalry.

I do not speak for the "Quorum;" I express my personal opinion and accept the responsibility of what I write or speak on this question.

Would Comrade Debs go to work and organize the Terre Haute trades into A. L. U. local unions? Certainly not. I don't recog-

nize any "pure and simple" and "Socialist" Trades-Unions, because I consider it ridiculous to make people believe that a mere pledge to a Socialist platform will make a man a Socialist or transform a conservative union over night into a Socialist union.

Comrade Debs knows from experience that leaders, no matter how honest, good and Socialistic they may be, cannot create a labor movement where conditions are not favorable. Sam Gompers is not the A. F. of L., and I must protest against the assertion that the A. F. of L. unions have not assisted their Western brothers when in trouble. I remember one instance when the St. Louis Central Trades and Labor Union donated the entire Labor Day picnic income, amounting to about \$700, to the striking members of the Western Miners' Union.

The Western brothers got sore at Sam Gompers and some other individuals and left the A. F. of L. They had a perfect right to do so. But if other radical elements had done likewise, would there be such a splendid Socialist progress among the rank and file of the A. F. of L. as can be witnessed in every industrial center of the East?

Educate the rank and file, let them elect Socialist delegates, representing the carpenters, miners, cigarmakers, machinists, printers, etc., and you will soon get rid of leaders whom you consider detrimental to the progress of the movement.

Often, very often, have I been disappointed and discouraged in the Trades-Union movement, but this is no reason why I should not continue the good work of Socialist propaganda in the movement.

I can fully understand the action of the American Labor Union, I may excuse it to a certain extent, but I cannot indorse it, still less can I encourage the work in that direction.

Here, again, I fully agree with Comrade Debs when he says:

"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."

May the time soon come when these factional fights will cease and the work of the grand army of Organized Labor will be crowned with victory and success.

Comrades of the A. L. U., we may disagree as to tactics, but I am with you heart and soul in the glorious war for the economic freedom of Labor.

Yours for Labor and Socialism,

G. A. Hoehn.

Who Said "Scab?"

NO man forgets the time he first heard a crowd of strikers yell "scab!" If his affiliations were with capitalism and the masters he remembers "how wicked the mob looked," and with what a sense of pleasure and increasing security he saw the line of bluecoats beat back the men and boys who crowded round the scabs. But if, on the other hand, he was himself a wage-worker, the strikers had his sympathy at once, and even if not a union man he felt a longing to help in the struggle—the class struggle. Not that he "scientifically" understood that there was a class struggle—no more did the strikers, nor the police—but self-preservation is a most wonderful force in nature and the wage-worker feels drawn to stand by his class as instinctively as animals herd together for protection against devouring enemies or wintry storms.

Yes, society is an organism—in spite of the protestations of little individualists—and the man who attempts to thwart the movements of the masses is soon dispatched and thrown out of the hive like the stupid drone who opposes the workers.

Even outside of the ranks of Socialism sharp thinkers have discovered the existence of social-organic action, and practical rules have been formulated, by business men, from which it can be foretold when people are going to die—not individually, mind you, no! no! but in the mass—as witness the tables drawn up by life insurance companies whereby the length of life of a given number of people can be calculated to a nicety.

A scab then is a man who is fighting against fate. Through some malformation in his nervous system nature has been unable to warn him that he must herd with his class or the wolves will devour him.

It was this lack of mental understanding which brought about the death of the Socialist Labor party,—as it will surely bring about the extinction of any Socialist party that scabs against organized labor.

Where De Leon and the Socialist Labor party failed most miserably, no other party need think to succeed. Scabbing at the ballot box will be as fatal to those who oppose organized labor as scabbing on the "economic field" was to the Socialist Labor party.

See what happened in California in the history of the Socialist movement: A few years ago one of our candidates in San Francisco polled over four thousand votes, while at the last municipal

election, when the Union Labor party also had a ticket in the field, we polled a little under one thousand votes, and now, at the last state election, the only Socialist candidate that ran in opposition to the Union Labor party, in the district of San Francisco, receives but 616 votes. And remember, the most ardent Socialist propaganda has been kept up in San Francisco for more than twenty years. If blame then is to be attached to any for this "backsliding," on whose shoulders must it rest? Not upon the shoulders of individuals, surely, for the Golden Gate has had the use of the best blood and brains that the American revolutionary movement ever possessed. If then we cannot blame individuals, the fault must lie either with the working class or the Socialist party,—who, for some strange reason, have not "fused." But dare we condemn the instinct of the working class?—for what other class, what other individuals, what other party, but the workers themselves are better fitted to understand the needs of the working class and bring about their salvation? And, if thus we find the workers of San Francisco condemning the action of the Socialist party in that city—as has been shown by the record of votes—the conclusion must be drawn that the tactics of our party have been wrong,—for no excuse can pardon any form of opposition to the working class when it lines up to fight the capitalist class.

The Socialist party is a revolutionary body first and a political party afterwards. To-day it is unquestionably expedient to fight our battle for power at the ballot-box. But suppose that events should so form themselves that the working class would be deprived of the right to acquire power through the ballot-box? Would we not organize the battle upon other lines? And if such necessity arose who can say just what form the class struggle would then take?

The tradesunions are sometimes a better representative of a mobile revolutionary force than the Socialist party. See how they act, and learn how the logic of Socialism is born from the experience of the wage-working class:

Step by step the workers suffer, organize and struggle with the wage-masters for bread.

From start to finish it is a battle in which blow is answered by blow.

First the master reduces wages.

And the worker strikes.

Then the master blacklists.

And the worker boycotts.

Finally the master uses the injunction-judges and the troops.

And the worker turns to the ballot-box.

All this is a chain of events, each link of which must be supported by revolutionary Socialists, whose duty is to unite the

workers of the world against the private owners of the commonwealth.

It will be seen that thus far, in this presentation of arguments, no reference has been made to some remarkable declarations that have lately come from organized labor, in its initial attempts to enter politics.

In Los Angeles, California, the Union Labor party issued the following preamble, in conjunction with its municipal platform:

"We, the organized wage-workers of Los Angeles, in convention assembled, declare in favor of the principles of the American Federation of Labor and the international working-class movement.

"The struggle which is going on in all the civilized world between the oppressors and the oppressed in all countries—a struggle between the capitalist and the laborer—must result in the abolition of the wage system, for wages can never be regarded as the full equivalent for labor performed.

"We believe that the various changes in national, State and municipal laws which are needed to give the producer the full equivalent of his toil can best be secured by united action at the ballot-box.

"We pledge our candidates, if elected, to carry out the before-mentioned principles to the full extent of their power."

In El Paso, Texas, a Union Labor party prints the following preamble to its municipal platform:

"In view of the fact that the logic of events has proven conclusively the impossibility of the working class being able to secure such municipal legislation as has become necessary from the corrupt parties of capitalism, i. e., Democratic and Republican—we, therefore, call upon all members of the working class, and all good citizens generally, to affiliate with the Union Labor party, to the end that we may secure to ourselves the following legislation."

On the other hand, no doubt, it can be shown that the platforms of certain Union Labor parties are far from clear,—notably the one in San Francisco. But we ask in all fairness, when our comrades in this last mentioned place are so befogged in their understanding of the class struggle as to declare war on organized labor when it is in actual bloody battle with organized capital (for it must be remembered that just before the election of Mayor Schmitz in San Francisco the police were clubbing and shooting members of the Union Labor party who were engaged in the last great strike), can we be surprised at the lack of Socialist phraseology in that particular platform?

But isolated action in any particular city, be it impregnated with a large or small degree of scientific declaration of the needs of the working class, has no bearing upon the argument we have attempted to express. It is an abstraction that we desire to present for an answer, and may be summed up as follows:

1. Is there a class struggle between the wage-earners and the wage-master?

2. Does this class struggle divide society into two parts?

If these things be true, then, when the wage-earners fight their masters on the political field, on the economic field, or any other field—and by thus doing divide society into two antagonistic parts—on which side must the “revolutionary, class-conscious, Socialist” be found? He cannot be neutral, he cannot get off the earth, and so he must be found fighting either with the wage-workers, or, like the S. L. P., be caught scabbing with the capitalists.

John Murray, Jr.

Los Angeles, California, Dec. 10, 1902.

the California Situation.

THE Socialist party has long prided itself on "never making a compromise to placate an enemy or gain a friend." All Socialists were confident that whatever other parties might do, the Socialist party would never indulge in fusion. Even outsiders had come to believe that a compromising deal with the Socialist party was impossible. Was it strange, then, that consternation should run through the Socialist movement of the whole country, when it was learned that the Socialist party in the two largest cities of California had withdrawn from the local field in the interest of a so-called Union Labor party, a party of reactionary principles, that in two of the three counties where it had tickets was in close alliance with the capitalistic Democratic party?

The main purpose of this article is to correct any false impression that people outside of California may have concerning the attitude of the Socialist party in this State toward compromising action; and by a comparison of election returns to prove that the action of the Socialists of San Francisco and Los Angeles was not necessary nor justified as a means of winning votes for the Socialist State ticket.

The advent of the Union Labor party in California, with strength enough to elect the mayor of the largest city in the State; the apparent strong tendency of the trades-unionists to renounce all relations with both old parties; the appearance of speakers on the Union Labor party rostrum talking strongly in favor of Socialism, made the situation a puzzling one, and for a time left many good Socialists undecided as to the wisest course of action.

The matter came up for discussion in the State convention while the new State constitution was under consideration. An amendment was offered making the nomination of a Socialist ticket mandatory at all places where candidates could be had. A substitute for this amendment was introduced, allowing the Socialist party to refrain from nominating whenever "a bona fide" labor party, demanding the abolition of the wage system, and with working class nominees appeared in the field. The battle over the "amendment" and the "substitute" therefor, was waged in the State convention for eleven hours, and no one could tell with whom were the fortunes of war. The matter was finally compromised by referring it to a vote of the locals of the State.

The writer is probably as well acquainted as any man with the personnel of the Socialist party in California. And he knows that

some of the straightest and best Socialists in the State for a time favored the "substitute," who after sober second thought became radical supporters of the "amendment." Nor should we impeach the motives of those who stood for the "substitute" to the last. Doubtless the Socialist party of California, like all other parties, has its professional opportunists, always ready to bargain for the furtherance of immediate ends; but unquestionably the great majority of those who voted for the "substitute" did, what seemed to them to be for the party's ultimate good.

Now, when I announce that the "substitute" won by seven majority in the State vote, many people at a distance will declare that the Socialist party in California has gone to the "demnition bowwows," and become an unreliable, half-baked opportunist movement. Such a conclusion would be far from the truth. Already there is a strong reaction all along the line. Put the "amendment" and the "substitute" to a vote to-morrow, and the latter would be overwhelmingly defeated without a doubt. It would be defeated in San Francisco by a goodly vote. People who still justify the San Francisco action as an experiment declare it will never be repeated.

Unfortunately the argument for the "amendment" had but a limited hearing before the party's rank and file. The Socialist papers of the State, in existence prior to the vote, favored the "substitute." They presented plausible arguments in its defense and to many party papers have the authority of oracles. The party papers outside the State, not knowing the situation, did not discuss the question at all. Hence the battle must be fought over again. Next time the "amendment" will have a hearing, and there need be no doubt that the California Socialists will sustain the well-tried tactics of the Socialist movement.

Now let us consider the logic of the election returns. The advocates of the action finally taken by Los Angeles and San Francisco, contended, that "inasmuch as the Union Labor party has no State ticket, if the Socialist party does not antagonize the Union Labor party locally, it will mean a big vote for the Socialist State ticket." To see if this claim was justified, we will compare the Socialist vote of the three counties in which there were Union Labor party tickets, viz.: Alameda, Los Angeles and San Francisco. In our comparison we must take the vote cast this year for the head of the ticket, which is customarily taken to be the straight Socialist vote, and we must reckon from the vote cast for Debs and Harriman in 1900.

The defenders of San Francisco's action insist on reckoning from the big slump of 1901, when the Socialist candidate for mayor received but 955 votes, a loss of 1,061 votes from that cast for Debs and Harriman the year before. To allow them to so

reckon would be like claiming that a man who had climbed half way up a ladder and then fallen to the bottom, would be at the top as soon as he climbed back to the point from which he fell. San Francisco must reckon from the 1900 vote like the others in comparison.

Alameda County lies just across the bay from San Francisco. It contains the three cities of Oakland, Alameda and Berkeley. In this county the Union Labor party had a full county ticket, and was in close alliance with the Democratic party, getting its chief candidates therefrom; conditions similar to those of San Francisco. In this county the Socialist party nominated a full county ticket and made a square fight. It issued over 25,000 leaflets containing both the Socialist and Union Labor party platform, with an analysis and comparison. It treated the Union Labor party just as it treated the old parties.

Now the action of San Francisco had its influence upon the Socialist party in Alameda County. A few of the members of the local Oakland, to which the writer belongs, were opposed to antagonizing the Union Labor party. Local Alameda refused to circulate the leaflets named above. Hence the party in this county did not have complete unity of action.

In 1900 the vote for Debs and Harriman in Alameda County was 828, in Los Angeles 995, in San Francisco 2,016. The vote cast this year for Brower, candidate for Governor and head of the ticket, was, in Alameda County 1,009, a gain of 181 votes, or 21.86 per cent over the 1900 vote. Los Angeles cast 1,140 votes, a gain of 145, or 14.57 per cent; while San Francisco cast 1,993 votes, or 23 votes less than the vote for Debs. It is seen at once that compromise is not a prolific means of winning votes for the Socialist State ticket; that standing squarely for the Socialist party brought much better results.

In conclusion, here are some points well worth considering.

First: In the city of Alameda, where the local was careful not to antagonize the Union Labor party, and refused to circulate the Anti-Union Labor leaflet, there was a gain for the head of the Socialist State ticket of 11.8 per cent. In Oakland and Berkeley, where nearly 25,000 of said leaflets were circulated, the gain was sufficient to make a gain for the county of 21.86 per cent over the vote of 1900.

Second: In San Francisco, where great care was taken not to antagonize the Union Labor party, the vote fell short of the vote of 1900. In Los Angeles, where similar care was exercised, the gain was 14.57 per cent. In Alameda County, where a straight Socialist ticket was nominated, but where the results were slightly influenced by San Francisco's action, the gain was 21.86 per cent. But in the fifty-three other counties of the State, where there was

no compromise, and where the party was removed from the influence of compromise, the Socialist gain was great enough to overcome the backset in the three largest counties of the State, and make a gain for the whole State of 26.66 per cent over the vote of 1900. Query: Is it better for a revolutionary party to lay down or fight?

Finally, the writer will risk the following prophesy:

First: That the Socialist party of California in all succeeding campaigns, will be found standing pat for straight Socialism, with a full ticket in the field.

Second: That the Union Labor party as such will never again materialize in large proportions in this State. A party whose chief leader and oracle has assumed a half dozen political attitudes in a single year; a party that has a different platform in every county where it has a ticket; a party that denounces both old parties for their corruption and wrong principles, and then selects for its chief nominees men who have not yet cut loose from these old parties with their corruption and wrong principles; a party that professing to stand for the wage-workers, bemoans the turning down of Henry T. Gage, the Southern Pacific Railroad's candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket; a party that dare not stand for its principles in a State campaign this year for fear that defeat would discourage and destroy it, is not a party to be feared by any movement standing for grand realities.

M. W. Wilkins.

The Patriot.



THE Patriot anti-imperialist
On yonder lonely peak forlorn doth stand
With arms outstretched to God—a moralist
And teacher of the Past! His stern command
Unheeded falls upon his fellowmen;
His groans the Heavens rend—yet never touch
The souls of those he most entreats—for when
He weeps, they laugh and mock his cries!

—“Not much
Care ye for Freedom’s name when thus ye slay
Brown, Orient men to swell your dividends!
That I should live to see this shameful day!
For in a sea of blood the river ends
That started once a glorious stream! O may
These treach’rous deeds be writ upon the scroll
Of future minds as infamy! And e’er
My children’s children read them to extol—
May this fair land be blotted out! I fear
My country’s future while I love her name:
No more her stars and stripes I care to see
Upon the morning breeze! I sink with shame—
And cry unto my God on bended knee—
Yet no man heeds—nor does my God
Incline his ear to me.”

The Patriot hides his face within his hands—
And shuddering—hears the click of telegraph,
As great commercial lords give their commands
And bid him fall before the Golden Calf—
As brutal Commerce seated on her throne
This message gives by way of telephone:—

SONG OF THE TRUSTS.

In the market—on the street—
Tidings bring of price of wheat;
Price of copper—price of gold—
Price of steel and iron cold!
Price of mutton and beef
Higher soars beyond belief!
Price of corn and sugar sweet—

Price of all you want to eat!—
 Price of coal in tiny pail—
 For the poor no larger scale
 Than they carry on the arm—
 'Tis enough to keep them warm!
 From that pail our profits come—
 Let the poor pay thrice the sum!
 Up and up the prices go—
 We the Trusts will have them so!

In the war across the seas,
 Tell that Patriot on his knees
 We can shoot the fellows down
 While he prays for black and brown!
 We have made this war for gain!
 Let him go and pray for rain!
 God is ever on the side
 Of the money-bags that ride
 High upon the backs of poor
 Workingmen—you may be sure!
 This our answer to his prayers—
 Let him flout us if he dares!

Upon his feet the Patriot stands once more
 Wild-eyed and speechless. Then with haggard face
 Turned from the sight of Wall Street's open door—
 And all the horrors of that Market Place—
 A sound he hears upon the evening breeze—
 A softly whispered sigh that fills the air
 Yet scarcely stirs a leaf upon the trees—
 A human sigh of weariness and care!
 It is a sigh from factory, mill and mine
 Department store and railroads' length along,
 From laborers who stand and seek a sign
 Of better things in store to right their wrong—
 While handing back their product with a moan
 And all their children in exchange for bread!

Now rustling murmurs from the trees are blown —
 The wind has changed! Around the Patriot's head
 Soft zephyrs play, strange music doth he hear;
 From distant mountain tops hoarse voices sing
 A noble anthem until disappear
 Those sighing moans of men!
 Then slowly ring
 Those voices in a chant with words most clear :—

SONG OF LABOR.

I.

Go—bind your wounded hearts, O ye
 Who stand and weep for liberty!
 The freedom that you weeping mourn
 For us has never yet been born;
 For us no poet sings the morn
 To cheer us with his ecstasy!

This is the land of patriots who
 Have ever cherished for the few
 The vision that the many knew
 For them was but a mockery!

The sigh of Labor you have heard
 Is but an echo of the word
 That sweeps along like frightened bird
 Before the winds of destiny!

Around the world that sigh extends!
 It has no meaning till it lends
 Its broken note to higher ends
 Than plaintive songs of poverty!

A thousand Christs upon the hills
 Of Calvary to bear our ills—
 By power of their celestial wills
 And all their sweet divinity—

Could not in suffering take our place,
 Or by their sacred tears displace
 What we have given to the race—
 We are the sons of Calvary!

Go—bind your wounded hearts, O ye
 Who take a word for liberty!
 'Tis but a name! When was it known
 To make atonement if a stone
 Was offered us for daily bread?

In Orient lands, another name
 Ye give to those who build their fame
 On highway robbery! The same
 Oppressing hands have always bled

The poor at home of all they made!
Now 'cross the seas they boldly raid
Those lovely isles that long have paid
The robbers' price with gallant dead.

II.

Across the blackened ages past
We see ourselves in truth at last;
We stand and look—and are aghast—
And wonder at the mystery!

For kings we swung the battle-axe:
We paid in blood a heavier tax
Than all the knights upon our backs
With all their pomp and chivalry!

For them we fixed our arrow true:
For them we aimed—the bow we drew—
Nor reasoned why—nor asked or knew—
Our brothers in the sunlight slew—
And with their blood wrote history.

The death of yeomen as a game
Our masters thought too dear when came
The manufacturer's day and fame—
Then marched we to the factory!

We took the thread and wove the cloth;
We built machines and pledged our troth
To make the goods for South or North—
We ate but little—and our broth
Was payment for our industry.

We mined the coal—we wrought the steel—
We taught the elements to kneel
Before the swift revolving wheel—
A meager, living wage we drew!

We strapped the continent with rails
And bound together hills and dales;
We held them fast with iron nails—
We builded better than we knew!

We spanned the river with a bridge
And tunneled through the mountain ridge—

We built the old—we built the new—
 We built all things so strong and true!
 We built them not for us but you!

III.

Yet all we built we only lent!
 We never surely could have meant
 Those treasures from the firmament—
 Like Juggernauts with cruel intent—
 To crush us in our discontent
 And swell the gains of cornered stocks!

Far better to have left the rocks
 Where Nature placed them—in her box—
 Than ever to have picked her locks
 And from her quarries torn the blocks
 As monuments to human greed!

We builded for the human race!
 As Master Builders by the grace
 Of God we hold the title-deed
 That every one who runs may read!

Behold the spirit of Labor! We
 Have all things made: our destiny
 Outrunning ancient prophecy
 Shall build man's goodness to the skies!
 Behold the spirit of Labor rise!
 Behold the face of Liberty!

Slow rising from the valley's depth is seen
 A cloudy mist of strange gigantic form;
 Upon its crest a white and silvery sheen
 As tho' the sunlight and the shadowy storm
 Had met! So piercing are those glorious beams
 Of light—all conquered is the sullen gloom!
 And dazzled are the Patriot's eyes! It seems
 As if before him now distinctly loom
 The outlines of a shape that line by line
 Majestically human grows! Benign
 It stands revealed in sunlight—then divine—
 With face celestial looking out from space!
 Then falls the Patriot awed upon his face
 And cries with all his soul in ecstasy:—
 "It is the face of Liberty I see!

The face of Labor beautiful and free!
The face of Labor glorified as Art!
O Spirit of Labor! Look forgivingly
On me—I know thee now—thou art
‘The Christ that is to be!’”

Caroline Pemberton.

EDITORIAL

Trade Unions and the Socialist Party.

A combination of events has forced the question of the attitude of the Socialist party toward the trade union movement prominently to the front. Unfortunately the relation of these two expressions of the class struggle are complicated by some unfortunate historical conditions. With these, however, we do not care to deal at this time, save that we wish to protest against those who would explain the present conditions entirely by the somewhat trite saying that the "pendulum is only swinging to the other extreme."

The situation which confronts us at the present time in several portions of the country is about as follows: Under the combined influence of economic development and Socialist teachings the trade unions have simultaneously become of great strength and permeated with Socialist thought, the latter generally of a rather indefinite and confused character. The cry that labor must go into politics is taken up. A "union labor" ticket is placed in the field. The Socialist party is at once confronted with the alternative as to whether it shall antagonize this "union labor" party, or whether it shall withdraw from the field.

Various comrades have by a process of what one might call "short-circuited" reasoning (to borrow a phrase from the vocabulary of the electrician) jumped to the conclusion that the Socialist party is at once compelled to make terms with the Union Labor party, even at the cost of the complete sacrifice of the Socialist party itself. Their reasoning generally runs something as follows:

The philosophy of Socialism demands that the powers of government be captured by a working class party. Here is a working class party. It can capture the powers of government. That would be Socialism; let us support it. Unfortunately there are several breaks in this chain of reasoning. The weakest point, of course, lies in the claim that any party bearing the name of labor, and largely made up of organized workers, is necessarily a working class party. In the sense in which Socialists use the word, a working class party means, not so much a party made up of working men as one based upon certain definite principles in accord with the interests of the working class. If the working class membership is the only condition, there has scarcely been a party in existence that could not fill the bill. Hence an argument based upon the fact that these parties are made up of laboring men, whether organized or unorganized, is utterly beside the point and has nothing whatever to do with the matter in question.

The fact that it is even offered by a Socialist shows a badly confused state of mind.

The only thing which determines whether a party is a working class party in the sense in which the Socialists use the word is whether it stands upon a platform expressing the mission of the working class as the future ruling class, and whether the attitude and spirit of the new party indicates that it is inspired by a consciousness of the functions of the working class as the collective owners of the instruments of production and distribution and the rulers of the social organism.

Judging by these standards not one of the so-called "union labor" parties has any right whatever to be called a working class party. Their principles are much more in accord with small capitalist interests than with those of the working class.

It is useless to point out that such parties are distinguished from the Republican and Democratic parties by the fact that the initiative comes from members of the working class themselves. This argument shows a very slight understanding of social psychology. To the superficial observer the initiative may appear to come from organized labor, but as a matter of fact it comes from the thoughts, printed matter and miscellaneous ideas that have been circulated by divisions of the capitalist class through the organs by which they control public opinion.

An example of this method of reasoning is given in the article by Comrade Murray in this issue, where he says: "But dare we condemn the instincts of the working class, for what other class, what other individuals but the workers themselves are better fitted to understand the needs of the working class and to bring about their salvation?" But that is just what the Socialist party always has and always must do until it has succeeded in making the working class thoroughly class-conscious. The "instinct of the working class," if it means anything means the ideas which have been communicated to the working class by the capitalist, and action in accordance therewith is almost always against the working class, except when it comes in the line of direct reaction from physical discomfort, as is the case with the economic side of the trade union movement.

Furthermore, even when the Union Labor party stands upon a professedly Socialist platform, there is no reason why the Socialist party should leave the field, or should renounce its name and organization.

The Socialist party is a national and international organization like the capitalism which it combats. The Union Labor party is almost invariably a municipal party, never more than a State party. The capture either of a municipality or a State would not be any very serious blow to capitalism while the more general powers of government remained untouched. Furthermore, such a capture at the expense of the disorganization of a wider party movement would be a dearly gained victory even if it were gained along Socialist lines.

In all this we see an exaggeration of the importance of the organized labor movement. There is not the slightest question but what the Socialist party is and always must be on the side of organized labor when the latter is waging a class struggle, but it is equally on the side of such workers as the toilers in the sweat shops and the child slaves in the factory, the agricultural laborers and a mass of others

far outnumbering those within the unions, for whom there is practically no possibility of organization.

So far from the Socialist party being but a side show to the trade union movement, as some of the members seem to think, the Socialist party, the Socialist movement and the Socialist philosophy are all infinitely greater than any trade union movement. There is not a point of the trade union movement which is not swallowed up and enlarged by the Socialist movement, and to let "the tail wag the dog" in the manner in which some comrades advocate would be a most ridiculous conclusion.

Even as a vote getter fusion is not a success. Comrade Wilkins in this number shows very conclusively the truth of this for California. Missouri was the only other State in which there was a tendency to subordinate Socialism to trade unionism, and this is the only State so far as we are aware where the Socialist vote has absolutely fallen off. This decline comes in spite of the fact that the national headquarters is located in that State, with all the advertising and assistance that this implies.

And apropos of this reference to national headquarters, it seems to us that in regard to other comrades this question of fusion is one on which they might act as their judgment might dictate, unhampered by any restriction. But when men who have been elected to take charge of the national destinies of the Socialist party deliberately send out letters indorsing the absorption of that party by other organizations, it indicates that the senders have a very low idea of personal honor in relation to their official position. If they had become firmly convinced that the time was now here for the Socialist party to take a back seat for some other organization, whether that organization be a trade union, or an independent labor party, they should first surrender the machinery of the Socialist party which has been entrusted to them.

To return to the argument. Comrade Hoehn, in his article in this issue, says he does not "recognize any such thing as a pure and simple or Socialist trade union." If he does not recognize them that is his fault, for they exist. While it is true, as he says, that resolutions by central organizations do not make Socialists, and indeed we are glad that there seems to be at least one member of the National Committee who recognizes this fact, as their actions would have given a contrary impression, yet there is a great difference from the point of view of the Socialist party between a union whose machinery of administration is used for the furtherance of Socialism and one in which that machinery is used to fight Socialism in the bitterest possible manner.

In conclusion it must be borne in mind that the Socialist party is a party of the working class and not of any fraction thereof. That today, if we are going to give up that class character which rests upon principle, it would be much less of a surrender to indorse the Allied party, which is made up equally of the laboring class and which has much more of a Socialist platform than has the Trade Union parties of some cities. But to do either would be a complete surrender of our position. The Socialist party can have nothing in common with any organization which supports and cringes before a man like Eugene Schmitz, immediately after he has come from the defense of Tam-

many Hall, and who has given no reason whatever to believe that he has accepted any of the principles of the working class movement.

We are not of those who think that this fusion movement is of such tremendous importance. Like the measles and the whooping cough in human beings, it is a disease which seems to affect the Socialist party in every country at certain stages of its development. We can only hope that it will not become epidemic in this country and that the acute stage may be quickly passed, because while it lasts there will be little effective Socialist work. The only unfortunate thing about it is that it has infected our national headquarters, which would seem to indicate that it was about time to make a selection of a more healthful locality for this body.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Germany.

One of the survivals of feudal ignorance in the penal code of the German empire is paragraph 175, making so-called "unnatural vices" a criminal offense. The Socialists have often pointed out that modern science shows such abnormalities to be pathological phenomena which belong to the field of the physician, not of the criminal judge. Capitalist morality, however, has never permitted the repeal of paragraph 175, and countless unfortunates have thus been under the constant fear of criminal persecution for practices that were the result of abnormal physical conditions.

It was with a view of protecting these victims of physical and social laws that "Vorwaerts," after a careful investigation of the actual facts, disclosed the sensational secret that Alfred Krupp, the "cannon king" of Essen, was one of these unfortunates and had selected the island of Capri, off Naples, for a refuge. The Italian criminal code, the only one in Europe without a paragraph 175, made this island the favorite haunt of such people, and it was only when public opinion became aroused that the Italian government gave Krupp a hint to leave the country. He died suddenly in his villa "Huegel" in Essen, shortly after Vorwaerts had made these disclosures, and it is still a matter of doubt whether he died of apoplexy or committed suicide.

In making this disclosure, the "Vorwaerts" plainly stated its reasons and again urged the repeal of paragraph 175. Nevertheless, the issue was confiscated by the police and a criminal prosecution against the responsible editor begun. The majority of the capitalist press at once proceeded to incite the public against what they termed the "vile calumnies" of the Socialist organ. Even the tragic death of the unfortunate man did not prevent the political press from making capital out of the incident for their grasping schemes. They even went so far as to charge the "Vorwaerts" with causing the death of the cannon king. The official autopsy, however, declared the death of Krupp to be due to brain paralysis, in consequence of a chronic enlargement of the vital organs.

Nevertheless, the capitalist press continued its scurrilous attacks and insinuations. Only exceptionally independent papers remained calm and discussed the case on its merits. Said the liberal "Munchener Neuesten Nachrichten": The process against the "Vorwaerts" is causing a great stir, as well on account of the personality of the man whom the Socialist organ has thus charged, as on account of the sudden and

energetic interference of the state prosecutor. The latter has hardly ever acted so quickly before, when a private individual was concerned. * * * It is pertinent to ask whether the state would also lend its aid to any less known and less wealthy private individual, against any paper that would publish any insulting or incriminating charges about him. We believe that in the case of any Mr. X or Y the public prosecution would remember paragraph 416 of the criminal rules, which says: "A public prosecution on account of the criminal offenses named in paragraph 414 is instituted only then when the public interest demands it." But we ask in vain, What public interest was affected in the case of Krupp? Public morality? The article of "Vorwaerts" was written very carefully and certainly did not dwell on those unpleasant matters any more, in reality even less, than is done in many reports of horrible crimes or police reports dealing with immoral offenses. "Vorwaerts" could not dare to give any sensational or "piquant" tinge to its disclosures for tactical reasons. For it pursued by its statements the humane purpose of contributing to the repeal of paragraph 175 of the penal code, which prosecutes in Germany such practices as Krupp is said to have indulged in on the island of Capri.

Another public statement remarkable for its objectivity is that of the "Scientific Humanitarian Committee of Berlin and Leipsic," which declares:

"In connection with the case of Krupp the opinion has frequently been voiced that it is a grave insult to charge any one with being addicted to homo-sexual practices. Without entering into the question whether Alfred Krupp was homo-sexual or not, the 'Scientific Humanitarian Committee' protests energetically against this opinion in the name of more than 1,500 homo-sexuals whose character and moral conduct are as honorable as that of sexually normal persons. The committee demands that humanitarian consequences be drawn from scientific investigations, in order that the fatal errors which have made social victims of constitutionally homo-sexual persons may at last be avoided."

The German emperor was present at the burial of Krupp and made an impassioned speech in which he charged the Socialists with blemishing the reputation of honorable men and ended with inciting the working men of the Krupp works to class hatred against their class-conscious fellow workers. The "Vorwaerts" took the emperor to task for this speech, declaring that he was anticipating the prosecuting attorney without being acquainted with the facts in the case.

As the capitalist press continued to flow over with praises of the energy, business talent, and magnanimity of the deceased, "Vorwaerts" made a number of disclosures about the "generosity" of Krupp, among which the following deserve special attention:

The firm of Krupp had built several thousand houses for its workmen, which they rented at a moderate price. This gave them not only a means of keeping the employes under constant supervision, but also the advantage of depriving them of their shelter on a moment's notice, whenever they showed a disposition to rebel against the feudal regulations of the establishment.

The firm maintained a number of stores which sold their goods to

the employes at current prices and returned a certain discount to them at the end of each year. This discount, amounting to from 6 to 7 per cent, was computed on the first of July and paid in December. But this discount was by no means paid to all of the employes. Those who left the employ of the firm voluntarily or involuntarily lost this discount completely. Even in the most favorable case, when a man left after receiving the discount in December, he still lost the whole discount from July to December. In other words, these company stores were only another means of exerting a material pressure on the employes.

The crowning "benevolent institution" of Krupps was the employes' pension fund. It was indeed highly benevolent—to the company. It was compulsory for every employe to contribute to this fund. The admission fee amounted to one and a half times the daily wage, on an average to six mark. The current contributions amounted to 2½ per cent of the wages, making a total contribution of about 35 mark per year for workmen. In order to be in line for the benefits of this fund a man had to be in the service of the company for twenty years without interruption, and his complete invalidity had to be certified by two physicians. In computing the time of service, the period of employment before the eighteenth year is not counted, but contributions for this time must be paid just the same. Spells of sickness longer than thirteen weeks and employment as a partial invalid are not taken into consideration. All who leave or are discharged before the twentieth year do not receive a cent. And an enormous number of employes left every year. Any attempt to have an independent political opinion or to belong to a trade union was at once punished by discharge. The total so discharged amounted to seven or eight thousand a year. Under these circumstances, an enormous surplus flowed back to the company, which amounted to almost half of the contributions paid by the employes. With a total membership of 25,882 and a total contribution of 2,248,000 mark, the surplus amounted to about 1,167,000 mark. "Indeed," says "Vorwaerts," "a more refined, one is tempted to say, a better swindling system for the exploitation of workmen under the guise of benevolence could not be devised." It is plain that the employes did not like to lose the great sums which they had contributed, and so they became meek and soulless subjects of the feudal despotism of the Krupp firm. This system finally became so oppressive that five protest meetings were held by the employes during last year, in which resolutions were passed demanding legal protection against the benevolent "pension fund." A telegram sent by one of these meetings to Krupp in Capri was never answered. Such was the benevolence of the Krupp firm.

"The capitalist press," says "Vorwaerts," "are celebrating Krupp as one of the great men of the world. But it is only their bad conscience that causes this wild disturbance. For no case is so well calculated to tear the mask of divine superiority from the faces of the exploiters as that of the late Krupp, whose position in his giant establishment had less meaning than that of the least laborer. * * * It is plain that the exploiters are not pleased to have it demonstrated how absolutely superfluous Krupp was in the organization of that enormous

undertaking. And it is the irony of it all that just those papers who are praising him most have spread the news that the income of the firm increased most after he had withdrawn from active management."

The attitude of the Socialists in this question, compared to the mean and low standard of the capitalist press comment, is so superior that even so conservative a man as Professor Mommsen, the famous historian, has declared "the only element in present society worthy of esteem are the Socialists."

The anarchist methods of the agrarians and clericals in the Reichstag have done much to open the eyes of the German people to the true condition of affairs. Indeed, the recent proceedings in the Reichstag mark a new epoch in the history of that country and will certainly produce radical changes in the sentiment of the majority of the intelligent voters of that country. And the oppressors see the danger.

"Right Honorable Sir!

"The Social Democracy received in the Reichstag's elections votes: 1881, 312,000; 1884, 550,000; 1887, 763,000; 1890, 1,427,000; 1893, 1,787,000; 1898, 2,212,000, and would probably poll two and one-half millions votes in the coming Reichstag's election if its growth only remained the same. But the Socialists expect to poll 3,000,000 votes, at least, so their leaders have declared at the national convention in Munich. The Socialist party will then contest the second ballot in still more election precincts than in 1898 and expects to win out, in consequence of the greater intensity of industrial, denominational and national antagonisms between the non-Socialist parties, even in those precincts where such a possibility was not given before.

"Unfortunately, we must, therefore, anticipate a considerable increase of Socialist representatives in the Reichstag, who now number 58, and thus a greater influence of this party, which is already strongly felt in the Reichstag. What a danger it would be to have the Socialists assume a dominating position in the Reichstag needs no explanation.

"To forestall this danger with all our strength is a duty which is dictated by national, social, industrial and ethical motives."

This is the introduction of a secret circular signed by the leaders of the feudal nobility and industrial plutocracy, and appealing to the capitalist elements for contributions to a fund of 300,000 mark for the purpose of publishing and distributing eight million pamphlets against Socialism. The "Vorwaerts" publishes the circular in full with all the signatures and invites the comrades to contribute a million mark for the purpose of publishing and distributing answers to the capitalist pamphlets, which "Vorwaerts" has also secured.

The campaign documents of the exploiters and their methods in the Reichstag are eloquent proofs how fearlessly and successfully the Socialists have defended the interests of the working class. And this defense of the oppressed finally became so unbearable to the exploiters that they had to exclaim with Odilon Barrot, "La legalite nous tue," and the only way to avoid defeat was to make parliamentaryism a farce. All the attempts of the Socialists to amend the proposed "usury tariff" in the interest of the working class were voted down, and when the proceedings threatened to become endless and make the passage

of the bill during the present term impossible, the majority simply changed the order of business and decided to adopt the whole tariff en bloc.

The Socialists were not slow to impress on the majority the consequences of such a step. "Never have I so much regretted as to-day," said Comrade Singer, "that neither the constitution nor the order of business contain a clause excluding all those members of the House from participation in the vote whose material interests are concerned in any bill under consideration. Without such a material interest, this new move would never have been made. It is the result of the personal interest which the gentlemen lawmakers have in the passing of the tariff bill. The whole country is unanimous in recognizing that such proceedings do not inspire any confidence in the majority. You charge us with aiming at the downfall of the existing order, but it is you who are making a revolution, a reactionary revolution for the purpose of trampling on the rights of the people, of making the rich still richer and the poor still poorer. This last motion completely tears the mask from the faces of the majority."

And Comrade Bebel thundered this warning into their ears: "It cannot be disputed that a revolution will again become necessary if the oppressed masses are deprived of every vestige of right, if disfranchisement, laws of exception and suppression of all opposition again become a fact. No nation will stand that. But this revolution will be made by a mass of men whose education and organization have never been equaled in history. We are sincerely willing to avoid such a disaster. For this reason alone do we enter this parliament and endeavor to make laws together with you that will prevent the oppression of the masses and ameliorate the condition of the working class as much as possible."

The Reichstag, already in a state of intense excitement, seemed temporarily on the verge of a riot when one of the speakers of the Center party, Mr. Bachem, intimated that the Socialists had made disparaging remarks about the radical allies, which alone assisted them in the opposition against the majority. The Socialists insisted that Bachem should openly declare what they had said, but he refused to prove the truth of his assertion. The excitement and the noise became so great that the presiding officer of the Reichstag had to suspend the session for half an hour.

This is the first time in the history of the German Reichstag that such a step became necessary, and the capitalist press is vociferously condemning the Socialists and blaming them for this "disgraceful incident." Disgraceful for whom?

Among the main agitators against the Socialists is now the German emperor. Perhaps he thinks it is time for him to throw his own weight in the scale and use his fancied influence on the German workmen to stem the tide of the threatening revolution. How great, or how little, his influence actually is will be seen at the next Reichstag's elections. The Kaiser party, which is to wrest the victory from the hands of the class-conscious workmen, will need nothing so much as votes. And recent press dispatches state, besides, that the emperor has decided to introduce a bill for the disfranchisement of the majority

of workingmen. Will not that disfranchise the voters of the Kaiser party also? Even the young crown prince has joined his father in the campaign against the "vaterlandslose Rotte," and has had the pleasure of receiving the tribute of the Socialists and Radicals in the form of the advice to go back to school and learn something before he opens his mouth.

Numerous meetings all over the country are violently protesting against the emperor's attitude, and the coming campaign bids fair to throw the land into a state of white heat. Of all the political parties, the Socialist party alone can view the coming struggle with equanimity. The capitalist press is forced to acknowledge that the Socialists are using the illegal proceedings of the Reichstag majority as a successful means of agitation. The last municipal elections in Stettin and Fuerth have again brought victories to the Socialists. Five of the eight Socialist candidates were elected in Stettin, and six of the united Socialists and Democrats in Fuerth, while the Socialist vote in Nuernberg drove all the capitalist parties together into one cartel. Wonder what Comrade Bernstein thinks now about the decreasing intensity of class antagonisms? The last scenes in the Reichstag should serve as very impressive lessons to him and to all who believe that the transition from capitalism to Socialism will be accomplished without an intensification of the class struggle.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

If the commission investigating the late coal strike does nothing more than to expose the bare-faced thievery and cannibalism of the coal barons it will have served a good purpose, and Clarence Darrow and Henry D. Lloyd deserve great credit for pushing the sanctimonious scoundrels to the wall.

James Gallagher, who worked in the Markle mines for thirty years, testified that the wages were so low that he was always indebted to the company and that in seventeen years he only once received money in wages, and that was \$50. He further testified that he had to deal at the company store, the only place where the miners could get credit, and that the prices were from 10 to 20 per cent higher than in other places. He said he has made large wages and wiped out his debt, but the company would then give him such bad workings that he would immediately get into debt again. He was evicted from his house and refused work, but he did not know why employment was not given him. Gallagher didn't experience wage-slavery, mind you. He didn't receive wages. He was like an old horse or a felon a century ago—he was on a tread-mill, treading out dollars for the Markles, big and little. But these old fat plutes had other victims. A 12-year-old breaker boy testified that he was working at the Markle mines to pay off the debt incurred by his father, who was killed in the mines eighteen months ago. He received no pay, but was given due bills, showing how much his mother owed the company. The due bills also showed that the debt his mother was incurring, such as house rent, etc., was growing more than he could reduce it, as he was only getting 4 cents an hour. The little boy was making no progress on the tread-mill; it was slipping backward under his feet, and the Markles stood around and grinned and feasted and went to the opera and to the seashore, and old age and youth, extremes, and others like them plodded and drudged and coined their sweat and blood into dollars that a few parasites, a few social lice, might roll in luxurious ease and comfort. Two other interesting witnesses were John McGlone, a weigh master of the Pennsylvania Coal Company, and Edward Ridgway, a docking boss in the employ of the Temple Iron & Coal Company. Mr. McGlone presented statistics to show that his company secured over seventeen thousand tons of coal during the past year for which the miners did not receive one cent. The coal was "docked"—in plain language, STOLEN! Mr. Ridgway stated that he had orders from his company to dock the miners 5 per cent of all the coal produced, no matter whether it contained slate or not, and besides this the miners were

compelled to fill cars eighteen inches higher than the law allowed. These illustrations may be exceptional cases of capitalistic exploitation, but it is difficult to determine in what degree, and they show plainly enough what is possible under private ownership of land and capital. No doubt such infamies are practiced in many other lines of industry, and they show conclusively that the capitalists are the most dangerous anarchists in the country. The Socialist ballot is the only weapon with which to knock the rapacious greed out of these modern cannibals.

No doubt the daily press will be pretty busy this month chronicling the harvest of the trust magnates, and the coupon-clippers will be loud in their praise of the record-breaking era of prosperity that was marked by the year 1902. The Wall street organs, as though to reassure the dear people that the combines will not squeeze the life out of them altogether, but are becoming quite tame, send out the glad tidings that there was not as much capitalization as last year. They do not add that fewer trusts were organized for the reason that nearly everything in sight worth cornering has been combined. The play now is largely to amalgamate the trusts and draw in independent competitors. Thus the United States Steel Corporation is swallowing concerns so rapidly that it is fattening to the two billion dollar mark. The two big plants of the Union Steel Company have been absorbed for \$45,000,000. They are composed of wire, rod, nail and other works, and when fully completed will have five modern blast furnaces and twenty-five open-hearth furnaces, with a capacity of 7,500 kegs of nails daily, and new and modern tube mills, bar mills, tin mills, sheet mills, plate mills, etc. They also control 5,000 acres of coking coal land, 6,200 acres of fuel coal, railways, steel cars, two lake steamers, 40,000,000 tons of ore in the Mesaba range, limestone and other valuable properties. Besides playing this master stroke in securing control of the iron and steel industry, Morgan is now reaching into Kentucky to obtain possession of the soft coal mines of that State and add to his properties in Pennsylvania, Ohio and other States. Then the railways have nearly all been grouped in five great systems, at the head of which is that controlled by Morgan dominating over 50,000 miles, not counting his new Southern merger that will include another 10,000 miles when completed. Morgan's transatlantic ship combine is now experiencing smooth sailing, while some of the independent lines are seriously considering the question of allowing themselves to be swallowed rather than bankrupted. So the new year is starting out gloriously with nearly everything trustified and coming under the control of a few hundred captains of industry, so even a blind man can see there is great prosperity—for the captains. And there is more to come.

The National Association of Manufacturers has issued a "declaration of war." Its President Parry, whose headquarters are in Indianapolis, has issued two secret circulars to the large employers of the country urging them to join his organization and extend all possible assistance to prevent the passage of the anti-injunction and eight-hour bills before Congress and to conduct their business without the aid or consent of any other body. These circulars were latterly followed by a scathing arraignment of organized labor and its officials, which was scattered broadcast by the capitalistic press, in which Mr. Parry de-

clares that the eight-hour day is wholly impractical and is "the result of Socialistic agitation in Europe;" that it is instigated by self-appointed leaders bent on creating mischief, and that those same individuals have attacked the church and the militia and want to overthrow all law, but "the employers of this country do not propose that such an anarchistic element shall ever have charge of the destinies of the United States." This is the same Parry who, when the manufacturers were being squeezed by coal barons during the miners' strike, rushed off to Buffalo and Philadelphia and had a conference with Mitchell in which he attempted to coax the strikers to return to work to save the employers from ruin. His newspaper interviewers announced that the interests of labor and capital are identical, and he was deeply pained to learn that labor was injuring industry. There is no denying the fact that the N. A. of M. is growing in power and making itself felt, and the organized workers have got to make up their minds to meet this combination of employers who seem to be determined on smashing unions. It is worthy of notice that the treasurer of this new association is a Detroit clothing manufacturer who has long posed as a philanthropist and "workingman's friend," and has received considerable free advertising in the labor press as a person worthy of patronage.

Just as though the New Orleans convention of the A. F. of L. had never been held and determined the jurisdiction controversy between the seamen on the one side and the cooks and waiters on the other, the former held their convention in Milwaukee during the past month, and decided to charter the Buffalo cooks employed on lake vessels. In the Federation convention it was declared that a cook is a cook, and is not expected to run aloft and wave a beefsteak as a signal, because the cook comes ashore during the winter months to tickle the palates of landlubbers, and for that reason ought to be under control of the hotel and restaurant employes' organization, so that a standard rate of wages and hours can be enforced. The action of the seamen is a clear violation of the mandates of the trade unions in convention assembled. sets a bad example to other organizations that are involved in jurisdiction squabbles, and comes with bad grace from a body whose representatives have constantly posed as being the par excellence of trade unionism and the embodiment of loyalty to the Federation. I might mention that Mr. Andrew Furuseth is the spokesman of the seamen in Federation conventions, as well as one of the floor leaders of the administration, and for a number of years he has been stationed at Washington as the A. F. of L.'s representative to secure the passage of bills introduced in behalf of the organized workers. Mr. Furuseth leans so far backward in his conservatism that he is actually reactionary, and therefore it is not surprising that he has deliberately jumped, or fell, overboard. He is an authority on maritime laws, the edicts of the Russian Czar and Sultan of Turkey, and knows all about ancient and medieval history, but his notions about industrial and political solidarity of the working class are peculiar, to say the least. Of course, the hotel and restaurant employes will fight the sea cooks and their sons and other relatives when they land, and it remains to be seen who will triumph. But the point that a good many trade unionists will watch closely is whether the seamen will receive the same

drastic treatment that was meted out to the brewers and amalgamated engineers, which are radical and not reactionary organizations.

President Gompers has sent out a call to the unions to renew their agitation in favor of the eight-hour bill and to demand of Senators from their States that they vote for it. But dispatches from Washington say there is little hope for the passage of the eight-hour bill or any other labor measure during the present session of Congress. A number of Senators have declared openly that the eight-hour bill is "dangerous" and that they intend to fight it if it comes on the floor. Senator Proctor, of the capitalistic and rock-ribbed Republican State of Vermont, declares that he will make a speech against the bill every day until the close of the session if necessary, and several dyed-in-the-wool Democrats from the South have expressed similar sentiments, while the statesmen on the fence from close States applaud them liberally in the hope that they won't drop into a hole. The opponents of the proposed law say it would work great hardship on American manufacturers, and point to the "pernicious effects" of the eight-hour movement in Great Britain, whose capitalists are losing in the scramble for the world's markets—probably because American labor works longer and harder, and therefore proportionately cheaper than the Englishman. The capitalists are maneuvering shrewdly, and they lay great stress upon the alleged fact that this is not a political question, but "a plain business proposition," you understand, and ought to be dealt with from a non-partisan standpoint. The Senators look wise and say amen, and the Southern Democrat declares solemnly with the Northern Republican that nothing must be done to cripple our industries, and endanger our free institutions and soil the flag. No; they, as great American patriots, will rise above party lines and consider this matter from the broad standpoint of the best interests of "all the people," and, since "all the people" are not as yet working but eight hours per day, why enact special legislation for a class? It is doubtful, however, whether the eight-hour bill will even come to a vote. There are so many tricks that can be worked, besides keeping the bill in a committee's pigeon-hole, that it is next to useless to expect a discussion on its merits. Capitalism will not even make that concession. It controls labor's vote and doesn't have to yield anything.

BOOK REVIEWS

Social Problems of the Farmer. Publication of the Michigan Political Science Association. Paper, 159 pp., \$1.

This is a compilation of the papers read at a joint meeting of the Michigan Political Science Association and the Michigan Farmers' Institutes. It is significant first as showing the growth of interest in rural sociology, and, second, for the large amount of really good material it contains for the student of such problems. Although some of the papers are decidedly academic and repeat generalizations based on popular truisms, yet on the whole it is all that could have been expected from what is practically the first attempt in this field. Some idea of the attitude taken by one of the speakers is furnished by the remark of J. L. Synder in the opening paper on "The Economic Value of Industrial Education" that "we have outstripped other countries with cheaper labor because we had a better supply of intellectual labor." He will not be quite so frank in appealing to capitalist slave-buying instincts in the future when those who listen to him come to be able to understand the real import of such statements. Henry C. Adams in "Higher Education and the People" gathers together much valuable information concerning the benefits of scientific research, but neglects to notice that the majority of these benefits have been monopolized by the ruling class. Charles H. Cooley contributes some statistical information in regard to specific localities in Michigan concerning "The Decrease of Rural Population," but when he comes to causes he could have found all that he says and many times as much more in any one of half a dozen Socialist writers of the last fifty years. The same sort of criticism might be made of all the papers. They are the best things that have yet been gathered together in English on the study of various rural problems, but all of them leave one with the feeling that the authors are themselves by no means sure of their positions, save in one or two instances where ignorance has grown arrogant.

Resist Not Evil. Clarence S. Darrow. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 179 pp., 75 cents.

This is a work that is bound to challenge attention whatever may be thought of its logic. The very strength of the language and beauty of the literary style entitle it to a place among the really great books of the year.

The thesis of the book is that forcible restraint will not abolish evil or lessen its effects. Taking as "the fundamental principle that the

conduct which makes for life is wise and right" he proceeds to show that authority and compulsion is never wise nor right. No one has set forth more clearly and emphatically the Socialist position in regard to the class nature of present governments. "Civil governments, like military governments, are instituted and controlled by the ruling class. Their purpose is to keep the earth and its resources in the hand of those who directly or indirectly have taken it for themselves." It is for this purpose that armies and navies are maintained. "In reality the prime reason for all the armies of the world is that soldiers and militia may turn their guns upon their unfortunate countrymen when the owners of the earth shall speak the word. And these unfortunate countrymen are the outcast and despised, the meek and lowly ones of the world, the men whose ceaseless toil and unpaid efforts have built the forts and molded the cannon and sustained the soldiers that are used to shoot them down. * * * The purpose of guns and armies is to furnish the few an easy and sure way to control the mass. Neither are these armies made of the ruling class. The officers, it is true, are generally taken from the favored ones, but the regular soldier is the man too poor and abandoned to find his place in any other of the walks of life. He is only fit to be an executioner of his fellow man. * * * That this is the real purpose of standing armies and warlike equipments is plain to all who have eyes to see. More and more the rulers have learned to build their barracks and mass their troops, not on the borders of their land but convenient to great cities, in the midst of districts thickly populated by working men. * * * These soldiers are moved from place to place, are massed at time of need, not in accordance with the petition of the citizens from whose ranks the soldiers come, but in response to the request of the ruling class.

But it is in the treatment of crime and punishment that we find the strongest portion of the book. Here the position of Ferri and the Socialist school of criminologists, that crime is an economic phenomena, are pushed to their logical conclusion. The theory which lies at the base of all our present class-made criminal laws, that the criminal is inherently bad, is attacked and refuted at every point. The utter futility of legal punishment to check the acts at which it is aimed is demonstrated beyond dispute. Here again the class nature of criminal legislation appears. "Nearly our whole criminal code is made up of what may be called property crimes, or crimes against property, if they may be so called. * * * Nothing could more completely show the inambuggery, knavery and the absolute hypocrisy of all punishment by the state than the patent facts with reference to these crimes. From first to last these inmates of jail and penitentiary, these suffering outcast men are utterly without property and have ever been. In the penal institutions of the world are confined a motley throng charged with committing assaults upon property, and yet this whole mass of despised and outcast humanity have ever been the propertyless class, have never had aught whereon to lay their heads. But where is all the property that has been the subject of these dire assaults? No matter where you turn your eyes in the world, the whole property is in the hands of a chosen few, and the so-called owners of all this wealth created by the labor of man and the bounty of nature—these so-called

owners have committed no crime against property. The statement of the fact is sufficient to show the inequality of the whole system under which the fruits of the earth are kept in the possession of the few. These despised and outcast ones have violated no law of justice or conscience, have committed no unrighteous assault on property. The plain fact that will one day stand clearly forth to explain the whole brutal code which is used to imprison and enslave—the plain reason and object of these laws—is the fact that the rulers who have forcibly seized the earth have made certain rules and regulations to keep possession of the treasures of the world, and when the disinherited have reached out to obtain the means of life, they have been met with these arbitrary rules and lodged in jail.”

“Nearly every crime could be wiped away in one generation by giving the criminal a chance. The life of a burglar, a thief, of a prostitute, is not a bed of roses. Men and women are only driven to these lives after other means have failed. Theirs are not the simple, natural lives of children, nor of the childhood of the world; but men and women can learn these professions or be bred to them. After other resources are exhausted they will be chosen for the simple reason that life is sweet.”

When we come to look for the positive side we find that much is lacking. There is keen analysis of existing conditions and merciless denunciation of present evils, but there is little in the way of any positive method of action. While class rule is clearly seen, there is more of a tendency to appeal to these rulers than to call upon the oppressed to act upon their own initiative. Although the utilitarian basis of ethics is definitely adopted at the beginning, and the idea of innate evil on the side of the criminal is mercilessly ridiculed and denounced, we hear him saying “that the real motive that causes the punishment of crime is malice and hatred and nothing else.” There is almost a complete lack of the historical point of view. Almost the only exception to this being in the discussion of the origin of human slavery: “In its more primitive stages slavery was enforced by the ownership of the man. In its later and more refined stages it is carried on by the ownership of the things from which man must live. All life comes primarily from the earth, and without access to this great first source of being, man must die. Passing from the ownership of individuals, rulers have found it more certain and easier to own the earth, for to own the earth is to fix the terms on which, all must live. More and more does the master seek to control access to land, to coal, to timber, to iron, to water—these prime requisites to life. More and more certainly, as time and civilization move on, do these prime necessities pass to the few. Every new engine of production makes it easier for the few to reduce the earth to their possession. * * * From the private ownership of men, the rulers have passed to the private ownership of the earth and the control of the land. The rulers no longer have the right to buy and sell the man, to send him here and there to suit their will. They simply have the power to dictate the terms upon which he can stand upon the earth. With the mines, the forests, the oil, the harbors, the railroads, and the really valuable productive land in the rulers’ hands, the dominance and power of man over his fellows is

absolute and complete. It is not necessary to show that it is the ruling class who own the earth—the owners of the earth must be the ruling class.”

On the question of what we are to do about all this little is said. There is a hint here and there that the political authoritarian state may not be the only form of collective action, but on the whole it is one of the works that is destined to clear the way for constructive action. As such it has few equals in the English language.

William Morris, Poet, Craftsman, Socialist. By Elizabeth Luther Cary. G. P. Putman's Sons. Cloth, gold stamping, 296 pp.; price \$3.50.

As the years pass by and the things for which he stood come to occupy a greater and greater place in the life of the world, the figure of William Morris grows larger and larger and attracts more and more the attention of critics. The present volume is one which all admirers of the man or his work will value. In binding, typography and general mechanical make-up it is all that could be expected in this commercial age. The illustrations, giving portraits of Morris, Rossetti, Burne-Jones, and the designs for wall paper, furniture, carpets, etc., designed by Morris, are particularly worthy of attention.

The boyhood of Morris was spent in the neighborhood of Epping Forest, in the County of Essex. “The County of Essex was well adapted to feed the prodigious appetite for antiquities. Its churches, in numbers of which Norman masonry is to be found, its ancient brasses, and its tapestry-hung houses, all stimulated his inborn love of the Middle Ages and started him fairly on that path which he followed deviously as long as he lived.”

“At an early age, when Scott was scouring his native heath in search of Border ballads and antiquities, this almost equally precocious boy was collecting rubbings from ancient inscriptions, and picturing to himself, as he wandered about the region of his home on foot or on horseback, the lovely face of England as it looked in the thirteenth or fourteenth century.” Nevertheless it is doubtful if Morris really was so much a product of the middle ages as the writer would have us believe.

He had really seen that a revival of those times was impossible. Numerous passages in his work could be quoted to show that he is not deserving of the epithet of reactionary that is so frequently thrown at him.

His life at Oxford with Burne Jones is sketched at considerable length. Here he was one of the editors of the “Oxford and Cambridge Magazine,” and finally left college with the determination to become an architect. Falling in with Rossetti he spent some time in the study of the technical side of painting, and then followed the construction and decoration of the famous “Red House.” Out of this grew the famous firm of decorators of which Morris was the head and which was destined to revolutionize the art ideas of two continents.

In this direction one can but marvel at the remarkable amount of work which he accomplished. He turned to everything that called for artistic craftsmanship, and in all of these he excelled all his contemporaries. In view of the diversity of the things at which he

worked one does not wonder that many people have been led to doubt his competence in some of these many lines.

Still, we are somewhat surprised to read in a review of this very book, in the New York "Independent," that "Morris was the foremost dilettante of the nineteenth century." Perhaps one reason for this is that his principal followers have been such pronounced dilettanti. Every faddist who desired to while away idle moments with tools, who had "ideas" on art or decoration, has attempted to declare himself a follower of Morris. Even in relation to his Socialism he has been continuously connected with Fabianism and middle-class reformers, who, while he lived, were his special abhorrence. For if there ever was a man who was a true going revolutionist, in Socialism as well as in art and every other field, that man was Morris. Hence the statement of the present writer that Morris did not understand Socialism is grotesque and serves only to show the absolute ignorance of the writer. Her ignorance on this point is proven by the fact that she considered it necessary to explain that Morris did not consider himself bound to divide his wealth with the poor in order to show himself a consistent Socialist. (PP. 162-3.) Aside from this the writer's treatment of Morris' Socialism is fairly good.

Taking the book as a whole, it is a splendid contribution of our knowledge of Morris and is one which every Socialist will love to own and study.

Books Received, to Be Reviewed Later.

The Spirit of the Ghetto. By B. Hutchins Hapgood. Funk & Wagnalls Co. \$1.35.

Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolution. By P. Kropotkin. McClure, Phillips & Co. \$2.00.

Economic Tangles. By Judson Grenell. Purdy Publishing Co. \$1.00.

The Coming City. By R. T. Ely. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 60 cents.

The Conquest. By Eva Emery Dye. A. C. McClurg & Co. \$1.50.

A Daughter of the Snows. By Jack London. J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.50.

Swords and Plowshares. By Ernest Crosby. Funk & Wagnalls. \$1.00.

History of the French Revolution. By C. L. James. Abe Isaak, Jr., \$1.00.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

A Practical Propaganda Book.

There are two classes of Socialist books, equally necessary and valuable. One is addressed to thinking people who have done some serious reading and are prepared to give some mental effort to the tremendous problems with which the twentieth century has to deal. The other class of books takes the conclusions of Socialist thinkers and restates them in a way to invite and, if possible, compel the attention of unthinking readers, of the wage-slaves who have till now been kept ignorant of the fact of their slavery.

To this latter class belongs the new book, "Capital and Labor," by "A Black-Listed Machinist."

It is not a work that will bring many ideas to the regular readers of *The International Socialist Review*. The author would be the last to make any such claim for it.

What it does accomplish is to state the Socialist position in a way that will attract and not repel the average trade unionist. We know of no other book on Socialism that the average union workingman would be quite so likely to buy if put in front of him, or to read after buying it, or to act on after reading it.

The book contains 203 pages, and is divided into fifty-five short chapters. We give a few of the titles at random: *Genius and Profit*, *Nothing Succeeds Like Success*, *Depew's Prosperity*, *Victims of Trusts*, *the Capitalist and His Specific*, *Democracy Exposed*, *Our Manifest Destiny*, *What Is Labor's Share?* *Benevolent Philanthropists*, *Experience Teaches*, *the Union Label*, *Profit Regardless of Results*, *Wage System and Slavery*, *An Invitation*, *What Can I Do for the Cause?*

Mechanically, the book is like the paper edition of *Vanderveide's "Collectivism,"* with a special cover design printed in three colors, and showing the party emblem enlarged. The price of the book is 25 cents, while our stockholders can get it at 13 cents by mail or 10 cents by express.

Any local with a few active workers can at once make Socialists and help out its campaign fund by pushing the sale of this book. Now is the time to send for a few copies and try it.

MR. DARROW'S "RESIST NOT EVIL."

This is a book which distinctly belongs to the other of the two classes mentioned at the beginning of this department. Clarence S. Darrow stands in the front rank of the legal profession in Chicago;

in fact, it would be no easy task to name his superior. He understands Socialism better by far than most of the Socialists, and while he has not yet formally joined the Socialist party, it is a pretty safe prediction that the logic of events will bring him to us before many months have passed.

His new book is a relentless indictment of our present capitalist government, particularly as to its methods of dealing with those whom it calls criminals. He shows with clear, keen logic that leaves no escape, the fact that the capitalist state as it exists to-day is neither more nor less than a machine for maintaining the supremacy of the parasitic class which holds paper titles to the wealth produced by the laborers.

Every Socialist will find this a stimulating book to read. Moreover, it has a propaganda value, although of a different sort from "Capital and Labor." Many brain workers who are well informed on general topics, and would readily see the force of Socialist arguments, if their attention could once be arrested, are repelled by the usual style of Socialist argument, which must of necessity be framed in a way to reach the manual laborers, on whose votes the Socialist movement must mainly depend. These brain workers will be quick to see the force of the unanswerable arguments urged by Mr. Darrow, and once they have begun to realize the rottenness of the whole social fabric as it exists to-day, they will be ready and willing to read more.

We therefore advise every Socialist to read "Resist Not Evil," and then lend it to some intellectual proletarian who is not a Socialist.

The book is well printed on heavy laid paper, in invitingly large type, and handsomely bound in cloth, with a unique cover design. Price, including postage, 75 cents.

Mrs. Maynard's Introduction to Whitman.

"Walt Whitman, the Poet of the Wider Selfhood," by Mila Tupper Maynard, is winning general recognition as the best introduction to the study of America's most characteristic poet. We have room for but one quotation this month; it shall be from Horace Traubel, the closest friend of Whitman in his last years, and the one writer generally recognized as Whitman's interpreter. In the last number of his magazine, "The Conservator," Mr. Traubel says:

Whitman may be criticized. But he should not be apologized for. Whitman is often written about by people who are more afraid than convinced. They give with one hand and take back with the other. For instance, there is Salter's Good and Bad Side of Walt Whitman. After all that is so completely offered is just as completely withdrawn you wonder why Salter discussed Whitman at all. For the result was a cipher. And any discussion that yields only a cipher is useless. There are writers who think themselves friends of Whitman who let we dare not wait upon we would. Now, Mila Maynard's fortitude is not skim milk. What she says about Whitman seems obvious enough. Yet the obvious things are often hardest to say. It is right for you if you feel that way inclined to jump on Whitman and show him up. It

never hurts Whitman to be shown up, by enemy or friend. There is nothing objectionable in criticism. But apology is a knife in the back. An apology for an author is an attempt, perhaps unconscious, to murder him. In the text of Mila Maynard's book there is not one word of insulting toleration. She is not idolatrous. She is simply rational and fervent. She has really produced an able compend. Leaves of Grass could easily be studied in schools through this brief. It creates no prejudice for or against Whitman. It presents the case in a simple way, relieved of all speciousness of phrase and matter. I have every sort of confidence in Whitman. But I am willing for the sake of Whitman to have Whitman suspected. For Whitman is never so strong as when he just issues from a fight. Mila Tupper goes particularly long in the particularly short chapter on The Larger Woman. Whitman used to say to me: "The women should easily understand me." Mila Tupper is that kind of woman. Her Whitman is a gateway to Whitman as Whitman himself is a gateway to the eternal.

The book is artistically printed and bound, and the price, including postage, is one dollar.

The Social Revolution, by Karl Kautsky.

This book is one which is at once a propaganda and an educational work. It clears up more questions and throws light on more disputed points than any work that has been issued for several years. It shows clearly the distinction between reform and revolution and points out the hopelessness of expecting a gradual and imperceptible transition from Capitalism to Socialism.

In the second part, entitled "The Day After the Social Revolution," we have what is perhaps the best short sketch of the transition period and the next social stage that has ever been written. Among the questions discussed under this head are artistic and intellectual production, the savings of co-operative organization, the relative fields of State, municipal and co-operative production and the psychological conditions essential to proletarian domination.

The book has already been translated into French, an English translation is appearing in London "Justice," and it has been welcomed by Socialists all over the world as a work of great importance. In the translation which has just been made by A. M. and May Wood Wimons every effort has been made to make the work clearly intelligible to those who are not familiar with economic terms. It is printed in good, large type and bound in the Standard Socialist Series, and sells for 50 cents, cloth.

Official Party Emblem Buttons.

The official emblem adopted by referendum of the Socialist party some months ago is a pair of clasped hands over a globe, surrounded by the words: "Socialist Party: Workers of the World, Unite!" There have been several emblems designed in accordance with this vote, all of which have been more or less unsatisfactory, especially so

for the reason that the words "Socialist Party" have been so obscurely printed as to defeat the main purpose of wearing a party button, namely, to impress casual observers with the number of active Socialists scattered through any given community.

We have now contracted with a large manufacturing house for a supply of party emblems from an entirely new design, with a red background and with the lettering in white instead of black, and with the party name larger in proportion than in any other official emblem button on the market. The button also carries the union label. Price 5 cents each, 25 cents a dozen, \$1.75 a hundred postpaid, \$12.50 a thousand by express.

Propaganda Leaflets and Booklets.

Two new numbers of the Madden Library are now ready. "Let's All Get Rich," by J. T. McDill, is one of the best all-round propaganda booklets for either city or country that has appeared for many a day. Mr. McDill was one of the most entertaining writers on the old Coming Nation issued by the Ruskin colony, and he is now making straight scientific Socialism into as easy reading as his "Colony Notes" used to be. "By the Throat: the Trusts Have Seized the Farmer," by William R. Fox, is an admirable little book to start the farmers thinking. There are now six numbers of the Madden Library. A sample set will be mailed for 10 cents.

"Compensation," by A. M. Simons, is the latest addition to the series of four-page leaflets which we publish at the nominal price of 50 cents a thousand by mail or 25 cents a thousand by express. Other leaflets at the same price are "Labor Politics," by A. M. Simons, and "Who Are the Socialists?" "Socialism Defined by Socialists," and "Why Join the Socialist Party," by Charles H. Kerr.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,

56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.