

\$1.00 A Year
10 Cents A Copy



Soc 708.1
(Boston)

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST THOUGHT

VOLUME VII

DECEMBER 1, 1906

NUMBER 6

CONTENTS

At the German Congress.	<i>Robert Hunter</i>
Starting a Daily Socialist Paper.	<i>A. M. Simons</i>
Class Struggles in the Italian Socialist Movement.	<i>Odon Por</i>
The Italian Socialist Convention.	<i>Odon Por</i>
Reform.	<i>Jos. E. Cohen</i>
New Movements Amongst the Jewish Proletariat.	<i>Jacob Milch</i>
The Military Power.	<i>Maurice E. Eldridge</i>

DEPARTMENTS

Editorial—The Recent Elections.

The World of Labor

Socialism Abroad

Book Reviews

Publishers' Department

PUBLISHED BY

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (CO-OPERATIVE)

264 EAST KINZIE STREET, CHICAGO, U. S. A.



Copyright 1906 by Charles H. Kerr & Company

The International Socialist Review

DEVOTED TO THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEMS INCIDENT
TO THE GROWTH OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

EDITED BY A. M. SIMONS

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS:

ENGLAND—H. M. HYNDMAN, WALTER CRANE, SAMUEL HOBSON, H. QUELCH, J. KEIR HARDIE, J. R. McDONALD. FRANCE—PAUL LAFARGUE, JEAN JAURES, JEAN LONGUET. BELGIUM—EMILE VANDERVELDE, HENRI LAFONTAINE, EMILE VINCK, MME. LALLA VANDERVELDE. DENMARK—DR. GUSTAV BANG. GERMANY—KARL KAUTSKY. ITALY—DR. ALESSANDRO SCHIAVI, PROF. ENRICO FERRI. SWEDEN—ANTON ANDERSON. JAPAN—T. MURAI. CHINA—CLARENCE CLOWE.

Contributions are solicited upon all phases of Socialist thought, and all problems of modern social organization. No alterations are made in accepted manuscript, but the right of editorial comment is always reserved. The absence of such comment, however, is to be in no way construed as editorial endorsement of the positions in any published communication. No rejected manuscript will be returned unless accompanied by stamps for return postage.

This magazine is copyrighted for the protection of our contributors. Other papers are welcome to copy from our editorial departments provided credit is given. Permission will always be given to reproduce contributed articles, provided the author raises no objection.

The subscription price is \$1.00 per year, payable in advance, postage free to any address within the postal union. Editorial communications should be addressed to A. M. SIMONS, 264 E. Kinzie St., Chicago; business communications to CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 264 East Kinzie Street, Chicago.

International Library of Social Science

The handsomest series of socialist books ever printed. Every one a book of permanent value; all uniformly bound in cloth, library style.

1. *The Changing Order*. By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D.
2. *Better-World Philosophy*. By J. Howard Moore.
3. *The Universal Kinship*. By J. Howard Moore.
4. *Principles of Scientific Socialism*. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.
5. *Some of the Philosophical Essays* of Joseph Dietzgen.
6. *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History*. By Antonio Labriola, translated by Charles H. Kerr. (Second Edition.)
7. *Love's Coming-of-Age*. By Edward Carpenter. (Fourth American Edition.)
8. *Looking Forward*. By Philip Rappaport.
9. *The Positive Outcome of Philosophy*. By Joseph Dietzgen.
10. *Socialism and Philosophy*. By Antonio Labriola.
11. *The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals*. By M. H. Fitch.

One dollar a volume, postpaid. Any volume sold separately. *What to Read on Socialism*, a book of 64 pages, mailed free to any one asking for it; extra copies one cent each, postpaid.

Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative)

264 East Kinzie St., Chicago

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

DECEMBER, 1906

NO. 6

At the German Congress.

IT is rather startling to one, whose impressions of socialist movements have been confined almost entirely to the United States, to enter into one of the largest and most beautiful halls in the world—a hall seating 10,000 persons—and find it packed to the point of suffocation with delegates, party members, and friends of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. I speak of entering; as a matter of fact it took me two hours to enter. Relying upon my experience at home for guidance I went a half hour late. When I came near the hall I saw an immense throng of people, surely not less than three or four thousand, standing before the doors. I congratulated myself on not being any later and hurriedly elbowed my way among the people in order to be as near the entrance as possible when the doors should be opened. But before I had gone far, I discovered that the hall was already over-crowded and that we were shut out! None of us was of a mind for that and so we broke a few window panes; but it was of no avail—we were informed that the hall would support no more and that the authorities would permit no one else to enter. Fortunately however for me most of those outside went away after a time, and somewhat later, as a few of those inside began to come out, I slipped in.

Inside and outside it was an impressive sight. They were workmen—to a man. And they were of that type of workman which one too rarely sees outside of Germany. They were not pale, anemic and undersized such as one sees in the East End of London, or in the factory districts of Lancashire, nor were they the tense, exhausted workmen that issue from the factories of the United States. It seemed as if they had escaped

somehow the perfected system of labor-exploitation which exists with us. They looked as if they were getting a loaf or two of bread the best of the struggle with the capitalists. They were serious-minded, ruddy-faced, muscular and one could see that they had saved from the exploitation of the capitalists enough physical and mental strength to live like men during their leisure hours. I should be willing to wager that physically or mentally they could hold their own in the essentials with any other class in Germany. These were my observations shoulder to shoulder with the mass outside.

Inside other things impressed me. I was squeezed so tight amongst the fellows about me that I could not see them and I contented myself with looking across a sea of faces such as I had never seen massed in one place before. Clear and resonant over this sea came the voice of Bebel. A few months ago I saw in New York a convention of American citizens standing on chairs and for twenty minutes waving their hats and arms, as if they had lost completely their senses, in order to show their appreciation of a candidate for office. They were mal-contented, they were in fear lest their liberties should be lost them, and they wanted a Moses to save them; this they thought was he. Here in Mannheim I see an old man talking to his sons. He has seen the movement grow up from its childhood. For nearly half a century he has served it with faithfulness and with power. He has worked his entire life for this thing; yes more, he has over-worked and not seldom has he been vexed, wearied and out of heart. In this service he has grown grey, and furrowed, and great. Today he is the ablest man in the German Reichstag and one of the ablest and most powerful debaters in the world. Every man in this gigantic hall knows his worth, knows his greatness, and loves him; but instead of grovel and hysteria they give him the good round applause of fellowship and of affection. It lasts perhaps fifty seconds and then they stop *to listen to what he has to say*. If what he says were nonsense I think they would let him know, for they have not intoxicated themselves with a frenzied and worked-up emotion. It was admirable. Without hysteria and without the worshipping of heroes or the seeking of a Moses to lead them out of the wilderness this German proletariat is coming to its own. They know their wilderness and they are sure of their own capacity for hewing the paths and bridging the streams out of the miasma of forest and swamp into the warmth and Sunshine of the New Time.

Such was the first general gathering, the night before the regular opening of the congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. The next day at 8 o'clock sharp the delegates assembled for their regular work. The entire floor of a large theatre was occupied by the delegates, from 385 electoral

districts of Germany, and by about 80 members of the Reichstag. The representatives of the press to the number of a hundred sat about the tribune and the galleries were crowded with visitors. The guests from other countries occupied positions upon the platform. Most of the session was taken up with hearing from the foreign delegates and with the report of the Executive committee of the Party. Perhaps the most interesting news in this report is that the Party is to open a school in Berlin to train the editors, lecturers and secretaries for the movement. It was also given out that 348,237 or 12.67 per cent of those voting the socialist ticket are affiliated with the party organization, and that the socialist press has 837,000 subscribers.

It is of course quite impossible to discuss in any adequate way the work of the congress, in space which is necessarily as limited as that of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. For instance two entire days were given to the discussion of questions arising out of the administration of the party's affairs. After that two days were given to the debate upon the General Strike or what the Germans significantly call the *politischen Massenstreik*. Within recent years the idea of the General Strike has gained many adherents in the European Movement. In Belgium it has been used twice; once with signal success, and the immense revolutionary power resting in its natural and proper use was shown once in Russia. As a result there has been a demand on the part of the more extreme sections of the party, the hotter heads and especially the anarcho-socialists, for its adoption as an ordinary weapon of the working classes against the power of the State and the tyrannies of the capitalist class. It is known to the readers of the REVIEW that at the Congress of the Trade Unions at Cologne, several months previous to the Congress of the Social Democratic Party at Jena in 1905, all idea of the propaganda for the General Strike was rejected. But the socialist congress at Jena nevertheless gave recognition to its value and advocated its use. Bebel had himself spoken in its favor. Later however when the party was considering the development of an immense propaganda to conquer universal suffrage for election to the Prussian Landtag and to retort to the assaults directed against universal suffrage in certain other German states, and violent outbreaks were feared, Bebel declared that the moment for a General Strike had not come and that he would oppose all propaganda looking to immediate action of that character. The way in which this series of events transpired created a lively discussion and to clear up the entire matter the subject of the General Strike was put upon the program for this congress.

Bebel's discourse was interesting, instructive and convincing as always. It is probable that it will be translated in full

and therefore it is unnecessary to give more than a few significant sentences which seem to me to be the essence of his position. It was an address of two hours in length, and after summing up the recent history of the subject, he said:

"The general strike can not be organized artificially. It is possible only when the masses are in a high ferment. In Russia the general strike has become stranded. The successful strikes there have not been artificially organized by the workingmen's associations. They have been provoked by events. Last August the workers refused to participate in the strike because they considered it inopportune."

Bebel's position as stated above and especially his opposition to the use of the general strike, except under the most extraordinary conditions and with the accompaniment of a revolutionary state of mind on the part of the masses, called forth a heated discussion. Young Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg especially attacking Bebel's position, but at the closure of the debate Bebel's position was supported by a large vote. Bebel's resolution upon which this debate took place was as follows:

1. "The congress reaffirms the resolutions of the Congress of Jena concerning the general strike.

"The congress recommends again with particular insistence the consideration of those resolutions which favor the reinforcement and development of the party organization, the diffusion of the party press and the reciprocal affiliation of the members of the party to the trade unions and of the members of the trade unions to the political groups.

"As soon as the National Committee of the party recognizes the necessity of a general strike, it must put itself in relation with the National Committee of the trade unions in order to take all the measures necessary to assure the action a fruitful result.

2. "The trade unions are organizations indispensable to the bettering of the conditions of the workers under the present state of society. These organizations do not concede a position of greater importance to the Social Democratic Party, which carries on the struggle for the uplifting of the working class and for its political rights, in opposition to the other classes. The Social Democratic Party has for its mission, besides these immediate tasks, the deliverance of the working class from all oppression and exploitation, by the abolition of the wage-system and by the organization of a system of production, distribution and exchange based upon a social equality. This is an end which the trade union workman, having a class conscience, should equally pursue. The two organizations are therefore frequently called upon to understand and to co-operate with each other in their struggles.

"To bring about co-operation in actions, which concern equal-

ly the unions and the party, the committees of direction of both parties should seek to understand one another.

"The invitation for the joint meeting of the two National Committees should be issued by that organization which particularly desires the joint meeting."

Kautsky created an important discussion by proposing an amendment to this resolution saying: "The trade unions are not less necessary than the socialist party" and to the paragraph which follows the following addition:

"In order to assure the unity of thought and of action of the party and of the unions, who can powerfully co-operate in the victorious march of the proletariat, it is necessary that the unions should be dominated by the spirit of the Social Democratic Party. It is therefore the duty of each member of the party to act in this sense in the unions, and to feel themselves bound by the decisions of the congresses of the party as much in their unions as in their political action. This is conformable to the interest even of the trade union movement, because the social democratic movement is the most elevated and the most extensive form of the class struggle of the proletariat and no proletarian organization can answer for its end if it is not inspired by the socialist spirit."

This resolution brought up the much discussed question of the neutrality of trade unions. It proposed to put the unions, at least so far as their general tendencies were concerned, under the domination of the socialist party. It is of course known that Kautsky is a partisan of the view that the unions should not be neutral politically. But after a discussion of his amendment the last part, the important part, was withdrawn and a new amendment as follows put and carried by a large majority:

"To assure the unity of thought and of action of the party and of the unions, which is supremely necessary to the victorious march of the proletarian class struggle, it is indispensable that the unions should be permeated by the spirit of social democracy. It is the duty of all members of the party to work toward this end."

Such were, or at least it seemed so to me, the most important decisions of the Congress. In any case I am not endeavoring here to mention in any comprehensive way the detailed work of the Congress. I am giving my general impression of its personnel and strength.

The thing that impressed me most in the German movement was its distinct proletarian character. I spoke of this to Ledebour, the member of the Reichstag from Liebnecht's old constituency. He agreed with me and remarked that it had become noticeably more so in recent years. The opposition to the party on the part of the middle class parents, the instructors in the

schools and universities had been effective in keeping men of better education out of the movement and it was now quite necessary to have a school of their own to train the youth of the working classes as editors for their party press and as secretaries to the party. But as the proletarian character of the movement struck me so did the independent and free discussion which took place. The leaders, the editors and the representatives in the Reichstag were called to account for every act that could justly be questioned or was of a controversial character. The German rank and file are not being blindly led anywhere and while Bebel's power is immense it results—aside from his exceptional ability—from the scrupulous care with which he presents his side of any case. To those who hear Bebel there can be no mistaking of his position. His sincerity and the way an idea dominates his mind so that he can present it from every conceivable point of view to his audience enables him to carry his party with him. Thorough, painstaking thinking, clear and forceful repetition of his thought with exhausting care to make his position clear to the most obstinate opponent or the most stupid auditor is to my mind the great secret of this extraordinary man's success. It is a power which Lincoln had, only to my mind Lincoln had it in a more gifted way. He was usually able to make his position clear in a few words. Bebel attains the same end but at times only by the most laborious means.

It struck me also that the party was to all outward appearances extremely conservative, (Some one will please hold down the editor of the REVIEW! I am not through my sentences.) I do not mean that they do not take the most advanced ground in their political programme or that they dilute in any way the revolutionary aim of the movement. What I mean is that they are not uselessly offending anyone. Inside the party they are extremely careful not to offend the more backward and slow-moving elements. They are even willing to sacrifice some positions which they would otherwise take or hold in order to *retain* the adhesion of the less revolutionary elements. They are scrupulously careful not to offend the trade unions. I suppose a majority of the congress wished to have Kautsky's resolution adopted but they were afraid to press it.

Outside the party they are quite as careful not to give the reactionary elements in the Empire any unnecessary excuse for their attacks. For instance it is unquestionable that Bebel, aside from, what seems to me, his sound theory of the *milieu* which must exist as a soil for the proper incitement and development of the successful *Massenstreik*, fears the power of the reaction if it should be too much harassed. For instance, in his speech on the general strike he said:

"My opinion at bottom has never varied. I have always said

that the general strike can not be organized in Prussia as in other countries. We are in the presence of a violent reaction, malicious and brutal, against which we can not launch an organization such as so important a struggle demands. To attempt such an adventure with out being prepared, is to furnish to the reactionaries, to the *agents provocateurs*, the very occasion they desire to reduce still further that which remains of our liberties."

That it seems to me is a pretty conservative stand for the leader of so great a party to take. But Bebel unquestionably relies upon parliamentary methods and strength for the attainment of the socialist ends. Perhaps he is so extremely cautious just now because he wants nothing to interfere with the prospect the party has at the next election of taking from the conservatives several seats in the eastern provinces and from the clericals some of their seats in Westphalia. Indeed only by doing so can the prophecy of Bebel, that they would poll at the next general election 6,000,000 votes, be realized. So far as I can judge Bebel is not yet ready to hold a test of strength with the opposition. They are losing in strength; social democracy is every day gaining. The workingmen must still further unite and become conscious of the historic role which they are to play before they can throw off "their chains." Until both of these objects of the party are more completely attained it might lose much that it has already gained if it were to attempt to move now by revolutionary methods. This attitude of the party is both conciliatory and conservative. It seems to me both far seeing and profoundly wise. It is the peace, calm and power of a youthful giant. He is like Siegfried. He can wait for he is growing. Others may bluster and bluff. He has no weakness to conceal and no organic disease gnawing at his vitals. When he moves every one is conscious of his presence and their breasts are agitated. They too know that day by day this Titan grows.

• ROBERT HUNTER.

Starting a Daily Socialist Paper.

Most of the readers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW are probably aware that at last we have a daily socialist newspaper in the English language. Not many of them, however, know the story of its birth and its rapid growth.

A few weeks before the last election some of the Chicago comrades decided to attempt the publication of a daily campaign sheet. It was proposed to run this for only the two weeks before election day and to make it largely a means of local propaganda. As soon as the project was announced it began to grow. The demand for it was larger than was anticipated. Comrade Joseph Medill Patterson was secured as editor, and then it was decided to include some news. The service of the Scripps-McRea Press Association was secured, and a small corps of correspondents enlisted.

Then began a strange story that shows over again the boundless capacities of the working-class movement. From every corner of the country the subscriptions began to pour in. While a circulation of five or six thousand, or perhaps ten thousand at the most, had been expected, the mail subscriptions alone soon passed that point, with bundle and street sales still to be heard from.

Then arose a new problem, born of this very excess of prosperity—a problem that well-nigh proved the undoing of the whole project. The Chicago subscriptions had reached a point where the original idea of distribution by voluntary efforts became out of the question. The time was too short to perfect the necessary arrangements for a proper handling by the regular carriers, although the most strenuous efforts were made in this line,—many of the comrades working twenty-four hours at a stretch. So it was that hundreds who had subscribed for the paper for the original two weeks were unable to obtain their papers. This could not but cause much dissatisfaction in spite of all explanations.

Nevertheless there began to arise a cry for permanent publication. At first those who were most closely connected with the paper, and who therefore knew the difficulties of such an undertaking, frowned upon this idea. Then took place a stranger phenomenon. From almost every state in the Union there came letters, literally by the hundreds, demanding that the paper be not allowed to stop. Many of these contained money for continuous subscriptions, although no regular paper had been an-

nounced. Others contained pledges of assistance to establish permanent publication.

In the face of this very evident demand the Chicago comrades decided to announce the continuance of the Chicago Daily Socialist. At once a mass of subscriptions began to pour in. Almost no advertising had been done. Indeed there was absolutely no capital at hand with which to advertise. For some time the subscriptions coming in by mail alone were sufficient to pay all the running expenses. A stock company was organized and a considerable sum has been realized in this way to meet the necessary expenses of preliminary organization.

Of course it is recognized that this rush of "prosperity" will not probably be continuous,—that is unless the paper continues to break all precedents in journalism. There will probably come times of struggle and difficulty, but the eagerness with which the paper has been received would seem to indicate that there will be a ready response when these times come.

A word about the character of the paper. It was intended in the beginning to issue an eight page paper, but this was soon given up in favor of a more "live" four page. The watch-word of the editorial and news department has been "condense and make alive". Cartoons are used liberally, a continued story is run, and numerous "features" are "played up". Socialist propaganda is confined to the editorial page, and to the headlines.

In the gathering of news the paper will stand a fair comparison with any evening paper. At least that has been the verdict of some of the best non-socialist newspaper men in the United States. A striking feature has been the publication of a number of "stories" each day that no other paper would dare to print. These have been largely obtained through the assistance of the thousands of readers of the paper who are employed in the institutions and industries exposed. Throughout the paper has adopted the policy of fearlessly publishing facts, and its reporters have been congratulated over and over again by men and women who had no sympathy with the editorial policy because it was the only paper in Chicago that dared to tell the truth on matters before the public.

Although at the present time only four pages are published, because of very little space being occupied by advertising, there is nearly as much actual news matter published as in the average evening daily, and this in a much more condensed form. Advertising patronage is now on the increase, and it is proposed to increase the size of the paper so that it will publish more and more matter. But it is not now intended to ever compete with the padded pages of most capitalist dailies.

One of the most interesting phases of the paper has been the immense amount of volunteer assistance received. Men

whose names are known though out the English speaking world have contributed articles free of charge. Well known newspaper writers have given assistance and advice, and written regularly for weeks without remuneration, merely for the sake of speaking what they wished. Reporters from other papers supply the *Socialist* with "tips" and news. Most striking of all has been the great amount of material sent in by the readers. When the paper was first proposed someone stated that it was expected that everyone of the 30,000 members of the Socialist Party would help edit. At once the Chicago dailies saw an opportunity to poke fun at the project, and numerous paragraphs and at least one lengthy editorial appeared ridiculing or philosphizing upon these "thirty thousand editors". Yet this feature soon ceased to be a joke. Every day a large number of letters come to the editorial office from every section of the country giving suggestions, news items, clippings, etc., all of which is the very best of material from which to construct an interesting paper. It is safe to say that almost any daily would pay well could it secure the services of these "thirty-thousand editors."

So much for the past and present, which alone is certain. It has been the policy of the paper up to present time to neither apologize or promise. Yet I am violating no confidence in saying that a large number of features and plans are under consideration for improving future issues. It is not intended to henceforth introduce any new thing however until it has been well thought out, and until it is certain that it can be carried out effectively.

A. M. SIMONS.

Class Struggles in the Italian Socialist Movement.

FROM a purely numerical point of view the Italian Socialist party with its 45,000 dues paying members, organized in over 1200 local branches is one of the strongest in Europe, being exceeded only by the German and Belgian parties.

Dr. R. Mitchels has recently made a careful analysis of the membership of this party. He secured answers from 803 branches with 33,686 members. This was in 1903, and showed that 72.18 per cent of the membership belonged to the proletariat, either of the city or the country, while 14.29 per cent were little bourgeois and 38 per cent were designated as intellectuals. The remaining 9.73 per cent were impossible of classification.

In view of the preponderance of the proletarian elements the influence exercised by the intellectuals is certainly remarkable. At the last parliamentary election the Italian socialist party polled 326,000 votes. In addition to this there is also a large number who do not consider political action of such great importance and whose members would be added to the vote cast. Moreover there are many restrictions on universal suffrage which disfranchise a large portion of the Italian proletariat. While in France 28 per cent, in Germany 26 per cent of the adult population have the right to vote, in Italy only 8 per cent are able to enjoy this privilege—4,121,863 Italian citizens belonging to the proletariat are debarred from the right of suffrage. Of the over two million and a half Italian voters only 1,593,886 took part in the last election. Of these 21.34 per cent voted for the socialist party, electing 29 members to parliament. Of these votes Dr. Mitchels shows that 256,874 out of the 326,016 socialist votes came from proletarians while the balance were cast by members of other social classes.

It must be remembered that a large part of the proletarian votes comes from agrarian and not from industrial districts. The little peasants and farm laborers in north and middle Italy are rapidly becoming socialists. The agrarian centers (Bologna, Mantova, Reggio Emilia, etc.) are the strongholds of the party.

The Italian parliamentary elections of 1904 broke across old lines of party division. In nearly all the districts the socialists carried on their fight independently of all other parties. This change was brought about by the first great Italian general strike, which broke out spontaneously as an elementary protest against the repeated military interference of

the government in the struggles between capital and labor. This strike was the "political baptism of the proletariat", as Lombroso has said. It was the first resistance of the independent revolutionary class. The government was so frightened at the display of force that it yielded to the pressure of reaction, dissolved parliament and ordered reelections. Thanks to the assistance of the worst reactionary elements the socialist parliamentary group was reduced.

EFFECT OF GENERAL STRIKE.

But while the representation in parliament was weakened by the general strike the vote of the party was almost doubled and the proletariat gained in strength and revolutionary consciousness, to an extent which is almost incalculable. For the first time the unions realized their power and real mission. It was especially in the great cities of northern Italy, where the bourgeois elements had been somewhat friendly to socialism that the vote fell off.

The increase in the vote means an increase of the proletarian elements of the party. Very few of the bourgeois voted for socialism since its revolutionary aim and its distinct class character were now clearly evident. Many of the little farmers and of the underpaid state employes of the railroads, post and telegraph service, the majority of whom are organized in unions, voted the socialist ticket. The same was also true of the elementary school teachers. It was the intellectuals who laid the foundation for the Italian Socialist Party. Their heroic conduct in the early days was marked with the same unselfishness that we see today in the Russian intellectuals. Their convictions, however, were largely of an ethical nature and it was natural that their propaganda should be influenced by this fact.

Thus the ideological and sentimental origin of the Italian Socialist Party is evident but this does not prevent that party from being clearly proletarian, and this notwithstanding its strong bourgeois following.

Arturo Labriola when analyzing the modern socialist tendencies shows that in almost all countries the time comes when the separation of the socialist party from the strictly economic movement leads to a conflict. "The moral lead of the proletariat passes to the socialist party which represents the interest of the working men. Yet the socialist party is not a class organism composed of persons living under the same general economic conditions but rather a normal organism composed of persons brought together by acceptance of a common ideological standpoint independent of their class position. It is granted that the ideal standpoint must serve certain definite class interest and whatever may be the class origin of the components of a party

It is always understood that they would sacrifice their original class interests for the ideals they have chosen to defend. But it can never be definitely determined in how far the primitive class instinct which subsists in every man identifying him with the class in which he was born still exists. This gives rise to the peril that the socialist party might be dominated by men of bourgeois origin until the whole workingman's movement might be turned over to serve interests antagonistic to those of the class of workingmen. There has always been a certain antagonism in the Italian Socialist movement between the intellectuals and bourgeois elements on the one side and the proletariat on the other."

The intellectuals have almost exclusively dominated the Italian socialist parliamentary fraction. They play the leading part in almost all local political branches of the party. They are editors of the party papers and secretaries of union and labor exchanges. These men come from the rank of the real intellectual proletariat compelled to earn their living. Hundreds of them are employed by the party and by workingmen's organizations. Because of this situation the Italian Socialist Party has never shown much enthusiasm for anything but political questions.

The bloody revolution of Milan (1898) was followed by a great repression on the part of the government. Especially the anarchists were persecuted and sent in large numbers to jail or into exile. The reaction, instead of strengthening the movement, depressed it. The large bourgeois element of the party got scared; they did not want to be troubled on account of their ideas and from that time they have used all their influence to accentuate the elective and legal character of the party. Political action becomes more and more degraded to and identified with electioneering. But at the same time many workingmen have joined the party whose influence began to be felt, for they commenced to take active leading parts.

FIGHTING SOCIALISM WITH REFORM.

Soon the government realized the futility of fighting socialism with brutal force and changed its tactics. Saracco's cabinet (1900) began to propagate social reforms on a large scale, trying to pacify the workingmen by promising slight reforms of the present system, which might procure them fairly good conditions of existence. Military interference in the struggles between capital and labor ceased, while hitherto the government had always defended the capitalist side.

The socialist party soon lost its orientation. It was accustomed to politics of oppression and knew the arms with which

to fight it. Now it did not know what attitude was to be taken toward the politics of concession. There were divergent opinions in the party in and out of parliament. We can distinguish two main currents. The first wanted to exploit the offered help and freedom, was friendly toward the government and has more than once suggested active participation in its action. This current, represented by Turati and his followers, is called revisionism. The other side led by Enrico Ferri and the revolutionists, represented the class-struggle standpoint. It refused to lend support to the government. Though it was for accepting all propositions concerning the people's welfare, it has always rejected the idea of a systematical support of the regime of the "menio peggio" (lesser evil).

Both fractions, almost equally strong, contested the supremacy of the party. Their tactics being diametrically opposed, it was impossible to have a unified socialist political action.

An acute crisis has arrived within the party.

Discussions, at first objective, soon degenerated into a campaign of personal denunciation. Revisionists charged revolutionists with incapacity to understand the immediate necessities of the workingmen and accused them of coming to the party in the hope of getting a position. It was easy for the revolutionists to throw the same charge upon the other side, stigmatizing the revolutionists as being political climbers and traitors to the cause. They labeled each other with the significant adjective "socialistic bourgeois".

COMPLAINT OF THE PROLETARIAT.

These mutual denunciations of the bourgeois elements and intellectuals have degraded their position in the eyes of the proletariat. The harmful consequences of the ephemeral victory of the revisionists had their reaction upon the workingmen. While the workers have not forgotten the early services of the bourgeois intellectuals, they could not but see that in the struggles led by the intellectuals, their own interests have not been recognized but neglected; that their movement of emancipation served only as a vehicle to carry interests essentially differing from theirs. The animosity on the part of the workingmen against the bourgeois elements within the party grew apace with the growth of the party among workingmen as the organized laborers came to realize their class situation. The leadership of the intellectuals began to be disputed by workingmen who, stirred up by the quarrel, have realized more and more that their influence hitherto exercised upon the party affairs had been altogether ineffective. The animosity grew into hostility. The stagnation in the progress

of the movement was ascribed to the personal quarrels of the bourgeois elements and leaders.

Meanwhile the revisionist or ministerialist current has been victorious. The majority of the party, convinced by the revisionist propaganda, came to believe in the illusion of the democracy of government. At the party convention of Timola (1902) the majority approved and justified the work of the ministerialist parliamentary groups. No wonder, for at that time the liberal cabinet, the promoter of reforms, was in all its splendor, and the revolutionary membership was not yet organized into a strong resisting body.

But ministerialist reform proved to be a solemn fiasco. Workingmen never suffered so much from governmental and military persecution as under the Zanardelli-Giolitti Cabinet, which was supported by the socialist party. Military expenses, for the reduction of which the socialist fraction spent a great deal of effort, were greatly increased. Social legislation was a mere bluff. Ministerialism suffered a crushing defeat along all lines. And then came the answer. At the party convention in Bologna (1904) the anti-reformist proletarian elements marched in closed ranks against ministerialism and their resolution proposed by Ferri was carried by a great majority.¹

But as Labriola very correctly notes, the real moral crisis of the Italian Socialist Party does not lie in the fact that the parliamentary group has voted in favor of the cabinet, but in the possibility that the socialist parliamentary group and the party organization were the means of writing, declaring and scattering notions which diverged entirely from the revolutionary ideas of socialism and the tactics of a revolutionary movement.

To define the socialism of the Italian reformists is very easy. It consists in affirming that the working classes should work in accordance with the other classes of society and with the liberal and democratic parties in order to realize certain definite reforms. By such reforms the various public services should be turned over to and operated by the state or city. The reforms are for the promotion of a great but not definite work of social legislation. The workingmen must actively participate in public life to prepare themselves for the management of collective affairs. With absolute respect for the present legal order, they must seek to prevail in electoral assemblies in order to effect other but not the specified reforms. Finally the goal of all these efforts is collectivism, postponed to a very far off epoch, and to be realized by

¹) Rendiconto dell' VIII. Congresso Nazionale. Rome 1904. These proceedings are one of the most important documents of the Italian Socialist Party, for here we find the best theoretical presentation of the various tendencies. See the speeches by Lazzari, Marangoni, Labriola, Mocchi, Ferri, Turati, Bissolati.

the gradual extension of state and municipal ownership of industries. Consequently at present the Socialist Party ought to act as a constitutional party of the government. Then in the future it ought to establish a species of state collectivism, respecting acquired possessions and in no ways opposing the capitalist interests. (Labriola.)

With this kind of socialism the Italian Socialist Party has lost practically all its revolutionary color. The reformist activity was encouraged by those whose class interests were favored by the reforms, and largely by those who were won over to socialism through the propaganda of intellectuals and their followers. The reciprocal obligations arising from this situation are clear. The peasants, but especially the little farmers, came to socialism through the evangetic propaganda of the intellectuals, and, not realizing exactly the revolutionary content of socialism yet knowing that socialism means transformation, a betterment, gave their support to the party, hoping for immediate reforms. Their state of mind reacts upon the leaders who are endeavoring to increase the parliamentary representation of the party and induces them to take the way of immediate reforms. From the same intentions originate the work of the party, focused in the struggle against sterile state expenses, against all kinds of corruption and against protective tariff; the demand for the revision of the taxing system, and the claim for better salaries for the state employes. The party transfers the center of gravity of its parliamentary activity to the conquest of advantages benefiting middle-class, little bourgeois and proletarian interests.

The vital interests of the proletariat have been neglected. First of all the voters must be satisfied. The socialist party ceased to be, if it ever was, the representative of the workingmen. The heterogeneity of the human material within the socialist movement resulted in the neutralization of the revolutionary spirit and scope.

RESISTANCE TO REFORMISM.

The growing reformism unchained passions and called forth a formidable resistance. The decadent tendency and its supporters were attacked from two different sides; on the one side were the "integralists" on the other the "syndicalists," the revolutionary unionists.

Ferri, the leader of the integralists, who before called themselves revolutionists, not only attacked the attitude of the reformists toward the government, but even denounced as futile their hitherto proposed social legislation.¹ Ferri's propaganda, which emphasized the necessity of evolving a multiform action in order

1) E. Ferri. *II metodo rivoluzionario*. Rome 1902.

to conquer the public powers, was finally successful, inasmuch as the integralists carried a resolution,—the resolution of the golden middle way,—at the last socialist convention, defeating the resolutions of the reformists and revolutionists.

The resolution proposed by Ferri reads as follows:¹

“The convention, maintaining that the method of class struggle does not admit the support of any governmental program, a participation of the socialists in the cabinet,

“Affirms that the accomplishment of the complex work of the socialist party requires a multiform daily activity intended for the education of socialist consciousness for the critical demolition of the systems of exploitation and parasitism and directed toward the conquest of economic, political and administrative reforms,

“And with the respect of the minority for the resolutions of the majority, affirms the unity of the party in the common work of all socialists.”

Thus the unitary tendency won a formal victory. The resolution passed has not decided anything. It insisted upon a unity of the party, which in reality did not exist. It was equivocal, and, as we shall prove, left open the way for all future ministerialism.

Resolutions cannot master the whirl of events. The Zanardelli-Giolitti cabinet was followed by another period of political mistification. After Giolitti and the double incarnation of Fortis came the Cabinet of Sonnino, greeted by conservatives as well as socialists as the great government of real reforms. The socialist parliamentary groups became very enthusiastic and with the cooperation of the “revolutionist” Ferri passed a resolution to the effect that while the proletariat could put no faith in the politics of any government of the bourgeois classes, the group resolved to give a favorable vote in order to put the new cabinet to the test of facts.

By accepting the program of the government, the parliamentary group violated the discipline of the party. And Ferri's revolutionism proved to be only a formal distinction. While he declares that the resolution of the group cannot be judged as being a systematical support of the government, but only a transitory approving of its policies, it is undeniable that this last move of his brings him down to the level of the reformists. All essential difference between integralists and reformists has been wiped out.

THE GENERAL STRIKE.

This new ministerialistic idyl was soon swept away by the elementary power of a workingmen's manifestation. Under Son-

¹) Rendiconto dell' VIII. Congresso Nazionale. Rome 1904, P. 134.

nino's short regime military force repeatedly interfered in the case of strikes, shooting down some workmen. Last May a workingman was killed in Torino. Great excitement seized the proletariat. Under the pressure of an impending upheaval, Turati proposed a law in parliament which should have regulated but not decidedly prohibited military interference at strikes. The proposal was rejected by the "socialistic cabinet." A general strike was the answer. For five days bourgeois society trembled once more for its existence. The direct action of the proletariat made itself felt.

The socialistic members of parliament resigned. There was no other way out of the dilemma. The government they supported left them. They did not approve a general strike, even decidedly opposed it, and it broke out against their will. They lost the ground under their feet. The dissonance between parliamentary and proletarian action, between intellectuals and workmen never has been so keen as now.

A few days later the cabinet was obliged to resign because one of its propositions was rejected by a majority precisely equal to the number of votes the socialist party could have cast. Thus the cabinet succumbed under the indirect pressure of the action of the organized proletariat. The new premier—again Giolitti—ordered new elections. The socialists returned to parliament weakened by the loss of a few seats.

As early as 1899 began the formation of the other oppositional group already mentioned. It gathered around the socialist weekly, *L'Avanguardia Socialista* of Milan. The group was led by Arturo Labriola,¹ professor in the University of Naples, W. Mocchi, Lazzari and a few other intellectuals. But the proletarian elements prevailed and had a decided influence upon its activity. This group gathered around its banners the majority of the Milanese branch of the Socialist Party and conquered the most powerful of Italian local unions, the Labor Exchange of Milan. A bitter fight was carried on against the predominance of bourgeois elements and their interests in the socialist movement. To this intensive propaganda is due the defeat of the revisionists at Bologna.²

Tremendous rapidity characterized the growth of this movement. The spontaneous general strike of 1904 set the workmen to thinking. They recognized the power of their hitherto latent energies and dormant faculties. At the convention of Labor Exchanges (1905) the majority of the hitherto reformist

1) This writer should not be confused with Antonio Labriola, professor in the University of Rome and author of "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History" and "Socialism and Philosophy," who died early in 1905. Editor.

2) The adherents of this current voted for Ferri's resolution when they saw that their own could not be carried.

unions declared for a general strike in the case of military interference in the conflicts of capital and labor, which attitude involved almost the whole union movement in the new revolutionary drift. Strike upon strike followed. In September 1905 the railroad men surprised the country with a general strike and forced the cabinet to resign. The political and economical potentiality and range of the general strike was fully revealed last May.

The proletariat came to feel at last the productive force of its great collective efforts. It realized that its acts of defense can be evolved into those of offense. It entered a new period in its life. The workmen have finally learned through the lesson of a series of eventful fights how to demonstrate the force of their will; they finally have found a way of directly asserting their initiative. They will not wait any more for the benevolent decisions of a distinctively class parliament when their very life is in question, but shall henceforth act upon their own account.

The last general strike, more than the previous ones, and the attitude of the different currents of the parliamentary body of the Italian Socialist Party clearly proved the divorce that has come about between the proletariat and its so-called representatives, the existing perilous dissonance between the Socialist Party and the tendencies of the unions.¹ The action of the socialist party culminates in capturing the powers of the state. Consequently it disdains any attempt which could disturb its function of gathering votes and despises any attitude which would enfeeble its capacity of penetration into the very powers of the bourgeois state. The unions by the reality of social life are forced to combat face to face the capitalists and their legal institutions.² Now it became perfectly clear that the action of the proletariat by its very nature is directed against the state and culminates in the expropriating general strike.

It is irrevocably proved that unions are the most important decisive co-efficients of proletarian politics and that consequently it is necessary to gradually transfer to them the functions of the socialist movement. The socialist party might maintain its function only under one condition, that is, of following the anti-state revolutionary method, unless it returns to its proletarian origins, to its function as being the executive power of the proletariat organized in its unions. Otherwise the socialist party becomes an appendix of bourgeois democracy. The socialist party must choose between two ways; it either goes with democracy toward

1) "Dopo l'Ultimo Sciopero Generale" by the editors of the Socialist Review. *Il Divenire Sociale*. Anno II, Num. 10 Roma.

2) In 1904 as well as last May the unions officially called the workmen to a general strike. In both cases the number of strikers surpassed the number of socialist voters.

conquering the state, or with the revolutionary unions toward the abolition of all bourgeois institutions centered in the state.

The action of the revolutionary organizations has produced unexpected results. All traditional conceptions of the party have been upset. The syndicalist conception, and above all the practical activity of the workingmen's socialism brought back to the labor exchanges, was the weapon with which the old parliamentary and legal socialism has been stricken,—the old socialism which now seemed to have secured its domination in the soul of the Italian working class. These facts brought about a new crisis in the socialist party and movement, the durability, extension and modality of which is difficult to foresee. The old personal and ideological hegemonies seem to be finally overthrown. (Labriola.)

I give here in a few lines the theoretical conceptions which have been deduced from the new facts.¹

ARGUMENT AGAINST PARLIAMENTARISM.

Parliaments are not and cannot become organs of social revolution. The inherent social and economical qualities and tendencies of parliamentarism limit the possibilities of reforms. The reformist conception that revolution is the result of an accumulation of reforms is absurd. It is practically and scientifically false. It is a most ridiculous utopian supposition that a socialist party ever can obtain a majority in the parliaments of any country. The social revolution which shall establish the "autonomous government of production managed by the associated working class" (Labriola) is above all a technical and economic fact which cannot be called into existence by an incompetent assembly such as the parliaments of all countries are; but must result from the autonomous development of the capacity and from the spontaneous initiative of those who attend to the process of production. The fundamental economic relations of the successive economic forms of society are infinitely rigid. In spite of the various and intensive transformations the capitalistic society has undergone, the juridical relations between capitalist and wage-worker have not suffered any essential mutation. That shows that the social environment, within which an economic organism operates, might be reformed without affecting the economic organism. The revolutionary work must be an inner work, a series of mutations in the balance of the several parts of the economic organism and cannot be an outer process, a result of a series of legislative influences and friendly transactions between the various parliamentary parties.

¹) I shall try in a separate essay to explain the scientific system of French and Italian syndicalism. The limits of this article, already outgrown—forbid by going deeper into this subject.

Thus the mission of revolutionary unionism, as the bearer of the emancipation of the workingmen, is not that of capturing the powers of government. Its political role is to empty the bourgeois political organism of all its life and transfer all valuable features it contains to the unions.

The economic task of the unions, which are losing more and more their purely corporative character to become organs embracing all interests of the workingmen, is the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, the wage system. Its political mission is the absorption of the state, which is nothing else but the collective capitalist. Revolutionary unionism cannot co-operate in furthering the growth of the state. It cannot further the extension of state activity, for it would mean the extension of capitalism's rule. Everything which reduces the powers of the state is done in the interest of the movement of the workingmen. Everything which weakens the force of the state gives more force to the unions, intensifies the class struggle, accelerates the process of taking possession of the means of production by the associated workingmen.¹ It must be emphasized that the political function of revolutionary unionism is purely negative, tending to eliminate the obstacles which hinder the face to face fight of capitalism and unionism and the development of the working-class.

The revolutionary act of taking possession of the means of production of each industry by the unions of each industry, determines the passage from capitalism to socialism. The transformation is brought to a close by an expropriating general strike, the only modern form which permits the proletariat to become its own directing actor and factor of its own history.

The mechanical conception of capturing the powers of government through parliaments has been replaced by a larger, more multiform, more organic conception of the class struggle, which culminates in the thought that the unions, fraught with revolutionary aims are the instruments and bearers of social revolution.

¹) G. Sorel. "L'Avenir Socialiste des Syndicats" Paris 1901, p. 51 and 60.

ODON POR.

Florence, September 1906.

The Italian Socialist Convention.

I TRIED to express above* that practice has eliminated all essential differences between the integralists, the fraction holding the traditional revolutionary notions and the reformists. The political activity of the socialist party,—prescribed and determined by the various diverging interests of the numerous and dissimilar elements the party embraces—necessarily arrives at a point where it must use all means offered by the present system, especially that of legislation, to realize immediate advantages favoring classes largely depending upon the extension of the powers of the state, while the vital proletarian interests, which cannot be realized unless through direct pressure upon capital, must be neglected, pushed into the background; for the actual effective inner forces of the party tend to a political and not to an economical struggle.

Reformism has been justified through the test of practice. The traditional revolutionary party now faces a dilemma. It either endorses reformism and extends its parliamentary work or else returns to the proletarian origins of the movement, renounces all acquired parliamentary prestige, abandons as the central activity the gathering of votes, dissolves the old forms of political organizations and resumes the revolutionary work upon the basis of purely proletarian organizations and pronouncedly workingmen interests.

However, the socialist party, not being virile enough to face the problem with an explicit decision, has taken the more comfortable way of compromise. This kind of solution has suited the peaceful spirit of the predominant bourgeois aspirations.

The resolution of the integralists, compiled by Ferri and his worshipers, has been accepted by the last congress of the party. Twenty-nine thousand nine hundred and forty-seven votes carried the propositions of unitary integralism, against 5,278 votes given for revolutionary unionism.

No wonder! The victorious resolution is a marvelous compilation of Marxism, the theories of Benoit Malon, of reformism and syndicalism. The integralist proposition, through its formal oneness attracts the untrained and immature minds of the unconscious workingmen, and charms the aesthetic sense of the bourgeois, who abhors straight opposition and is always seeking reconciliation. And by restoring harmony between contradicting

*) This part of the article is written the day after the last socialist convention, Rome, October 7th—10th, 1906.

theories and between vitally different practical activities it presumes to save the unity of the party.

Integralism, though leaving out some practical exaggerations of reformism, embodies the reformist activity, and by accepting some minor syndicalist conceptions it flirts with revolutionary unionism. The reformists and all their most prominent leaders withdrew their resolution and endorsed integralism. The fusion of the traditional revolutionists with the reformists, long ago accomplished in practice, has been at last officially announced. The syndicalists have all voted for Labriola's resolution. The discussion between revisionism and traditional revolutionism is closed. The horizon is cleared. The problems of Italian socialism became simplified, but in the meantime sharpened. Henceforth only two fractions face each other: integralists and syndicalists. The fight has not been brought to an end. Living issues keep it alive,—living issues brought forth by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

Conventions represent a moment of transitory excitement, of psychological effervescence, created by many causes and infinite elements which are unfamiliar to the homogeneous functions and continuance of the organisms which live the every day life. Conventions might formally resolve upon questions which have been solved long ago in practice, but resolutions cannot check the growth of inflexible social tendencies. They might retard or interrupt their progress but never shall impede their march toward a final realization.

Syndicalism has been defeated at the convention. But it lies in the consciousness of the infinite elements of the workingmen, who do not want to be protected and taken in tow by people who cannot understand their very interests and their revolutionary spirit tempered by the every day fight they wage against capital.

Labriola has precisely translated this proletarian consciousness, exclaiming in his passionate defense of revolutionary unionism: "We do not want labor legislation! We do not care that the workmen should work more or less! We want the struggle! Struggle means life. And underneath the struggle lies victory." The convention applauded furiously this conscious confession. The syndicalists will not give up their fight. Fight means life to them.

Here follows the integralist resolution:

"The general principles of the socialist party are: The final aim of the socialization of the means of production, the method of the class struggle and the faith in a gradual development of socialism within the bourgeois society.

"In order to realize this scope the socialist party uses all legal means, reserving the use of violence when the dominating classes should hinder the use of legal means.

"The socialist party is unfolding a practical action tending:

"To propagate the general principles of socialism: to consider as its greatest task the development of the economic organizations (unions, co-operatives, mutual aid societies, etc.) and to conquer from the public powers a labor legislation which should integrate and generalize the fragmentary conquests of the economic organization, unifying them, confirming the decisions of the proletarian organization.

"To extend the collective dominion in the form of democratic municipalization and nationalization.

"To elevate the conditions of the social environment through conquering the political liberties, by increasing the culture of the proletariat, by the struggle against political and administrative corruption, through the development of the economic powers of the country.

"To use the pressure of the general strike also when the question of greater demands comes up, to accentuate the antimonarchical and anticlerical propaganda and also that of antimilitarism in order to educate the Italian youth in the socialist spirit, to neutralize the tendency of the dominating classes to use the army as an organ of antiproletarian repression.

"To control the correct application of laws favoring the proletariat.

"Consequently the party refuses.

"To abandon the propaganda of the general principles; and rejects obligatory co-operation with the government;

The systematical alliance with the radical parties;

The excessive and absorbing care for local questions which are not specifically proletarian or concern the general interests of the country;

Any action which is or seems to be an acquiescence to the form of monarchical government;

The frequent and excessive use of the general strike;

The insistent call to violence which disturbs and handicaps the practical worth of proletarian organizations;

The exaltation of the direct action, which is directed to discredit and not to integrate the representative action;

The anti-state premise in so far as it signifies discrediting or rejecting social legislation or means the negation of a socialist state;

The tendency to eliminate from the party the socialists who are not manual laborers;

The conception of transferring abolished private property to the unions.

The party realizes as its most urgent necessity to increase the forces and better rapidly the conditions of the proletariat and the social environment, this activity needs: unison and discipline.

Therefore the party appeals to all comrades for intense activity, stigmatizes evil polemics and in order to leave the greatest liberty for discussion it demands from the minority respect for the deliberations of the majority."

"Regarding the parliamentary and electoral tactics the party decides:

"a. that in the electoral struggles inflexibleness (intransigenza) should be the maxim, and flexibleness (transigenza) the exception;

"b. that the parliamentary group of the party cannot approve a governmental program; however, when an exceptional case comes up in which the group finds it necessary to endorse the program of a cabinet, it must consult the direction of the party, the member-

ship of which should be increased, and the congress should elect them with the consideration to include in the direction comrades belonging to the greater economic organizations."

This historical document speaks for itself. Everybody, if unprejudiced, at once realizes its equivocal character, its ambiguous phrasing which leaves open the way to different interpretations and to materially different activities. This resolution does not guarantee that the socialist party shall be henceforth a mere revolutionary party; on the contrary, emanating from the preconception of a successful reconciliation and pacification of contradictory forces and interests, it would exclude a priori every possibility of a revolutionary struggle. It certainly will hinder for a while the development of revolutionary spirit, but shall not kill its already far reaching roots.

The rejected syndicalist resolution is a clearer, a more determined platform of proletarian class struggle. It is an honest declaration of principles, a brave call to arms.

"Considering that the aims of socialist revolution: 1, the expropriation of the capitalist class; 2, the decomposition of the public powers, are the natural results of the increasing potentiality of the working classes and have their instruments in the union organism, which realizes the union of the wage laborers.

"That this process of development of the working class is conditioned by the successive transformation of the trade organisms in organs which represent the totality of the interests and of the movement of the working classes, as well as their immediate practical action, directed to acquire the betterments compatible with the existence of the present society, as well as in the final revolutionary action.

"That the success of the socialist revolution and its proximity depend upon the degree in which the movement of the laboring classes is kept in hostile separation from the other social classes and upon the degree in which the proletariat is constantly directed toward its revolutionary scope.

"That the revolutionary mission is not yet perfectly understood by the Italian union organizations;

"The congress declares:

"1. The socialist party represents purely proletarian interests, interests of workingmen dependent upon the capitalist regime;

"2. Its duty is to educate and prompt the union, consequently the class organization of the proletariat, and the socialist party represents the most radical fraction of the proletariat;

"3. The parliamentary action of the party is directed to safeguard the use of the common right for the working classes and to support the legislative desires of the proletariat, firmly sustaining the principle of the separation of the proletariat from any active or passive governmental office;

"4. The revolutionary action of the party is expressed through the specific means of the unional organization, consequently through the general strike, perfected with all means which revolutionary experience shall successively advise, and transfers the functions of the state to the unional organs or to the individual;

"5. According to the things affirmed in the preceding paragraph.

the Italian proletariat finds a particular interest in an active anti-monarchical, antimilitarist and anticlerical propaganda."

The difference between the two resolutions is obvious. The revolutionary activity of the integralists centers in legislative work, the syndicalists believe in the direct activity of the proletariat. The movement of the integralists should be a parliamentary, a political one, while that of the syndicalists one of continual direct action. Integralism is essentially a legislative action, its philosophy is evolution, positivism. Syndicalism is an essentially practical method, lives only with action. Action is its principle and its essence. "Syndicalism does not expect anything from history, but wants to make history. Here lies all its philosophy."

.ODON POR.

October, 1906.

Reform.

IT was Ben Hanford who said something to the effect that our strength is tested not by the way we conduct ourselves in time of adversity, but in time of success. The "unexpectedly large vote" of the Socialist Party in 1904 presented a striking example of the soundness of Hanford's observation. For the vote of over 400,000 offered an irresistible temptation to every sunshine Socialist to calculate by the laws of arithmetical and geometrical progression that the Socialist vote in 1906 would come between 600,000 and 1,000,000 (the difference of half a million in these estimates being of minor importance), and, furthermore, that the Socialist Party would poll anywhere from 2,000,000 to — well, electing a Socialist president in 1908. In fact, the thing that should have been concerning us most all this time is the selection of a committee to arrange the details of the co-operative commonwealth, that there might be no hitch or delay when our president reached the White House.

The fact that modern Socialists are presumed to be thorough-going scientists did not at all seem to militate against some of our number being thorough-going utopians to the extent of rushing into print, especially in professional periodicals, to warn the ruling class that their day of reckoning was at hand. It was no longer a question of the inevitability of Socialism; it was a question of the inevitability of Socialism in 1908—or at least in 1912.

Now, there is no particular harm in prophesying what the Socialist vote is going to be from election to election. It is a source of idle amusement, and if the Socialist movement can be harmed to any great degree, it will likely be not through regarding everything with a sense of humor, so much so as through taking ourselves too seriously and winding up as howling fanatics, engaged in clarifying our ranks by heresy hunting, expulsions and demoralization in general. So let us not be too hard on the self-appointed captains of the proletarian army when their calculations go awry. The more so can we afford to do this since the "army" has manifested no inclination of taking the self-appointed captains seriously.

The reason why the Socialist vote in 1906 was not uniformly greater than that of 1903, we are told, was because of the "reform" movement. Sure enough, whether by coincidence or not, no sooner had the "unprecedented vote of the Socialist Party" finished being commented upon by every capitalist editor

in the country than tremblings and rumblings of reform were heard at various places as though a political earthquake were going to shake the whole country. But in 1905 the reform wave struck only certain states, in 1906 a greater number, and indications point to the movement's coming to a head in 1908.

There are a great many tendencies grouped under the caption "reform." Hearst or "friend-of-labor" politics are reform politics. Schmitz or "union-labor" politics are reform politics. La Follette or "smash-the-machine" politics are reform politics. Dunne or "municipal-ownership" politics are reform politics. Focht—Hoch—Colby and Fagan—Berry and Emery—still reformers completely absorbed with the desire to purify the common life and give us a full dinner pail of civic righteousness. All reform.

To analyze these different reforms and ascertain their distinguishing features would be valueless. We might learn that the leading spirits consisted in unequal parts of disgruntled leaders, politicians on the "outs" trying to break "in"; professional reformers, who dedicate their soul's best energy to the holy cause—for a pecuniary consideration; business men, prompted by the desire to create competition in the legislative labor market, and others who devote themselves from unselfish motives to whatever party they expect to win. But to learn in just what proportion these elements constituted the movements in different localities and climates would avail little. What might more likely be of service, for the purpose of coping with the reform movement in the future, would be to learn just what element there is underlying all reform movements, what element predominates, the element that is really essential to their existence, whatever aspects they may assume according to the character of different peoples.

It is noteworthy in this connection that the increasing of wages after the 1906 election is but a repetition of the action taken after the 1904 election. This may or may not warrant the belief that the Socialist vote had something to do with it.

But let us take the other extreme, the Hearst movement, which is supposed to have been building for many years back. Hearst is the legitimate fruit of the present order as much so as is Rockefeller. The Hearst papers have not outdistanced their rivals because Hearst has less business acumen than Pulitzer and Bennett nor yet because Brisbane is an abler editor than those exploited by Pulitzer and Bennett. The success of the Hearst papers lies in the fact that they cater to the crowd. They understand the psychology of the crowd—and nature moves easiest in the line of least resistance. The kind of stuff that Brisbane writes and the way he writes it is what the crowd wants, and that's the only reason the Hearst papers are the go. The

Hearst papers—with Brisbane—could not be the go in England, which has a different crowd psychology, nor would it have been the go in America fifty years ago.

Let us understand the situation. The masses of the people think they think. That is to say, that while they deplore and condemn existing conditions, they deplore and condemn to no purpose. An insignificantly small percentage are hearty advocates of any specific remedy such as municipal ownership, income tax, eight hour law, abolition of child labor, anarchy, single tax, state capitalism or Socialism. The masses are stirred by the "revelations" of newspaper and magazine scribbling revelators because the mind's eye of the masses can picture the carnival of crime and corruption. If their mind's eye were not peeled, so to speak, they couldn't be made to understand. You can't shock a two year old babe by reading it one of Brisbane's gushes. In the same way the Hearst papers have not created the present discontent and outlook anymore so than has Hearst created the millions of which he happens to be possessed. The discontent was here. The Hearst papers start very few people thinking. The Hearst papers do not make Socialists or unmake them. The truth of the matter is that a host of people vote the Socialist ticket for just as good a reason that a greater lot of people do not vote it. These votes Hearst takes from the Socialist Party, because the voters want *it*—whatever they imagine they want—*now*. Hearst gives *it* to them *now*. And not knowing the difference, their ideas having been very hazy in the first place, they are satisfied until they grow restless again. Then they get *it* again under a new form, being none the wiser. For that reason the votes the Socialist Party lost in the Hearst campaigns were not Socialist votes. There is no such thing as a Hearst Socialist. As we shall see later, it is a contradiction in terms. Hearst doesn't represent Socialism, secured no Socialist votes and did not and cannot hurt the Socialist movement.

A little further. The twentieth century requires twentieth century methods, and the twentieth century produced that specimen of intellectual bankrupt and nincompoop hailed by the crowd as the genius of all time, Willie Randolph Hoist.

Hearst is a composite up-to-date P. T. Barnum. Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Beatrice Fairfax, Dorothy Dix, Arthur Brisbane, Opper, Carter, and the rest are about as good freaks as Barnum ever imposed upon a gullible public. And the Hearst freaks are to be assured that they are no more to be blamed for being freaks than were the two-headed ladies, human pincushions and wild men from Borneo to be blamed for having been created by God in his own image.

Hearst satisfies New York. Schmitz satisfies San Francisco. Dunne satisfies Chicago. Colby and Fagan satisfy New Jersey.

La Follette satisfies Wisconsin. Berry and Emery satisfy Pennsylvania. All for just a little while. But the people want reform—and they get it. And the people create their own deities, whether Hearst, Schmitz, Colby, La Follette or Berry. And they create them after their own image.

What is to be found in all reform movements? This. The capacity to give the crowd capitalism, under new names, because the crowd while drifting about is not ready for Socialism. It makes little difference to capitalism whether it secures its tariffs, purporting to spring from McKinley statesmanship, or national progress, honor and integrity, so long as it gets the tariffs. And it makes little difference to the capitalist class of New York, in procuring the measures it must and will have, whether it gets them as a result of "plunderbund corruption" or "government by the people". Hearst reform, like all reform, can only mean capitalism (big, not small) growing bigger with the kindly assistance of the Old Parties. Reform means smoothing the way for the industrial juggernaut in its destruction of the life, limb and everything designated by the old school moralists as the soul, virtue, mind, honor, etc., of the human family. For just as in every historical epoch the intellectual superstructure is based upon the method employed by the people in producing and exchanging goods and the social relations following from it, just so every government is bound to be a reflex of the economic status of different classes in society. So a monopolized, centralized, despotic economic system will not tolerate a diversified, democratic and republican form of government. So, as the capitalist system develops, as the ownership of the country concentrates into fewer and fewer hands, so the political powers will concentrate into fewer and fewer hands. The tendency is for the ruling class to also become the governing class.

This is somewhat unique. Where once upon a time the ambitions of submerged ruling classes appealed to the toilers by concessions promised and given them, nowadays the reformers improve their opportunities while fastening the chains tighter upon the toilers from whose shoulders they rise into power. The present economic despotism must needs have political despotism, and it looks as though "reform" would usher in our political slavery. It would be brutally frank for the capitalist class to deprive us of our political liberties in boldly asserting their intentions. But it can be accomplished more smoothly and more agreeably to all parties concerned by being a little more deft about it. More refinement and taste. The people demand it; children cry for it. None genuine without this label—*reform*.

Let us take Pennsylvania for example. And if our analysis proves to be true of Pennsylvania, if it be scientifically accurate, then it will prove true upon application to conditions elsewhere.

Well then. "Never was a state so corrupt and contented as the banner Republican state! Machine made majorities! Legislatures bought and sold! Bank manipulations! Capital building scandal! Rights of the people overridden by predatory corporations! Etc.! Etc.!! Etc.!!!" So we got reform. And a special session of the legislature to "reform" the election laws. What reform? The proposal of a measure to require every candidate to pay a fee running from \$10 to \$50. (Aping the English.) This measure failed of enactment only because the country members are not quite so big capitalists as their city cousins. Wouldn't it have been *reform* for the working class if last November (1906) it would have had to pay about \$3,000 in fees to place a ticket in the field in Philadelphia alone? Talk about reform! That measure has not become law. But a new registration and a reformed primary law were enacted. Their purpose is to make it easy for an uncompromising party, necessarily the class conscious party of the working class, to cease to exist. How the working class will glory in this achievement for reform when (in the due course of time, give them time) they awaken to their class interests! Will not the workers jump with joy when they learn that any ignorant or knavish voter can enter the primaries, get a Socialist ballot, and proceed to place on the regular election ticket and in the offices of the Socialist Party, too, the unconscious or conscious enemies of Socialism? Will there not be a day of rejoicing? And—which will come home to them a little sooner—will they not simply get intoxicated with delight at the prospect of their boss' knowing what ticket they vote, thanks to the registration and primary laws? O, the joy of reform is unmeasurable! What the reform movement means, then, in addition to permitting capitalist development to proceed (which, for that matter, no man or party can stop) is to make it as difficult as possible for the workers to unite into a party of their own for the purpose of capturing the powers of government to be employed in their class interests having for a goal the overtoppling of capitalist class mastery. Yet, we are often told, that reform is the way to get Socialism. That this is mere hearsay will be manifested when we compare the tactics of the Socialist and reform movements.

While the Socialist does not vote for Debs or Hearst, but votes the straight ticket, whether the election be one for president or surveyor of sewers in Swanee Township, the capitalist political "reformer's" mission is to teach the philosophy of the "split ticket". When Pres. Eliot called the scab the type of American hero, he committed a grievous fault. The man who manifests the highest courage, American spirit of independence, etc., etc., etc., is not the scab. Not that the scab is not all right in his way. But he does not deserve the highest pedestal. Not he.

It is the man who dares throw off all party yoke—and vote the split ticket! Eliot, join the revisionists!

The capitalist press fairly teems with clarion calls to assert our manhood, by splitting our votes. And if, as often happens, the public is uncertain as to this being the necessary course to pursue to be unselfish, public spirited and patriotic, the clarion call to duty is reinforced and directed in the proper channel by statute. In this connection, let us quote the opinion of the right honorable John H. Fow, counsel for the City Commissioners of Philadelphia. Says Johnny Fow:

'Hereafter there will be no nominations on any party ticket of minority number of candidates for a public office, where the voter is confined by law to voting for a limited number.

"Six magistrates are to be elected (in February). Each party, under the primary election law, must necessarily have six candidates, but the electors will only be allowed to vote for four; so, therefore, if a voter should put a vote in his party square and nowhere else on the ballot, he would lose his vote for magistrates altogether."

So there! It may be that man-made laws can be circumvented by man, but that is beside the question. And it may be that the Socialist Party will be equal to the occasion (and here's saying that it will), but that, too, is beside the question. The fact remains that reform aims to hinder labor in expressing its demands in the only way it can properly express them—by voting the *straight* Socialist ticket.

Another phase of the split-ticket racket is the attempt to make the issue one of "good men." So Hughes and Stuart put a quietus to the ambitions of Hearst and Emery because they were "clean, honest men". And while this means the relegating to the rear of the crooked political heeler and must needs come, the peculiarity of it is that clean, honest men are expected to spring from the present system, ever growing more rotten. Really, nature works by paradoxes.

Furthermore, the reform movement being a capitalist class movement cannot help partaking of capitalist class political economy. Only such as are ignorant of Socialist economics or opposed to it, vote the reform ticket. When it came to a show down in the Hearst papers as elsewhere it was the same old cry of Hearst being able to benefit the whole people, of the business men's interests being the same as that of the workers', etc. Where, as in Pennsylvania, the capitalist organs didn't have to be so hypocritical as does Hearst (because the people are more backward), the appeal was almost invariably addressed to the civic pride of the *tax-payers*. The worker was to be benefited indirectly, through the tax-payer, the landlord.

Just a word in regard to the matter of "who pays the taxes".

Of course, we need not recur to the fact that Marx established that wares exchange at about their value, that there is little or no robbery when the worker exchanges his wages for roof, fodder and shoddy; that all exploitation takes place in production when the worker sells his labor power as a commodity; that surplus value is unpaid labor. The worker does not pay the taxes through the landlord; the worker has little interest in the rise or fall of taxes. Let us anticipate a little. Does not the Socialist know that when once the workers secure political power and are able to relieve the labor market, so that wages will not be determined by roof, fodder and shoddy, that one of the most effective, legal and gentlemanly (?) methods of "expropriating the expropriators" would be to tax the capitalist class and tax them well? Then is not Socialist economics opposed to those of reform? Then how can reform be said to be a step along the line of working class victory?

Let us not say that reform movements get the votes of Socialists who "want something now". Let us not say that Hearst steals our "thunder". The votes taken by reform from Milwaukee Social-Democratic opportunism, S. L. P. impossibilism and Socialist party sanity are not Socialist votes. The things that are vital and fundamental with us, the class struggle and the class tactics, remain with us. But only to the extent that the working class learns Socialist philosophy and tactics will it withstand the beating of reform storms and to that extent will the Socialist movement grow.

Should the reform wave continue to rise, should it assume national proportions in 1908, and the two Old Parties having no issue over the tariff, use the cry of "reform" to befuddle the workers into voting to perpetuate capitalism, it may be that the Socialist vote will not rise much above that of 1904. But what if we do not get Socialism in 1908? What if the vote of 1904 be not doubled? What if the calculations of the self-appointed captains of the proletarian army be not realized? It will not be disproving our philosophy; will it? And that's all we need bother about. For one thing is certain: reform is but a part of the capitalist political system. And when the working class are prepared for the social revolution, all the forces of reaction, confusion and reform will not prevail against them.

JOS. E. COHEN.

New Movements Amongst the Jewish Proletariat.

I.

THE newest stream of Jewish immigration, driven to these shores by the waves of the Russian Revolution, and its counterpart, the atrocious massacres of Jews, has brought in its wake an undercurrent of new ideas and ideals which of late has excited the interest of the Jews in their old homes.

As a result the little world in the so-called Ghetto is teeming with new life, new aspirations, new problems and new hopes.

Until recently the intellectual life of the great East Side of New York was absorbed mainly in social questions of a general nature, or, to be more correct, in Socialism.

To be sure no great event of contemporary life escaped the philosophic mind of the East Side, neither did the inhabitants thereof forget their unfortunate brethren at home, but all these were, so to say, secondary questions. The great problem which has moved the heart of the East Side was Socialism. The victories and the defeats of the proletariat in any part of the world were of greater importance to them than the victory of the Japanese at Port Arthur, or any like event.

This has now been changed to a great extent. The general spread of socialist thought throughout Russia, the deathly struggle now raging between the entire Russian people and the despotic regime, and the cowardly outrages perpetrated against the Jews by the "Black Hundreds" organized and supported by the bureaucracy for the purpose of combating the revolution—all these have made their imprint upon the psychology of the Russian Jews and gave impetus to the organization of innumerable parties, the consequence of which is a mosaic of theories and movements which have for their end the establishment of an independent Jewish state on the one hand and the social revolution on the other. With the newest immigration these theories have now been transplanted to our shores and the little Jewish world was beset by a host of new parties of different descriptions and denominations: we have now Zionists and Territorialists, Zionist-Socialists and Socialists-Territorialists, Poalei Zion, (Workingmen-Zionist) Socialist Revolutionary Territorialists, etc. And it goes without saying that each has its own theory,

which is of course the only true one, with its own newspaper and party organization; and it also goes without saying that everlasting discussions, squabbles, quarrels and all sorts of friction is the order of the day.

Upon a close examination we find that these theories and movements, notwithstanding their high-sounding and unpronounceable names, all emanate from, and are very much connected with, the oldfashioned Zionism, are indeed only variations of the same. Our accounts must therefore be settled, first of all, with Zionism proper. And Zionism is as old as the Exile itself. From the day when the Jews lost their independence and were dispersed among the nations—from that day to this they have never ceased to hope for a return to their country, and their hopes for a restoration of their Kingdom have never been abandoned. Various ways have they tried and different means employed towards the realization of that everlasting dream of theirs; they have taken advantage of the political condition of their neighbors in the time of Assur and Babel; they have employed "diplomacy" in the time of Cyrus and later on in the time of Darius under the leadership of Ezra and Nehemiah; they made an attempt at the sword under Bar Kochba, until at last they have given up all hope of ever acquiring the land by their own might, and have instead turned over the whole job to the Almighty Father to send his Messiah disguised as a "Beggar riding a mule", while they themselves, in one way or another, settled in exile for good, at times even comfortably.

But the thought and the hope of a speedy return to his cherished land the Jew has never given up altogether. The oath: "Shall my right hand be forgotten if I shall ever forget you, Jerusalem", which he made on the banks of the rivers of Babylon, he never broke. He now only waited for the Almighty to deliver him with "song". Every day he prayed: "And thou shalt bring me to thy city of Zion with melody", but he seemed to have grown reluctant to lift a finger himself after so many disappointments and defeats. And so he has suffered and waited for almost two thousand years.

In the last twenty years of the past century new life has been blown into the movement of Zionism. Under the stress of the Anti-Jewish riots in Russia in the year 1881, and the special laws enacted against them the following year (which laws were, by the way, the result of rather different origin than hatred to Jews by the Russian people) the "Jewish question" assumed a new aspect. The Jew, perforce, asked himself: What is the cause of this persecution? And he came to the conclusion that he is being persecuted, not because he is a Jew, but because he is a foreigner—a foreigner who nowhere has a country of his

own, and that his suffering, his misery and persecution will cease only with the acquisition of a country.

Expression to this thought was first given by Dr. Pinsker in his "Auto-emancipation". The well-known Hebrew author M. L. Lilienblum followed him up in his little book "On the regeneration of the Jewish people in the holy land of their ancient fathers." The same thought pervades the entire Zionistic movement; the same thought we hear to-day expressed by the Socialist-Territorialist. The Jew must acquire a country which he may call his own. This much is certain! The problem to settle has only been how was this country to be gotten?

The first step in this direction was to discard the "Beggar riding a mule". Century after century have they been waiting for him. In vain! The beggar has not shown up. He was therefore repudiated and rejected, and his place was taken by the "Millionaire riding the mule". The Rothschilds and the Baron Hirsches were to supply the capital, and the poor, down-trodden Russian Jews were to be the beasts of burden. This was the colonization scheme, the outcome of which is well known. The millionaire and the mule did no more good than the "Beggar and the mule", who never appeared.

Meanwhile the Jews emigrated; everyone helped himself as best he knew how; they ran as if from a fire. Hundreds of thousands emigrated, but very few of them went to Palestine. The immense mass of wanderers turned their eyes, not to the East wherefrom wisdom comes, but to the west of Europe and to the north of America, where they expected to find bread and shelter for themselves and their families.

At this juncture Dr. Th. Hertzl appears in the Zionistic firmament with his "new" scheme of "diplomacy", and he was at once hailed as the true Messiah, sent by Providence to redeem the people of Israel from thralldom. He who was so well known in diplomatic circles, who was so beautiful of visage, so noble in character, so majestic in stature, so fascinating in speech and so imposing in manners; he who standeth before Kings; who had been all his life estranged from Jews and Judaism; who had been so rich and so great, and who had renounced all this greatness to help his unfortunate brethren whose country was not his and whose language he could hardly understand—is not the finger of God visible in this? Will he not redeem the children of Israel? And the plan he proposed was, in addition, so plain and so simple that a child could comprehend it: The Jews are persecuted, he reasoned along with others, because they are strangers in all countries; what they need then is a country of their own. But there is a country just suitable for them. Indeed it was once theirs. True enough it is now being held by the Turk, and the Jew has no chance whatever of acquiring it by

force of arms. But there is no necessity for that; why not buy it? This is a world of barter, the Jews are reputed to be rich, the Turk chronically and hopelessly poor, and for a consideration the bargain could be arranged to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned.

How magnificent and how plain!

Why did they suffer so many centuries? Where were their senses all this time? How many sufferings could have been avoided? How many tortures could have been escaped? How many lives could have been saved?

Of course the thing was not so easy of execution. The deal was not to be made with an ordinary democratic merchant but with a great ruler by Divine Grace. Many obstructions would have to be removed, and many more obstacles encountered. But here is just where the "diplomacy" comes in, and Dr. Hertzfel was manifestly destined to great diplomatic affairs. And with all the zeal and energy of a great dreamer he threw himself upon his task. He exhausted all his strength and abilities, he sacrificed his health, his wealth, his very life, for this great dream.

He traveled from country to country, from ministry to ministry, he knocked at the doors of the great and the mighty; received in return recommendations and assurances of aid; he was accepted in special audiences, got promises, negotiated treaties with representatives of great rulers; he urged his plan upon the rich Jew, he reached the Sultan himself. And the Jews the world over have stood with bated breath watching with anxiety the overtures and maneuvering of their great hero, of their new Messiah, in the hope and belief that another while and an end will come to the troubles of the Jews; another while and the eternal wanderer will find a place of repose for his tired limbs, his restless head and his dry bones.

And the result?

The result is known. It turned out that all this tireless activity was based on the assumption that the Sultan could be persuaded or fooled into playing the role of the traditional "mule" in the Messiah legend. But the unspeakable Turk prudently but thankfully declined the honor. He received the doctor civilly, spoke to him in flattering terms about the Jews, professed his great friendship, even love, for them, but further he did not venture—not one step.

Dr. Hertzfel had been aware of the collapse of his scheme before anybody else, but there was no retreat, he reached a point wherefrom he could neither advance nor turn backwards, and he had to live through the tragedy which had befallen so many great dreamers before him.

To be practical is characteristic of all great Utopians. They

are never discouraged; they never despair at disappointments and are never short of practical schemes. No sooner does one plan fail (because of the shortsightedness and wickedness of the people, of course) than another plan, a better and more practical one is at hand.

Dr. Hertzels was such an Utopian, and although, as is well known, he did not long survive his great disappointment, he did not surrender at once and without another trial. As soon as he convinced himself of the utter impossibility of ever realizing his ambitions with regard to Palestine, he at once hatched another, more "practical" plan. And in this new position his reasoning seemed to be as rational and as easy of execution as in the first instance. It is not Palestine that the Jews are in need of, he claimed. It is a country of their own that they most need. What matters it in what part of the world they will be located? He would, of course, prefer Palestine, but as long as Palestine is not in the market, he would, like a good, practical merchant, take the next best thing. And at the Sixth Zionist Congress at Basel he sprung the Uganda plan, which was accepted by his followers after a great uproar as a "temporary home for the Jews."

Uganda turned out to be undesirable. In the meantime Dr. Hertzels died, but his new idea took root and blossomed and grew up to a new movement.

From Uganda to any other territory is but a short step, and this step was made the following year under the lead of Israel Zangwill. The idea of Territorialism came into being. Of course not all the Zionists were ready to renounce the land of "their ancient fathers", but those that did go along were sufficient in number to almost disrupt the Zionist movement.

This short sketch of the history of the "new" Zionism will suffice to show that Territorialism is not a new invention; it is only a further development of the old, very old, Zionist movement. It therefore inherited all the maladies and weaknesses of its progenitor—Zionism.

II.

It is not within the province of this short work to point out all the shortcomings of political Zionism. Besides, the subject has been thrashed out so many times that there is hardly any new word to be said about it. At best I can only repeat some of the objections that are being made against it, and this I shall do here only to the extent absolutely necessary to the understanding of our discussion.

Zionism, or rather, Zionists, though starting from a common point—the persecution of the Jews, and reaching the same conclusion—the necessity of establishing an independent Jewish state,

are nevertheless divided and subdivided among themselves as to the reason and ultimate aims of their movements. We shall here touch upon the two main divisions only, namely, the "Materialistic" and the "Idealistic".

Materialist Zionism deals mainly with the economic conditions and necessities of the Jews, while the Idealists take for their text the spiritual side of the Jew—the Jew not as an individual but as a nation. The one seeks to acquire the holy land for the purpose of improving the economic condition of the Jews as a nation, while the other refuses to consider this side of the question, claiming that with regard to the question of bread and butter the Jew can work out his salvation in exile. What he most needs, they maintain, is an "intellectual center" where he would be enabled to develop his national genius, to preserve the national "self" which each nation possesses and has a right to preserve. The author of this latter Zionism is Asher Ginsburg, better known as Akhad Haam.

Both these factions, as can be seen, are one as to the cardinal point, namely, that the Jews are a separate nation; that neither their sojourn in so many different countries, among so many different peoples for almost twenty centuries, nor the various political institutions, nor the degree of civilization of those countries and peoples, has in the least affected or impaired their character as a nation; that they are being persecuted just because of this peculiarity of theirs; that they have, nevertheless, suffered greatly in their economic development, according to the one, and in their intellectual progress, according to the other.

The materialist Zionists have in a great measure already received an answer from life itself. They found, to their great discomfiture, that Palestine is not to be had, and, on the other hand, that the Jews would not go there if it were to be had. Out of the one and a half million souls that have shaken off the dust of their native land for the last twenty years, only a very small portion migrated to the "Yiddish" land, a goodly portion of which have since left it in disgust. And this in spite of the financial aid they received out of the Rothschild funds. Moreover, this immense mass of emigration has not in the least diminished the Jewish population in Russia. This fact alone should have sufficed to convince the Zionists of the futility of their efforts. It should have proven to them that the Jewish problem is not to be solved by emigration; that a whole nation can not, will not, emigrate on account of an imaginary prosperity in a semi-barbarous land where their forefathers of two thousand years ago lived, or out of devotion to ideals, no matter how sublime they may be; that it is rather the immediate necessities, and, to a certain extent, political oppression, that will put the wandering stick in the hands of a great number, and that, consequently, the

place of destination would be decided upon by the chances it offers to new comers to win bread and shelter.

This fact alone, I repeat, should have been sufficient to show the Zionists the impossibility of their scheme. Unfortunately such "minor" considerations do not enter the mind of Zionists. Cause and effect seem to have no meaning for them. They reckon little with the cold facts of life, and they listen only to the voice of their mind and desires—the result is, therefore, usually disastrous to them.

But when the facts become so obvious that even the blind can see them, they take refuge in reasoning somewhat like this:

"We know perfectly well," they say, "that all the Jews can not emigrate; it is in fact not at all desirable they should. It is not desirable, for instance, nor necessary, for the Jews of England, France or North America to emigrate. The Zionist movement is mainly for the benefit of the Russian and Roumanian Jews, and even from those countries it is not necessary they should all emigrate. What we are after is a center, a home, somewhere, for a portion of the nation. There are many foreigners to-day living in Russia without being molested because they have somewhere a fatherland with a government to protect them. So would the persecution of the Jews cease if they had a country somewhere."

In an article entitled "Zionism or Socialism" in Number 6 of the "Jewish Worker", Ben Ahud brings out some remarks which are worth while reproducing here. After having shown that Zionism is a dream at best; after having shown that the whole of Palestine is neither sufficiently large in area to hold, nor does it possess the fertility of soil to support, a population of ten millions; that, in addition, the Jews could not prevent non-Jews from immigrating to their country, were it ever sufficiently developed industrially to invite foreign immigration; after having pointed out that it would take at least fifty years for two or three millions of Jews to emigrate to the new land, in which time the depletion would be made good by new births—after having shown this, Ben Ahud continues:

"It is true some of the Zionists think that so soon as the Jews will have established their own government, even the smallest, the other nations would refrain from persecuting those that will have remained in exile, because they would all know that there is a Jewish state which would protect its children, that there is a nation which would fight for their brothers. How puerile! It is only to laugh at such expectation. The great majority of the Jews will have remained with such great naval powers as Russia, Germany, Austria, France, England and the United States of America, and these first class naval powers shiver in their boots at the sight of the Lilliputian "Yiddish

Land". They would be frightened to death at the news that the representatives of the "Yiddish Land" in Congress assembled have adopted a resolution protesting against Russia for the expulsion of the Jews from Moskow; against Austria for mistreating the Jews in Galicia; against Germany for not admitting Jewish girls to the profession of teachers; against France for the massacres of Jews in Algiers, etc. Did Russia shrink from oppressing Germans in the Baltic provinces in the face of Germany with its large and modernly equipped army, with its great influence in European politics? Would this same Russia treat its Jews with more consideration because somewhere in Asia existed a little Jewish country under the suzerainty of the Turkish Sultan?"

"It can thus be seen that the plan of Dr. Hertzl, should it ever be realized, could not in any way ameliorate the sufferings of the Jews."

"A good portion of the Jewish bourgeoisie would make capital out of the scheme; a small portion of the Jewish workingmen would get a chance to sell their labor power, as they do everywhere. This is at best the sum total of the whole Zionistic movement. And with such empty, worthless dreams they try to avert the thoughts of the Jews from their real needs at home!"

So far Ben Ahud as to the argument of the materialist Zionist about a Jewish center to infuse respect for the Jews in exile.

Not much better showing can the argument of an intellectual center make for the "idealist" Zionist, those who try to save the souls of the Jews.

This twin brother of the "materialist" commits the same error, but in a different way. The "materialists" who speak of the economic backwardness forget the economic surroundings of the Jews, and the economic impossibility of their scheme. The "idealist" again, trying to save the Jewish "spirit", forgets to consider the nature of this spirit. They talk much of the Jewish genius, of the intellectual culture, and they forget that the Jewish "spirit" is not "Jewish" at all; that if the intellectual side of a nation can be developed, modified or mutilated under specific social and economic environments—and there can be no doubt about that—then the Jewish nation has undergone such an evolution for almost two thousand years under exceptional circumstances, and that the results of this evolution cannot be erased because a million or even two million people will emigrate to a semi-barbarous country which once upon a time belonged to their ancestors. This point is very often omitted by our newly baked nationalist.

The truth of the matter is that we can speak of a Jewish nation in a spiritual sense only, because in the sense of a political or social unit the Jews are surely no nation. But this intellect,

this spirit, manifested in a special Jewish form (if there be such a thing) is the product, not of the Jewish land, but of the exile, nay, it is because of it! What forms the Jewish culture would have assumed had they lived on their own soil all this time, what shape it would assume should it again settle independently on its land, or any other newly acquired territory is a matter of conjecture. The Jew of to-day is the Jew of the diaspora. His culture, his civilization, his "spirit", is therefore not Jewish, but western. It is therefore pure nonsense to speak of a Jewish "spirit" that can thrive on the soil of Palestine only. Furthermore, there are many arguments in support of the theory that the Jewish nation, such as it is, is a "nation" in exile only. There are probabilities that the Jews would not have retained their religion and the purity of the race, a thing the Zionist puts much stock in, had they remained in their land. No ruling nation preserved its purity in the same degree as the Jews. The ruling nations usually assimilate with others, either through conquest or immigration. The Jews in their own land were not exempt from such influences. Their language they had lost long before their independence, so much did they mix with the heathen by intermarriage, their very religion was much neglected.

The exile alone united them; in exile the form of their religion developed and crystallized; in exile they stopped intermarriages. The exile then developed the peculiarities of Judaism. If we are therefore to speak of a Jewish nation as an intellectual unity we cannot separate it from the exile spirit. It is utterly incomprehensible how this evolution of twenty centuries can be done away with.

Add to this that the Zionists of all shades admit that the great majority of the Jews will remain where they are at present and the whole proposition of an "intellectual center" becomes ridiculous. A million, at the best two millions, of the poorest and humblest Jews will emigrate to a semi-savage country. At the best it will take tens or even hundreds of years until they will be able to procure a decent livelihood by tilling the soil and doing all kind of manual labor. And this handful of Jews somewhere in Asia or Africa is to become the intellectual and spiritual guides of the ten or more millions that remained under the intellectual influence of European and American civilization, with its famous universities and libraries, museums and laboratories, literature and theatres; with its highly developed art and technic, with its newspapers, etc. Is this not puerile? Is this not ridiculous? Jerusalem in intellectual competition with Paris, London, New York, or even Warsaw. Uganda, or another wilderness somewhere in Africa to compete with Heidelberg, Oxford, Yale or Columbia as teachers. Jaffa racing with the British Museum, or the Paris, or even the New York Library.

It is only to laugh!

Turn Zionism or Territorialism as you may, the whole thing is ridiculous.

But the worst was yet to come.

Before Zionism had time to stand firmly on its feet, before it was able to make the first step, it was already clear to every observer that besides its external deformities it is subject to an incurable, chronic, internal sickness.

At the time when Zionism made its great efforts social life in Russia took its usual course. Industry, with the aid of foreign capital, had been greatly developed, and along with it grew the proletariat and its class consciousness.

The Revolutionary movement progressed immensely, and the Jew did not only not keep aloof from it, he, on the contrary, was found in the front line, and these circumstances helped to tear asunder the Zionist movement. The proletarian Zionist opened his eyes; the working man and his exploiter met face to face and the sweet dream of a united nation was at once scattered to the winds. The united and undivided Jewish "nation" was divided into two hostile camps.

The proletarian Zionists did not, however, awake altogether; they only awoke for a minute, turned on the other side and began to dream again.

Would they dream quietly to themselves we could leave them alone. The trouble with them is that they speak out in their dreams and produce much noise.

We must, therefore, disturb them from their pleasant dream.

JACOB MILCH.

(To be continued).

The Military Power.

WANTED, able bodied men of good character between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-five for the United States Military and Naval Service."

In almost every city in the United States one may see upon the bill-boards and hanging upon the walls of government buildings and railway depots posters containing the above notice accompanied by pictures of soldiers and officers in gaudy uniforms. The recruiting bureaus of the army and Navy Departments are squandering enormous sums of money yearly on poster advertising for the purpose of attracting young men to the military service. But let it be said to the credit of the young men of America that the great majority of them prefer to work for their living rather than enter the Regular Army or Navy. It is a fact that, except in time of war, almost all of the young men who apply for enlistment in the military service are either out of jobs or on account of some misfortune are driven to seek shelter or oblivion in the ranks.

I am satisfied that the propaganda of Socialism has not yet secured a footing among the men in the American military service but the conduct of our government makes me feel that it is absolutely necessary that the task be undertaken at once. In the past year or two orders have been issued in every garrison situated near the large cities and centers of industry that the troops be drilled especially for the purpose of controlling conditions in the streets of the cities. Plats have been drawn of every city, the boards of strategy have perfected new tactics, and the soldiers have been drilled with particular regard to conditions in the great factory, shop, and business districts. This means that the capitalists who are in control of our government are looking to their future welfare. They realize that the agitation of Socialism in America is taking root in the minds of the working people. They realize the accuracy of Mark Hanna's prophecy that the next great political battle will be between the Republican Party representing the capitalist class and the Socialist Party representing the working class.

I delight in repeating to my fellow workingmen a comment which I heard Comrade Eugene V. Debs make in one of his speeches with regard to the military and Old Glory. He said: "You workingmen who have jobs today and are satisfied will shout yourselves hoarse if some one waves Old Glory in your face; but if you go out on strike tomorrow to better your condition you will find Old Glory floating over the troops lined up

to shoot you down like dogs." Comrade Debs has so well expressed in his speeches and pamphlets the opinion of Socialists with regard to the military question that it seems almost a waste of time for any one else to discuss it, and yet I undertake to do it hoping to more thoroughly impress upon the minds of revolutionary workers and thinkers the importance of understanding this mighty force of ruling class power.

At the age of sixteen I enlisted in the United States Army, Co. D, 2d Infantry, and in July and August 1894, marched up and down the tracks of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company at Butte, Montana, ready at any moment to send a forty-five caliber bullet crashing into the breast of any workingman who should dare to trespass upon the private property of that great corporation. I need not discuss the grievances which impelled the employees of the road to go out on strike, neither is it necessary to discuss the right or purpose of the government in sending the troops to Chicago, Butte, and other cities to protect the property of the railroads as was done in 1894. But what I do wish to consider is the American soldier, his occupation, and his relation to society in general.

The regiment to which I belonged was stationed at Fort Omaha, Nebraska. On May 1st, one month after my enlistment, we were ordered to prepare our field equipment for inspection. The next morning at sunrise the "general call" sounded and fifteen minutes later we fell into line in heavy marching order. A few minutes sufficed for the inspection and then, led by the martial airs of the famous Second Infantry Band, we marched out of the garrison en route to Fort Crook about sixteen miles south of Omaha. Shortly after noon we halted and pitched camp at Bellevue Rifle Range and at once began the annual season of target practice.

Every soldier in the United States Army fires four thousand rounds of ammunition at target practice each year. The greater part of the practice is in firing at figures shaped like men in the positions of standing erect, kneeling, and lying prone. The firing is in skirmish line formation and begins at eight hundred yards distance, the line advancing from point to point in double time. As the skirmishers arrive upon the firing line the bugle sounds "halt" — "commence firing." At the first note of the bugle the soldiers halt and lie down to shoot. But thirty seconds are allowed in which to load and fire each range and many of the soldiers become so expert that they can fire sixteen shots in the thirty seconds and hit the target with every shot. The new recruit often hesitates before firing at these figures which so much resemble men in the distance but as they see the enthusiasm of the others all along the line they soon smother the qualm of conscience and enter into the spirit of murder. Bullseye targets are

also used and are marked after each shot showing where the bullet hit, and thus with constant practice at aiming and firing and the spur of competition for the prizes and medals which are given many soldiers develop considerable skill at marksmanship.

At the end of the month with target practice finished we marched back to the barracks and the regular routine of garrison duty which consisted of daily drill and parade, and guard duty and fatigue (fatigue means labor) about once a fortnight. The soldier, generally, performs no productive labor, his occupation is to destroy. He is a parasite and is maintained as such and educated and encouraged in the art of destruction for the purpose of defending and supporting the parasites who control the wealth and political power of a nation. The soldier is subjected to the strictest discipline by his (so-called) superior officers (men who are made gentlemen by an act of Congress). Under penalty of arrest and severe punishment the soldier must obey every command of an officer and on the approach of one he must salute as a mark of respect for his superior. I have been an orphan practically all my life and having grown up free from the restraint of parents and void of respect for my natural (?) superiors; the democratic spirit within me rebelled when I found myself bound to respect and salute drunken beasts who had been made officers and gentlemen by the above mentioned "Act of Congress."

My captain, Wm. J. Turner, was a man of fifty some years, a short bow-legged insignificant looking fellow, but a man of good sense and good heart. He had risen from the rank of a private soldier to that of a commissioned officer and quite contrary to the rule in such cases he was very kind to the men in his company. He was fond of me and interested himself greatly in my welfare. I overstepped some army rule or regulation almost every day and while a single breach of these rules generally meant confinement in the guard-house, the captain forgave me every time and let me off with a reprimand. One day I asked him why a soldier should always salute an officer even when he felt and knew that he was in every way superior to the officer. He tugged away at his pipe for a minute and then with a self-satisfied smile replied, "My boy, you don't salute the officer, you salute his uniform." And that quaint but truthful reply of my honest old captain was often a source of consolation to me when in going about the garrison I was compelled to raise my hand to my cap as a mark of respect for some brute whom I would have loathed to touch.

The routine of garrison life tends to make a soldier lazy and, of course, lazy people do not like to work. The ranks of the army are recruited from the working class, men who in private life must work eight hours or more each day to make a liv-

ing. The soldier works only one day in two weeks and this is the thing that makes army life attractive to those who enter and remain in it. The soldier gets \$13.50 per month and his board and clothes and the right to be lazy as compensation for his betrayal of the class to which he belongs. Without the ever ready support of the United States Army the ranks of which are made up of workingmen, the capitalist class of this country could not keep the great masses of workers enslaved as they are today. Like the regular army, the militia of the several states is made up of workingmen, but they are of a different stamp. It is mostly clerks and book-keepers, office employees who join the militia, and they are generally the worst enemies of the working class. Most of them have had some educational advantages and with hardly an exception they expect to become business men themselves. They are not at all "class conscious." They are snobbish and patronizing as is proven by the fact that the rich men who join the militia companies are always elected to be officers. The police and detective forces are also made up of workingmen, although they are quite unworthy of such classification. The army, the militia, and the police, these are the bulwark of capitalism and without them our modern capitalist exploiters would soon pass out of existence and labor would be supreme.

The question which now arises in the mind of the active Socialist is, How may we reach "the man behind the gun" with our propaganda so as to win him to the revolutionary cause of the world's workers?

In the case of police and detectives our efforts would be entirely wasted for they are a highly developed specialized type of "petty grafter," man-hunters who have become gluttonous with their power and who live only by accentuating the miseries of the legally disinherited producers of the world's wealth. The clerks and book-keepers who compose the rank and file of the militia companies ought to be good material to work upon and it seems to me that wonders might be accomplished if a campaign of education were carefully planned and carried out. But the "regular" is the man we want and he is the man who will tax all our energies and resources in the effort we put forth to win him. He is looked upon by all classes of society as an outcast, the scum of the earth, yet held in fear and awe. This condition has been accomplished by the designs of the ruling class for a purpose easily understood, namely, that the soldier may be made to feel keenly the odium of his position and become resentful against the public generally. This fact together with the training which he receives in the business of murder, accounts for the the relation which the soldier bears to his fellows in civilian life. It accounts for the fact that I (and how I have loathed myself for it) and my soldier comrades in 1894 could calmly patrol the tracks of the

Northern Pacific Railroad Company, rifle in hand, awaiting the signal to send to eternity the soul of a fellow workingman who might be an entire stranger and whose only crime might be that by word or look he had dared to protest against the hellishness of capitalist misrule.

In Russia the revolutionary propaganda has so completely permeated the regiments of the czar's army that we have lately seen whole regiments hoist the flag of revolt and refuse to obey the commands of the autocrat. We know that the German Army is so thoroughly "class conscious" and in sympathy with the great working class movement that when Kaiser "Billy" was clamoring for war with France a few months ago he was given to understand that the German workingmen had no quarrel with their brother workers across the border and the war clouds were wafted away on the breezy atmosphere of diplomatic statesmanship. In Belgium the government is confronted with a situation which to us is indeed laughable. If regiments are drawn from the Flemish provinces for duty in the cities it quickly develops that they are but a source of propaganda for Socialism and if regiments are drawn from the Walloon provinces they become immediately the willing prey of our propagandists. But in America, "the land of the free, the home of the brave," the land where capitalism and wage slavery are in their most highly developed state, the military powers are absolutely at the beck and call of the capitalist exploiters. I think that I would be quite safe in saying that there is not a regiment, or company, or squad, in the whole United States military service, with the possible exception of one regiment, I. N. G., formerly the Clan-na-Gael Guards, an Irish patriotic organization, that could not be depended upon to carry out any order issued by the powers that be in the event of trouble either external or internal.

Therefore I am of the opinion that it is high time that the revolutionary workers in America begin to consider ways and means for the education of our soldiers. Every garrison in the United States has a library the shelves of which are heavy with books, some worthless fiction but mostly histories recounting the deeds of soldiers and heroes. Every soldier can read and many of them do read a great deal. If we can devise a means of circulating among them the revolutionary literature of the proletariat, I believe that we can reach many of them and eventually win them to the cause of freedom. I believe that we can convince them that they are a part of earth's disinherited and that they are occupying a position that is traitorous to their class interest simply because they have been the victims of capitalist and ruling class trickery and treachery. The soldiers are not murderers at heart and in their associations with one another they come but little short of the best moral codes. But the education

and the economic environment of the man while he is a soldier are the forces which impel him to his dastardly work. His qualms of conscience are allayed by the legality of his actions just as the owner of a factory sees no injustice in the fact that he grinds human lives and human happiness into profits through legal channels. The government maintains an Army Chaplain in every garrison just as the capitalists in civil life maintain churches and ministers in every city and town to befool and mislead the workers. But the greatest crimes of the ages have been committed in the name of Jesus, the lowly sorrowful Nazarene who gave up his life in martyrdom to the cause of the working class.

Karl Marx says in the "Communist Manifesto," "The emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself." I would like to add that the emancipation of the working class will be accomplished only when the workers have been thoroughly educated in their class position, class interest, and in the possibilities of a "class conscious" political organization of the proletariat. The regular soldier belongs to the proletariat and too long we have neglected him in our propaganda work here in America. I have now nearly developed a plan to reach the soldiers in our army and feel assured that with the hearty co-operation of a goodly number of enthusiastic American comrades, we will be able to do with the American soldier what our comrades in Russia, Germany, Belgium, and other European countries have done with their respective armies. Comrades, if you realize the importance of this undertaking and feel yourself interested enough to take part in it, kindly let me hear from you with any suggestions you may have to offer.

MAURICE E. ELDRIDGE.

Address care INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, *Chicago, Ill.*

EDITORIAL

The Recent Elections.

As soon as an election is over with all the socialist editors prepare to draw morals from the result. These editorial sermons are as inevitable as the elections, and we should feel that our duty had been neglected did we not come up to popular expectations in that line.

The one general lesson which is writ so plain in the election which has just taken place is the need of better organization and a wider distribution of literature. If any socialist has not taken this lesson home to himself before this time we hope that he will at once do so.

Wherever the party organization was strong and the movement composed of reading, thinking socialists there was little or no falling off, even though the reform storm beat ever so heavily.

Wisconsin offers the best example of this, and whatever criticism may have been showered upon the head of the Wisconsin comrades, many of which were undoubtedly well deserved, it must be recognized that they "delivered the goods" at the last election.

The Rocky Mountain States would seem to make an exception to the rule that the greatest growth was where the best organization is found. This exception however is easily accounted for the strenuous efforts at agitation and the great amount of literature circulated, and most of all to the fierce class struggle that is being waged there.

Hearstism has shown strength enough to warrant the belief that we may expect about six more years of the yellow peril before it will have run its course. During all this time Hearst can only live as he skates closer and closer to Socialism, and he has been skating on such thin ice for sometime that he is liable to break through at any time and find that his following has followed where he did not dare to lead—if our readers will excuse the bull.

This phenomenon need not worry the socialists. If it is necessary to give a majority of the population a dose of Hearst physic before they can digest the solid meat of socialism, then let us get the treatment over with as quick as possible.

The size of the vote is not at the present time so essential as the progress of education, and certainly this is moving on at a most amazing rate.

* * *

Roosevelt's Message.

For the first time in the history of this country a president devotes the larger portion of this message to a consideration of the problems of the struggle between capitalists and laborers. For the first time also a president's message makes an attack on socialism. There are none of the readers of the Review so blind as to need to have the significance of these two facts pointed out.

Every socialist knows that this means that industrial events are as always, making the issues which politicians must follow, regret it as they may.

The message may be summed up on this point as saying to the masters "Be good"; to the workers, "Be patient." That this will solve the present labor problem any more than the same advice has solved similar problems at any time in history is unthinkable.

Somewhat in detail the message says:

1. If the capitalist is not good we will hold the threat of an income and inheritance tax over him, and the threat of "regulation."
2. To the worker we will promise indefinite eight hour legislation, and give the postal clerks twelve hours under the existing eight hour law.
3. We will encourage Japanese immigration to hold wages and trade unions in hand, and preach a rabid jingo patriotism to keep American laborers from thinking.

This is the program that is expected to hold back the socialist flood.

* * *

We publish in this issue an interesting study of the Italian Socialist movement. The publication of this article however does not by any means indicate that the editor endorses the extreme syndicalist position there set forth. We are very glad, however, to secure so good a statement of this position, in order that our readers may know something of the phase of the labor movement which is undoubtedly growing steadily and rapidly in Europe.

We desire also to call attention to the article by Comrade Hunter in this number, and to announce that this is the first of several that he has promised to send for publication in the International Socialist Review. His next one will treat of the Italian Socialist Congress and will probably present this gathering from quite another point of view than Comrade Por. Arrangements are also being made for a number of articles from other comrades at home and abroad that will make the Review far better for the coming year than ever before.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

ENGLAND.

The House of Lords has now come in contact with something that is apt to prove the finish of that bulwark of obstruction. For about a century even capitalism has recognized that the English upper house was an anachronism, yet neither Liberal nor Conservative ministries have dared to do more than mildly scold at it, save on one or two occasions when the expedient of increasing the number of peers (packing the House) has been resorted to as a means of securing the passage of some particular piece of legislation. But a new force has come into English politics. With the entrance of the Labor and Socialist members into Parliament there came a force that has no respect for tradition, no love for privilege, no matter how old and "respectable," that is bound with no alliances, and that brooks no opposition without resistance. So it is that the cry of "abolish the House of Lords," which had practically disappeared five years ago is now being again raised, and this time in a tone of voice that means business.

JAPAN.

The editor of the Hikari has been declared not guilty in the prosecution for violation of the press law.

The Japanese comrades are arranging to start a daily socialist paper. They except to issue the first number on the 15th of next January.

FRANCE

Although the Socialist Party has disavowed the entrance of Viviani into the French Parliament, yet he would seem to be standing as clearly for the socialist position as a man can, occupying his place. His introductory speech has been especially commented upon favorably by the socialist papers of France and Germany. In it he stated his position as a socialist and declared his adherence to the socialist philosophy.

The French Socialist Congress at Limoges will be treated at further length in our columns by a correspondent who was on the ground. There were over three hundred delegates present, who reported that the membership had increased from 40,000 to 54,000. The organic unity of the party has developed, until now all possibility of division seems to have passed. Local groups have amalgamated in most places. The report of the electoral commission stated that the party had 346 candidates in the 540 electoral districts.

Thirty-one candidates were elected on the first ballot and twenty-one on the second.

HOLLAND.

The Dutch socialists seem to be in the midst of a struggle between the Marxists and Revisionists, through which every country seems doomed to go at some stage of its existence. Each faction has its organ and the discussion is going on with all the fierceness characteristic of socialist disagreements everywhere.

GERMANY.

The school which was established by the German socialist party for the education of agitators has been in operation since the 15th of November. A considerable number of students are in attendance and the results promise good for the future work of the German party.

The capitalist paper, *Das Reich*, of Berlin, moans over the fact that Germany has the highest percentage of socialist legislators of any country in Europe, with the exception of Denmark. It concludes its comment as follows:

"The situation is certainly dark enough, but there is one ray of light which promises hope and improvement. This is to be found in the Christian and national labor movement, and only in it." Those who have watched the progress of these unions have seen that they either disappeared before the growing social democratic unions, or when they have grown to great numbers have affiliated with the socialist party. Thus there is very little hope in this "ray of light."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The American Federation of Labor has once more met and adjourned, and the world is moving along just as if some three hundred odd delegates had never journeyed up into Minneapolis and spent several weeks' time and a barrel of money in going through the same old performance that stamped this year's gathering several degrees below the mediocrity of its predecessors. Judged from a purely news standpoint, the mass of American people were utterly oblivious of the fact that the convention was in session. The bare announcement was made in the dispatches, along about the 12th of last month, that the convention had begun, and on the 24th it was stated that Gompers had been re-elected president. Little other information came through the daily press, except that a number of speeches had been made by various persons and that the political policy of rewarding our enemies and punishing our friends would be continued. From the official proceedings it appears that the same old resolutions were introduced, discussed in a spiritless manner, adopted or defeated, as the case may be, and that ended the matter for another twelve months. The officers' reports show that slight progress was made in the gain of membership, and the wage increases surely did not keep pace with the rising prices of necessities of life. The one gratifying feature of the industrial movement during the past year was the earnest effort made to reduce the hours of labor in some of the trades. There is some hope of genuine betterment in this direction, whereas in the matter of increasing wages the Federation, taken as a whole, is rather on the defensive than the aggressive. The trusts and combines keep pounding up prices while many of the organizations are at a complete standstill and actually coddle themselves with the thought that they are happily conservative. It looks as though some of the unions have been cowed into submission by centralized capital and its satellites, the open shop brigade. But while the union people are somewhat better off than the unorganized workers, who usually accept, in a spirit of weakness and humility, whatever is handed to them by the master class, still organized labor would build a much more powerful influence if it could forever put an end to its jurisdiction quarrels, concentrate its forces, and take a firm, uncompromising position on the wage question — if, in a word, it would be true to its own obligation promulgated in the Federation ritual. Instead of affirming and reaffirming its opposition to the wage system, the conservatives regard that system as a sacred institution, and if you as much as propose any plan attacking the wage system in the slightest degree the fossils and ignoramuses start to holler "Socialist!" as though that would put the quites to all oppositions and make the master class secure for all time.

Those in control of the A. F. of L. have no desire to emancipate the working class. The Minneapolis convention and all the gatherings of the past prove that fact. Gompers and his followers have their faces set sternly against every form of radicalism. They have a mortal dread that the capitalist class will take offense if a clear-cut declaration is made, and, therefore, beyond talking vaguely about "labor's rights," etc., no unequivocal statement can be wrung from them. So long as jurisdiction squabbles are the principal issue there can be no harmony and that solidarity essential to success. Hence Gompers and his clique, in upholding the vicious principles of craft antonomy and all the wrangling and hair-splitting that it entails, have been working along a definite program to prevent the realization of a homogeneous industrial organization that would ensure unity of action on the industrial field and pave the way for a distinct, definite political movement. Spurred by the clamor for some sort of a demonstration at the ballot-box, the conservatives have grudgingly thrown out a sop of pretending to punish and reward capitalistic politicians. The latter may vote in the legislative bodies for every piece of any devilry that their corporation masters may dictate, but as long as they stand for the Gompers bills, which, even if enacted into law, would have no more effect upon the system than a flea bite on an elephant, they can expect a certificate of good character. So we are to have another year of "independent" politics, during which period Mr. Gompers will pick out the "good" men and the "bad" men, and he will take almighty good care that the Socialists are classified with the latter. It is doubtful, however, whether the great bulk of the membership will pay any attention to such political tomfoolery— at least no more than they did in this year's campaign. The average trade unionist is a Republican, Democrat, Socialist or other partisan, and he doesn't change his coat every couple of days to please Gompers. The fight will be continued along partisan lines, and the Socialists, now that the bars are down, should lose no opportunity to proselyte among the working people irrespective of the wishes of the conservatives. The future belongs to the Socialists despite all obstacles.

The election of last month showed a distinct upward tendency in the Socialist vote despite the injection of so-called radical movements into the campaign for the purpose of capturing the dissatisfied elements that had absorbed more or less socialistic ideas, and in spite of the fact that glooming promises of certain victory were held out as well as immediate reform and relief the day after election. In but few States did the Socialist vote decrease, and it is quite probable that when the official counts are all announced it will be found that the half million mark has been reached and passed. It has been noticeable nearly everywhere that the Socialist vote was more solid and uniformly cast for all candidates this year than ever before. There was very little scratching and complimentary voting. Those converts who came in in 1904 and last year have become pretty well assimilated and have rid themselves of the notion that they ought to vote for some "good man" on this or that ticket to defeat some "bad man" on another ticket and to display their "independence" generally. In proportion as the socialist sentiment increases such radical gentlemen as Hearst, Bryan, Johnson, LaFollette, Moran and others can be expected to make a loud noise to attract the people who become dissatisfied with the reactionary policies of the old parties, but in like proportion these same reformers will also become less dangerous. There are thousands—yes, tens of thousands—of citizens who are almost in entire accord with the Socialist movement, but they have an uncontrollable desire to be on the winning side and

get something now, even if it is only 3-cent street railway fare or a little cheaper ice perhaps. Of course they are not sufficiently drilled in the principles of socialism to appreciate their fallacious position, and for that reason the Socialist party workers, after a brief breathing spell, must redouble their efforts to strengthen their movement.

Organization is the key to the situation. The locals and branches must be made larger and stronger, and the real effective work, the work that counts, must be done through those bodies. I have about come to the conclusion, after making first-hand studies of the situation in various places, that we have a superabundance of speakers and lecturers and too few organizers. Any number of orators go from place to place, speak their little piece (sometimes sense and sometimes nonsense), are given the glad hand, and yet when the vote is counted the results obtained don't seem to have warranted the expense and trouble. On the other hand suppose the same effort had been expended in circulating literature among those who displayed some interest in socialism, and then followed up the move by sending around an organizer for a week or so to have heart-to-heart talks and secure their applications for the local if possible, would not that be a substantial gain? Speakers are necessary, to be sure. But there are times when a plain organizer, who doesn't profess to be able to make speeches, is worth a whole houseful of orators.

There is no question, for example, but that Milwaukee has a fine, solid movement that any city might be proud of. True, the pioneers of Milwaukee have been in the harness a good many years, some of them in the old country. Yet that is all the more reason why they deserve the highest credit and also why their perseverance and persistence should be emulated. There are but few speakers in Milwaukee, but they have lately developed some good local organizers and a corps of workers who know how to and do hustle. According to the papers, the Socialists of Milwaukee achieved their splendid results recently "chiefly by the distribution of Socialist literature." Three tons of newspapers, besides leaflets by the bushel, were distributed every week from house to house. Some 300 volunteers covered the city every Sunday morning, and in a few hours, because of organization, the work was done. In the Ninth Congressional district of New York the same systematic methods were pursued. While there was no organization to speak of in the district six weeks before election, yet by aggressive work scores of volunteers were enlisted, blocks were marked off, canvassed, polled, and flooded with literature, and it required the combined efforts of the Tammany and Republican machines to prevent the district from going Socialist. Such efforts are bound to be crowned with success before long. It is the steady, persistent pounding at the battlements of the enemy that must win sooner or later.

Those who read themselves into socialism usually stick, while only too frequently speeches go in one ear and come out through the other. Wherever a local or ward or precinct branch exists the comrades, even though they number but half a dozen, ought to map out a plan of action to make a thorough canvass of a given section of territory on average of once a week to distribute newspapers and leaflets and get in touch with sympathizers. Such methods will gradually increase the membership and make it possible to expand the work of the organization and strengthen the movement generally. The party press and the publishing houses, which produce the ammunition, ought to be liberally patronized. Education is the need of the hour. Liter-

ature is dirt cheap and people are hungering to read books, papers, leaflets, etc., today where five years ago they would have thrown them into the stove. The trusts and their politicians have been giving the public so many "object lessons" recently that a wave of dissatisfaction is sweeping over the country with which nothing similar in the past can be compared. It is up to the Socialists to take advantage of this condition and do all in their power to encourage the growing political revolt against capitalism and its rotaries, and the result will be an early victory for our cause. Distribute literature — sow it knee deep!

BOOK REVIEWS

The Romance of John Bainbridge, by Henry George, Jr. The Macmillan Company, Cloth, 468 pages, \$1.50.

John Bainbridge is a young lawyer in New York City who starts out as a municipal reformer. He does a favor to a Tammany boss and finds the nomination for alderman thrust upon him, with certainty of election ahead. To the surprise of Tammany he rushes into a real campaign, declares war on "vested interests", and proceeds to stir the city to its depths.

Meanwhile he has fallen in love with an artist who has designed some remarkable cathedral windows which are to be executed by Bainbridge's father, a glass worker. In the midst of his campaign and his romance he discovers that Jessica is the daughter of the great franchise king whom he is fighting. Complications then rapidly develop, but the book ends with everybody happy and even the horrible franchise grabber is converted to municipal ownership and turns over all his enormous possessions to the city.

The story is very well told and carries the reader along with plenty of action and interest. It is only when the author ceases to be a novelist and starts to preach municipal ownership that he destroys his work. This is not necessarily because it is impossible to preach a purpose while telling a novel, but it has all the ludicrousness of an anti-climax when the hero defies the heavens and earth and goes into heroics in order to secure municipal ownership of street car lines. One cannot help but feel that the object is scarcely worth all this heroic action and there is a constant suggestion of melodrama.

The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals, by M. H. Fitch. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, Cloth. 266 pages, \$1.00.

We have here several things of value to the student. In the first place it has a good condensed statement of evolution. It has also a very satisfactory short review of Darwin's personality and work. The especially interesting portion about this book is that devoted to Darwin's critics. It is hard to realize how, less than half a century ago, this now almost universally accepted doctrine of evolution was received by the "great thinkers" of the time.

The chapter on Spencer and his mistaken disciples seems to give full credit to Spencer while pointing out the serious errors which arose from his doctrine of the "Unknowable." This chapter is especially needed by American readers since it was an American, Fiske, who developed this worst side of Spencer to the fullest extent.

There is considerable discussion on physiological psychology,

showing a familiarity with the best modern writers. The chapter on "A Natural Code of Ethics" would have been much improved by a thorough knowledge of socialist writings on this subject. A specially interesting chapter is the one on "Limitations and Impediments," showing the difficulties which have impeded the general introduction of the evolutionary idea into popular thought.

The book has a very full index, which in a work of this character is specially needed.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

MARX'S "CAPITAL."

The event of the month just closed in the socialist publishing world was the issue of the first volume of the first complete American edition of "Capital." Full descriptions of this book have appeared in our advance notices, and it only remains to say that our purchasers have been surprised and delighted with the excellence of the workmanship on this book. The London edition, which until lately we have been selling, was far superior to the New York non-union reprint which has been the only competing edition. Our new edition, on the other hand, is in every way superior to the London edition. The type is clearer, the printing being done from new electrotypes instead of old stereotypes. The binding is far stronger and the cloth handsomer. The improvements made by Frederick Engels in the last German edition are incorporated, and Engels' last preface is included. Finally, there is a complete alphabetical index, prepared by Ernest Untermann expressly for this edition, which makes it easy to refer quickly to Marx's treatment of any topic. There are 869 large pages. The price, including postage to any address, is \$2.00; our stockholders buy it at \$1.20 postpaid or \$1.00 if purchaser pays expressage.

THE SECOND VOLUME.

Type is now setting on Ernest Untermann's translation of the second volume of "Capital," never yet within the reach of English readers, though German and French socialists have been making effective use of it for many years. Former English and American editions of the first volume of "Capital" have been printed in a way to give readers the impression that they were getting Marx's entire work, when as a matter of fact they were getting only a third of it. We expect to have the second volume ready for delivery early in 1907. The exact date will be announced later. The price will be \$2.00, with the usual discount to stockholders.

The publication of this book is made possible by the generosity of Eugene Dietzgen, who has provided the money necessary to enable Ernest Untermann to devote himself to the difficult task of the trans-

lation for many months. Comrade Dietzgen has made a free gift of the translation to the publishing house, and it is for this reason that we are enabled to issue it at a price which simply pays the cost of printing and advertising. Even this is no small sum, and to avoid serious embarrassment a rapid sale for the book will be necessary. Every reader of the International Socialist Review should be vitally interested in giving the widest possible circulation to Marx's great work. Comrade Untermann is now translating the third and last volume, and the active co-operation of our readers will enable us to publish the entire work within a comparatively short time.

MARXIAN ECONOMICS.

This new work by Ernest Untermann, which we expect to publish early in 1907, will be an introduction to the three volumes of Marx's "Capital" for beginners and a text-book for students and teachers. The Marxian theories have long become the center around which the storms of political economy rage and which even the professors in capitalist universities must face if they would not become hopeless back numbers. In Europe Marx has become the recognized authority in working-class economics, and bourgeois lights like Schäffle, Sombart, Böhm-Bawerk, Masaryk, Brentano and others, have vainly assaulted this citadel of socialist thought by analysis, critiques, expositions, and all sorts of questionable polemics. Every attack has fortified the Marxian position. In the United States the time is now approaching where "Capital" is being referred to as a standard work on economics, even in Rockefeller's universities, for many students are now Socialists in this country and compel the professors to recognize the existence of our fundamental work. Unfortunately, the complete work of Marx is not yet accessible to American readers who cannot read German. And none of the various popularizations of "Capital" (whether Hyndman's, Deville's, Aveling's, etc.) gives a complete synopsis of the Marxian theories as an organic whole. All of them are more or less abbreviated summaries of the first volume of "Capital" and, with the exception of Hyndman's, take no notice of volumes II and III at all. And some of these so-called popularizations require themselves a popularizer before beginners can get any good out of them. Even Hyndman's "Economic Socialism," where it refers to volume III, does so but incidentally in the course of a series of loosely jointed lectures and touches upon but one point of that volume, the average rate of profit. Comrade Untermann's work gives a full and yet very clear view of the contents of all three volumes of "Capital," and shows us the organic connection between the three volumes, the unity and consistency of Marx's theory of value, and the way in which this theory stands the test of actual application to the conditions of capitalist production and competition. Unter-

mann does not give us a mere summary of Marx's analyses, as other so-called popularizations of Marx do, but unfolds before his readers the essential facts of the Marxian theories, as they would appear to one who has studied and fully assimilated the three volumes of "Capital." Cloth, \$1.00 postpaid. (Comrade Untermann will be delayed on this book by the necessity for putting most of his time for the next few weeks on the final revision of "Capital," but we expect to announce the date of publication soon).

MORGAN'S "ANCIENT SOCIETY."

Our reprint of this epoch-making work has been delayed far longer than was first expected, but as we go to press with this month's Review the typesetting has been completed, so that only the electrotyping, press work and binding still have to be done. We can therefore confidently promise its delivery early in January, and the following description, prepared by A. M. Simons for "What to Read on Socialism," will be of timely interest:

There is one American, and one only, whose name is known in every great European center of learning, as one of the world's great scientists, and that man is Lewis H. Morgan. What Darwin's "Origin of Species" is to biology, what Marx's "Capital" is to economics, that Morgan's "Ancient Society" is to anthropology. Every text book on the history of institutions which has been written during the last generation is based upon this great work. Yet, because his logic is destructive of the existing order, his work has been ignored and belittled even by those who have built upon the foundation it laid. Marx was one of the first to recognize its merits, and Engels thought it of so great value that he popularized some of its principal positions in his "Origin of the Family." It is a fundamental part of the Marxian system, applying to the pre-historic period the same principles which Marx applied to the stage of capitalism. Morgan shows that the evolution of society in the pre-capitalistic stage obeys the same laws as in the present society. The first division of the book shows how the social stages may be classified by the form of production employed, and his classification remains the base of all subsequent ones. The second part deals with the "Arts of Subsistence," and traces the development of the powers of production until the stage of a possible surplus is reached. Man, unlike any other animal, finally reaches that control over his environment which the possession of such a surplus implies, and this fact determines many social institutions.

The second part traces the "Growth of the Idea of Government," which he shows to have originated in the sex relation. It is this portion, tracing the evolution of the gens, tribe and phratry into the beginnings of modern government, that constitutes the most famous portion of the work. Morgan had lived for many years as an adopted member of the Iroquois tribe of Indians, and it was the knowledge which he thus gained that gave him the clew to the laws of institutional evolution. He further elaborates the facts thus gained in the Third part on the "Growth of the Idea of the Family," a portion of the work which rivals the second part in its epoch-making character. Since it was written, no discussion of the family has ever appeared

which is not founded upon it. The Fourth part, the "Growth of the Idea of Property," is more directly connected with the socialist philosophy, although it is really but the logical conclusion of the book. Here is traced the relation of the property relation to different industrial stages, and to other social institutions, especially the marriage relation.

Hitherto this work has been sold only at a price which made it practically inaccessible to the working-class reader. This largely accounts for the unfamiliarity of most socialists with its contents, save as they have gained them indirectly. This edition for the first time places this work within the reach of every student of socialism and makes possible a wide diffusion of its contents.

Our edition will be handsomely bound in maroon cloth with gold stamping on back, uniform in style with our new edition of "Capital." There will be about 600 pages, and the price will be \$1.50, with usual discounts to stockholders. The book has heretofore sold for \$4.00.

"THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN PROLETARIAN."

This is a new, original work, scholarly but not scholastic, by Austin Lewis of California. It is a masterly study in ground hitherto scarcely touched by the student of socialism. We have no space this month for an outline of the work, but will give further particulars next month. Typesetting on the book is already under way, and we expect to publish it early in January. It will be the 14th volume in the International Library of Social Science, and will retail at \$1.00.

OTHER NEW BOOKS.

"Socialism and Philosophy," by Labriola, translated by Ernest Untermann (\$1.00), "Class Struggles in America," by A. M. Simons (50c), and "Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History," by Karl Kautsky, translated by J. B. Askew (50c), all described in last month's Review, will soon be ready.

Comrade Austin Lewis has nearly completed a translation of Engels' classic work "Anti-Duehring," and this will probably appear early in 1907 as a volume in the International Library of Social Science. Other important additions to our list of books are only waiting for the raising of more capital.

FINANCIAL REPORT.

The book sales for the month of November were \$1,470.21, the receipts of the Review \$219.92, the receipts from the sale of stock \$253.82, and there was a cash contribution from Eugene Dietzgen of \$150.00 (his final payment on the cost of the plates of "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy"). It will thus be seen that we fell far short of breaking the record for October. The most encouraging item in the report is that the receipts of the Review equal the necessary ex-

penditures on the Review for a month. The book sales were crippled by the November election, which this year as always exhausted the energies of our best workers for a week or two. The weak point last month was in the stock subscriptions. We are now making heavier outlays than ever before in the plates of new books that are indispensable to the movement, and that are certain to sell steadily for years to come, but as most of our sales are made to stockholders at reduced rates, the first sales of the new books can not in the nature of the case pay the bills. We must depend on new stock subscriptions, and we ought to take in at least a thousand dollars from this source during December. We have to provide at this time for the cost of setting up and electrotyping the two volumes of "Capital" and of "Ancient Society," besides all the smaller books we are announcing. We want if possible to get through the month without borrowing money, and we will therefore renew, for the month of December only, an offer accepted by many during September. Send ten dollars this month in full payment for a share of stock, and we will send by express at your expense any of our books to the amount of five dollars at retail prices. If you wish us to prepay the expressage send fifty cents extra. This will be advisable for those living more than 400 miles from Chicago. Full particulars regarding the value of the stock will be found in "What to Read on Socialism," mailed free on request. Address,

**Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative),
284 Kinzie Street, Chicago.**

A CHANCE TO GET WHAT YOU EARN.

Modern Methods Applied to Sheep Farming.

The raising of sheep is one of the few important industries still in a backward stage, still carried on in the old individualistic way.

New scientific methods are beginning to be applied by which a given amount of labor will produce a vastly increased product.

These methods cannot be applied by one man working alone or with what labor he can hire on an investment of one or two thousand dollars. But a dozen or a hundred such men, uniting their capital, skill and energy, on a rational plan, can accomplish more than could a capitalist with equal resources depending wholly on hired labor.

The Enterprise Co-operative Range Sheep Company is being organized to unite the resources and the ability of practical men who have some little capital, and want to get what they earn, while sharing the advantages of co-operation under modern methods.

A limited amount of capital can be received from those who do not put in their labor, but it is our aim, in so far as possible, to employ stockholders in all responsible positions.

Full particulars will be found in a booklet which may be had for the asking.

Address,

Clayton J. Lamb, Concordia, Kansas.

THE CHICAGO DAILY SOCIALIST

published daily except Sunday, 28 columns, including all the important news of the day, fearlessly discussed from the point of view of the working class. Two dollars a year by mail to subscribers in the United States outside Chicago.

We do not publish the CHICAGO DAILY SOCIALIST, but we recommend it, and we have made an arrangement by which we give our readers the advantage of the following combination offers:

For *Two Dollars* we will send to subscribers outside Chicago the CHICAGO DAILY SOCIALIST one year and the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW one year.

For *Three Dollars* we will send both periodicals for one year and will also send postpaid any book or books published by us to the amount of \$ 2.00 at retail prices.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,
(CO-OPERATIVE)

264 East Kinzie Street,

CHICAGO.