

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV

NOVEMBER, 1903

NO. 5

## The Negro in the Class Struggle

It so happens that I write upon the negro question, in compliance with the request of the editor of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, in the state of Louisiana, where the race prejudice is as strong and the feeling against the "nigger" as bitter and relentless as when Lincoln's proclamation of emancipation lashed the waning confederacy into fury and incited the final and desperate attempts to burst the bonds that held the southern states in the federal union. Indeed, so thoroughly is the south permeated with the malign spirit of race hatred that even socialists are to be found, and by no means rarely, who either share directly in the race hostility against the negro, or avoid the issue, or apologize for the social obliteration of the color line in the class struggle.

The white man in the south declares that "the nigger is all right in his place"; that is, as menial, servant and slave. If he dare hold up his head, feel the thrill of manhood in his veins and nurse the hope that some day may bring deliverance; if in his brain the thought of freedom dawns and in his heart the aspiration to rise above the animal plane and propensities of his sires, he must be made to realize that notwithstanding the white man is civilized (?) the black man is a "nigger" still and must so remain as long as planets wheel in space.

But while the white man is considerate enough to tolerate the negro "in his place," the remotest suggestion at social recognition arouses all the pent up wrath of his Anglo-Saxon civilization; and my observation is that the less real ground there is for such indignant assertion of self-superiority, the more passionately it is proclaimed.

At Yoakum, Texas, a few days ago, leaving the depot with two grips in my hands, I passed four or five bearers of the white man's burden perched on a railing and decorating their environment

with tobacco juice. One of them, addressing me, said: "There's a nigger that'll carry your grips." A second one added: "That's what he's here for," and the third chimed in with "That's right, by God." Here was a savory bouquet of white superiority. One glance was sufficient to satisfy me that they represented all there is of justification for the implacable hatred of the negro race. They were ignorant, lazy, unclean, totally void of ambition, themselves the foul product of the capitalist system and held in lowest contempt by the master class, yet esteeming themselves immeasurably above the cleanest, most intelligent and self-respecting negro, having by reflex absorbed the "nigger" hatred of their masters.

As a matter of fact the industrial supremacy of the south before the war would not have been possible without the negro, and the south of today would totally collapse without his labor. Cotton culture has been and is the great staple and it will not be denied that the fineness and superiority of the fibre that makes the export of the southern states the greatest in the world is due in large measure to the genius of the negroes charged with its cultivation.

The whole world is under obligation to the negro, and that the white heel is still upon the black neck is simply proof that the world is not yet civilized.

The history of the negro in the United States is a history of crime without a parallel.

Why should the white man hate him? Because he stole him from his native land and for two centuries and a half robbed him of the fruit of his labor, kept him in beastly ignorance and subjected him to the brutal domination of the lash? Because, he tore the black child from the breast of its mother and ravished the black man's daughter before her father's eyes?

There are thousands of negroes who bear testimony in their whitening skins that men who so furiously resent the suggestion of "social equality" are far less sensitive in respect to the sexual equality of the races.

But of all the senseless agitation in capitalist society, that in respect to "social equality" takes the palm. The very instant it is mentioned the old aristocratic plantation owner's shrill cry about the "buck nigger" marrying the "fair young daughter" of his master is heard from the tomb and echoed and re-echoed across the spaces and repeated by the "white trash" in proud vindication of their social superiority.

Social equality, forsooth! Is the black man pressing his claims for social recognition upon his white burden bearer? Is there any reason why he should? Is the white man's social recognition of his own white brother such as to excite the negro's ambition to covet the noble prize? Has the negro any greater desire, or is

there any reason why he should have, for social intercourse with the white man than the white man has for social relations with the negro? This phase of the negro question is pure fraud and serves to mask the real issue, which is not *social equality*, BUT **ECONOMIC FREEDOM.**

There never was any social inferiority that was not the shrivelled fruit of economic inequality.

The negro, given economic freedom, will not ask the white man any social favors; and the burning question of "social equality" will disappear like mist before the sunrise.

I have said and say again that, properly speaking, there is no negro question outside of the labor question—the working class struggle. Our position as socialists and as a party is perfectly plain. We have simply to say: "The class struggle is colorless." The capitalists, white, black and other shades, are on one side and the workers, white, black and all other colors, on the other side.

When Marx said: "Workingmen of all countries unite," he gave concrete expression to the socialist philosophy of the class struggle; unlike the framers of the declaration of independence who announced that "all men are created equal" and then basely repudiated their own doctrine, Marx issued the call to all the workers of the globe, regardless of race, sex, creed or any other condition whatsoever.

As a socialist party we receive the negro and all other races upon absolutely equal terms. We are the party of the working class, the whole working class, and we will not suffer ourselves to be divided by any specious appeal to race prejudice; and if we should be coaxed or driven from the straight road we will be lost in the wilderness and ought to perish there, for we shall no longer be a socialist party.

Let the capitalist press and capitalist "public opinion" indulge themselves in alternate flattery and abuse of the negro; we as socialists will receive him in our party, treat him in our counsels and stand by him all around the same as if his skin were white instead of black; and this we do, not from any considerations of sentiment, but because it accords with the philosophy of socialism, the genius of the class struggle, and is eternally right and bound to triumph in the end.

With the "nigger" question, the "race war" from the capitalist viewpoint we have nothing to do. In capitalism the negro question is a grave one and will grow more threatening as the contradictions and complications of capitalist society multiply, but this need not worry us. Let them settle the negro question in their way, if they can. We have nothing to do with it, for that is their fight. We have simply to open the eyes of as many negroes as we can and bring them into the socialist movement

to do battle for emancipation from wage slavery, and when the working class have triumphed in the class struggle and stand forth economic as well as political free men, the race problem will forever disappear.

Socialists should with pride proclaim their sympathy with and fealty to the black race, and if any there be who hesitate to avow themselves in the face of ignorant and unreasoning prejudice, they lack the true spirit of the slavery-destroying revolutionary movement.

The voice of socialism must be as inspiring music to the ears of those in bondage, especially the weak black brethren, doubly enslaved, who are bowed to the earth and groan in despair beneath the burden of the centuries.

For myself, my heart goes to the negro and I make no apology to any white man for it. In fact, when I see the poor, brutalized, outraged black victim, I feel a burning sense of guilt for his intellectual poverty and moral debasement that makes me blush for the unspeakable crimes committed by my own race.

In closing, permit me to express the hope that the next convention may repeal the resolutions on the negro question. The negro does not need them and they serve to increase rather than diminish the necessity for explanation.

We have nothing special to offer the negro, and we cannot make separate appeals to all the races.

The Socialist party is the party of the working class, regardless of color—the whole working class of the whole world.

EUGENE V. DEBS.

## The Negro or the Race Problem

**M**EMPHIS, TENN., SEPT. 16.—From the standpoint of Southern interest the forthcoming session of Congress probably will be the most memorable.

“Senator Edward W. Carmack, in the next Congress will introduce a bill in the Senate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment, which provides that there shall be no discrimination against a citizen of the United States because of color, religion or previous condition of servitude. Senator Carmack would eliminate the enfranchised negroes as a political factor. This bill of Senator Carmack’s will be supported by every Southern Representative in Congress.

“Senator Carmack will not introduce his bill in the hope of getting it passed, but for the purpose of precipitating discussion. Senator Carmack favors the separation of the races and the ultimate deportation of the negro from this country.”

The above appeared in the Jacksonville (Fla.) *Metropolis* September 16, 1903 (and that which follows below). John T. Graves formerly published a paper in Jacksonville. He contended lately for the right of the Socialists to free speech in Atlanta when Comrade Fitts was arrested.

“That mantle of Mr. Graves is full of rhythmic rhapsodies, but as a temple his head is a cymbal. The negro is now and has for years been as essentially a part of our Southland as is the sunshine. Every well-informed man knows that the negro is the prime motive power that has increased the cotton crop of the South from the 4,000,000 bales of “before the war”—slave-made product—to the present 12,000,000 bales per annum—Freedmen-made cotton output. We know, too, that in the phosphate mines and turpentine farms, as a worker, the negro stands unequaled, sublime and alone. We know, too, that when it comes to the clearing of hammocks with the grubbing and planting of them to orange trees on any big scale, the negro does it all. For the cutting out of the right of way, the grading, making of cross-ties and the laying on of the rails, we all use the negro. We all know that 90 per cent of his wages finally goes into the coffers of the white man. For, if he spends it on his first love, the “skin game,” the gambler who wins it spends it on “his woman,” and the dress-maker and hackman get it. For every article of his food he depends on the white man’s commissary. For his booze he patronizes the white man’s bar, and he will buy the “boss” old cast-off clothes, and wear them with as much pride and grace as a bear wears his own hide.”—Albertus Vogt, Rosebank, Fla.

The writer of this paper has been cautioned by prominent Socialists of Florida to "go slowly with this problem, as the people of this State—and the Southland generally—consider any effort to elevate the negro to equal civil, political and economic rights with the white race *as wrong.*"

In their minds he is a "Dam Nigger," and must remain so.

Physicians, as a rule, make no distinction as to race or color. All are patients. The National Socialist Constitution recognizes no distinction of color in the wage-slave, and regard both as being equally the victims of the exploiting capitalists. Yet of the two races, the negro is the most class-conscious.

Now, in view of the fact of the passage of the militia bill of the last Congress, it will be as well for us Socialists that we do what we can to consolidate the entire working class of wage-slaves as a united whole against the persistent inroads of capitalism. The negroes are already looking with interest and sympathy on our movement for the emancipation of the workers of the world from the thralls of capitalists. They receive our advances with a welcome, recognizing—as they freely do—that we are the advanced race, and therefore should be the leaders in the "irrepressible conflict." They hold with Abraham Lincoln "that class laws"—under which they now labor—"placing capital above labor, are more dangerous" (to them) "at this hour than chattel slavery." "*Labor is prior to and above capital and deserves a much higher consideration.*" (Abraham Lincoln.) The trades unions in the South recognize the necessity of taking the colored laborer into their unions: For were they not, the colored men would be found successful competitors against organized labor.

Now, shall we who are outside the unions repudiate the negro laborer as a working factor in our industrial fight with capital?

The negro, since the war, has degenerated both physically and morally.

Is this degeneracy to go on? Physically, in the past, he has been found a worthy model for an Apollo Belvidere.

Morally, what a difference between the pious negro slave of war times and the great filler of jails and chain-gangs! Again I say, "Can we afford to let this go on? Will the shotgun, the rope and the stake improve the race? Does it deter them from crime? The other day a negro rapist about to be hanged for his crime said, "It is worth dying for"! Can we say with Cain "Am I my brother's keeper"?

Carlyle in his "Past and Present" says: "A poor Irish widow, her husband having died in one of the lanes of Edinburgh, went forth with her three children, bare of all resources, to solicit help from the charitable establishments of that city. At this charitable establishment and then at that she was refused; referred from

one to the other, helped by none; till she had exhausted them all; till her strength and her heart failed her: she sank down in typhus fever; died, and infected her lane with fever, so that 'seventeen other persons' died of fever there in consequence."

The humane physician asks thereupon, as with a heart too full for speaking, Would it not have been *economy* to help this poor widow? She took typhus fever, and killed seventeen of you!—Very curious. The forlorn Irish widow applies to her fellow-creatures, as if saying, "Behold, I am sinking, bare of help: ye must help me! I am your sister, bone of your bone; one God made us; ye must help me!" They answer, "No: impossible: thou art no sister of ours." But she proves her sisterhood; her typhus fever kills *them*; they actually were her brothers though denying it! Again. Two members of a family residing in Fifth avenue, New York, died of typhus fever, directly traced to a handsome silk wrap. This wrap was made by a poor widow living in a garret, where her child was dying of this disease. The mother, on the child complaining of cold, threw the wrap over it.

The intimate relationship of all classes of society, and their constant intercommunication one with the other, makes it impossible for one class to hold down in degradation—or even ignore such degradation—an inferior class. "From 1870 to 1880 the negro population increased nearly 36 per cent; from 1880 to 1890 the increase was only a little over 13 per cent. This is about one-half the rate of increase among the whites." For the year 1895, when 82 white deaths from consumption occurred in the city of Nashville, there ought to have been only 49 colored, whereas there really were 218, or nearly four and one-half times as many as there ought to have been.

It is an occasion of serious alarm when 37 per cent of the whole people are responsible for 72 per cent of the deaths from consumption.

Deaths among colored people from pulmonary diseases seem to be on the increase throughout the South. During the period 1882-1885, the excess of colored deaths (over white) for the city of Memphis was 90.80 per cent. For the period of 1891-1895, the excess had risen to over 137 per cent. For the period 1886—1890 the excess of colored deaths from consumption and pneumonia for the city of Atlanta was 139 per cent. For the period 1891-1896 it has risen to nearly 166 per cent." Before the war this disease was virtually unknown among the slaves.

These constitutional diseases which are responsible for this unusual mortality are to be traced largely to immorality, malnutrition and unsanitary environment. According to Hoffman, over 25 per cent of the negro children born in Washington City are admittedly illegitimate. This will more than hold good far-

ther South. The negro does not desire to mix with the white race. This was aptly expressed in the writer's presence at a barbecue, where we organized a colored local. An old negro patriarch remarked in the course of a general conversation: "The negro does not desire a bedroom in the white man's house, or to sit at his table." It is our experience *that it is the white man who is the father of the mulatto*, while the black man largely fills the roll of the *rapist*. Which is the most frequent I leave my readers to judge.

Expediency has been the death-blow to the Democratic party.

Born to the glorious heritage of Democracy left by Thomas Jefferson, it is now dead to everything democratic but the *name*. We Socialists cannot afford to *barter principle for expediency*. We must be true to the democratic idea: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." We will be forced, by the logic of events, to act in accord with the following motto: "Workingmen, Unite; You Have Nothing to Lose but Your Chains: You Have a World to Gain."

In the coming industrial fight, all workingmen will have to be a *unit*. Already the capitalists are becoming a unit in their fight with the unions, who will be worsted until their members, both white and black, take to the ballot-box unitedly and claim victory as theirs by the inauguration of the "Co-Operative Commonwealth."

The great problem of the ages, "What to do with the surplus," must be solved once, and for all time by making consumption keep pace with production and producing for use only. Overproduction in the past was partially met by the luxurious consumption of the few rich, together with wonderful works of art, ostentation and public utility. But since the great advances in the arts and sciences, together with the great development of machinery, and, further, the great production required for *profit*, it is impossible to meet the problems on other lines than the restriction of production for use *only*.

A. T. CUZNER.



## Socialism and the Negro Problem

**A** GAIN and again it seems necessary to reiterate that socialism is merely an economic reform, and affects only indirectly and incidentally questions of a political, social and ethical character. For the problem of race prejudice, as for those of intemperance and the "social evil," depending largely on individual culture for solution, socialism is no specific. By furnishing an improved environment it may facilitate individual culture and so become an important factor in the working out of the answers which the future holds concealed, but were socialism realized to-morrow these questions, sinister and ominous as ever, would still confront the American people.

The prejudice against the colored man in America has two causes; the first sectional and no longer operative, though its effects persist; the second universal, active, and of economic origin. The first of these is the quondam status of the negro as a slave, and of his white associate as master. Slavery has ceased to exist, and before the law all races are equal, yet the reluctance of the dominant class to receive on terms of equality that class which it so recently held in bonds, and which, in the main, has not yet emerged from its degradation, is as natural as it is unchristian. Here time, bringing with it the culture of the individual, alone can aid. And the culture needed is not merely that of the colored man, but of the white man also. The white man must learn that, real as his feeling of repulsion for his black brother may be, it is a base and ignoble thing, an occasion not of pride but of shame, a blemish in his character not to be fostered but to be eradicated. It is essential to the continued prestige of the white man that he should learn this. Bitter as oppression is to the individual, it is a most powerful stimulus to a race; and every act of injustice, every denial of recognition duly earned, but brings nearer that much dreaded day of negro domination,—brings it nearer because it justifies it. The negro's lessons, if not more difficult, are multifarious, among the first being that no legal *ipse dixit* can confer on him a standing or secure for him a consideration he has not as an individual fully earned and wholly merited. Even then he must accustom himself to denial, while still asserting with courage and persistence the justness of his claims.

Obviously with all this socialism has nothing whatever to do. It cannot compel one man to admit another to his house, seat him at his table, or marry him to his daughter. Nor can it on the other hand, curb that pragmatic spirit which leads one man, afflicted with a race prejudice, to impose it by law or social convention on

his fellows. Matters of this sort are ethical, and may become political, but they are certainly not economic.

The second occasion of prejudice against the negro operates in the breast of the white wage-earner, and arises from the presence of the colored man as a competitor in the field of labor. A glance at the conduct of mobs, North and South, when bent on negro punishment, will serve to differentiate this from the cause first mentioned. In the South the mob, composite in character, captures and murders a single victim and disperses peaceably, the negro community, if nonresistant, suffering comparatively slight perturbation. In the North the mob, made up almost invariably from the proletariat, using the punishment of some particular criminal as an excuse, hastens on to a general persecution and race war, assaults the worker's natural enemy, the militia, and occasionally, as in the case of the recent Evansville riot, receives the *quasi* endorsement of labor papers and organizations. Under capitalism, with the surfeit of labor which it engenders, each additional competitor in the labor market, constrained by necessity to offer his labor power for the bare price of sustenance, tends to enforce the Ricardian law of wages, and becomes an embarrassment and menace to every other laborer. This is particularly true in the case of the negro, whose scale of living is generally lower than that of the white. As he can, and will, work for less wages, so proportionately is the animosity of his white fellow-worker kindled against him; and it is more unfortunate than strange if, schooled in a system which has for its key-note fratricidal strife, the white laborer resorts to violence to rid himself of a competition threatening his own livelihood. Here the ameliorating effect of socialism is immediately apparent. When co-operation amongst laborers is substituted for competition, and the consequence of added numbers is merely to shorten the hours of toil for all, without any decrease of compensation to any, the colored laborer will be welcomed as a brother, not reviled as a "scab;" will be hailed as a fortunate accession to the armies of industry, not dreaded as a club ready to the hand of the employer to coerce refractory employes. And it may be remarked that the ready sympathy of the "better classes" (capitalistic employer) for the negro when mob violence is afoot, is not wholly devoid of a suspicion of self interest. But here, as in other instances, the manifest remedy for the white worker is not to terrorize and murder his more unfortunate fellow laborer, but to vote for his own class interest at the polls.

Lastly, what should be the attitude of the socialist to the negro problem? And here there must be no doubt, or cavil, or temporizing, or subterfuge or uncertainty. For very shame, the ethics of socialism dare not be inferior to those of the bourgeoisie which socialism supplants; and the bourgeoisie having in its victory over the noblesse overthrown all distinction of birth, socialism dare not

revive it. Absolute economic equality for white and black, covering perfect uniformity not only in opportunities for labor, but also in all those public services, such as education, transportation (including, let it be added, hotel accommodations), entertainment, etc., which may be collectively rendered, together with complete recognition of political rights, must be insisted on more strenuously by the socialist than ever they could have been by any abolitionist agitator. No "segregation of races," or other claptrap "solution," can be entertained for a moment. The drawing of invidious caste distinctions must be left to the private individual alone, in his private affairs. There is another and stronger reason for this attitude than the incentive to preserve the good gained by the bourgeois revolution. The historic mission of the working class is to destroy in its supremacy all classes, and to blend humanity into one homogeneous, fraternal whole. If now, socialism, which is the economic victory of the working class, countenances and preserves a distinction of race, that is, a caste distinction, so far from accomplishing a final triumph and perfecting human solidarity, it will be but a partial success, nursing further injustice and further revolt. And how can socialism, the champion of the proletariat, which by classic inclusion embraces not merely the workers, but the criminals, and all the despised and rejected of earth, recognize any distinction of race, or color, or birth, or faith amongst its children? To ask the question should be to answer it.

CLARENCE MEILY.

## Dresden Conference

**N**O gathering of the socialists for many years has been of as great importance as the recent Dresden Congress of the German Social Democracy. For several years the capitalist press has been filled with stories of the decreasing revolutionary character of the German socialist movement. So continuously and emphatically has this report been spread, not only by the capitalist press, but by some persons who claim to be socialists, that the idea had become quite generally accepted that success had brought demoralization to the great German socialist movement.

It may be worth while before proceeding to a description of the Dresden Congress to give a brief review of the growth of the opportunist movement in the Socialist party. This movement centers around Edward Bernstein, who was editor of the official organ of the German socialist party during the time of the "Laws of Exception." When those laws were repealed, he remained in England and fell largely under the influence of the Fabian sentimentalists. Soon he began to drift away from the old standards. His works were filled with apologies for capitalism and criticisms of the socialist doctrine, while his practical activity tended to give aid and comfort to the English liberal party much more than to the socialist organizations. His theoretical development culminated in his "Voraussetzung des Socialismus," which was hailed by capitalist readers as the greatest work on socialism ever published, and was welcomed with glad acclaim throughout Europe and America. When examined, however, there is practically nothing in it that has not been set forth by bourgeois critics of socialism many times before. Common-place facts are repeated in a most bombastic manner as if they had just been discovered. Capitalist statistics are used with little attempt at discrimination or investigation as to their reliability. Sweeping generalizations are made only to be modified or denied on subsequent pages.

Shortly after the publication of this work Bernstein returned to Germany. On the strength of his services to the party in former days he was elected to the Reichstag. Meanwhile he continued his attack on the policy of the party and soon gathered about him a little clique of worshippers of whom Vollmar was the most prominent. Vollmar comes from the south of Germany and reflects in his political ideas and actions the low stage of industrial development prevailing in that portion of Germany.

Meanwhile practical opportunism had found expression in other countries, notably in France and Italy. In France this led to an open split in the party, and now promises to leave Millerand and Jaures high and dry in the bourgeois ranks with no connection whatever with the socialist movement, while the workers move on in a clear-cut revolutionary movement.

In Italy also "Bernsteinism" has been receiving some rather hard blows, and Turati, who represents this wing of the Socialist movement, has been practically forced out of the party and the great Socialist daily, *Avanti*, has been taken from the control of the opportunist faction and given into the editorial direction of Enrico Ferri, who has always stood for the most uncompromising revolutionary attitude.

The latest manifestation of opportunism in Germany was the "Vice-Presidential" question, which has been discussed in these columns, and it was round this question that the fiercest storm raged at the Dresden Congress.

The first day of the Convention, however, was taken up with another and somewhat analogous question, that of editorial work by socialists on capitalist papers. This question owed its prominence largely to the fact that several of the socialists had been working with a radical bourgeois paper, *Die Zukunft*. These comrades had used this paper and other similar ones for the purpose of publishing criticisms of the Socialist party policy and members. The Convention decided by an almost unanimous vote that any person affiliated with a capitalist paper should not be allowed to hold any position of trust within the party. In this debate there was much severe criticism of the so-called "intellectuals." Comrade Quark, a delegate from Frankfort-on-the-Main, saying: "When the entrance of a Social Democrat into the party is signaled with the publication of long articles on 'How I Became a Socialist' and other biographical matter, his case is plain to me from the beginning. The collegian who comes to us should first quietly place himself in the rank and file and fight for a time in the most humble positions."

Comrade Bebel also declared: "The developments of the last few years have compelled me to say, look close at every party member, but look twice or three times at the "Academics" and the intellectuals. I say this notwithstanding I am myself a graduated "Academic" and have always taken their part. We need the intelligence of the intellectuals. Fortunate circumstances have given them the scientific training which, when they are interested and truly in harmony with the party, enables them to perform such distinctive services for the party. But, on the other hand, there is danger in this very fact. I do not accuse these collegians of dishonesty or of any intention to injure the party. Not at all. But just because they are collegians and men and women of greater

energy and in a certain sense of greater intelligence and deeper interest, they have to be doubly and trebly careful that in all their acts and deeds they are always upon the right road, to inform themselves concerning the proletariat, as to what the masses think, how they feel, and what they wish, and these masses know better than the collegians about those matters with which the struggle of the proletariat is concerned."

It was in the midst of this debate that the bitter attack was made upon Comrade Mehring by Comrade Braun, which finally resulted in the resignation of Mehring from all active editorial work in the party. This resignation is universally regretted. The attack was made by Braun in an effort to show that Mehring was guilty of all the things of which he (Braun) was charged, in that Mehring had been actively engaged as a contributor on some capitalist papers. In thus attempting to hide behind Mehring's shoulders Braun only succeeded in bringing a condemnation upon both, even though all felt it was largely undeserved in Mehring's case.

An effort had been made by certain party officials to suppress the discussion and the *Vorwaerts* had even refused articles by Bebel on the subject. Bebel was determined, however, to insist on the fullest discussion and declared that it was time to be done with the farce of pretending that there was really no disagreement within the party. Bebel's speech on the subject was probably the most thorough review of the entire opportunist position ever attempted in a public speech, taking him nearly six hours to deliver. After a review of the general situation following the election, in which he showed that the present was of all times the most inopportune in which to take any conciliatory attitude toward the enemy, he proceeded to discussion of the principles involved. The following quotations give some idea of the exhaustive character of his discussion and his masterly overthrow of the entire opportunist position. He says:

"The question now arises as to whether we shall change our previous tactics? When should a party change its tactics? That no tactics are eternal is self-evident. Liebknecht said once in his drastic manner: 'If necessary, I will change my tactics 24 times in 24 hours.' While an extreme statement, it was very correctly expressed. The tactics of every party must correspond with the foundations upon which the party is built, and if I must actually change my tactics 24 times in 24 hours, nevertheless they must during none of these 24 times be in contradiction with the fundamentals of the party. (That's right.) That is the deciding point. Can any one claim today that our tactics are in conflict with the fundamental principles of our party. On this point only the party itself and the outcome of facts decide. Now it so happens that the development of the party up to the present

time has been such that we have not the slightest occasion to change our hitherto victorious and time-tested tactics. (Vigorous applause.)

"Again, a change in tactics may be rendered necessary because they have proven false or unsatisfactory. But nothing of the kind has occurred. To be sure, there is something in the fact that we have grown, that we have more representatives, and therefore we must, in a certain sense, change our tactics, but by no means in the sense that we hesitate or draw back. No. Just because this great body of voters have given us their endorsement on the basis of our previous tactics and position, we must go forward in a more energetic, uncompromising and clear-cut manner than hitherto. (Tremendous applause.)

"Nevertheless there are people in our ranks—and some of these are among those whom we have been accustomed to call revisionists—who since the last election have demanded that we undertake a most comprehensive parliamentary activity in the nature of the introduction of bills, plans of legislation, etc. Therefore, I must give a few words to the destruction of these illusions. As a general thing it is not practical for the party to develop broad plans of legislation and work for them through the Reichstag, for this is a gigantic task. I remember once how we fixed up a job for our good old Liebknecht with such a legislative plan. It was in the Saxon Landtag work. We had rejected the mining law and demanded a change. The minister said that the government recognized the necessity of changes, but that this required time, investigations, suggestions and studies. Then it was that our old comrade, like the hussar that he always was, broke out and said, 'Why, I can do it in five minutes.' The word was spoken, and I said to myself, now we are in for it (merriment.). Naturally, the minister was sharp enough to say: 'If the Social Democrats can do it so quickly, then we will let them do it.' We had to do it, for we had no one but ourselves to blame. I assure you I toiled and sweat for fourteen days and nights to complete the plan.

"I remember also our great plan of the law for the protection of labor, and I wish to tell you something about it. In the eyes of many of our opponents, and even a large portion of our own members, I belong to those people who take no part in any practical activity. Even during the last few weeks I have been designated as a rider of principles who always comes forward with fine phrases and negatives everything. Now with a short interruption I have been a member of the Reichstag for the last 36 years, and there is no single person amongst us that has initiated more acts and worked out more plans of laws than I have, the man of negation. Our scheme of legislation for the protection of laborers is given great praise in Herkner's book on the labor

question. When we first brought out this scheme the press of Nauman and Gerlach were so filled with praise that they declared that the Reichstag would adopt it "*en bloc*." Yes, noble sirs (the speaker motions toward the press table where Nauman and von Gerlach are sitting). Did you know then who had worked out this first scheme? It was I, the man of negation. (More merriment.) To bring in legislative schemes is very beautiful, but it is not so easy to work them out. We must leave this to other people who are appointed and paid for it. You, Mr. Privy Councillors, yourselves have the material, the knowledge of facts and the possibility of preparing such propositions. We worked in parliament until we were overworked. Do you really think that even now, when we are 81 men strong, that we can compel the majority to adopt the proposals which we initiate? Singer and I have worked in vain in the Senior convent to make clear to the members that parliament is there for something else than the adoption of governmental proposals. We have preached to deaf ears. I can tell you that we cannot initiate any more propositions.

"No. The decisive thing is that the whole system of legislation in the German empire and in all of the other parliaments of the world is so incompetent and unsatisfactory and incomplete that when a law is established today, by tomorrow everybody says that it must be changed. (That's right.) We can no longer enact great fundamental laws because a majority can no longer be obtained for such laws. The assertion which Savigny made over a hundred years ago that our time had no need of legislation holds also for today. But why is this? Because the class antagonisms become ever greater, so that one can make only 'half laws' because whole ones are impossible. Let me give you an example of this. Over a hundred years ago the *Code Napoleon*, the legislative work of bourgeois France, arose. The *Code Napoleon* was the work of the Revolution, of a glorious time such as bourgeois society has not experienced since then. The greatest minds of that time labored on this work—that meant something at that time—and it was formulated to meet the necessities of bourgeois society. That work was made at a single cast and it stands even to the present day in France. Now I want to ask Frohme and Stadthagen, who have co-operated with the session on the bourgeois law book, if it is not true that we have had this bourgeois law book for only three years and already every nook and corner has developed obscurities and contradictions.

"Take again the factory acts. What has not happened to the factory act during 30 years? In 1869 the factory act was a complete satisfactory work. Then came the new developments and to-day it is a miserably patched up thing full of contradic-



tions. There is no call for legislation at the present time. It is no longer possible to make complete laws. Is all the expenditure of labor, time and money which is spent in your parliament treadmill worth while? I have often asked myself that, but be sure I am altogether too aggressive to continue long of this opinion. I said to myself, such thoughts help nothing, we must cut and hew our way through. Man does what man can, but one does not necessarily deceive himself concerning the situation.

"I explain all this to you in order that you will not think that because we are now 81 men, therefore we can root out parliamentary growths. In one of the books that is distributed here is a description of the congress of 1871, more than 32 years ago, in which the ten-hour day was demanded, and then I was alone. At the same time the so-called Social conference met in Eisenach and also declared themselves for the ten-hour day. Indeed Rudolph Meyer has I believe proven that Bismarck at that time gave his word to work out a plan of a law for a ten-hour day of labor. (Hear, hear.) The plan was to include a ten-hour day of labor for the cities, and eight hours in the country during the winter, ten hours in the spring and fall, and twelve hours in summer. Thirty years have gone over the country and what of today? I am certainly a confirmed adherent of the eight-hour day. There is no one in this hall that is more convinced of its necessity than I. But, I have often said openly that if we could only achieve a ten-hour day at present we would die with joy. Let us have done with illusions in whatever field. (Unrest.) Oh, that will not hurt you seriously. On the contrary, it can only help you.

"This then is our situation. We will remain, as we have before, in a certain isolation and in the sharpest opposition. That does not necessarily exclude the accepting of concessions when we can secure them and when they appear worth the trouble to us. To be sure we have often differed over the value of these concessions. Indeed that was the whole difference. The right wing of the Socialist fraction in the Reichstag—to use this expression—sought to secure even the smallest concessions which, according to my ideas, were wholly insignificant. I have said to myself: why should I vote for these concessions which we will receive whether we vote for them or not? What is it to me that I should vote for these concessions which are certainly parliamentary compromises. Once we have come to the conclusion that a valuable concession was involved, then we have voted for it.

"So there were struggles in the fraction, and I can tell you openly that at the next session such struggles will not be diminished, but increased. It is easily possible that what I designate as the right wing of the fraction can win out in the new Reichstag, and therefore I consider it necessary that you thoroughly

understand the situation, and so to speak, write out the tactics for the fraction (applause) at least as far as is possible. It is naturally inconceivable that the Convention should definitely determine the attitude of the fraction. The Convention can only offer directions and sketch out the road of march. If you do that, then the fraction must march in that whether they will or not. . . . .

"The party must become clear on this matter and the standpoint that we take must be as clear and transparent as crystal glass, so that no opportunity will be given to our opponents to say that the result of the wonderful victory is that the Social Democrats go as all bourgeois parties have gone hitherto; when they reach a certain height then they disintegrate, surrender their fundamentals, and all is over with them. (That's right.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"Since the great debate in Erfurt twelve years ago I have swallowed so much from Vollmar and been so often angry, and then again reconciled to reach out the hand for the purpose of bridging over the antagonisms, that I have at last said to myself, things shall go this way no longer, and now we must finally make things clear, and clean off the slate, and at this time strike at our antagonisms as fundamentally as possible. (Unrest.) The foundation of the whole new "revisionist" movement is, as is well known, Bernstein's book, which, to his good fortune, was written while he was in London. For, as soon as he was given the opportunity to return to Germany, which I was glad to grant him from my heart (I have myself as far as possible contributed thereto),—since he has been practically occupied in Germany he has, according to my conviction not gained followers but rather lost many (That's right) and this, not simply among the radicals, but among his friends the revisionists, and indeed among these the most. What has not been said during the last few days of him who was once greeted by his friends as a Messiah and of whom was expected the preaching of a new evangel, a new belief and new tactics. Now they are all shouting, 'Stone him! Stone him!' not because he has taken back a single word of that which he has said, but because, according to their ideas he was so unskilful, or so frank in speaking out. It is for this that he has been so sharply blamed, so that many have said, if this goes much further he must be put out of the party. None of us have said this as yet, but it has been said to Bernstein by those who, until a short time ago, were reckoned among his followers. Bernstein has grown to become a sort of *enfant terrible*. Because his views, however, were already discredited in wide circles of the party, no very great significance was laid upon his first suggestion that we choose a Vice-president who would be compelled by the cus-

tom of the Reichstag to make the ordinary visit to court. In fact I was much less embittered that the question was raised at all, than that it was set forth in such a public manner, because I said to myself: could Bernstein do anything more foolish from his own standpoint than at the very moment when the greatest rejoicing over the result of the election was prevailing throughout the party, and where the whole party with the exception of a disappearing minority had reached the conviction that now was the opportunity to take advantage of this victory and go forward to a sharper and more thorough attack by virtue of the strength of the great principles and the accomplishments of our previous tasks,—that he should come forward at this moment with the Vice-presidential question and declare that 'even if we have to go to court we dare not deny ourselves,' and that at a moment when the news from Breslau and Essen (long and vigorous applause) still burned before the eyes of the Social Democratic Party. At a moment that more than showed to every one who could think even a little what had been prepared for us from above, at that moment when we were saying to each other, now we will have to do with a representative of the ruling powers who has so often announced to us that in the last analysis 'the army is still there to shoot against father and mother.' (Long and renewed applause.) Did Bernstein really believe that all this had gone out of the heads of the German proletariat? (Loud applause.) Did he believe that there was a single one of us in doubt that the tremendous power which this man commanded on water and on land would one day be set in motion if he believed that the time had come to lead it against us? Whoever does not see all that, whoever does not know all that, should cease to play at politics. (Long and continued applause.) Bernstein had in my estimation shown a significant lack of foresight, and as far as I could observe no great portion of the party members considered it worth while to use any heavy weapons against him. To be sure I was roused that such a great moment should be disturbed by this trivial proposal.

"I will tell you this, that even if a great portion of the party press and that portion which is not ordinarily opposed to me on tactical questions blames me, on the other hand, I can give you written proof of the fact, that as long as I have been active in the party, and you know there have been some fierce struggles in the party, I have never received so many endorsements from the ranks of the party comrades as at the present time. Our comrades rejoice when the right word comes at the right time. (Laughter and applause.) Never has it happened to me to receive so many letters of endorsement as at the present time from the masses of the party comrades, and also from Switzerland, Austria, Belgium and England. From the German comrades,

however, not from the others. They are all rejoicing that we have at last belled the cat. (Loud applause.)

\* \* \* \* \*

“When it became apparent that nine-tenths of the party disapproved of Vollmar’s tactics, and that it was by no means a question of an extension of power but a little insignificant discussion of formalities, then there came from all sides a demand that the Convention should not occupy itself therewith. Now, if we were living behind a Chinese wall then the question would be wholly different. But, we are not. The whole world, we may say with a certain pride, is looking at us, and every movement in our ranks is closely followed by all Germany. On the other side all of those who during the last twelve years have brought this disagreement to the front at least every two years, and annually during the last five years, were praised by the bourgeois press and painted as great statesmen with a wide outlook. They will, in this manner, as I have already said, praise them out of the party. This has already taken place to a degree that I must say has many times disgusted me. (Applause.) Certainly those praised have not been responsible for this, but if such a thing should happen to me—it can not happen to me and I am glad of it—and so long as I can breathe and write and speak out, it shall not be otherwise. I will always be the deadly enemy of this bourgeois society and this social order as long as I live and I wish to exist only in order to bury its conditions of existence and to abolish it if I can. (Loud applause.)

“I wish the comrades to be informed on everything and if this had been done things would not have reached the pass in the party that, unfortunately, they have now attained, for the party comrades would have come together and said ‘Hold on, this can not go further. We see that what you are saying is exploited in the opposition press and how you are misunderstood, and this must not continue.’

\* \* \* \* \*

“They think the more modest we are the easier we shall conquer. I say, the more modest we are the less we will get. (Applause.) Marx says in Capital, ‘It is not possible to leap over an essential stage of development, but its duration may be shortened.’ There has been no greater practical politician than that Marx who is so much slandered in our own ranks. A stage of evolution cannot be leaped over, but it may be shortened. Our whole activity proceeds from the point of view of shortening the stages of evolution which lead to the socialist society. (Great applause.) With the revisionists, however, things are turned completely round. ‘Do not be so rash nor eager;’ those are not their words but the sense. ‘The masses are not yet ready, how can you flatter

yourselves.' They tell us the masses are not in a position to use the governmental power if it should come to us. Never mind breaking your heads about that. You know little of the intelligence there is upon our side if you are really in accord with the masses. (Very true.) What have not the laborers performed in the unions, in the mutual benefit associations, in industrial lines and in parliaments? Especially, what have not been the accomplishments of those men who have come from the proletariat in parliament? I do not speak of the collegians. How well these men filled their places during the last spring and summer upon the tariff commission. I think you honestly could have expected that our men would be placed there, but that they would fulfill their duties in such a satisfactory manner has filled me with amazement. . . . What do you know of the intelligence in labor circles? You have no conception of it. (Very good.) In every great popular movement intellects come from beneath of which no man has thought. For there has never been a great cultural movement of which it is more true that it has produced its own men than of the socialist movement. (Loud applause.) If the condition should arise tomorrow which should throw our opponents from their positions and place us therein, you need have no worry but what we would know what to do. (Applause.) But this petty point of view, this small heartedness, this cowardice, this everlasting diplomacy and compromise! (Great merriment and applause.) Naturally, all the diplomatic genius is on the side of our revisionists, all diplomatic history is on their side. Their genius for statesmanship is visible a thousand meters away and their statesmanlike features are noticeable from afar. In spite of all this, I say to you that the riders of principles, the people who more than ever represent the old ideal revolutionary standpoint of the party, these are no diplomats, no statesmen, nor do they wish to be; but I say to you, when one begins to write of *himself* as a statesman he is one no longer. (Cries of "Very good" and great merriment.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"This smoothing out, this bridging over of the antagonisms between proletariat and bourgeois society, that is the object of the men who call themselves revisionists. (Loud applause.) It is always and forever the old struggle, here Left, there Right, and between, the swamp. These are the elements that never know what they wish, that never say what they wish. These are the ones who first listen and look to find where the majority is and then go there. We have this same sort in our own party. (Renewed applause.) Many of them have been brought to light by this discussion. This, comrades, must be denounced. (Cry, 'Denounced?') Yes, I say 'denounced,' in order that the comrades

may know what sort of people they are. The man who openly takes some standpoint from which I can tell where I am and with what I have to battle and whether he conquers or I is not so much to be feared, but the miserable element that always hides and avoids every clear expression and is always saying, 'We are all united, we are all brothers,' this is the worst. (Loud applause.) This I fight the most. (Tumultuous applause.) If there is any doubt as to whether this view is correct, I find my best reasons for it in the attitude of our enemies. They are for me the best barometers. I ask then if the revisionist movement has not been encouraged and praised in every possible manner, by the capitalists, and if they have not morally supported it as far as they can? The *Frankfurter Zeitung* is, so to say, the organ of the revisionists, and the same could well nigh be said of Naumann's *Hilfe*. As poor an opinion as I have of Herr Naumann and as little as I believe that he has a wide political outlook, in relation to the tactics that he has adopted toward us he was generally skilful. (Shout, 'Yet he has had no results; yet he accomplished nothing.') Certainly he accomplished nothing. Do you think, comrades, that I believe that revisionism will accomplish anything in our party? (Loud applause.) No, comrades, it has had no results, save that it has brought disgrace to the party. (Shout, 'That's right.') It divides our strength and it restricts our development, it compels disagreements and reciprocal attacks where the opposite should prevail. (Very true.) Numerous comrades are also led astray. That these people have fought honestly I have no doubt. I have said the same in regard to our collegians who generally have forgotten all too soon what they have learned as Social Democrats, until they all more or less believe that they are actually born leaders of the proletariat, until finally more than one of them believes the proletariat should be brought to think that he does it an honor to represent it. (Very true.) There is no evil intention, no absolute betrayal, but it is an injury to the party. Alongside of the collegians comes that other portion of the revisionists, the previous proletarians who have risen to higher positions in life, people who have had a certain break in their lives. We need only to apply the materialistic conception of history and you can solve the riddle. That which holds true of our opponents holds true for us also. And thus is born the belief that one has statesmanlike blood and is a diplomatic genius. This belief in connection with the intercourse with people of the other side, gradually leads to the position which I have today pointed out. So it is that so-called proletarians are found therein. Certainly they are the unscientific and unskilful who but follow a man to whom they believe themselves personally bound. But, if it were once possible to set forth what the actual proletariat of the party

thinks of revisionism, the revisionists would have a beautifully fine general staff but the army behind them would have disappeared. (Loud applause.)

"But because revisionism since the last election (I practice no deception, I conceal nothing) has had a considerable strengthening in the Reichstag; because I know that people will seek to shake the proletarians in their convictions; and because I know that this, as it always has, will lead to continuous struggles and friction of the most unfortunate form, I have said, 'but now the Convention shall finally decide for the representatives of the party what shall be their standpoint and firmly fix the future tactics of the fraction.' (Applause.) I have already said in my first statement, 'I know that we have had sharp contests over tactics in the fraction and I know also that in the last instance that if the party was to speak these questions would be decided otherwise than they are in the fraction. (True, true.) Therefore we will more than ever call upon the party for decisions concerning the tactics of the fraction.' From this point of view I have presented the resolution with the amendment which I read at the beginning. From this point of view I ask you to observe this resolution and judge it, and if you believe that the resolution expresses what should be expressed, then vote for it with an overwhelming majority. (Shout, 'unanimously.')

And I am convinced that if this rule of conduct is given us, and if the other measures are grasped as they should be in order to spread clearness, truth and knowledge, then am I convinced that the party will go forward in its broad, victorious course, and fulfill its historical mission in the most glorious manner." (Tumultuous and continuous applause.)

After various other speakers, including Kautsky, Vollmar and Auer had addressed the Convention, Edward Bernstein proceeded to set forth his position. As with Bebel's, it is impossible to publish the whole of Bernstein's speech, but the substance is given herewith:

"I shall not hesitate from the beginning to declare that I am a revisionist. (Bravo.) Indeed I will even go further and admit that I am a Bersteinian. (Great merriment.)

"What is revisionism? It was not I who created the word. It was Schönkank who in 1894 while speaking in France declared the necessity of a revision of socialist ideas. I have never spoken of the revision of socialism, but have dealt with a list of questions under the title of 'problems of socialism.' What does revisionism seek to do? If all of the people who at one time or another have had opinions differing from the great majority of the party comrades on practical or theoretical questions were to be designated revisionists we would have a large body in which wholly different

views would be represented. The critical minds are always much harder to bring together than the dogmatic minds. In the time of the Reformation the Catholic Church held together while the Protestant movement was split up into numerous little movements which indeed constituted its temporary weakness. So it is no wonder that the so-called main revisionists disagree on different points. I have never had any illusions on this point. I have never imagined that the theoreticians would agree at all points with Vollmar, Auer or Heine. Even while I was in England I have declared that these men were independent politicians, men of practical experience, and were not responsible for me, nor I for them. So it is no disavowment, no kick that I have received from them. (Hear, hear.)

"I recognize so little the existence of revisionist party comrades that on various occasions I have shown that these men were no nearer to me than our party comrades. Auer is a dear comrade to me, but he stands no closer to me than August Bebel. When I went to Switzerland this summer I visited Bebel in Küssnacht, and also Vollmar in Munich. We are not here concerned with personal relations, but it is false to think that a uniform revisionist faction exists which conspires against the whole party. (That's right.) There are only a number of people who take an heterodox attitude towards the views expressed in the official scientific organ of the party, the *Neue Zeit*. If, however, a declaration of war is issued, as was just now done by Bebel, then it is self evident that we will find ourselves together in order to defend the right of freedom of thought. (That is right.) Then when this occasion has passed by, each one will go his own way and work in the ranks of the party. (Many shouts of "that's right.")

"To my mind the task of revision lies in the sphere of theory, and not of practice, and certainly theory owes much more to the practical movement than the movement to theory. Kautsky asserts that the revisionists question the party programme. No, that is not correct. The revisionists in the first place in no way question the second portion of the programme, including all of the political and economic demands. You cannot show me a sentence of these demands which I question. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the danger to the party which our work threatens is not very great. I also question in no way the last sentence of the theoretical portion of our programme. What does need revision are the first five paragraphs and part of the sixth. Therein lies the task of revisionism, as it appears to me as a theoretical worker. What revision is necessary in practice, can only be discovered through practical experience.

"I deny entirely that the vice-presidential question has anything whatever to do with my theoretical views. It is always made to



appear as if I were continually sitting and watching to see if I could not find some place in our programme to revise. That is not the case. And it is especially true that my proposition in regard to the vice-presidential question sprang out of no hypercriticism, but was the result of practical consideration. If it was ever true of any proposition, it was of this one that it was the product of practical experience which I gathered last winter in the Reichstag. You may think what you will, but I came to this conclusion as the result of the battle over the tariff bill. Call to mind the various stages of the tariff question, and especially that which was called the uprising (*Umsturtz*) in the Reichstag, and we must not deceive ourselves that what we had then experienced in the Reichstag was really a defeat—a defeat which was brought upon us through the use of brutal force. (Bebel, "it was a moral victory.") To be sure it was a moral victory, but in fact a defeat. If Kautsky drew the conclusion from such events as that of the tariff that the form of the political struggle is not growing milder, but rather sharper, then that is surely a peculiar manner of treating the question of the development of class antagonisms. The question was not, how could we fight in Parliament, or in the election, but whether we would not have to go upon the street and fight out the battle in blood, or if we could fight with other means. That the antagonisms are growing sharper I have never denied. \* \* \*

"As a consequence of the result of so many popular movements the ruling class by no means presents a solid front. Kautsky has spoken again today of the increasing sharpness of class antagonisms and of the increasing hatred of the possessing class by the proletariat and of the increasing persecution of the bourgeoisie. In my opinion it is one of the main mistakes of Comrade Kautsky that he always deals with such fallacious ideas (Bebel, "No, no.") Yes, certainly. And when one holds this formula his deductions are of iron logic and with no escape. Everything else is false and I am in every way an incurable confusionist. (Great laughter and shouts of "that's right.") Is the hypothesis of Kautsky correct? Are the governing classes a unit as opposed to the proletariat? Do all portions of the possessing classes stand in equal antagonism to the Social Democracy? (Shout, "sure.") Then you have struck yourself in the face at the last election where we made a distinction between our opponents. Look once honestly at evolution. Great industries in Germany are united under the domination of trusts in order to terrorize other industries and the laboring class. Against these trusts a great opposition exists today and at this point the antagonisms between the bourgeois classes are extraordinarily far reaching. The question continually arises, how does the labor party stand in regard to these questions? And at the decisive moment it is easily con-

ceivable that the bourgeois parties will be split on these questions.

"Through what have we gained the greater part of our victories in our wage struggles in the unions? Because it is often impossible for the different employers to combine, since a universal lock-out of the workers in the whole country is not possible for any length of time. The employers see that it is impossible to continue to shut the laborers out, and that they have diverse interests among themselves. I can illustrate this with concrete examples. The number of those among the possessing class, who from material grounds have an interest in securing the favor of the laborers, is continually growing. In my first address, after my return from England to Berlin, I have spoken about the way in which the saloonkeepers with which Social Democrats generally associated were gradually accepting the idea of Social Democracy (Laughter.) Laugh if you wish, but in that assembly there was no laughter. (Applause.) And this holds true, not only of the saloonkeepers but also of the great brewers (Laughter, shout of "horrible.") But you will remember how, not long ago, after the *Vorwaerts* had published the history of the campaign against suffrage, how a large number of brewers on their own initiative came forward to declare that they knew nothing of this (Shout, "in order to improve their business.") Yes, to be sure; that they did not come because of ideal grounds is evident. But it is to their interest to be in good favor with the laboring class. It is indeed self-evident that the more the laboring class grows, the greater becomes the significance of laborers as consumers, and consequently the greater the interest of the employer to raise the consuming power of the workers. You cannot deny this, and the result is not alone that these people look favorably upon the efforts of the laborers to improve their condition, but that they will occasionally strongly support them. We have also among bourgeois parties the antagonisms between free traders and protectionists, between the great commercial cities and the agrarians. Just because the interests of the possessing class are so antagonistic, and because it happens that one class is opposed to the other class, and under certain circumstances can increase the strength of the Social Democracy, is the reason why reaction is so extraordinarily hard and the unity of reaction so very hard to maintain. It is not correct to always deal only with such simple ideas as bourgeoisie and reaction. We must clearly understand that the ruling classes have different interests, and that under certain circumstances we can use these differences for our purposes. \* \* \*

After 1878 Marx and Engels expressed the opinion that the Socialist Law of Exception had one advantage in that it would cure the German Social Democracy of parliamentarianism. Those who followed the actual development, however, saw that the

opposite has resulted. The Social Democratic fraction of the Reichstag were far more parliamentarian at the time of the repeal of the Socialist law than on its enactment. \* \* \*

"If we permit our parliamentary fraction to adopt a purely protesting attitude, the result would at once appear that many have feared, that the unions would continually grow nearer to the bourgeois parties. That this has not occurred is due to the parliamentary activity of our party. We have, therefore, become no less radical, but only more firm. If radicalism actually consists in big words and extreme demands and ideas, then, this conception was correct, and the child is more radical than the man because he cries for the moon. (Very true.) Man does not reach after the moon, but he constantly brings the elements more and more to his service, and in the same way the increasing labor movement compels us ever more and more to reject illusions, and to use the necessities of present society as much as possible for our purposes. Let us lay all declamations to one side and accept parliamentarism for what it is, namely, a really great power, a great factor in our universal political life. For these reasons I have made my suggestion and still maintain it.

"On the question of freedom of thought I agree much more with Kautsky than in other directions. A fighting political party is no economic congress, and doubt and questioning must have some bounds. This we can demand of comrades. But where are these bounds? Not in the views of probable development. Here the most complete freedom of opinion must rule. The boundaries consist in the fundamentals which are placed in the party programme, and these fundamentals have never been denied by me at any time. On the contrary I have always maintained them with energy. \* \* \*

"For all these reasons I cannot support the resolution. It contradicts my convictions and I do not consider it especially clever. \* \* \*

"We have an electoral battle behind us in which we all stood together. Where was there a revisionist who did not do his whole duty and fight shoulder to shoulder with the others. We have gained a victory. Shall we celebrate this victory by throwing out and abusing one portion of our ranks so that they must go away with angry hearts from this congress. Withdraw this resolution. (Laughter). I know you will not do it, but I am convinced that it would be for the best if you would. Reject this resolution in order that we may go from this convention as comrades in battle who fight in common for a great and common cause." (Loud applause, clapping of hands and hissing.)

The Convention adopted by a vote of 288 to 11 a resolution condemning the revisionist movement of which the following is the portion referring to general tactics:

"The Convention rejects in the most decisive manner the revisionist efforts to change our hitherto tested and victory-crowned tactics, resting upon the class struggle, by substituting for the conquest of political power through the overthrow of our opponents, a policy of conciliation with the existing order of things. The result of such revisionist tactics would be that a party that works for the most rapid possible transformation of the existing bourgeois society into the Socialist society, and which in the best sense of the word is revolutionary, would be changed into a party which would occupy itself with the reformation of bourgeois society. Accordingly the conference is opposed to the revisionist movement now existing in the party, and is of the conviction that the class antagonisms do not decrease but rather grow sharper and clearer, and the party refuses the responsibility for the political and economic conditions resting upon the capitalist manner of production, and accordingly it refuses all endorsement of means that tend to maintain the ruling class in power."

The effect of this decision has been most far reaching in strengthening the revolutionary wing of the Socialist movement throughout the world. Jaures had expressed himself in *Le Petite Republique*, previous to the conference, to the effect that while it would be too much to expect a victory for the revisionist wing at Dresden, nevertheless that movement would undoubtedly show great strength, and victory might be looked for at an early day. We have not seen what he thought after the Conference, but feel quite sure that his opinion must have been changed.

One of the best evidences of the wisdom of the German Socialists is seen by the attitude taken by the capitalist press. They published columns of editorials expressing their disapproval of the decision of the Conference and declaring that it was fatal to the success of Socialism, and expressing warm sympathy with Bernstein and Vollmar.

Kautsky says in a review of the proceedings published in the *Neue Zeit* that "what is needed is clearness. And to a high degree clearness was brought about at Dresden." Again he points out what has been called attention to elsewhere, but is worthy of still further emphasis, that at the very beginning of the Conference it became clear that revisionism "had no roots in the masses of the party, and it had only officers and no troops, that its representation in the press and in representative bodies was relatively much greater than its hold upon the masses."

And he expresses what is undoubtedly a fact when he says: "This German revolution is, however, by no means insignificant. Its significance reaches far beyond German boundaries and creates a proper prelude to the Amsterdam Congress, where, unless the prevailing order of business is changed, the question of tactics

will be once more taken up. Jaures had expected, with the help of his German friends, to gain a victory there.

“For Germany, however, the declarations and votes of Dresden have buried the theoretical revisionism as a political factor. To be sure the convictions of individual members are not changed by votes, and just as little can the resolution of the Conference prove the truth or falsehood of the teaching, but its political strength is taken away. When once practical revisionism is rejected we may perhaps now and then have an opportunity to occupy ourselves with criticising some form or another of the revisionist literature, but we can be quite sure that theoretical revisionism will play no important role in the future political battles of Germany.”

—*Translations and Comments by A. M. Simons.*

## The Socialist Ideal

OUR COMRADES in Germany were discussing some time since the question of whether Socialism is a science. Socialism is not and cannot be a science for the simple reason that it is a part of the class struggle, and must disappear when its work is accomplished after the abolition of the classes which gave birth to it; but the end which it pursues is scientific.

Guizot, who had a vague idea of the theory of the class struggle—himself a product of the Revolution, which was a dramatic struggle between classes—said with good reason that a class cannot emancipate itself until it possesses the qualities requisite for taking the leadership of society; now one of these qualities is to have a more or less definite conception of the social order which it proposes to substitute for that which is oppressing it. This conception cannot but be a social ideal, or, to employ a scientific word, a social hypothesis; but an hypothesis, as well in the natural sciences as in social science, may be utopian or scientific.

Socialism, because it is a political party of the oppressed class, has therefore an ideal. It groups and organizes the efforts of the individuals who wish to build on the ruins of capitalist society, based upon individual property, an ideal or hypothetical society based upon common property in the means of production.

Only through the class struggle can modern socialism realize its social ideal, which possesses the qualities demanded of any hypothesis that claims a scientific character. The fact of choosing a scientific goal, and of trying to reach it only through the class struggle, distinguishes it from the Socialism of 1848, which was pursuing through the reconciliation of classes a social ideal which could not but be utopian considering the historic moment in which it was conceived. Socialism has thus evolved from Utopia into science. Engels has traced the main lines of this evolution in his memorable pamphlet, "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." It is the same with all sciences, which begin with Utopia to arrive at positive knowledge; this course is imposed by the very nature of the human mind.

Man progresses in social life as in intellectual life, only by starting from the known and traveling toward the unknown, and that unknown must be represented by the imagination; that imaginary conception of the unknown, which cannot but be hypothetical, is one of the most powerful incentives to action, it is the very condition of every forward step. It is natural that men like Bernstein in Germany and Jaures in France should seek to domesticate Socialism and to put it in tow of liberalism, accusing it of

hypnotising its soldiers with an ideal of the year 3000, which makes them live in the expectation of a Messianic "catastrophe" and reject the immediate advantages of an understanding and co-operation with bourgeois parties, and which blinds them to their shocking errors regarding the concentration of wealth, the disappearance of small industry and the middle class, the increase of class antagonisms, the spreading and intensification of the misery of the working class, etc. These errors may have been plausible hypotheses before 1848, but since then events have shown their falsity. This unfortunate ideal prevents them from descending from the revolutionary heights to accept the responsibilities of power and of setting aside the cause of labor to devote themselves entirely tongue and pen, to the rehabilitation of a millionaire leader; it obliges them to oppose all exterior policies and acts, to vote not a cent nor a soldier for colonial expeditions, which carry labor, Christianity, syphilis and the alcoholism of civilization to the barbaric tribes. The neo-methodists of the ancient and outworn gospel of the brotherhood of classes advise the socialists to suppress their ideal, or, since it unfortunately captivates the masses of the people, to speak of it without caring for it, as Jaures does, that they may consecrate themselves to practical necessities, to the vast plans of agricultural and industrial co-operation, to popular universities, etc.

The diletantes of politics, these practical groundlings of opportunism, nevertheless hold themselves up for transcendent idealists and march with their eyes fixed upon the stars, because they substitute for ideas a brilliant orchestra of sonorous words and eternal principles.

These bourgeois idealists edge their way in everywhere; after the Revolution of 1789 they rebuked the scientists for their hypotheses and their theories; according to them science should have stopped with the study of facts in themselves without dreaming of uniting them into a general system. "What is the use of cutting stones without putting up a building," replied Geoffroy-Saint-Hilaire, the genial disciple of Lamarck, who lived to see the extinction of his theory on the continuity of species, which, only thirty years after his death, was to take on a new birth with Darwin. They are still reproaching the physiologists for wasting their time in elaborating hypotheses which last on an average only three years and which cannot explain what takes place in a muscle which contracts and in a brain which thinks. They grumble against the hypotheses of the physicists, who do not know the real nature of elasticity, of electrical conductivity, or even what happens when a particle of sugar is dissolved. They would like to prohibit scientists from any speculation because it is disastrous and may lead into error. But the latter protest and declare that imagination is one of the first and most indispensable

faculties of the scientist, and that the hypotheses to which they give birth, even though they be erroneous and able to survive only three years, are nevertheless the necessary condition of all scientific progress.

If the communist ideal were an hypothesis undemonstrable and false it would still be a propelling force of social progress, but such is not the case.

The hypothesis in science, as in the social field, is the more undemonstrable and susceptible of error in proportion as the data contributing to its elaboration are less numerous and more uncertain. Greek science, which had to furnish a conception of the world when the data regarding the phenomena of nature were of the most rudimentary, was obliged to resort to hypotheses which for boldness and intuitive accuracy are marvels of history and of thought; after having admitted, according to the vulgar opinion, that the earth was flat, and that the temple of Delphi was situated at its center, they put forth the hypothesis of its spherical form, then undemonstrable.

Socialism, which dates from the first years of the nineteenth century, started, like Greek science, from hypotheses the more erroneous, and from an ideal the more utopian, in that the social world which it proposed to transform was less known; and at that epoch could not be known for the excellent reason that it was in course of formation.

The machine operated by steam was beginning to edge into industry where the tool, managed by the artisan, was moved by human power, and in some rare circumstances by animals, wind or waterfalls. The Socialist thinkers, as Engels observes, were then obliged to draw from their own brain the social ideal which they could not extract from the tumultuous economic environment in full course of transformation. They grasped again, infusing new life into it, the communist ideal which has slumbered in the mind of man since he emerged from the communism of primitive society which the poetic Greek mythology calls the golden age and which has awakened to shine here and there with a glorious splendor at great epochs of social upheaval. They sought, then, to establish communism, not because the economic environment was ready for its introduction, but because men were miserable, because the laws of justice and equality were violated, because the precepts of the Christ could not be followed in their purity. The communistic ideal, not springing from economic reality, was then but an unconscious reminiscence of a prehistoric past, and came only from idealistic notions upon a justice, an equality and a gospel law no less idealistic; it is then idealistic in the second degree, and consequently utopian.

The Socialists of the first half of the nineteenth century, who rekindled the communist ideal, had the rare merit of giving it a



consistency less idealistic. They spoke little of the Christian religion, of justice and of equality; Robert Owen laid the responsibilities of social evils upon the family, property and religion; Charles Fourier criticises the ideas of justice and morality introduced by the bourgeois Revolution of '89 with incomparable animation and irony. They did not weep over the misery of the poor, but left that for Victor Hugo and the charlatans of romanticism. They preached the social problem from its realistic side, the only side from which it can be solved. They used their talents to prove that a social organization of production would succeed in satisfying the desires of all without reducing the share of any, not even that of the privileged capitalist class. Meanwhile the recent application of steam and machinery demanded also a new organization of labor, and this was the constant concern of the industrial bourgeoisie. The socialists were thus pursuing the same end as the industrials; bourgeois and socialists might consequently come to an understanding. We therefore find in the socialist sects of that epoch industrials, engineers and financiers who in the second half of the century cast away their sympathy for the workers and occupied an important place in capitalist society.

The socialism of that epoch could not under these conditions be anything else than pacific; instead of entering on the struggle with the capitalists, the socialists thought only of converting them to their system of social reform from which they were to be the first to benefit. They proclaimed the association of capital, intelligence and labor, the interests of which, according to them, were identical; they preached a mutual understanding between the employer and the employed, between the exploiter and the exploited; they know no class struggle; they condemned strikes and all political agitation, especially if it were revolutionary; they desired order in the street and harmony in the work-shop. They demanded, finally, nothing more than was desired by the new industrial bourgeoisie.

They foresaw that industry, strengthened by the motive power of steam, machinery and the concentration of the instruments of labor, would have a colossal producing power, and they had the simplicity to believe that the capitalists would content themselves with taking only a reasonable part of the wealth thus created, and would leave to their co-operators, the manual and intellectual laborers, a portion sufficient to enable them to live in comfort. This socialism was marvellously agreeable to capital, since it promised an increase of wealth and advised an understanding between the laborer and the employer. It recruited the great majority of its adepts in the educational hotbeds of the bourgeoisie. It was utopian, therefore it was the socialism of the intellectuals.

But precisely because it was utopian, the laborers, in constant antagonism with their employers on questions of labor and hours,

looked on it with suspicion. They could understand nothing of this socialism which condemned strikes and political action and which assumed to harmonize the interests of capital and labor, of the exploiter and exploited. They kept aloof from the socialists and gave all their sympathies to the bourgeois republicans, because they were revolutionary. They joined their secret societies and climbed with them upon the barricades to make riots and political revolutions.

Marx and Engels took socialism at the point to which the great utopians had brought it, but instead of torturing their brains to invent out of whole cloth the organization of labor and of production, they studied that which was already created by the very necessities of the new mechanical industry which had arrived at a degree of development sufficient to permit its power and its tendency to be apparent. Its productivity was so enormous, as Fourier and Saint Simon had foreseen, that it was capable of providing abundantly for the normal needs of all the members of society. This was the first time in history that such a productive power had been observed, and it was because capitalist production could satisfy all needs, and for that reason alone, that it is possible to reintroduce communism, that is to say the equal participation of all in social wealth, and the free and complete development of the physical, intellectual and moral faculties. Communism is no longer a utopia but a possibility.

Machinery replaces the individualistic production of the small industry, but the communistic production of the capitalistic factory and property in the means of labor has remained individual, as in the time of the small industry. There is then a contradiction between the individualistic mode of possession and the communist mode of production and this contradiction translates itself into the antagonism between the laborer and the capitalist employer. The producers, who form the immense majority of the nation, no longer possess the instruments of labor, the possession of which is centralized into the idle hands of a decreasing minority. The social problem imposed by mechanical production will be solved, as the social problems imposed by preceding modes of production have been solved, by precipitating the evolution begun by economic force, by finishing the expropriation of the individual in the means of production, by giving to the communistic mode of production the communistic mode of possession which it demands.

The communism of contemporary socialists no longer proceeds, like that of former times, from the cerebral lucubrations of gifted thinkers; it proceeds from economic reality, it is the final goal of the economic forces which, without any attention on the part of the capitalists and their intellectuals, have fashioned the communistic mold of a new society, the coming of which we only have to hasten. Communism, then, is no longer a utopian hypothesis; it

is a scientific ideal. It may be added that never has the economic structure of any society been better and more completely analyzed than capitalist society, and that never was a social ideal conceived with such numerous and positive data as the communist idea of modern socialism.

Although it is the economic forces which fashion men at their pleasure and spur them to action, and although these constitute the mysterious force determining the great currents of history which the Christians attribute to God, and the free-thinking bourgeois assign to Progress, to Civilization, to the Immortal Principles and other similar manitous, worthy of savage tribes, they are nevertheless the product of human activity. Man, who created them and brought them into the world, has thus far let himself be guided by them; yet now that he has understood their nature and grasped their tendency, he can act upon their evolution. The socialists who are accused of being stricken by Oriental fatalism and of relying upon the good pleasure of economic forces to bring to light the communist society instead of crossing their arms like the fakirs of official Economics, and of bending the knee before its fundamental dogma, *laissez faire, laissez passer*, propose on the contrary to subdue them, as the blind forces of nature have been subdued, and force them to do good to men instead of leaving them to work misery to the toilers of civilization. They do not wait for their ideal to fall from heaven as the Christians hope for the grace of God, and the capitalists for wealth; they prepare, on the contrary, to realize it, not by appealing to the intelligence of the capitalist class and to its sentiments of justice and humanity, but by fighting it, by expropriating it from its political power, which protects its economic despotism.

Socialism, because it possesses a social ideal, has in consequence a criticism of its own. Every class which struggles for its enfranchisement seeks to realize a social ideal, in complete opposition with that of the ruling class. The struggle is waged at first in the ideological world before the physical shock of the revolutionary battle. It thus begins the criticism of the ideas of the society which must be revolted against, for "the ideas of the ruling class are the ideas of society," or these ideas are the intellectual reflection of its material interests.

Thus, as the wealth of the ruling class is produced by slave labor, so religion, ethics, philosophy and literature agree in authorizing slavery. The ugly God of the Jews and Christianity strikes with his curse the progeny of Ham, that it may furnish slaves. Aristotle, the encyclopedic thinker of Greek philosophy, declares that slaves are predestined by nature and that no rights exist for them, for there can be no rights except between equals. Euripides infuses into his tragedies the doctrine of servile morality; St. Paul, St. Augustine and the Church teach to slaves submission to

their earthly masters that they may deserve the favor of their heavenly master; Christian civilization introduces slavery into America and maintains it there until economic phenomena prove that slave labor is a method of exploitation more costly and less profitable than free labor.

At the epoch when the Greco-Roman civilization was dissolving, when the labor of artisans and free workers began to be substituted for slave labor, pagan religion, philosophy and literature decided to recognize in them certain rights. The same Euripides who advised the slave to lose his personality in that of the master does not wish him to be despised. "There is nothing shameful in slavery but the name," says the pedagogue in *Ion*, "the slave, moreover, is not inferior to the free man when he has a noble heart." The mysteries of Eleusis and of Orphism, like Christianity, which continues their work, admit slaves among their initiated and promises them liberty, equality and happiness after death.

The dominating class of the Middle Ages being military, the Christian religion and social ethics condemned lending money at interest, and covered the lender with infamy; to take interest for money loaned was then something so ignominious that the Jewish race, obliged to specialize itself in the trade of money, still bears the shame of it. But to-day, now that the Christians have become Jews, and the ruling class lives on the interest of its capital, the trade of the lender at interest is the most honorable, the most desirable, the most exclusive.

The oppressed class, although the ideology of the oppressing class is imposed upon it, nevertheless elaborates religious, ethical and political ideas corresponding to its condition of life; vague and secret at first, they gain in precision and force in proportion as the oppressed class takes definite form and acquires the consciousness of its social utility and of its strength; and the hour of its emancipation is near when its conception of nature and of society opposes itself openly and boldly to that of the ruling class.

The economic conditions in which the bourgeois moves and develops make of it a class essentially religious. Christianity is its work and will last as long as this class shall rule society. Seven or eight centuries before Christ, when the bourgeoisie had its birth in the commercial and industrial cities of the Mediterranean basin, we may observe the elaboration of a new religion; the gods of paganism created by warrior tribes could not be suited to a class consecrated to the production and sale of merchandise. Mysterious cults (the mysteries of the Cabiri, of Demeter, of Dionysus, etc.) bring the revival of the religious traditions of the prehistoric matriarchical period, the idea of a soul and its existence after death revive; the idea of posthumous punishments and rewards to compensate for acts of social injustice are introduced, etc. These religious elements, combined with the spiritual data of Greek

philosophy, contribute to form Christianity, the religion, *par excellence*, of societies which have for their foundation property belonging to the individual and the class which enrich themselves by the exploitation of wage labor. For fifteen centuries all the movements of the bourgeoisie, either for organization, or for self-emancipation, or for the acquisition of power have been accompanied and complicated by religious crises; but always Christianity more or less modified remains the religion of society. The revolutionists of 1789, who in the ardor of the struggle promised themselves to de-Christianize France, were eager when the bourgeoisie were victorious to raise again the altars they had overthrown and to reintroduce the cult that they had proscribed.

The economic environment which produces the proletariat relieves it on the contrary from every idea of sentiment. There is not seen either in Europe nor in America among the laboring masses of the great industries any anxiety to elaborate a religion to replace Christianity, nor any desire to reform it. The economic and political organizations of the working class are completely disinterested as to any doctrinal discussion of religious and spiritual dogmas, although they combat the priests of all cults because they are the lackeys of the capitalist class.

The victory of the proletariat will deliver humanity from the nightmare of religion. The belief in superior beings to explain the natural world and the social inequalities, and to prolong the dominion of the ruling class, and the belief in the posthumous existence of the soul to recompense the inequalities of fate will have no more justification when once man, who has already grasped the general causes of the phenomena of nature, shall live in a communist society from whence shall have disappeared the inequalities and the injustice of capitalistic society.

The militant socialists, following the example of the encyclopedists of the eighteenth century, have to make a merciless criticism of the economic, political, historical, philosophical, moral and religious ideas of the capitalist class in order to prepare in all spheres of thought the triumph of the new ideology which the proletariat brings into the world.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)

## Congress of French Socialists

**T**HE congress held seven sessions, two each on Sunday, September 27, and Tuesday, September 29, and three on Monday the 28th, when there was a night session.

A report on the general activity of the party was read by the Secretary for Internal Affairs, Louis Dubreuilh. In the course of this report he stated that the Parti Socialiste Francais already includes three-fourths of the organized Socialists of France. In a large number of the provinces it is carrying on a systematic activity. In not a single place is it declining. On the contrary, in most of the provinces it is making a rapid gain and it will soon include all the intelligent workers for revolutionary Socialism.

The interest of the convention centered largely upon the question of closer organization of the allied socialist forces. The committee appointed to elaborate plans looking to this end presented three reports. The second of these offered by Paul Lafargue dealt with the question of putting an end to the provisional arrangement adopted at the conference of Ivery, and continued by the congress at Commentry. This arrangement gave to the old organizations the duty of distributing membership cards. All the delegates who took the floor demanded in the name of their respective organizations that this should be done away with, and complete unity be realized. This present congress offered the one occasion when the members could meet together in the capacity of delegates from the old national organizations which had been continued in existence by the compact of Ivery. These organizations were of course the only ones which could authorize their own obliteration.

It is for this reason that Vaillant, in the name of the Central Revolutionary Committee, offered a resolution affirming the unanimous desire of the Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire to realize a complete and indistinguishable unity with the comrades of the other organizations, indicating, moreover, the conditions under which he considered that this unity morally and materially established in form as well as in fact might become the absolute law and duty for all. His resolution reads as follows:

The Central Revolutionary Committee at its regular meeting held June 16, 1903, under the presidency of Comrade Calnel, adopted unanimously the following proposition offered by Comrade Vaillant:

The Central Revolutionary Committee accepts, but only on

the following conditions, the abolition of the temporary arrangements of the compact of Ivery. That is to say, the abolition of the national organization of the Parti Ouvrier Francais, Parti Socialiste Revolutionnaire and Alliance Communiste, which, with the concurrent local federation, constituted the Parti Socialiste de France.

These conditions are:

One, absolute regard for the compact of Ivery guaranteed by applying a preliminary investigation to every motion for modifying it from any source whatever.

Two, the suppression of all titles and names, of all designations and emblems of all inscriptions and, in fact, of all signs of any kind which might recall, as if existing, the old organizations, P. S. R., P. O. F., and A. C.

Three, only the names and inscriptions of the Parti Socialiste de France are allowed dating from the day when by the abolition of the temporary arrangements of the compact of Ivery the old organizations shall have been merged in the P. S. de F. There was likewise a unanimous decision to establish unreserved unity on the part of the delegates who had received their credentials from the adherence of the Parti Ouvrier Francais. And all agreed in affirming that not only had the P. O. F. exercised no functions as a national organization since the congress of Commenary, but that every public action performed by its federations, sections and groups in the various regions, had been in the name and under the title of the Parti Socialiste de France.

The complete unity which they were commissioned to bring about naturally meant for them the disappearance of the national organization of the Parti Ouvrier Francais, and therefore of the initials P. O. F. even as a sub-title. The representatives of the Alliance Communiste also declared that they had come with a view to bringing about complete unification.

The committee upon a legislative and municipal program for the party presented the following report, which was adopted unanimously. Upon a motion by Vaillant the title of the program was changed so as to read henceforth:

“Program of Immediate Demands.”

## POLITICAL SECTION.

Article 1. Abolition of all laws limiting for working men the liberties of the press, of meeting and of association. Abolition of all restrictions effecting directly or indirectly the international association of the workingmen.

Art. 2. Civil and political equality for all members of the social body.

Art. 3. Separation of church and state. Abolition of appro-

priations for public worship. Restoration to the nation of the property of the churches and of the so-called mort-main property real and personal belonging to religious congregations, including all industrial and commercial appendages operated by these congregations.

Art. 4. General arming of the people. Suppression of standing armies and their transformation into national militia.

Art. 5. Measures securing secret voting and the free exercise of the right of suffrage.

Art. 6. The municipality to be supreme over its administration, its finances and its police.

Art. 7. Remuneration for all elective functions.

### ECONOMIC SECTION.

Art. 8. Abolition of the taxes which weigh most heavily on the producer and the poor. Uniform and progressive taxation upon incomes above 3,000 francs.

Art. 9. Abolition of inheritance on collateral lines. Limitation of inheritance on the direct line to the profit of the nation or the municipality.

Art. 10. Abolition of the public debt.

Art. 11. Resumption by the nation of the public properties granted to private parties (banks, railroads, mines, etc.), and delivery of their management to the laborers, under the control of the nation.

Art. 12. General scientific and professional education guaranteed to all children, their support being at the expense of society represented by the municipality and by the State.

Art. 13. Legal limitation of the labor-day for adults to eight hours.

Art. 14. Prohibition of the employment of children under 14 years. Limitation of the labor-day of children between 14 and 18 to half the legal labor-day for adults.

Art. 15. Legal prohibition of requiring labor more than six days out of seven.

Art. 16. Prohibition of night labor for children less than 18 and for women.

Art. 17. Prohibition of requiring labor from women six weeks before and six weeks after the birth of a child.

Art. 18. Prohibition of labor in houses of refuge and orphan asylums, etc. Reorganization of labor in prisons so as not to compete with private labor.

Art. 19. Prohibition of piece work of every description.

Art. 20. Legal minimum for wages fixed annually according to the local cost of living by delegates of laborers and employees, or by the unions.



Art. 21. Equal wages for equal work to laborers of both sexes.

Art. 22. Legal prohibition against employers hiring foreign laborers at wages below those paid to French laborers.

Art. 23. Abolition of fines and of any deduction from wages or salaries. Prohibition of payment in goods or checks. Abolition of company stores.

Art. 24. Abolition of employment agencies. Legal prohibition of pass-books for adults.

Art. 25. Direct participation on the part of laborers in the fixing of all the regulations of factories, shops, stores or offices.

Art. 26. Inspection of labor entrusted to laborers, and employees chosen as delegates empowered to look after the execution of labor legislation.

Art. 27. Revision of the Arbitration laws to assure more guarantees to the laborers.

Art. 28. Extension to all classes of workers, laborers, and employees, in manufactures, mines, transportation, commerce, agriculture, municipal and state works of all labor legislation, especially the arrangements concerning conditions of labor, arbitration, accidents, etc.

Art. 29. Compulsory and immediate compensation at the expense of employers for damages in all cases of accidents without distinction of position or trade.

Art. 30. Direct and exclusive control by the laborers and employees of the labor funds for mutual assistance, sick benefits and insurance. Absolute prohibition of any interference on the part of employers.

Art. 31. Relief at the expense of employers and society for all those whom age, infirmities or sickness have made unable to supply the needs of their existence.

#### MUNICIPAL SECTION.

Art. 32. Suppression of the octrois with absolute liberty left to the municipalities to establish taxes to replace them, and with participation in the revenues of the State.

Art. 33. Exemption from all personal taxes for small tenants to be obtained by a progressive tax on tenants of a higher grade.

Art. 34. Taxes upon buildings not rented and upon ground not built upon.

Art. 35. Free text books and school supplies. Establishment of school restaurants, providing a gratuitous meal for the pupils between the morning and afternoon sessions. Distribution of clothing and shoes. Establishment of municipal libraries.

Art. 36. Introduction into bureaus of public works and into municipal contracts of clauses establishing stated conditions of

labor. (Eight-hour day; minimum wage; prohibition of piece work; healthful and safe conditions for the workers.)

Art. 37. Establishment of labor exchanges in municipalities where several labor unions exist. The direction and administration of these to be entrusted exclusively to the unions. In default of unions and labor exchanges free employment bureaus to be maintained by the municipalities.

Art. 38. Remuneration for workmen arbitrators at a rate assuring them independence of employers.

Art. 39. Municipal hygienic service and sanitary inspection. Compulsory sanitary repairs at the cost of the owners of lodgings found unhealthful. Establishment of free public washhouses and shower baths.

Art. 40. Free medical attendance. Municipal pharmacies furnishing medicine at cost.

Art. 41. Establishment of free sanitariums, maternity hospitals and dispensaries, belonging to the municipality, or a group of municipalities.

Art. 42. Outdoor relief and establishment of municipal and inter-municipal homes for children, the aged and those disabled by labor.

Art. 43. Relief in the way of food for every workman traveling or without fixed residence in search of employment. Establishment of free lodging houses.

Art. 44. Legal advice free.

Art. 45. Publication of an official municipal bulletin or regular placarding of decisions taken by the municipal council.

#### AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM.

On recommendation of the committee the congress decided to refer to the central council:

1. The preparation of a plan for an agricultural program which was to be adopted after consultation between the federations.

2. The publication of a pamphlet commenting on the articles in the program of immediate demands.

The central council was also instructed as proposed by Lagardelle and Deslinieres to prepare before the next municipal elections a declaration of principles to precede the program of reforms of the party. Finally on a proposition by Laudier and Compère-Morel representing the federations of the Cher and Oise the following resolution was adopted.

#### AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

The second national congress of the socialist party of France (U. S. R.) in assembly at Reims September 27, 28, 29, 1903, In view of the ever increasing concentration of landed prop-

erty in the hands of a capitalist minority which brings into agricultural communities the same degree of exploitation that prevails in industrial communities, and,

In view of the introduction of machinery in agricultural labor, which intensifies more and more the struggle for employment and causes the machine (which under the socialist system would be a source of benefit and happiness for the farm laborers by relieving them from the severe fatigue of the work of harvesting) to be under the capitalist system a source of poverty, trouble and privation through the competition which it brings about among country laborers;

Declares that there is need for the party to carry on an active propaganda in the country districts in favor of the limitation of the labor-day, for the relief of those out of work, and in favor of the establishment of a minimum wage, awaiting the time when the economic and political organizations of the forces of labor for the expropriation of the possessing class and the benefit of the dispossessed class, in landed property as well as in agricultural machinery, may permit it to use the means of production in common for the greatest good of all.

#### EDUCATION.

The report drawn up by Lafargue states in the first place that the question may be reduced to primary education, since secondary and higher education are inevitably closed to the children of proletarians. The congress agreed with him. Lafargue's project is developed in the following resolution:

Whereas, the children of the laborers, given up to the exploitation of employers from the tenderest age, receive only primary instruction and do not profit at an adult age from the scientific information which might permit them to emancipate themselves from the religious falsehoods with which they are poisoned,

The second congress of the socialist party of France declares that, first and foremost, primary instruction should be taken away from the congregations and the ministers of all religions.

Whereas, the laborers, despoiled by the capitalists of the social wealth which they alone have to produce, and receiving only enough to live upon in trouble and poverty, cannot defray the necessary expenses for the education and support of their children, and

Whereas, the laborers provide the revenue of the state directly through the taxes which they pay and indirectly by the taxes which the capitalists pay with the money stolen from them;

The second congress of the socialist party of France declares that the state should be compelled to give gratuitously primary instruction to the children of the laborers, and procure for them

gratuitously school supplies, clothing, food and other necessary articles.

Whereas, the state, which is the exploiter of wage labor and which shares with the capitalists the thefts which they commit daily upon the wage laborer, gives only an education corrupted by bourgeois ideas of property, justice, legality, the rights of man, patriotism, glory, military honor, savings, liberty to work, etc., and,

Whereas, these bourgeois ideas, which are no less dangerous than the outgrown dogmas of religion, are taught in the primary schools for no other purpose than to prepare the laborers from childhood to submit to the yoke of capital, to live in privation by the side of the increasing wealth which they produce, and to accept without rebelling the inequalities and iniquities of society.

The second congress of the socialist party of France demands that the mothers and fathers of the children attending the municipal schools constituted into an electoral body, elect, in each municipality, women and men to form school boards charged to look after the hygienic conditions of their children and the distribution of food, and clothing, and to control the instruction which is given them, as well as the books which are put into their hands.

Neither the state officials nor officers and ministers of any organized religion shall be allowed under any pretext to hold a place on the school boards.

A discussion ensued on this proposition, participated in by Vaillant, Constans, Galmot, Roussel, Myrens, Landrin, Roland, Lagardelle, Rappaport, Guesde and Ghesquiere. It was unanimously agreed that while the preamble of Lafargue's plan was to be endorsed completely, his conclusions leave much room for discussion and it will be better for the present to leave the question for the study of the party.

On motion by Vaillant it was decided that the party should ask the international congress to declare itself upon the "revisionist" tendencies, by whatever name they may be called, by presenting a resolution similar to that adopted by the German Social Democracy at the congress of Dresden.—*Translated from Le Socialiste by Charles H. Kerr.*

## Materialism and Its Relations to Propagandism of Socialism

I HAVE been a reader of THE REVIEW since its beginning, with the exception of the numbers of the first half of 1903, and, in the main, especially as far as has to do with the doctrines of socialism, I can indorse what has appeared in its columns. It is a power which is opening the eyes of the thinking class of the American public. Nevertheless I cannot but deplore the efforts of some of its writers to build evolution and socialism upon materialism as its philosophic basis. This position in philosophy I must criticise as untenable and destructive of all tendency to reform. Instead of being a stable structure it is an inverted pyramid, whose only foundation is its apex, and which the slightest breath of reason topples over.

First let us consider the objection to materialism from the view point of the propagandism of reforms. Materialism is determinism pure and simple. No old time straight-jacket Presbyterian could be more rigid in his predestinarianism than are the inevitable conclusions of materialism. Everything flows in a determined stream whose sources are the "fortuitous concurrence and clash of atoms." Mind is a function of matter, the same as sound, heat, light, and electricity. The brain is a mechanism which gives off thought, consciousness, and will as a tea-kettle gives off steam. The kind, quantity and direction of these products are wholly determined by the motor forces included in the atoms themselves, and the concourses and clashes fortuitously determined by their several environments. In the individual there is no self-determining power; he is merely a molecule carried on and on by the irresistible force of gravity and the direction-determining enclosure of the stream's banks.

With such a philosophy it is folly for an individual to put forth an effort to will, and much more to act. With such a philosophy as our guide to truth no person can in the slightest degree change the flow of events, nor can he in the slightest degree held responsible for his acts. Materialism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. The ancients placed the world on a turtle's back, but what the turtle rested on was answered by the agnostic "I don't know." Materialism bases the world on the atom; but how the atom has and exercises its wonderful and Godlike power is answered by the agnostic "I don't know."

It has been a hackneyed custom of some philosophers to brand certain kinds of reasoning as metaphysical, and in such a man-

ner do they speak as to convey the conclusion concealed in their contemptuous epithet, that metaphysics and metaphysical reasoning are obsolete relics of the middle ages, and that no well informed man of the present time will attempt to lead through tortuous windings of a reasoning which begins nowhere and ends in the same place.

Allow me to say here without fear of controversy that there can be no philosophy without a metaphysical basis; and the philosophy which ignores metaphysics has no foundation—no commanding power to give it credence.

All philosophies may be classified under three general heads—materialism, dualism, and idealism. Though under each head are a multitude of variations, each class has certain distinctive doctrines.

Materialism holds that the atom, or whatever it may term the ultimate portion of the world which affects our senses, has the potency of all things and all phenomena, both physical and mental, which we see about us. Everything is reduced to a push and a pull of this ultimate entity of matter—nay, that is not the last analysis; for in strictness we cannot conceive a pull—everything must be reduced to a push of material atoms against each other. The various phenomena of gravity, molecular attractions and repulsions, sound, heat, light, and electricity, sensation, perception, consciousness, thought, and will, all require a foundation—a rational explanation; but at each step the philosopher can only assume that it is so, and attribute the phenomena to the mysterious and wonderful properties of matter. In this upward march to the higher realms of thought the materialistic philosopher continues to endow matter and the atom with attributes and powers adequate to explain the phenomena which he discusses until his matter and atoms arise to the dignity and power of God! His explanations are all irrational assumptions.

Dualism is for the most part the philosophy of religionists in all ages of the world, though there is no necessary relation between religion and dualism. It is also the philosophy of the common sense of mankind. This fact doubtless has for its reason the other fact that it is much easier to attribute the two utterly different orders of phenomena (mental and physical) to two entirely different orders of reality (spirit and matter), than to attribute all phenomena to one kind of reality—the explanation attempted by both materialistic monists and idealistic monists.

Dualism assumes a world of matter and a world of spirit, both of an entirely different order of existence; that in the organism the two orders of existence are mysteriously united, allowing the spiritual to reach over into, as it were, and control the material; that each order of existence is independent in

its essence from the other. While the assumptions of dualism are rational and cannot be disproved—at least with mathematical certainty—it must call to its aid many agnostic “I-don’t-knows,” and fails to explain what seems more simple and rationally explained by idealistic monism.

In idealism we find the most impregnable position in philosophy. We cannot conceive how a push can become gravitation, molecular attractions and repulsions, sound, heat, light, electricity, sensation, thought, consciousness, and will. Each transition involves an inconceivable leap from a physical entity to an idea—a transformation from a physical order to one to which we cannot conceive that the physical has any relation whatever. Yet if we start with consciousness—that which says “I am the being that has these thoughts, and will, and know, and act”—we are driven to the conclusion that all our knowledge is mental. Every sensation, perception, thought—the whole realm of knowledge is mental. What we are wont to call physical phenomena are those streams which seem to reach us from without ourself—without the limiting area of our sensorium—streams of phenomena which seem to be to a greater or less degree beyond our reach and control. If all phenomena have a mental reality behind them, as we know to be the case with our own sensations, thoughts and wills, then can all be rationally explained. Every so-called atom of matter is what we may term a mental monad with a mentality and will pertaining to itself. There may be other existences than mental; but we have no way of proving or disproving this hypothesis. To assume that all nature is thought, consciousness, and will is the only hypothesis by which to explain satisfactorily the phenomena of nature. It is the only rational foundation for evolution and therefore of economics. Determinism has no place in philosophy except as one mental existence limits another. Freedom of will between limits is everywhere, though in man the limits of freedom are most widely separated, allowing the widest swing of mentality. In the atom of what we term inert matter there are the narrowest limits of freedom, yet we have no right to say that the ultimate mental unit has no freedom, else it would be defacto inert and the world would be dead and without life and no motion.

So broad a subject allows but the touching of its salient points in a short magazine article, yet I hope this will be enough to induce more critical thinking on the part of your materialistic contributors.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

Agricultural College, Mich., Sept. 4, 1903.

## The Class Struggle in Australia

**C**LASS warfare has at length been declared in Australia by the capitalists themselves. The employers of the three eastern states are united in an Employers' Federation, and in each of these states are preparing to raise a large fighting fund to down labor at the forthcoming Federal elections. The secretary of this organization says "The Employers' Federation makes no secret of its intentions. It will adopt an aggressive attitude towards Socialist-Labor legislation. The object of the defense fund is to assist present political organizations in banding together in opposition to the Socialist-Labor party. We make it clear that we have no objection to legitimate unions (i. e. bogus unions of the Machine Shearers' Union type). Our object is purely to encourage the investment of capital, and consequently the employment of labor and the development of the natural resources of the state." One would think that this declaration on the part of the employers would force the Labor Party to come out as a straight-out Socialist Party. But no; they simply ignore this accusation of being socialistic, for they feel by no means guilty. Their cry at the forthcoming Federal elections will probably be "A White Australia," and "support the party that helped to abolish the duties on tea and kerosene." Indeed the Brisbane Political Labor Council has issued an appeal to labor sympathizers which contains the following: "You who believe in A White Australia, in adult suffrage, in conciliation and compulsory arbitration, in equal pay for equal work and in the adjustment of taxation, are urged to organize."

A new and uncertain factor in Federal politics will be the presence of women voters. In New South Wales and Victoria they are rapidly organizing themselves in Women's Political Organizations. Attempts are being made by *The Woman's Sphere* (the only woman's paper in Australia), to prevent the women from allying themselves with any political party.

In Queensland, however, they have organized along party lines and at the formation of a women's workers' political organization the class warfare was fearlessly insisted on. It is to be feared that the labor politicians who are assisting the women to organize will be able to keep this jarring note in the background. Australian labor politicians seem to imagine that they can abolish class-warfare by conciliation and arbitration bills.

The following is the "Labor Platform" as adopted at "Commonwealth Labor Conference," Sydney, December, 1902.



## FIGHTING PLATFORM.

1. Maintenance of a White Australia.
2. Compulsory Arbitration.
3. Old Age Pensions.
4. Nationalization of Monopolies.
5. Citizen Defense Force.
6. Restriction of Public Borrowing.
7. Navigation Laws.

## GENERAL PLATFORM.

1. Maintenance of a White Australia.
2. Compulsory Arbitration to settle industrial disputes, with provision for the exclusion of the legal profession.
3. Old Age Pensions.
4. Nationalization of Monopolies.
5. Citizen Military Force and Australian-owned Navy.
6. Restriction of Public Borrowing.
7. Navigation Laws to provide (a) for the protection of Australian shipping against unfair competition; (b) registration of all vessels engaged in the coastal trade; (c) the efficient manning of vessels; (d) the proper supply of life-saving and other equipment; (e) the regulation of hours and conditions of work; (f) proper accommodation for passengers and seamen; (g) proper loading gear and inspection of same.
8. Commonwealth Bank of Deposit and Issue and Life and Fire Insurance Department, the management of each to be free from political influence.
9. Federal Patent Law, providing for simplifying and cheapening the registration of patents.
10. Uniform industrial legislation; amendment of Constitution to provide for same.

## CONDITIONS OF CANDIDATURE.

1. That all candidates for the Federal Parliament shall sign the following pledge; I hereby pledge myself not to oppose the candidate selected by the recognized political Labor organization, and if elected, to do my utmost to carry out the principles embodied in the Federal Labor Platform and on all questions affecting the Platform to vote as a majority of the Parliamentary Party may decide at a duly constituted caucus meeting.
2. That subject to the acceptance of the Federal Platform and Pledge, each State shall control the selection of its candidates for the Federal Parliament.
3. That all Labor candidates shall have a free hand on the fiscal question.
4. That no member of the Federal Labor Party shall accept office in the Federal Government except with the consent of a duly constituted caucus of the Party.

ANDREW N. ANDERSON.

# EDITORIAL

## Some Current Events

The expected appears to be happening. The crest of the industrial wave has passed and the depression which socialists have been prophesying is evidently at hand. Notwithstanding all the talk about trust organization, etc., there seems little reason to believe that the approaching crisis will differ in any great essentials from the preceding ones. There may not be exactly the same phenomena in the financial world, bankruptcies will probably be even more closely confined to the small capitalists than in 1894, and it is possible concerted support of banking institutions may prevent any large number of these from going through the bankruptcy courts. Yet all this is but the superficial side of the crisis. To be sure it is the portion to which the capitalist press and writers on trusts pay the most attention because it is the phase which concerns their class the closest. But after all these things are but a part of the machinery of exploitation, and however they may vary in their action, the result is practically the same. This result is a glutted market, an army of unemployed, and suffering and misery among the workers.

Frederick Engels pointed out many years ago that since steel came to be a fundamental in modern industry, it was always the steel trade which first reflected industrial conditions. The reason for this is apparent on slight consideration. The great instruments of production, the rails, and the cars and locomotives that roll over them, the frames and trusses for bridges and sky scrapers, the machines in the factories, all these are made from steel. In each upward swing of the industrial pendulum there comes a time when the individual capitalist decides that his plant has been enlarged as far as his resources will permit, or his view of the market makes him think advisable. Then, while his orders may still be large for consumption goods, he ceases to invest in additions to his plant. At once the laborers engaged in the manufacture of productive articles are thrown out of employment. This greatly disarranges the calculations of the purchaser of consumption goods by tremendously and suddenly reducing the market for such goods in proportion to the employes who have been thrown out. This is the stage we have reached at the present moment. Thousands of men have been discharged in the iron and coal mines and tens of thousand in the steel and

iron works. The second stage will follow fast. Here the purchaser of consumption goods still depends upon his old market as reflected in the orders which have been sent in by wholesalers, and even by retailers, before the slackening of work in the field of production goods had taken place. But the slackening of demand will be at once reflected in a withdrawal of orders and in a decrease of new orders. This, however, always takes place much slower than the rate of production, so that jobbers, wholesalers and retailers find their stores and warehouses loaded to overflowing with the goods which have, so to speak, backed up on them from the rising tide of bankruptcy and distress. The result is a sudden collapse and this in spite of all the trusts can do.

Some of the trust financiers have been profiting themselves in this time of falling prices and crashing industries by methods which, from the standpoint of the little capitalist, are several degrees worse than highway robbery. A tremendous howl is going up in the press which reflects the interest of these small investors over the way in which Schwab and Morgan unloaded nearly ten million dollars' worth of wind on to the community, and incidentally disproved the existence of honor among thieves by forcing even their fellow pirates to agree not to begin their excursions until the chiefs had practically swept the industrial seas of all profitable craft.

All of this is having its effect on the contest between employer and employed. The larger capitalists are welcoming a period of depression for the double reason that it will enable them to at once clear the field of troublesome competitors and give them a powerful weapon in the army of the unemployed with which to crush the resistance of their employes.

In the face of these conditions employers are paying little attention to the ridiculous farce of the Civic Federation. This organization held a meeting during the past month in Chicago, which discounted anything on the boards of the variety theater in the way of farce comedy. An editor on one of the city dailies who attended one of the sessions that was held expressed the situation in a most striking manner. He said that the whole scene suggested to him a cartoon in which Hanna, Gompers, Easley, Mitchell & Company were promenading round a circle marked socialism, and continually leaping to one side lest they might, in some way, come in contact with the thing that was frightening all of them.

Since few of the laborers have shown any great eagerness to follow the stool pigeons caught by the Civic Federation, and also because of the fact noted above that changing industrial conditions will probably add to the strength of the employers in the struggle with the trade unions, most of the capitalists show much more interest in the Employers' Association, which is just beginning its sessions as we write these lines. This organization, as was pointed out in these columns last month, makes no secret of its aims, but openly declares its intention of crushing the trade unions, and especially of all socialist agencies in the trade unions.

Such an association will be of sufficient strength to make good its claim to represent combined capitalist class interest and as such will have

at its disposal the governmental machinery, including, of course, the police and militia. That they will use these forces ruthlessly, is shown by the history of the past ten years, and receives special confirmation from the recent events in Colorado.

The inevitable result of these contending forces will be the transference of the fight to the political field. Here we come to a point where socialists are directly and immediately concerned. Up to this point the movements have been beyond the control of any set of persons and least of all the laborers. When the question arises, however, as to the struggle in the political field, how the forces shall be aligned and the battle fought, it is the special mission of socialism to see that the struggle on the part of the workers shall be no longer carried on unconsciously, but shall be guided by an intelligent recognition of working class interests.

The task being thus set for us, it is fitting that we glance for a moment at the forces involved in the political field. As yet, the radical democracy shows little signs of crystallization. Hearst has opened headquarters for his presidential boom, but as yet the boom itself has failed to appear. What effect the crisis may have in this direction it is hard to tell. The efforts of the Civic Federation to retain the laborers in the old party organizations will fail when the class struggle becomes sufficiently sharp to pierce through the covering of sentimentality that they are spreading over it. If the socialists have a sufficiently strong organization to grasp the direction and control of the revolt which will arise as a result of the industrial depression of the next few years, or even months, then the day of the final struggle between capitalism and socialism is not far away. Their ability to do this depends almost exclusively upon the strength and cohesiveness of their party organization. Every energy must and should be exerted towards increasing the membership and perfecting the machinery of organization. Any talk of splits or fusions at this time is criminal; incidentally, it is also very idiotic, since either of the wings which have shown a tendency to sprout from the main socialist body contain so few numbers, that if they should secede, their movement would not rise to the dignity of a "bolt," but would much more resemble a "carpet tack."

The coming National campaign is going to demand concentrated intelligent energy on a national scale, and anything that will tend to hinder this should be promptly suppressed.

# SOCIALISM ABROAD

## Argentine Republic

Ave Lallemand writes as follows in the *Neue Zeit* concerning the movement in Argentine Republic. The fifth congress of the Argentine Socialist Party met in Buenos Ayres on the seventh and eighth of July, 1903. It was composed of 49 representatives from 30 organizations having a total membership of 1736, of which only 840 possessed the rights of citizenship. The party officials for eleven years have been practically the same comrades, mainly Bourgeoise ideologists who kept up a very strongly centralized organization completely corresponding to the old Spanish traditions. They complain of a lack of discipline in the party, especially in struggles with the very numerous anarchistic elements who preach the general strike which it is claimed has greatly injured the party.

The great majority of the Argentine laboring class have permitted themselves to be driven to anarchism through their hatred of the despotically governed state and have rejected the political tactics advocated by the socialists, which, to be sure, can only be of a purely platonic character since a government according to popular election is absolutely non-existent. All opposition even of the most mild character to the government is suppressed by force and its adherents scattered. The union movement is wholly under anarchistic influence. Only on the first of May the anarchists and the socialists meet together. This almost always leads to fights which naturally do not better things. The weekly organ of the party has a circulation of 25,000 copies and is strictly controlled by the central authority.

The congress adopted after great discussion a long new party program with a so-called minimal program to which every half way liberal and radical party can subscribe with good grace. Among others there are anti-clerical planks since the party officials believe that they can best meet the attacks of the church with a decisive anti-religious program. They are unwilling to let religion be a private affair and seek to pledge the members to strong anti-church tactics. Some articles of the program take the small farmer directly under the wing of the party and demands complete freedom from taxation for him and the enactment of duties for his amelioration, instruction for agricultural labor with relation to protection of the health, etc. This agrarian portion of the program is decidedly weak and shows little knowledge of agrarian conditions. Of actual socialist demands and principles the program contains absolutely nothing, and they were also wholly lacking in the proceeding, and the party organ shows very little socialist tendency.

## England

Amid the general confusion reigning in political matters in England the socialists are sounding the one clear note. It is now evident that a general election cannot be postponed beyond next spring and the socialists are everywhere preparing to run candidates for Parliament. The following, taken from the *Labor Leader*, the organ of the Independent Labor Party shows something of the way in which our English comrades are meeting the old question of free trade and protection which did valiant service as a "red herring" during so many years in America.

"The 'Socialist reply to Chamberlain's Glasgow speech' was brought off in the St. Andrew's Halls, Glasgow, last Friday night, and a magnificent reply it was. The great hall was packed from floor to ceiling—with working men and working women. There was not a duke or a marquis in the building—or if there were they were incog. The chairman was Mr. W. C. Anderson, ex-chairman of the I.L.P. in Glasgow, and the speaker was Mr. H. M. Hyndman. The Clarion Choir rendered good service. Mr. Hyndman asked the people not to be gulled with this bogus agitation on fiscal matters. Neither in free trade nor in protection was a remedy to be found for the social ills of the country. Yet the workers must not neglect the agitation, for there was a possibility of Chamberlain winning. Mr. Hyndman gave some interesting figures as showing how workmen in America fared under protection. In 1850 67½ per cent of the produce was paid in wages; in 1880 the percentage had dropped to 36, and in 1902 only 12 per cent of the wealth produced went to wages. The rest went into the pockets of the heads of the trusts, of the mortgage-holders, the railroad and other robbers. While the skilled workers earned higher wages than in this country, there were worse slums in some of the cities than even in Glasgow. In Germany, it was the same. In the mines in France tuberculosis was growing at an alarming rate. What the people wanted was protection for themselves and their children from the rapacity of the landlord and the capitalist. Two generations of free trade had produced 12,000,000 of people just outside the starvation area and a lessened physique all over. He wished the people to rise in their might and demand better government than these incapables gave them. They were at the parting of the ways, but it was the parting between plunder and enjoyment, between the people and the plutocrats, between the masses and the classes. Mr. Hyndman then urged the necessity and possibility of a great scheme of nationalization."

---

## Germany

The National Social Party, a party which was formed for the purpose of turning the revolutionary energies of the German proletariat away from the Social Democratic Party, has finally disappeared. At its Convention, held in Gottingen, the 29th and 30th of August, the founder of the party, Friedrich Naumann, declared that it was no longer possible for them to exist in competition with the Social Democracy, and the majority of the members will probably go at once into the ranks of the Social Democracy.

---

## Italy

The threat of the Italian socialists to publicly show their disapproval of the Czar in case of his visit to Italy, compelled him to avoid all public places and to practically remain in hiding while in Italy. The *National Zeitung* declares that this constitutes a great triumph for Ferri, and that thereby "the radical wing of the Italian Social Democracy has gained the upper hand." As was pointed out some time ago the revisionist

movement in Italy was really overthrown some time back, but this recent move has further strengthened the revolutionary position. The revisionist wing had opposed all unfriendly demonstration. But when it was pointed out that this strong Russian government had demanded the extradition of the Russian Socialists who happened to be in residence in Naples as a price of Russian friendship, then the socialists were well nigh unanimous in their determination to publicly express their disapproval of Russian tyranny.

According to the last party "Bulletin," the Socialist Party of Italy now has 1,136 branches and 39,192 dues paying members. Of the 69 Italian provinces, Cosenza is the only one which has no Socialist organization. Reggio Emilia, the province of the "apostle of Socialism," Camillo Prampolini, M. P., takes the lead, with 100 branches and 3,948 members. The province of Rome has 19 branches and 853 dues paying members. Many Socialists are not enrolled in the party. In the past parliamentary elections, held in 1900, the Socialists received 215,841 votes. There are now 31 Socialists in the Parliament of Italy.

---

## Russia

The *Volks Tribune* of Vienna brings further information of the unrest in Southwestern Russia. It seems that at the beginning of the movement there was little coherence or organization. Indeed, it was said that thousands struck simply "because all were striking," and it was felt necessary to make a sort of elemental uprising as a general protest against tyranny. Further events are described as follows: "Meetings then began to be held, speakers appeared with various positions. Those who were organized, placed political freedom as their principal demand; some others would not listen to any political propositions, but confined themselves to economic demands. Meanwhile, all industry was at a standstill, railroad trains ceased to move, bread and meat trebled in price. This led to the third phase; the military was brought into action. A remarkable feature was seen in this that everywhere the soldiers acted with great reluctance. Many times they fired into the air, and some officers ordered their men to refuse to shoot. Then the Cossacks appeared upon the scene and were turned loose in their customary brutal manner, for which work they were richly rewarded; in one case directly from the manager of the street railways (Leode by name), who is said to have distributed 20,000 roubles among them in order to break the strike. Numbers of the laborers were shot and others wounded until at last the military attained the upper hand, and after several days, labor was again taken up.

"At first, it would appear as if this labor movement had been of no result, and that there had even been a loss in moral energy. A closer examination, however, shows the other side. The outrages by which the laborers were driven back under the old yoke cannot but result in further uprisings against the employers. And no one can tell at what time the storm which is now threatening throughout Russia will break loose, or what the result will be when the next outbreak comes. But conditions will be much different and that is the greatest gain of the battle. The unorganized have seen that they have nothing to expect from the government but Cossack whips and bullets, and, furthermore, that under the present Russian conditions a labor movement on purely economic foundations is impossible. Now that their hopes of favorable action by the government have disappeared, they will constitute the most favorable possible ground for Socialist propaganda and can be drawn into an organization and be better prepared for the next battle. Meanwhile, the government is helpless before this growing movement; its strongest support, the army, begins to give way, and frightened, it seeks only to cover up its terror by new outrages.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

London.—As has been explained in the REVIEW before, the British trade union movement is in fairly good shape, but the new issue that has arisen, namely, the decision of the House of Lords in the Taff Vale railway case, that labor organizations are responsible for any damages that may be sustained by employers because of strikes and boycotts, will test the unions as nothing has before. In fact, the very life of organized labor in Great Britain is at stake. The result is that, whereas half a dozen years ago the great majority of unionists refused to listen to the proposition of taking political action along class lines, now they are falling all over each other to get into the political arena in the endeavor to secure legislation to protect their funds, for be it known the thrifty and saving Englishmen have many millions of dollars in their treasuries which are now at the mercy of the capitalists if they strike, picket and boycott.

This haste to take political action has produced a new species of misleader, who pleads with his fellows to use temperate language, take what you can get, one step at a time, etc. He is a hyphenated critter called a Liberal-Labor leader. The Liberal party is in England what the Democratic party is in America, a conglomeration of antagonistic elements promising all things to all men and never accomplishing anything except to betray the working classes to their capitalist masters whenever the opportunity offers. Some of the British unionists now have the scent of success in their nostrils if they engage in fusion deals with the Liberal procreans, and hence their definition of independent political action is to throw the labor vote to "the party most favorable to our views," etc.

But while some of the unionists can be tricked back into the old ruts by this policy, not all can, and the most intelligent among them are joining the Independent Labor party and the Social Democratic Federation or standing pat with the new Labor Representation organization, strictly independent of the old parties. The I. L. P. and S. D. F. are bound to grow, because of the new conditions that have arisen. I find that there is really not much difference between these two parties. While it is largely a matter of policy, the dividing line is somewhat imaginary and many of the rank and file belong to both organizations and work together in spreading propaganda. No matter from what viewpoint the situation is approached, it is a dead certainty that Socialism is growing rapidly in Great Britain.

Paris.—In France the unions and co-operative societies work in harmony with the Socialist parties, although the latter are at odds over the question of supporting the Millerand-Jaures tactics of upholding the Republican capitalist government against the attacks of the Monarchical-Nationalist combine. The unions have about 700,000 members and are taking the lead in federating the trades of all Europe with considerable success.



They are also anxious to arrange harmonious relations with the workers of the United States.

From what I am able to learn, there are quite a few anarchists in the labor organizations, and they are using every scheme possible to discourage the unions from supporting the Socialist parties. At the present time they are making a great hullabaloo about the differences of opinion between the Socialists who look to Jaures for leadership on the one hand, and Guesde on the other, and they are also pleased at the manner in which the Socialists have become entangled in the capitalist government's crusade against religious orders. The anarchists hope that the bitterness between the Socialist factions will increase, so that the unionists will withdraw their support and play in the anarchist yard. Just what the outcome will be is problematical. Probably the rank and file will rise one of these fine days and bump the swollen heads of all their leaders and adopt a newer and better policy than to pull chestnuts out of the fire for capitalist governments.

Brussels.—The unions, co-operative societies and the Socialist party of Belgium are three branches of labor activity that are in perfect harmony. A union man who is not a Socialist is regarded as something of a freak in Belgium. Some of the trades are nearly completely organized and during the past three years wages have been boosted as high as 50 per cent in many of the trades, while hours of labor have also been reduced. The co-operatives are spreading all over the country and cutting deep into the business of capitalists. In Brussels, for example, the co-operatives have fixed the price of bread, having forced a reduction of 50 per cent with their bakeries, and at the same time the employes receive higher wages and work shorter time than in capitalist bakeries. The co-operatives are also aiming to dictate prices of coal, meats, clothing, etc.

The Socialist party of Belgium is in excellent shape. There is not the least sign of dissensions or jealousies among the leaders. Besides holding 35 seats in Parliament, they also control 700 municipal councilmen and have a clear majority in 60 places, mostly rural localities, however, that have little power. The Belgians are pushing educational work hard at present, and it would not be surprising if they were the first to secure control of the governing powers.

Hamburg.—We were lucky in reaching Germany just after the Dresden congress and could study the effects of that meeting. For weeks we have read in European newspapers that a terrible crash would occur in the Socialist party of Germany when the Dresden congress met. We kept our ears to the ground, but heard no sounds of deadly combat and the disruption of the Socialist movement. All the calamitous predictions were, after all, merely editorial gas. All the coddling of Mr. Bernstein on the part of the capitalist press simply had the effect of more thoroughly solidifying the party under the leadership of Bebel and making a temporizing policy impossible.

Now the capitalist press is changing its tune. While postponing the schism for another year, for the very good reason that the Socialist party was never more thoroughly united and refused to split itself, the capitalist press is not willing to take any further chances with the "Socialist specter" and a howl is going up to change the ballot law and restrict the franchise. Capitalism feels that it has been driven into the last ditch, and in its desperation it is willing to go to any length to maintain its privilege of driving labor and dividing its product to suit itself.

As for adopting the Bernstein reform policy, that is out of the question. The Socialist party of Germany will remain true to its traditions—revolutionary to the core. And there can be no split, because nobody would follow Bernstein out of the party. The few who sympathize with his

views are "academics," lawyers, editors and other professionals who seldom come into contact with the practical questions, the hard, cold facts that stare the workers in the face.

Of course, in Germany the unions and co-operative societies are almost as a whole, thoroughly committed to the Socialist program. Both of these branches of the labor movement are steadily growing in numbers and financial resources. The Catholic and Protestant churches, fearing that their communicants might become Socialists if they join the recognized trade unions, have started to organize unions of their own. The Socialists are good-natured about it and wish the good Christians every luck. At the same time they are giving long odds that when the workingmen of the church unions bump up against the good Christian capitalists the same old class struggle will ensue. "And then," say the Socialists, "the church unions will come to us, as they already did in a number of instances." Then, again, our old friend, Emperor Wilhelm, threatens to start a "loyal" labor organization, as well as a labor paper, and become the editor of the same. So it will be observed that our German brethren have plenty of funny things to amuse them between steins.

## BOOK REVIEWS

The Call of the Wild. Jack London. The Macmillan Company. Cloth.  
231 pp. \$1.50.

We have no hesitation in saying that, considered simply as a story this book will rank among the great books of the beginning of the century. As an animal story it easily beats Kipling in his own field. It is the story of "Buck," a dog, who, raised the pampered pet of a California ranch, is stolen and sold to the Klondike. He meets his master in the dog tamer who takes him in hand and he learns the terrible power of the club. This prepares him for the "law of club and fang" that rules throughout the Northland. He discovers that to slip, to give way, to fall, is to die. He learns the tricks of the trade, and fits himself into the environment until he is better suited to it than those who were born into it. He finds his way to the leadership of the team of dogs and then adding to the characteristics gained from the new environment the experience and memories retained from the old, he becomes a dog of fame. He suffers in the hands of incompetent and cruel drivers to fall at last into the hands of one with whom he formed a companionship that was akin to human friendship on both sides. Buck returns from a long hunt to find his master killed by the Indians. He attacks these and for the first time kills the master of animals, "he had killed man, the noblest game of all and he had killed it in the face of the law of club and fang." And here he is left, having become the Evil Spirit of a certain valley which he rules at the head of his pack.

You do not need to search for social philosophy in it unless you want to. But, if you do, it is one of the most accurate studies of "reversion to type" that has ever been published. And here and there throughout the work one catches glimpses that tell us that the author is a Socialist.

The Souls of Black Folk. By Professor W. E. D. Du Bois. McClurg & Co. Chicago. Cloth. 265 pp. \$1.20.

In the eyes of capitalism Booker T. Washington is idealized as the leader of the negro race in America. There is no question whatever but what he may represent a social stage through which the negro must pass before he can enter into that heritage of capitalism which it is the business of socialism to realize. Nevertheless we cannot feel but when the history of the black race is written, the author of "The Souls of Black Folk" will rank infinitely above the instrument of capitalism who is perfecting black wage slaves at Tuskegee.

It would be hard to imagine two minds more diametrically opposed than those of Du Bois and Washington. Du Bois is poetical, fanciful, he sees visions and builds castles. Washington is practical, mechanical, he glorifies the dollar and gains endowments for his college. It was impossible that two such men should not come into conflict, and we find one of the principal essays in this work devoted to "Mr. Washington and Others,"

in which in a quiet, non-controversial manner the weaknesses of Mr. Washington's movement are pointed out.

But after all it is rather a series of vivid pictures that the essays appeal to one than for the philosophy which they contain. On the question of intermarriage which is always flung at the defenders of negro inequality a most striking answer is found on page 106: "When you cry, Deliver us from the vision of intermarriage, they answer that legal marriage is infinitely better than systematic concubinage and prostitution. And if in just fury you accuse their vagabonds of violating women, they also in fury quite as just may reply: The rape which you gentlemen have done against helpless black women in defiance of your own laws is written on the foreheads of two million mulattoes, and written in ineffaceable blood. And finally, when you fasten crime upon the race as its peculiar trait, they answer that slavery was the arch-crime, and lynching and lawlessness its twin abortion; that color and race are not crimes, and yet they it is which in this land receives most unceasing condemnation, North, East, South and West."

In his essay "Of the Sons of Master and Man" he shows much of an appreciation of the economic causes which underlie the present social relations in the South, but has not seemed to grasp the possibility of evolution into a better social stage.

Although now and then there are portions that seem somewhat over-drawn in style, yet, on the whole, there is such tremendous strength that it covers up an occasional excess of adjectives. You realize that he is tremendously in earnest, that he has really pulled aside the veil that divides the races to let one see the inmost souls of black folk.

Political Ideas of Modern Japan. Karl K. Kawakami. University Press. Iowa City, Iowa.

This is the first appearance in the English language of anything approaching a political history of Japan. There is a very good survey of the origin and development of political situations including a short sketch of the geographical situation and industrial development. The various stages of social and political evolution through which Japan has passed during the last half century are described, and one gains an idea of how much it is possible to shorten social stages when the necessary influences to that end exist.

In the chapter on "The Growth of Social Democratic Ideas" it is pointed out how "the pity, generosity, mercifulness and above all self-sacrifice which have descended from the knighthood of olden Japan are constantly giving way to the greed of gain and the aspiration for wealth." As a consequence he tells us that "envy, enmity, discontent on the part of the poor; and vanity, extravagance, luxury and debauchery on the side of the rich; these are but the symptoms of the great social conflict which will surely arise in Japan in the near future."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Under such circumstances it is simply as a matter of course that Social Democracy is now preached in Japan where industrial tranquillity had prevailed only a decade ago."

The history of the attempt to organize a Social Democratic Party and its suppression by the State is told and the platform of the suppressed party is given. His treatment is somewhat unsatisfactory on this point, especially when one remembers that the author has been actively engaged in the socialist work in this country as a member of the Socialist Party, in that he seems to proceed almost entirely from the idealistic point of view. Throughout the work he attempts to account for the ideas which have arisen in Japan by the importation of theoretical works written by Europeans. The work as a whole would have been much more satis-

factory had he shown more completely how the industrial conditions made inevitable the adoption of those ideas whenever Japanese society reached the stages in which similar ideas prevailed in Europe. However, it is rather ungrateful to criticize when he has really put before us a work which was so much needed and which contains so much of value.

**Le Syndicalisme Anglais.** Resume historique from 1799-1902 by F. Fagnot. Published by Societe Nouvelle. Paris. Paper. 116 pp. Half franc.

We have here a most excellent summary of the English trade union movement. The opening chapter on the situation of the unions in January, 1902, is a condensed tabulation of facts concerning the membership, resources and activities of the unions. Then follows a historical survey which is a model of condensed information. For those of our readers who read French this little handbook will prove of great value as giving in compact form a great mass of information concerning the trade union movement of England. We only wish that a similar work might be written on American trade unions.

The usual bunch of propaganda pamphlets has appeared during the month. One which was published some little time ago, but which we have neglected to notice until the present time is N. A. Richardson's "Methods of Acquiring National Possession of Our Industries," at least has this in its favor, that it does not simply seek to repeat the entire philosophy of Socialism, but deals with specific points. We may not entirely agree with his solution, but it probably is as good a statement as has been published, and is a beginning along a line of pamphlets which will be worth while. Published by the *Appeal to Reason*, 5 cents.

The same publishers issue at the same price a conventional propaganda pamphlet by H. P. Moyer on the "A B C of Socialism." *The Comrade* issues a pamphlet by Ben Hanford "On What Workingmen's Votes Can Do." It is a very effective piece of propaganda material. It is published in imitation of the well known *Pocket Library of Socialism* and sells for 5 cents.

"The Wind Trust," by John Snyder, with an introduction by Edward Everett Hale, is published by James H. West & Co., 79 Milk street, Boston, and sells at 10 cents. It is a rather clever satire on the possibilities of the trust movement should it be extended to the atmosphere.

*Social Ethics* is the title of a little magazine issued by Granville Lowther at Wichita, Kan., which contains some very good little articles, although so far as it has touched on ethics up to the present time it has been anything but socialist in its philosophy.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### THE GROWTH OF OUR PUBLISHING HOUSE.

In the spring of 1899 the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company published its first socialist party pamphlet, "Woman and the Social Problem," and made its first appeal for the co-operation of the socialists of America in the work of circulating the literature of international socialism. Since then it has grown with the growth of the American socialist movement, slowly but steadily, and unless all signs fail the movement and the publishing house which serves it are both entering on a period of more rapid growth.

The offices on the fourth floor of the building at 56 Fifth avenue have long been overcrowded, and on the first of October we secured quarters double the size on the fifth floor of the same building. Here we shall have room to welcome the comrades from Chicago or from a distance, and shall be able to supply properly the ever increasing demand for books of scientific socialism.

Another sign of growth which will be apparent even to the comrades who are unable to come to Chicago to visit us is in the new and enlarged edition of "What to Read on Socialism." This is practically a new publication, but we have kept the title formerly used for a little booklet because this title fits equally well the contents of the larger book. This contains a brief introductory chapter on "The Central Thing in Socialism," which may possibly be of some service in clearing the ideas of those who have heretofore come in contact with imitations of socialism rather than socialism itself. But the body of the book is taken up with full and clear descriptions of the best socialist books by the ablest writers of America and Europe. It is printed on paper of extra quality, and contains thirty-six large pages, including portraits of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht, Vandervelde, Whitman, Carpenter, Blatchford, Simons and other writers. A copy will be mailed free to any reader of the REVIEW who requests it. Extra copies for propaganda use will be supplied in any quantity, large or small, at the uniform rate of one dollar a hundred where we prepay charges or fifty cents a hundred when sent at the expense of purchaser. These figures are far below the actual cost, and no discount from them can be made to our stockholders.

### THE SALE OF AN APPETITE.

The name of Paul Lafargue will be recalled with pleasure by every regular reader of the REVIEW as the author of some of the ablest books and articles that have ever appeared on the subject of socialism. New readers will get some idea of his power as a writer from the article entitled "The Socialist Ideal," which appears in this issue. It will be remembered that Lafargue, now well along in years, is the son-in-law of Karl Marx, and is still one of the most active socialists in France.

A good many years ago Lafargue wrote a remarkable story, entitled "Un Appetit Vendu," "The Sale of an Appetite," which had a wide

circulation in at least two languages on the continent of Europe, but has never, to our knowledge, been offered to English-speaking readers.

This story has now been translated by Charles H. Kerr, and illustrated by the talented young "New Thought" artist, Dorothy Deene. The story tells of a young peasant who had vainly sought work in Paris, and was standing, at the point of starvation, eagerly looking into the window of a fashionable restaurant of Paris. He is approached by a corpulent capitalist, who takes him inside, gives him the most luxurious of dinners, and then proposes a five-year contract by which the young man is to do the capitalist's digesting in return for a monthly salary of two thousand francs, payable in advance. The offer is gladly accepted, but the carrying out of the contract was intolerable, and the young man begged to be released. The old notary who had witnessed his contract told him that release was impossible, but by way of consolation said:

"You complain because you have been reduced to becoming nothing but a digestive apparatus, but all who earn their living by working are lodged at the same sign. They obtain their means of existence only by confining themselves to being nothing but an organ functioning to the profit of another; the mechanic is the arm which forges, taps, hammers, planes, digs, weaves; the singer is the larynx which vocalizes, warbles, spius out notes; the engineer is the brain which calculates, which arranges plans; the prostitute is the sexual organ which gives out venereal pleasure. Do you imagine that the clerks in my office use their intelligence, or that they reflect when they are copying papers? Oh, but they don't; thinking is not their business; they are nothing but fingers which scribble. They perform in my offices for ten or twelve hours this work which is far from exhilarating, which gives them headaches, stomach disorders and hemorrhoids, and at evening they carry home writing to finish, that they may earn a few cents to pay their landlord. Console yourself, my dear sir, these young people suffer as well as you, and not one of them has the satisfaction of saying that he receives per year the sum that you draw for a single month of digestive labor."

This quotation will give a fair idea of the moral of the story, but no idea of its charm and its humor. To appreciate these you must read the whole book. Dorothy Deene's pictures are surprisingly good. They have an individuality all their own, and at the same time they interpret the story most admirably. The book will be daintily bound in cloth with a unique design, and will make an ideal Christmas gift for a non-socialist friend who needs waking up, or for a socialist who would enjoy one of the cleverest satires on capitalism ever written. The retail price will be fifty cents; the price to stockholders thirty cents, including transportation charges, or twenty-five cents if sent at purchaser's expense.

Our printers are now at work on Charles H. Kerr's translation of Labriola's "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History." This is one of the most important socialist works ever published, and no American student of sociology, whether a socialist or an opponent of socialism, can afford to miss reading it. Historical materialism is the essential principle underlying the whole of our socialist philosophy, but it has never hitherto been adequately developed in any book accessible to English-speaking readers, and this book will prove invaluable in clearing the ideas of our writers and speakers.

It will be handsomely printed, substantially bound in cloth, and will contain about 300 pages. The retail price will be one dollar, with the usual discounts to stockholders in our co-operative company.

#### GOLD-PLATED PARTY BUTTONS.

Our newly designed party emblem in gold plate and enamel is proving exceedingly popular. The retail price will hereafter be 25 cents; the price to stockholders 20 cents, postage included.

## MARX'S "CAPITAL."

We are glad to announce that a plentiful supply of the latest London edition has been arranged for, so that we can at last count on being in a position to fill all our orders promptly. This edition contains 847 large pages, is handsomely printed and bound, and retails for two dollars, while our net price to stockholders is far below the price charged for the inferior, non-union reprint.

## NEW EDITION OF "THE AMERICAN FARMER."

This book by A. M. Simons, published in February, 1902, has been endorsed by the best critics of America and Europe, socialist and anti-socialist, as "the largest contribution yet given to the agrarian literature of this country," to quote the words of the *Chicago Tribune*. The first edition having been exhausted, the author thought best to rewrite the entire work, for reasons explained in the preface to the second edition, which we quote:

"When a little over a year ago the first edition of this book was published, practically no interest was taken in Socialism by American farmers or in American farmers by Socialists. Today few will deny that the farmer question is arousing more interest than any other with which the Socialists are concerned, while Socialism is growing with great rapidity among the farmers. I would be more than human if I did not take to myself some credit for this change of conditions, but fundamentally that change is due far more to economic developments, whose traces were only just appearing one year ago, but which have now grown to be important factors in our social life.

"Owing to the many changes that have occurred in the past year, I thought it best to rewrite the whole work, rather than add an appendix or explanatory chapter. The first part of the book has naturally been changed but little, since history is not altered by the march of events. The second book, however, has been wholly rewritten, expanded and changed to conform to the new material which has since appeared, particularly the census of 1900 and the report of the Industrial Commission. The chapter on "Concentration," which, to my mind, is the most important in the whole book, has been most completely changed. Nevertheless, I do not find that this new material has made necessary any change in the conclusions at which I arrived in the first edition. On the contrary, social evolution has brought many new proofs of the positions there taken,

"Two things are now evident, first, that the small farm owner is a permanent factor in the agricultural life of America, and that he forms the largest uniform division of the producing class. Second, and as a consequence of this, that any movement which seeks to work either with or for the producing class, must take cognizance of him. On the other hand, there are two equally important considerations; first, that large as is this division, it is not large enough to protect itself against the encroachments of the exploiting class of America. And, furthermore, that its isolation and disorganization make it impossible for it to take the initiative in any national social movement. Second, and again as a corollary of the first, if it is to successfully meet the encroachments of the exploiting class, it must do it through co-operation with the better organized and more homogeneous body of the working class composed of urban wageworkers. This is the line of evolution which is now taking place, and which is destined to grow as time passes."

The price of the book, in cloth binding, uniform with the Standard Socialist Series, of which this is the third volume, is fifty cents, with the usual discount to stockholders. Full particulars regarding subscriptions to the stock of our co-operative company will be sent upon request. Address, Charles H. Kerr & Company, 56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.