

# THE WORKERS' CALL.

Workingmen of all countries unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain."

VOL. 1.—NO. 47.

CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 27, 1900.

PRICE ONE CENT.

## DEFECTIVE SHELLS

### Gunners Carnegie and Rockefeller Bombard the "Young Man."

## OUR "BLESSED HERITAGE."

### Capitalists Exult Poverty and At the Same Time Tell How to Escape From It

On the night of January 18th the sound of heavy firing was heard in the direction of—not Ladyship this time—but New York. The rapid fire battery Andrew Carnegie operated by that skillful gunnery expert John D. Rockefeller, opened a tremendous fusillade upon the unfortunate young men of the Fifth Avenue Baptist church, with the result that the latter were completely demoralized, and must have retreated in confusion.

Notwithstanding the fact that many of the shells fired at the Baptist young men were defective (like the "blow hole" armor of the same source), it must be admitted that the bombardment on the whole achieved its purpose. Rockefeller and Carnegie are adepts at the "shell game" and their united efforts could not fail to start the aforesaid young men on the road to "success in business" at a 2:40 gait.

The following fragments of the bombardment which were picked up by a zealous reporter on the field of battle, will be subjected to analysis for the benefit of our readers:

"As a young man I had the best education in the world with which to begin life. I was born to the blessed heritage of poverty. I hope I speak to poor young men tonight. It is my earnest hope that none of you is burdened with the care of riches. When this burden is laid on a young man and he acts his part well he deserves double credit. He is surely the salt of the earth.

"In these days we hear a lot about poverty. The cry goes up to abolish poverty, but it will indeed be a sad day when poverty is no longer with us. Where will your inventor, your artist, your philosopher, your reformer, your patriot, anybody of note—come from then? They all come from the ranks of the poor. God does not call his great men from the ranks of the rich.

"To my mind the first thing for a young man starting out in life is to determine to do more than his simple duty. Don't be afraid of your employer. When you know you are right, stick to it, and fight it out with your boss. The boy that can beat me in an argument is the boy that I want in my employ. He is the boy that some day will get into the firm.

"I say to fight it out with your employer when you are right. He may want a partner some day. He will go home and tell his wife about you. He will talk about you, and—who knows—maybe he may have a pretty daughter. Then you must never do anything wrong in business—not even if your employer wants you to. Stand up for your own rights and be a man.

"Of every \$1,000 given to charity \$500 might as well be thrown into the sea. It is bad policy to aid the submerged man. Give your aid to the man who is fighting with his head above the water.

"There are three classes of young men who start in life. First, there is the one who says he aims to acquire riches. Then there is the one whose vain ambition is to obtain a vainglorious reputation. He is the young man who would step in front of a cannon to attract the attention of men. And, by the way, this shooting business is a bad business. I don't believe in taking a shot at a man, and worse, going out of your own country to do it. No man could ever get me to go out of my own country to kill a man. I believe that the only time to kill is when your native land—your own home—is in danger of invasion. The third, and man who will be successful, is the man who starts out in life with self-respect and who is true to himself and his fellows. There is the young man who cannot fail to win."

At the conclusion of his address Mr. Carnegie was introduced to those present by John D. Rockefeller.

"The 'blessed heritage of poverty'! Well, if that's so, we are surely a people who do not appreciate the nature of our blessings. If poverty is a blessing, why do we hear the fellows that are not in the trust howling against it? Don't they recognize that the trust is bringing 'the blessings of poverty' within their reach, that it is daily holding before them the promise that their lives shall be as 'blessed' as those of the residents of the slums and tenement houses. And they don't want to have it so! All that we can say is that mankind don't know what's good for them. But if poverty is a thing to be desired why does Carnegie give pointers to 'success in business' to these young men? If they succeed won't they have to leave their 'blessed heritage' behind? It looks as if there was a hitch in this argument that wants straightening out.

Andrew expressed the hope that none of his hearers were burdened with riches. A society which produces Rockefeller and Carnegie is a pretty good warrant that the young men will be relieved from this burden. A young man upon whom this burden is laid deserves 'double credit.' But Carnegie hopes that they are not so burdened. Therefore he is willing to see them deprived of this 'double credit.' But why? Surely 'double credit' is cheap and hurts nobody.

The 'burden' bearers are the salt of the earth. Carnegie's audience can all

become ditto if they only act their part well, which is to look after the interests of their employer, and the capitalist class. When they have grown old in this service, like the salt of the scripture, they will have lost their savor and shall be cast out and trodden under foot of men—men, like Rockefeller and Carnegie for preference.

The abolition of poverty would certainly be a sad day for the Rockefeller and Carnegie class. Instead of working others, they might perhaps have to work themselves.

From the ranks of the poor come the inventors, artists and all great men. The Rockefeller class steal the product of these men's brains and hands, therefore it is not strange that they should try to preserve the source of their supply.

The next piece of advice is one that will surely prove disastrous to the Baptist young man if he tries to put it in practice. "Don't be afraid of the boss. When your's right fight it out with him." Now isn't it playing it rather low down on the young man to run him up against a dead sure thing like this? We have a recollection of some misguided men attempting to put this scheme into action at a place called Homestead, but it didn't pan out well. They fought the boss for all they were worth, but we never heard that any of them became partners in the firm, to say nothing of marrying their employer's daughter.

"Don't do any crooked business, not even if your employer wants you to." (By the way, how did that "blow hole" armor affair pass muster?) "Stand up for your rights, be a man, and you will find that your employer can't do wrong, and that anything he asks you to do is right, for he can decide what's what. You will have ample time to reason out this matter, when you are out in the cold world hustling for another job.

"It is bad policy to aid the submerged man." It is. And the fellow that's got his head above water stands on the shoulders of the submerged gentleman, and he doesn't want any aid either. The submerged fellow will have to aid himself, and if he don't he will get all that's coming to him—and he deserves it.

Andrew doesn't believe in taking a shot at a man. He may of course now and then throw a volley of capitalist "morality" into an audience of Baptist young men, as on the present occasion, but he doesn't propose to do any literal shooting himself. He don't have to. He can leave the direction of that business to his understrappers, who are on the road to "success" and are keeping a sharp lookout for a "partnership" in the firm. Probably John D. and Andrew never shot a man with their own hand—but Homestead and Warden Bull-pen still require some explanation.

This philanthropist also denounced the Transvaal war—as a matter of sentiment. Out in South Africa both combatants are destroying vast amounts of railroad material, bridges, rails, ironwork of all sorts. These will have to be replaced. That is the "business" side of the proposition. Who knows that Rockefeller and Carnegie won't have a chance. 'Tis an ill wind that blows nobody good.

It may be that out of this audience there may be one ambitious young man who will outstrip his competitors and advance a long way on the road that his crafty guide has mapped out for him. He may even attain the partnership, and in time become an employer himself. But from the present outlook it is more likely that when he has gathered to his own use sufficient labor product to attract the attention of larger rivals, that his career will be suddenly checked. As he tramps gaily along the road to success in business, he will not be aware that just round the corner somebody of the Rockefeller type is laying in wait for him armed with that excellent and up-to-date sandbag, the trust. And when he regains his senses he will find that his birthright has been restored to him, that he has been again endowed with that "blessed heritage of poverty" with which he started on the road.

## A Manly Minister.

It is gratifying to note that some ministers have manliness and courage enough to call attention to the miserable sham and hypocrisy inherent in modern society, and which every "right thinking" person is supposed to acquiesce in. Rev. J. McInnes of Oakland, California, has just kicked over the traces in this respect. After some remarks on the above subject he concludes as follows:

The ministry is no place for a young man who wants his personal liberty. He must use too much hypocrisy and overlook too much hypocrisy in others.

This is decidedly refreshing, but it may have serious consequences to the courageous speaker. Most of his brethren of the cloth have learned the lesson that they are the paid wage laborers of capitalism, and must uphold it in all its contradictions and frauds, or else forfeit their places. We welcome such revolt upon the part of the clergy, as it is a sure sign that the decadence of the present economic system is becoming plainer and more distinct every day.

The receipt of a sample copy is an invitation to subscribe.

## MARCH OF PROGRESS

### Satisfaction of Human Wants the Basis of Socialism.

## SAVAGERY AND CIVILIZATION.

### Socialist Movement Harmonizes With the Tendencies of Human Progress.

Man is a complex animal; and, because of the great complexity of his nature, his wants are more numerous than that of any other animal. Man is simply a bundle of wants and man's history is but the record of his continual struggle to satisfy these wants.

All progress is the result of man's struggle to satisfy his ever-increasing wants. At first man's wants are purely material. To satisfy the stomach is his only aim. The object of the savage is to find the means of his life and all of his energy is devoted to that alone. But it is not so with civilized man. The wants of the latter are of a twofold nature. They are material and intellectual. Civilized man has to satisfy the wants of the body and the mind. The impossibility of satisfying the cravings of the mind for knowledge is to civilized man, just as painful as the impossibility of satisfying the simple needs of the stomach.

The difference between civilized man and savage is greater than between savage and animal. What makes this wide difference—the intellect? The mental development of civilized man is what makes him "lord of all creation," what lifts him so high above all living creatures. On the highest branch of the "Tree of Life" is situated the throne of civilized man, and from there he commands and subjects the whole of the animal kingdom to his own needs and wants. And because of the intellectual status of man, his whole life is totally different from the life of all other animals. To get the means of life, to satisfy the stomach, is not HIS aim in life. Civilized man has more of the material things of life, than he can possibly consume. His aim is something higher—intellectual. He realizes, to know one's own self and to understand one's exact relation to the rest of the universe, is what inspires civilized man.

But if the above is true, i. e., if the intellectual development of man is the only characteristic difference between savage and civilized, then the status of our modern workman is far from being civilized. For example, take the average workman of today. His life is one of continual toil and misery. All his energy and manhood are devoted to what?—to the getting of the material means of life. His intellect is not developed and his intellectual wants are very few or none at all. He knows very little of science, art and philosophy; cares very little to know of the deep mysteries of the universe and he is indifferent to most social problems of vital importance to his own class. Indeed, he is

"A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,  
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox."

The nineteenth century is generally spoken of as an age of civilization. This is only partially true. It is true in so far as this closing century is one of human achievements, especially of great material progress. But it is not true in so far as our present system denies to a majority of people all the conditions of a truly civilized life. And here it is precisely wherein capitalism proves itself to be one great contradiction. And it is because of this contradiction that our modern society must inevitably give way to some other form of society which is more harmonious, which, in the light of past history, must be socialism!

Socialism will be simply the result of a harmonic adjustment of the forces of civilization. Remove the contradictions inherent in capitalism and you will have made way for the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

Under socialism all men and women will be given equal opportunities to live their own individual lives. The intellectual wants of every one will be greatly multiplied and all energy of society will be devoted to the satisfying of those wants. Man will be truly civilized and all human achievements will be accompanied by human enjoyments. In short, the fruits of civilization will be within the reach of all and the forces of civilization will be utilized to the best advantage of all mankind.

William Edlin.

In the old time a man made his plans, did his work, received his product, said it was his right, and thanked his God that there was enough for all, so no one need starve. Now, an employer makes the plans, a laborer does the work, a monopolist receives the product, a professor says it is all right, and a clergyman thanks his God there is too much for some, so no one need care.—From "Things As They Are," by Rufus Hall.

## THE MODERN THUG

### Impracticable Proposals for His Extermination.

## AN ANTIQUATED EXPLOITER.

### Present Economic Conditions Responsible for the Surroundings Which Produce Him.

In the early years of this century the British government in India found itself confronted with a serious problem which called loudly for settlement. It seems that there existed in that country, a most unpleasant band of individuals, whose operations kept the inhabitants in a state of constant uneasiness and terror. The chief reason of their unpopularity arose from the fact that they adhered to a peculiar creed, in which the taking of human life formed a most essential feature. A candidate for membership in the band, was required to prove his fitness for admission, by first committing a murder, and as a rule the sufferers were generally natives who were traveling from one town to the other and who were easily disposed of during the journey. The assassins were wont to lay in ambush in lonely places for their victims, and suddenly springing out from their concealment they usually consummated the murder by the method of strangling. A long bandanna of silk was used for this purpose, and these gentlemen often became very dexterous in its use through long practice. All who passed the first preliminary test were thereafter required to follow the assassin's trade in the future, the property found on the victims being used as a means of support.

These people were known by the name of "thugs," and the British government determined that their suppression was a necessity. After many years of unrelenting hanging and shooting, this object was accomplished. Although the thug is now extinct in India, his name has been bequeathed to a part of the community inhabiting our great American cities, and this part being quite as objectionable to society as those who bore the original name, we are now confronted with the problem, "What shall be done with the thugs?"

One of our "city fathers," with the example of the British most probably in his mind, has proposed that \$300 shall be paid to the slayer of a thug, provided such killing is done whilst the latter is engaged in his occupation.

This proposition has given rise to a large amount of comment favorable and otherwise. It is generally conceded that the extermination of the thug would be a good thing; but this plan of carrying it out has raised many objections.

It has been put forward as an argument against this method, that if this bill becomes a law, there will be a vast amount of men ready to persecute farmers and other unsuspecting persons in order to attract the attention of the thug and tempt him to exercise the arts of his profession upon them, so that they can instantly shoot him for the reward of \$300. A thug-killing industry would therefore be inaugurated. This is a most remarkable tribute to the elevating influence of our civilization, and a sure sign that the "brotherhood of man" is within hailing distance.

The Chicago thug is no doubt a most disagreeable person. He don't play according to the rules of the game, and therefore society demands his suppression—with the least possible danger to themselves.

The thug has wants that must be satisfied, and as he is not possessed of sufficient capital to form a trust, he must necessarily return to primitive methods. Accordingly he secures whatever means of production may be acquired in his profession, and waits for the first favorable opportunity to do "business," which consists in extracting whatever values he may find upon the person of his victim. It makes no difference to him how the latter obtained these values, so long as he succeeds in securing them.

Such proceedings are irregular, unorthodox, antiquated and illegal. Thousands of years ago these methods were quite up to date and were also looked upon as customary and moral, but times have changed.

The principle, however, yet survives. Our present society is based upon the appropriation by individuals of values produced by other individuals. It is only the method of such appropriation that has been changed.

The thug may therefore plead that his intentions are of the best, even though his methods may be crude and faulty. The constitution of society however is gnarled. In all modern cities there are places set apart where the evolution of the thug is carefully watched, fostered and encouraged. It is the business of society to see that all the local surroundings shall be made to harmonize with his growth and education. These places are generally known as "slums,"

and they are admirably adapted for the purpose.

Sometimes a lot of strange people called "reformers" talk loudly about the abolition of the slums and attract a good deal of attention by the noise they make. They are humored to some extent in this, and very often society makes a pretense of approving of their schemes, but stops at that, knowing well enough that the abolition of the slum means the overthrow of civilization.

It does seem strange that society should so loudly demand the destruction of the thug, and at the same time carefully prepare breeding places for him. But such curious contradictions are sometimes explained away by terming them "necessary evils," and there is no doubt that the thug will in time be entered on the same list.

If the subject of this discussion would reform and bring his methods up to date, he might possibly escape a good deal of public odium.

If instead of sandbagging an individual he were to turn his attention to dealing with a whole city, state, or community, in the orthodox business manner, he could if successful, earn the approval of a goodly number of his neighbors, although at the same time he would still make enemies. But no man can altogether escape from this fate.

Out in Africa, in a town called Kimberly, there is at present a very notorious thug, (though he is not generally called so), who has so far had a most prosperous career. He has always done business on a large scale, not plundering individuals, but communities. He has made enemies too, poor fellow, and at present they are laying for him, for he is not liked by his enemies, who in this case object to his up-to-date methods, being a trifle backward themselves.

Thus in every stage of civilization, we may see the counterpart of the thug. His presence is one of the "problems" which confront society, but only in Chicago but everywhere. While society is solving it, the thug will no doubt continue to do business at the old stand, with the most improved weapons if he can get them—but if not he will do the best he can.

## The Reward of Truth.

The author of "Things As They Are" had a new experience the other day with the Y. M. C. A. of Sing Sing, N. Y., at the Highland Avenue Methodist church in that place. He took material things as his text which he described as "Give us this day our daily beef steak" but his talk evidently didn't suit the Christian young men of Sing Sing, as the report says he was "forcibly expelled from the pulpit" by the secretary of the Y. M. C. A., and this act seemed to meet with the entire approval of all present. Mr. Hall is a keen observer, and he will no doubt see "things as they are" in regard to the attitude of the middle class when the sight of all to have beefsteak and other good things, is brought under consideration. The Y. M. C. A., we hope, have given Mr. Hall a strong push on the road to socialism.

## Facts and Fiction.

That pious assemblage of "reformers," the Municipal Voters' League, is out again with its recommendation of "honest" candidates for aldermen. A great many of the so-called "boodlers" are slated for retirement, but just how this will affect the proprietors wage workers we are not told. The "boodlers" aldermen are no particular weight on their shoulders, that they should attempt to throw them off. The boodler exploits their exploiters, and if every man on the city council were a boodler it would make little difference to them as a class. The same may be said in case that every man on the same council represented the highest type of "business honesty." It would absolutely make no difference to the wage earner. This Voters' League is merely one of the decey-ducks of capitalist interests, used for the purpose of making the proletariat believe that capitalist and laborer have identical interests. Commenting on conditions in the Nineteenth ward it says that "Christmas turkeys are a poor substitute for proper representation in the council." Are they? We don't think so—and neither do the people of the Nineteenth ward, who have returned Johnny Powers to the council year after year. Turkeys without "proper" representation are better than "proper representation" without turkeys and the people of the Nineteenth ward are intelligent enough to know it. They don't know that socialism is better than turkeys, but they will find that out in time, but at present turkeys are material things and "proper representation" mere wind.

We advise our fellow workingmen and comrades to watch closely the actions of the contractors in the building trades in this city. They say that their desire is to establish peace in their business. When the capitalist says he wants peace he usually means that he shall have the undisputed right to pluck the workers as he pleases.

What have you done to help spread the news of socialism? Have you sent in a club of ten to The Workers' Call? If not, why not?

## PUBLIC HONESTY

### Business Principles Applied to Municipal Affairs.

## INVEST CAPITAL IN OFFICES.

### How "Reformer" Smith Gets There and Recompenses Himself for His Trouble and Expense.

"What we need is honest men."  
"Honest men?"  
"Yes, honest men and lots of them."  
"Why, haven't we enough of them?"  
"No, we need more of them, and in public offices especially."  
"In public offices, why, are the men in public offices dishonest?"  
"Are they?"  
"Well, are they?"  
"Yes! They are corrupt, dishonest, boodlers, bunco steers, confidence men. They are all rotten; rotten to the core!"  
"Well, that's bad."

"That's what I say too, and the sooner we elect honest men in their places the better."  
"And so you say they are dishonest, eh?"

"I do, sir, and you know it. Why look here man. Don't they sell franchises, rob the tax payers, boodle the water funds and sell privileges, give away the people's rights? Do you think that's what we elect them for? No, sir! We put them there to work for us and not for themselves. That's what we do!"  
"Oh! you do, eh?"

"Yes we do. The dishonest rascals!"  
"Well, old man, let's see what is dishonest in their actions. Now your's a business man are you not?"

"Yes."

"And as such you believe in profits, don't you?"

"Sure."

"Now let's take it this way: Say a man goes into business. Invests, say two, three or four thousand dollars. You as a believer in profits certainly believe that it is correct and proper for him to get profits on the amount he invests?"

"Sure, he must."

"Good; 10 per cent profits are good, 20 better, 30 better, 40 better, 50 better, etc. etc. The more profits the better business man, eh?"

"Well, yes."

"Now let's turn to our 'dishonest public official.' Here is a man that lives in the ward; good business man; jolly fellow; lots of friends, etc. etc. Election day draws near. Previous alderman was not satisfactory to the business men in the ward. These same business men felt that their interests had not been properly cared for. They look around for a candidate, a business man who will look after their interests. And he (name him Smith), being a business man will certainly look after their interests. And so they say: 'I say, you know Smith?' 'Sure, I know him. He's a fine fellow.' 'You bet; know him years; lived next door to me, etc. etc.' 'I say, by the way, what do you think of him for our candidate for alderman?' 'Good; first rate. Put him up; I'll vote for him.' 'You bet! And up he goes. Now comes our friends the politicians who know the 'righteous indignation' of the small shop-keeper crowd. Hears their talk: 'Dishonesty,' 'corruption,' 'boodles,' etc. etc. Hears Smith boosted as the man. The honest man, to represent the ward. Knows the way of the ward. Takes up Smith. Primaries go for Smith. Convention goes for Smith. Smith, Smith, Smith, everywhere."

Flushed and happy, Smith urged on by his friends, accepts with a little speech. Few days later Jerry O'Donohue comes into Smith; calls him to one side; assures Smith he's a friend of his, and will vote for him. But, in the 14th precinct of the ward there are 300 voters; all of them to a man will vote against Smith for some reason or other that Jerry does not make clear. Nevertheless they are not going to vote for Smith, unless—yes, unless—and votes are votes, and when a man starts in to win he wants to win, and Smith does. For \$100 he can fix the thing so that he can talk with them, and after the talk the drinks, etc., etc., they may change their mind and vote for Smith; and Smith thinks \$100 very little to make a winner with and Smith puts to Jerry with \$100 to get the 14th precinct.

Day later Johnny Doe comes to Smith; same tale; another precinct with a slight variation. Smith parts with \$100 more. And here \$50, and here \$50 and here \$75, etc., etc., all before long Smith in politics has separated himself—invested, in fact—to get this aldermanic job two or three thousand dollars. And he wins. Being an honest citizen, recommended by the Honest Voters' League as a man who will carry on the city affairs on business principles. In fact, apply business methods, and business, you know, means profits. And so Smith, now in office, after investing three thousand dollars, is met by, say yourself, another

(Continued on page 1.)

THE WORKERS' CALL.

Issued every Saturday at 25 N. Clark St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second class at Chicago, Ill., on July 11, 1905. The Workers' Call is published for and under the control of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party of America, a corporation without capital stock, the whole revenue of which must be expended for socialist propaganda.

Subscription Rates: One year \$3.00, Six months \$1.75, Three months \$1.00. Single copies, per annum \$1.00. To European countries, per annum \$1.50. Always in advance.

Special rates if ordered by the hundred. Orders for current issue should reach the office by Tuesday evening.

Advertisements: A limited number of acceptable advertisements will be inserted. Rate will be made known upon application.

Editorial Announcements: To secure the return of unused manuscripts postage should be enclosed. Communications must reach the office by Monday evening preceding the issue in which they are to appear.

The fact that a signed article is published does not commit The Workers' Call to all opinions expressed therein. Contributions and items of news concerning labor movement are requested from our readers. Every contribution must be accompanied by the name of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as an evidence of good faith.



The Socialist Vote. UNITED STATES.

Table showing election results for the Socialist Vote in the United States, listing years from 1890 to 1905 and corresponding vote counts.

WORKINGMEN UNITE!

As this issue of The Workers' Call reaches the hands of our readers, an event of the utmost importance to the socialist movement of this country will be in course of progress. The convention of the Socialist Labor party now being held at Rochester, N. Y., will, it is hoped, not only remove a great many of the obstacles which have to some extent retarded socialist progress in the United States, but also lay the foundation for a united movement of the different bodies of the class-conscious proletariat. From all over the country where this paper has readers, a cry is going up for that unity which is so much to be desired, and it would seem that for the moment, large numbers of socialists are waiting in an attitude of expectancy for the results which it is hoped that this convention will accomplish.

longer headed by those whom these cries have heretofore duped. In such a case it would be an act of criminal folly upon the part of the socialists, to allow fanciful differences to prevent their taking advantage of the situation, and we hope that the comrades who meet in this convention will be quick to appreciate the fact that the present outlook imperatively demands, that unity and concerted action on the part of all class-conscious socialists is at present a necessity before which no individual interest should be permitted to intervene. Should this result be happily consummated, the coming year, and the conditions prevalent therein, give every promise of an impetus to the socialist movement that may perhaps exceed the expectations of the most sanguine, by clearing the ground for the great battle in which at last the proletariat and capitalist classes must meet for the final conflict. The eyes and minds of the many thousands of earnest socialists in this land, are fixed upon the convention. That the course of action resulting from its deliberations may unite the forces of socialism in one compact and determined body for the conquest of political supremacy is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

THE PASSING OF RUSKIN.

On Saturday, January 20th, a well-known figure in English life passed away. John Ruskin the famous art critic has just died in his eighty-first year. His writings have had a wide circle of readers and were a favorite theme with those who profess a knowledge of what is known as "art." From reading the accounts of Ruskin's life work, one would be led to suppose that his influence on art was so wide and far reaching that no strata of society was unaffected by it. It is no exaggeration to say that such a conception is almost completely false. We are well within reasonable bounds when we say that three-fourths of the inhabitants of Great Britain and the United States were altogether unconscious of the existence of such a man. For them he might as well have never lived. The "art" which is associated with his name is something which the material conditions of the lives of most of mankind utterly debar them from enjoying, something in which they could take no possible interest and which could have no permanent effect upon them. And only because the surroundings and environment which modern capitalism dictates shall be the condition of the wage slave, are in themselves a positive barrier which no art can penetrate. Ruskin was the son of a wealthy wine merchant, and his whole environment was a capitalist one, yet nevertheless he presents to us a spectacle which is not uncommon, the revolt of an artistic mind against the shams and pretence of modern society. Not understanding the economic basis of society to be the determining factor in art as well as all other phases of human progress, he thundered against the frauds of modern society without discovering their causes, and for this reason he and such men as Carlyle, who also denounced shams, were looked upon with approval and admiration by those, who while appreciating their ability also understood their harmlessness. To John Ruskin the working class presented no initiative, nothing to be considered in relation to art. Like all sentimental socialists, the middle class appeared to him as the lever by which society is moved, and the attempt to propagate artistic desires and knowledge by means of this medium was foredoomed to failure so far as the great majority of mankind are concerned. The seed was sown upon stony ground, sprang up and withered away, as was natural. Here and there small "Ruskin" societies were formed amidst much enthusiasm and affection, for the purpose of introducing what was known as "art culture" among the masses, but the result has been absolutely nil. Like their master, the disciples failed to see that modern society based upon economic classes and the consequent deprivation of the great masses of mankind of the product of their labor, offered no soil in which true popular art could grow. The stunted, one-sided product, which did appear was the exact reflection of the soil from whence it sprang. The artist who like the late William Morris is able to perceive that art is a natural spontaneous growth from economic conditions, and who therefore points out to the working class the necessity of economic change, is accomplishing more in the interest of art in clearing the field for its development, than all the small middle class cliques who have made out of John Ruskin a patron saint, and sung his praises to the world. We make no

attempt to disparage Ruskin's artistic knowledge and perceptions, and will cheerfully admit that all the encomiums lavished upon him are well deserved. But we would point out the fallacy of supposing that under a system based upon greed and profit-mongering any true art can permeate from above to the stratum upon whom rests the burden of society. The socialists are preparing the necessary economic surroundings in which alone the aspirations of men like Ruskin can be realized, so that what now is now an artificial stunted product, may become a natural and healthy growth.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

City Sealer Makes Charges of Fraud Against Salesmen—Another "Reform."

An official of this city whose function is to examine weights and measures is now in the midst of a little "campaign of reform" on his own hook. He declares that "There is no protection to the people in having properly adjusted scales unless they watch carefully the weighing of the articles they purchase," which on the whole is not a flattering tribute to what is known as "business honesty." If this "honesty" which is so much talked of in the business world were really the sure guide to success which we are asked to believe it is, how comes it, that so many struggling retailers not only refuse to practice it, but actually cultivate to a science the defrauding of customers by short weights? It is not we who make this charge. Listen again to the words of this official:

"Many salesmen have reduced to a fine art the trick of so quickly and deftly weighing goods as to give them a greater weight than they really have. As an aid to the accomplishment of their purpose they either engage their customer by conversation or take advantage of a moment when his eyes are turned in another direction than toward the scales."

This perhaps looks bad enough upon the face of it, but why do these men go to such trouble if "honesty is the best policy"? It can hardly be that they are not acquainted with that maxim, for as a phrase it has become "familiar in our mouths as household words." Why does present society prize of honesty as a virtue, and refuse to practice it? Because this maxim under present conditions is a falsehood. The economic basis of the present system which consists in buying of labor-power at the cost of production of the laborer, and appropriating the surplus product as profit, is the point at which this lie starts, and from thence there is no phase of our social life in which it is not reflected. The "city sealer" does not content himself with making general statements, he illustrates his remarks as follows:

"When potatoes are purchased in South Water street it is on the basis of sixty pounds to the bushel, but I know it to be a fact that the retail peck in many cases weighs only from eight to ten pounds, when it should be fifteen. It is well, too, to see that there is no butter on the bottom of the scales. In one case I found three ounces on the bottom of a pair of scales."

The socialist sees nothing wonderful in all these exposures. It doesn't even shock his "morals" for he recognizes in this matter, the logical effects of the competitive system which makes life a wolfish struggle between the human race as individuals. The defrauding of the customer in this manner is the only defence of the small distributor against his greater rivals, and it is natural enough, under present circumstances, that he should make the fullest possible use of it. To relinquish this weapon would probably mean his extinction as a distributor, and that in turn would place him at once in the proletariat, the class who are directly exploited in production. He doesn't want to get there, for he often knows from experience what such a life means, and is determined to avoid it if possible. In such case, all maxims and proverbs incalculating "honesty" must be thrown overboard, and they are. But at the same time the humbug is kept up, that the only sure road to success lies in the practice of these maxims.

The question on the whole is of no great importance to the working class, if by some miracle, capitalist society became "honest" up to the point where no "city sealer" was required, if short weights and fraudulent measures were unknown, the conditions under which the workers live, would not be perceptibly changed for the better, so long as the system of production which is the basis of all frauds remained unaltered.

One of the clearest illustrations as to how far the current "morality" which is largely the most detestable sham, has unconsciously entered into every part of our social life lies in the fact that the very class against whom the "city sealer" brings his charges, are often the first to denounce socialism as confiscation and robbery. Everywhere the contradictions engendered by our present social system of production are cropping out, and showing that where material interests come into conflict with current morality the latter must give way. The fact that a "city sealer" is a necessity only shows that the material interests of the small distributor cannot be subserved by the practice of the business ethics under which his larger rival can operate. It is merely one of many symptoms that capitalist society is even now beginning to weaken under the weight of its own contradictions, and when its further progress has forced upon the working class a knowledge of what their own material interests really are, the whole structure and the "morality" to which it has given birth must collapse. In the meantime the "city sealer" will proceed with his "reform."

SNAP SHOTS BY THE WAYSIDE.

The Chicago Chronicle of January 21st devotes a whole column to the Wardner Bull-pen, and the average reader will arise from its perusal with a fixed idea that the Republican party is wholly responsible for that outrage. President McKinley's fear of the results of publicity regarding Wardner is enlarged upon, and on the whole the article in question is written to show that the Democratic side of capitalism could never be guilty of such a horrible deed. This article is no doubt the usual beginning of the usual capitalist political campaign, in which the working class are implored to remember, that "Short's the friend, not Codlin."

The alliance between the lowest stratum in society and the capitalist political classes is again brought into prominence in the row going on in New York state amongst the thugs and plug-uglies known as pugilists. The connection between the Republican and Democratic bosses and the fighting fraternity, is to say the least an additional corroboration of the socialist philosophy of modern society.

Some time ago it was reported that Gompers had "settled" the piano-makers' strike in this city, but the strikers profiting by the knowledge of how this "leader" "settled" the strike in the Armour plant in Kansas City, have decided that "Sammy" could "settle" nothing for them. They may of course lose in the end, but even if so they will lose like men, and they will learn from this strike more than their "leaders" intended. If they are able to penetrate the tactics and methods of Gompers and his ilk, the lesson will bear fruit.

Violations of the child labor law, are now attracting the attention of "reformers." For the sake of "humanity" great things are to be done. Fifty children are to be taken from the grasp of capitalism at one end of the line, while perhaps five thousand are to be taken in at the other. For the past thirty years we have had legislation on this subject, and yet child labor is continually increasing. "Not that the laws are bad, but the interests of those who are appointed to enforce them, are diametrically opposed to the spirit that demands the enactment of these laws."

The laws covering this matter and other kindred ones such as those concerning shorter hours of labor, better sanitary conditions, abolition of unreasonable risks, etc., etc., will never be enforced until the working class, whose interests are involved in these matters, take possession of the public powers for their own protection. When this is done they will free themselves from the conditions which make such laws necessary.

The public were edified this week by listening to the pros and cons of the woman suffrage question. The discussion between the suffragists and the anti's has a peculiar interest to the revolutionary socialist. If anything were wanted to emphasize the correctness of their position in opposing the "step-at-a-time" method advocated by alleged "socialists," the remarks and arguments of Mrs. Catherine Waugh McCulloch on the suffragist side of the question, will amply suffice.

This lady denies that woman suffragists in general have any sympathy with those who advocate "advanced" ideas. When this assertion is more clearly studied it will be seen that the suffrage is looked upon as an auxiliary towards the protection of women in their "property" rights. Now socialism embodies absolute equality for men and women, and therefore the "step-at-a-time" comes to the socialist and says: "Come and help realize this reform, forgetting that equality can only result through the abolition of the "property" right, and that this "property" right would not be weakened in the slightest degree were "women suffrage" established to-morrow."

The socialists will continue as heretofore to point out to the workers the necessity of struggling for political supremacy, and the fact that the consequences of that supremacy cannot be drawn into the foreground, by ignoring the only possibility of their realization, the first essential step, by the working class making themselves the ruling class.

Dr. Francis W. Shepardson, professor of history in the University of Chicago, in speaking of the fight in Frankfort Tuesday said that there was some sociological reason why Kentucky's fight so much. He said:

"They do not fight because of the bad effects of Kentucky whisky, for that is to be had in other places. There is nothing peculiar in the climate or soil which leads them to slay each other. In my opinion there is some inherent sociological reason for this, and it is a great problem for sociologists to solve. I am inclined to believe that the trait comes from the old Virginia blood and is a continuation of the old customs in vogue when Hamilton and his son were slain in duels."—Chicago Daily News.

Here is wisdom. It is supposed, that the recklessness of human life in Kentucky is inherited. This is a very short and satisfactory way of settling the question. It saves the professor and his audience the trouble of thinking. But if we only look at the economic condition of the state in question we may perhaps get a truer insight into this matter, which the professor so glibly ascribes to heredity.

The industrial development of Kentucky has not as yet taken the form which marks the great capitalist industrial states of this country, and this backwardness finds its reflex in the con-

dition of such communities where modern society in its highest industrial form has not yet taken root. In the middle ages, the ruling class represented by the "knights of old," satisfied their fighting instincts with the tournament, and at a later period the duel supplanted this form. When capitalist society fully asserted itself the duel was placed under ban, and the ruling class asserted its vampire character and began to feed on the substance of the workers as at present.

The old method of destruction of human life gives way to new forms, through industrial exploitation, and the literal destruction which capitalism now wreaks among the working class far exceeds that produced by tournaments, duels and Kentucky feuds. As evidence of this we point to the fact that when the war between Spain and this country broke out, the physical deterioration of the modern working class was revealed in the recruiting system, and the same is equally true of England at present. When capitalism is fully developed in Kentucky the feud will perish, and the Carnegie will be diluting on the blessings of poverty as they now do in more "advanced" states.

Owing to the fact that the Atlantic steamship companies have raised the rate of passage to Europe, it is not likely that great numbers of the working class will be able to attend the Paris exposition. But these disappointed ones can at least have the satisfaction of knowing that through their own skill, industry, and energy, they will be able to supply their masters with sufficient funds for this purpose. The motto of the capitalist class is "Not by, but by industry we thrive."

That French count who some years ago was purchased by "our Annie," has been caught playing "bull and bears" on the Paris Bourse, and has quit after being severely plucked. He is now on his way over here to the source of his wealth, and things are moving so that his losses can be made good. The class to which the count belongs know that "work" is a blessing, and they are going to load the laborers on the Gould system with some more of it—that is after a few thousands of them have been let out.

The incomes of the railroads, of the Gould systems as well as others, will no doubt be considerably augmented by the improved methods which are about to be introduced by the railroad pool. The following headlines from an evening paper will explain far more clearly and forcibly than any socialist argument:

TRUNK LINES' BIG SCHEME. Movement Said to Be on Foot for Common Ticket Offices in Great Cities.

RESULTS WOULD BE SWEEPING.

Men Might Be Thrown Out of Employment and Competition Injured, Say Some.—Common Schedule Part of Plan.

There you have it. This is how Count Castellane's shattered finances are to be restored. The ticket offices are to be consolidated. Large numbers of high-priced employees will be dispensed with, and therefore the dividends will increase. This course will be a good thing for the Count. It may be a good thing also for the employees who are to be let out, though they won't be able to realize it immediately. They will be compelled to think hard over the matter and then their course of action will take form.

These men who have never considered themselves as workingmen, will when thrown out of employment make efforts to win the workmen's assistance for reinstatement in their old positions or others equally good. While their clothes are still new they will ask workingmen to unite with them for that purpose, but their clothes will wear out and then they will realize as never before that their interests are after all the same as those of all other toilers employed or unemployed. The socialist ranks are open for the reception of these men, when they recognize the folly of their reactionary aspirations.

We do not underestimate the value of these new recruits. The intellectual proletariat have a considerable part to play in the socialist movement. When they behold society from the standpoint of class-conscious workingmen, their better education will be a powerful aid. Men, who have to some extent tasted the good things of life, and who have been suddenly deprived of them, will make formidable combatants in the front ranks of the socialist hosts. On the continent, the intellectual proletariat is a decided factor in the labor movement, and the same will be realized here.

This Boer war is full of grotesque incidents. Last week a dispatch announced that the Kaffirs who are the original inhabitants of the country had beaten a small party of Boers, who were traversing the district. Did the British glorify this incident? Not at all. On the other hand they in a manner apologized and made excuses for it. They stated that the Boers first attacked the Kaffirs, and under these circumstances, the British authorities "permitted" the latter "to defend themselves."

Now, what is the meaning of this

Two bands of robbers are fighting for the possession of the soil of these Kaffirs. When the latter are endangered they are "permitted" to defend themselves, when those who assume authority over them are in sore straits. The Kaffir who successfully defends himself with a gun in his hand, might get into his head that with the same gun he would be able to successfully assert himself against both thieves. Hence the apology.

We are informed that during this spring a charitable institution for the reception of homeless cats, is to be established by a philanthropic Chicago lady. "Charity" is a peculiar thing. If the Bureau of Charities could have had its way a few weeks ago, on the question of opening the public stations as shelters for homeless men, the latter might with good reason wish they had been born cats instead of men. But another philanthropist came to the rescue and the "bobo" is placed on a level with the other animal. Harrison's philanthropy is the more "practical" also, for cats can't vote.

Here is a striking comment on the "sanctity of marriage" in capitalist society. An American girl, who should know what she is talking about, hopes to warn her countrywomen by inserting a letter in the daily papers, of which the following is an extract:

"It is a matter of barter and sale. I was an American girl, and when young I married a Frenchman of title. When he died, not long ago, I found among his papers a contract which he had made with a person who was in that business to find him an eligible wife with a fortune. He paid in instalments for the services of the person who brought me to his attention."

This is marriage up to date—"business" matrimony. Woman is a commodity to be bought and sold, and will remain so while capitalist class rule exists.

This is the latest nefarious attempt to smother the reputation of a "good" man:

Senator Jones of Arkansas, who poses as one of the most interested foes of trusts, and who never tires of preaching against corporate aggrandizement and centralization in general and in detail, has fathered a bill which is in flagrant defiance of the principles for which he has stood so long. This bill is to confer authority upon "any railroad" company created by or existing under the laws of the United States and operating a line of railroad either wholly or partially in the Indian Territory to purchase the railroad and other property of, or to consolidate with, any other railroad incorporated under the laws of any other state or territory of the United States whose lines may not hereafter form a continuous line of railroad, either directly or by means of an intervening railroad, with that of the company so purchasing, upon complying with the regulations and requirements of the laws of the state or territory in which such road is located applicable to such purchase or consolidation.

We don't quite see where Jones' inconsistency comes in. He is yet the most "inflexible foe" to all trusts—that he, Jones, can't get into "Corporate aggrandizement" is of course detestable—unless Jones is a part of the corporation to be aggrandized, and then the whole case is altered. The principles of Jones mean the material interests of Jones, which is as good a creed as a man can embrace, and one which fits present society like the paper on the wall. We take great pleasure in vindicating Jones from such slanderous charges, because these same papers have before now given us a fixed idea that he was a "good" man—which he is—for Jones.

The Command of the Sea.

Let us have a fleet of swift battleships, with quick-firing guns. Rapid movement commands victory. In modern peace, who controls the sea wins.—New York Journal.

This is the highest, the very highest, philosophy and statesmanship of capitalism, perfectly logical from the premises. And the premises are: Every country needs a thousand acres of land to grow one ear of corn; every country needs a whole forest to get one toothpick. But in this limited little world there is not land enough and forests enough to go round. Somebody must go short: nobody wants to be that somebody. Therefore those who get there first have first chance. Who controls the sea wins. Therefore if we want to win and have land enough and forests to do a paying corn and toothpick trade we must get a hump on. We must have the best armour plate (and you can't do better than patronize the gift-giving Carnegie's superior blow-hole), the quickest-firing guns, and the best gunners.

This is the statesmanship of capital, of Jingoism, of the "Socialist," "coming our way" New York Journal, the statesmanship of struggle and fight and hate, of competition for the possession of a planet which, if used co-operatively and with the common sense of a louse, would make everybody's own country so big and fertile that he wouldn't have time or need to go coveting other people's acres, neither they his, but which, used so wastefully and illogically as it is, will never be big enough for us even if it were increased to a million times larger than Jupiter. The state of Texas would hold the whole world co-operatively. All heaven, all hell, and all the universe would not be big enough for them competitively. There would always be a dispute for the possession of a ten-acre asteroid beyond.—The People.

The Danish branch of the Fourth ward, S. L. P., at their meeting in Nelson's hall, 4th street and Armour avenue, on Thursday the 18th of January, nominated Com. Thomas Mikkelson as candidate for Alderman in the ward.

# Industrial Evolution.

By WM. T. BROWN.

(Continued from last week.)

You have noted, of course, that capitalism from the outset has meant conflict. At first it was a conflict between capitalists and capitalists. It has been found that such a conflict is detrimental to the interests of society and industry, and a way was found to put an end to it. But now we have the bitterest kind of conflict between capitalists and laborers. In this struggle millions of dollars have been wasted. Of all the strikes that have been declared, only a small portion have been successful, and it is safe to say that almost none of them has really been of great value to the laborer. The conflict between capitalist and capitalist was ended by making the interests of capitalists identical. It is inconceivable that this warfare between labor and capital can continue indefinitely. But it cannot be terminated except by making the interests of all economic classes identical. It is useless to say that the interests of capital and labor under the present system are identical. It is idle to say that under capitalism the success of the man of wealth means a great service to society. That last sentiment is no doubt true, but the other is not true. It is impossible, or practically so, for any man to amass wealth in this country, without conferring benefit upon society. It is also true that no man amasses wealth without receiving a tremendous tribute from society. But that is not the question. Capitalism has created two economic classes: the wage-laborer and the capitalist or receiver of profit. The whole tendency of industrial evolution is to make these the only economic classes in society and to make the passing from the lower to the higher all the while more difficult. The wage-class increases, the capitalist class grows smaller. That condition of things simply cannot persist for any great length of time. It is a belief that grows with every twenty-four hours that with all its tremendous contribution to the structure of modern civilization the system of capitalism has served its purpose, and like the system which preceded it, must make way for another and higher form of industrial organization, that the highest interests of the race may be subserved. Quoting again from Kirkup, "It is now admitted by all inquirers worthy of the name that history, including economic history, is a succession of orderly phenomena, that each phase in the line of succession is marked by facts and tendencies more or less peculiar to itself, and that laws and principles which we now condemn had formerly an historical necessity, justification, and validity. In accordance with this fundamental principle of historical evolution arrangements and institutions which were once necessary, and originally formed a stage in human progress, may gradually develop contradictions and abuses and thus become more or less antiquated. The economic, social and political forms which were the progressive and even adequate expressions of the life of one era become hindrances and fetters to the life of succeeding times. The existing arrangements of landlord, capitalist, and wage laborer are burdened with contradiction and abuse. The life of society is being strangled by the forms which once promoted it. The really vital and powerful tendencies of our times are toward a higher and wider form of social and economic organization—toward socialism." I am not personally inclined to regard Thomas Carlyle as the most trustworthy interpreter of history, but it may not be out of place to recall at this point a prediction in which he indulged many years ago: "We must some day, at last and forever, cross the line between nonsense and common sense. And on that day we shall pass from class paternalism, originally derived from the fetish notion in times of universal ignorance, to human brotherhood in accordance with the nature of things and our growing knowledge of it; from political government to industrial administration; from competition to individualism to individuality in co-operation; from war and despotism in any form to peace and liberty." In 1855 another English philosopher made a prediction. It was John Stuart Mill: "And this is what he said: 'Eventually, and perhaps in a less remote future than may be supposed, we may, through the co-operative principle, see our way to a change in society, which would combine the freedom and independence of the individual with the moral, intellectual, and economic advantages of aggregate production, and which, without violence or spoliation, or even any sudden disturbance of existing habits and expectations, would realize, at least in the industrial department, the best aspirations of the democratic spirit, by putting an end to the division of society into the industrious and the idle, and effacing all social distinctions but those fairly earned by personal services and exertions.' To this may be added the declaration by Kirkup that 'Albert Schaffle, one of the first living authorities on economics and sociology, has, after long years of study of the subject, come to the conclusion that the future belongs to the purified socialism.'

Without regard to these last authorities whom I have quoted, whose opinion today would be worth a great deal more, perhaps, than it was when they gave it, I am convinced that at no very distant day the capitalist era will be recognized by all thinking men to have become a thing of the past, along with feudalism and slavery. That it can be ought to be wiped out summarily by any sort of fiat, is too absurd to be believed by any intelligent person. That the full inauguration of the Socialist Commonwealth will involve the loss of some things which we have had under the present regime, I can easily believe. But no man who believes in evolution or in God, which amounts to the same thing, can doubt that the Co-operative Commonwealth will mark a distinct advance over any industrial system we have ever known, and that it holds in its keeping for every department of human life possibilities of which thus far we have scarcely dreamed.

To sum up the facts and conclusions embodied in this paper, permit me again to call your attention to the fact that the era of capitalism was ushered in by feudalism fell and the tools of production and distribution became the possession of those who did not use these tools. Capitalism began when the laborer could no longer own the tools with which he worked. In its early stages this era of industry was also marked by free competition among capitalists. While that competition lasted, the possibility existed that the laborer could himself become a capitalist. That same era was marked also by compulsory co-operation of laborers. To put it all in a single sentence, at the beginning of the era of capitalism three or four facts stand out clearly: the method of production has been socialized, there is compulsory co-operation among laborers for the sake of a larger product, the means of production have been taken out of their hands, and the wage system has been introduced; there is compulsory competition between laborers, labor becomes a commodity with its price determined like that of every other commodity by the law of supply and demand, and this competition tends to reduce the wage of the laborer to the lowest possible point; there is also competition among capitalists, due to the rise of the profit system and the prospect it holds out of becoming rich, and to the fact that capitalists have not learned the waste of competition and the value of a co-ordinated system of production. Such was the state of things at the beginning of this industrial era. It is perfectly useless to discuss the question, whether this change from feudalism was a good one, whether it involved the best interests of the individual. We have simply to remind ourselves that history is the record of evolution, that the change from feudalism to capitalism was not a scheme, but a development. No one's permission was asked. No ethical considerations had anything to do with it or are germane to the question. Probably no great change has taken place without loss to some one, without pain and hardship. Perhaps no change can be expected in the future which will not be attended by those same features. Contrast now with that initial stage of capitalism the industrial system we have today. The method of production is still socialized. It will never be changed back to the individualistic system. That is simply impossible. No sane man could desire it, and it would make no difference if he did. The production of commodities must be social. Those who produce must co-operate. Co-operation is compulsory not because men have so decreed, but because evolution has so decreed. The means of production are still out of the hands of the laborer. The wage system is still here. Laborers still compete with each other in the labor market, labor is still a commodity whose price is determined by the law of supply and demand, and wages measured by what they will buy back of the product of labor are not higher, but lower, and their tendency must inevitably be in that direction. But when we compare the condition of capitalists today with their condition at the beginning, we come to sight of a radical change. Instead of competition of the early stage we have co-operation, combination, co-ordination. Instead of the reckless commercial strife of that early day we have the trust, the monopoly, whereby a whole department of industry or production is controlled by aggregated capital, supply and demand are regulated, and up to a certain point the price of commodities is absolutely determined by the CAPTAINS OF INDUSTRY. We are perfectly well aware that the tendency toward this co-ordination of industry and production is the one conspicuous tendency in the commercial world today. There is none other to be for a moment compared with it. We know that progress does not go backward. We are sure that evolution is something different from hyolution. We know perfectly well that we have not reached the end. There is no end to be reached. The evolutionary process will go on. Nothing can stop it. Evolution has given us the socialization of the method of production. It will as surely give us the socialization of the instruments of production. That is inevitably the next step beyond the trust. There is no other step that industry can take, if it is to follow the lines which all the past give us reason to expect. In the change from capitalism to socialism, or from the plutocratic socialism which exists today to the democratic socialism which is as surely in the future as time is, there is another element to be taken into consideration. Heretofore, so far as can be discovered by a careful study of history, economic changes

have taken place regardless of ethical considerations and without any conscious co-operation on the part of men. I am inclined to believe that in the consummation of the next step in industrial evolution another force must be reckoned with. It is none the less an evolutionary force because it involves intelligent co-operative action on the part of individuals. It will be none the less evolutionary because it may involve the entrance of ethical forces or political action. It seems to be inevitable that in this great evolutionary process, which it is possible for us as students of history to observe and in which it has ever been necessary that the human race should take a central part, the time would come when men should consciously act a part in the drama. It does not seem to be unscientific to believe that such a time has come and that evolution has put into our hands the instruments by use of which we may and are destined to take that conscious part in the evolutionary process. The political evolution of the past century has not been less wonderful than the industrial evolution of the same period. It would be foolish to assume that there is no connection between the two. The period which has seen the laborer made the servant of the machine and the dependent slave of the capitalist, a mere commodity in the market, has also seen the acquisition by him of political equality with his economic master. It has witnessed the rise of democracy above the horizon as inevitably the coming form of human government, the only form of government, conceivably tolerable to sane men. It has witnessed the rapid spread of the desire for freedom. It has enshrined in the souls of men the ideal of liberty, fraternity and equality. It has made it the political death of any political party to deny or repudiate that creed in its appeal to the support of the people. It has seen the introduction of the common school system and compulsory attendance at these schools, with the consequent education of the masses. It has seen a progress, every part of which focusses upon the fullest emancipation of men from every form of slavery. I cannot, therefore, as a student of history for a moment doubt that the time is not far in the future when this growing proletariat, numbering already more than 75 per cent of our population, moved by the deepening consciousness of its own interests, together with no inconsiderable portion of our people who do not yet know themselves as members of the proletariat class, but who are sensible to the imperative demand for the realization of democracy and conscious of the utter impossibility of such realization in the realm of political life, so long as any sort of despotism is maintained in the industrial world, will make use of this political power which is already theirs to strike off these chains which, if we only had power to escape far enough from the prejudice of capitalist class-consciousness to see it, mean the real mental enslavement of the whole race. The instruments of production and distribution, which must be used co-operatively, must also be owned co-operatively. They can never again be owned by the individual. They are not today owned by the individual. They can be owned now only by the combination of immense capital in the form of a trust. Such ownership involves conditions which are intolerable under any just or sane government and is diametrically hostile to anything approaching political democracy. The only choice that is left to you and me and the other citizens of this nation is whether this change from government by monopoly and this appropriation by private individuals of wealth produced socially by the toiling millions to the co-operative commonwealth shall take place peaceably or shall involve continued waste and loss with the certainty of violence and bloodshed. Permit me to remind you that, the only men today who either believe in, or are working for, the consummation of this end peaceably are the socialists. If it must come by violence, let us know that the blame will lie at the doors of those who have insisted that it should not come at all, at the doors of those who have attempted to postpone the change until by starvation and slavery the disinherited masses are driven to desperation. The hope of a peaceful transition at this day, when so much political power has been put into the hands of the people and which so much depends upon the conscious co-operation of the voters in the evolutionary process, lies in earnest, courageous leadership on the part of men who have no good excuse for not knowing the facts of economic history, in the enlightenment of the working class as to their interests, and in fearless proclamation of the gospel of industrial justice.

(The end.)

At the South Town convention held by the 4th and 5th Ward branches, S. L. P., at 220, Wentworth avenue, on Monday, January 15th, 1900, the following candidates were nominated: Collector—Louis Kasselbaum, Supervisor—Wm. Figolia, Jr., Clerk—Joseph Keidel, Alderman 5th Ward—H. C. Dreisvogt.

This is the statement of William Jennings Bryan in a recent speech:

I have tried to distinguish between the peaceful extension of the limits of the republic and the change of a republic into an empire.

We would like to hear Mr. Bryan's opinion on the method by which the present state of Texas became part of the union.

Comrades August Kienkie and Jas. S. Smith will represent Section Chicago at the convention in Rochester, N. Y.

## FOREIGN NEWS.

"Le Mouvement Socialiste" Works for International Unity Among Socialists.

Our readers know how zealously we have struggled for socialist unity. The Congress has just laid its first foundations, but yet this cannot be quite sufficient. The system of a General Committee can give external unity alone. It is not able to create that really deep intimate unity which must give its existence to the strong will of the socialist conscience. All militant socialists must therefore associate their efforts in order to attain this desired object.

After one year of experience we are conscious of what is necessary to be done towards the fulfillment of that complete unity. And now at the beginning of a new year we have to form our readers that we understand the duty which the new organization of the party prescribes for us.

First, "Le Mouvement Socialiste" will remain a review of information. We shall endeavor to tell our readers at any time "This is how the socialist movement stands at present, on national, international, political, or economic matters." "This is the situation among such or such group of workmen." If we succeed in giving our comrades clear ideas of the progress of the movement, we will be powerfully contributing to the foundation of real unity.

In this manner everyone becomes aware of the thoughts and actions of others. Consciously or unconsciously the ideas and acts of our comrades, or such or such professions, of this or that country, will take effect on us provided we know them.

Nothing was more instructive or decisive at the Paris Congress than the speeches of the militant peasants and workmen, delegates of foreign countries. It is precisely this change of thoughts and wills that we wish to extend. And to succeed, nothing is better than to constantly supply such information to the comrades of the French Socialist Labor party.

First we want to show the infinite variety of socialist movement and action. In our "studies," "investigations" and "monographs" in our "Social Chronicle," we show how such circumstances create such organizations, and call forth such tactics, how the diversity of temperaments reflects itself to the diversity of works. We endeavor to point out that a complete socialist movement exists in reality everywhere, where each can act according to his aptitudes, and that no individual can have the right to represent such movement exclusively.

We will also indicate the progress of socialist thought and doctrine. New questions are always coming forward either concerning our party, or the different factions of international socialism. Socialists under the influence of facts or scientific studies are constantly proposing new questions to our movement. New solutions of problems which are now supposed to be settled are also being presented, and lastly there are sometimes proposals on new tactics, which must be taken cognizance of. It is this increasing work of international socialist thought which we will continue to relate in every phase of its complexity.

Again, as this is a review of information, "Le Mouvement Socialiste," faithful to its past, must also be a critical review. We must bring into contact all the active and living elements of the movement, for the socialist idea is eminently critical. We have not only to diffuse the opinion of such or such expert theorist, but also resuscitate the criticism of other theorists, and thus stimulate intellectual debate in the party. Everyone must be able to form an opinion for himself on the actions and ideas of others. Censure must be possible and precise, so that we may all know the reasons why we reject or accept some new idea or tendency.

On the other hand it is necessary that everyone shall act upon the actions of others, even upon the ideas of all, and so give his impulse to the movement. We wish to point out to the thinking proletariat, the most remarkable modes of socialist organization, the most recent and profound forms of socialist thought. This we believe the proper method to establish the veritable unity.

This will not be the external unity prescribed by the necessity of action, but the internal unity which grows from the conscious will and consent of all the militant proletariat, knowing at last that their activity has some value, only if combined with that of others of the same party. In fact the general movement of national and international socialism, must be the result of these mutual actions of the individual and socialist groups, the conscience and criticism constituting the essential character of the movement. Everyone must act openly, and the reasons for the decision of the proletariat must be clearly alleged. This internal liberty is the life and strength of socialism. Only under such conditions can the movement manoeuvre freely. When all are acquainted, and all discuss mutually and for the same reason, it is easy for everyone to find his proper place in the ranks of the party.

In our opinion this is the only way to destroy the divisions which from time to time disturb the French socialist movement. These misunderstandings arise from a lack of knowledge either of the aim or object under discussion. That there are numerous forms of socialist action we believe, and also that these different forms of action are connected and complete as a whole. There is a solidarity between the economic and political activities, the simplest and most common claims being directly connected with the most

ideal and elevated ones. The more reformist acts equilibrate the more revolutionary propaganda. The unity in the aim makes the unity in the party.

Whatever diversity of methods and temperament may exist, all those who aim at the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society, can and must fulfill their appointed function in the party.

It is for the realization of this complete unity of actions and consciences that "Le Mouvement Socialiste" has the honor of struggling.

M. T.

ODE TO THE ASSERTERS OF LIBERTY.

Arise, arise, arise!  
Thee blood on the earth that drenches  
ye brows;  
Be your wound like eyes  
To weep for the dead, the dead, the dead,  
What other grief were it just to pay?  
Your sons, your wives, your brethren,  
were they?  
Who said they were slain on the battlefield-day?

Awaken, awaken, awaken!  
The slave and the tyrant are twin  
born foes,  
Be the cold chains shaken  
To the dust where your kindred repose,  
repose,  
Their bones in the grave may start  
and move  
When they hear the voices of those they love  
Most loud in the holy combat above,  
Wave, wave high the banner  
Which Freedom is riding to conquest by  
Though the slaves that fan her  
Be Famine and Toll giving sigh for  
sigh,  
And ye who attend her imperial car,  
Lift not your hands in the banded war,  
But in her defense whose children ye  
are.

Glory, glory glory!  
To those who have greatly suffered and  
done!  
Never name in story  
Was greater than that which ye shall  
have won,  
Conquerors have conquered their foes  
alone,  
Whose revenge pride and power they  
have overthrown  
Ride ye, more victorious over your  
own.

Blind, blind every brow  
With crowns of violet, ivy and pine;  
Hide the bloodstains now  
With the hues that sweet Nature has  
made divine  
Green strength, azure hope and  
eternity,  
But let not the pansy among them be;  
Ye were injured, and that means  
memory.

—Percy Bysshe Shelley.

TIME PROVES TRUTH.

Capitalism Creates the Conditions and Forces for Its Own Overthrow.

Many years ago the greatest economic thinker which this century has produced, after an exhaustive analysis of the modern system of production made a general forecast from the observed tendencies of capitalism in the following words: "That which is now to be appropriated is no longer the laborer working for himself but the capitalist exploiting many laborers. This expropriation is accomplished by the inherent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many."

The effect of this process is then summed up as follows: "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production, and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." So far Karl Marx.

Let us now turn to the following wall of despair from the New York World, and see if the first part at least of this forecast is not verified to the letter:

The strength of the Standard Oil bank is:

1. Its position of sole administrator of the finances of that greatest, richest, boldest, most unscrupulous of monopolies, the Standard Oil trust.
2. Its position as the financial agent of the Morgan, the Vanderbilt, the Havemeyer, the Schiff interests, the railway "combine," the Coal trust and the Sugar trust.
3. Its correspondence relations with the most influential banks in the great centers of wealth and population, from San Francisco to Boston.

The power of the Standard Oil bank is:

1. The vast sums of money deposited with it and its vassal banks and its tributary and allied banks; the hundreds of millions of capital in the form of cash which it can mass to aid or destroy any commercial enterprise.
2. Its millions upon millions of credits, which it can expand or contract when and when to whatever extent the "Standard Oil crowd" may see fit. It can start or stop a stock panic at will. This menace of the Standard Oil bank is:

The accumulation of such strength and the exertion of such power that Mr. McKinley was constrained to turn over to it the conduct of the National Treasury, hoarding money or releasing money as this Colossus dictated—accepting the private interests of the Standard Oil coterie as the national financial policy.

The Standard Oil crowd, acting through the Standard Oil bank, is moving on the domination of the industrial, the financial, the commercial, the governmental interests of the republic. The president yields and aids. The most of the great merchants, bankers, capitalists have either surrendered and joined in or fear to speak above a whisper or an anonymous interview in protest and warning.

There remains only the people.

The Colossus and the people are face to face. What will the people do?

Yes, the Colossus is here, plain and distinct enough, but who are the "people" and when and how are they going to deal with this monster? The function of the "Standard Oil crowd" has not been the expropriation of the laborer working for himself, but the expropriation of the capitalist exploiting many laborers. And these capitalists who "fear to speak above a whisper"

regarding this mighty combination, and who have already "surrendered," are they "the people"? They have already made their fight, have been conquered and know it.

There will be no fight against the "Standard Oil crowd" that can ever accomplish its destruction. Those whose material interests have suffered by its development are already powerless. Those who have now nothing to lose, may for a time be duped into opposing the enemy of their enemies, but even they cannot turn back the development of capitalism, and if they could, they would speedily discover that such action was of no benefit to them. The centralization of the means of production as exemplified by this capitalist combination, must and will work out its own solution, not by disintegration and decentralization, as its jealous and impotent competitors vainly hope, but by its own growth and development, bringing the recognition that private property in the means of production is no longer compatible with the progress of society. Those who recognize this are the "people" who alone have power to deal with this economic phenomena and those "people" will be the socialists, ready to lay hold of and intelligently direct the productive forces of society in the interest of the producer. When the "integument is burst asunder," when the "knell of capitalist-private property sounds," as Marx says, then the class-conscious proletariat become the "people," assumes the political power, which capitalist class rule is no longer fitted to wield, makes itself thereby the ruling class, and inaugurates the new economic system, of collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, assuring to the worker the full social value of his product.

Public Honesty  
(Continued from page 1.)

business man. You have a store with a long front of show windows in which you display for the benefit of those who would be buyers, all the choicest of the season's novelties. And while these goods are on display in these windows the sun shines on them and fades them, thus causing you a financial loss, which of course, cuts into your profits. This loss no business man can stand. And you as a good business man must seek to avoid such a loss. But how? Here's the rub. By keeping the sun from shining in on the goods in your show windows. And so you must have an awning. But it does not reach out far enough to keep the sun out. Why? Because a law has been passed limiting awning to five feet over the sidewalk. And five feet of awning is not enough to protect your goods in the show windows from the sun's rays. To prevent a financial loss to yourself an awning reaching out more than five feet must be strung, law or no law, over your show windows. This you tell to Smith, explaining the facts, showing him, as a business man, you cannot stand this loss. He agrees with you; promises to do what he can for you. And you knowing full well you don't want anyone to do anything for you without being paid for it, and also remembering that it cost Smith something to be elected, you leave with him enough to pay him for the trouble he is going to put himself to, in seeing that an extra large awning is permitted in front of your store. A check, not as a bribe, but only to pay him for his trouble in seeing to it that you have the awning. Nothing wrong in that, is there? He (Smith) spent time and money getting elected, and don't you forget, also, that about the time he ran for the place as alderman, he was interviewed by the representatives of the Honest Voters League. He promised them, over his signature in the daily papers, that he, Smith, as far as it was in his power, would carry on the city's business on business principles, and "business," means profits, does it not? And so you see you are only paying him for the time he puts in looking out for your interests. And he, Smith, before taking office pledged himself to look out for the interests of his constituents, and you are one of them. And as he looks out for your interests, so he does for his other constituents: the City Railway Co.'s, the Gas Co.'s, the Telegraph Co.'s, etc., etc., in the city. In the state legislature the men elected on the same plan represent a constituency there and look after their interests. At Washington those elected to go there again are looking after the interests of their constituents in the way of tariff laws, subsidies, commercial treaties, rights of way, grants, and numerous other laws to favor their class and the best interests of their class they represent there. And they, the Smiths, honestly and scrupulously look out for this class, of which they are representatives or members of. And that laws are passed to their best interests only, and that nothing detrimental to them shall pass and become a law. What's dishonest about that? Nothing! These are all honest men, never betraying their class interests. But, my friend, if you want it so that these privileges, grants, subsidies, etc., etc., can not, need not be sold, make it impossible to sell them. It will be impossible to sell them only when the working class are aroused to a consciousness of their real class interests. Study socialism; vote for socialism, and usher in an era in which there will be no need of your kind of honest men.

R. A. M.

Always remember that the main bulwark of capitalism is the ignorance of the workers. They are in darkness only because they do not know the way out. Are you doing all you can to show them the path?

