

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. V

JUNE, 1905

NO. 12

Differences Among the Russian Socialists.

G APON, as is well known, has lately sent out a call through the secretary of the International Socialist Bureau to the Russian socialists urging them to unite and the *Vorwaerts* has published a comment thereon in which it talks about the "chaos of divisions and conflicts that disrupt the socialist camp" as well as of the "note of union" which the Revolutionary Socialists have brought into this chaos. A few remarks that I have made regarding this in the *Leipsiger Volksezeitung** have brought requests to me from various directions that I explain this Russian chaos to the German Comrades and I respond all the more willingly to this request since I believe that it has become necessary to set the comrades of Germany right concerning the Russian differences. The less they know of these differences the more they have, simply the indefinite idea of a chaos, in which the friends of socialist unity are seeking in vain to bring order, and so much the greater the danger that they will condemn our Russian comrades falsely, and that their support will be weakened. Such a result would be a great misfortune to socialists not only in Russia but throughout the world.

I would have been glad to have left a description of the Russian differences to some other pen, to a comrade who stood closer to Russian affairs than I. But if such a comrade is a member of one or the other of these different parties, his description no matter how non partisan, would be open to the suspicion that it was colored.

* See INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for May.

If we seek to find the truth about the "chaos" in the midst of the Russian dissensions we will soon notice that not all of these divisions are of the same nature but that they fall naturally into certain groups. Things that, to the superficial observer appear an inextricable chaos are then easily distinguished.

Three groups can be plainly distinguished.

The first is that based upon national divisions, Russia includes many more nations than Austria. Some of these, like Poland, previous to their union with Russia, led an independent political existence. Others such as the Armenians had long ago lost this independent existence, or had never had it, and constituted simply the ruins of peoples, often nomadic, when they came beneath the rulership of the Czar. Out of this confusion of peoples the proletariat of Russia is recruited. The mixture of peoples is even more vari-colored, the further capitalism extends and the greater the number of new circles which are opened. The socialist propaganda must naturally be conducted among each people in their own speech. This in itself, since the party has become of any strength leads easily to a certain independence of organization, into many national party groups, even if they agree with the main party on programme and tactics. The backwardness of commerce and the impossibility of a popular organization strengthened still further the independence of individual groups. But independence of organization leads always to differences of opinion and this naturally will never fail to bring about slight friction, conflicts of authority and conflicts of all kinds. There is need not only of great theoretical and tactical agreement, but also a personal unselfishness and the greatest possible tact if the solidarity is to avoid all rocks.

In view of all this we should not wonder that such great differences exist. The Social Democratic organization of the peoples of the Caucasus (the Armenians, Georgians, etc.) constitute an integral portion of the Russian Social Democracy. These latter as a whole, together with the Jewish "Bund," the Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania and the Livonian Social Democracy formed a socialist "Bloc" which seems to promise a mutual co-operation of these organizations.

Of a wholly different character than the national differences are those inside the organization of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Russia. Here we have to do with actual differences which have formed two factions inside the party each of which have their organ. One of these is the *Iskra* (Spark) among whose contributors are many who are well known to the German Comrades, especially Axelrod, Deutsch, Plechanoff, and Vera Sassulitsch. The other is *Wperjod* (Forward) whose most prominent representative is **Lenin**.

So far as programme and tactical principles are concerned both factions are completely agreed, much more than are the German Social Democracy. There are no revisionists among them. The only question at issue between them is that concerning the best form of party organization. These differences can be well compared to those which existed between the Lassalleans and Eisenachers and Lenin is often compared by his critics to Schweitzer. He demands strong centralization with dictatorial powers vested in a central committee, while Axelrod and his friends would leave much greater freedom of action to the individual local committee. The longer the separation continues, as with every quarrel, the more, no matter what may have been its origin, do personal antagonisms develop, together with other reasons for antagonism. The contest, however, of organization is pushed into the back ground by the tactical question of the best means to overthrow absolutism.

There is no doubt but what all these are extremely important questions whose discussion is very necessary. Nevertheless there is no doubt but what the feud of the two papers is at the present time injuring the Russian revolutionist movement; something that is all the more to be regretted since the actual differences of opinion are not so great as to make the cooperation of the opponents impossible. We can not set these differences on the same level with those which divided the French socialists at the Paris and Amsterdam congresses. In France it was a question of *different tactical principles*, which gave different character to the *continuous* work of the party. In the Russian social democracy there is complete unity concerning tactics, and differences exist only over the question as to the form of *practical application* of these principles to the *immediate situation*. These differences must disappear with the situation that brought them forth. They may lead to differences of opinion and to discussion, but not to separation.

But because the antagonism between *Iskra* and *Wperjod* are wholly different than those between the *Parti Socialiste Francais* and the *Parti Socialiste de France* it does not necessarily follow that outsiders should mix in or that they can be decided by an international congress. There are certain tactical principles which follow from our programme and which are the same for all socialist parties. An international congress can give a decision on these, and especially if in case of a division concerning them one of the contending parties ask for a decision as was the case with the French, where in Paris both divisions, and in Amsterdam at least one appealed to the congress. How can an international congress, however, decide which form of organization is best in Russia, or under what circumstances the armed

revolt, the strike or the peasant uprising is the most effective, or what we may expect from the Russian laborers?

However desirable it may be that the two factions should come to an understanding it is nevertheless impossible that outsiders should do anything. The most that would be possible would be to reduce the personal mistrust and antagonism that stands in the way of every union movement today, by means of a non-partisan court of arbitration which should examine into these personal accusations. But even this cannot be forced from without, but must come in response to the request of the participants. The *practical* differences, however, can only be settled by the Russian Social Democrats themselves, and this is not so simple since it appears as if each faction contained a majority, and from the very nature of a secret organization each little increase for one side is claimed by the other as accidental. We can only hope that the battle against the common enemy and the rapid changes of the political situation will bring about a removal of the bone of contention and the unity of the party.

We come now to the third group in the Russian divisions, —that between the different social democratic organizations on the one side and that of the Revolutionary Socialists upon the other, including the Terrorists, and which the *Vorwaerts* seems to look upon as the leaders of the unity movement in Russia.

Immediately after the call of Gapon the *Vorwaerts* published a letter written by Karl Marx in 1881 to his daughter concerning the Russian terrorists at that time. The *Vorwaerts* took the letter from *La Vie Socialiste* and accompanied it with comments in which is stated among other things "In a few lines Marx here exhausts all that can be said over the question of Russian terrorism."

No one would have been more astonished at such a statement than Karl Marx himself could he have read it today. For what was in this letter after all? In the first place Marx's statement of the fact that the originators of the St. Petersburg attempt upon Alexander II "were true heroes with no melo-dramatic poses." Wholly correct, but something that today does not hold true for the Russian terrorists alone, but for the whole mass of Russian revolutionists to whatever faction they may belong. But this says absolutely nothing concerning the real question of Russian terrorism.

The two statements contained in the letter are equally true that the tactics of the Russian terrorists are a "peculiar Russian tactic" and "historically unavoidable." So far as I know nobody has ever denied this, but this is very far from "exhausting everything that can be said on the question of Russian terrorism." Rather this statement merely formulates the question without attempting to give a final answer. That there is almost nothing

else in the letter concerning Russian terrorism, shows that the exaggerated importance which has been given to these "few lines" as an expression of "Marxism," is only intelligible by a complete ignoring of all that has been previously accomplished by the "orthodox" Marxists. This exaggeration shows however that those who make it would maintain that the Russian terrorism of today is identical with that of a quarter of a century ago. Otherwise it would be understood how impossible it would have been, even in a complete and scientific investigation of many volumes, to say nothing of a "few lines" written in 1881, to exhaustively treat the question of terrorism in 1905.

Let us endeavor, not necessarily to exhaust the question, but at least to briefly indicate what are the specific Russian circumstances which have created the Russian terrorism.

Are they to be found in absolutism? Certainly not. The whole European continent was under the yoke of absolutism in the 18th century, as were Austria and Russia in the first half of the 19th, without a terrorist tactic developing among the classes striving for political supremacy. The peculiarity of the Russian absolutism in opposition to that of Western Europe consists in the fact that it is Oriental and not founded upon a balance of powers between a strongly rising bourgeoisie and a feudal nobility which made the King a sort of court and over-lord of both; but was founded upon the absence of a bourgeoisie, the domination of a landed class, and a people scattered in countless village communities with no unity among themselves and consequently helpless before a central political power; so that the leader was absolute over the whole mass.

In the 18th century this absolutism came in closer touch with Western Europe and at the same time it began to take on something of the features of the political organization of the latter, such as bureaucracy, army, navy and the corresponding tactics. For this purpose an educated class was necessary which grew out of the hereditary environments and sought to immediately take on all the views and needs of the intellectuals of Western Europe. These views and needs influenced the ruling circle itself to a certain degree, at least so long as the circle was itself assisted thereby. When, however, the intellectuals became more numerous and began to constitute a class outside of the ruling circle, and in opposition to it, a struggle began between the intellectuals and the government, which grew all the more sharp and the intellectuals all the more revolutionary, and the government the more reactionary, the longer it continued.

In the eighties of the last century, however, the intellectuals stood alone in this battle. They found no other class which supported them; no strong independent bourgeoisie, no revolutionary

class of little capitalists. In Western Europe it had been these classes which had constituted the heart of the popular revolutionary forces of the English and French revolutions up to the middle of the 19th century. In Russia the little traders were generally nothing more than uprooted peasants who still were inferior to the peasant of the villages, since they had lost the support which the village community with its communist system had given. The peasant stood higher than the little trader, but his democratic and communistic inclinations and instincts did not extend beyond the borders of the *village* community. For a *national* democracy the Russian peasant lacked both understanding and interest.

All of this led to a condition where the Russian intellectuals after many disappointing attempts at a democratic propaganda finally came to trust in their own strength as a means of overthrowing absolutism. This strength, however, was utterly inadequate to conquer the enormous powers of a modern government. There remained to them therefore, the single form of battle, of intimidation, of terrorism,—the battle of individual heroes, who took their lives in their hands in order to threaten the lives of the possessors of governmental power. This was the root of the “historically unavoidable, peculiarly Russian” tactics of terrorism.

In connection with these tactics, however, there were also certain peculiar socialistic views. The Russian intellectuals were, as we have seen, wholly dependent for their political views and needs upon the West, during the time that terrorism was developing. Meanwhile, the liberalism of Western Europe had ceased to become revolutionary and had become a conservative power. There was now but one revolutionary factor, the Social Democracy. This re-acted upon the Russian revolutionists. They had been from the beginning also socialists. Where, however, in so economically backward a land were they to find the starting point of a transformation of society in the socialist sense. A developed industry which could offer such a starting point did not exist, but they hoped to find a complete substitute for this in a direction which is in the Europe of today “peculiarly Russian”—the agrarian communisms of the village community. That was the theory of the *Narodniki*, which became the theoretical foundation of the terroristic agitation of the *Narondnaja Wolja*.

Like the terrorist battle against the government, so also the agrarian socialism of the Russian revolutionists was “historically unavoidable.” This does not by any means say that it was certain to attain its object. All political tendencies and efforts of a definite epoch are “historically unavoidable,” but only a portion thereof are destined to succeed. Another portion must just as unavoidably disappear without result as that they appear. Twenty-

four years ago no one could assert with certainty that the Russian village communities might not become the starting point of a modern form of communism. Society as a whole can not leap over any stage of evolution, but single backward portions thereof can easily do this. They can make a leap in order to correspond with other and more advanced portions. So it was possible that Russian society might leap over the capitalist stage in order to immediately develop the new communism out of the old. But a condition of this was that socialism in the rest of Europe should become victorious during the time that the village communities still had a vital strength in Russia. This at the beginning of the eighties appeared still possible. But in a decade the impossibility of this transition was perfectly clear. The revolution in Western Europe moved slower and the village communities in Russia fell faster than appeared probable at the beginning of the eighties, and therewith it was decided that the special peculiarity of Russia upon which the terrorism and the socialism of the *Narodnaja Wolja* was founded should disappear, and that Russia must pass through capitalism in order to attain socialism and that also Russia must in this respect pass along the same road as had Western Europe. Here as there socialism must grow out of the great industry and the industrial proletariat is the only revolutionary class which is capable of leading a continuous and independent revolutionary battle against absolutism.

That the tactics of the *Narodnaja Wolja* alone were not sufficient to overthrow absolutism became evident at about the time the Marxian letter was written. (April 1881.) The death of Alexander II marked the highest point ever attained as a result of the terrorist tactics of that period. Indeed what more could be attained than the killing of the Czars? But society did not move in accordance with this striking example; no class arose to support the brave fighter and so he was finally executed in the unequal struggle.

Marx did not live until these facts became evident, dying in 1883. In this very year however there arose a new body in Russia that set itself to work to establish a new foundation for the revolutionary movement. Since the 60's there has been an industrial capitalism and an industrial proletariat in Russia. In the beginning, however, this possessed no special class-consciousness, resembling in many ways the little tradesmen of the cities, mere uprooted peasants, with peasant narrowness, but without that peasant strength which comes from contact with their native earth. In the 80's however, Russian capitalism and proletariat began to rapidly develop. It now became evident that here was a wholly new revolutionary class. The first to recognize this were the Marxists.—Axelrod, Deutsch, Plechanow, Vera Sassu-

litsch, who, in 1883, founded the *League for the Emancipation of Labor*. This organization was in full accord with the German Social Democracy. It took up, not simply the battle against absolutism but also made the organization and education of the laborers to the end of conducting an independent class-struggle, a part of their program. Even at this time the conditions for the formation of a labor party in Russia were very unfavorable. But the comrades whose names we have just given did not permit this fact to discourage them. They labored with tireless activity, until in 1898, they at last succeeded in founding a Russian Social Democracy.

They did not attain this however, except after a continuous energetic fight against the *Narodniki* and the terrorists, to which, in the days of its greatest effectiveness, they had themselves belonged. Both their ultimate aim and their tactics brought them into conflict with the Socialist Revolutionists, who after the old terrorist wing had disappeared, sought to bring about a revival of the traditions of the *Narodnaja Wolja* through the invigorating power of the new labor movement, by establishing the *Socialist Revolutionary Party* in 1901.

The Social Democracy sees in the industrial proletariat the force that must carry the revolutionary and socialist movement. A strong industrial proletariat, however, presupposes a developed capitalism. The Social Democracy resting upon the capitalist development of Russia, sees in its rapid progress the inevitable preliminary condition of revolution.

The terrorists seek to found socialism on the inherited village communism. The enthusiasm for the little industry, the dislike of the economic development that dissolves the village communism, the desire to confine this development,—all create reactionary economic tendencies among the terrorists, and bring their economic goal into opposition to that of the Social Democracy.

On the other hand also terrorism rests fundamentally upon the firmly rooted distrust of the political initiative and revolutionary attitude of the masses which existed at the time of its origin, as well as upon the conviction that only through the heroic courage of a few chosen individuals and not through action of the masses can absolutism be overthrown. The Social Democracy makes it its special mission to destroy this very distrust, to arouse the masses, and to show them that only through themselves can they be freed; that they cannot depend upon any Messiah, that the boldest and most sacrificing heroism of individuals is incapable of accomplishing what only an uprising of the proletarian masses can accomplish.

As a result there followed the bitter struggle of the Russian Social Democracy, first with the *Narodniki* and then with the

Socialist-Revolutionists, that has already been going on for two years, and that is just as "peculiarly Russian" and "historically unavoidable" as terrorism itself: unavoidable and necessary in order to raise the revolutionary movement out of its imperfect outgrown forms up to a higher plane.

If they have today attained this higher plane and are able from it to direct socialism in its battle against absolutism with far different resources and objects than were possible for the *Narodnaja Wolja*, then this is due, apart from the mightiest factor of all, the economic development, to the Russian Social Democracy, and the tireless criticism that it has directed against the *Narodniki* and their allies, the Socialist-Revolutionists.

So great were the results of the economic development, and the propaganda of the Russian Social Democracy, who, thanks to their theoretical training, comprehended the tendencies and direction of this development better than any other revolutionary group, that the Socialist-Revolutionists were themselves affected by it. The standpoint of the old *Narodnaja Wolja* is today everywhere given up. The new terrorism is a wholly different thing from the old. It is compelled to adapt itself to the new facts and theories, and take more and more into consideration the proletarian class-struggle. On the other hand it is easy to understand how the Social Democrats in the heat of their polemic against the Socialist-Revolutionists might go to extremes. Because they value the action of the masses higher than the bomb, it may many times appear as if they completely rejected the terrorist tactics, something wholly aside from their intention. When they lay the emphasis upon the conversion and organization of the city proletariat, and point out the reactionary economic tendencies of the village communism, it may sometimes appear as if they undervalued the significance which a peasant uprising might have during a time of revolution in weakening absolutism—something also of which they have no intention.

At all events the actual antagonisms between the Social Democrats and the terrorists are less today than they were twenty-five years ago. But nevertheless the differences are great enough to lead the Social Democrats to refuse to unite with the Socialist-Revolutionists.

The latter are more "tolerant", but this is simply because they have not yet passed the stage of continuous ferment, so that even at the present time they have no definite program. Their ranks are open to the most divergent factions—such as formerly composed the German National Socials—with which, however, I certainly do not wish to compare them. We find among them people who stand very close to social democracy, together with elements that are distinctly anarchistic, as well as small capitalist

democrats and social reformers. The objects and their tactics are as indefinite as their boundaries, but everywhere there are antagonisms between them and the Social Democrats; not simply in theory but also in political tactics.

This was shown, for example, a few months ago, when Socialist-Revolutionists at Paris, in opposition to the Russian Social Democratic organizations formed an alliance with the Liberals. This served to considerably widen the division between them and the Social Democrats—a strange way to prove the necessity of a union with the Social Democracy. But they thereby to be sure gained the endorsement of the *Vorwaerts*, whose sympathies they had long had, and which preached against the Social Democrats because they held themselves apart from the Liberal-Socialist alliance. It held that it was imperatively necessary for all the opponents of absolutism to unite. Certainly there is nothing more desirable than such a union, for in union is strength. But why should not the Russian Social Democracy be recognized as the base for unity? In practice the question always is, *for what* shall we unite? Shall all the elements of the opposition unite simply to shout “Down with absolutism?” Unfortunately the days of Jericho are past. Nothing is done by shouting alone. Fighting is what is needed. But for a common *fight*, common *tactics* are required. The creation of such a tactic is the preliminary condition of every union for fighting. So long as the antagonisms remain, any unity would be but an ineffectual pose. And this is just what the Liberal-Socialist alliance has become in spite of the enthusiasm of the *Vorwaerts*. Its first act was also its last—the sending out of a signed proclamation to the various organizations. It has proceeded no further. Its single action consisted of a few phrases.

How then, for example, can the Liberals and the Socialist-Revolutionists fight together? The Liberals rest mainly upon the great land-owners, the Socialist-Revolutionists to some degree upon the peasants; the first demand a constitution in order to secure their landed possessions, the latter wish to seize this property. The fight against absolutism is only a class struggle to a certain degree, since each class is conducting it in a different manner and for a different purpose.* The different classes can cooperate for certain *definite objects*, but a permanent alliance between them for a whole revolutionary period, with its rapidly changing combinations is evidently an absurdity.

But *one* motive, aside from mutual hate of absolutism, served to unite the various organizations that formed an alliance in Paris,—distrust of the fighting capacity of the Russian proletariat.

* Even as I write word comes from St. Petersburg that the liberal papers are utilizing their slight temporary freedom of the press to preach against Socialism.

This is the animating thought of the Liberals. Their representative in Paris, the editor of *Oswoboschdenje*, Peter Struve, was at one time a Social Democrat. He declares at the present time that he is not false to his social democratic ideals in going over to the Liberals, but that he has become a Liberal for Russia only, because its proletariat is not in a condition to form an independent and militant political party.

In spite of all its transformations the old mistrust of the Russian industrial proletariat ever clings to the Socialist-Revolutionists. The Polish socialist party, when it finally concluded the agreement, stood firmly upon the ground of the class-struggle, but only for Poland, and they gave us a reason for their peculiar position in antagonism to the Russian Social Democracy, that the Polish proletariat, but not the Russian, was ripe for revolution, and that the former could not allow itself to be retarded in its struggle for freedom by the backwardness of the latter. This is one of the grounds of antagonism between them and the Social Democrats of Poland and Lithuania, the latter fighting as a part of the whole Russian proletariat.

No sooner, however were the three named organizations and a few others of insignificant importance, united with the *Vorwaerts* in declaring the failure of the tactics of the Russian Social Democracy, than the latter were most splendidly justified by the events of the 22nd of January and the days that followed, which showed the Russian proletariat to be a revolutionary force of the first rank, and by far the strongest revolutionary force in the Russian empire. In spite of this the *Vorwaerts* did not cease praising the Socialist-Revolutionists in contrast with the Social Democrats, as their note concerning Gapon and comment on the Marxian letter showed, which would however, have been wholly meaningless had they not stated that Marx in an exhaustive discussion had declared that the tactics of the Socialist-Revolutionists were the only correct ones for Russia.

.....

Naturally we do not demand of the *Vorwaerts* that it reverse its previous tactics and oppose the Socialist-Revolutionists. In spite of all theoretical considerations we must grant our warmest sympathies to these fighters, who represent an important division of the Russian proletariat, and have entered heroically into the battle against absolutism, that is going on before our eyes and is creating a new Russia. This historic mission is so colossal that we can spare no force that makes for its realization, and the battle field is broad enough to offer room for the activities of all. Wherever we can help the Socialist-Revolutionists in their fight against absolutism we must do so. But we have not the slightest reason for supporting them when they come in conflict

with the Social Democratic organization. They have done nothing which would justify such an action.

Neither is socialist unity furthered by such interference, no matter how often the word "unity" may be used.

Fortunately there are just at this time far more powerful forces working for unity of the Russian socialists than the wise warnings of outside comrades. These forces arise from the very nature of the revolution itself, which is more and more compelling the activity of the Russian socialists to take on the form of a movement of the whole popular masses, in which the differences of the various groups are constantly dissolving, until at last a uniform tactic will grow out of the events, which in turn, will make possible a single organization.

The less a movement apparently progresses, the more urgent the demand for new tactical methods, and the greater also the diversity of views concerning these methods. The smaller a movement, and the more secret, the more do differences of opinion of individuals gain in strength and power to influence party activity. Just as easily do these differences lead to divisions. Smallness of party, slowness of growth, and dissensions in the ranks generally go hand in hand. The last however is much more of an effect than a cause. The party is more often split because it is small and ineffectual, than small and ineffectual because it is split. Once a party movement becomes a great popular mass movement, gaining victory after victory, and the differences lose their force and significance, and as the conflict goes on the party becomes continually more consolidated and united—so far at least as it rests upon the interests of a single class, as does the social democracy. A party that includes various and often antagonistic classes, as do the most bourgeois parties will to be sure, on the other hand, more frequently incline to divisions than to closer cooperation, as the party development in France during the great Revolution shows. It is just exactly during the time of revolution that a coalition of various classes is the hardest to hold together.

It was just because the revolution was at the very door that the Liberal-Socialist alliance was a still-born child. On the other hand the revolution has already strengthened the solidarity of the Social-Democratic forces. From Poland as well as from Russia comes the news that the latest activities have been common activities of the previously warring Social Democratic organizations.

Just what will be the relation between the Social Democratic organizations and the Socialist-Revolutionists is not yet clearly evident. Class parties are welded more firmly together by revolutions, while those that represent divergent interests are torn asunder. The Socialist-Revolutionists however are no purely

proletarian party. They wish to serve the interests of the whole "laboring people," by which they mean the peasants and the small tradesmen as well as the proletarians. The revolution will certainly bring about a deep transformation in this party. The direction of this transformation will depend upon whether it draws closer to the Social Democrats until the momentary cooperation of today leads to permanent amalgamation, or whether the antagonism between them grows sharper.

All that we in other countries can do must appear insignificant contrasted with the gigantic forces that are today operating in Russia, and which are determining the relations which party organizations shall bear to each other. These forces are working so energetically and so irresistibly for proletarian interests that we have not the slightest reason to take a pessimistic view of Russian affairs, or to speak of a "chaos" in the Russian Democracy. The relations of the Russian comrades are perfectly clear and intelligible for whoever has followed their development from the beginning, and the revolution itself is now at hand to still further clarify them. Chaos exists far less in the ranks of the socialists than in those of the ruling classes. It is there we find dissension, anarchy, and mutual antagonism on the increase. In the midst of this chaos we find the chaos of the latest of the social strata to enter into political life—the peasants. This chaos will grow ever greater, but in the degree that it grows will grow the power and the influence of the industrial proletariat, united through the teachings of the class-struggle, impressing more and more its stamp upon the new Russia, that will finally arise from the chaos.

KARL KAUTSKY, in *Neue Zeit*.

Translated by A. M. Simons.

Materialistic Conception of History and Class Struggle.

One of the most amusing features of modern Marx criticism is the grave discussions by the critics, of the question whether or not Marx was a philosopher and whether or not Marxism is a philosophy. Most divergent and contradictory opinions are held by the different eminent and learned critics. And not only this but the most contradictory accounts are given as to what Marx himself thought on the subject. The confusion is so great that there seems to be no way out of it,—unless one turns to Marx himself, or to Engels. . . . This, by the way, is always the best way out when one finds himself in one of the mazes of contradictory accounts of Marxism which abound so much in anti-Marxian literature.

A careful study of the writings of Marx and Engels discloses the fact that in their opinion what used to be known before their day as "philosophy" reached its culminating point and came to a close with Hegel. That henceforth the place of philosophy is taken by science. Already Ludwig Feuerbach said:—"My philosophy is—no philosophy," and Marx and Engels carried this statement into effect by replacing abstract philosophy by concrete science. Engels therefore says,—(Ludwig Feuerbach P. 56) :—"This conception (the materialistic conception of history) puts an end to philosophy on the historical field, just as the dialectic conception of nature makes all natural philosophy unnatural and impossible." Marxism is no abstract philosophy. It is just the reverse, it is concrete science, and therefore, the heir and successor of all philosophy.

It is heir to all philosophy, because notwithstanding the break with the old philosophy which the new method of treating human society has effected, and the superseding of philosophy by science, there is a continuity of thought running through philosophy and the science of human society just as there is a continuity of human society itself notwithstanding the changes in the form of its organization, or just as there is continuity in the economic structure of human society notwithstanding the different "economies" which were prevalent at different stages of its development.

The Marxian science is the result and logical sequence of the whole development of mankind. Marx found awaiting him the component parts of philosophy: the dialectic or evolutionary

method of contemplating the world, and the materialistic view, that is the view that the material conditions of the world being the only thing we know are therefore the only thing we can take cognizance of. His was the new combination and the method of application which, however, were loudly demanded by the needs of the time.

In order, however, that we may come unbiased to the study of this science which is variously known as "economic materialism," "dialectic materialism," or "The Materialistic Conception of History," we must rid ourselves of some prejudices which cling to the name because of the association of the words which represent the ideas forming its component parts, in vulgar parlance, with certain objectionable moral and mental qualities. Dialectics is commonly associated with a certain mental trick by which a shrewd debater *seemingly* proves something which may be quite untrue; the reasoning by which the proof produced contains a mental shuffling of cards. It is sometimes used in the same sense as "sophistic,"—another much-abused term. But worse yet are the vulgar associations of materialism. A materialist is commonly supposed to be a man who is gross, mean and egotistical. A materialist philosopher, according to the common notion, is a man whose ideas are chained to the gross pleasure of life, who always has his eyes open to the main chance, a man who has neither God in his thoughts nor humanity in his feelings; a man to whose constitution any ideal or higher motive is an absolutely foreign element.

This is, of course, fallacious. Philosophic idealism or materialism has absolutely nothing in common with the influence of, or adherence to, ideal motives in practical life. Idealism or materialism in philosophy is simply the question whether we must go beyond the world that we perceive with our senses in order to get to the *real world*, that is to say, to the world which has a full and independent existence, and therefore, contains in itself the laws of its own existence and development. The idealists insist that the world of matter which surrounds us and includes us has no independent existence at all; that certain non-material things, or *ideas*, are the only things having an independent existence, and therefore their own laws of development; and that the material world merely follows the development of those ideas, of which it is the shadow of manifestation. The materialists, on the other hand, declare that the only real world, for us, is that material world which we perceive with our senses; that, furthermore, we know nothing beyond what knowledge we gain by the help of our senses, that ideas have not, and can not have any real independent existence, but are merely the *reflection* of the material world as perceived by us through the medium of the senses.

This is something different, and apart, from the preconceived

notions of idealism and materialism. It is now easy to understand that the fact that one is a materialist in his philosophic views cannot possibly prevent him from, or have any bearing upon his being an "idealist" in practical life. Nor is this changed by adding "dialectics" to materialism, that is to say by transferring the discussion to the historical field, because that is all that "dialectic method" really means. In other words it simply means that we do not look at the world as something dead and unchangeable, but as something which is continually changing; as the great Greek philosopher who first saw this great truth expressed it: nothing *is*, everything becomes, or, to be more exact, existence is a constant process of change or growth. If we want to understand things we must understand their appearance and disappearance, their growth and decline.

This way of contemplating things in their *movement*, of studying their birth, growth and decline, when applied to the study of the history of human society by a materialist, that is to say by one who knows that only material facts exist and develop independently, and ideas only reflect the existence and development of the material world,—is the Materialistic Conception of History, the foundations of the Marxian Scientific System. In other words, the Materialistic conception of history maintains that the evolution of human society as a whole, and that of all human institutions, is not, as the idealists insisted, the result of the changes in men's *ideas* relative to the society they were living in and its institutions, which changes are brought about by the inherent law of development of the ideas; but that, quite to the contrary the development of society, including men's ideas of human society and institutions, are the result of the development of the material conditions under which men live; that these conditions are the only ones which have an independent existence and development; that the changes of the material conditions cause the institutions of human society to be changed to suit them; and that the ideas on all subjects relating to man in society, including those of right and wrong between man and man and even between man and his God, are changed by man in accordance with and because of, those changed material conditions of his existence.

As was stated before, both the component elements of this philosophy: the materialistic "view" and the dialectic "method," were found by Marx ready to do service, and his great merit in this field was the combination of the two, and the reduction of the combination to a clearly defined system.

This, however, was not all, and, perhaps, not even the most distinctive contribution of Marx to philosophy, science. The mere statement of the philosophic doctrine still left the *course* of human history unexplained, until Marx applied his genius and

transformed history, a sealed book to his predecessors, into a science. A science which, if not as exact, is just as useful, as any one of the natural sciences. This he achieved by abandoning abstract philosophy and treating history scientifically. That is to say, he examined the facts of history itself, in order to obtain from such examination the laws of their evolution and relation to each other. This was strictly in accordance with his materialistic "philosophy" which would not admit of any outside preconceived constructions, and insisted that we get all our knowledge and ideas from the existing "matter" itself.

His "Materialistic" conception gained, the next thing for Marx to do was to determine what were the "material" factors of history. His investigations led him to the belief that the economic conditions were the prime movers of history. Accordingly, he found it necessary to substitute the term "economic" for the term "material." This completed Marx's conception of history and gave it that distinguishing characteristic which stamps it, and the whole of it, as truly Marxian, notwithstanding the many claims of priority; that characteristic which at once gives it its scientific value and makes it the butt of all pseudo-scientific criticism.

The great merit of this theory of history, is—that it really explains, in the course of history, something which could not be said of the previous attempts at explaining history, including those of "materialists" like Taine and Buckle.

Marx's insistence on the predominance of the economic factor is not the result of any arbitrary predilection or any preconceived schematic explanation brought into the study of history from outside considerations. The economic factor is insisted as THE material factor because it is the only material factor that changes and develops, and consequently is the only one which can cause change and development in what Marx calls the "superstructure" of society. It goes, of course, without saying, that something that does not change can not produce any change. No mathematician has ever attempted to ascribe the change in a mathematical operation to the factors that remain constant. It is the varying factors that produce changes in the results. But all the material factors that have been mentioned beside the economic factor remain constant, or nearly so. Such are race, geography, etc. To the extent, however, that these factors do change, and by their change affect the course of human history, full credit is given them. So in the study of primitive, undeveloped, society, where, owing to the crude character of his tools, man is dependent entirely upon nature and is directly affected by its least changes, or where, as in the case of great discoveries, certain geographical features hitherto of no importance

become important, these factors are fully recognized and their influence carefully studied and determined.

In other words, all the material factors, outside the economic, are "taken into account," except that upon careful account taken the influence of these factors appears to be very small and tributary to the main, the economic, factor, and, (and this is most important of all) this influence is constantly diminishing, with the progress of mankind. They may, therefore, be left out of account when outlining the general scheme of the evolution of society.

The adherents of the Materialistic Conception of History therefore assert that production, and, next to production, exchange of the product, is the basis of every social order; that in every historic form of society the distribution of the product of human labor produced by it, and with it the social arrangement into classes or estates, depends on what and how is produced in that society and how the product is exchanged. Accordingly, the last causes of all social changes and political transformations are to be sought not in the increasing insight of men into the laws of eternal truth and justice, but in the changes of the methods of production and exchange. Not in the philosophy, but in the economics of the given epoch. They are not to be sought in morality, because morality itself is changeable and is itself the result of circumstances which lie deeper in the structure of human society. "Every moral theory which has existed until now was, in last analysis, the result of the economic conditions of the society in which it prevailed. The awakening insight that the existing social arrangements are unreasonable and unjust, that reason became nonsense and charity torture, is only a sign of the fact that the methods of production and forms of exchange have been quietly undergoing such changes that the social arrangements which have been cut to suit previous economic conditions are now out of joint. It also betokens that the means of remedying the discovered evils have already to a more or less degree been evolved with the changed relations of production."

The basis and superstructure of society of which Marx speaks in his famous preface to his "Zur Kritik," a portion of which was quoted in the preceding article, may therefore be formally constructed on something like the following plan: The basis of the structure is a given state of the development of the productive forces of society; this brings about certain relations between the individuals composing that society in the social process of production and exchange, which determine the distribution of the product among them; this, in its turn, results in a certain form of society, certain social institutions, which expresses these relations; the society is then permeated by a condition of the minds and a set of habits and customs which conform to the form of

society; and all that culminates in the philosophy, literature, and art of the society which will be the result of the abilities, the tastes, and inclinations which this condition of the minds, the habits and customs will produce.

The ideas which prevail in a given society exert a powerful influence on that society. These ideas, however, have their source in the social milieu of that society, which milieu, in its turn, is the result of the economic relations of that society. The ideas, therefore, whether political, moral, religious, or otherwise, which prevail in a given society, and which influence the conduct of men in that society while they prevail, cease to prevail, and are gradually discarded, when the economic conditions in which they had their inception undergo a change. Furthermore, in our society which is divided into classes based on economic interest, the ideas prevailing in it at any given time will not only be the result of certain economic conditions, but will in the main answer the needs, desires, or aspirations, of the social class which was brought to the front by those economic conditions. So that there may be, and very often there is, more than one set of ideas on one given subject current in a given society at the same time; that these ideas are in direct conflict with each other; and that they are held, respectively, by those classes of that society whose interests they give expression to.

Usually there is only one set of ideas prevailing in society, and for the following reasons: In our society, that is society based on the private ownership of property, there is always a class of persons having in their possession or control the means where-with society produces the things on which it subsists and from which it derives its comfort. This class, by reason of its control of society's means of production, carrying as this does with it the management and supervision of society's production and exchange, shapes the institutions and customs of society to suit its interests and to insure its dominion in society. It has absolute sway except that it must not disregard the law of its own existence. That is to say: its dominion must be exercised in conformity with and in furtherance of the economic powers which created it, giving them full play so that their latent forces may fully develop and give to society all the benefit there is contained in them.

This dominion of the class which control the production of society is due not only to the coercive power it possesses over the other members of society by reason of such control, and of the control of society's means of subsistence and comfort which result therefrom, but also to its persuasive powers. From the standpoint of interest it must be admitted that its interests lie along the road of the progress of society, and therefore coincide with the interests of society as a whole. From the higher,

"ideal," standpoint its position is also impregnable: what it obtained by might has in due course of time become its right by the rule of prescription, euphonesically known as "tradition," the greatest and most potent source of right as it requires no evidence of title and works itself into the very inner consciousness of man and becomes co-extensive with his feelings. To help and augment this natural feeling of its right, the dominating class, which controls the spiritual food of society along with the material, inculcates the ideas of its rights into the members of society artificially. So that the whole of society is usually permeated with the ideas of the dominating class.

But "the world do move." Man, in his struggle with nature for its domination, is very inventive. His inventiveness (its tempo) will depend on many circumstances, but he almost continually changes his tools wherewith he exploits nature by inventing new ones. With the change of tools he changes the methods, and sometimes the fields, in which he had heretofore exploited nature. The change does not, however, come suddenly. The new, improved, tools, and the new methods which they bring with them, are being slowly perfected and brought into use, and slower still are the new fields of exploitation becoming popular. But the march of the new economic force embodied in the new tool is irresistible. Slow though its progress be at first, it gains in velocity and momentum as it proceeds along, like the falling stone, until its slow progress is converted into a rushing torrent sweeping along in its course all obstacles.

When a new tool makes its appearance, a new political force is born into society. This force grows with the growth of the importance of the new tool in the economy of society, and, in its turn, helps the new tool to unfold itself properly, if it is hampered by artificial barriers from asserting itself. This new political force, the class which owns and controls the new tool, and consequently the product which is produced by means thereof, enters into a struggle with the then governing class, that is with the class which owns and controls the old means of production, and this struggle for the control of the organization of society, grows from day to day with the growth of the use of the new tool. Each recruit to the new field of economic activity becomes a soldier in the army of the class controlling that field.

This struggle continues until the inevitable result is reached: Economically, the new improved means of obtaining society's goods becomes pre-eminent; politically, the class which operates and controls those improved means of production becomes predominant. Then a new order of things is created, if the new method of production is sufficiently different a new society is born: New political institutions, new religious beliefs, new moral notions, new aesthetic tastes, new philosophic systems. So does

History run her course. The new of yesterday is the old of to-day, and the new of to-day is the old of to-morrow. Each order of things is in turn young and old; struggling for existence and recognition first and then struggling for existence and the maintenance of its authoritative position against the recognition of new elements which threaten to undermine its existence. The progressive of to-day is the reactionary of to-morrow.

In this struggle for existence between two economic forces and the two classes of society representing them, for social dominion, force as well as persuasion are usually used, the manner and proportion of their use being determined by local influences. The established opinion, whether born of interest (class-interest) or received by tradition exert a powerful interest on society as a whole, as already stated, until the new economic forces become strong enough to formulate their own set of opinions, their own "ideology," and inculcate them into the minds of men. The new ideas formulate slowly, and make converts even slower. But when the time has come, society has been sufficiently revolutionized economically, these ideas become a revolutionary factor in themselves and help destroy the old order of things. Not only is the class whose interests lie in the economic changes which gave birth to these ideas fired by these ideas to such an extent that it often forgets those economic interests themselves and is carried away by the ideas alone, but neutral classes of society and even people whose interests lie in the opposite direction are carried away by the new ideas and enter the lists for the new order of things.

New ideas, therefore, are always the result of new economic conditions, produced sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly, but they always have an important place in the struggle of the classes for the progress of human society, for each new class fights for society as well as for itself, and they truly characterize the social forces engaged in the struggle.

L. BOUDIN.

(To be continued.)

Veblen the Revolutionist.

IT must have been highly gratifying to every Marxian to find that the first article in the INTERNATIONAL REVIEW for April was devoted to calling attention to the work of Thorstein Veblen, the greatest exponent, who has yet arisen, of the psychological effects of economic causes. Unfortunately the article is by a writer whose ignorance of Marx is eclipsed only by his ignorance of Veblen.

While it is not worth while to dwell upon it here, it may be noted in passing that Comrade Walling has not yet emancipated himself from the handicap of the Great Man theory of history, and is still looking for Providence (?) to raise up an American Moses to found an American Socialism (God save the mark!) and free the American toilers from the bondage of Capitalism. A closer study of his own pet Great Man, Veblen, would have led him to "put not his trust in princes," but to rely upon the "Cultural Incidence of the Machine Process" to develop "socialistic disaffection" among the industrial workers, and he would thus have remained upon the solid ground of the teachings of Karl Marx, who, he tells us, "has been outgrown in Europe" and "must become an historical reminiscence in the United States."

While the attempt to establish an antithesis between the teachings of Marx and those of Veblen was of immense service to the meretricious rhetoric of Comrade Walling, it is much to be deplored, for it is but too sure to cause many revolutionary Marxians to whet their tomahawks for Veblen.

Most socialists have hitherto accepted as axiomatic, as it were, this statement of Marx in the Preface to the Critique of Political Economy, "The mode of production obtaining in material life determines, generally speaking, the social, political, and intellectual processes of life." But they have been unable and have apparently cared but little to explain how psychological processes were moulded by material and economic causes. Even Labriola was little more than suggestive along this line — merely stimulated thought upon it. Now it is the peculiar merit of Prof. Veblen that he has explained the *modus operandi*, by which economic causes produce psychological effects. In this field he is not only *facile princeps*, he is practically alone. His "Theory of the Leisure Class" is, in the writer's judgment, the most serious contribution to Socialist thought since the Communist Manifesto. But Veblen is not great as a rival of Marx, but

as an expounder of Marx, a developer of Marxian theses. It is not too much to say that all his best work is nothing more than Marxian exegesis.

But Comrade Walling is not wholly to blame for having misapprehended the nature of Prof. Veblen's work. Part of the blame must rest upon Veblen's shoulders, for he never gives credit to Marx and Engels, but constantly assumes that he, Veblen, is an original investigator. In this respect Thorstein Veblen and Achille Loria are curiously alike. Writing in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* for Sept., 1900, of the latter's book, "The Economic Foundations of Society," the present writer said: "Curiously enough in this long book he never once gives Marx the credit of having discovered this theory, but constantly talks as though he — Loria — had revealed it to a waiting world." In a recent number of the *Chicago Socialist* Comrade Untermann translated a passage from one of Engel's prefaces to one of the posthumous volumes of "Capital" making substantially the same charge against Loria. But in this respect Veblen is not so egregious a sinner as Loria, for he gives frequent references to Marx in his foot notes. But on the other hand at times — either ignorantly or intentionally — he positively misrepresents the teaching of Marx and Engels, as in the foot note on page 340 of "The Theory of Business Enterprise," where he says that the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels "was a product of Hegelianism blended with the conceptions of natural rights, its chief count being the 'claim to the full product of labor.'" In his review of the book just referred to the editor of this *REVIEW* showed how erroneous was this statement that the chief count of Marxian Socialism was the "claim to the full product of labor." One wonders how Prof. Veblen would harmonize "the conceptions of natural rights" with this famous sentence from the Communist Manifesto: "the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

Comrade Walling's ignorance of Marx is so obvious it requires no demonstration. His ignorance of Veblen can best be shown by printing in parallel columns the following excerpts from Walling and Veblen:

WALLING.

The capitalist system will not fall of its own weight. There is no possibility of a cataclysm. The problem of disposing of the growing surplus for which foreign markets are so urgently demanded, can be easily disposed of by the ruling class. The methods of doing this are two-fold. Either the country

VEBLEN.

The persistent defection of reasonable profits calls for a remedy. The remedy may be sought in one or the other of two directions: (1) in an increased unproductive consumption of goods; or (2) in an elimination of that "cutthroat" competition that keeps profits below the "reasonable" level. If enough of the work or of the output is turned to wasteful expenditures, so as to ad-

can be hurled into international war and all the wasteful preparations that precede and degradations that follow international war, or a benevolent feudalism can be developed. If the trusts continue their present rapid rate of growth, the latter seems the more likely outcome.

How the surplus will be disposed of in that case, Prof. Veblen showed in his recent book on the leisure class in America. Here Veblen conceded that the business man himself does not waste any vast sums in consumption, however wasteful and anti-social may be his operations in production.

In consumption it is his wife and children who spend the money. To the possibilities of consumption in this line, there is no limit. If the money-making sport comes to an end on account of the complete organization of industry by the great financiers, then the vast sums formerly manipulated by the business men for various speculative purposes will be entirely turned over to his wife and children who have already made such splendid records in extravagant living and "conspicuous waste."

In the book just mentioned, Prof. Veblen not only shows this waste, but he analyzes its causes. These are an effort to spend money in an emulative manner in order to make obvious to all observers either the amount of wealth owned or the length of time it has been in the possession of the family. Expenditure, in other words, is not for material brute comforts as Marx and all his followers have supposed. To such expenditures there is a physical limit. To the very "spiritual purpose" on the other hand of showing off a supposed social superiority which may take the form of innumerable houses, servants, dia-

mit of but a relatively slight aggregate saving, as counted by weight and tale, profitable prices can be maintained on the old basis of capitalization. If the waste is sufficiently large, the current investment in additional industrial equipment will not be sufficient to lower prices appreciably through competition.

Wasteful expenditure on a scale adequate to offset the surplus productivity of modern industry is nearly out of the question. Private initiative cannot carry the waste of goods and services to nearly the point required by the business situation. Private waste is no doubt large, but business principles, leading to saving and shrewd investment, are too ingrained in the habits of modern men to admit an effective retardation of the rate of saving. Something more to the point can be done, and indeed is being done, by the civilized governments in the way of effectual waste. Armaments, public edifices, courtly and diplomatic establishments, and the like, are almost altogether wasteful, so far as bears on the present question. They have the additional advantage that the public securities which represent this waste serve as attractive investment securities for private savings. at the same time that, taken in the aggregate, the savings so invested are purely fictitious savings and therefore do not act to lower profits or prices. Expenditures met by taxation are less expedient for this purpose; although indirect taxes have the peculiar advantage of keeping up the prices of the goods on which they are imposed, and thereby act directly toward the desired end. The waste of time and effort that goes into military service, as well as the employment of the courtly, diplomatic, and ecclesiastical personnel, counts effectually in the same direction. But however extraordinary this public waste of substance latterly has been, it is apparently altogether inadequate to offset the surplus productivity of the machine industry, particularly when this productivity is seconded by the great facility which the modern business organization affords

monds, laces, etc., there is no limit whatever. There need be no more crises or underconsumption if capitalists work this outlet for its full value.

Between international war and "conspicuous waste" there is no danger of the capitalist ever becoming seriously embarrassed by the surplus. In Marx's time the petty bourgeois ideal of personal economy and rational living prevailed widely. In our times the ruling element in the ruling classes everywhere are troubled with no such scruples. Even the "simple life" requires enormous expenditures in charity and display of a "quiet" kind.

for the accumulation of savings in relatively few hands. There is also the drawback that the waste of time involved in military service reduces the purchasing power of the classes that are drawn into the service, and so reduces the amount of wasteful consumption which these classes might otherwise accomplish.

So long as industry remains at its present level of efficiency, and especially so long as incomes continue to be distributed somewhat after the present scheme, waste cannot be expected to overtake production, and can therefore not check the untoward tendency to depression.

Theory of Business Enterprise pp. 255-6-7-8.

It will be seen that it was fortunate for Comrade Walling's purposes that he did not read Veblen before attempting to expound his teachings.

In his seventh chapter (in *The Theory of Business Enterprise*) on "The Theory of Modern Welfare," Prof. Veblen gives an interesting and original theory of crises and depression. This may be regarded, and undoubtedly Prof. Veblen so regards it, as an attack upon and a substitute for the Socialist theory of crises popularized in Bellamy's "Parable of the Water-Tank." The gist of the theory is that crises and depression are to be traced to disparity existing or arising between the earning capacity and the capitalization of business enterprises. "Depression is primarily a malady of the affections of the business men." As a substitute for the Socialist theory, this theory is up in the air — pure moonshine. There is nothing to start the chain of events so clearly analyzed by Prof. Veblen. It is the lack of purchasing power of the working class that punctures the balloon of loan-credit and serves as the starting-point for Prof. Veblen's whole cycle. As an addition or complement to the ordinary Socialist theory, it is difficult to cavil at Prof. Veblen's theory. As an independent theory it is without foundation, and is utterly inconsistent with Economic Determinism which is the foundation of most of Veblen's work.

Prof. Veblen himself hints at the necessary hard-fact foundation for his psychological superstructure on page 190 (*Business Enterprise*): "The readiness with which contracts of purchase and sale are negotiated is appreciably greater in brisk times than in times of depression; that, indeed, is the obvious difference between the two."

What are the chief lessons that we as Socialists can learn from

Prof. Veblen, especially from his later book, "The Theory of Business Enterprise?" In attempting to answer this, we must bear in mind that Prof. Veblen's conclusions are not only most carefully guarded, but are often purposely hidden and obscured. This is not surprising when we remember that when he wrote his books, he was working as one of John D. Rockefeller's "hired hands."

But if we make due allowance for this difficulty in finding positive, definite, clear-cut statements in his books, I think it is fair to say we will find that, among other things, Prof. Veblen teaches:

First. That Socialism is inevitable.

Second. That the Socialism generated by the "Cultural Incidence of the Machine-Process" is, of necessity, Revolutionary Socialism.

Third. That Capitalism and the Natural Rights philosophy are inextricably interlinked and intertwined.

It is true that in his closing chapter, he carefully avoids drawing the conclusion that Socialism is inevitable, but he does assert clearly enough that the only alternative is the revival and vigorous development of "warlike enterprise and prowess." He describes the effect of this latter alternative in one of his best ironical passages as follows: "The regime of status, fealty, prerogative, and arbitrary command would guide the institutional growth back into the archaic conventional ways and give the cultural structure something of that secure dignity and stability which it had before the times, not only of socialistic vapors, but of natural rights as well. Then, too, the rest of the spiritual furniture of the ancient regime shall presumably be reinstated; materialistic skepticism may yield the ground to a romantic philosophy, and the populace and the scientists alike may regain something of that devoutness and faith in preternatural agencies which they have recently been losing. As the discipline of prowess again comes to its own, conviction and contentment with whatever is authentic may return to distracted Christendom, and may once more give something of a sacramental serenity to men's outlook on the present and the future." (P. 399).

Any one who can believe that Prof. Veblen really regards this alternative as a possibility must have been born devoid of a sense of humour.

But Prof. Veblen teaches the inevitability of Socialism much more clearly than this, as may be seen by linking together the two following quotations from the chapter on the "Cultural Incidence of the Machine Process":

"The discipline of the modern industrial employments is relatively free from the bias of conventionality, but the difference between the mechanical and the business occupations in this re-

spect is a difference of degree. It is not simply that conventional standards of certainty fall into abeyance for lack of exercise, among the industrial classes. The positive discipline exercised by their work in good part runs counter to the habit of thinking in conventional, anthropomorphic terms, whether the conventionality is that of natural rights or any other. And in respect of this positive training away from conventional forms, there is a large divergence between the several lines of industrial employment. In proportion as a given line of employment has more of the character of a machine process and less of the character of handicraft, the matter-of-fact training which it gives is more pronounced. In a sense more intimate than the inventors of the phrase seem to have appreciated, the machine has become the master of the man who works with it and an arbiter in the cultural fortunes of the community into whose life it has entered.

"The intellectual and spiritual training of the machine in modern life, therefore, is very far-reaching. It leaves but a small proportion of the community untouched; but while its constraint is ramified throughout the body of the population, and constrains virtually all classes at some point in their daily life, it falls with the most direct, intimate and unmitigated impact upon the skilled mechanical classes, for these have no respite from its mastery, whether they are at work or at play.

"The ubiquitous presence of the machine, with its spiritual concomitant—working ideals and scepticism of what is only conventionally valid — is the unequivocal mark of the Western culture of today as contrasted with the culture of other times and places. It pervades all classes and strata in a varying degree, but on an average in a greater degree than at any time in the past, and most potently in the advanced industrial communities and in the classes immediately in contact with the mechanical occupations. As the comprehensive mechanical organization of the material side of life has gone on, a heightening of this cultural effect throughout the community has also supervened, and with a farther and faster movement in the same direction a farther accentuation of this "modern" complexion of culture is fairly to be looked for, unless some remedy be found. And as the concomitant differentiation and specialization of occupations goes on, a still more unmitigated discipline falls upon ever widening classes of the population, resulting in an ever weakening sense of conviction, allegiance, or piety toward the received institutions." (pp. 322-3-4.)

"With such generality as commonly holds in statements of this kind, it may be said that the modern socialistic disaffection is loosely bound up with the machine industry—spreading where this industry spreads and flourishing where this industry gives

the dominant note of life. The correlation between the two phenomena is of such a kind as to leave no doubt that they are causally connected; which means either that the machine industry, directly or indirectly, gives rise to socialism, or that the two are expressions of the same complex of causes. The former statement probably expresses the truth of the case in great part, but the latter need not therefore be false. Wherever and in so far as the increase and diffusion of knowledge has made the machine process and the mechanical technology the tone-giving factor in men's scheme of thought, there modern socialistic iconoclasm follows by easy consequence." (pp. 354-5.)

Here we have a conclusive demonstration of the inevitability of socialism, and with a change of terminology the argument is precisely the same with which it is to be hoped readers of this Review are familiar in the Communist Manifesto and in Engel's "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific."

The revolutionary character of the "socialistic iconoclasm" generated by the cultural discipline of the machine process is well brought out in the following passage:

"The machine process gives no insight into questions of good and evil, merit and demerit, except in point of material causation, nor into the foundations or the constraining force of law and order, except such mechanically enforced law and order as may be stated in terms of pressure, temperature, velocity, tensile strength, etc. The machine technology takes no cognizance of conventionally established rules of precedence; it knows neither manners nor breeding and can make no use of any of the attributes of worth. Its scheme of knowledge and of inference is based on the laws of material causation, not on those of immemorial custom, authenticity or authoritative enactment. Its metaphysical basis is the law of cause and effect, which in the thinking of its adepts has displaced even the law of sufficient reason.

"The range of conventional truths, or of institutional legacies, which it traverses is very comprehensive, being, indeed, all-inclusive. It is but little more in accord with the newer, eighteenth-century conventional truths of natural rights, natural liberty, natural law, or natural religion, than with the older norms of the true, the beautiful, and the good which these displaced. Anthropomorphism, under whatever disguise, is of no use and of no force here." (pp. 311-2).

Does not this suggest to the reader's mind this paragraph from the Communist Manifesto?

"The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property-relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas."

But it is above all the difference in the mental processes of the

conservatives and of those "tainted" with the "socialistic disaffection," which makes compromise and half-measures impossible, and makes modern socialism, our socialism, whether we will or no, revolutionary. That two classes differently circumstanced materially and economically should reason differently is a logical corollary from Marxian principles, so that it is in vain that Walling and Veblen attempt to differentiate the Veblen class-struggle from the Marxian class-struggle.

Prof. Veblen tells us :

"Leaving aside the archaic vocations of war, politics, fashion, and religion, the employments in which men are engaged may be distinguished as pecuniary or business employments on the one hand, and industrial or mechanical employments on the other hand... * * * * There is an appreciable and widening difference between the habits of life of the two classes; and this carries with it a widening difference in the discipline to which the two classes are subjected. It induces a difference in the habits of thought and the habitual grounds and methods of reasoning resorted to by each class. There results a difference in the point of view, in the facts dwelt upon, in the methods of argument, in the grounds of validity appealed to; and this difference gains in magnitude and consistency as the differentiation of occupations goes on. So that the two classes come to have an increasing difficulty in understanding one another and appreciating one another's convictions, ideals, capacities, and short comings.

"The ultimate ground of validity for the thinking of the business classes is the natural-rights ground of property,—a conventional anthropomorphic fact having an institutional validity, rather than a matter-of-fact validity such as can be formulated in terms of material cause and effect; while the classes engaged in the machine industry are habitually occupied with matters of causal sequence, which do not lend themselves to statement in anthropomorphic terms of natural rights and which afford no guidance in questions of institutional right and wrong, or of conventional reason and consequence. Arguments which proceed on material cause and effect can not be met with arguments from conventional precedent or dialectically sufficient reason, and conversely." (pp. 314 and 317-8).

Is it a violent inference to conclude that when conflicting material interests hurl against one another two classes that have absolutely no common ground in the realm of reason, the conflict can be settled by force alone, whether that force be the force of the workers' folded arms or the force of bullets and bombs? At any rate we may be quite sure the socialist iconoclast moulded by the cultural discipline of the machine process will not shrink from the use of force whenever and wherever the circumstances make its use expedient.

While, according to Prof. Veblen, the distinctive ear-mark of socialism is its disloyalty to the existing institution of property, "this is backed," he tells us, "by a similar failure of regard for other articles of the institutional furniture handed down from the past." To understand just how revolutionary this "failure of regard" is, one must read Veblen's "Theory of the Leisure Class," for in that epoch-marking volume, Veblen, the revolutionary iconoclast, hurtles around among the inherited "institutional furniture," the traditions and conventions and ethics bequeathed to us by the past, with all the joyous unconcern of a bovine male in an emporium for the sale of ceramic products. And how can a socialist fail to gurgle with glee when he realizes that this bomb was constructed by a Rockefeller employee in the Standard Oil laboratories at the University of Chicago?

How contemptuously Veblen regards reform and non-revolutionary socialism is shown by the following foot notes:

"Where members of the well-to-do classes avow socialistic sentiments and ideals it commonly turns out to be a merely humanitarian aspiration for a more equitable distribution of wealth, a readjustment of the scheme of ownership with some improved safeguarding of the 'reasonable' property claims of all members of the community." (pp. 342-3).

"If this account of the class limitation of the socialist bias is accepted, it has an immediate bearing upon a question which is latterly engaging the attention of the advocate of socialism. The question is as to the part played by propertyless office employees and by the business men whom the modern consolidations of business reduce to the position of salaried managers and superintendents. With a faith prompted by their own hopes rather than by observed facts or by the logic of events the spokesmen for socialism are strongly inclined to claim this business proletariat as a contingent which the course of economic development is bound to throw into the socialist camp. The facts do not in any appreciable degree countenance such an expectation. The unpropertied classes employed in business do not take to socialistic vagaries with such alacrity as should inspire a confident hope in the advocates of socialism or a serious apprehension in those who stand for law and order. This pecuniarily disfranchised business population, in its revulsion against unassimilated facts, turns rather to some excursion into pragmatic romance, such as Social Settlements, Prohibition, Clean Politics, Single Tax, Arts and Crafts, Neighborhood Guilds, Institutional Church, Christian Science, New Thought, or some such cultural thimble rig." (pp. 351-2).

"What may be called the normal socialism, socialism of the later, more dangerous, and more perplexing kind, does not build on the received metaphysical basis of the 'natural order.' It de-

mands a reconstruction of the social fabric, but it does not know on what lines the reconstruction is to be carried out. The natural rights of the individual are not accepted as the standard (except by certain large bodies of neophytes, especially rural Americans, who are carrying under socialist mottoes the burden of animosities and preconceptions that once made populism,) but nothing definite is put in the place of this outworn standard." (p. 339).

Veblen's view of "immediate demands" in a socialist platform may be inferred from the following foot note reference to Hobson, a typical "intellectual" socialist:

"Hobson (Problem of the Unemployed), whose analysis of overproduction and its relation to depression goes farther than any other, reviews and criticises (ch. VII) the palliative measures that have been advocated. He finds them, all and several, inadequate and inconsequent, in that they do not touch the root of the evil—oversaving or 'underconsumption.' They do not touch this because they do not mitigate the automatic saving and investment process that necessarily goes with the possession of large private incomes. But in point of practical efficiency his own proposed remedies must also be scheduled under the head of 'palliatives.' These proposed remedies are measures looking, to a 'Reformed Distribution of Consuming Power (ch. VI), such as taxation of 'unearned' incomes, higher wages, shorter working day. The aim is, to increase the proportion of the total wealth of the community, which falling to them as wages shall be spent in raising the general standard of working-class consumption.' The contemplated move is manifestly chimerical in any community, such as the modern industrial communities, where public policy is with growing singleness of purpose guided by business interests with a naive view to an increase of profits." (p. 257.)

Prof. Veblen's second chapter on "Business Principles" shows that the metaphysical basis of the business or capitalist concept of ownership, of property, is derived from the Natural Rights philosophy as expounded by Locke.

"It became a principle of the natural order of things that free labor is the original source of wealth and the basis of ownership. In point of historical fact, no doubt, such was not the pedigree of modern industry or modern ownership; but the serene, undoubting assumption of Locke and his generation only stands out the more strongly and unequivocally for this its discrepancy with fact." (Veblen pp. 78-9.)

"Political economy confuses on principle two very different kinds of private property, of which one rests on the producers' own labor, the other on the employment of the labor of others. It forgets that the latter not only is the direct antithesis of the former, but absolutely grows on its tomb only." (Marx, Capital Vol. I p. 488, Humboldt Edition.)

"Such a concept belongs to the régime of handicraft and petty trade, and it is from, or through, the era of handicraft that it has come down to the present." (Veblen p. 79.)

This thought is more fully elaborated in the eighth chapter on "Business Principles in Law and Politics," as will be seen by the following excerpts:

"Modern (civilized) institutions rest, in great part, on business principles." "Legislation and legal decisions are based on the dogma of Natural Liberty. This is peculiarly true as regards the English-speaking peoples, the foundation of whose jurisprudence is the common law, and it holds true in an especial degree of America. The dogma of natural liberty is peculiarly conducive to an expeditious business traffic and peculiarly consonant with the habits of thought which necessarily prevail in any business community.

"The current body of natural rights preconceptions antedates the modern business situation. The scheme of natural rights grew up and found secure lodgement in the common sense of the community, as well as with its lawgivers and courts, under the discipline of the small industry and petty trade ('domestic industry') whose development culminated in the eighteenth century." "The movement of opinion on natural-rights ground converged to an insistence on the system of natural liberty, so called. But this insistence on natural liberty did not contemplate the abrogation of all conventional prescription. 'The Simple and obvious system of natural liberty' meant freedom from restraint on any other prescriptive ground than that afforded by the rights of ownership. In its economic bearing the system of natural liberty meant a system of free pecuniary contract." "This principle of natural (pecuniary) liberty has found its most unmitigated acceptance in America, and has here taken the firmest hold on the legal mind. Nowhere else has the sacredness of pecuniary obligations so permeated the common sense of the community, and nowhere does pecuniary obligation come so near being the only form of obligation that has the unqualified sanction of current common sense. Here, as nowhere else, do obligations and claims of the most diverse kind, domestic, social, and civil, tend to take the pecuniary form and admit of being fully discharged on a monetary valuation. To a greater extent than elsewhere public esteem is awarded to artists, actors, preachers, writers, scientists, officials, in some rough proportion to the sums paid for their work." "Freedom of contract is the fundamental tenet of the legal creed, so to speak, inviolable and inalienable; and within the province of law and equity no one has competence to penetrate behind this first premise or to question the merits of the natural-rights metaphysics on which it rests." "As should fairly be expected, the higher courts, who are presumably in more in-

timate touch with the principles of jurisprudence, being more arduously trained and more thoroughly grounded in the law at the same time that they have also presumably a larger endowment of legal acumen—these higher courts speak more unequivocally for the metaphysical principles and apply them with a surer and firmer touch. In the view of these higher adepts of the law, free contract is so inalienable a natural right of man that not even a statutory enactment will enable a workman to forego its exercise and its responsibility. By metaphysical necessity its exercise attaches to the individual so indefeasibly that it cannot constitutionally be delegated to collective action, whether legislative or corporate." (pp. 68 to 280).

How beautifully the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court declaring unconstitutional the New York State law making ten-hours a legal working-day in bake-shops illustrates and enforces these remarks of Prof. Veblen!

Now, just as the Natural Rights philosophy is the metaphysical basis of capitalist apologetics, so the most marked characteristic of socialism is not so much a tendency to reject, as an utter incapacity to comprehend this same philosophy. In Veblen's words, "the immediate point of danger in the socialistic disaffection is a growing disloyalty to the natural rights institution of property."

That socialism meant a total rejection of the whole natural rights scheme, including Natural Liberty, was clearly enough understood by Marx and Engels, as witness this sentence from the Communist Manifesto:

"The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at."

Prof. Veblen points out that it is this rejection of natural rights and Natural Liberty which differentiates socialism most clearly from anarchy. He says:

"In their negative proposals the socialists and anarchists are fairly agreed. It is in the metaphysical postulates of their protest and in their constructive aims that they part company. Of the two, the socialists are more widely out of touch with the established order. They are also more hopelessly negative and destructive in their ideals, as seen from the standpoint of the established order. This applies to the later socialists rather than to the earlier, and it applies, of course, only to the lower-class, democratic socialists, not to the so-called state and Christian socialists.

"Anarchism proceeds on natural-rights ground, and is accordingly in touch with the postulates of the existing property arrangements to that extent. It is a more unmitigated working out of the same postulates. It is a system of 'natural liberty' unqualified to the extent even of not admitting prescriptive ownership. Its basis is a (divinely instituted) order of nature, the key-

note of which is an inalienable freedom and equality of the individual, quite in the eighteenth century spirit. It is in this sense an off shoot of the Romantic school of thought. Anarchism is a *de jure* scheme, which takes no account of mechanical exigencies but rests its case altogether on anthropomorphic postulates of natural-rights. It is, from the natural-rights standpoint, substantially sound, though senselessly extreme." (pp. 338-9.)

In the light of all this how absurd was the spectacle of an American Socialist convention adopting an American Socialist platform representing the American socialist party as the defender of the (capitalist and anarchist) idea of (natural) liberty in which this nation was born! Let us hope the party will provide each member of its next platform committee with a copy of Veblen's "Business Enterprise," and (will Comrade Walling regard me as hopelessly behind the times if I add?) the Communist Manifesto.

It is true the S. L. P. also has a natural-rights platform, though the natural-rights philosophy is not so obnoxiously in the foreground as it is in ours, but I do not care to dwell on the shortcomings of the S. L. P. as it is always painful to speak ill of the dead.

I am unable to agree with Prof. Veblen's contention that "the pervading characteristic of the trade-union animus is the denial of the received natural-rights dogmas wherever the mechanical standardization of modern industry traverses the working of these received natural rights." (pp. 328-9). For reasons that I gave at length in this REVIEW about a year ago, it seems to me that the pure and simple craft unions in defending their ordinary methods must have recourse to the same natural-rights philosophy upon which capitalism relies. It is only in the later developments of industrial unionism that I can perceive a tendency to break with the natural-rights philosophy.

Indeed I am inclined to think it would be a matter of no great difficulty to disprove Prof. Veblen's statement that "the growth of trade-unionism and of what is called the trade-union spirit is a concomitant of industry organized after the manner of a machine process." (p. 327.) There is much reason for maintaining on the contrary that unions are strongest in just those trades that are most nearly akin to handicrafts, and that the more machinery dominates a given trade the weaker either numerically or in efficiency do the unions in that trade become. If this be true, the largest and most powerful unions would be composed of just those workmen who had been least exposed to the cultural discipline of the Machine Process. I do not care to press this point, but it appears to me to afford at least a very fair working hypothesis to account for the ultra-conservative attitude of the American Federation of Labor.

In conclusion, to speak plainly, let me say that I regard Veblen's as the very greatest intellect that has been applied to economic and social questions since Marx and Engels; but, that if, as is not unlikely, he is about (to use George Ade's phrase) to "break into" the Socialist Party I shall not blister my hands celebrating the event. Why not? Because nine out of ten intellectuals who join the movement do so to lead it and not to serve it, and nine out of the said nine, if they attain leadership, prove misleaders. The only one who is ever worthy of trust in the movement is the one out of the ten who joins not to lead, but to serve.

In Veblen's case his straining after what he would call the "renown" of originality (when he was for the most part merely revamping Marxian doctrines) and his failure to give due credit to Marx, Engels and others, does not inspire me with confidence.

In general, when I hear that a new "intellectual" has joined the party my feelings are much the same as those of a sailor who sees a storm-signal hoisted when he is about to sail. The intellectual who will come in with the clear understanding that there are *no* reserved seats and all the benches are hard, will always have a comrade's welcome from me; but, frankly, what is the use of jumping out of the frying-pan of Herronism into the fire of Veblenism?

ROBERT RIVES LAMONTE.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

THE English and French jingoes of the 17th and 18th centuries were doubtless convinced that their countries were not only the leaders of Europe in economic and political progress, but also the pathfinders in science and philosophy. The wider horizon of the present day enables us to notice without difficulty, that a few thinkers of other nationalities, who viewed the events in England and France at a distance and enjoyed the advantage of undisturbed study and seclusion, did as much, if not more, for the evolution of human understanding as the scientists and philosophers of those industrially and politically more advanced countries.

Of course, the list of the scientific accomplishments of those two countries is not exhausted by the enumeration of the few facts previously mentioned as mile-stones in the road of evolutionary theories. Many other significant advances might be mentioned. To name but a few, the work of Hooke and Grew for the elaboration of the cell-theory, the discovery of the function of the stamens of flowers by Millington, and the attempts at classification made by Ray, the forerunner of Linnaeus, were among the minor steps in a forward direction. Priestly's studies on the absorption of carbon-dioxide and the evolution of oxygen by plants were rendered epoch-making by the deeper research of Lavoisier, who subverted the entire phlogistic theory of chemistry by showing the actual function of oxygen. But the significance of these discoveries for the progress of science was not appreciated in those times, not even by their authors. Their relation to philosophy was still less suspected.

This is especially true of an invention, which opened up entirely new fields of study, and has become one of the most revolutionary aids in evolution, the microscope. It developed out of the magnifying glass, and came into use as a scientific instrument about the beginning of the 17th century. Francesco Stelluti is regarded as the first, who made its use known to science. It became especially effective in the hands of Malpighi and Leeuwenhoek. Malpighi, in the latter half of the 17th century, published a complete anatomy of the silk-worm and studied the development of the chicken in the egg. Leeuwenhoek discovered the blood corpuscles and described the active elements

in the semen of male animals. After these scientists came an able corps of investigators and used the microscope to good effect in laying the foundation for an understanding of the individual development (ontogeny) of beings. From ontogeny to phylogeny, that is to say to the development of species, genera, classes, families, races, was but a logical step, which was made in the 19th century as soon as the material premises for it had developed.

But in the 17th and 18th centuries, the microscopical revelations "fell flat." This was mainly due to the prevailing theological conception of nature and to the lack of interrelation between the various sciences, which aggravated the difficulties arising from insufficient experience and from the undeveloped state of human control over society and nature.

Under these circumstances, a similar fate befell a work, which in our day ranks high in the literature of evolution—Kant's "Natural History and Theory of the Heavens," published in 1755, the year of the great earthquake, which in five minutes destroyed the city of Lisbon and killed 60,000 people. Hardly anyone took notice of the ideas advanced in this work, until Laplace, in 1799, published his "*Mécanique Céléste*" and furnished the mathematical proof for the Kantian hypotheses. Yet Kant's work was the most revolutionary, and, from the standpoint of materialist monism, most epoch-making publication since the time of Democritus. In it the Königsberg philosopher undertook to treat of the "constitution and the mechanical origin of the entire universe on the basis of Newtonian principles." He proceeded to demonstrate that the sun and its system had developed mechanically by a rotation of a primitive nebular substance filling universal space, and thus established a theory, which has maintained itself up to the present day. Only in the beginning of the 20th century a few voices have been lifted against it and a new cosmogony advocated, which nevertheless, in its essence, is still a mere modification in modern garb of the atomic theory of Democritus, on which Kant's theory is likewise based.

By demonstrating the mechanical origin of the universe and transforming the "divine" act of creation into a historical process, Kant went far beyond Newton, who had assumed that a god had given the first impulse to the universe and then left it to follow its own laws. Yet Kant, too, was loath to dismiss the creator. There was still a last hiding place for the mysterious element of dualism in the fact that the human understanding, with its present organization in the cosmic process, does not penetrate to the "final nature" of things. Kant made this fact the basis for carping attacks on Democritus, on whose shoulders he stood and whose philosophy was in many respects superior to his own.

Moreover, Kant never grasped the historical relation of Democritus to Epicurus, and always regarded Epicurus as the father of "sensualism" (materialism), while we have seen that Epicurus was a follower of Democritus. It is also indisputable that lack of historical perception was not the least of Kant's shortcomings. His philosophy suffers especially from his unfamiliarity with those natural sciences, without which no sound theory of understanding can exist, namely comparative physiology, biology, and sociology. He never realized, that philosophy requires not alone the direct co-operation of these special sciences, but in the last analysis of every department of human knowledge. Even if we admit that this defect was largely due to the scantiness of the empirical material of his time and to the incomplete equipment of the Prussian universities under Frederick the Great, it was also a consequence of his extreme philistinism and book-worm tendencies. He certainly made more liberal concessions to the arrogance of orthodox and bureaucratic censorship, than many of his humbler intellectual contemporaries in Prussia.

But in spite of his mental gymnastics in the matter of a god, the fact remains, that his nebular theory of the origin of the universe, in its logical application, knocks the main prop from under the Mosaic world-conception, which had already been considered ably shaken by the discoveries and demonstrations of Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton. Laplace was more consistent and courageous than Kant and did not hesitate to declare in reply to a question of Napoleon I., that he had no need of the hypothesis of a creator. No better proof is required for the soundness of this position, than the persistent silence, which the theologians have maintained about Kant's nebular hypothesis, while praising the dualistic ethics and theory of understanding contained in his second work. "The Critique of Pure Reason," published in 1781.

In order to appreciate Kant's philosophy fully, this work must be compared with his "Critique of Practical Reason," published in 1788. The essence of his teaching in the former work is, that the world of phenomena, such as we perceive it, is entirely conditioned on the organization of our senses. Owing to this fact, we can never perceive the true nature of a thing, the "thing in itself." There is only one universe, and everything in it is regulated by natural laws, operating as sternly as the law of gravitation. The freedom of will cannot be demonstrated by "pure" reason. The existence of a god and the immortality of the soul cannot be ascertained within the possible limits of experience.

However, throughout the work there are scattered passages stating the exact opposite. One would be at a loss to understand what Kant was really driving at, if he had not given an explanation for his contradictions in his preface to the second edition

of this work, 1787. There he says that he had "to abolish reason, in order to make room for belief." And this was necessary, in order that he might "confer an inestimable benefit on morality and religion, by showing that the objections urged against them may be silenced forever by the Socratic method, that is to say, by proving the ignorance of the objector. For as the world has never been, and no doubt will never be, without a system of metaphysics of one kind or another, it is the highest and weightiest concern of philosophy to render it powerless for harm, by closing up the sources of error." One of these sources of error, as he says in his "Critique of Pure Reason," is found in men like Locke, who promote the idea that the existence of a god and the immortality of the soul *can* be proven with mathematical certainty from the fact that there is no knowledge outside of experience.

What a strange spectacle! Materialist Locke reprimanded by idealist Kant for insisting that the existence of a god and the immortality of the soul *can* be mathematically demonstrated, and idealist Kant violently insisting that such a thing is entirely outside of all possible experience and must be *believed!* And all for the benefit of religion and rulers! And what a peculiar logic! Fancy the Socratic method in the role of the invincible sword, which will lay open the ignorance of all objectors to religion, and remember that no religion in the world could stand the test of that method!

This, then, was the mighty outcome of two thousand years of philosophy since the time of Democritus, that religions were considered safe, and the states defended by them secure, *because* it could *not* be proven by experience that a god existed and that the human soul was immortal; that the mass of the people could never ascertain the truth of these things by their own unaided faculties, but must *believe* them upon the word of authorities! Surely, the mountain need not have labored through 500 pages of gold-brick science to bring forth such a mouse!

Of course, Kant had spoken the truth, when he said that theology must be believed. But what a strange fact, that all other schools of thought, especially the natural sciences and psychologies, should be compelled, under penalty of immediate ridicule, to demonstrate every iota of their theories by irrefutable evidence, while the champions of religion should be privileged to fling their unprovable assertions into our teeth and insist that they were speaking the truth, *because* it could not be demonstrated. And that from the man, who had done more than any of his predecessors to undermine the world foundations, on which this preposterous assumption is resting!

Kant thus acknowledged voluntarily, that he was not a philosopher, who stood high above the world and men, but merely a

common bourgeois sophist, who served the interests of the ruling class. As such he destroyed the dogmatic philosophy, which had done the work of feudal society so well, and established a philosophy, which was made to order for the requirements of the rising bourgeoisie. As a scientist, he was a materialist, who re-iterated the philosophy of Democritus, Epicurus, and Locke, and who re-established the principle of mechanical development in nature, which was a distinct advance over the English and French materialists, if not over the Grecian natural philosophers. But as a philosopher, he was as scholastic, sophisticated and reactionary as any foe of progress could be.

Much is made of Kant's "categorical imperative," the basis of his ethics, which runs: "Act at all times so that thou usest man in thy own person as well as in that of others not only as a means, but also as an end." This ethics, like many another conceived by bourgeois minds after Kant, falls to pieces the moment it is tried as a rule of conduct in society. Its ambiguity, and therefore its meaninglessness, becomes apparent in the effects of class-environment on human reason. Well does Franz Mehring characterize the Kantian imperative, when he writes: "For the historical thinker, this statement of Kant's appears at once as the historical precipitation of the economic fact, that the bourgeoisie, in order to obtain objects of exploitation suitable for their ends, must not only use the working class as a means, but also take care to create a proletariat, in other words, to free them in the name of human liberty from feudal rule."

But in spite of his categorical imperative, and his admiration for the French revolution, Kant demanded full liberty only for the *citizens* of the state, not for all its members, especially not for the women and for the working class. Thus he fell back to the status of the Roman constitution under the Caesars.

In his "Critique of Discrimination," Kant discovered the laws of creative imagination and demonstrated that art is an innate faculty of man. This work also contains the statement that the descent of all organic beings from a common primeval ancestor is a thesis which is in conformity with the principle of mechanical development in nature. But Kant deprecated such a hypothesis as a "risky adventure of reason." He was afraid of the logical application of the very principle which he had established in his cosmogeny. In other respects, however, this work and his cosmological views may be read with profit, even by modern proletarians.

The thinker of the present day, with his vast array of empirical facts, is apt to be too harsh in his judgment of the shortcomings of his predecessors in earlier centuries. But I cannot blame Paul Ree for summing up Kant's philosophy in these words: "In

Kant's works you feel as though you were at a country fair. You can buy from him—anything you want—freedom of the will and captivity of the will, idealism and a refutation of idealism, atheism and the good Lord. Like a juggler out of an empty hat, so Kant draws out of the concept of duty a god, immortality, freedom, to the great surprise of his readers. True, these illegitimate children of Kant's philosophy do not like to venture forth into the light of day. They are somewhat ashamed of their existence, more especially so, because they find favor in the eyes of god and men, particularly of men clothed with authority."

The followers of Kant claim that he has defined the powers and limits of human perception for all time to come. But the "Critique of Pure Reason" demonstrates precisely the impossibility of such absolute perception on the part of Kant or of any other man. His own powers of perception, especially in sociology, certainly never penetrated beyond the bourgeois horizon, and in other respects even some of his immediate followers surpassed him, for instance Laplace in his elaboration of the nebular theory, and Schopenhauer, the legitimate heir of his philosophy, in ethics. As for the germ of truth contained in Kant's "categorical imperative" and in his "thing in itself," we shall see that proletarian philosophers gathered out of it an advance in thought for the revolution of the modern working class.

In the same year, in which Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" appeared, Herschel discovered the planet Uranus. And two years later, the brothers Montgolfier made their first successful balloon ascension, opening new fields of research in the atmosphere and spurring the inventive minds of humanity to greater technical exertions. In 1789, Lavoisier established the law of the conservation of matter, which, supplemented in 1842 by Robert Mayer's law of the conservation of energy, remained one of the fundamental tenets of modern science, until the evolutionary conception of the transformation of energy was introduced at a later stage. In 1791, Galvani published his discoveries in animal electricity, and Thomas Paine appeared with his "Rights of Man." Galvani's discovery led to startling industrial revolutions in the 19th century. Paine's idea that man has natural rights, which no other creature in the universe has, furnished a great deal of powder to the bourgeoisie, so long as they were revolutionary, but philosophically it was a step backward and away from a monistic conception of the universe and human society. Paine stood in sociology on the same ground as Rousseau, and was as little aware of the existence and functions of evolutionary development and class-struggles as the celebrated Frenchman.

The French revolution had broken out in the meantime, and the philosophers now had an opportunity to watch what pure

reason, practical reason, natural rights, the categorical imperative, the social contract, and metaphysical idealism could accomplish. After wading through rivers of blood at the instigation of practical reason, pure reason mounted the throne by decree of the national convention, on November 10, 1793. The worship of reason, lasted till June 8, 1794, when Robespierre brought god and metaphysical idealism back to the throne, dethroned reason, declared atheism to be an aristocratic sin, and celebrated the festival of the supreme being. But on July 27, 1794, the supreme being remembered the categorical imperative, left Robespierre ungratefully in the lurch, and looked on at a safe distance while "eternal justice" chopped off the good man's head with that gory instrument of natural rights introduced by practical reason, the guillotine. Lavoisier received the same reward for his services to mankind that Robespierre earned for his services to the supreme being. Reason and the supreme being continued to relieve one another, until finally Napoleon I. replaced them both by bayonets and cannons, and discredited the supreme being by declaring that it was always on the side of the strongest battalions. And so the reign of reason and of the supreme being ended in the nauseating farce of the restoration of "law and order."

The reign of reason appeared on closer scrutiny as a transcendental image of the capitalist state. The existence of the supreme being had not been proven, neither by decree of parliament nor by the guillotine, and for that very reason it continued to exist in those heads which were accustomed to reason no better than those which had been chopped off. The categorical imperative, stripped of its gaudy trappings, stood forth as the impotent and incapable wag that he was. The social contract was renewed on the basis of "Every one for himself and the devil takes the hindmost." And the natural rights were bossed around by the right to exploit the proletariat and to place private property above propertyless man.

In the beginning of the 19th century, the disappointment over the failure of all the glittering ideals of bourgeois philosophy soon made itself felt in an awakening of evolutionary ideas in social science among the champions of the working class. Fourier began to elaborate his theories of social reconstruction, in 1799, and to aim the danger thrusts of his critique at the heart of capitalist society. And for the first time since the overthrow of women's equality with men in prehistoric times, a woman, Mary Wollstonecraft, raised her voice in protest against the economic and social slavery of her sex. Saint Simon saw dimly that material forces are the active element in social movements and compel society to develop mechanically through class-struggles. And Fourier, after him, drew the first theoretical outline of the evo-

lution of man from savagery, through barbarism and patriarchy, to civilization. The investigators of the 19th century following him were soon to supply the empirical proofs for this theory. On the other side of the channel, Robert Owen startled the comfortable English bourgeois with his colony at New-Lanark and threw the firebrand of the Chartist movement into the quiet dulness of British life.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(To be Continued.)

EDITORIAL

School "Strikes" in Chicago.

Nothing that has occurred in connection with the great teamsters' strike has created as much comment as have the "strikes" of the children of the public schools. Not even the importation of criminal cut-throats, who have committed more crimes during the past month than can be laid at the door of the unions for the last decade has aroused the professional moralists of capitalism like the signs of sympathetic resistance to tyranny on the part of the children of the public schools. Every daily in the city has filled its editorial columns with wise gush about the horrible actions of these young "lawbreakers." The board of education, the truancy department and the police have been all called into action to "crush out rebellion in the public schools." The Teachers' Federation has been fiercely attacked, for even a suspicion of sympathy and sermons have been preached without number all agreeing that it is a most "deplorable situation."

Especially interesting has been the attitude of these professionally good people, sentimentalists, "sociologists," and class harmonizers, the Social Settlement residents. They have thrown aside their palaver about "no class" and rushed frantically into print in order to "express their disapproval" of any action on the part of the school children showing sympathy with their fathers and brothers in their struggle for better conditions for those same children.

And, as defenders of capitalism, exploitation, wage-slavery and all that goes to make up the present social hell, they are perfectly right. There has been nothing that has happened these twenty years that so certainly tells the story of the coming downfall of that same capitalism as the action of these children. It shows that the entire proletarian strata of society is becoming conscious of its rights, and still more of its wrongs.

Such spontaneous movements as these indicate the existence of a deep class-consciousness, a solidarity of action, rebellion and co-operation that bodes ill for the social tyrants of today, and forecasts much of good for the society of tomorrow.

"But," these moralists whine, "this is no question for the children to

take part in. They cannot possibly know what they are doing. It is wicked to involve these little ones in these great questions." But these same moralists do not object to the use of the public schools to teach lessons of "patriotism," servility and submission to the system that means enslavement for the laborer's child the moment he leaves the school. We heard no protest from those who are so frightened lest the children may now be misled, when on the twenty-second of last February the schools were given up to the most nauseous palaver concerning the institutions that condemn these same children to the narrow, cramped life of the wage-slave in the midst of a land so filled with bounty that all might be free.

So, backed by editor, priest, preacher and philanthropist, the truant officers have descended upon these little ones to prevent their corruption by sympathy for the struggle of their fathers, and have made them familiar with the inside of courts, prison walls, and reform schools. Their parents have been fined or imprisoned because they did not use force to crush out every symptom of righteous sympathetic rebellion on the part of their children.

We are proudly told that at last the "majesty of the law" has been vindicated because the police and courts of Chicago have succeeded in sending twenty or more of these children to a "truant school." Surely that will make them love "law and order." It will instill into their minds an abiding affection for the institutions of justice as at present administered, of a sort that will take many a Fourth of July and Washington's Birthday oration to eradicate.

It is certain that the children who refused to attend school, because the educational authorities were employing scab drivers, and who were dragged into court and placed in confinement for so doing will have learned at least one lesson that was not in their text-books,—and that lesson is that the society in which they now live is a class-ruled society, in which the ruling class is their enemy. The years are but few when they will put that lesson into practical application at the ballot-box. When that day comes we may perhaps thank our "dear friends the enemy," for having kindly helped in this way to wipe the whole system of class-rule, exploitation and slavery off the earth.

Something About the Review.

There are four reasons why we want to say a few words about the REVIEW to our readers at this time.

First, We believe that the present is perhaps, the very best number we ever issued. The Kautsky article is attracting international attention, and has been referred to in various capitalist as well as socialist publications of this country as a remarkable analysis and contribution to the understanding of a very complicated situation. The series by Comrade

Boudin is, we believe, the most important contribution to Marxism that has ever appeared in the English language, and is exceeded by few if any treatments of this subject that have appeared in other languages. Its study constitutes no mean education in socialist philosophy.

The series now running by Comrade Untermann has also attracted a large amount of favorable comment and is also entitled to be ranked as one of the few actual additions of permanent value. Comrade Lamont's and Comrade Thompson's articles are examples of two wholly different kinds of controversial contributions, one a theoretical and educational treatment of a disputed point, the other a fiercely controversial discussion of a tactical difference.

The second reason for talking at this time on this subject is the fact that the present volume completes the fifth year of the REVIEW's existence and it is always customary to take stock at such a time. We ask our readers to go back over the five years and ask themselves if the REVIEW has not made good its title to a place in the American expression of the international socialist movement. We believe that an examination of its pages will show that it has been what it has claimed to be, a periodical history of international socialist thought and action. In this connection we might state that the material for the articles on socialism in the two leading American encyclopedias, was largely drawn from the files of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Third: We have just taken over the subscription list of "*The Comrade*," and this means that the present issue will go to many who have hitherto been strangers to the REVIEW. To such we ask that they lend us their support if, on examination of our work they believe we deserve it.

Fourth, we wish to call the attention of every reader to the fact that up to the present time the REVIEW has been published at a loss, and that this deficit has now reached a point where it endangers the future existence of the publication. If every present subscriber renew when his subscription expires, sending a full dollar, the deficit will disappear. By the way a large number expire this month. Is yours one of them? If so send in the dollar today. Some will not do this, so it will be necessary for others to subscribe. To get these additional ones must be largely the work of the present subscribers. If every reader whose subscription expires this June were to send in one additional name with the dollar the problem would be solved. When it is so easy to prevent it, it would be criminal and disgraceful to the American socialist movement to permit the REVIEW to stop. Read what Comrade Debs says on this point. Then go and do likewise.

Dear Comrade Simons:

Please find \$1.00 enclosed for which send the "REVIEW" for a year to some workingman who ought to have it.

It is not to the credit of socialists that they do not give better support

to the "REVIEW." I have read what you have been forced to say upon this point in the current issue with regret. The "REVIEW" holds a place of its own and is doing a great work and it ought to be far more liberally supported than it is.

Don't give up; you'll win out.

Yours fraternally,

EUGENE V. DEBS.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

No sooner did Congress adjourn leaving the eight-hour bill sleeping peacefully in a pigeon-hole of a committee room, to the great delight of the Parryites, who were shaking hands with themselves and each other because of their victory, when along comes Attorney-General Moody and announces that the present eight-hour law—which regulates the labor time of government employes, while the bill in Congress also proposed that supplies furnished the government must be produced on an eight-hour basis—does not apply to work on the Panama Canal. By what method of reasoning Moody has arrived at the conclusion that laws can be arbitrarily set aside in building the canal when it is enforced in building sewers, or constructing ships in the Brooklyn navy yard to float through the canal, is not mentioned, but in all probability the Attorney-General heard his master's voice, and that is sufficient reason. Roosevelt evidently wanted the decision just handed out, for the dispatches that gave the details stated that "this ruling is especially gratifying to the President and the Secretary of War." It is rather significant that this decision was rendered at the very first Cabinet meeting after Roosevelt's arrival from the West, where he displayed his human and lofty ideas of citizenship by slaughtering wild animals and delivering speeches for the benefit of the people in general and the Chicago striking teamsters in particular upon the necessity of "obeying the law." While this brazen violation of law on the part of the President and his politicians is bad enough, yet there is another phase of this question that demonstrates the utter heartlessness of Roosevelt where the interests of labor are concerned. Everybody, including the President and Secretary Taft, has read the dispatches announcing almost daily that hundreds of workers are fleeing from Panama because of the yellow fever epidemic, and that strikes are quite frequent on account of low wages, long hours, bad sanitation, poor food, shelter, etc. Medical experts declare that persons weakened by excessive labor or over-indulgence in liquor or poor food and housing are the first to fall a prey to the dreaded scourge; and so if there is any class of men on earth who ought to work the shortest hours, receive the highest pay and enjoy the best possible conditions it is those who are burrowing through the swamps of Panama for the glorification of American capitalism. Moody's decision is an outrage, but strictly in line with the whole policy of the present administration, which will go down in history as the most brutal and hostile to labor's progress that has ever been in office. For some reason that nobody has attempted to explain "Terrible Teddy" has been called "the workingman's friend" in many quarters; yet the reverse is true. Roosevelt's whole public career has been one in which he displayed supreme contempt for labor, beginning with his office of police commissioner in New York City, when he was credited with being

the inventor of a policeman's riot club bristling with spikes, a weapon so barbarous that a patent could not be obtained from the authorities. As governor of New York he called out the militia to help break the eight-hour law during the Croton Dam Strike, when the guns of his minions were turned against the laborers who attempted to compel the contractors to enforce the law, while the law-breaking employers were given full protection. Roosevelt also wrote in books and magazines, in one of which he declares that Grover Cleveland did the right thing in smashing state rights and breaking the backbone of the Pullman strike; in another he says the dissolute cowboys of the West, who are driven crazy by liquor and ride through town shooting right and left (his ideal existence apparently) are a better class than the workers of the shops and factories; in still another he declares that the advocates of abolition of government by injunction belong in the age of prehistoric man and the woolly rhinoceros. As President he has embraced every opportunity to make it known that his sympathies are with the union-smashing open shop fanatics. In the anthracite coal strike his man Carroll D. Wright wrote the commission's open shop agreement; in the government printing office case he encouraged disloyalty to the bookbinders' union and damaged the discipline of a whole department and humiliated responsible officials by upholding a man named Miller, enforcing the open shop principle. Then he appointed as Secretary of the navy the notorious lawbreaker and open shop disciple, Mr. Paul Morton, who was engaged at the time, as an official of the Santa Fee railway, in making every effort to destroy the unions of machinists, boilermakers and other workers. He also offered a Cabinet position to Mr. H. C. Frick, the pioneer open shop union-buster of Homestead infamy. When Senator Quarles, the Wisconsin open shop leader, was defeated for re-election Roosevelt quickly appointed him as a United States judge, where Quarles will have a life job to harass the organized working people. About the same time the cowardly ruffian, Sherman Bell, of Colorado bull-pen fame, informed the Denver newspaper reporters that Roosevelt, his dear friend, had offered him the position of special U. S. agent in Venezuela. Some of the apologists of capitalism may say that the government does not and cannot endorse trade unions, which in itself is a debatable question. Neither do the national and state constitutions and the laws endorse wholesale scabbery and all the open shop villainy that breeds poverty and suffering and every form of crime. Wipe out all the unions, and what would Roosevelt and all his satellites do for labor? Where have they ever championed a reduction of ten hours of toil, a raise of wages or improvement of conditions in any way? Let those who voted for the present occupant of the White House answer. Those workingmen who are Republican party slaves and defenders of criminal capitalism will have a mighty hard job to square the foregoing facts with their conscience, provided they claim to be free men.

Readers of the REVIEW will recall that last month I mentioned the fact that Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, made the deliberate misstatement that "the Socialists have called another convention to smash the American trade union movement," which convention is to assemble in Chicago on the twenty-seventh of this month to form an industrial federation, that the trade union declarations of the Socialist party were not adopted in good faith, and that I had challenged him to prove his charges at the Pittsburg session of the A. F. of L. next November. I asked him to prove, in a public debate, first, that the endorsement of the trade union movement by the Socialist party was not in good faith, or, second, that said Socialist party was directly or indirectly concerned in the formation of the proposed new federation, or thirdly, that Socialism is wrong in

principle (wrong, unsound and impossible, as he declared in the Boston A. F. of L. convention). This fair invitation to discuss the charges made at a time when he will be surrounded by his warmest partisans from every section of the country has elicited a three-page editorial roast in the American Federationist (May) of a personal nature. Mr. Gompers declares that in the past I have "indulged in the worst diatribes against the men in the trade union movement who have and are giving their all—aye, their very lives—to the cause and interests of their fellow workers," and further on, speaking of the challenge, he asks in an insulting tone whether I desire to place myself "in the category of the anti-trade unionists or as an opponent to trade unionism." He also modifies his charge that "the" Socialists are attempting to smash trade union movement by declaring that "the most active" members are misbehaving in this respect. But just as he originally charged that "the" Socialists were engaged in organizing the opposition federation, in the hope that the studied misrepresentation would lead the unthinking working people to believe that the Socialist party was going into the trade union business, so now he charges that I have indulged in the worst diatribes against "the men in the trade union movement who have and are giving their all—aye, their very lives—to the cause and interests of their fellow workers," etc. In other words, my sleek old friend would have it appear that I attacked the whole trade union movement, of which he poses as the savior, just as every political demagogue pretends to speak for "the people." That I have condemned the acts of *some* of Gompers' friends is true, and if he accepts my challenge, which still stands unless he retracts, he can have the privilege of defending them. For example, Mr. P. J. McGuire, formerly first vice-president of the A. F. of L., Gompers' right bower, Socialist smasher from Wayback Junction, who was repudiated by the union that he thought he owned, the Brotherhood of Carpenters, for malfeasance (a charitable term) of office. There was Henry Weissmann, general secretary of the bakers, left bower of Mr. Gompers, who did yeoman service at the New York A. F. of L. convention to defeat John McBride and boost Gompers back into office; Weissmann, the ingrate, who has been gloating like a fiend in the New York papers because he, as the walking delegate of the open shop baker bosses, succeeded in securing the decision from the United States Supreme Court declaring the ten-hour law unconstitutional. He was a great Socialist smasher in his time, but when any trade unionist pronounces the name of Weissmann now he ought to wash out his mouth with some strong antiseptic. Then there was "Bill" Pomeroy, the notorious labor skate of Chicago. How he used to denounce the Socialists and cultivate the acquaintance of boodle distributors and give champagne suppers—and all for the glory of the workingman! "Dick" Powers, Pomeroy's side-partner, also gave his all and his very life to the cause and interest of his debauched fellow skates. Only a short time ago Harry White, general secretary of the garment workers, who was wont to howl like a stuck pig about being "abused" when anyone essayed to criticise his acts, and who was ever ready to denounce the Socialists as enemies of trade unions, turned Judas in a life and death struggle against the open shop, and was ignominiously expelled from the organization. The late Sam Parks and his understudy, Weinsheimer, who wouldn't hesitate to steal a red-hot stove, were also "ferninst" the wicked Socialists. I have likewise attacked the methods of the late P. M. Arthur, ardent autonomist that he was, who gave his "very life" for a mansion on Euclid avenue, in Cleveland, and large holdings in stocks and bonds, acquired through his cleverness and thrift, probably in isolating the engineers when their brother workers were engaged in struggles, and his ability to win the confidence of the railway magnates, frenzied financiers and wall street manipulators. I confess to

having "roasted" in print and to their faces such old-time trade unionists as Frank Sargent, ex-chief of the railway firemen; Mahlon Garland, formerly president of the iron and steel workers; T. V. Powderly, ex-master workman of the K. of L.; "Mike" Ratchford, ex-president of the United Mine Workers; John McBride, Pat McBride, "Jim" Sovereign and others more or less obscure who "gave up their very lives" for political jobs while professing that labor should keep out of politics, or went over to the employers and are now using the valuable knowledge they obtained as union officials in "the cause and interest of their" capitalistic master. If Mr. Gompers insists upon defending these gents, "the" men in the trade union movement, from my "diatribes" I am perfectly willing to give him the opportunity at Pittsburg or any other place at any time or he may write an article for the REVIEW, and I will undertake to answer the same. My contention is and has been that the trade unions are no place for persons who would climb over the backs of their fellow-workers to do service for capitalism, as betrayers, political office-holders, agents, commissioners or in any other capacity. Labor has honored and rewarded them and supported them in comfortable circumstances, and deserves a better fate than to be sold into a new slavery. If to attack those who deliberately urge workingmen to vote for brutal labor-crushers and for policies and principles that have proven to be and are now a menace to the workers; if to advocate that labor resolve itself into a compact, disciplined and class-conscious mass, vote against capitalism and itself into control of the law-making machinery, the courts, the militia and police, if that is diatribe, denunciation or high treason, I plead guilty. Gompers asks whether I desire to place myself "in the category of the anti-trade unionists or as an opponent of trade unionism." The brazen cheek of the man! Neither I or my friends are not now Parry open shop advocates or boodlers, like the Weissmanns, Whites, McGuires, Pomeroy and the rest of the unprincipled bunch who attacked me and those who believe as I do, and attempted to sell labor from the auction block, as they sold themselves. Nor do I or my friends hobnob with the Belmonts and Carnegies and Clevelands in the National Civic Federation, nor advocate the autonomy policy that causes one craft organization to remain at work while another is on strike, nor oppose political action while the capitalist class wields the big stick over the back of labor in every great strike. Trade unionist? Trade unionism? Where did Gompers get his knowledge of the organized labor movement from? Say, from the old British school? Well, while he has stood in his tracks like a petrified man for a quarter of a century the British have moved forward. The British Trade Union Congress (to which body we send fraternal delegates) as well as the Labor Representation Committee have declared in favor of socialism. Did he receive his knowledge from Australia? The trade unions and the Labor party, which recently had control of that commonwealth, have gone on record in favor of socialism. Surely Gompers did not get his education from the organized workers in Germany, France, Austria, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and other continental countries, or even from far-off Japan or South Africa, for the toilers of those nations have declared in favor of Socialism. The man is simply attempting to enforce his peculiar policies for evermore upon the working people of the United States, even if they are to be isolated from the rest of the world, and to bully and browbeat everybody into accepting his views. He doesn't seem to have the slightest conception of the evolution of capitalism, industrially or politically, or care how much or from in what direction labor is oppressed, but there is an end to all things, even the "inside ring" of Gompersism.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

RUSSIA.

Very little is allowed to leak through concerning the progress of revolutionary forces in Russia. From what little can be learned it would seem that there is a condition closely approaching a continuous general massacre prevailing throughout the Russian empire. A private dispatch from one of the participants to *Vorwaerts* concerning an occurrence at Warsaw on the first of May gives a view of one of the terrible happenings in Russia. "About twenty thousand workers had gathered to celebrate the first of May when suddenly without the slightest warning or without the least occasion on our part, with no command to disperse, a volley was fired at us, which was but the beginning of a continuous firing. We rushed into a building but the soldiers like wild beasts, sprang upon us firing volley after volley into the mass crowded together within the room. The shooting continued for a full quarter of an hour, which seemed to us an eternity. More than fifty persons fell dead before our eyes, more than a hundred were severely wounded; the most of which were women, children and aged persons." Meanwhile the Russian Capitalist class is showing their true colors. The following article also taken from *Vorwaerts* shows how correct is the position taken by Comrade Kautsky in his article which appears elsewhere in this number. "Scarcely had the dawn of the new time appeared in Russia and the revolution attained its bare beginning when there arose within the classes that are interested in the abolition of present conditions the most fundamental class antagonism. To be sure the capitalists and the entrepreneurs are very anxious to see the autocracy abolished. They are very willing also that the proletariat should fight for this end, but they do not wish the demands of the working class to be attained. Very characteristic of the class struggle which actually exists today between capitalists and laborers in Russia are the resolutions which the factory owners association of St. Petersburg adopted a few weeks ago. This union is composed of 140 industrial firms. The first resolution opposes the shortening of the hours of labor, whether by law or by agreements of a private nature between factory owners and their laborers. The participation of laborers in determining wages or in the question of internal factory management are absolutely unallowable. Every attempt on the part of the laborers to take part in the decision of these questions must be rejected. The right to discharge must belong exclusively to the manager of the factory and any participation of laborers in this privilege must be opposed under all circumstances. The demands of the laborer for the abolition of fines are to be rejected. The demands of the Laborers for a guaranteed wage for piece workers as well as a

minimum wage for day laborers are not to be considered. Wages must be fixed by the law of supply and demand and any deviation therefrom, even if it appears to be merely formal, is to be considered dangerous, since it sets an undesirable precedent for the participation of laborers."

ENGLAND.

The Social Democratic Federation and the Independent Labor Party have both held their annual conference during the past month. Both report increased growth. The Social Democratic Federation passed a resolution looking toward a unity of the two parties. The I. L. P. refused to consider unity unless the S. D. F. should first unite with the Labor Representation Committee. It was well recognized that this would not be done, and therefore the resolution of the I. L. P. can scarcely be considered as being wholly in good faith.

In this connection a letter to *Justice* from Comrade S. C. Hobson, who is known to most of our readers, is of interest. He states that "One if not two of the most influential members of the N. A. C. now sees the need for socialist consolidation. One of them is prepared to work in that direction and last week publicly expressed this intention. I refer to Keir Hardie. The situation now is that in the near future the L. R. C. must become so socialistic in tone and outlook as to justify the S. D. F. affiliation, or it must declare itself so distinctly non-committed in regard to socialism that the I. L. P. must leave it. Its present indeterminate position can not long continue, in either alternative unity is assured."

BOOK REVIEWS

"THE HISTORY OF THE STANDARD OIL COMPANY." By *Ida M. Tarbell*.
McClure, Phillips & Co. Cloth, Two Vols. \$5.00.

The story of Standard Oil has now been told thoroughly from three different points of view. Henry D. Lloyd gave us the methods by which it controlled government agencies. Lawson is telling the story of its "Frenzied Finance," and in these volumes Miss Tarbell writes more fundamentally from the industrial point of view. As is suited to her method of approach she speaks with less of vehemence than either of the others. She takes as a sort of introductory motto, Rockefeller's now famous saying that "The American Beauty Rose can be produced in its splendor and fragrance only by sacrificing the early buds which grew up around it." In the first chapter we have the story of the competitive stage. In 1859 the first well was sunk at Titusville, Pennsylvania. "By the opening of 1872 they (the oil men) had produced nearly 40,000,000 barrels of oil, and had raised their product to the fourth place among the exports of the United States, over 152,000,000 gallons going abroad in 1871.... As for the market, they had developed it until it included almost every country of the earth—China, the East and West Indies, South America and Africa." On the mechanical side also the development was well-nigh complete. Pipe-lines were extensively introduced, and the methods of well-drilling perfected. The refining side was equally well developed. Indeed we are told that "it was overdone. The great profits on refined oil and the growing demand for it had naturally caused a great number to rush into its manufacture. There was at this time a refining capacity of three barrels to every one produced." It never occurs to the author at this point that since the limit of the world-market had been reached, there was no longer an opportunity for a competitive struggle to start new plants, and that consequently, the only thing left was a fight for life between those already in the field. In other words the "trust stage" in the oil industry was reached in 1872 as it has been reached by hundreds of other industries since that date, and it was that fact and not any "natural depravity" on the part of one John D. Rockefeller that led to concentration. To be sure it may have been his greater ability, or, as she seems to imply, in agreement with all other students of the subject, his greater unscrupulousness, that made him the particular "American Beauty Rose" that was destined to come out of the thorny thicket of the oil industry. It is strange that she does not see the force of this point, since at one place she plainly states it. This is on page 88, of Vol. I, where in describing the attitude of the "oil men," by whom she means the anti-Standard people, during the "Oil War of 1872," she makes them say, "Give the refiners open and regular freights, with no favours to any one, and the stronger and better equipped would live, the

others die." On the other hand (pp. 119-120 Vol. I) "Mr. Rockefeller and his associates proposed to save the strong and eliminate the weak. . . . Their program was cold-blooded but it must be confessed that it showed a much firmer grasp on the commercial practices of the day, and a much deeper knowledge of human nature as it operates in business, than that of the producers." The Standard men, it is needless to repeat, never were bothered with any such inconvenient business appendage as a conscience. She tells once more, and more thoroughly than it has ever been told elsewhere, how they bribed, and brow-beat the railroads into giving them rebates until they dominated the refining industry. Then came the struggle for control of pipelines, and once more she tells a story whose significance she seems utterly to miss. (p. 138, Vol. I.) "There was perhaps twice the pipe capacity needed for gathering all the oil produced and as the pipes were under at least a dozen different managements, each fighting for business, the result was, of course, just what it had been on the railroads and in the markets—severe cutting of prices, rebates, special secret arrangements, confusion and loss." She does not see, and the whole mass of struggling small capitalists who follow her do not see, that this is the preliminary condition to trustification, and that you can no more stop the trustification when it has reached this point than you can stop gunpowder exploding after fire has reached it. The remainder of the two volumes is largely given up to the story of the methods by which this process of concentration was accomplished, and the story is certainly not lacking in tragic elements. Just where this tragedy really comes in for the small producer she tells us in the following striking passages: "The thing which a man has begun, cared for, led to a healthy life, from which he has begun to gather fruit, which he knows he can make greater and richer, he loves as he does his life. It is one of the fruits of his life. He is jealous of it—wishes the honor of it, will not divide it with another. He can suffer heavily his own mistakes, learn from them, correct them. He can fight opposition, bear all—so long as the work is his. . . . To ask such a man to give up his refinery was to ask him to give up the thing, which after his family, meant most in life to him." It never occurs to Miss Tarbell that this is just what the entire working class are condemned to from the very nature of their industrial position,—that they can have no voice in the work they do, no right to exercise their inborn love of creative activity, and that big and little capitalist alike is robbing them of this opportunity as remorselessly as Mr. Rockefeller took it from the smaller exploiters. In so doing he used railroad rebates, and all the power of governmental institutions that he could control, just as the whole capitalist class uses all the forces at its disposal to continue the enslavement of the laborers. Had these particular methods been denied him (at least so far as the rebates are concerned) the chapter on "The Legitimate Greatness of the Standard Oil Co." shows that the process of killing the small fish would only have been a trifle slower, but no less certain. Yet of all this we hear nothing. But the socialist need not trouble himself on this point. Events are telling the rest of the tale so plainly that all who wish may read, and Miss Tarbell has furnished us with a story, of which it is only necessary to point the moral, and that is easily done. Meantime the work is one that no student of American Industrial history can afford to neglect.

"MODERN INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS." By Charles H. Cochrane. J. B. Lippincott Company. Cloth, 647 pp. \$3.00.

This is an elaborately illustrated presentation of the mechanical marvels of modern industry. The introduction contains a series of striking maps showing how fast the world has grown during the past century, of how Asia, Africa and Australia have been opened up to human knowl-

edge. Then comes a series of chapters on iron and steel, vehicles, great canals and tunnels, farms and farming machinery, etc., etc. In each of which illustrations and descriptions are given of the latest inventions and processes. The chapter on the "Conquest of the Air" is very full and gives descriptions of all the latest attempts to navigate this element. As a reference book of information concerning modern inventions it is of very great value. On the historical side, however, it is very weak. The thought which will come to every socialist reader of the work is the possibility which these wonderful machines offer for the freeing of humanity. It is a store house from which countless illustrations can be drawn to point the moral of how thoroughly man has conquered his environment, and yet how thoroughly subject he has become to the very instruments of that conquest.

"THE EVOLUTION OF MAN." *By Wilhelm Boelsche. Translated by Ernest Untermann. "Library of Science for the Workers." Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 160 pp. \$50.*

There is no greater need of the working class movement of the world than education, and in education there is no more important field than the knowledge of modern science. Were the facts that are contained in this little book really a part of the mental make up of a majority of the laborers of America, capitalism could not last a single year. Because in some dim way our rulers have become conscious of this fact, science, like the industrial factors of modern times, has been made the monopoly of a favored few. It is peculiarly the mission of the socialists to break this intellectual as well as the industrial monopoly. The series of books of which this is the first are most wonderfully adopted to this end. They are written in so intensely interesting a style that even the mind that has been corrupted by yellow journalism and cheap fiction will nevertheless read them with eagerness. They are so simple in language that whoever can read a newspaper can understand them. Yet on the scientific side they present the deepest and best of the great universities. In this work we see the steady upward growth of the human form from the first exhibition of life to modern man. Those who are familiar with Darwin, but have not had the time and opportunity to follow the work of scientific specialists since his time will marvel to see how one by one the missing links have been discovered, until today the chain of descent is unbroken throughout its length. Those who, like the great mass of people, have no clear conception of the great laws of evolution will find this work a revelation in its simple convincing statements of scientific facts. It should be in the hands of every boy and girl in America. The Socialist Local that wishes to lay the foundations of its movement so deep that no power can ever disturb them can do no better than push the circulation of this work. The socialist who builds his philosophy upon the facts he will find here will never be shaken by any passing storm. The translation is remarkably well done, preserving, and if possible, improving upon the simple lucid style of the original.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

WHAT CO-OPERATION HAS DONE.

Six years and three months ago, in the spring of 1899, American socialism was not only without a literature of its own, it was without access to the socialist literature of Europe. If this statement is challenged, barely enough exceptions will be found to "prove the rule." There were a few badly translated and badly printed books from the German, and there was a mass of the sentimental literature well characterized as "socialistic," the effect of which was to make votes for populism or Bryanism.

At that time the publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company, already organized on a co-operative basis, and with a considerable number of past offenses to answer for in the way of publishing books of the sort just mentioned, came definitely in touch with the International socialist movement, and began to turn out the literature of which that movement stood in need.

We do not wish to be understood for a moment as making the absurd claim that the rapid growth of an American socialist literature was due to this action of ours. It was obviously due to economic causes, which made evident the intellectual bankruptcy of Bryanism, and demanded an application to American problems of the materialistic conception of history. But what we do claim is that the circulation of the literature which grew out of this necessity might have been retarded seriously, but for our co-operative organization which was in 1899 put at the service of the socialist movement.

The need of this literature was realized, not by people with large capital to invest, but by a slowly increasing number of working people, at first the same people who had previously been purchasing populist and utopian books. It was from these men and women, not from the party socialists, that the first stock subscriptions came that made possible the first issues of the Pocket Library of Socialism and the first translations of the German socialist classics. And most of them have long since become active party workers.

During these six years more capital has gradually been subscribed by about a thousand different stockholders in sums of ten dollars each;

the total capital stock as we go to press with this issue of the REVIEW is \$11,800. But this has been wholly insufficient to meet requirements of the business, and the managers have from the start been obliged to carry a crushing load of debt. This is now reduced to a lower point than ever before, and most of it is to stockholders, but so long as it remains it is a source of danger and a cause of wasted energy.

Meanwhile the work of the publishing house has been steadily growing. In 1900 it began the publication of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and it has each year expended upon the REVIEW more than a thousand dollars over and above the receipts from subscriptions and advertising. And scarcely a month has gone by during the whole six years without the addition of some valuable book, large or small, to its list of publications.

THE PRESENT SITUATION.

Just now there are two important developments, which need to be brought to the attention of the friends of the publishing house. One is the unqualified success of the new series of scientific books, the Library of Science for the Workers. A thousand copies of the opening volume, THE EVOLUTION OF MAN, have been sold in the first three weeks, and the enthusiasm with which the book is received wherever it is introduced shows that the new series is needed and will meet with a rapid sale. But to put on the market the next six numbers, all of which can soon be ready for the printers, requires an investment of about \$2,400.

Meanwhile one of our stockholders, Comrade Becker of Wyoming, who lent the company \$1,600 at six per cent some two years ago, writes us that he has immediate need for at least \$600 of the money. We can if absolutely necessary raise the money for him by borrowing from a bank at a higher rate of interest, but to do this involves danger in the event of a financial crisis, besides increasing the burden of interest.

There is a very simple way out of the difficulty. There are probably not less than three hundred readers of the REVIEW who intend some time to become stockholders in the co-operative publishing house, thus getting the privilege of buying books at cost as well as helping to make possible the publication of more books. If each of these would send ten dollars at once, the problem would be solved. However, most of those who subscribe for stock pay for it at the rate of a dollar a month because they never have the ten dollars to spare at one time. So it is not likely that the full \$3,000 can be raised in this way as soon as needed.

On this account Charles H. Kerr renews his offer to duplicate out of the balance due him from the company any contributions made before the end of June for the purpose of paying off the debt to Comrade Becker and bringing out the new scientific books. No monthly pledges are asked for; only cash contributions. These will be acknowledged in the July number.

BRENHOLTZ' "THE VOICE OF EQUALITY."

Edwin Arnold Brenholtz, who presented to the co-operative publishing house the copyright of "The Recording Angel," reviewed on page 700 of last week's issue, has published through the Gorham Press of Boston a noteworthy poem in free rhythm without rhymes, entitled The Voice of Equality. A few short extracts will tell more of its strength and beauty than paragraphs of description. In the passages which follow, as indeed in nearly the whole poem, Equality is personified as speaking:

O waves that link all lands, convey my love to all!
 Ye winds that whisper to the stately and soul-satisfying trees, with every
 tremble of their tuneful leaves convey my love to all.
 Convey my love, convey my love all unimpaired to bird and beast to stick
 and stone to flowers and flowing stream, *unbounded love*.
 Convey—and not a word but *love* to them.

* * * * *

Race with the speed of hurricane's impelling breath,
 O Wave I love!
 Dash all your saltness cold and harsh into my Brother's face.
 Back on earth's breast of sand and shell toss his reviving form.
 O Wind beloved, quick; and whisper to this would-be suicide, so brave
 to face the all-unknown, so fearless as to dare the death, so tired
 of life's unequal lot and strife—quick my be-loved! salute returning
 sense and sanity with message ne'er to be forgot:
*Your mistress-lover waits the touch and close embrace of man as brave,
 as fearless and as wearied of life's wrongs as now are you.*
*Come, come! there's joyful work for you: you must not die this day, or
 year.*
*Sweet are the children she will bear to you in future years;
 Sweet are the hours when you shall see them crush the cruel wrong you
 could not slay.*
 O Winds and Waves, be swift, be swift:
 This word of mine within my lover's ear can never fail.

The book is daintily printed and cloth bound, with gilt top and gold lettering. The publishers' price is \$1.25, but by special arrangement with Comrade Brenholtz, we are enabled to offer it at one dollar postpaid; to stockholders sixty cents by mail or fifty cents if sent at purchaser's expense.

The first thousand copies of "The Recording Angel" are nearly sold. The price is the same as that of the book just described, and the story is one that every reader of the REVIEW will enjoy.

GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS.

Under this title we shall publish early in August a translation by A. M. Simons on "*Das Sinnes-Leben der Pflanzen*," by R. H. Francé. It will be the second number of the Library of Science for the Workers, and is of equal importance and interest with "The Evolution of Man." An essential link in the system of capitalist ethics is the assumption that the human mind is something unique in the universe and is not the product of physical forces nor subject to physical laws. If this could be proved, the whole socialist philosophy of historical materialism would be discredited.

But recent discoveries in biology, some of which are charmingly presented in this book, prove that on this important question of fact the capitalists and their well-paid advocates are wrong, and the socialists are right.

In these books of popular science there is no attack on persons nor on creeds; there is nothing but a clear and simple story of the discoveries that science has made. Thus these books can be offered without offense to those who have not yet broken away from conventional ideas, with they will be sure to stimulate thought wherever they are read.

We promise this book in August because we believe that the money required to pay for the printing will be ready by the time it is needed, for we think every one who reads this announcement will want to buy. Here is the way to do it.

If you are already a stockholder, send a cash order in advance for as many copies as possible at thirty cents each, postpaid. And if you have not already sent for copies of THE EVOLUTION OF MAN, include this in your order.

If not already a stockholder, subscribe for stock now. If possible, send ten dollars in one remittance and get a full-paid certificate. If not, send one dollar with your promise to pay a dollar each month for nine months. As soon as your first dollar is paid, you will be entitled to buy books at the same low rates made to other stockholders.

If not already familiar with the co-operative organization of our publishing house, ask for booklet explaining it, which will be mailed free of charge upon request.