

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI SEPTEMBER, 1905 NO. 3

Study of the Historical Development and Evolution of the American Proletariat.*

THE United States of America is the Promised Land of capitalism. Here for the first time are all the conditions requisite to its full and perfect development. Land and people were never before created so favorable to its highest evolution.

* * * *

The fact is that nowhere else on earth has capitalist society and capitalist character attained so high a degree of development.

Nowhere else does the desire for gain play so great a part; nowhere else is the hunger for profits, the making of money for its own sake, the beginning and end of all economic activity. Every moment of life is filled with this striving, and death alone ends the insatiable pursuit of gain.

The non-capitalist renting class is almost unknown in the United States. This struggle for gain is directed by an economic rationalism of a crudeness unknown in any European community. The capitalist class furthers its interests unaffected by any scruples, even though its way lies over corpses. The statistics of railway accidents prove this assertion. In 1903 the American railroads injured 11,006, the Austrian 172. For every kilometer of

*This very remarkable article by the author of the "Socialism and the Socialist Movement in the Nineteenth Century," and Professor in the University of Breslau, is one of the most searching analyses of American society ever published. The translation published herewith is really but a condensation of the original article, which in turn, is but the introduction to "A Study of the Historical Development of the American Proletariat." We shall endeavor to present the most important portions of the succeeding articles to our readers as they appear.—*Trans.*

road the American injured 3.4, the Austrian .87. For every million persons carried the railways of the United States wounded 19; those of Austria .99.

In power of capital—the height of capitalist accumulation—the United States, in spite of its “youth,” stands far in advance of all other lands. The gauge by which the height of the capitalist flood is measured are the figures of the bank balances. In 1882 the Controller of the Currency reported 7,302 banks; in 1904 there were 18,844. Those of the earlier year had a capital of \$712,100,000; those of the latter, \$1,473,904,674. * * * The total “banking power” at this later period (including capital, surplus profits, deposits and circulation) was \$13,826,000,000; while the corresponding figures for all the other countries of the world was but \$19,781,000,000. After this we need not be surprised at the sums that have flowed into the lap of industry during the last twenty years. According to the census, the capital invested in manufactures has been as follows:

1880.....	\$2,709,282,606
1890.....	6,525,050,759
1900.....	9,831,486,500

It is thoroughly recognized that the United States is the one country in which the program of the Marxian theory of evolution has been most minutely fulfilled, in that the accumulation of capital has reached the stage designated in a celebrated chapter of “Capital” as immediately preceding the *Götterdämmerung* of the capitalist world.

* * * *

When the giant combinations of capital are considered as a whole it will be evident that they control the largest share of American industry, and reach the enormous figures of \$20,379,000,000 nominal capital.

Just how absolutely the capitalist system rules can perhaps best be seen by a study of the present social structure, scarcely a feature of which is of non-capitalist origin. Nowhere do we meet with those survivals of a pre-capitalistic class, whose greater or less prominence in European society give it its characteristic features. There is no feudal nobility; the magnates of capital reign supreme in the social realm. The time described by Marx in “Capital” as then existing only in prophetic imagination has arrived in the United States of to-day, where “eminent spinners,” “influential shoe black dealers,” “extensive sausage makers,” together with the “railroad kings,” have their feet upon the necks of the people. * * *

The United States is to-day a land of cities; or more exactly,

a land of *great* cities. While the number of people living in cities of two thousand population and over is somewhat less than in Germany, yet the percentage of inhabitants of great cities (having over 100,000 population) is greater than anywhere else on earth, except in England. Furthermore, the percentage is a rapidly increasing one, and would even now be much higher were it not for the inclusion of the backward agricultural South.

But when I say that the United States is a "city-land," I mean it in a deeper, more fundamental sense, that can only be explained by showing the relation which the city bears to capitalism. I mean it in the sense of a method of living that is foreign to all organic life, resting on a purely mechanical basis, and determined wholly from the quantitative point of view. The European city is generally an organic growth; at bottom, it is only a grown-up village. What has Nuremburg in common with Chicago? Nothing save the superficial feature that many people live close together on streets, and depend upon products brought in from without for their sustenance. Their spirits have nothing in common. The former is a village-like, organically developed structure; the latter is artificially constructed according to a "rational," mechanical plan, in which all traces of community life are eliminated. When a European city spreads out over the country, some of the rural features are still preserved. In the United States, on the contrary, the open country is itself, at bottom but a city settlement, where the actual city is lacking. The same "rational" attitude that gave rise to the box-like cities has accompanied the surveyor's chain over the whole country, cutting it up into those uniform squares which make impossible, from the very beginning, any naturally developed "organic" settlement.

That other most striking characteristic of all societies resting on a capitalistic basis—sharp contrasts between the rich and the poor—is by no means absent in the United States. * * * Whatever may be the exact division of the total wealth, there is no disputing the fact that nowhere else on earth are the absolute contrasts between the rich and the poor anything near as sharp. This is true because, first of all, the "rich" are so much richer than anywhere else. There are certainly more people in America who possess a thousand million marks than there are that possess a hundred million marks in Germany.

* * * *

On the other hand the misery of the slums of the great cities in America is equaled only in the East End of London. [Here follow some statistics from Robert Hunter's "Poverty," with which our readers are already familiar.]

But the one infallible sign of the high development of capitalism in the United States is the peculiar character of its intel-

lectual culture. The existence of any general American character has been repeatedly denied, and it is undoubtedly true that the diversities between the different sections are as great as between the different European nations. Nevertheless there is a uniformity to the American mind. This "American spirit," however, is not something wholly new and peculiar. We meet it as an old acquaintance, whom we learned to know in Lombard St. and Berlin W., save that in America the type has been perfected and has spread over an entire nation. It is easy to trace the origin of this type to a definite environment that arose in Europe and attained its full development in America, and in so doing we shall find an explanation of its uniformity.

No one who has investigated the popular mind in America can avoid seeing that its characteristic features are just the ones having their root in the capitalist organization of society.

It is universally recognized that the fundamental feature of a capitalist society is the reduction of all things to a money standard. When this has continued for generations, all sensitiveness to purely qualitative elements of wealth gradually disappear. Value is assigned only to those things which are either "useful" and "comfortable," or else "costly." The sense for expensiveness is seen in the fact that everything that is decorated in the United States is "over-loaded," from the ladies' toilets to the reception rooms of the fashionable hotels. If "costliness" is not apparent, then every opportunity is taken to display the figures that tell of its valuation. "Have you seen the \$50,000 Rembrandt in Mr. X's house yet?" is a frequently heard question. "Early this morning the \$500,000 yacht of Mr. Carnegie left the harbor," is a newspaper item. Naturally the possession of money—the amount of income—becomes the standard for the valuation of men. All sense of the immeasurable differences in personalities and all breath of individuality disappears.

There can be no doubt that this habit of estimating everything in terms of a money valuation has so warped the judgment for value that attempts are constantly made to apply the money standard where it is wholly out of place. It leads naturally to that over-valuation of mere *quantity*, which so many observers have noted as one of the most evident of American characteristics. Every large quantity becomes an object of admiration: whether it be the number of inhabitants of a city, the number of packages sent by the post office, the speed of railroad trains, the height of a monument, the breadth of a river or the frequency of suicides. This "mania for bigness," so characteristic of modern Americans, has been ascribed to the great extent of their country. But if this is the cause, why do not the Chinese have it? Or the Mongolians on the plains of Asia? Why did not the Indians have it, who formerly lived in the same country? Whenever such ideas

of greatness appear among primitive peoples they take on a cosmical character; they deal with the endless firmament of the stars, the boundless limits of the steppe, and their fundamental characteristic is just their *immeasurableness*. The worship of *statistical* largeness as a part of the human mentality can have its roots nowhere else except in the utilization of money according to the methods of capitalism.

Those who reckon value only in terms of quantity soon tend to *compare* two objects in order to measure one by the other, and to assign the higher value to the larger. When one of two things becomes larger in a given period this is called success. The sense of measurable greatness has as a noteworthy accompaniment a high valuation of success: once more a prominent American characteristic. To gain success, however, always means to *beat someone else*, to get more, do more, have more than someone else—to be bigger. Naturally that sort of success is valued the highest that can be expressed in figures—especially getting rich. Even for the non-trader, the one question is “how much can he make” with his talents?

Some of the peculiar mental attitudes that arise from this are shown perhaps the clearest in the American attitude toward “sport.” Here the only question of interest is “who won?” I was once present at a mass-meeting in New York that received telegraphic bulletins of a match being played in Chicago. The only items that aroused excitement were those that settled questions of victory. * * * Betting serves to arouse this excitement and at the same time reduce the whole field of sport to a purely money basis.

* * * *

This peculiar method of judging value gives a definite trend to the whole social mind. The American prays to success, and therefore all his efforts are directed toward leading a life that shall be pleasing to his God. So it is that every American from newsboy up is possessed with an unrest, a yearning and seeking to attain the top by climbing over others. The life ideal of the Americans is not found in the pleasurable development of self, nor in the beautiful harmony of a well-rounded life, but only in “getting ahead.” From this there follows as a natural consequence the restless striving, the reckless competition in every field. Since all are seeking success, therefore everyone is forced into a struggle to beat every other individual; and a steeple-chase begins—a race for fortune—a race that differs from all other races in that the goal is not fixed but constantly moves ever further away from the runners. The term “restless” is often applied to this struggle, but it is still more evidently *endless*; for any endeavor must be endless that seeks only quantity, since this is always boundless.

Out of this competitive psychology there arises naturally the demand for more elbow room. With a race as the ideal of life, no one wishes to be tied hand and foot. The dogma of *laissez faire*, therefore, is the natural economic maxim of Americans. * * * Nevertheless the American is not at all doctrinaire on this point, and does not hesitate to use the state to any degree, when it will further, or even not interfere with, his race for "success."

For the genuine American to be successful means "get rich." This explains why the characteristic restless striving of Americans finds its principle outlet in the field of industry. The ablest and most active minds, which in Europe enter political life, in America turn to trade. This again leads to an over-valuation of industrial pursuits, since it is in this field that the great object of striving—wealth—can be soonest attained. Industry in the capitalistic sense deals with stocks and bonds and has its seat on the Board of Trade. * * * There is no other country on earth where so large a proportion of the population participate in stock speculation, or in which the population is so thoroughly impregnated with the capitalist idea.

This completes the circle of our observations. We started from capitalism and found in it the source of the essential elements of the American popular mind. Now we see how the very proof (*Bethätigung*) of this contributes to an increase and growth of the very essence of capitalism, and that the peculiar "American spirit" is ever re-born from itself, and ever purifies itself in the *spiritus capitalisticus, purus rectificatus*.

* * * *

These remarks are intended merely as a starting point for a few observations concerning the American proletariat. Since we know that the conditions of the wage working class are determined by the essential features of the capitalist movement, and especially since we have learned that all "social movements" originate in the environment created by capitalism, and that modern socialism is only a reflex phenomena, then it is self-evident that we must proceed from a consideration of the economic situation if we are to form any clear conception of the condition of the proletariat of any country. This method is especially fruitful for the United States. * * *

If it is true, as I have always held, that modern socialism is a necessary product of capitalism, then it follows that the land having the highest capitalist development (which is the United States) must also be the classic land of socialism, and its laboring class must be the leader in the most radical socialist movement. When, however, the assertion is constantly repeated (complainingly among socialists, rejoicingly among their opponents) that the opposite is the case; that there is no socialism among the

American laboring class, and that those who are called socialists are really only a handful of bankrupt Germans with no following—then we have a land without socialism in spite of the highest capitalist development. The doctrine of the inevitable future is disproved by the facts. There can be no more important work for the sociologist or practical worker than to fathom this phenomenon.

But when we come to examine the facts we find that this bold assertion that there is no socialism in America is indisputably false.

There is a socialist party, or to speak exactly, two socialist parties on a thoroughly continental European basis. These parties cast 453,338 votes at the last presidential election. * * *

Nevertheless it can not be denied that there is a measure of truth in the statement that the American laboring class is far removed from socialism.

* * * *

The American laborer (so far at least as the "normal" laborer, whose votes seem to dominate the majority of the laboring class and among whom are included the leaders) is on the whole not *dissatisfied* with existing conditions; on the contrary he feels very well and is very well satisfied with himself—like all Americans. His view of the world (*Weltauffassung*) is most rosily optimistic—live and let live is his fundamental maxim.

This unbounded optimism, which is his most prominent characteristic, expresses itself in a faith *in the mission and greatness of his country*—a faith that often takes on an almost religious character: for him the Americans are the chosen people of God—the salt of the earth. * * * This means, however, that the American laborer identifies himself with the present American state and is most intensely patriotic. The centrifugal force that leads to class divisions, class antagonisms, class hatred and the class struggle is weak, while the centripetal force that leads to endorsement of the national political commonwealth of the state—to patriotism—is strong; consequently there is a lack among American workers of that enmity to the state so characteristic of continental European socialists.

* * * *

The American laborer is not in any way antagonistic to the *capitalist economic system as such*, neither mentally nor sentimentally. [Quotations are here given from John Mitchell and other pure and simple trade unionists to prove this point.]

Indeed I believe that the relation of the American laborer to capitalism is even more intimate than even these friendly declarations and testimonials of respect really express. I believe he enters into it with all his heart: I believe he loves it. At least he

gives himself up to it body and soul. If there is any one place in America where the restless striving for gain, the complete surrender to industry, the sacrifice of all to business has its home it is among the laborers. The laborer will—practically without limit—earn all that his strength will possibly permit. Consequently it is very seldom that we hear any complaints concerning the lack of protection against dangerous machinery. Indeed he would ordinarily much rather not have such protection if it reduced his earning capacity in the least. Consequently there are very few complaints about restriction of output or objections to piece-work or improved machinery. * * * The greater intensity of American labor is nothing more than the expression of the laborer's fundamentally capitalist mental attitude.

That it is the "business spirit" which rules the American movement is best shown by the peculiar character of their labor organizations.

* * * *

The majority of the American labor organizations do not differ in any essential way from the earlier English trades unions. They proceed from a purely business point of view which leads to exclusiveness and monopolistic attempts to divide the interests of the various organizations and to a disregard of the interests of the proletariat as a whole, and especially of the interests of the lower layer of unskilled workers. As a result strong craft antagonisms arise, which lead to an essentially vertical dismemberment of the proletariat, and prevent any joining together into a single solid defensive class. This business policy finds its clearest expression in the coalitions between monopolistic trades unions and monopolistic bosses for the common exploitation of the public by a few employers and by the laborers of the single trade. This kind of trades unions, because they are cut from wood taken from the tree of capitalism, and because their tendencies as well as their practical operations are not directed toward the overthrow of the capitalist system, *may well be designated as capitalist unions, as contrasted with socialist unions which never lose sight of the necessity of a proletarian class movement directed toward capitalism.*

WERNER SOMBART in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft.*

Translated by A. M. Simons.

The Political Position of the Labor and Socialist Party in Australia.

TO UNDERSTAND the present position of the Socialist movement in Australia it is necessary to have regard to the time when there was not even a political labor movement in these states, and that is only fourteen years ago. In 1890 there was no labor movement, politically speaking, although in Victoria a trade union official, Mr. W. Trenwith, was active as a trade unionist and a protectionist. The dividing line in politics was almost exclusively the fiscal question. Free Trade versus Protection, the workmen in Victoria being mainly Protectionists and in the neighboring state of New South Wales mainly Free Traders.

In 1890 a strike occurred, known as the maritime strike. It originated with the officers of vessels, but the general body of workers made common cause with the marine men and throughout the whole of the Australasian states, including New Zealand, a severe and prolonged struggle took place.

The men were badly beaten, and the employers having used the governmental machinery of the various states against the men so viciously and effectively, opened the eyes of the men to the foolishness of returning employers to the respective legislatures. From that time the desirability and necessity of political action independent of if not in direct opposition to the monopolist class has been advocated; but for years after scarcely a labor parliamentarian ever advocated or realized the necessity for Socialism.

As in most countries, in each state an occasional Socialist would arrest the attention of a small number and give a little tilt to the study of economic questions. But although the workers in the respective states gradually added to the number of members returned as labor men, it meant but little beyond the endorsement of trade union conditions plus in Victoria wages-boards and in New Zealand an industrial conciliation and arbitration act for the adjustment of wages and working conditions by law.

And still here were the beginnings of a class-conscious movement, and small Socialist organizations were established in each of the states.

Even five years ago the Melbourne Trades Hall, the rendezvous of the organized workers industrially and politically, had very little sympathy with Socialism, while quite a large propor-

tion of the delegates were avowedly hostile, and the same was true as regards the workers' centers in each of the other states.

In Sydney, N. S. W., there is an active propagandist body, the Australian Socialist League; in Melbourne, Victoria, there is a similar body, the Social Democratic Party; in Brisbane, Queensland, they have the Social Democratic Vanguard; in Perth, Western Australia, the Social Democratic Federation, and in Adelaide, South Australia, there is a Clarion Fellowship Society; but none of these bodies have successfully returned any of their members to the legislative bodies. Although the ex-secretary of the Victorian S. D. P., H. Scott-Bennett, who stood as a Socialist candidate at the last Victorian election was returned, he was endorsed by and ran as the candidate of the Political Labor Council. In Sydney and other portions of N. S. W. members of the A. S. L. have fought elections on a number of occasions and polled well but have not been returned.

There is no room for doubt but that the various Labor Parties in Australia are now rapidly becoming straight out Socialist organizations; and the progress in this direction during the last three years is easily seen by any one.

The Federal Labor Party is of course composed of the same persons as the State Parties. The Parliamentary Federal Labor Party is a virile body of fighters, none of whom are anti-Socialist, two-thirds of whom are Socialists.

The Platform of the Party is not one of a drastic character nor is it issued with a statement of principles that clearly sets forth the justification for and necessity of a change from capitalism to collectivism as is usually the case with the European Parties, still they stand as the force receiving all the hard knocks of the various plutocratic parties and are travelling pretty rapidly in a Socialist direction, partly as a result of the spread of knowledge and largely as the result of politico economic pressure.

The Labor Party is called a Socialist Party by its enemies, and although some members of the Labor Party doubtless wish Socialism had remained in Europe or lost itself on the way out, the more capable of the Labor Party have declared in favor of Socialism in too pronounced a way for any of them now to draw back.

The following is the Platform of the Federal Labor Party:

1. Maintenance of a White Australia.
2. Compulsory Arbitration to settle industrial disputes, (now secured.)
3. Old Age Pensions.
4. Nationalization of Monopolies.
5. Citizen Military Defence Force and Australian owned Navy.

6. Restriction of Public Borrowing.
7. Navigation Laws.

Not much straight out Socialism here, and if this covered the whole case it would be most unsatisfactory, but during the past year three of the State Labor Parties, viz.: New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia have each included in their constitution, the declared object of the Party to be: "The securing of the full results of their industry to all producers by the collective ownership of monopolies, and the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the state and municipality."

It is not to rest here however. Before this reaches you in Chicago, there will be held in Melbourne an Interstate Conference of delegates from the respective Labor Parties and part of Melbourne's contribution to the agenda of the forthcoming conference is as follows:

"Conference affirms that capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property. Its development is through the legalized confiscation of all that the labor of the working class produces above its subsistence wage. The private ownership of the means of employment grounds society in economic slavery, which renders intellectual and political tyranny inevitable. Therefore, conference affirms that it is the object of the Australian labor organizations to obtain control of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange, i. e.: the means of employment—wealth production—to be owned and controlled by the people in the interest of, and for the use of the whole of the people, in contradistinction to profit for a class.

Further: As the object of capitalism is the same in all countries, i. e., the exploitation of the worker—one who is divorced from the means of employment, and forced to sell his labor power as a commodity for the right to live—conference affirms it desirable that the Australia Labor organization pledges its fidelity to the principles of international socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the Socialists of all nations." This proposition well indicates the advance made by the Labor Party in Melbourne and gives warranty for concluding that in a few years' time not only will the principle contained in the proposition be heartily-endorsed by the Workers' Party in the State, but also that the representatives of that party in the State Legislature will be the governing body.

In the Federal House of Representatives there are three parties each having about one-third of the total of 72 members composing the House. The present premier is the Hon. G. H. Reid whose foremost political incentive and object is Free Trade. At present he is dragging along with a majority of two, i. e., a majority of the protectionists vote with the Free Trade plutocrat

rather than be supporters of the Labor Party. The Protectionists under the leadership of the Hon. Alfred Deakin are opposed to Socialism much the same as the Free Traders, but most of the Labor men are Protectionist as against Free Trade though they put Labor first. Under such circumstances it will not be surprising if the Protectionists and Labor Party attempt a coalition, but a large portion of the rank and file of the Labor Party are opposed to alliances of this sort and they may be strong enough to prevent it. In the Victorian Legislative assembly out of a total of 68 members, 18 are straight-out Labor, about three-fourths of whom are Socialists, and they are doing good, propagandist work.

A similar proportion in N. S. Wales Assembly keeps the Plutocrats very watchful and busy.

In the Queensland Assembly out of a total of 72 members the Labor Party have exactly half and they have formed a coalition government, with two labor members in the ministry, Mr. Kedston as State Treasurer and Mr. Peter Airey as Home Secretary. In Western Australia there is actually a Labor Ministry in power and has been so now for twelve months. This is the longest spell of any Labor government. Of course it is not a large population. All told Western Australia has but 250,000 population so it is almost like playing at government. Still all the institutions are there, and the plutocrats are there and they have an enormous and very rich area, W. A. being 975,920 square miles in extent.

The State elections for South Australia took place six weeks ago, and the election cry was, Socialism and Anti-Socialism; the result is cheering. The Labor Party before the election had only six members in the assembly; as the result of the election they now have 15 members in an assembly of 42.

Tasmania has made a start and at the last State election returned four labor men and their delegates will be at the Interstate Conference.

New Zealand is not included in the Commonwealth of Australia and is not directly affected by the political activities here. At present New Zealand is in the backwash as she has no straight out labor men or Socialists in the legislative chamber, they are all of the petty bourgeois type, but steps are now being taken to organize on purely independent lines.

This progress is certainly being made, but many of us are expecting to see the rapid economic development of the United States make of that country the pace setter in the realization of full-fledged Socialism.

TOM MANN.

Melbourne, Victoria, June 28, 1905.

Australian Labor Convention.

THE Interstate Labor Convention has just taken place and it has gladdened the hearts of the State socialists by the adoption of the following objective:

(a) Securing the full results of their industry to all producers by collective ownership of monopolies and the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the State and of the following objective:

(b) Cultivation of an Australian sentiment based upon the maintenance of racial purity and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

In moving the adoption of this objective Watson, the leader of the Federal Labor Party, stated that it was purposeless to look for a seventh heaven, and the Victorian and Queensland objectives went much further than generations would see. Personally he was not a social democrat, but believed that State Socialism was the only practical form. It was not proposed to nationalize all industry, but monopolies should be in public and not in private hands. One member of the convention stated that he was a social democrat and held that State Socialism was bureaucracy, but still he favored the objective. Another prominent member of the party, who was a member of the Federal Labor Ministry, said that the Labor Party had only been called socialists two years ago, but they had nothing to do with the international socialist movement.

This same objective had been previously adopted by the New South Wales Labor Party. It was hailed by enthusiastic laborites everywhere as a great step in advance. Mr. Watson himself, however, was the means of dispelling this illusion by pointing out to the timid supporters of the party that in 1897 the Labor Party had as one of the planks of their platform "The nationalization of land and the means of production, distribution and exchange." This plank has since been removed from the platform and after some considerable cutting down has again put in an appearance as the Party's Objective.

The Queensland Labor Convention also presented the Labor Party of that state with an ornamental piece of timber in the form of the following objective:

(a) Securing the full results of their industry to the wealth producers by the collective ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, to be obtained through the extension

of the industrial and economic functions of the state and local governing bodies.

(b) Cultivation of an Australian sentiment based on the maintenance of racial purity and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

The Victorian Labor Party has adopted an objective of somewhat similar import.

The reason for this attack of objective-framing is to be found in the present state of unstable political equilibrium. While the Labor Party were in office in the Federal Parliament they allied themselves with a small section of the Protectionist Party, who would make no compromise with the free traders. The Labor Government was defeated on the Arbitration Bill and an understanding was arrived at between Reid (leader of the Free-Trade Party) and Deakin (leader of the Protectionists) by which the first issue was to be dropped. Reid came into office supported by most of the protectionists, the irreconcilable protectionists and the Labor Party occupying the Opposition benches and maintaining their alliance. Reid has sought to consolidate his following by raising the banner of "anti-socialism" and by labeling the Labor Party socialists. He has toured Australia, speaking in every state on this question, and has thus, by arousing public interest, forced the Labor Party to make some declaration. Another cause of the forcing of the hands of the Party has been the discontent of the Labor supporters with the Labor alliances, more especially with the Coalition Government in Queensland. Last August an election took place in Queensland, at which the Coalition Government were greatly strengthened. The Labor Party now number one-half of the Lower House, and yet planks of the Labor Party are treated with no more respect than if they were the merest shavings. Firm believers in the value of the Labor platform naturally resented this sort of thing and the Coalition Government has fallen into disfavor, the Labor Party are warned against alliances with other parties and the rank and file of the party are in revolt against the labor politicians and have accordingly sought to bind the party by means of the objective.

Reid's attempt to scare the protectionists with the cry of "Socialism" has proved ineffectual. The manufacturers of Australia were not to be caught with chaff and Deakin last month deserted the standard of fiscal compromise and with the help of the Labor Party has put Reid out of office and is now Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, with the support of the Labor Party guaranteed for one session. It is significant that three of the ministers in the present government are allies of Labor, one of whom (Sir William Lyne) has outdone many of his Labor friends by announcing himself a State Socialist. If this ministry retains office, the manufacturers are likely to get something more

substantial than anti-socialist vaporings in the form of a high tariff wall. The Federal Labor Convention has declared in favor of taking a referendum of the people of the Commonwealth on the fiscal question. If such a referendum be taken it is almost certain to result in a protectionist tariff. The Labor Party has been moving Protectionwards for some time and it is only the adoption of some such plank as tariff referendum which could prevent them from ultimately entering the Protectionist fold. It is this reason which makes the protectionists more eager to secure alliances with the Labor Party. It is this fact also which explains the circumstance that no prominent protectionist has taken any part in the so-called anti-socialist campaign.

The word socialism is in everyone's mouth, but one never hears anything about a class struggle. The one bright spot amid all the confusion is supplied by the Australian Socialist League, who, by sheer grit and perseverance, are beginning to make themselves heard among the working class of New South Wales. Out of all the voluminous paper contributions on the subject of Socialism the declaration of the A. S. L. was the only clear and class-conscious effort. It was pointed out that labor was the sole creator of wealth; that the present methods of production depended on the wage-slavery of the workers; that in Australia 71½ of the adults who die have no property that necessitates making a will; that the cause of the trouble lay in the private ownership of the land and of the machinery of production. It was pointed out that "the class who do the world's work will not be deterred by the word 'confiscation' when they are ripe for action at the ballot-box."

Right throughout the Australian colonies we still have New Zealand held up to us as "the workingman's paradise." Yet towards the end of June Dick Seddon himself (New Zealand's premier) declared: "Despite the increased wages, the workers found themselves no better off than they were formerly, on account of the increased cost of living. It was not the employers or the workers who scooped the money, but the people who took the increased value of land and property as their profit, and reaped the reward earned by the employers and the workers." It would seem from this that Compulsory Conciliation and Arbitration had not benefited the lot of the workers. A humiliating confession to come from the High Priest of Conciliation! The New South Wales Arbitration Court has been shut up for six months because the state judges were unwilling to act on it. In the meantime the Federal High Court has pulverized the clause granting preference to unionists and has placed the non-unionist and the unionist on an equal footing according to law, but according to practice is bound to result in preference to non-unionists.

Still the belief in Conciliation and Arbitration is not killed and the unions of New South Wales' will provide the re-opened court with abundance of work.

ANDREW M. ANDERSON.

My Mammy's Son.

I don't want to see him crushed, my dear old mammy's son,
The boy I played with long ago, whose chinas oft I won;
Who stood with me in many fights in the old plantation days;
Whose heart was true and loyal in a thousand different ways.

I don't want to see him crushed, his children made the prey
Of every wolf that howls along the Anglo-Saxon way;
Of every low-browed, heartless thing that bays him with the scream:
"I am the Anglo-Saxon and I am the white supreme!"

I don't want to see him crushed, his black face scarred with grief,
His sorrows made unending, or his pleasures few and brief;
For often I remember how he stood there at my side,
When the old home went to pieces, with a friendship true and tried.

I don't want to see him crushed, his life-work made in vain,
His misery the corner stone of demagogic gain;
His degradation the excuse for Pharisees on high,
A refuge for the scoundrel and a cloak for every lie.

I don't want to see him crushed, nor made a nameless thing,
A chattel in the service of the menials of the king;
A slave unto the servants who attend the lords of gold,
Who are rotting the structure that the fathers built of old.

I don't want to see him crushed, my dear old mammy's son,
The boy I played with long ago, whose chinas I oft won;
And for his sake an Aryan pleads with Aryans to-day
To rise in Aryan manhood and drive the wolves away.

COVINGTON HALL.

The Rights of the Horse and the Rights of Man.

CAPITALIST Civilization has endowed the wage-worker with the metaphysical Rights of Man, but this is only to rivet him more closely and more firmly to his economic duty.

"I make you free," so speak the Rights of Man to the laborer, "free to earn a wretched living and turn your employer into a millionaire; free to sell him your liberty for a mouthful of bread. He will imprison you ten hours or twelve hours in his workshop; he will not let you go till you are wearied to the marrow of your bones, till you have just enough strength left to gulp down your soup and sink into a heavy sleep. You have but one of your rights that you may not sell, and that is the right to pay taxes.

Progress and Civilization may be hard on wage-working humanity, but they have all a mother's tenderness for the animals which stupid bipeds call "lower."

Civilization has especially favored the equine race: it would be too great a task to go through the long list of its benefactions; I will name but a few, of general notoriety, that I may awaken and inflame the passionate desires of the workers, now torpid in their misery.

Horses are divided into distinct classes. The equine aristocracy enjoys so many and so oppressive privileges, that if the human-faced brutes which serve them as jockeys, trainers, stable valets and grooms were not morally degraded to the point of not feeling their shame, they would have rebelled against their lords and masters, whom they rub down, groom, brush and comb, also making their beds, cleaning up their excrements and receiving bites and kicks by way of thanks.

Aristocratic horses, like capitalists, do not work; and when they exercise themselves in the fields they look disdainfully, with a coupon-clipper's contempt, upon the human animals which plow and seed the lands, mow and rake the meadows, to provide them with oats, clover, timothy and other succulent plants.

These four-footed favorites of Civilization command such social influence that they impose their wills upon the capitalists, their brothers in privilege; they force the loftiest of them to come with their beautiful ladies and take tea in the stables, in-

haling the acrid perfumes of their solid and liquid evacuations. And when these lords consent to parade in public, they require from ten to twenty thousand men and women to stack themselves up on uncomfortable seats, under the broiling sun, to admire their exquisitely chiseled forms and their feats of running and leaping. They respect none of the social dignities before which the votaries of the Rights of Man bow in reverence. At Chantilly not long ago one of the favorites for the grand prize launched a kick at the king of Belgium, because it did not like the looks of his head. His royal majesty, who adores horses, murmured an apology and withdrew.

It is fortunate that these horses, who can count more authentic ancestors than the houses of Orleans and Hohenzollern, have not been corrupted by their high social station: had they taken it into their heads to rival the capitalists in aesthetic pretensions, profligate luxury and depraved tastes, such as wearing lace and diamonds, and drinking champagne and Chateau-Margaux, a blacker misery and more overwhelming drudgery would be impending over the class of wage-workers.

*Thrice happy is it for proletarian humanity that these equine aristocrats have not taken the fancy of feeding upon human flesh, like the old Bengal tigers which rove around the villages of India to carry off women and children; if unhappily the horses had been man-eaters, the capitalists, who can refuse them nothing, would have built slaughter-houses for wage-workers, where they could carve out and dress boy sirloins, woman hams and girl roasts to satisfy their anthropophagic tastes.

The proletarian horses, not so well endowed, have to work for their peck of oats, but the capitalist class, through deference for the aristocrats of the equine race, concedes to the working horses rights that are far more solid and real than those inscribed in the "Rights of Man."

The first of rights, the right to existence, which no civilized society will recognize for laborers, is possessed by horses.

The colt, even before his birth, while still in the fetus state, begins to enjoy the right to existence; his mother, when her pregnancy has scarcely begun, is discharged from all work and sent into the country to fashion the new being in peace and comfort; she remains near him to suckle him and teach him to choose the delicious grasses of the meadow, in which he gambols until he is grown.

The moralists and politicians of the "Rights of Man" think it would be monstrous to grant such rights to the laborers; I raised a tempest in the Chamber of Deputies when I asked that women, two months before and two months after confinement, should have the right and the means to absent themselves from the factory. My proposition upset the ethics of civilization

and shook the capitalist order. What an abominable abomination—to demand for babies the rights of colts.

As for the young proletarians, they can scarcely trot on their little toes before they are condemned to hard labor in the prisons of capitalism, while the colts develop freely under kindly Nature; care is taken that they be completely formed before they are set to work, and their tasks are proportioned to their strength with a tender care.

This care on the part of the capitalists follows them all through their lives. We may still recall the noble indignation of the bourgeois press when it learned that the omnibus company was using peat and tannery waste in its stalls as a substitute for straw: to think of the unhappy horses having such poor beds! The more delicate souls of the bourgeoisie have in every capitalist country organized societies for the protection of animals, in order to prove that they can not be excited by the fate of the small victims of industry. Schopenhauer, the bourgeois philosopher, in whom was incarnated so perfectly the gross egoism of the philistine, could not hear the cracking of a whip without his heart being torn by it.

This same omnibus company, which works its laborers from fourteen to sixteen hours a day, requires from its dear horses only five to seven hours. It has bought green meadows in which they may recuperate from fatigue or indisposition. Its policy is to expend more for the entertainment of a quadruped than for paying the wages of a biped. It has never occurred to any legislator nor to any fanatical advocate of the "Rights of Man" to reduce the horse's daily pittance to assure him a retreat that would be of service to him only after his death.

The Rights of Horses have not been posted up; they are "unwritten rights," as Socrates called the laws implanted by Nature in the consciousness of all men.

The horse has shown his wisdom in contenting himself with these rights, with no thought of demanding those of the citizen; he has judged that he would have been as stupid as man if he had sacrificed his mess of lentils for the metaphysical banquet of Rights to Revolt, to Equality, to Liberty, and other trivialities which to the proletariat are about as useful as a cautery on a wooden leg.

Civilization, though partial to the equine race, has not shown herself indifferent to the fate of the other animals. Sheep, like canons, pass their days in pleasant and plentiful idleness; they are fed in the stable on barley, lucerne, rutabagas and other roots, raised by wage-workers; shepherds conduct them to feed in fat pastures, and when the sun parches the plain, they are carried to where they can browse on the tender grass of the mountains.

The Church, which has burned her heretics, and regrets that

she can not again bring up her faithful sons in the love of "mutton," represents Jesus, under the form of a kind shepherd, bearing upon his shoulders a weary lamb.

True, the love for the ram and the ewe is in the last analysis only the love for the leg of mutton and the cutlet, just as the Liberty of the Rights of Man is nothing but the slavery of the wage-worker, since our jesuitical Civilization always disguises capitalist exploitation in eternal principles and bourgeois egoism in noble sentiments; yet at least the bourgeois tends and fattens the sheep up to the day of the sacrifice, while he seizes the laborer still warm from the workshop and lean from toil to send him to the shambles of Tonquin or Madagascar.

Laborers of all crafts, you who toil so hard to create your poverty of producing the wealth of the capitalists, arise, arise! Since the buffoons of parliament unfurl the Rights of Man, do you boldly demand for yourselves, your wives and your children the Rights of the Horse.

PAUL LAFARGUE, (*Translated by Charles H. Kerr.*)

General Election in Holland.

FEW of us expected the actual results of the elections that took place in the second part of June. We did not expect the overthrow of the clerical-conservative government, nor did we think the number of votes for the social democracy would grow so largely as it did.

In 1901 we reached the number of about 39,000 votes on our candidates. Had nothing *extraordinary* passed in the next four years, perhaps we would have dreamt of doubling our strength in and outside of Parliament. But as those who followed Dutch affairs will remember, in 1903 we had first in the end of January the great and for the moment successful railway strike, when the railway companies had to give in to the men and the "Christian" government and the bourgeoisie lost its head over the fact that the workers were for one day masters of the traffic. Then came the reaction. The companies grew bolder every day and the government threatened the railway men and the whole working class with laws that would prevent the trade unions from developing their strength. To throw down and to terrify the opposition from the workers the government raised the militia, so that the most direct and strong measures of the working class had to be put in action. Thus the general strike was attempted, for we in Holland, in so-called free Holland, have not yet the universal suffrage so that we could threaten a reactionary government with the votes of the workers. The general strike in Holland, a heroic but desperate measure, as the workers are not united but divided into socialistic, non-political (so-called anarchistic) and Christian groups—the general strike, we mean to say, proved a failure as a means to prevent the government from measures of retaliation against the working class and its trade unions. So it weakened many already weak unions and it intensified the class struggle by the damage done through the strike to the middle classes throughout town and field. The social democrats came to stand, as is right, all by themselves, and many of us, let us not say feared, but stated that with the next great election we would certainly not only not double our contingent of votes and seats, but would have the greatest difficulty in keeping what we have. We had a thousand or so less votes than 40,000 in 1901. We would be glad to win a few thousand more than this number in 1905.

Seen in the light of these unquestionable considerations our

success was great. More than 65,000 votes were given to Socialist candidates in the 75 or 76 (of the 100) districts where Socialists stood for Parliament. We won six seats for Parliament by the second ballot in the elections of 1901, we got seven seats by the second ballot of this year. True it is that we lost one seat, obtained by social democracy in a contest for a Parliamentary vacancy after the general election of 1901; true that we lost another seat; but we won one that we never had held before and all in all the results are, as we have said: *Over 25,000 votes increase and one seat more* than we obtained at the former general election.

Yet I have only mentioned one of the obstacles that prevented a great Parliamentary victory for Socialism.* But there were more than one. Holland has for a long run of years hardly ever been governed by any other cabinet than one of the Liberal party. We had about fifteen years ago one "Christian" Conservative minister and that was all. And now in 1901 the Christian cabinet was formed under the premiership of Dr. Kuyper, a man who tried a very personal government. In fact, he did not rule on any principles but on these two: That capitalism had to be strengthened against the rising power of the workers and that *he* had to be the one and all in the State of Holland. No queen, no secretary of state was reckoned with. He tried to be, not in name, perhaps, but in fact, the absolute President of a Dutch Republic. To attain this he gave the higher and the lower offices to his favorites, the more insignificant the better, and every one who wanted to be an official had to believe in God of the Calvinists and in Dr. Kuyper, their prophet. So that the opposition grew day by day. Not only the workers and the Socialists, not only the liberals and the democrats, but the intellectual people, the teachers and the professors, even a great many of the parsons—Dr. Kuyper himself had been a minister in his younger days—went into the opposition. The Socialists of course asked for real liberty, the economical freedom for material existence with all its consequences. But the liberals and the democrats and the intellectuals asked the freedom of the mind, freedom of the school, freedom of the university, freedom of religion. And as Kuyper wanted to lean on the large and little proprietors of the ground, and therefore asked protection, the cry for free trade also was mixed in the great choir of voices that shouted for freedom in everything and deliverance of Kuyper. And all these cries over-shouted the cry of the people for a free existence, and it was a hard work for Holland's social democracy to stand upright and independent in that fierce struggle against both capitalistic parties.

Again I say, seen in this light our party has done splendid work. In the capital, in Amsterdam, one of the focuses of liberal

capitalism, we got over 10,000 votes against 35,000 that were given to the Christian and liberal candidates together. Knowing that in our great cities—Amsterdam has over 550,000 inhabitants—only a tiny part of the great working class has a vote, everybody will recognize this as an important victory, especially as we obtained in this town by the former elections *far less than the half* of this number of social democratic votes.

So that we may conclude that we as yet have not had the famous "*Schweinglück*" that often enlightens the way of German social democracy; but that though everything was there to block our way, we held upright by the first ballot our red flag amidst the black flags of anarchists and clericals and the blue of the liberals and democrats of all sorts. And about one-tenth part of the Dutch people may be said to be on our side after the first elections that were held after the great strike. This may be called a triumph.

DAVID J. WYNKOOP.

Amsterdam, Holland, July, 1905.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

MATERIALIST monism had enabled Marx, Engels and Dietzgen to find a general key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe by means of inductive reasoning from experienced facts. The conscious and consistent application of this method on the part of Marx and Engels permitted them to realize the general evolution of nature and society by dialectic processes, to make a scientific forecast of industrial and political evolution, and to lay bare the mechanism of social evolution under capitalism by the discovery of the origin of surplus-value and the function of class-struggles. In the hands of Dietzgen, the same method produced a theory of understanding which established harmony between the human mind and the universe and solved all the difficulties which had been the stumbling blocks of scholastic and metaphysical philosophy for centuries, and which have remained insuperable obstacles for nearly every bourgeois scientist and philosopher until this day.

The vital truth and strength of dialectic materialism was quickly demonstrated by the fact that this philosophy became the accepted guide of millions of proletarians in all countries, who organized themselves for conscious co-operation in line with evolution. The bourgeois world, ignorant of the historical necessity of this new world-movement and its materialist monist philosophy, continued its heedless and headlong course of individualistic anarchy in thought and action. And when the new movement began to show its power, and press for an organization of social life in accord with higher evolution, the bourgeoisie opposed it with might and main as a danger to "law and order."

But the bourgeois scientists more or less consciously carried the method of dialectic materialism gradually into almost every department of their science. In the last half of the 19th century, the Marxian method was frequently plagiarized by bourgeois professors, especially in the field of sociology, economics and history, with the full knowledge of its original authorship and with the intention of robbing its author of his credit. But not one of the bourgeois plagiarizers or commentators equalled the proletarian master who had made a new departure in those sciences.

In other sciences, especially in biology, physiology, psychology, physics and chemistry, the combination of the dialectic method with science and natural philosophy led to a universal cor-

roboration of the general conclusions established by Marx, Engels and Dietzgen. In the course of the 19th century, nearly every science gradually made front against metaphysical dualism and worked its way towards materialist monism. But while the proletarian mind pursued its steady and conscious course along a consistent materialist monist road, the bourgeois mind never succeeded in fully divesting itself of metaphysical relics. Its class-environment proved too great a handicap for a complete emancipation from all vestiges of metaphysics.

In the beginning of the 19th century, the microscope began to exert its influence on philosophy by a succession of discoveries, which enabled scientists to abandon speculation for facts. The beginnings of the cell-theory, established by Grew in his "Anatomy of Plants," and the first description of the cell-nucleus by R. Brown, in the 17th century, now bore unexpected fruits. Schwann and Schleiden showed that all organic structures are built up of cells, and Van Mohl described a certain substance which forms the lining of cells and called it protoplasm. No one realized as yet that the essential basis for a mechanical explanation of life had thus been discovered.

But the microscope gave rise to an entirely new science, histology, the study of the microscopical structure of animal and plant tissue. Specialization became more and more an indispensable necessity for thorough research, and with the multiplication of special departments the need of correlation by means of philosophical generalization grew apace. Specialist science and natural philosophy thus became more and more indispensable to one another.

From the study of structure to that of function was the next logical step. Thus dialectics inevitably accompanied the new evolution of things in science.

As soon as this stage had been inaugurated, the battle against metaphysics and the survivals of Mosaic philosophy in natural science began to rage all along the line. Vitalism was compelled to reorganize its lines, even though no consistent theory of vital evolution had then become known. In 1833, Johannes Müller attempted to give a physical basis to this metaphysical theory, by comparing the physical processes in animals and man, in his "Handbook of the Physiology of Man." But this work was indirectly a proof of the untenability of the vitalist metaphysics. In spite of the dogged resistance of the old theories, the cell and protoplasm made themselves at home in the studies of bourgeois scientists, and produced in Virchow's "Cellular Pathology" a new departure in the study and treatment of diseases.

This was the time of physiological anatomy, and the work of Müller, Brücke, Helmholtz, Du Bois-Reymond and Ludwig in Germany, and of Claude Bernard in France, became the basis on

which their pupils in those two countries and in England, America, Denmark, Sweden, Italy and Japan built up the structure of modern physiology. In the course of this development, laboratories became a part of every well-equipped school and university.

Chemistry soon took part in this revolution and began to reproduce, by simple laboratory methods, many of the compounds which had been regarded as special products of a supernatural vital energy. Berthelot emphasized the growth of the tendency toward a uniform scientific method of research by declaring in his "*Mécanique Chimique*," that he intended to "introduce into the entire chemistry the same mechanical principles which already reign in the various departments of physics."

In 1846, Leverrier and Adams simultaneously and independently of one another discovered the planet Neptune and thereby reminded the scientists of the vast universe outside of their little specialties. This discovery was a new triumph for empirical science and another blow for revelation and metaphysics. For the existence of this planet had been proclaimed by mathematical astronomy long before it was actually observed by human eyes, and reactionary mysticism had, of course, scoffed at such "daring blasphemy."

Researches concerning the function of electricity, magnetism and light became more frequent, but led to no definite results until the latter half of the 19th century. In 1864, Clerk-Maxwell announced his electro-magnetic theory of light, but it was not until 1887 that Hertz demonstrated the actual existence of electric waves in the ether. In 1881 J. J. Thompson established the basis of the electro-dynamic theory, and in 1888 William Crookes advocated the theory of the formation of chemical elements from one primordial substance. He spoke of an "infinite number of immeasurably small ultimate—or rather ultimattissimate—particles gradually accreting out of the formless mist and moving with inconceivable velocity in all directions." Thus the 19th century reaffirmed on a more infinitesimal and refined scale the atomic theory of Democritus.

With the steady progress of this new tendency, Lamarckian ideas gained more and more favor in the eyes of the younger generation of scientists and found two able champions, about the middle of the 19th century, in Alfred R. Wallace and Charles Darwin. In 1859 Darwin's "*Origin of Species*" carried fresh dismay into the ranks of metaphysics and theology. Here was the irrefutable proof that Lamarck's ideas of descent and heredity were upheld by the facts of nature as occurring before our eyes in animals and plants. And in addition to these irrefutable facts, Darwin laid bare the mechanism by which natural evolution produced the various animal and plant species, which had so long been claimed as special creations. Without any guiding intellect,

without any preconceived purpose, by an apparent fortuitous natural selection, which, however, was the product of forces mutually controlling one another, nature was seen to produce its variety of forms by incessant interaction of forces, by a struggle of all organic forms against one another and with their environment, leading to the survival of those which were best equipped for this struggle by superior powers of adaptation to the conditions surrounding them. These produced an offspring well adapted to continue the struggle under the same conditions and in their turn to transmit their qualities to their progeny by means of heredity, while the organisms not well adapted to their conditions of life were eliminated from the line of evolution.

One of the most significant results of this transformist theory was that it wiped out the line of demarcation, not only between the various animal species, but also between animals and plants. In his first work, Darwin had left the question of man's descent open, from considerations of expediency. But when Wallace, Huxley, Haeckel and others showed that "in every visible character, man differs less from the higher apes than these do from the lower members of the same order," Darwin assented and came forth with his "Descent of Man," in which he indicated the evolution of man and the anthropoid apes from a common man-like ancestor.

Simultaneously with Wallace and Darwin, Herbert Spencer appeared upon the scene, supplementing and perfecting their work by a complete elaboration of the theory of organic evolution and tracing the struggle for existence through all its manifold aspects. In his "First Principles," he stated the general outline of the universal theory. In his "Principles of Biology," he applied it to the life of organisms. In his "Principles of Psychology," he furnished a comprehensive summary of the results of physiological psychology. And in his "Principles of Sociology," he presented the relations of this theory, as he understood it, to human society, activity and ideas in general. Although we are far from agreeing with Spencer on all points, as we shall presently show, we have no hesitation in saying that Spencer's works rank as high in the evolution of materialism as Hegel's do in idealism. The "Synthetic Philosophy" will always hold its place among the great works of the world.

In Darwin, Wallace and Spencer, dialectic materialism erected on English soil a landmark of its progress over speculative idealism. Although the dogmatism and bigotry of the entire reactionary world united in a furious assault upon their work, not one of their fundamental stones in the structure of evolution was injured by the attack. Metaphysics and theology had no weapons with which to defeat their materialist antagonist in open battle.

Vainly did Agassiz try to save personal creation and fixed species by his "Essay on Classification." Vainly did the most reactionary of churches set its learned men to work forging arguments against Lamarckian, Darwinian and Spencerian transformism. Instead of defeating the new ideas, even the Jesuit scientists that had not quite degenerated into spiritual obesity from lack of exercise of their reason became gradually "tainted" with transformist ideas, and finally the church itself sanctioned the greater part of the new ideas as divine creations and, as usual, sought to ruin by adoption what it could not conquer by force. And the palaeontological work of Agassiz himself compelled him to proclaim the fact of progressive changes in the organisms of each successive geological epoch.

By tracing the descent of man below the primates, the question of the evolution of man was not fully solved. It was merely stated in its correct form, and science could not rest satisfied and regard the Darwinian theories as proven, until it had located the transition forms between the common primeval ancestor of man and anthropoid apes and then followed the line of evolution as far back through the lower animals as human faculties would permit. It was palaeontology, embryology, comparative physiology and histology that became the most convincing witnesses for the mechanical origin and development of organisms. In the Neanderthal man, the Spy man, the Krapina man and the Pithecanthropus of Trinil, palaeontology supplied one by one the missing links between man, the anthropoid apes and their primitive common ancestor. At the same time, it gathered the proofs of the existence of similar types in the Tertiary age. Haeckel formulated his biogenetic law, which revealed the fact that individual development (ontogeny) is a condensed repetition of the race development (phylogeny), and that the embryos and newborn individuals resemble their ancestral types more closely than the adult parents. Then came Behring with his discovery that blood serum of horses treated with poison of diphtheria bacilli was an antidote and preventive of diphtheria, and Uhlenhuth found that blood transfusion furnished an infallible test for the close or remote relationship of animals. Uhlenhuth, Wassermann, Stern, Friedenthal and Nuttall continued these experiments and proved the blood relationship of man and the anthropoid apes.

In therapeutics and pathology, similar experiments led to the introduction, by Koch, Pasteur and others, of serous treatment, and the advance of chemistry supplied anaesthetics for surgical operations and robbed pain of its victims.

Comparative physiology, assisted by the biogenetic law and palaeontology, gradually traced the evolution of man from the common ancestor of man and primates down through some primitive species of lemurs (night monkeys), thence on through mar-

supials, duckbills, saurians, fishes, to ascidians. Then Haeckel advanced his gastrula theory and divided the lowest organisms into unicellular protozoa and protophyta and multicellular metazoa and metaphyta, bringing the descent of man down to some primordial common protist ancestor of animals and plants.

In Haeckel's "New History of Creation" and Boelsche's "Evolution of Man," the whole thread of evolution from the unicellular protoplasm to modern man is outlined so plainly that we can follow it from natural specimen to natural specimen and convince ourselves by a visit to any well-equipped museum of natural history of the reality of this outline.

In the sixties, Kirchhoff and Bunsen discovered spectral analysis and thus furnished science with another revolutionary instrument, by which the unity of the farthest fixed star with the rest of the universe was irrefutably demonstrated. Ethnology and the study of languages clearly established the unity of the human race. Natural science dominated all human thought and even found its way into political history in Buckle's "History of Civilization."

Once that the unity of all organisms in the world had been established, two questions immediately required an answer. One of them concerned the unity of psychological phenomena, the other that of life.

If the physiological development of mankind, animals and plants knows no line of demarcations, but only degrees of organization, and if psychology is in reality a branch of physiology, why should there be a line of demarcation between the psychological development of man, animals and plants? And if all organisms are descended from some common primordial protoplasmatic form, then the discovery of the origin of the vital processes of that form, or of any form, would solve the question of all organic life in the universe.

The answer of science to both questions was positive. Romanes, Haeckel and Jacques Loeb accumulated superabundant proofs for the physiological nature of the "soul" and the fundamental unity of the "soul" life of all organisms. The line of demarcation was gradually wiped out between mankind, animals and plants, also in psychology.

Romanes, in his "Mental Evolution of Animals and Man," pictured the growth of the "soul" from primitive beginnings to its present superb organization in the brain and nerve system of man. Haeckel in his "Soul Cells and Cell-Souls" demonstrated that the fundamental conditions of "soul" life were contained in every cell, whether it was a human, animal or plant cell. And Loeb showed convincingly that so-called intelligent or instinctive action does not depend on a supernatural, or even natural, centers of orientation or control, but on chemical and physical interac-

tions between the environment and the individual. The attraction toward the earth (geotropism), toward the light (heliotropism), toward solid bodies (stereotropism), and similar movements, in connection with electricity, magnetism, radiation and chemicophysical changes in the organism, explained all the intricate "soul" processes formerly attributed to supernatural intelligence or animal instinct. Hereditary transmission by means of simple natural processes in connection with use or disuse, produced the faculty of conscious memory in the higher organisms and led by imperceptible stages of gradation to the superior mind of man. The primitive line of psychic development has been outlined in popular language in Francé's "Germs of Mind in Plants."

The quest after the origin of life compelled science to penetrate far beyond so-called living organisms. It led on into the inorganic, and wiped out the line of demarcation between organic and inorganic, living and dead matter. It showed that organic life arose through the mechanical evolution of inorganic life. It revealed that life and death are but two poles of the same universe, that the distinction can no longer be between life and death, but only between different degrees of organization and intensity of life, between positive and negative life.

Personal immortality now resolves itself into personal evolution. Life and consciousness are now revealed as attributes of all matter, going through as many different stages of evolution as the various material forms in the universe. The personal immortality of any definite form would involve the control of all evolutionary processes which endanger the persistence of that form. So long as such a control is not established, there is a "transmigration of the soul," but not in the way that the mystics use this term. The physiological processes of a certain positive consciousness, or "soul," are simply converted by the process of "death," into negative consciousness, which in turn becomes the positive consciousness of some other form.

With Haeckel and Jacques Loeb a school of biologists has arisen, which marks a new stage in the revolution of the ideas concerning life and consciousness. This school has made the first steps toward a conscious control of the processes of life and consciousness, and the question of the control of these processes is within measurable distance of solution by means of laboratory methods. Loeb's works on tropisms and his "Comparative Physiology of the Brain and Comparative Psychology" are indispensable text-books for every sincere student of materialist monism.

Other sciences have likewise gone far on the road toward a conscious control of universal processes. Liebig's commercial chemistry inaugurated the realization of Berthelot's dream, who looked forward to a time when all human foodstuffs would be prepared in the laboratory and the drudgery of industrial and

agricultural labor eliminated. A new impetus was given to electric vacuum work in 1893-95 by the publication in Germany of the results of experiments made by Lenard and Röntgen, showing that certain rays of light, invisible to the human eye, penetrated substances, which had been considered impenetrable for light of any kind, and affected photographic plates. And in 1896, Becquerel, experimenting in France with phenomena of phosphorescence, showed that salts of uranium emit radiations, which penetrate opaque bodies, affect photographic plates and discharge an electrometer. Following close upon Becquerel's discoveries came the brilliant work of Mr. and Mrs. Curie on the radio-activity of bodies accompanying uranium (radium and helium).

Edison's phonograph, Marconi's and Tesla's experiments with wireless telegraphy, liquid air, the transmission of power by means of waterfalls or tides of the oceans, sun-motors, airships, color-photography, the ultra-microscope and similar discoveries and inventions, augur an impending revolution in methods of industrial activity, reducing the element of distance to a minimum, transforming manual labor into a superintendence of machines, and narrowing the domain of disease and death. Everywhere we see the coming of that conscious control of elements which Marx has foretold.

But here, where natural science touches elbows with social science, even the clearest of the bourgeois thinkers bears evidence to the force of environment by falling short of a complete monistic conception of evolution. For such a conception foreshadows the abolition of the ruling classes and the control of society by the working class. Even the most encyclopedic mind among the bourgeois transformists, the avatar of evolution, as he has been called, Herbert Spencer, admitted but grudgingly that the evolution of society tended inevitably toward socialism. And so enveloped was he in the prejudices of bourgeois individualism, in spite of his understanding of the trend toward socialization, in spite of the eloquent language of dialectic evolution which through his own mouth heralded the conscious interrelation of things, that he completely misapprehended the effects of the socialization and democratization of industry and bemoaned the sad fate of humanity under the "coming slavery." In ethics, his bourgeois horizon likewise did not permit him to arrive at a dialectic solution. He could not reconcile his biological and social ethics with his idea of the coming slavery.

The same criticism applies to Haeckel, who in many respects equals Spencer in his conception of evolution. Haeckel's monism is not free from class bias and metaphysical vestiges. He interpreted the struggle for existence with regard to man as an aristocratic principle, resulting in the selection of "the best," and declared that the "crazy ideas" of the socialists had nothing to do

with Darwinism. Forty years of socialist literature and activity in Germany have made little change in his opinions on this point. He has never realized that the struggle of man against nature is accompanied by the struggle of economic classes, and that the modern class-struggle between the working class and the capitalist class is a democratic principle, resulting in the organization of a new social environment, in which the struggle of classes shall be eliminated, and man unite all his social and individual forces for the struggle against nature. In his ethics he is as vague as Spencer, unable to reconcile his biological understanding of the physical basis of ethics with his views on sociology.

The logical result of this class bias is that notwithstanding all the efforts of Haeckel and others to establish a perfect monism, they are unable to escape from the contradictions inherent in the historical myopia of the bourgeoisie. Haeckel's works on monism, such as the "Riddle of the Universe," "Monism," or "The Wonders of Life," are sadly disfigured by sudden relapses into metaphysical language and thought. The same incongruities also vitiate the scientific discussions of bourgeois Darwinians, whenever the subject calls for an understanding of the dialectic nature of evolution, more especially an understanding of the peculiar nature of the human faculty of thought. The discussion of the continuity of the germ plasm and the transmission of hereditary characters by natural selection through the sole agency of this plasm in multicellular organisms, as advocated by Weismann, or of the mutation theory of De Vries, who tries to explain the sudden appearance of new varieties by the peculiar laws of crossing, would have produced far better results if the bourgeois scientists could have agreed on a consistent understanding of "natural selection," and if they could have risen sufficiently above their environment to grasp the full significance of materialist monism as revealed by Dietzgen's theory of understanding. As it is, they one-sidedly emphasize now this, now that, forgetting the wider interrelations of their subject, and this little shortcoming defeats all their efforts to disentangle themselves from the difficulties of their semi-metaphysical mode of reasoning. The tangle in the details of Darwinism and Spencerianism will not be straightened out until a socialist Darwinian will bring order out of this chaos, as Marx did out of bourgeois political economy.

This bourgeois handicap becomes especially apparent whenever the practical application of scientific understanding comes into conflict with the business organization of bourgeois society. A drastic illustration of this fact is furnished by the attempt to reform the department of criminology and introduce evolutionary methods into the treatment of the insane. When the revolution in psychology demanded a revision of the ideas concerning the free will and personal responsibility of criminals, the bourgeois

criminologist made vain efforts to bring their criminal codes into accord with the new facts without undermining their own juridical foundation. This became especially plain in Italy, where the ideas of Beccaria acted as a ferment and led to the rise of the so-called positive school of criminology, in the last quarter of the 19th century. Carrara, Pessina and even Lombroso strove vainly to overcome bourgeois environment by radical bourgeois criminology. They did not get farther away from mediaval methods and mass imprisonment than an imitation of the American system of solitary confinement would permit, with its corollary of sham justice. And they gave up in despair the attempt to find the dividing line between conscious and unconscious action, between completed and incompleting crime. It was not until Lombroso's disciple, Enrico Ferri, found his way into the field of historical materialism and socialism that the positive school of criminology was enabled to teach a monistic and evolutionary solution for the vexed question of social crime, by demanding the social prevention of crime instead of police repression. But Ferri does not indulge in any illusions as to the revolutionary role which the bourgeoisie may play in this question. He understands that the evolution into socialism is the only means of realizing his demand. His "Socialism and Criminality" and "Socialism and Modern Science" are gems of dialectic and monistic materialism.

It is a significant fact that not one of the numerous textbooks on psychology written by bourgeois professors for the use of universities takes frankly issue with the metaphysical rubbish of pseudo-science and espouses uncompromisingly the cause of materialist monism. And this is so for the same reason that no bourgeois professor teaches the Marxian theory of surplus-value and accepts its logical conclusions. The same reason prevents bourgeois Darwinians from accepting the facts of socialism. Darwin was at least honest enough to admit that he had not studied sociology and did not consider himself competent to judge of the merits of Marx's "Capital." But the modern Darwinians are not so modest. They ridicule the socialist philosophy before they have studied it. On the other hand, every socialist writer of note is a convinced Darwinian and Spencerian besides being a convinced Marxian. For this reason, the socialist Darwinians are alone able to reason in a consistent materialist monist way.

When in 1877 Lewis H. Morgan appeared with his main work, "Ancient Society," in which he demonstrated the blindness of his predecessors, Bachofen and McLennan, in the field of anthropology and disclosed the true nature of the primitive sexual organizations, it was the socialist Engels who rescued Morgan's work from oblivion and applied the new discoveries of Morgan concerning these primitive "gentes" with telling effect

to further historical research. In Engel's "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," the connection between the dissolution of the primitive sex-organizations and the rise of private ownership of the essential means of production was laid bare, and the origin of the modern state as a result of this process clearly proven. And the socialist Cunow, in his "Sex-Organizations of Australian Aborigines," supplemented and perfected Morgan's work by additional studies.

Again, when bourgeois female emancipation started its painless crusade and hoped for the support of the equally painless bourgeois science, it was the socialist Bebel, who in his "Woman in the Past, Present and Future" demonstrated the weakness of bourgeois science and reminded bourgeois women that female emancipation was a process of evolution and could be accomplished only through the proletarian class-struggle.

And finally, when the bourgeois psychologists kept turning around their own axis in the vain endeavor to find a monistic formulation for the new psychological facts, it was the socialist Engels, who in his "Anti-Duhring" showed that the dialectic process pervaded society and nature, and the socialist Josef Dietzgen, who in his "Outcome of Philosophy" perfected his materialistic monism by demonstrating that the universe is an organism and the infinite cause and effect of everything, including itself and the human faculty of thought, or "soul."

But bourgeois minds will as soon accept the socialist philosophy as a camel will go through a needle's eye, or a rich man go to jail. So the bourgeois science gropes along as best it may in its half-hearted monism which is not monism, continues the fruitless discussion of semi-metaphysical *functions, forces, or faculties*, and leaves much room for the speculations of pseudo-scientific occultism. With *functions, forces and faculties*, all manner of miracles are performed by spiritualists, mental scientists, theosophists and other votaries of the mystic. But what do these terms signify? What is, for instance, the faculty (function, force) of thought?

Labor is a function of labor-power. Labor-power is the latent (potential) energy of the human body, and it performs its function by converting this potential energy into kinetic energy, or motion. Quite analogically, thinking is a function of the faculty of thought. This faculty is the labor-power of the human brain, the latent energy of the protoplasmic system of the human body. The brain performs its function by converting its latent energy into motion, or thought, in response to all the stimuli sent to it by way of the protoplasmic system. This function is a labyrinth of objective reactions and subjective counter-reactions. It is all this as a part of the entire natural universe, and it is nothing else. The difference between conscious and unconscious, or

subconscious, thought is purely one of the intensity of stimuli and reaction. And when physio-chemical biology will have analyzed this labyrinth of processes, traced its fundamental reactions in the laboratory and connected them with the final source of all, the universe, man will know all that his faculty of thought can find out about itself and other riddles of the universe.

This conception of the universe and of the human soul is diametrically opposed to metaphysical and theological dualism. Truly does Haeckel cry out: "An honest and objective observation of these obvious antagonisms makes their reconciliation impossible. Either an understanding of nature and experience, or the fables of belief and revelation!"

But a scientific theory of understanding implies the recognition of the socialist philosophy. And the only element which is conscious striving for the realization of this philosophy is the class-conscious proletariat of the world.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(THE END.)

(This series of articles is about to be published in book form, as a part of the "Library of Science for the Workers," under the title "Science and Revolution." The book will also contain two additional chapters applying the historical material to present conditions.—EDITOR.)

Concerning Sacrifices.

I caught my flesh saying to my soul that it had made some sacrifices for Truth's Cause.

Astounded I stood in silence.

Flesh finally shamed to silence, Soul flamed forth,—identifying me with Flesh:

"Thou art aflame with love and zeal for this great Cause?

"Let's estimate the *sacrifices*, O thou strident boaster of bestowals!

"One *might* have loved his enemies with such all-mastering love as would have won them to the life-long service of the Cause.

"One *might* have borne the base betrayals of his Judases with manliness so manifestly love-inspired that Judas had survived and stood unflinchingly through future flames—a great evangel for Truth's Cause.

"One *might* with little effort have been martyred for e'en a half-way truthful cause—have let the free-shed blood be seed for something mightier than a church in love-bestowal, uplift, saving-power (in Time) producing men from a brute beast soil.

"One *might*, with mightier consecration, have accomplished Truth's commands. With perfect consecration this could be, *and not one sacrifice then call to Truth for recognition or expected recompense.*

"One might at least have starved, gone naked or scant clothed, never rested night or day through unremembered years for such a Cause."

* * * * *

"Instead, thou standest shamed, alive, with little done, thought not too hardly of by rivaling plutocrats, rulers, priests, parsons, church-deacons, elders and the sort! contributing a dole *at times* that never caused one lack of comfort in thy full, well-fed, well-clothed, well-sheltered life——

"*Thou!* and speaking of a sacrifice, *to Truth!!*

"*Thou and standing shamed before thy Soul!?"*

Thus flamed my soul illuminating words before the startled senses cowering in shame, silenced, paralyzed with perfect comprehension of the past.

Come, Comrade, let the accusation stand, said I to Flesh; *forthwith let us accomplish Truth's commands.*

* * * * *

O CAUSE BELOVED, THE DAY OF PERFECT CONSECRATION IS AT HAND.

—EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLTZ.

At The Live-Oaks, Turnersville, Texas.

Value and Surplus Value.

(Continued.)

TRUE to his method of "no philosophy," Marx set about his task of finding the true laws of exchange-value in the most "unphilosophic," matter-of-fact way. He argued that, while the laws of value furnish the key to the understanding of our economic system, those laws themselves can only be derived from the observation of the actual every-day facts of our production and distribution. In order, however, that these facts may be properly understood and appreciated they must be examined in their historical connection and in their proper historical setting.

The production and distribution of the capitalist system can be best studied by an examination of a typically capitalistic commodity; A Factory Product. While the capitalist system has impressed itself upon every phase of life of every society in which it prevails, so that nothing can escape it, whether it properly belongs within its domain or not, its characteristic features, its vital elements, are contained in their purity and simplicity only in its historic embodiment,—the factory product. The factory product is not only the historic form of capitalist production, accompanying its appearance on the historical arena as its technical embodiment, but it represents the vast majority of all the commodities of capitalist society. The factory product bears the imprint of capitalism so deeply emblazoned upon it, and is so free from entangling alliances with any forms of production other than capitalistic, that there can be absolutely no mistaking its origin and virtues. Not so with other products. Take, for instance, a farm product. You can not, by the manner of its production, tell whether it was produced under the capitalistic regime or not. This is due to the fact that our form of ownership and cultivation of land have to a great extent remained far behind the general progress of our economy. We cannot, therefore, by examining a farm product tell the characteristics of capitalist productions, for we cannot tell which of the properties of the farm product are the result of capitalism and which are the survival of some prior mode of production. After we shall have learned to know the characteristics of capitalist production, we shall see that these characteristics are to be found also in the capitalistically produced farm product. The examination of the farm product may, therefore, serve to find

out the limits of the laws of capitalistic production, but not these laws themselves. For that purpose we must study the factory product.

It is well to remember in this connection that historically the capitalist system has built its foundation on the ruins of farming. That their progress is usually in the inverse ratio, to each other. It is one of the contradictions of capitalist society, that while it needs farm products in order to sustain itself, farming does not fit into its scheme. In such typically capitalistic countries as England, for instance, this contradiction was solved by practically eliminating farming, and drawing its food supply from abroad. But as this is an obviously impossible solution for the whole capitalistic world, attempts have been made to capitalize farming. So far, this has met with only indifferent success. That is why the "agrarian question" is now uppermost in all economic discussions. From all this it is perfectly plain that if we want to understand the capitalistic system we must study the factory product.

The chief characteristic feature of the factory product as a natural phenomenon, that which marks its contrast to the farm product, is its comparative independence of climatic and other natural phenomena—an independence which makes it practically reproducible at will. Unlike the farm product, which depends for its successful production on the varying conditions of soil and climate, conditions usually not subject to change at the hands of man, and therefore limited in its production by a force to which all men must bow, the factory product knows no other superior but man who reproduces it at will. The limits of the production of the factory product are not given by nature, but imposed by man; production of the factory product increases or slackens in accordance with the demands of the "market;" that is to say, its limits are set by the relations of the members of society in the distribution of the manufactured product among themselves. In this it typifies the capitalist system. With the advent of the capitalist system poverty and riches have ceased to be a natural condition; they have become a social relation.

Let us, then, take the factory product and follow its natural course in life; let us examine the manner of its production, the course it takes in the circulation of goods to the point of its ultimate destination,—consumption; let us see who are the persons participating in its production, instrumental in its circulation and sharing in its distribution.

In thus writing the biography of any factory product we will find that its life history will read as follows:

It was produced in a large factory building owned or hired by the manufacturer. It was made by a large number of workmen hired by the same manufacturer, who paid them for

their labor, out of materials provided for by the manufacturer, and by means of machinery owned by him. After our factory product was ready for use it was shipped to a wholesale dealer, who bought it from the manufacturer, and who, in turn, sold it to a retail dealer. From the retail dealer it went to the consumer, who purchased it from him. This is the usual course. There are, however, variations of this course. The wholesale dealer may, for instance, have been omitted, if the manufacturer sells direct to the retailer; or, there may have been a good deal more of buying and selling done in it before it finally reached the consumer. One thing is sure, however, its life-course led through these three stages: manufacture, trade, consumption.

The persons who met in this, its life-course, who affected its existence and its different changes, and who participated in its distribution in one way or another, besides those who participated in the production and distribution of the raw material from which it was made, which may itself have been a factory product, are: The laborer who produced it and was paid for it; the manufacturer who caused it to be produced, paid the cost of its production, and who received the purchase price from the trader who bought it from him; the merchant who bought it at one price and resold it at another, pocketing the difference; and, finally, the consumer, who paid for it and kept it for consumption, either personal, non-productive or impersonal, productive consumption in the manufacture of some other factory product. There may have been others: the manufacturer may have paid rent for his premises to the landlord or interest for his capital to the banker; the trader may have paid rent, interest, or for help; there may have been a lot of time and labor spent in transporting it from place to place until it finally reached its place of ultimate destination, the consumer—and all of this had to be paid for.

All these persons who participated in the production or circulation of our factory product, and all those with whom they must "divvy up," must share in our factory product, that is to say, in the price which the ultimate consumer paid for it. Let us see how it is done.

We must, of course, as already pointed out in the preceding article, assume that each gets what is due him, under our present system, as they are all presumed to be honest, and the cases of one getting advantage of the other are exceptional, and they are all free agents working without compulsion. The workingman is "free" to work or not to work, so is the manufacturer and merchant to hire, buy and sell. The capitalist system needs for its proper development, and we therefore assume, absolute freedom, personal and commercial. How, then, is the share of each determined, when is it produced and when paid over?

It must always be remembered that none of those interested in the production, circulation and distribution of the factory product, have any interest whatever in its existence, or desire for its possession. None of them gets any share of it physically. Their distributive share comes out of the purchase price paid for it by its ultimate consumer, who takes it out of the "market," converts it from a commodity into an ordinary good possessing only its natural qualities of a use-value. In other words, each of their distributive shares comes of the exchange-value of the commodity which is turned into the universal medium of exchange—money—by its sale to the ultimate consumer.

This exchange-value first manifests itself when the manufacturer has the commodity ready for sale and places it on the market for which it was produced. The manufacturer produced it not for its use-value,—he never had any personal use for it and never intended to use it,—but for its exchange-value, and as soon as it is ready in exchangeable form he offers it for sale or exchange. He sells it, again, to somebody who has absolutely no personal use for it and does not intend to use it himself, but buys it just as the manufacturer manufactured it, because of the exchange-value there is in it, and which, by the way, for some reason or other, he expects to be more than what he pays for it.

On this first manifestation of the exchange-value of the factory-produced commodity the manufacturer gets in exchange for it a certain sum of money or other commodities, the price obtained on its sale or exchange. The exchange value of the commodity has realized itself in his hands in the form of its price.

We must not, however, confuse price with value. Value is something which the commodity possesses when placed upon the market and before any price is paid for it, and it is because of this value that the price is paid for it. The value is the cause of the price. Furthermore, value and price do not always coincide in amount. The price of an article may be greater or less than its value, according to circumstances. The proof of this is the fact that things may be bought "cheap" or "dear," that is to say, for a price above or below their value. If the price of a thing and its value were the same, nothing could be bought either cheap or dear, because the price paid would be its value. The fact that we speak of things as being bought or sold "cheap" or "dear" proves that our valuation of the thing is something outside of the price, and therefore something with which the price may be compared and proved either too high or too low. It is, therefore, manifest that value and price are not only not identical in their nature, but that they do not always

even coincide in amount. And this, notwithstanding the fact that value is the cause of price. The reason for it is easily discovered. Value is a social relation and is therefore determined by social conditions, whereas price is an individual valuation and is therefore determined by individual motivation. Value being the cause of price, the chief motive of the individual making the price, will, of course, be the value of the thing priced. This does not mean, however, the actual value of the thing, but his idea of its value. Whether this idea will be a correct estimate of the actual value of the thing depends, of course, on a number of individual circumstances and conditions. Besides this chief motive, again, there may be a number of subsidiary motives, all being either directly individual in their character, or individual estimates of social conditions or relations. All this produces what is called the "haggling of the market." As a result of this haggling comes the price actually paid for the article, and the average of the prices paid makes the market price.

This price is purely accidental within certain limits, being the result of individual volitions based on individual estimation. It is so within certain limits only, for it is controlled by its primary cause,—value—which sets the standard by which it is measured and to which it naturally tends to conform, and will conform the more the nearer to the truth are the individual estimates of the social relations and conditions, and the freer the individual motivations are from purely personal considerations. Value is the norm about which the "haggling" of the market takes place, and the price which results from this "haggling" naturally gravitates towards its norm-value. Price will be "cheap" or "dear" according to whether it is, in the estimation of the person making the valuation, below or above the actual value of the thing.

What is this social element, this social relation, which gives a commodity its value? A careful search will reveal only one element common to all commodities, which is social in its character and is capable of giving commodities the value which will express the social relations of production, and that is—*Human Labor*. The production of the typically capitalist commodity, the factory product, is wholly a question of the application of human labor, physical or mental, and its results merely a question of the quantity and quality of the human labor expended. It is this labor which gives the product its value. It is by the expenditure of this labor that its value is measured. It is as the embodiment of a certain quantity—quality of human labor that the finished product is placed upon the market for sale, and it is as such that it is exchanged for another commodity, or the universal commodity, money. In making a sale or ex-

change the parties estimate the respective quantities of labor contained in the articles exchanged or in the articles sold and the price given, and if one finds them to be equal or to preponderate in his own favor he makes the bargain. The question of quality is also regarded as a question of quantity, labor of a higher nature being reduced to its simple form of ordinary average labor of which it represents a larger quantity.

It must be borne in mind, however, that, value being a social phenomenon based on social conditions and relations, it is not the labor which happens to be accidentally contained in any given commodity, as the result of some individual conditions or circumstances under which its producer worked, that gives the commodity its value, but the socially necessary labor therein contained. In other words, the value of a commodity is not derived from the particular labor actually put into its production, nor from the amount of labor actually expended upon its production, but from the amount of average human labor which it is necessary for society to expend for its production. The mere expenditure of labor on the production of any article does not make that article a commodity having exchange value. It is social expenditure of the labor, that is, its expenditure for the purposes of social productions, of the production for society of things which are useful for it, that makes the article produced a commodity having exchange-value. The expenditure, therefore, in order to create value must be necessary in accordance with the social relations and conditions existing at the time the valuation is made. This includes a variety of considerations, only the most important of which can be noted here.

To begin with, "socially necessary" labor must not be confused with "average" labor. The average of labor only comes into play when the productive power of individual producers working with the same tools is under consideration. Otherwise, "socially necessary" and "average" may, and very often do, represent different things. For instance, the labor expended on the production of an article, in order to create new value, must, in addition to having been productive according to the average expenditure for the production of such articles, have created something which was necessary for society. In determining whether an article is "necessary" for society or not, it is not merely the general usefulness of the article and its actual necessity for some of the members of society that is to be considered, but also, whether, in the state of the society's economy, the need for such articles has not already been provided for sufficiently when compared with other needs, and having due regard to the general conditions of production and distribution in society. If too much of a certain commodity is produced, too much not absolutely, but according to existing social conditions and rela-

tions, such production does not create any additional value. It is so much labor wasted. Of course, that does not mean that any particular labor thus expended will create no value, or that any particular article thus produced will have no value. But, value being a social relation, all the labor expended in the production of this class of articles in society will produce less value proportionately, each article will have so much less value, so that the aggregate of such articles produced will have no more value than if that labor were not expended and the additional article were not produced.

Again,—the tools of production in a certain industry may be undergoing a change by which the amount of labor necessary to be expended in the production of a certain article is reduced. During the period of transition the “average” amount of labor expended on the production of the article will be considerably above the amount necessary for its production by means of the new tools and considerably below that of the old, for the average is made up of the articles produced by means of both the old and the new tools in so far as they are being used. The value of the commodities produced, however, will not be measured by the average expenditure of labor, but either by that of the old or that of the new methods. If the new method has not yet been sufficiently perfected, so that it can not as yet supply the needs of society, then the valuation will be in accordance with the old method; if it has been so perfected, then in accordance with the new method. If, between the time of the production of an article and its valuation in the market, the new tools have attained the required degree of efficiency, the value of this article, whether produced by the old or the new method, will change from the valuation in accordance with the old method, which was socially necessary at the time of production, to that in accordance with the new method, which is that now socially necessary.

In other words, the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor which society will necessarily have to expend for its production when it requires it. That is to say, by the amount of labor socially necessary for its *reproduction*.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Evolution by Mutation.

PROF. HUGO DE VRIES of the University of Amsterdam has been pursuing a series of investigations, the results of which he has published in a recent work, * which in many ways presents some of the most important contributions that have been made to the theory of evolution since the writings of Darwin. The author himself disclaims all originality. He says: "My work claims to be in full accord with the principles laid down by Darwin, and to give a thorough and sharp analysis of some of the ideas of variability, inheritance, selection and mutation, which were necessarily vague at his time." While the fact of the origin of species by evolution is now universally accepted by men of science, and generally ignored in the reasoning of most bourgeois editorial writers, yet the methods by which it operates are still very much in dispute. The question of how new species originate for "natural selection" to "select" has always been considered one of the weak points in the theory.

"On this point Darwin has recognized two possibilities. One means of change lies in the sudden and spontaneous production of new forms from the old stock. The other method is the gradual accumulation of those always present and ever fluctuating variations which are indicated by the common assertion that no two individuals of a given race are exactly alike. The first changes are what we now call mutations, the second are designated as 'individual variations,' or as this term is often used in another sense, as 'fluctuations.'"

Of late years, owing largely to the influence of Wallace, all the emphasis has been laid upon the slow gradual evolution through a succession of minute fluctuations. De Vries, on the other hand, announces as the purpose of his book:

"I intend to give a review of the facts obtained from plants which go to prove the assertion, that species and varieties have originated by mutation, and are, at present, not known to originate in any other way."

The question of what constitutes a species must first be determined, and he concludes that "any form which remains constant and distinct from its allies in the garden is to be considered as an elementary species." Once that such a species has been established he shows that no amount of selection can make any great change. For a short time selections of the best specimens within the species produce startling results, but this process soon reaches its limit. He shows, by a host of illustrations drawn from the

* "Species and Varieties, their Origin by Mutation," by Hugo de Vries. Open Court Publishing Co., cloth 865 pp., \$5.00 net.

sugar beet, double flowers, cane sugar and other long cultivated plants, that practically no improvements have been made for centuries, although the species have in some cases been subject to the closest and most scientific selection. Neither do great changes in the environment produce corresponding permanent changes in the species, as is shown by experiments with Alpine and desert varieties, which, after having been subjected to the peculiar selective action of the extraordinary environment presented on high mountains and deserts, for centuries, will revert to the ordinary lowland or humid type in the life of a single individual. The great variety found in some cultivated species seems to be due rather to the original selection of greatly varying types, than to the effects of subsequent selection. (On all these points it is impossible to cite any portion of the wealth of evidence accumulated in support of the positions stated).

While this constant state of the species is the normal one, yet there come times when great and sudden fluctuations take place, which give rise to permanent distinct species. These are what he calls "mutations." These mutations are sharply distinguished from "fluctuations" such as constantly occur in all living things. He says concerning "fluctuations":

"Their essential character is the heaping up of slight deviations around a mean, and the occurrence of continuous lines of increasing deviations, linking the extremes within this group. Nothing of the kind is observed in the case of mutations. There is no mean for them to be grouped around, and the extreme only is seen, and it is wholly unconnected with the original type."

Over and over he points out that there are no stepping stones between the new and the old. There is no succession of stages that can be pointed out. Nor do the new species show any signs of reversion to type. Its fluctuations are around a new mean, and not around that of the parent from which it sprang.

A large amount of material had been accumulated in support of this position before actual experimentation proved it. Many new species were shown to have suddenly appeared at different points, which showed no close line of variations between them and neighboring plants of the older species. Yet it was always possible to claim that these might have come from some previously existing, but hitherto undiscovered species. Finally, however, in an experiment with the evening primrose (*Oenothera Lamarckiana*) new species were produced under all the restrictions of laboratory experimentation. From one and the same lot of seeds, all taken from a single existing species showing no variations in the direction of wide fluctuations, five new species were produced. These were distinct in every way, well marked, permanent and showed no signs of reversion to type.

Sufficient has already been determined about this method of

evolution to make it possible to formulate some of the laws of mutations.

"The first law is, that new elementary species appear suddenly, without intermediate steps."

The second law is that

"New forms spring laterally from the main stem." They may leave the old species unaffected and generally do, but a few individuals seeming to be affected by the mutating principle. At the same time several new species may spring into life at once.

III. "New elementary species attain their full constancy at once."

Several other laws are given, but these are the more important. "It is readily granted that the constant condition of species is the normal one, and that mutating periods must be the exception." He does not attempt to determine what it is that gives rise to this condition of mutability, but he makes a couple of almost startling suggestions:

We may search for mutable plants in nature, or we may hope to induce species to become mutable by artificial methods. The first promises to yield results most quickly, but the scope of the second is much greater, and it may yield results of far more importance. Indeed, if it should once become possible to bring plants to mutate at our will, and perhaps even in arbitrarily chosen directions, there is no limit to the power we may finally hope to gain over nature.

In this connection he makes the following observations:

The amount of mutability and its possible directions may be assumed to be due to internal causes. The determination of the moment at which they will become active can never be the result of internal causes. It must be assigned to some external factor, and as soon as this is discovered the way for experimental investigation is open.

Summing up the results of this very hasty survey, we may assert that species remain unchanged for indefinite periods, while at times they are in the alternative condition. Then at once they produce new forms, often in large numbers, giving rise to swarms of subspecies. All facts point to the conclusion that these periods of stability and mutability alternate more or less regularly with one another.

This theory at once meets the only two objections to the theory of evolution that have ever been worthy of consideration. One of these was the question of the origin of the variations to be selected, the other was the time objection.

"If evolution does not proceed any faster than what we can see at present, and if the process must be assumed to have gone on in the same slow manner always, thousands of millions of years would have been needed to develop the higher types of animals and plants from their earliest ancestors."

The physicists have shown that no such time has elapsed since life appeared on earth. The estimates now run from twenty to sixty million years for the period of life. The mutation theory of course at once disposes of this argument, and therefore fits in with the evidence from geology and paleontology.

The importance of this modification of the accepted theory

of evolution to the socialist should be at once apparent. The pseudo-scientist has always been quoting at us, that "there are no sudden leaps in nature." While this has already been overthrown in geology, and numerous other fields, yet this victory in the field of biology is much more significant. It will be noticed how closely this theory fits in with the socialist doctrine of the class-struggle, according to which there is a long period of slow growth with slight variations (or reforms) followed by a sudden change of social character (called revolution) brought about by the accession of a new social class to power. Nor is this analogy without significance. The universality of natural law is one of the fundamental premises of modern science, and the best work in sociology at the present time is being done by those who are extending the law of other sciences into the more complete field of society.

A. M. SIMONS.

EDITORIAL

Science and the Workers.

A great change is going on in the systematized portion of human knowledge known as science. In the early days science was welcomed by the bourgeoisie as a means of discovering new dyes, new materials, new machines, in short new sources of power, production and profits. But when Darwin, Wallace and Marx showed how scientific methods might be applied on a wider scale the industrial rulers sought to shut up science once more, as it had been imprisoned in the middle ages. The expensive laboratories functioned very well as a cloister and the technical jargon of the *savant* was well nigh as unintelligible as Medieval Latin. A "public opinion" to correspond arose among the scientists. They came to believe it undignified to speak in language that the laity could comprehend. The necessity for division of labor was exaggerated into a virtue. The "specialist" whose work only a half dozen could understand became the ideal in the scientific world. A vast multitude of imaginary divisions called classifications were run through the universe of facts. These imaginary lines soon came to be looked upon as real natural boundaries separating the world into little plots each having its own peculiar laws and phenomena. Science, like all the rest of the capitalist world, was individualized. To generalize across these line-fences became almost as great a crime as to popularize scientific investigation; both were "unprofessional."

Natural events were supposed to move in a manner suited to their exclusive dignity. There were no sudden changes. "Catastrophies" were abolished from geology; "Transformations" of all kinds from biology, and of course, revolutions were excluded from history. Soon, however, the facts themselves began to play havoc with this artificial structure. A Krakatoa would explode in spite of geological theories, in the same way that revolutions had taken place, historians to the contrary notwithstanding. Natural laws and phenomena were found to pay very little attention to the scientific line-fences. Most horrible of all, scientists were forced to recognize that the most valuable facts for many fields of

science were those most obvious and whose observation required neither the trained technique of the specialists, nor the expensive laboratories of the universities. Furthermore, that it was the great general laws which correlated and explained these most general facts that were of great value, rather than the minute dissection of the strange and unusual. Along with this came, also the knowledge that science itself was becoming stifled within its bonds. With only a handful of persons who could understand the specialist, his own growth was limited until he became bigoted, egotistic and the opposite of scientific. A wide appreciative, comprehending clientele was found to be essential to any real growth of knowledge. So it was that "popularization" from being "unscientific" come to be recognized as an absolute essential of any true science.

It can not be too often repeated that the breaking down of division lines is one of the most prominent characteristics of the new scientific revolution. A London scientist has proven that the sensations of living matter, which botanists had already shown existed in plants as well as animals have at least an analogy in what has hitherto been called the inorganic world. Then comes the son of Charles Darwin to show that the great laws which his father discovered in the field of biology are operative in physics and chemistry. So it has come about that the line between the organic and the inorganic is being well nigh wiped out with the result that all science is forced to think in terms of materialism. But if these laws reach back through life, through man and plant to metals they also reach forward or upward into that most complex of all organisms, society. This is now recognized by practically every sociologist, entitled to the name, be his point of view bourgeoisie or proletarian.

For us, however, the significant fact is that this science in its conclusions affords an inexhaustible arsenal of weapons for the working class in their struggle to better themselves.

Every new discovery in the field of science seems to bring new support to the doctrines of socialism. There are two great fundamental laws which seem to underlie the whole field of science. One of these is the law that only the necessary happens. In the field of biology, for instance, it has long ago been seen that nature is very economical of her material. Only those things that tend to further survival are permitted to survive. Consequently all organs are determined by the necessity of getting a living, which after all is but the biological statement of the economic interpretation of history.

The other great law that makes its presence felt at every point in the field of science is the law of change. That nothing is, but everything is becoming. Evolution after all is really nothing but the general name of all the laws that govern this change. Science is today, therefore, to a large extent a study of the rules and methods by which change is brought about. When we realize that changes are accomplished in much the same manner throughout the whole world of phenomena,—physical, chemical, biological or social, it should become evident at once of how tre-

mendous importance are all the facts discovered by modern science for the sociologist.

Many of these points are elaborated further in the articles by Comrade Untermann that have been running through the REVIEW for some time. Still more are accessible in the series of works on science, whose publication is announced elsewhere.

The important fact, however, is that the sociology of the future must draw its laws to a large extent from the field of physical and biological science. This is necessary partly because of the priority of these earlier fields of investigation, partly because of their great simplicity, which makes their examination easier. For the socialist this field is especially fruitful since it constantly adds to his efficiency as the opponent of the existing order. There is no work that will yield such rich returns in valuable information for the Socialist worker as the study of natural science.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

There have been many strong objections raised to the recent alliance of the socialists with the clericals in Bavaria, although this alliance was for the purpose of furthering the cause of universal suffrage which is always admitted to be the one issue which will most palliate any sort of compromising tactics. Nevertheless the socialists of other countries as well as many of those in Germany feel that nothing whatever would justify even a temporary alliance with the reactionary clericals. The French socialists have been particularly bitter against these tactics. The by-elections which have just taken place in Germany have not shown any great increase in the socialist vote, and indeed in many places there was considerable of a falling off. In some countries this is laid to the reaction against parliamentarism, others claim it is due to the natural reaction following the great effort of 1903.

A very bitter discussion is now being carried on between Kautsky and the editor of the Berlin "*Vorwaerts*" in regard to the attitude of the party toward the general strike. It is probable that much of the attention of the next congress of the German party, which meets on the 17th of September at Jena, will be occupied with the discussion of this question.

ITALY.

The socialist union of Rome has expelled seven quite prominent members of the organization for having voted for liberal candidates at the last municipal election. Four of these were connected with the editorial staff of *Avanti* at the time when Bissolati was dominating the policy of the party in Rome.

SPAIN.

Spain is passing through a most acute industrial crisis which is making itself felt, especially in the agricultural districts. As a result, there have been numerous uprisings with considerable bloodshed. So long as the proletariat remains so close to the subsistence point, and industrial development is at so low a stage, social movements are largely violent and unintelligent. However, there are the germs of a socialist movement which may be hoped to make the national revolutionary attitude of the Spanish intelligently effective.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Those Socialists who are connected with the trade union movement, and who have patiently endeavored in recent years to interest their fellow-workers in their political principles, are surely having a merry time of it, and it begins to look as though, since the launching of the so-called Industrial Workers of the World, confusion will become worse confounded. It was none other than the irrespressible and rejuvenated Prof. Daniel DeLeon who invented a new name for the Socialists in the trade unions, and since the distinction has been made and for convenience sake it will probably be accepted. Thus we regretfully drop the old appellation, of which we were once quite fond, of "kangaroo" and pin on the new badge and shining mark, "pure and simple Socialist." As intimated, the p. and s. Socialists are having a lively experience in side-stepping the blows that are coming from every direction and returning a few for company's sake. In the first place, the double-headed capitalistic bunch, marshalled by Parry and Post on one wing and Belmont and Easley on the other, have labored in season and out to discourage the spread of Socialism in the trade unions. Parry and Post have sought to arouse the prejudice and antagonism of the anti-Socialists by charging outright that the organizations have become Socialistic and approve of confiscation, physical force, etc. Belmont and Easley have set themselves up as guardians of the unions, and through their official organ they are assuring the world that organized labor has no sympathy for Socialism, and that the Socialists in the unions are of little importance anyhow. From another direction come the attacks of the old conservatives, led by Sam Gompers. In his organ, the Federationist, Gompers has been making a steady campaign for some time against socialism and Socialists of every stripe. That the "Little Napoleon," has been striking over the back of the Industrial Workers of the World at the Socialists in his own army is undoubted when his bald misrepresentations are thoroughly analyzed. Gompers' scheme has been to throw the Socialists in the unions upon the defensive and force them to bear the blame for every sin of omission and commission of every Socialist in the land. In this manner he hopes to destroy whatever influence his opponents in the unions may have and perpetuate his policies and himself in office. Gompers' tactics are closely followed in a number of national organizations, and even in local and central bodies the lines between the conservative and radical elements are quite clearly drawn. Then from a third point comes a perhaps more vicious onslaught than any other, namely, the attacks that are made by little bands of crooks and grafters who have an unconquerable desire to use the trade unions for corrupt purposes. These schemers hate the Socialists because the latter have become strong enough pretty much the country over to block the old game of endorsing boodle politicians and parties as "working-

man's friends," and thus an important source of revenue has been destroyed. The grafter doesn't fight openly and upon questions of principle. He works under cover, sneaks about and puts in a knock here and a mysterious insinuation there, and the dirtier he is the louder he proclaims his virtues as a trade unionist. Every labor skate that I have ever known, from Pomeroy, Weissmann, White, Parks and their like down to the most obscure ward-heeler in a backwoods village, has been a strenuous and enthusiastic advocate in favor of "keeping politics out of the union" and kicking out the Socialists. From a fourth direction we are forced to meet the hostility of those who have fed upon their hatred for individuals and organizations to such an extent that they have become unbalanced and run amuck and would now down everybody but those who follow them. I refer to that peculiar band of fanatics that have become generally known as deletonites. It is unnecessary here to give an extended description of this faction or its methods. They are pretty well known. Captained by a crafty conspirator—who has been a howling failure in the single tax movement, the old K. of L., in the so-called Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, and who has all but ruined the old Socialist Labor party of membership and vote polled—this scattered band of disruptionists take peculiar delight in denouncing and villifying the "pure and simple Socialists" above all others. Their attack has not been directed so much at the common enemy, the capitalist, or even the old conservatives of the labor movement, but their main efforts have been aimed at destroying the Socialist party. It has become a craze with them, and their interpretation of the class struggle has been to demolish "the party of many aliases" and the pure and simple unions, and only then will the field be cleared to put the capitalist system out of business. They have obstinately and blindly butted their heads against a stone wall so persistently that they were practically out of existence, when suddenly the Chicago conference is held and they succeed in engrafting themselves upon the new Industrial Workers of the World, and now they are actually making the claim that their methods have been endorsed and with their accustomed brazenness are asserting their right to lead the whole show. Back about ten years ago, when Prof. DeLeon launched his freak Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, the edict soon went forth that every Socialist in a trade union who refused to fall upon his knees and worship the new calf was a traitor, a fakir and should be "kicked out." Now the fellow has the impudence to renew his ridiculous and bombastic command, and whosoever refuses to withdraw from the trade unions and join the "Industrialists" becomes an object of suspicion and a mark for slander and villification. Talk about intrigue and double-dealing to sow the seeds of dissension! The adventurous professor is a past master at the game, and it seems that a great many thoughtless and unsophisticated union men and Socialists are mere putty in his grasp. The day that De Leon has long prayed for has come at last. The Socialist party can be split! Note the manner in which he cunningly attempts to make a distinction between the "Kangaroos," who smashed his dishonest schemes and whom he naturally hates and the original Social Democrats he ridiculed and now pretends to admire. Note how this arch-conspirator juggles with and strings together the names "Debs, De Leon and Hagerty" in his personal organ, hoping thereby to create enmities between the Eastern Socialists, who detest the conspirator and everybody who attempts to succor him, and for mighty good reasons, and the Western Socialists who have been warm admirers of Debs and Hagerty. And note, finally, how this disgusting schemer, through his garbled "volcanic rumblings" and malicious perversions of facts in his blackmail sheet, has incited and encouraged and magnified differences that developed in the

Socialist movement throughout the country. Would a man who is a Socialist resort to such contemptible tricks year in year out? If he is a Socialist, why does he attempt to comfort the capitalistic enemy by continually making war not only upon the honest views, but upon the individual character, of every Socialist, man or woman, who dares to disagree with him? If he is a Socialist and really despises the pure and simple policy of Gompers, why does he everlastingly villify and slander the men in the trade union movement who are attempting to the best of their ability to supplant the old policies with new ones? If he is a Socialist, why does he hearten and aid every crook and grafter that sneaks into the labor movement by furnishing mud balls and downright falsehoods to be thrown at the Socialists who are attempting to keep the unions clean and respectable? I repeat that the day that this cold-blooded schemer has longed for has arrived. Already in a score of places dissension has developed in the Socialist party, and we find our own members parroting the phrases coined by De Leon a dozen years ago, writing articles for his disreputable organ, and attempting to revive his malevolent and repudiated policies. Is our splendid party and dues-paying organization to be wrecked again to satisfy the inordinate cravings of a fool or knave to rule or ruin? It is for the readers of the REVIEW and the Socialists of the country to say whether the Socialist party is to be destroyed by another industrial organization experiment. If the rest of the members can stand it, I will have to, but I protest against accepting the interpretations of the principles of socialism and the policies to be pursued in spreading the propaganda from a professional trouble-breeder. The 400,000 votes of the Socialist party were largely recruited from the trade unions, and I know that in every industrial center of the country the Socialist sentiment is spreading as rapidly as we can safely desire among the organized men. It is a matter of education, and the workers who are unacquainted with the principles of Socialism must be reached by those in whom they have confidence, who help fight their battles and stand by them whether they are right or wrong, because they are of the working class. For more than a decade De Leon, the dancing dervish has been howling against the trade unions, sneering at "boring from within" and firing his mud-batteries from without and what has been the result? The trade unions are stronger than they have ever been, while his own once promising movement has become a fake, and jubilantly, like an old man of the sea or a ship-wrecked pirate, he crawls on board of the new craft and continues his old methods. If the fellow can only "capture" something he is in the seventh heaven of bliss for the time being. But come what will the present trade union movement is bound to go forward, changing its character where necessary to fit conditions as they are met, replacing old leaders with new ones naturally enough, and the very struggles in which it engages will serve to enlighten and discipline the membership until they are in readiness to play their part in changing from one system to another. You can sit up and take notice that the Socialists who have borne the brunt of the fight in the trade unions, who have met and still are meeting the attacks from the four directions indicated, and who have been compelled to penetrate the natural crust of ignorance and prejudice among the rank and file during a period when it was decidedly unpopular to advocate the principles of Socialism, will stand true to their economic organizations despite all their alleged faults, and confusion to all the meddling professors and priests, academics or impossibilists, together with the fossilized conservatives, hypocritical plutocrats and their politicians and grafters.

There is little to chronicle of occurrences of general interest in the labor movement this month. During the "dog days," when business is

usually dull, labor affairs also lag and the active workers embrace the opportunity to lay plans for the celebration of Labor Day. This year, as far as I am able to learn, practically every Socialist speaker in the country, was pressed into service to make a Labor Day address at some union celebration—in fact the demands exhausted the supply. And it was a splendid opportunity to spread the propaganda, with the desperate struggle in Chicago still fresh in the minds of the workers and some important events looming up on the industrial horizon. While the teamsters' strike was officially declared off by the unions, the employers are not waxing very enthusiastic about their victory. It was a mighty costly battle for them, while as a matter of fact the unions engaged in the struggle are nearly all intact and their members are back at work, and in a short time the organizations will be as strong as they ever were. It is not likely that the employers will want a second strike very soon. President Shea, who, like the leading spirit in every great industrial struggle, from Debs to Donnelly, has been denounced and villified by the plutocrats, their press and pulpiteers and his opponents in the union, triumphed over all his enemies and was vindicated by a re-election at the Philadelphia convention. He has probably learned something about the class war by this time.

On January 1 the printers employed in the book and job offices on the North American continent will inaugurate a strike for the eight-hour day. The employers have an organization called the United Typothetae, which is in close touch with and will have the support of Parry's National Association of Manufacturers, and the combined bosses, judging from present indications will resist the demand of the journeymen, and, if possible, attempt to deliver a knockout blow to the International Typographical Union, which body is generally regarded as one of the most substantial and best equipped of the national organizations. All the followers of Parryism in the country realize that if they can defeat the I. T. U. their open shop campaign will be greatly strengthened, while on the other hand the international unions in other trades understand that if the printers win the moral effect will be of tremendous advantage on organized labor's side. So we are approaching another crisis.

The miners are also looking forward to next spring, when their agreements in both the anthracite and bituminous coal fields expire. Mitchell and all his lieutenants are working like beavers to strengthen their lines in anticipation of a national struggle. It is no longer a secret that the operators in both fields expect to force a reduction of wages upon the men, and reports from many districts state that the magnates are storing immense quantities of coal to supply the market (at fancy prices, of course) during a suspension. While the miners are compelled to suffer their masters will pile up more fortunes. That is one of the beauties of the capitalist system. And the miners are learning that fact, as you will probably see when the Socialist vote is announced from the mining districts.

Generally speaking, there is no extraordinary activity noticeable in organization work at present. Most of the unions are holding their own, some are making steady gains while a few are reported as losing ground.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GAME, by Jack London. Cloth, 182 pp. The Macmillan Co., \$1.50.

WAR OF THE CLASSES, by Jack London, The Macmillan Co., Paper, 278 pp. 25 cents.

"The Game" is superficially the story of a prize fight and it is a good story. Considered only as a description of the fight it would make the fortune of any sporting editor in America. For most readers this with the love story that runs along with it will be all that is seen, but those who know Comrade London as a socialist will see that "The Game" is the story of a bigger fight than ever took place within the squared circle. It is the game of life that is being fought throughout the book, the game in which the struggle for success swallows up the participant, in which skill, brains and training tell for much, but which at last may be decided by a lucky punch. It is intensely realistic, even to the extent of animalism at times.

The illustrations and decorations by Henry Hutt and T. C. Lawrence are striking features of the book. The pen drawings which open the chapters are ghastly strong at times.

Just now Jack London's fame as an author is being pushed close by his notoriety as a socialist. At least that is the way the capitalist critics put it. The trouble with London is that he is not the ordinary kind of a literary socialist. It would be easy to name a half dozen prominent writers of the last decade who have occasionally admitted that they were socialists, but their socialism was generally of such a mild inoffensive sort that it didn't hurt them much with their capitalist friends. London, however, is the genuine, old fashioned, proletarian, class struggle, etc., socialist. His socialism is like everything else about him, virile, combative and genuine to the back bone.

He does not call his work "The Ethical Aspirations Toward the True and Beautiful," but "The War of the Classes." He indulges in no sentimental dreams about the possibility of betterment of the workers. but declares that "May God strike me dead if I do another day's work with my body more than I absolutely have to do." He says this just after he has described how he went down into the "Social Pit" and saw what waited those who fail in the struggle for survival. "The War of the Classes" is a series of essays, most of which would make excellent propaganda pamphlets. The one on "The Scab" and "The Review" (the latter on Ghent's and Brook's recent books) are already familiar to our readers. Others are on "The Class Struggle," "The Tramp," "The Question of the Maximum" (one of the most striking analyses of international competition ever published) and "Wanted a new Law of Development." There are

enough striking illustrations and strong quotations between the covers of this little book to supply a small army of soap box orators with ammunition.

SOIXANTE-QUINZE ANNES DE DOMINATION, *Essays by Camille Huysmans, Louis De Brouckere, and Louis Bertrand, Edited by the General Council of the Parti Ouvrier of Belgium, Paper, 327 pp. one franc.*

The seventy-fifth anniversary of the bourgeois revolution in Belgium has just been celebrated, and the Socialists who refused to take part in the rejoicings, address the "patriots" as follows: "We refuse to consider the seventy-five years of bourgeois rule as so many years of independence, since so far as the working class is concerned, they have continued, and even aggravated the oppressions of the preceding regimes. The working class remains your enemy, and when you speak of the seventy-five years of peace you seem to forget, the massacres that have stained our streets with the blood of laborers. 1830 was for us no year of deliverance for our country. We are preparing for a true deliverance ourselves. We will celebrate it later when the proletariat shall have taken its just share of our common inheritance." The work is a most valuable historical survey of Belgian history during the last three quarters of a century.

MY LITTLE BOOK OF PRAYER, *by Muriel Strofe, 2nd Edition. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill.*

Just why this title should have been chosen is not apparent. It is true that the author's attitude is often one of prayer, but it is quite as often one of direct affirmation. What we have here, is really a collection of aphorisms and emotional utterances, unrelated to one another, except in so far as they are the expressions of a single, more or less constant mood.

One does not look for any distinct philosophy in a book of this character, and one does not find it here. Obviously the writer is an individualist, but individualism such as hers, which seeks for itself a new path, not because the paths trodden by others have been found undesirable, but merely to taste the exhilaration of novelty, such individualism springs rather from temperament than from reasoned conviction.

The theology of the book seems considerably mixed; but so is most theology.

Here and there, we find tiny fragments, of, shall we say prose, poetry or poetic prose?

These show indeed, no great degree of original talent, but they are graceful both in thought and imagery. The following is illustrative:

"Better than tiaras—the diadem of freedom.

Better than broad acres—a garland of heartsease.

Better than mines of gold—a mint of dreams.

Better than bars of silver—the silver of a laugh.

Better than strings of pearls—the crystal of a tear.

Better than bands of choiristers—a lute in the soul."

—LILLIAN HILLER UDELL.

SONGS OF SOCIALISM. *By Harvey P. Moyer, The Brotherhood Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich., Paper, 96 pages, 25 cents.*

This book contains seventy-six songs, considerably more than half of them written by the compiler of the book. He is a song writer of no mean ability, and a surprising number of the songs are really good. This is not saying that most of them are good. A nation's songs can not be produced by the yard on a few months' notice, and the literary quality of

the words in this book is decidedly uneven. As for the music, there are a few original melodies on which we can express no opinion. Most of the songs are set to familiar tunes, as they should be. But familiarity has evidently been the only test of selection. Coon songs, gospel hymns, and rag time music are interleaved with national airs and folk-songs. The compiler's aim has obviously been not so much to educate as to please, and to please those who are just on the edges of the socialist movement. Many of the songs are religious, with occasional anthropomorphic touches. The appeal is largely to the sentiment of brotherhood and altruism. The book will doubtless be welcome and useful in the newer locals and especially in territory that is backward in the industrial sense, and where class lines are not closely drawn.

C. H. K.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

The fall of 1905 finds our socialist co-operative publishing house in better condition than ever before, with a larger and more varied stock of books than we have yet been able to offer, and with the prospect of a rapid increase in sales. This is due first to the increased interest in socialism everywhere, and second to the fact becoming more and more generally recognized that in our co-operative plan for supplying books at cost through our stockholders a difficult problem has been solved.

We have now a little over 1,100 stockholders, nearly all of whom have invested just ten dollars each, not with the expectation of drawing dividends but of buying books at cost. The sales of books pay running expenses; there is no deficit except on the REVIEW, of which more hereafter. The new stock subscriptions make possible the publication of new books. If you want to see our list of books increase faster, the way to bring it about is to subscribe for stock and find others who will subscribe.

BOOKS BY REV. CHARLES H. VAIL.

Two of the most useful propaganda books ever published in America are these of which we have bought the plates and copyrights within the last month. MODERN SOCIALISM, now in its fifth edition, contains 179 pages and sells for 25 cents in paper, 75 cents in cloth. PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM, now in its fourth edition, contains 237 pages and sells for 35 cents in paper. We shall soon issue a cloth edition to retail at \$1.00. These books by Comrade Vail are by all odds the most important American works on socialism which we have until now been unable to supply to our stockholders at the same discounts as our regular publications. They can be sold in every socialist local in the United States, and will not only make new converts but help make clear thinkers out of those who already call themselves socialists.

SOCIALIST SONGS, DIALOGUES AND RECITATIONS.

This new collection, edited by Comrade Josephine R. Cole of San Jose, California, supplies a demand that has been constant during several years,

for a book to be used in arranging for socialist entertainments. The selections here offered have the great merit of being adapted to the capacity of children and amateurs. At the same time they are well suited to interest casual listeners in the study of socialism. Paper, 25 cents.

FORCES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.

This is a lecture delivered at Cooper Union, New York City, by Comrade John Spargo. He has given the copyright to our co-operative publishing house in order to secure the widest possible circulation for the pamphlet. The subjects treated are: Socialism an International Movement, Growth of the Socialist Vote, the Organized Socialist Movement, Blind Economic Forces, the Trust Problem, the Poverty Problem, Babies and Poodles, Capitalist Domination of the Old Political Parties, the War of the Classes, Growth of the Social Conscience, the Responsibility of Increasing Power. We are sure our readers will welcome this strongly-written pamphlet and that it will make socialists wherever it is circulated. Price 10 cents; to our stockholders 5 cents by mail, 4 cents by express at purchaser's expense.

THOUGHTS OF A FOOL.

This book of satirical essays by "Evelyn Gladys" has puzzled the reviewers of England and America. It is full of keen and clever satire on capitalism and capitalistic ethics. The original publishers, E. P. Rosenthal & Co., printed several thousand copies in sumptuous style, intending to sell them through the usual capitalist channels at \$1.50 a copy. They found that the book tells too much truth to sell in that way. It appeals to working people and revolutionists,—to the very ones who buy their books through our co-operative publishing house. We have now arranged to handle the book as one of our own publications at a dollar a copy, with regular discounts to stockholders. It is the best printed book for the money that we have ever been able to offer.

LIBRARY OF SCIENCE AND THE WORKERS.

The printers delayed us beyond expectation on "Germs of Mind in Planets," but copies are now ready and all advance orders have been filled. Our printers are now at work on "The End of the World" and "Science and Revolution," and we expect to have both of these ready on October 5. Mrs. Simons has nearly completed her translation of "The Triumph of Life," and copies of this should be ready early in November. A. M. Simons is translating "Life and Death," by Dr. E. Teichmann, which will be published in December. We shall soon have a definite announcement to make regarding the works of Josef Dietzgen, including "The Nature of Human Brain Work" and "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy," references to which have appeared in the series of articles by Comrade Unter-mann. We expect to issue one volume of Dietzgen's works before the

end of 1905 and another in 1906. The volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers already issued or in press are as follows:

1. **THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.** By Wilhelm Boelsche. Translated by Ernest Untermann. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. Fourth thousand now ready.

Professor Boelsche of Berlin is recognized as the leading popularizer of the evolution theory in Germany. In this book he has chosen the form of a simple narrative, which makes his argument easy for even untrained readers to follow. He traces the history of man backward by aid of the bronze and stone tools and the fossils that show man's life-history on the earth to extend back a million years—a period far longer than was claimed by the earlier evolutionists. Starting then with the caveman of the tertiary period, he traces the ancestry of man backward step by step through ever simpler and simpler forms of life, until he reaches the animal consisting of a single cell. He shows then how this cell itself might have been developed from matter that we call "inorganic" by the action of the same forces that we see working in the universe to-day. The book is illustrated with many engravings showing the different forms of life through which man developed.

"The Evolution of Man" has met with an instant popularity far beyond what the publishers had counted upon. It contains just the information the people are looking for, and it sells at sight wherever it is introduced.

2. **GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS.** By R. H. Francé. Translated by A. M. Simons. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. First edition ready Sept. 1.

This is a delightful and fascinating book. The idea worked out in it is that plants are living beings which receive impressions from the outside world, and act on those impressions for their own advantage, just as people do. This is not a mere fancy: the author brings a wealth of interesting facts to prove that it is true. He shows that the main reason why the voluntary motions of plants have not been generally observed is that in most cases they are exceedingly slow compared with the motions of animals. There are, however, many interesting exceptions to this rule, and he describes a few of these in full detail.

Some of the most important contributions of recent years toward the rounding out of the evolution theory have been in the field of botany, and this little book, now for the first time put within the reach of English readers, is a most charming introduction to this field.

3. **THE END OF THE WORLD.** By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer. Translated by Margaret Wagner. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. First edition ready Oct. 5.

The central thought of this book is that the earth itself, solid and permanent as it appears to us, is subject to the same forces, moving in cycles of evolution, dissolution and new evolution, which operate on everything great and small throughout the universe. The matter of which the

earth is composed is indestructible, but it existed in different forms before the earth was, and it will exist in different forms when the earth has ceased to be. Moreover, time was when the earth had reached almost its present form and yet when the existence of human life on it would have been impossible, and a time is coming when forces now at work will put an end to the cycle of human life on this planet.

It is with these destructive forces that "The End of the World" deals. The book is not fanciful and speculative, but purely scientific, yet it is written in the same delightfully simple style as the other numbers of the Library of Science for the Workers. A companion volume by the same author, entitled "The Making of the World," will appear some time in 1906.

4. **SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION.** By Ernest Untermann. Cloth, 59 cents. First edition ready Oct. 5.

This is an original work by the translator of "The Evolution of Man." Mr. Untermann is a graduate of the University of Berlin, an accomplished linguist, and a special student in biology as well as in social science. He is an American citizen, and within the last few years has done much important writing in American periodicals. The present volume is based on a series of articles which appeared in a prominent review, but their form has been popularized so as to offer few difficulties to the student who wishes to investigate the important subject of the relation of modern science to the working-class movement. The scope of the book is well indicated by the following:

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Proletarian Science.
 2. The Starting Point.
 3. The Awakening Philosophy.
 4. A Step Forward in Greece.
 5. A Step Backward in Rome.
 6. In the Slough of Ecclesiastic Feudalism.
 7. The Struggle for More Light.
 8. The Resurrection of Natural Philosophy in England.
 9. Natural Philosophy in France.
 10. A Revision of Idealism in Germany.
 11. In the Melting Pot of the French Revolution.
 12. The Wedding of Science and Natural Philosophy.
 13. The Outcome of Classic Philosophy in Germany.
 14. Science and the Working Class.
 15. The Offspring of Science and Natural Philosophy.
 16. A Waif and Its Adoption.
 17. Materialist Monism, the Science and Religion of the Proletariat.
5. **THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE.** By Wilhelm Boelsche. Translated by May Wood Simons. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. Ready Nov. 10.

This latest work by the author of "The Evolution of Man" will be found even more fascinating than the earlier volume. It is based on a

series of popular lectures delivered by the author to large audiences in Berlin. In the preface he says:

"We accompany life in its conquest of the planet earth. Out of the boundless space, this earth first appears to us as a star. We rush to this star upon a meteorite. While this strange world-visitor glows and puffs out in the earth's atmosphere, the ocean suddenly sparkles beneath us. This glowing of the water is the work of living creatures, and thus we first enter upon the kingdom of life. We dive down into the cold abyss of the deep sea with its light-giving fishes. Through the primeval water-forest of sea-weed we rise once more to the wondrously colored coral strand. In the stone of this coral island, built of the remnants of life, we find a passage back into the interior of the earth, into the dark caves where the bones of the shapeless saurians of the primitive world lie buried in the rock. From these caves we climb to the glaciers of the ice age, to the mammoths and pre-historic men. The volcanoes of the mysterious south polar land send forth their smoke. In the fern forests of New Zealand we walk once more in the carboniferous age. Now we follow the luxuriant life of the primitive forest of Brazil; we see the blooming palms of India, the wonderful giant trees of Mariposa, the grotesque cactus forms of Mexico; until life fights its last battle for us in the desert and on the eternal snow of the lofty mountain. But out of these wastes comes man, who reads the stars and learns the laws of life. So the triumph of life culminates in the triumph of man, who spreads the rule of his mind over the earth from the equator to the poles.

Any of these books will be mailed on receipt of price, or the five volumes will be mailed to one address for two dollars. Advance orders will help us to bring out additional volumes in the series. These will be announced later.

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

It will be seen from the foregoing announcements that the co-operative publishing house is more active than ever before. It is expending more money than ever before in the publication of new books, and the first sales of these books are rapid enough to go far toward paying the cost of publication. There is no deficit on the book business; on the contrary there is a surplus. But all the surplus and more is urgently needed. The paid-up capital of the company is \$12,440, but the total amount invested in books, plates, advertising and the cost of establishing the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW up to the end of July, 1905, was \$29,255.68. Part of the difference has been made up by contributions, and most of the outstanding debt is to stockholders who are satisfied with four per cent. interest and will allow the company to keep the money until it can be repaid conveniently. There is, however, one note of \$400 to a bank drawing seven per cent. which should be paid, and one stockholder has lent us \$1,500 at six per cent. which he needs to withdraw very soon.

These two debts should be gotten out of the way within the next two

or three months. If each stockholder would do a little the matter could easily be closed up, but the trouble is that only a few have done anything. Charles H. Kerr has made an offer, good until the end of 1905, that he will contribute out of what the company owes him as much as all others combined to help clear off the debt once for all. Here is what has been done up to the end of August:

Previously acknowledged	\$733.92
Dr. P. E. Gold, Texas.....	.50
Henry Fliniaux, Nebraska.....	2.00
Lawrence Christiansen, Illinois.....	2.50
B. F. Burkhardt, California.....	10.00
William Russell, Cuba.....	.50
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania.....	1.00
H. T. Smith, Illinois.....	3.00
"D," Florida	4.40
Dr. H. M. Wilson, Pennsylvania	4.00
Edgar N. Phillips, Illinois.....	5.00
Thomas Hitchings, California.....	1.00
A. F. Simmonds, New York.....	1.00
Margaret V. Longley, California.....	5.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	39.90
Total.....	<u>\$773.82</u>

Look back through the last two numbers of the REVIEW and see whether your name is in this list. If it is not, consider whether it would be worth anything to you to know that this publishing house was established on a basis where an accident to one individual would not cripple its work.

Two thousand dollars will accomplish this. Are there not a hundred who will give \$5.00 a month each for four months?