

THE VANGUARD.

"We're beaten back in many a fray,
Yet newer strength we borrow,
And where the Vanguard camps to-day,
The rear shall rest tomorrow."

Vol. 3. No. 12. MILWAUKEE, WIS., AUG.-SEPT., 1905. Whole Number 32.

The more we realize the vast possibilities of human welfare which science has given us, the more we must recognize our total failure to make any adequate rational use of them. With ample power to supply to the fullest extent necessities, comforts, and even luxuries, for all, and at the same time allow ample leisure for intellectual pleasure and the esthetic enjoyments, we have yet so sinfully mismanaged our social economy as to give unprecedented and injurious luxuries to the few, while millions are compelled to suffer a life-long deficiency of the barest necessities for a healthy existence.

ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE.

For some time we have been desirous of publishing *The Vanguard* at the beginning instead of the end of the month, but have found it impossible to make the change, as we hoped, by issuing two numbers within one month. Therefore in order to catch up we have decided to date this special number August-September and bring the October number out promptly on time. This will in no way affect the number of copies our subscribers will receive, all subscriptions being reckoned accordingly.

We trust all our friends and comrades will avail themselves of the favorable season we are just entering upon to push the circulation of *The Vanguard* and place the magazine in the hands of many new readers. There is nothing better for Socialist propaganda, the magazine being issued with this purpose ever in mind. For a short time we make the special rate of 25 cents a year. Let us hear from you with a good sized list of subscribers,

Alfred Russell Wallace, the great English scientist, who shares with Darwin the discovery of the principle of Evolution, is a Socialist and looks at our present social arrangements with a Socialist's eye. Thus he said recently: "The crowning disgrace is that with a hundred fold increase in our powers of wealth, production adequate to supply every rational want of our whole population many times over, we have only succeeded in adding enormously to individual wealth and luxury, while the workers are on an average as deeply sunk in poverty and misery as before. I am convinced that the society of the future will be some form of Socialism, which is organization of labor for the good of all, just as the post office is organized labor for the benefit of all."

Socialism will no more think of keeping a sick man at work than a humane man today thinks of driving a sick horse.

FREE SPEECH OVERTHROWN.

The procedure and rulings of the Post Office Department in the case of Moses Harmon should arouse the most callous to a realization of the extent to which our liberty is invaded by a postal autocracy in America. For publishing simple arguments on the marriage question, Mr. Harman has been convicted of mailing obscene literature, and now awaits the result of appeal to a higher court. Meanwhile, three entire issues of his paper have been confiscated as unmailable by the postal authorities, the pretext being an extract from Dr. Alice Stockham's well-known work, "Tokology," and articles by women, advocating a high degree of self-control. Only a buzzard could scent "obscenity" in any one of them. Protest having been made against the outrage, R. P. Goodwin, Assistant Attorney-General for the Post Office Department, makes the following monstrous ruling: "Any and all discussion upon the sex question is obscene and unmailable. The only occasion for any talk of such matters is in the private conversations of physicians with patients." This marks the extreme limit of a tyranny unparalleled even in Russia. Its infamy defies adequate comment. If this ruling holds, free speech in America is dead. Is it possible that any American can be blind or indifferent to this deadly conspiracy against our dearest liberties? If the term "obscene" can be stretched to cover all discussion of the sex question, what cannot "sedition" be made to include? Socialists, Single Taxers, trades unionists and other minority advocates need not flatter themselves that the administrative process will stop here. The time to protest is NOW, before all liberty of expression is hopelessly crushed, and buried under a mass of precedent. Those who remain silent, because they differ from the views of Moses Harmon and other victims, or because the sex question does not particularly interest them, are responsible for the consequences, and deserve nothing better than to be the basest of slaves. Be sure the old lesson of history, that encroachment ever succeeds encroachment, will prove true here as elsewhere.

In spite of the fearful danger, there is only one organized movement to confront it. The Free Speech League, composed of men and women of every shade of personal belief, united only in their

loyalty to the vital issue of the preservation of our most fundamental liberties, has been founded to arouse public sentiment, and to defend freedom of speech, press, assemblage and mails, whenever and wherever assailed. Before this issue, all other immediate national problems pale into insignificance. A hundred years ago, the great Federalist party was wiped out of existence by an indignant people, for attacking free speech through the "Alien and Sedition Laws." Are we of today miserable degenerates, that we look with indifference on a far worse state of affairs?

Let all who care for freedom send a dollar to E. B. Foote, Jr., M. D., 120 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y., Treasurer of the Free Speech League, for a year's membership in the League, and as much more as can be spared to fight the present battle. Much money is needed for printing, postage, and for legal expenses in the defence of Moses Harmon, in whose cause your own is bound up. Dr. Foote will be glad to send printed matter giving detailed information of this latest assault on liberty.

James F. Morton, Jr.

Socialism does not make people good, it simply gives their natural goodness the courage to assert itself. It will not change human nature, it will rescue it.

There is enough clothing, there is enough shelter, there is enough food in the world to provide everyone with an abundant living. But as long as some are allowed to have more of these things than they need, others must certainly go without.

The Countess of Warwick has converted her husband to Socialism. The earl is a member of the House of Lords and will be the first Socialist to be numbered among that "heavenly host." If he is as vigorous as his wife there will be something doing at Westminster before long!

Aug - Sept, 1915

Letters To An American Farmer.

By Clayton J. Lamb, of Dryden, Michigan.

I. Modern Conditions are Rendering the Farmer Insecure and His Life One of Hard Toil for the Enrichment of Others. Socialism the Remedy.

DEAR BROTHER JO:—You ask me why you, a substantial Nebraska farmer, owning several hundred acres of good land, with cattle on your two-score hills, or why I, a fairly well fixed Michigan farmer, should be a Socialist, or even be interested in the subject. There are very many reasons why we should be Socialists—too many to tell in one letter—and I am going to try to show you if it takes a half dozen.

Farmers naturally divide into four varieties, according to their modes of operation:

1. Capitalistic farmers. These are usually bankers, brokers, or other business men living in the towns. Strictly, they are landlords, more or less wealthy, who do their farming by proxy. They assist to farm the real farmers. Their capital makes them bosses who control means of production which others must use in order to live.

2. The "operative" farmers. These own their own farms and work them in person, hiring help as needed. They own their own means of production, take their own business risks, and usually work harder and longer hours than the average hired man. They are part capitalists and part workingmen. As capitalists they receive rents, profits, and interest, and to the extent of these receipts they are exploiters of labor. In turn they, as laborers, are exploited by themselves and other capitalists. In modern commercialism they are financially weak, almost entirely unorganized, and very largely at the mercy and service of the capitalist class. To this variety of farmers you and I belong, and I particularly desire to show you how Socialism would improve our and their financial condition and social status, as well as that of all other varieties of farmers, not excepting the real capitalist farmers and all other capitalists, and all other workingmen.

3. The "Renters," or tenant farmers. These own (subject quite generally to chattel mortgages) their own horses, wagons, machines, and tools with which they work the land they do not own, upon such terms as they may make with the capitalist owners of the soil, for cash rent or for a share of the crop produced. They move from farm to farm from season to season, striving to keep out of the wage working class. Occasionally one succeeds in doing this, but generally they gravitate down the scale, unable with their small means and lack of organization, to hold their own in competition with the real capitalist class. The reward of their labor is that part of the product remaining after the claims of the

landlord, landlord, tax collectors, et cetera, are satisfied. Practically they are wage workers who, thinking they are working for themselves, work harder than the real wage worker would consent to work.

4. The farm laborers.. These have neither farm nor tools. They work for wages, and are proletarians. While they are not formally organized, they do have such an identity of interest and mutual understanding as to be able to control, in large part, the rate of wages, in which they receive the benefits of present labor organizations.

Now, Jo, let us examine for a moment the income of these farmers and trace that income to its sources. You and I are operative farmers. Part of our income is due to our capital, part to our labor, and perhaps a part, but really a small part, is due to the possible profit made upon or out of the labor we hire. This latter item is small, because actually what we make out of the wage worker is taken from us by the real capitalists, the railroads and other trusts and combinations. They regularly charge us "all the traffic will bear" and what little we are able to exploit from the wage worker actually passes to those higher up in the scale.

From these sources, then, that is: from our capital, from our labor, and from the direct exploitation of wage labor, we derive our incomes. Let us examine our incomes as capitalists:

Your 4,000-acre Nebraska farm will probably sell for \$100,000; my 160-acre Michigan farm is worth, say, \$10,000. To that extent we are capitalists. Our income from our capital is equal to the usual rate of interest—the net rate, after deducting taxes, superintendence and risk. Here that net rate would not exceed four per cent per annum, and it is a fact that this farm cannot be rented for \$400 per year over and above taxes, insurance, and cost of keeping it in its present state. I am a capitalist, say to the extent of four per cent a year on \$10,000, or \$400 a year. I presume that the same net rate would apply in your case; that is, four per cent a year on \$100,000, or \$4,000 per year. This then shows our respective interests as capitalists, under the present capitalist system. If, now, it can be shown that under Socialism our material interests would be actually improved, then it is clear that we should be Socialists, and work for its object, which is the entire destruction of all income from rent, interest, and profit, and the placing of the material interest of the State, the nation and the world upon an exclusively labor base, instead of upon its present capitalist base. For it must be and is admitted, that labor implies honest social service, while capitalism implies the exploitation, speculation, gambling and graft from which the people, and not necessarily the wage workers alone, are now suffering. In subsequent letters I will endeavor to show the entire soundness of the Socialist position, and not only the desirability, but also the inevitability, of Socialism.

Yours,

C. J. LAMB.

II. What Capitalism is Doing for the Farmer-Class by Means of the Combinations. Socialism the Only Escape for the Tillers of the Soil.

DEAR BROTHER JO:—It is true, as you say, that many Socialists are inclined to be intolerant. Usually these have rather recently become Socialists and have not yet gotten over the belief that farmers being small capitalists and hence a part of the bourgeois class, are not qualified to enter the straight and narrow gates of the Socialist party. It is true, too, that in some states, as in Nebraska, attempts have been made to exclude the gentle agriculturist from the sacred precincts, the holy of holies, where only wage-workers, the pure proletarian stuff, are fit to gather in council. These Socialists are really like most farmers in that they fail to see why and wherein the material interests of wage-workers and farmers are identical. Which is exactly what I am trying to show you.

In my last letter I showed that a \$10,000 farmer could credit only \$400 of his income to capital, and that he was a capitalist only to that extent. The rest of the farmer's income is due to his labor and to what he can "make" off the labor of his hired man or men. His income then comes from three sources:

1. Interest, or what is the same thing—Rent of land.
2. The wages of his own labor.
3. The profit derived from hired men's labor.

The first item we have considered. On the average his capital pays him about 4 per cent per annum.

On the third item, profit from hired labor, his income is really quite insignificant, since the trusts and combinations of all kinds see to it that Mr. Farmer is kept in the "position in which it has pleased God to place him," which is not much if any above that of the average wage-worker. As between the average Michigan farmer and the wage-worker it is generally conceded that the latter is the more leisurely gentleman of the two. What the farmer "makes" off his hired man he must and does hand over to those upon whom he almost helplessly depends for a market for his products, and for the goods he must buy. The market is the farmer's master and he is a small exploiter of labor, only for the benefit of organized capital.

This leaves only the second item of the farmers income to be considered—his income from his labor, which is his wages.

Now, Jo, if I can demonstrate that the scientific, comprehensive organization of industry in the exclusive interest of the working class, as Socialism proposes, will afford you, with your \$100,000 Nebraska farm, and all farmers in less fortunate circumstances, a greater net income and more of the necessities, comforts and luxuries of life than you now enjoy, with less of the strain and harassment than the average well-to-do farmer now endures; and that such organization of industry is not only possible but inevitable, then certainly you should be, and as a sensible business man, will be, a Socialist.

First, let us see what is the economic status of the farmer. On one side he sees organized capital, the trusts and a thousand business men's combinations. On the other side he sees organized Labor steadily ex-

tending and strengthening, till even his own hired men, way out in the country, have their understandings as to what the wages shall be, and who, like the capitalists, do not hesitate to "charge all the traffic will bear." Between these two organized and organizing forces stands the farmer, himself unorganized. In these circumstances something is going to happen to the man who stands alone—and something continually does happen.

We all see these combinations going on all around us, none so blind as not to see. But why is it so? What makes them organize? Socialists know why, because they have studied the causes and effects. Socialists see why **THESE ORGANIZATIONS MUST BE**, why they cannot be prevented, why and wherein they are the effects of a cause, what that cause is. They see that there is such a thing as social growth and they call that growth by a name—Social Evolution. They see the cause of this growth and they give that a name also—Economic Determinism. These are scientific terms. Some men get scared at them like a horse gets scared at an automobile.

Machinery compels these organizations. We cannot use machinery without organization. We want to produce all we can with as little labor as possible. Hence we invent, build and use machines. But the use of these machines forces us to work together, sort of half socializes us, if you please. Men associate in order to compel machinery to do their work. One man can make a flail—it takes a million to make a modern threshing outfit. One man can use a flail, but it takes a dozen to use the threshing outfit. The threshing machine throws these men into new relations with each other. Its building compels business organization. Self-defense compels labor organization. So machinery has revolutionized the mode of production and compelled the organization of Labor and of Capital.

If we plant corn under proper conditions, the corn will grow—it cannot help growing. No more can men help growing, no more can social growth be prevented. Machinery demands that men organize and they must obey that command or be snuffed out of existence.

The farmer is quite unorganized. He is a sort of an economic survival and has not yet found his place in the new social order which is brought about by the use of machinery. He sees organization all around him and cannot quite understand what it all means. He has a vague idea that the proper thing for him to do would be to get into an organization like the others. He joins the Grange, or a Farmers' Club, and there he considers questions grave and gay. He discusses the merits of long wool sheep, good roads, equal taxation, farm vs. city life, short horn cattle, and primary elections. He puts in time trying to dodge the binding twine trust, and he is squirming under the exactions of the stock yards, beef, oil, sugar, wire, milling, and a thousand other organizations which he more or less clearly sees "getting in their work on him." And he is looking for a way out of the woods. He is seeking his place in the new social order. But some way he cannot find it. His grange don't seem to fill the bill and his sudden shoot into populism seems to have "petered out." What is the matter with the farmer?

This letter is long enough. In my next I will try to answer that last question. We are repainting our house and have been doing business with the White Lead Trust, the Linseed Oil Trust, the Turpentine Trust, the Tin Can Trust, the Brush Trust, the Painters' Union, and I do not know how many others. They fixed the prices.

Your brother,

C. J. LAMB.

* * * * *

III. Why the Trusts do not Own the Farms. It is Cheaper to have the Farmers Own" them, and then Pluck the Farmer at Every Point. The Change that is still going on.

DEAR BROTHER JO:—Really you need to be set right on one point touched in your card of June 6. The term "Social-Democrat" by no means implies "fusion" with the so-called Democratic party. I say so-called "democratic" party because that party is only so called. It is not in fact a democratic party and never was. Up to 1864 it was a slave owners' party. Under Grover Cleveland it was a bond holders', trust and straight-out capitalist party. In 1896-1900 it made a little squeak for small capitalism and in 1904 it got back again and was a capitalist party. It never was a workingman's party and hence could not be really democratic. Get this point, Jo. Just so long as any class in society is dependent upon another class for its right to work, there can be no such thing as a really democratic or republican form of government. The Socialist, or Social-Democratic party, as it is called in most nations and in some states, proposes a genuine and not a sham democracy, in which no class will dominate any other class, and no man be dependent upon any other man or class for his opportunity to earn his daily bread. It proposes that each man shall receive from society the value of his service to society as exactly as that value can be ascertained and agreed upon, and that this will result from the ownership, by society, of those means of production which are socially used. It cannot "fuse," for the moment it "fuses" it ceases to be a Socialist or Social-Democratic party, and goes out of existence as did the Populist party, because of its unfitness to represent Labor. Political parties are but the expression of class interests striving for supremacy.

The two great, big facts that stick out more plainly than any other facts today, are Organized Labor and Organized Capital, and between these two economic forces there is a continuous struggle. The Socialist or Social-Democratic party is the political organization of Labor. When it "fuses" it surrenders, it commits suicide, but the class struggle does not cease; Labor simply repudiates that party which fuses (as it did the Populist party) and deposits its remains on the dump. Labor needs a straight, non-fusion party in its political business, and it won't be happy till it gets it.

The farmer stands between those two great opposing economic forces—Organized Labor and Organized Capital. How long can he stand the pressure?

Say, Jo, if the trusts were not making more money off the farmers than they could make by owning the farms and running them with hired labor, *don't you think they would soon own the farms?* To be sure. Farmers are "easier" for the trusts than the hired men are. It is less trouble and more money for organized capital to control the unorganized farmer by controlling his means of transportation and his markets, than it would be, *at present*, to own the farms and have to deal with the wage-workers. So much for the "independence" of the noble farmer!

And again: Money is largely loaned on farm mortgages at five or six per cent, gross, or about four per cent net. If the capitalist money loaner could make more than the usual rate of interest by running the farms with hired labor, wouldn't they soon own them? *Then don't you see that the "Independent Farmer" is more profitable to the capitalist class than the wage-worker would be?*

But what is the matter with the farmers? Why don't they organize? Well, they can't except in one way which I will attempt to point out later on. The economic reason why farmers cannot organize is because they have not wealth enough to take them into the trust, and just a little too much to entitle them to fraternal association with the wage-workers. They are neither capitalists nor proletarians. They each belong partly to both opposing classes and wholly to neither. They are each a house divided against itself. They are a mixed lot—a sort of economic hermaphrodite, as it were. They are each partly of the exploiting class and partly of the working class. They are exploiting themselves, and their wives and children, as well as their hired men, for the benefit of the real capitalist class. And organized capital has no use for them except to pluck them when they come to market.

Apples 20 cents a bushel to the Dryden farmer, and 40 cents a peck to the Detroit factory worker, 52 miles away by rail! What is the matter with the farmer? His market fools him. He mistakes his market. He thinks it is the capitalist who buys his product first. In this he is mistaken. His real market is the working class which buys his product last. Between the two stands Rent, Interest and Profit, taking their toll, which is, in amount, "all the traffic will bear." To demonstrate that it is to the farmers' interest that all rent, all interest and all profit be wiped out, eliminated and annihilated and that business be done on a labor or social service base, and that the interests of farmers and wage-workers are identical, is the object of these letters. To make my demonstration complete, I must also prove that Socialism is not only possible of attainment, but is inevitable.

You are getting old, brother Jo. Let's see—nearly seventy. You remember well back into the days of hand production. When you were a boy there were no circular or band saws; no sewing, knitting, planing or mowing machines or harvesters; no cultivators, drills, planters or listers; no telegraphs or telephones, and almost no railroads; no type writers or even steel pens. You remember our mother carding, spinning, twisting and dyeing the yarn for our clothing, and the old hand loom in the old log house, and so many other such things. Then almost

all things were produced by hand labor and but little by machinery. Now almost all things are produced by machinery and very little by hand labor. Within the time of your memory a revolution has been wrought in the mode of production, and an exactly corresponding and consequent revolution in the social status and relations of the people. Then there were three millionaires in the United States—Astor, Stewart, Girard; now there are thousands. Then there were no tramps—now there are millions. Then there were little shops in many villages—now there are great factories in a few cities. Then there were few wage-workers—now there are many. Then there were many employers—now there are few. Then there was no shoddy or adulteration—now honest goods are scarce—*it would be suicide for capitalism to make honest goods*. In these days Organized Labor and organized capital were almost unheard of—now they are IT, and they are at it. Then hand labor compelled competition—now the machine compels co-operation, it compels Socialism as its logical result. And the farmer is not exempt from this influence.

Capital organizes, Labor organizes. Every big business and every little business. Every manner of wage-worker. They all respond to the change in the mode of production. And they keep right on organizing, don't they? Even in spite of the old laws made to fit the conditions of hand production? Even in spite of the injunctions of big and little courts? Now say yes to this, Jo, so I can get in my climax and close this letter.

Labor and capital cannot help organizing, Jo, Were they to stop organizing—that is if they were to stop growing, they would die. They must organize, they must socialize, as corn must grow or hens lay eggs, because they cannot help it. Growth, organization, socialization is the perfectly natural thing. Both Labor and capital are obeying the law of self preservation. Production by machinery is the environment which compels association.

And when will these social forces stop organizing? They will not stop. They cannot. They are headed straight for Socialism and are already well along the road and will run over anything that gets in their way. Old methods, old institutions, old customs, ancient precedents, all give way to the social influence of modern machinery. The inventor is the basic social revolutionist.

A thousand plain, every day facts declare that Socialism is inevitable. The change from the competitive lack of system to the co-operative, systematized organization of industry is already half accomplished.

The farmer must also respond to these influences. He cannot forever stand between the fires of these two opposing forces. As a capitalist, as an exploiter he is already a failure. The working farmer is a wealth producer and he must go with the other wealth producers—the wage-workers. And he must go as a workingman and not as a capitalist.

Your Brother,

C. J. LAMB.

IV. How the Struggle Between Labor and Capital Concerns the Farmer. Small Capital Helpless Against Large Capital.

DEAR BROTHER JO:—It must be plain that modern machinery is compelling co-operation. Men must co-operate on some terms or machinery cannot be run at all.

The first tiller of the soil did not and could not co-operate. He just got a good, strong stick, sharpened it by burning it to a point in the fire, and that constituted his entire farming outfit. No chance to co-operate in the use of tools of that kind, or in their product. This was the original and only really independent farmer.

Let us now examine into the "independence" of the modern farmer who uses the modern tools and machines which have developed from that sharpened stick, and find out just how really "independent" this modern farmer is.

The modern farmer must have modern machines, and—

1. An army of men is mining iron for his use.
2. Another army of men is preparing timber for his use.
3. Another vast army is mining the coal.
4. Other armies are building ships and railroads.
5. Another immense army is transporting these raw materials to the factory and from the factory to the farm.
6. Other armies are building factories and machines for making and moving machines.
7. Still other armies are making farm tools and machines.
8. Other vast armies are providing the clothing, shoes, fuel and shelter for these armies while they make the tools and machines for the farmer.

Upon all the men of all these armies the farmer is dependent. In every plow, every mower, every binder, every shovel and hoe, every fence board, nail or bolt is the work of millions of men, all of whom have labored with and for the farmer, who, in turn, has fed them all. To-day it takes all the useful people of society to make and transport the one match with which the fire is lighted in the stove in which is embodied the labor of all those same millions, farmers included. Thus are we so far socialized already, and the process still continues. And it cannot stop. To stop would be to go backward towards the sharpened stick. Socialists are those who see these things and who propose the organization of all these social functions in the interest of the useful class—the workers and thinkers—those who render useful social service.

In all the processes of social growth through all the ages, one law of evolution is plainly written: "Eliminate the useless." That which no longer serves a useful purpose in the economy of nature is cast aside. Under the operation of this law, society has cast off several outgrown social systems, such as theocracy, aristocracy, chattel slavery, feudalism. And now we have come to the age of Democracy—not the shoddy article, mind you, but the real thing—Social-Democracy. Society is now making war upon capitalism, and if capitalism be no longer useful, if it no longer serve a useful social purpose, as it once did, it, too, must obey the law and pass away.

The evidences that the competitive system (or perhaps rather lack of system) is gradually becoming not only useless, but dangerous, are numerous. Gradually the means of production upon which all must depend for their very lives are passing into the control of trusts and combinations. The supplies of lumber, coal, iron, leather, paper, oil, lead, flour, meats, cotton, tobacco, farm machinery, in fact, nearly every article of commerce, are controlled entirely, or very largely, by organized capital. The mines, the forests, the factories, the means of transportation, have almost wholly been reduced to the trust form of ownership, but so far the trust system has paid little attention to the trustification of the farms and farming. The control of the farmers' market and means of transportation has been sufficient for the purposes of modern capitalism. So long as it can "make more money" off farmers than it could off those same farmers were they wage-workers, it is satisfied to leave things as they are, and there is no other reason why the farming interest is not treated by capitalism exactly as are the mines, the forests, the factories and the railroads.

Nevertheless, agricultural production is now beginning to afford a good field for the industrial organizer. Admittedly the farm interests are not organized and systemized for the economy of labor in production, as are mining, manufacturing and transportation. But with the quite recently introduced traction engine, which has been over one hundred years in process of development, and considering the possibilities of electrical power as applied to farming, it seems certain that agriculture must follow the other industries in systemized production. Already machinery has been so far applied to farm operations as to increase the power of labor to produce, by five, ten, twenty or one hundredfold, as compared with former methods. Comparing the modern mower with the ancient scythe; the binder with the old cradle or still older sickle; the lister and cultivator with the old plows, harrows and hoes; the modern horse rake with the old hand rake; the horse forks with the hand forks; the modern thresher with the ancient flail, and so on through a long list, it is plain that the productivity of farm labor has increased not less than fivefold since you were a strapping lad and I a mere kid, and, compared with the original sharpened stick, not less than 500 or 1,000-fold. That the farmer has received the benefit of this increased capacity to produce will hardly be contended, and the wages of labor continue about the same as they were—a bare living. The surplus value thus created, the unearned increment, has not gone to those whose labor produced it, but has been taken in the shape of rent, interest and profit, by the owning class. Vast millions and billions have been piled up in a comparatively few hands and is now exploiting labor in all its useful forms. And the real working farmer is paying the same tribute that the wage-worker is paying.

But the day of systemized, organized and economical farm production is now almost at hand. A new power is being applied. The completed traction engine indicates a still greater revolution in farm methods, and electricity stands just in the background, almost ready to add its force. Perhaps some day the power of the water in Niagara Falls

may be used in tilling the big fields of your **Nebraska farm**, or be shearing sheep on this old homestead!

Nearly all the divisions of industry are now operated, from top to bottom, by hired men, for the profit of the owners. The capitalist no longer even manages—he hires his managers, who are expected and ordered to produce satisfactory dividends. Social evolution has reached the stage where the value of the social service of the capitalist class is being reduced to zero. Formerly the capitalist managed his own business and engineered his own profits. Now even this service, the last useful function of capitalism, has been turned over to the wage-working class, which is thus made self-exploiting. And thus a managing class is growing up among the wage-workers themselves. Labor now both produces and manages. That it will always continue to pay tribute to a socially useless and entirely predatory class is not believable. Labor is organizing. Its cerebro-spinal nervous system, its brains, are developing. It is the growing social force. It is becoming class-conscious and in due time it will add administration and ownership to its list of social functions, and then capitalism, as a social system, will belong to the dead past as do chattel slavery and feudalism. Society is now saturated with Socialism.

The present position of the farmer in the economy of society we well know. He is paying tribute to capitalism just as the wage-worker is. There is only this difference—the farmer pays tribute when he sells his product in the market, while the wage-worker pays when he sells his labor. Both are exploited as producers of wealth, and their interests are identical except only to the extent of the farmers' interest as a capitalist, which is quite inconsequential. This identity of interest calls for organization, the only available weapon of defense. We cannot longer depend upon competition as we could in the days of hand production or production by the use of simple tools. The social force of modern machinery is too great. It demands co-operation all along the line.

For competition itself compels co-operation, and in this way: Those who by use of the best business organization and the use of the best machines produce goods with the least labor and expense drive those with poorer business organization and inferior machines from the market. The strongest, or fittest, survive, and those less fit are gradually pressed into the ranks of the wage-workers. But that by no means ends the struggle. As wage-workers their only means of escape from actual, absolute slavery is organization. They organize by crafts and are again overcome. They organize industrially (that is by whole industries) and the Masters of the Bread whip them again. But they learn by defeat. The struggle develops their strength, their class-consciousness, their powers of perception, their whole capacity. At last they see a weapon which in their hands is irresistible—the Ballot. They organize socially, that is to say, politically, and in that field, because of their growth in strength and numbers, they themselves become the Masters of the Bread and there at last they win their victory. In the labor unions of to-day are the statesmen of to-morrow. To "smash

the unions" is to transform craftsmen into statesmen, and, if need be, into Soldiers.

The struggle between Labor and Capital is constantly growing more and more tense. It is the issue upon which the farmer must choose his position. He cannot long remain "a-straddle of the fence." He must get down on one side or the other.

Small capital, such as most farmers have, cannot successfully compete with the systemized management and superior facilities of real, or large, capital. Small capital can neither produce nor distribute goods economically, and yet this is the business game the farmers are now playing. Really the material interest of the farmer, as a small capitalist, is quite inconsequential when compared with his interest as a working man.

I have pictured the farmer as being on the fence between Labor and Capital. He has not always been in that position and has been placed there by modern capitalism. He cannot get down on the capitalist side from which the real thing capitalism has driven him, and it only remains for him to land on the labor side, where he belongs. And that, if he only knew it, is exactly where modern capitalist methods, in the due process of economic or business evolution, has located him. Some figures in my next letter. Yours sincerely. C. J. LAMB.

* * * *

V. The Independent Farmer is a Myth. — The True Significance of the Grange and the Alliance Movements is Made Clear.

DEAR BROTHER JO: Statistics are dry. Long columns of figures are uninteresting to most people. Only students care to dig among them, so I will defer figures till later.

The independent farmer is a myth. In these days of semi-socialized production there are no independent people. We are dependent upon each other. Machinery has made us dependent. Socialists recognize this fact and propose the arrangement of the terms of this inter-dependence in the interest of the producers of wealth, the working class. At present the terms of our inter-dependence are dictated by capitalists in the interest of the capitalist class.

The independent farmer! The idea has been preached until many people actually believe it. But let us see how it actually is. My neighbors, I presume, are fair samples. On the southeast is Uncle Jake's farm, now occupied by renters who work all the time. They have been renters for years. I can't speak as to the hours and days they put in, but their landlord is well pleased with them. On the southeast lives a widow with two or three boys. The boys have little time for school; they are too busy. Early and late they are at it, and they are aged beyond their years. They think they are working for themselves when in fact they are working for the fraction of what they actually produce—the trusts generously taking the most of it.

On the southeast is neighbor Taylor whose farm is of sixty acres. He is our pathmaster. He drove in here the other day to "warn" us to go to work on the road, and was telling me that he had not been away

from home at milking time, night or morning, for a year and a half. The trusts have him tied up to three cows and is making him hustle about fifteen hours a day. Taylor has a pretty clear idea that he is pretty nearly a slave to the "system," and begins to see the way out of his Egypt. On the east is another fifteen-hour-a-day farmer. Tappan is doing two men's work and his wife helps him in the field. He gets the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table, is a prohibitionist and a Methodist. He thinks men ought to be good and contented. His son has just graduated from our high school and is said to be looking for an easier job than 15-hour-a-day-farming. On the northeast lives a man, a painter, poisoned by lead till he is an invalid at thirty-five years of age. He has come with his family from the city to the country, hoping for restoration to health. One of my neighbors on the north is a carpenter as well as a farmer. He gets up in the morning at four, works two hours and a half in his fields, bolts his breakfast, works at carpentry ten hours and after a six o'clock supper does farm work as long as he can see. He makes about fifteen hours a day. My other neighbor on the north is a wage worker. He works ten hours a day and then "knocks off." So there you have it—the "independent" farmer and the wage-worker. Once in a while, thanks to the blessed railroad corporations which run cheap Sunday excursions, the "independent" farmer gets an occasional outing.

In a former letter I promised to point out the way, and it would seem the only way, in which farmers had organized and could organize. It is true that farmers have in recent years twice set up strong organizations and done quite a lot of business. Once was in 1874, during the panic of '73 to '79. Times were mighty hard then and the good old grange called the farmers together. They met in country school houses mostly and there they deliberated. Their grange was almost a sacred place to them and among other things they highly resolved that it should not be contaminated with that hateful thing—politics. There should be no politics in this grange—not a bit of it. The grange would keep out of politics and it would keep politics out of the grange. Nevertheless, the grange went heels over head into politics—and they surprised not only those who had an idea the farmers could never organize—never do anything for themselves, but they surprised even themselves. Like a flash they captured state legislatures, filled them full of grange farmers and they proceeded to legislate for themselves and even to amend state constitutions. Through the agricultural west the farmers became a great power and considerable grange legislation was the result. Then the panic, with its stress of hard times passed, the farmers got a breathing spell, a few more crumbs fell for them from the rich man's table, and they settled down again rather contentedly to work for their capitalist masters. The grange movement slumped, the good old parties were given credit for having brought prosperity. Thirty-one years ago the gentle agriculturist became militant and then a tub was thrown to the whale, the grange subsided, and capitalism was again on deck.

Again in 1889 came the rumblings of an approaching economic storm. It was the Farmers' Alliance this time. This movement spread over the south and west and everywhere their shibboleth was: "Keep the

Alliance out of Politics; Keep Politics out of the Alliance!" But they couldn't do it. The Alliance went into politics all over. They captured several states, elected congressmen and United States senators and during the time of the panic until 1896 the farmers made themselves felt in the councils of the nation. Then "good times" came again, the farmers nodded off to sleep and lulled by the sweet song of prosperity, they went back willingly to the service of the capitalist masters. There are no farmers in congress now—just lawyers, bankers, and other good people whom the farmers send there to make the laws for them. And these grafters will look after the interests of the farmers—of course they will—just as a wolf would look after the interests of a flock of sheep.

Most people have splendid forgetters. Their forgetters are better than their thinking apparatus, but you will remember these grange and alliance movements and can draw logical conclusions from them.

There is an old saying which was: "You'll never miss the water till the well runs dry." When the farmers got "hard up" in 1874 and 1893 they missed the water—and then they forgot, and capitalism resumed its old game.

These Grange and Alliance movements are full of significance. First they prove that farmers can organize when they go about it; second that their effective organizations are political, even in spite of the farmers themselves, and third that heretofore farmers' organizations have been spasmodic and short-lived. It is too bad, but they also prove that farmers never go about it to organize till they feel the financial pinch.

Economic or business organizations of farmers is impossible for many reasons: 1. Their numbers are so large. 2. Their isolation caused by the nature of their occupation. 3. Their adverse interests as producers, the cotton-grower's interest being adverse to the wool-grower's; the corn-grower's interest adverse to the feeder's, etc. 4. Their divided interests as capitalists and working men, the one interest playing against the other. They cannot organize as capitalists because they have a labor interest, and they cannot organize as workingmen because they have a capitalist interest. Hence, all their organizations are necessarily short-lived. When the Trust method of production includes agriculture, as it now does mining, manufacturing and transportation, then the farmers will have only their labor interest left and then they will not only be able to effect a permanent organization, but they will be forced to organize and to stay organized. As it is, their spasmodic efforts at organization only occur at those periods when their interests, as wealth producers, are most seriously assailed by Capitalism; that is, during periods of panic and financial depression.

A harsh definition of a trust is: A Trust is a business association of gentlemen who have too much sense to compete against each other when they can do better, for themselves, by co-operating against those who do not know enough to co-operate.

And Socialism may be defined again as the business association of class-united workingmen who have too much sense to compete against each other for the benefit of mere property owners when they can do better for themselves and their families by co-operating against those

who do no useful work, but who merely boss the jobs and divide the products of labor according to the dictates of their own material interests.

The history of the past generation seems to indicate that no form of effective organization is open or available to farmers except the political form, and that they are capable of exercising great influence in that field is already demonstrated by the grange movement in the seventies and the alliance movement in the nineties. That these movements collapsed proves that they were not properly based—that they contained in themselves the elements of their own destruction. Indeed it was said: “No servant can serve two masters; for either he will hate one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the old one and despise the other.” So farmers cannot serve both those two contending classes—Labor and Capital. If they try to serve one they oppose the other. They cannot organize on those terms.

Only as workingmen can farmers organize and become strong. As capitalists they are a puny people—it is as workingmen that they feed the world. Modern machinery enables Labor to produce so abundantly that it will not much longer call any man master—and all Labor must respond to these new conditions. When no man is the servant of any other man, that will be Socialism.

Your Brother,

C. J. LAMB.

* * * * *

VI. The Increased Productiveness of Labor by Means of Machinery and Why the Workers do not get the Benefit. A Social System that Lacks Harmony.

Dear Brother Jo: I have before me “Vol. I, Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor (U. S.), 1898, Hand and Machine Labor.” From the tables on pages 24 to 79, I condense the following table, showing the comparative power of Labor to produce goods, by hand and by machine.

Name of Article Produced.	Effectiveness of Machine over Hand Labor.
1 acre Wheat, 20 bu.	22 to 1
1 acre Rice, 2640 lbs.	3½ to 1
1 acre Corn, 40 bu. shelled.....	5 to 1
1 ton Hay	3 to 1
1 acre Barley, 30 bu.	25 to 1
1 doz. Pitchforks	15 to 1
100 Blank Books	8 to 1
100 pairs Men's Shoes	9½ to 1
100 pairs Women's Shoes	11½ to 1
1000 loaves Bread	3 to 1
1 Buggy	4 to 1
1 Farm Wagon	5 to 1
1 fifteen Jewelled Watch	35 to 1
Overalls and Jackets	10 to 1

Name of Article Produced.	Effectiveness of Machine over Hand Labor.
Barrels	3 to 1 to 20 to 1
Rope	10 to 1
Hemp twine	106 to 1
Unbleached Sheeting	11 to 1
2 cord Sewing Cotton	73 to 1
No. 12 Cotton Yarn	162 to 1
Jeans cloth	24 to 1
Axes and Adzes	8 to 1
Butter and Cheese	10 to 1
Men's Woolen Mittens	66 to 1
Hats and Caps	8 to 1
Men's cotton socks	115 to 1
Men's wool socks	45 to 1
Shawls and blankets	38 to 1
Bolts and nuts	5 to 1
Shingles	13 to 1
Sawing lumber	60 to 1
Cut shingle nails	125 to 1
10 d. cut nails	75 to 1
Iron pipe	75 to 1
Pins	17 to 1
Paint (white lead)	10 to 1
Pine doors	40 to 1
Planing lumber	30 to 1
Moulding	10 to 1
Making sash	10 to 1
Making lead pipe	70 to 1
Making harness	4 to 1
Sheet iron ware	32 to 1
Soap	15 to 1
Butcher knives	30 to 1
Hammers and hatchets	15 to 1
Turning hoe handles	11 to 1
Breaking stone	65 to 1
Mining coal	2 to 1
Loading coal and ore	75 to 1
Unloading coal from boat	40 to 1
Making and repairing road bed	40 to 1
Moving freight	200 to 1

These statistics were gathered in 1895-6, nine and ten years ago, since which time later inventions have very largely increased the efficiency of labor. All this machinery has been installed since you were born.

From these facts competent persons conclude that THE AVERAGE POWER OF LABOR TO PRODUCE GOODS HAS BEEN INCREASED TWENTY FOLD.

And yet labor lives about as near the starvation line as it did when it produced only one-twentieth as much as it does now. And that is what Labor is kicking about, and it has a right to kick. Does anybody imagine that it is going to stop kicking?

Farmers generally think that trusts and combinations are bad. Nevertheless they have a mission, and a very important one. They are organizing the industries of the world. For this service Labor, that is farmers and wage workers mostly, are paying "all the traffic will bear." Hence we have a few men vastly wealthy and a corresponding army of tramps. Robert Hunter says that ten million people of the United States live in a state of chronic poverty. In New York City 94 per cent of the people are tenants and 60,000 evictions take place annually. It is a one-sided contract, this capitalist system, under which both farmers and wage workers are working. The big capitalists are dictating the terms of the present social contract, and Labor has little to say about those terms. "We produce admirably; we distribute wretchedly." Farmers produce and capital controls the market. That is a nice arrangement—for the capitalist class.

But as admirably as we now produce all manner of goods, the processes of production are by no means finished. There yet remains much to be done. We are in a transition stage between hand and machine production—between the competition necessary to a state of society in which goods are made by hand labor, and the co-operation which is compelled by the machine. Under hand labor only individualism can exist. Under production by machinery we must socialize and we do socialize, and we are very largely socialized. Our modes of production are modern, but hating Socialism as most people hate all innovation, we cling to the same old system of distribution which prevailed under the modes of production by hand labor.

To illustrate the growth or evolution of society I quote Frederick Engels in "Socialism, from Utopia to Science:"

"Production has become a *social act*. Exchange and appropriation continue to be individual acts, the acts of individuals. *The social product is appropriated by the individual capitalist*. Fundamental contradiction, whence arises all the contradictions in which our present-day society moves, and which modern industry brings to light,"

"A. Severance of the producer from the means of production. Condemnation of the worker to wage labor for life, *antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie*."

"B. Growing predominance and increasing effectiveness of the laws governing production of commodities. Unbridled competition. Contradiction between socialized organization in the individual factory, and anarchy in production as a whole."

"C. On the one hand, perfecting of machinery, made by competition compulsory for each individual manufacturer, and complemented by a constantly growing displacement of laborers. *Industrial reserve army*. On the other hand, unlimited extension of production, also compulsory under competition, for every manufacturer. On both

sides, unheard of development of the productive forces, excess of supply over demand, over-production, glutting of the markets, crises every ten years, the vicious circle of excess here, of means of production and products, and excess there of laborers without employment and without means of existence. But these two levers of production and of social well-being are unable to work together, because the capitalist form of production prevents the productive forces from working and the products from circulating, unless they are first turned into capital—which their very superabundance prevents. The contradiction has grown into an absurdity. *The mode of production rises in rebellion against the form of exchange.*” The bourgeoisie (capitalists—Lamb) are convicted of incapacity to manage their own social productive forces.”

“D. Partial recognition of the social character of the productive forces forced upon the capitalists themselves. Taking over of the great institutions for production and communication, first by joint stock companies, later on by trusts, then by the state. The bourgeoisie (capitalists—L.) demonstrated to be a superfluous class. All its social functions are now performed by salaried employees.”

So says Engels. And we have now reached the trust stage and are rapidly moving towards state ownership, which is not yet Socialism, but rather state capitalism. Not until the workers of the world become the organized and directing force in public affairs will Socialism be realized. Then the already largely socialized means of production will be given their complete socialized character, and socialized production upon a predetermined plan will become possible. That will be industry fully organized and towards that society is rapidly driving.

Labor now produces by machinery twenty times as much per unit as it formerly did by hand. With the industrial organization now in plain sight production will be again doubled and with Socialism established it will be doubled once again. And farmers will be benefited, as well, if not as much, as wage workers. Even \$100,000 farmers like yourself, and much more little two or three cow—fifty sheep—one-horse farmers like myself, will be in receipt of an actual, material, increased income.

In my next letter I will make some figures on this particular question and endeavor to show how and why your interest as a workingman, even though your farm be four thousand acres in extent, are greater today than your interests as a capitalist. To prove this is to prove that every small capitalist who is also a workingman should be a Socialist.

We are in the midst of haying and harvesting. We are using trust machinery, trust oil, trust binding twine, paying trust prices for repairs, and when we get done we will haul the stuff to a trust elevator with trust harness on a trust wagon, to be shipped over a trust railroad to trust mills. Oh, yes! we farmers are very independent, we are!

Your Brother,

C. J. Lamb.

VII. The American Farmer Gets a Mere Subsistence Portion of His Product. Capitalism Strips Him in All Possible Ways. What the Trusts do to the Farmer in Harvesting Time.

DEAR BROTHER JO: I now attempt to prove to you that the interests of farmers and wage-workers are identical, even though the farmer be as well situated as yourself with your \$100,000—4,000-acre Nebraska farm.

The interest of the farmer (and other working people of small means) as a capitalist is measured by his income from his capital, which I have estimated to yield four per cent. per annum, net. The gross rate, of course, would be more than 4 per cent., but taking taxes, risk, superintendence and other items of expense into consideration, four per cent. is about the net rate.

The interest of farmers (and of other persons of small means, by which I mean property up to \$100,000 in amount) as workingmen, is fairly measured by the amount they would produce were they organized for systematic and economical production in their own interests as wealth producers.

Competent investigators who, because of their special study of the thousands of facts touching this matter, are experts and specialists, some of whom have been connected with the U. S. Labor Commission for many years, have stated that the average product of labor is now not less than twenty times as much per unit as it was one hundred years ago, when there was little or no machinery and almost all goods were produced by hand work. In a very few lines of production the product of labor has been increased but little—in some not more than doubled. In other lines the product has been increased fivefold. In most lines the product is ten, twenty, fifty or one hundred times increased, while in still others the rate of increase is from 100 to 10,000, or upwards. The average rate of increased production is computed by specialists at about twentyfold. Common observation confirms these figures.

One hundred years ago the farmers and wage-workers received a subsistence. They made a living by their labor, and on the average it was pretty nearly as good a living as they make now. For purposes of comparison let us call that living worth \$200 per year, or \$16.67 per month.

If it be true, then, that the average working man and farmer now produces twenty times as much as he did 100 years ago, his income now should be twenty such livings, or \$4,000 per year.

Who gets this increased product? *IT IS CERTAIN THAT THE WAGE-WORKERS DO NOT GET IT. AND IT IS ALSO CERTAIN THAT THE FARMERS DO NOT GET IT.* It is also certain that not more than one in twenty of the small business men who are hounded and harassed by the present system (or lack of system) almost past endurance, get even a small part of this increase. *Where then does it go?*

The present commercial or business system is very complicated, but even a layman can see some things with his own eyes. Labor receives about the same living it did when it produced only about one-twentieth

as much as it does now. Why? Because the rate of wages depends not upon how much labor produces, but upon how cheaply it will consent to live. Production is semi-socialized in the interest of the capitalist class. Wages are paid on the competitive basis—the “system”—capitalism—is looking for the men who will produce the most for the smallest portion of their product—and *the farmers are easy victims of this system*. But to where does this immense product go? The farmer does not get it, nor does the wage-worker. Who, then, does get it?

Largely the product of labor to-day is wasted—wasted by the “system”—capitalism—in maintaining its economic position in the domination of what is called “business.”

Wasted in a thousand useless or even harmful ways. Some of these are: (1) The army and navy, maintained by Labor at an enormous expense, in wars of aggression in order that capital may have a market for Labor's product. National greatness and national integrity are the pretexts. Summed up and summed down, the armies and navies of the world are useful to and used by the capitalist class in their wars against each other and against the producers of wealth. (2) Lawyers and courts: In cases where labor and capital are contestants the decisions are almost uniformly in favor of the “system.” Labor seldom wins. In fact, the expense of litigation bars labor from the courts, which are almost only useful to capitalists in their contests with each other and with labor. Precedents of the days of chattel slavery and feudalism are now used to hold wage-labor subject. Lawyers are mostly parasites upon parasitic capitalism. Labor feeds, clothes and shelters them as they serve, not society with a useful service, but the “system.” Labor foolishly surrenders not less than nine-tenths of its product to the “system,” and lawyers, being a part of that “system,” come in for their share of the plunder. (3) Politicians: I use that word to designate the great raft of grafters, or hangers-on, who for proper consideration steer state and national governments in the interests of the capitalist class. Bosses Hanna, Quay, Platt, Coker, Cox, Atwood of Michigan, Thurston, Mitchell, Morton, Burton of Kansas, Depew, Aldrich, and Belmont are shining examples. There is a vast army of these craftsmen, a valuable adjunct of the “System,” who are *well paid by Labor itself to keep Labor in due subjection*. Of course, Labor does not handle the “check book,” but it furnishes the “stuff” with which the “system” does the business. (4) The police who see to the preservation of order while capitalism gets in its work. (5) Charity: Some thousands of goody people who essay to patch up a very few of the social wounds caused by the “System,” and some thousands of others who use charity to cover a multitude of sins. (6) Advertising, which employs an immense army of workers in the interest of rent, interest and profit—never (or seldom) in the interest of Labor. (7) Salesmen on the installment plan or otherwise, whose business it is to sell goods for profit—another great army of socially useless people. (8) Commercial travelers—an immense and expensive army used in the service of the “system,” which would be almost wholly unnecessary in a Socialist state. (9) Go into any town or village and see

the rows of little stores and shops—in cities mile after mile of them, all striving, struggling for existence, and nearly all failing. A survival of the individualist system of hand production miserably striving to continue their petty businesses in these days of machine production and organized capital. It is doubtful, indeed, if Socialism could be a greater relief to the wage-worker than to these hundreds of thousands of worn and weary people. (10) Adulteration, shoddy and frauds in goods. Actually under the “system” as we have it, there is a vast army engaged in legally defrauding society with shoddy, adulterated and even injurious goods. And Labor pays for this, too; that is, it permits the “system” to do this sort of business, and it furnishes the wherewithal. (11) Speculators, brokers, board of trade men, with their clerks, stenographers, messengers and other employes—these constitute still another large army of socially quite useless people, who, under Socialism, would become useful.

All these armies are engaged in some capacity in the service of the “system”—capitalism. They are rendering little or no service to farmers or wage-workers and next to no real social service at all. Perhaps their greatest social service is that of “HORRIBLE EXAMPLES OF HOW NOT TO DO THINGS.” Out of that portion of the wealth which Labor produces, but does not receive, capitalism—the “system”—pays these, its servitors. And this list is by no means complete. To it can be added other armies of those engaged in personal service—the lackeys of the rich—sailors who navigate yachts for capitalists; builders who build mansions for capitalists; collectors, telegraph and telephone people who mostly serve the exploiting class; landlords, pawn shop people, and others.

These indicate some of the institutions which Labor supports for the personal use and service of the comparatively few people who constitute the “system.” And after paying all these there is still a surplus left which is constantly accumulating in the hands of a small percentage of the people. The average wage of labor is reported as \$437 per year, and the average farmers’ wage does not much, if any, exceed that sum. Now, suppose the average wealth producer “saves” \$100 per year—it would take the “savings” of 300,000 such workers to equal the “savings” of one John D. Rockefeller. In other words, the oil king’s savings would equal the savings of all the working people of the great state of Nebraska combined. And Rockefeller is only the recognized largest one of a class which numbers perhaps 10,000 in all, or only about one-twenty-fifth of the adult male population of Nebraska alone, or about one-fiftieth of the adult male population of Wisconsin alone.

These wastes eliminated and the products of labor placed where they rightly belong, to the socially useful people, as Socialism proposes, it is quite safe to say that the average income of the average wealth-producer would be the equivalent of an income of \$4,000 per year, which is equal to your income as a capitalist rated at \$100,000 at 4 per cent. net ($\$200 \times 20 = \$4,000$). But that is not all. Production to-day is going through a period of transition—of change from individualistic methods

to Socialistic methods. This change is not yet complete. Further development, further invention, further specialization, further consolidation, known now to be realizable, and towards which society is rapidly making, insure an easy doubling of Labor's product. Indeed, the organization of the forces of production and distribution, as Socialists propose, would easily double the present productive power of labor, and yield to each socially useful workingman the equivalent of not less than \$8,000 per year, and that is why you and I, and every farmer and every wage-worker, and every little business man, should be Socialists. There are still other and perhaps better reasons; but, in these days of capitalist graft, and because the social problem is easily solvable by a few figures drawn from actual and historical facts, and also because it is a business-bread-and-butter question that comes home every day to the life of every man, I present the question from this side.

All real farmers, all small capitalists, all wage-workers, all who render, and all who desire to render actual social service on fair terms, should be Socialists and all for exactly the same reason,—to better their condition in life. Yes, I know, as you say, that there are some Socialists who rather strenuously insist that farmers and small capitalists generally because of their really quite insignificant interests as capitalists, must be regarded with suspicion by the simon-pure, wage-working Socialists. I know, too, that in some cases, as in Nebraska, Socialist farmers have been excluded from the controlling, dues-paying organization of the Socialist party. Usually the Socialists who take this view are the more recent converts, the freshmen or sophomore Socialists who have not yet entirely divested themselves of their utopian views. They are those who have not yet tested Socialism by the science of mathematics. They are very suspicious that someone has designs to capture the forces of social evolution and switch "the movement" on to a sidetrack somewhere in the woods where it will get lost. The older Socialists, those who have been longer in the Socialist work, have gotten past this utopian stage. They have tested Socialism by more of the sciences, and they know that social evolution cannot be switched off anywhere, and they are hence more tranquil. They have gone through the chickenpox, measles, mumps and whooping cough stages of Socialist growth and find plenty of reasons why even millionaires should be Socialists.

Facile production destroys capitalism. It compels Socialism. Easy production by machinery retires the struggle for existence into oblivion. It reduces cost and commercial value to the minimum and finally to the vanishing point. It destroys greed by destroying the necessity for greed. But I will not go into that now—this letter is long enough.

We are haying now and harvesting. The farm machinery trust, the rope and binding twine trust, and even the Standard Oil trust, whose oil we must use to lubricate our mower and binder, are getting in their work on us. Even the wage-workers have their combination. They all fix the price we independent (?) farmers have to pay, eh?

Your Brother,

C. J. LAMB.

VIII. How the Farmer Groans at the Extortions of Capital, yet Gives Capitalism His Vote on Election Day. Concluding Letter of the Series

Dear Brother Jo: Trusts are not altogether bad as most farmers think. The long-headed men who constitute the trusts are organizing the industries of the world. They are showing farmers and wage workers how to do business. They are systemizing production and distribution. They are using machinery to advantage, and, remember, the full use of machinery can only be had by organization and system. The more complete the organization the better will machinery perform its service. **THE MACHINE IS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION**, and Socialism proposes the completest possible organization of these social forces in the interest of the useful citizenship.

For this social service the trusts are charging their own price. Farmers and wage workers are not paying enough attention to their side of this social contract. They are producing abundantly, but they leave the entire management of the business, particularly the transportation and distribution departments, to the trusts, and for their own useful services as working people, they more or less meekly, more or less grumblingly, take just what the trusts are forced to leave them. Instead of \$4,000 or \$8,000 per year they manage to subsist on \$437.

It is well known that "the law is a part of every contract," and Socialists at least understand that political parties are the social representatives of the economic classes—workingmen and capitalists. That the laws are made and administered by the politicians of both old parties in the interest of capitalists, of labor exploiters, is plain, and when a farmer or wage worker votes for the politicians of either old party, he votes for \$437 per year instead of \$4,000 or more. He votes into every contract laws in the interest of the exploiting capitalist class, and these laws fix his relations with the masters of the "system." **IF THE GIANT LABOR BE IN CHAINS IT IS BECAUSE HE VOTES TO WEAR THOSE CHAINS.**

The secret of the success of big capital is not so much of a secret after all. Big Capital organizes and systemizes its business. It doubles, trebles and quadruples the productive power of labor. It cuts off waste. It commands the use of the best machinery against which small capital using inferior machinery and poorer system cannot successfully compete. It causes goods to be produced cheaper; sells at less expense and thus takes the market from the little old fogies who hang to the old methods. Thus the trusts are creating a small class of capitalist owners and a large class of wage workers. The little independent producers, who are mostly farmers, are being squeezed out. **CAPITAL IS SOCIALIZING INDUSTRY.** Let Labor now proceed to the socialization of capital. Towards this we are rapidly proceeding in the due course of social growth. The air is full of Socialism. It is all around us. Even now we are in the midst of the social revolution.

But capitalists now dictate the terms upon which Labor produces and exchanges. Labor scarcely has a voice in the matter. Capital takes

the cream because we consent to this one-sided business arrangement. We protest, we grumble, we "kick," but we consent. How do we consent? Now look out, Jo, here is the bald fact, **WE CONSENT WITH OUR BALLOTS.** And we can only withdraw our consent by casting our votes for more complete Socialism. In the arrangement of the terms upon which Labor serves society the ballot is Labor's only voice. If he is satisfied that the present capitalist class shall absolutely dictate these terms, he does well to vote either old party ticket. If he wants the \$4,000 per year standard of living instead of the \$437 standard, he must vote for it. Farmers and wage workers get just what they vote for.

We cannot go backwards to the days of small capitalism. The machine, which is distinctly a social institution, forbids it and it demands not less, but more organization. Agriculture is the last of the great industries now waiting for organization. That half accomplished or even well begun, brings Socialism.

Facile production is creating a new social environment. The machine, by producing abundantly, is destroying capitalism. It brings with it the cooperation in production and distribution which can only end in complete cooperation—which is Socialism. The only other alternative is the absolute enslavement of the working class, which must go forward to Socialism or backward to feudalism and actual chattel slavery. A great machine, or combination of machines, the printing press, spreads information broadcast to the "four corners of the earth" and prevents any backward movement. Labor organizes and farmers go heels over head into politics, on occasion, to prevent this backward movement. Labor does not desire to be reduced to a condition of abject dependence. That is what both farmers and wage workers are fighting against, and, since exercise develops strength, these labor and farm organizations are in a fair way to gain in power. On the other hand capitalism, having turned over the very management of its interests to its employes, is becoming emasculated and is only kept temporarily alive by craft and graft.

In the Grange and Alliance movements wage workers were not interested. They failed to support the farmers in those movements and there were no very good reasons why they should have supported them, because, as between small capitalism and big capitalism, Labor had little to choose. Either meant the continued exploitation of wage labor. As capitalists farmers can only offer continued servitude to wage labor, but as workingmen, as producers of wealth, they have a common interest—an identity of interest which must draw them together in social action.

That "community of interest" between wage workers and farmers can be shown by a simple arithmetical calculation.

Counting the average income of the average worker under Socialism at an equivalent of \$5,000 per year, and the income of the \$10,000 farmer at four per cent net, today (which would be \$400 per year) then the farmer's financial interest as a workingman is twelve and one-half times as great as his interest as a capitalist.

If there are good reasons why a wage worker should be a Socialist, then the financial reasons why a farmer should be a Socialist are nearly as great. And the same is true of all small capitalists.

The power which the trusts are exercising is distinctly a power to tax. They are exercising a purely governmental or social function. Let us not delude ourselves—the trusts are the real government and they can be superseded in government, not by political organization of small capitalists, but by the political organization of Labor. Effective organization of working farmers is only possible on the labor side, and when the industries of the country and of the world are organized by workingmen and for workingmen, then all the useful people will receive the blessings of machinery, and the rewards of Labor be most bountiful. And not until then will social usefulness receive its due honor.

Many people look upon Socialism as a great danger. Socialists are those who are in harmony with the laws of social evolution, and the only danger is in resistance to these laws.

The propositions of the Socialists must, and so far as I know they do, stand the tests of every recognized science at every point of contact. This being true, it follows that Socialism is itself a science which can be learned and used by men for their benefit as are the other sciences.

All around us we see the evidences of the progress of society from competition to cooperation. Among these evidences are the trusts themselves, labor unions, alliances, granges, our common schools, our publicly owned roads, bridges, libraries, parks, mutual insurances, clearing houses, our postal system, businessmen's associations, municipal ownerships, hospitals, colleges, drainage and irrigation works, and many others, all driving towards the inevitable goal—Socialism. From our own observations and experiences, from study and from history we can learn somewhat of the course of social evolution. We can calculate in part the social effect of the introduction of machinery. We Americans pride ourselves on the thing we call progress, which is only another name for social growth, and as sensible citizens we should study these laws and act in harmony with them. It is worse than folly to oppose the due progress of social evolution, and from such opposition only evil can result.

When farming was done with a fire-sharpened stick and later when it was done by simple tools, greed was actually necessary to the preservation of life. But with society organized to use the machinery of production to the best advantage there will be no necessity for greed and greed will disappear, and with it a long list of social evils—even war itself. To be a Socialist is to be in harmony with the known laws of social progress.

Yours Fraternally,

Dryden, Mich., July, 1905.

C. J. Lamb.

Prof. Ferri's 'Socialism and Modern Science'

"Briefed" by Ida Crouch-Hazlett.



THE purpose in preparing the following brief has been to present the argument and the subject matter of what is perhaps the clearest exposition of the claims of Socialism to be a scientific analysis of society, in a simple and complete manner, so as to be accessible to a great body of men and women, who have not much money to invest in books, and who are so wearied with the work of carrying society on their shoulders, that their opportunities for study are necessarily limited.

The exact language of the author has been adhered to as much as possible, with only slight variations here and there to facilitate the process of abbreviation.

* * *

In the preface the author states that his intention has been to point out the general relation existing between contemporary Socialism and the whole trend of modern scientific thought.

The contention is made that Socialism is in conflict with the fundamental facts of the physical, biological and social sciences. He says that he purposes to demonstrate that Marxian Socialism, the only Socialism that has a truly scientific method and value, is only the practical fulfillment in the social life, of that modern scientific revolution which has triumphed in our times, thanks to the works of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

Darwin and especially Spencer halted when they had traveled only half way toward the conclusions of a religious, political or social order which necessarily flow from their indisputable premises.

Virchow in opposing Haeckel's defense of Darwinism asserted that it led direct to Socialism. Haeckel and the other German Darwinians immediately protested that it is in absolute opposition to Socialism, and Haeckel stated that every intelligent statesman ought to advocate the theory of descent and the doctrine of evolution as the best antidote for the absurd notions of the Socialists, that the tendency of the theory could be nothing but aristocratic, by no means can it be democratic, much less socialistic.

His three principal arguments have reference to the equality of individuals, the struggle for life and its victims, and the survival of the fittest. They are as follows.

Socialism tends toward a chimerical equality of persons and property, while Darwinism shows the organic necessity of the natural inequality of individuals.

Only a small minority can triumph in the struggle for existence, while Socialism asserts that all ought to triumph.

The struggle for existence assures the survival of the best and this leads to an aristocratic hierarchy of selected individuals instead of the democratic collectivist teaching of Socialism.

In answer to the first, Ferri asserts that scientific Socialism has never denied the inequality of individuals. Social equality has to do with the right to live a man's life, and not to be forced from the means of existence by the fraud, favoritism and unscrupulous methods of the few. Equality according to Socialism is a relative thing and must be understood in a two-fold sense:

1. All men should be guaranteed human conditions of existence.
2. All men ought to be equal at the starting point.

These conditions can be obtained only by the transformation of private ownership of the means of production into social ownership.

He goes on to state that the first anti-Socialist objection is overruled since its starting point is non-existent; that inequalities will never disappear on account of the principle of variation that manifests itself in the continuous development of species.

He likens the division of labor, on which Haeckel puts so much stress to the different functions of the cells in an organism, equally useful and necessary to the life of the organism as a whole. In the biological organism all remains inactive, and it obtains nourishment by exchanges only in proportion to its labor.

In dealing with this first category Ferri treats of the incentive, choice of labor, remuneration, anarchist and socialist distinctions, suppression of individuality, and false social standards.

In regard to the alleged Darwinian position that the vast mass of individuals must perish that a few may live, Ferri states that there is a decreasing proportion between the "called" and the "chosen" as we ascend the biological scale. The more complex the organization the less waste in the attainment of life. He illustrates this by plants, animals, and the lower and higher races of man. He says it is unscientific to interpret the cannibalism of the past to justify modern individualist competition.

The muscular struggle of primitive life is superseded more and more by the intellectual struggle. Historical society has struggled for civil equality, religious equality, political equality, and is now struggling for economic equality.

Even under the best conditions scientific Socialism does not deny that there will be some "losers" in the struggle. These Ferri treats of under the name of degenerates and criminals. He speaks of the absurdity of the modern penal system based on the erroneous notion of free-will and moral delinquency, and characterizes cellular confinement as one of the mental aberrations of the age. He says that criminalologists are united in desiring to substitute simple segregation for those not fitted for social life on account of pathological conditions; and he concurs with Lombroso in his conclusion that all criminality depends on

the influence of the economic environment. Under Socialism the chief forms of degeneracy will be suppressed by the elimination of their principal cause, physical poverty and its consequent mental suffering.

The law of mutual aid as a factor in evolution is also cited as sustaining the cooperation for life.

In discussing the third and last part of Haeckel's argument, Ferri objects to the phrase, "survival of the best." He says this is simply a persistence of the idea which used to see in nature and history a premeditated goal to be reached by a process of continuous amelioration. There is a vast difference between the survival of the best and the survival of the best fitted. The "best fitted" means those who are best fitted to their environment. If this is vicious there will be a retrograde selection. This is shown in modern society in marriage conditions, in the persistence of the rich, inhuman labor conditions, and the advantage of capitalism over the proletariat. The victory goes to him who has the fewest scruples. It is only under natural and equal conditions in society that the best fitted for survival would be the most desirable.

Ferri next proceeds to Socialism as a consequence of Darwinism. He deals with the attitude of its position as affecting existing religious superstitions.

Socialism occupies an analogous position in regard to liberal movements. They represent the activities of the bourgeoisie which will hasten to establish them when monarchies no longer serve their interests. (Vide Russia.)

The next point of identification of Socialism with science is in the relation of the individual to the species. The eighteenth century closed with the glorification of the individual. This has led to the individualist position of the capitalists and the anarchists. Modern biology has demonstrated that the individual exists only as a member of society. Every object is a collectivity. The cell is an aggregate of various parts. The federation of various parts constantly increases with the ascent in zoological series. The social aggregate is the eternal reality of life. The instinct of reproduction gives birth to the social sense, and even this and its results have been seized by the capitalist class to perpetuate the servility and helplessness of the working class. Whereas modern society has made its deduction that millions of individuals should suffer for the advantage of a few, modern science has demonstrated that it is the individual who lives for the species.

As Darwinism has shown that the entire mechanism of animal evolution may be reduced to the struggle for life, so the machinery of social evolution rests on the struggle between classes to control the economic forces that form the physical basis of life, and determine all consequent institutions. It is this grand conception which forms the imperishable glory of Marx, and assures him in sociology the place that Darwin occupies in biology and Spencer in philosophy. Human society like all other organisms is not a homogenous whole. It is made up of diverse parts, and their differentiation constantly increases in direct ratio to the degree of social evolution attained. A tribe of primitive savages advances to the intricate organization of modern civilization with its

ever increasing class specialization. Individuals may pass from one class to another, but the classes remain and will do so as long as the reason for their differentiation remains. The circumstances and phenomena of the hostile conflict of these classes varies, but its most pronounced phase is the antagonism between those who hold the monopoly of the means of production and those who have been expropriated. The resulting injustice can only be abolished through the operation of the class struggle. It is not a struggle of individuals. Man has no free will, but his acts are the necessary effect of race and environment. The peasant is bound by invisible threads to the life of the whole world. Private property as well as the individual works by inexorable laws in connection with its environment. Its obstitution and the substitution of social ownership are inevitable. The change is taking place under our eyes as private properties and functions become social properties and functions.

* * * * *

The bourgeois class is the result of historical conditions that have changed the economic structure of the world. In the history of the civilized world it has inscribed a page in letters of gold by wondrous developments in the lives of nations and marvelous applications of science to industry. Its dissolution is near at hand. The smaller the number of those who hold possession of the means of life, the easier is their expropriation by society, accomplishing its results not through individual conflicts, but through a class struggle of which the workers must be made conscious.

The continued examination of Darwinism and Socialism would but disclose their indissoluble harmony.

Part Second deals with evolution and Socialism. The tendency of modern scientific thought has been made to appear in contradiction with the theories and practical ideas of Socialism. This criticism applies to the Socialism that preceded Marx, with which contemporary Socialism has nothing in common. Scientific Socialism is but the logical consequence of the application of the evolutionary theory to the domain of economics.

The orthodox thesis and the Socialist thesis are then contrasted. The Socialist affirmation is made as follows: The present economic world represents a transitory phase, and a collectivist organization is destined to succeed it, as an ultimate conclusion from the examination made of Darwinism and Socialism.

The orthodox thesis is: That the present production and distribution of wealth is determined by final laws that are immutable in their principal features.

Socialism holds that these laws are simply relative to periods and will no more apply to the future than they did to pre-historic times.

The theory of evolution, of which Herbert Spencer was the true creator, applied to sociology the tendency to relativism which the historical school had used in law and political economy. Every physical science shows that the present is the result of myriads of incessant transformations, and that the future will certainly differ from the present.

The old metaphysics were imbued with the notion of conflicting laws of a dual universe. Modern science holds the magnificent synthetic conception of unionism—a single substance evolving a succession of forms relative to time and place. Ethics, law and politics are mere superstructures of the economic structure, varying with its variations, and never absolute.

According to the absurd contention of economics and juristical orthodoxy, property alone is subject to no changes.

It is said by the adversaries of Socialism that the collective ownership of the land would be a return to primitive barbarism. It is true that collectivism would be a return to the primitive social organization. This reversion to primitive forms is obvious in the category of social institutions. We can perceive this spiral return in literature, religion, politics, punishment, marriage, and property regulations. It is, however, not a pure and simple repetition, only an apparent retrogression that preserves the vital conquests of preaching evolution, and builds a result far superior to the primitive social embryo.

It is asserted that Socialism constitutes a tyranny that will destroy the blessings of liberty won at the cost of so many sacrifices.

Science has established the law that each succeeding phase of the social evolution preserves the vital manifestations of the preceding phases, and eliminates the pathological manifestations. The laborer of today has gained certain points of which the producers of the past were deprived, liberty, suffrage, association, but he has not the guarantee of bread and a home. The purpose of Socialism is to give this guarantee to all, but it does not follow that it will do away with the conquests already obtained.

We find an example in the invention of machinery. These marvelous substitutes for human labor should have had only beneficent consequences, but they have condemned multitudes of workers to the tortures of idleness and hunger, because of the irresistible advantage to the capitalist. The only solution is that the workers must own the machines.

No intelligent Socialist has ever dreamed of not recognizing all that the bourgeoisie has done for human civilization. These are permanent conquests of human progress. But it is necessary to rid the social organism of the poison that it has generated, that no privileged class shall longer pass their lives in idleness and dissipation, but the immense majority of men will rise to the heights of serene security instead of living in the anxieties and bitter strife of the present.

In substituting social ownership for individual ownership of the land and the means of production it is obvious that it will not be necessary to suppress private property in individual food, clothing, and objects of personal use, and family consumption.

It has been argued that men will no longer be impelled to labor when not constrained by personal self-interest. In those survivals and attainments of collectivism that we see about us although men have only

the use and enjoyment instead of an absolute title to the industrial means, we do not see that they are any less inclined to put forth their efforts.

The considerations that have condemned to death the famous communist colonies is that they are obliged to develop in an economic environment that cannot furnish them the essential conditions for growth. In an individualist environment the psychological tendency of anti-social egoism is most highly developed as an instinct of self-preservation. In an environment where every one may assure himself of his daily bread egoism will have fewer stimulants to manifest itself than solidarity.

The last of the alleged contradictions between Socialism and the scientific theory of evolution relates to the question of how Socialism will be inaugurated and realized. There is an idea that Socialism is expected to come "over night," It is impossible to prophesy in regard to the details of a social organization which will differ from ours more profoundly than present society differs from that of the Middle Ages, because the bourgeois world has retained the foundation of individualism while the Socialist world will have a fundamentally different polarization.

All that scientific Socialism can affirm, and it does this with mathematical certainty, is the progressive preponderance of the interests of the species over those of the individual. It would have been just as rational to have asked the rising bourgeoisie, emerging from feudalism, what kind of a new world theirs would be. The artificial impression of a monastic military discipline was the Socialism that Herbert Spencer attacked. The contemporary artificial product of State Socialism has contributed to confirm this impression. This Liebknecht called a State Capitalism which would join political slavery to economic exploitation. The administration of the new Socialist state will be a natural and not a parasitic product of the new social organization.

The processes of social transformation, like those of all living organisms, are evolution, revolution, rebellion, individual violence. Revolution and evolution are normal functions of social physiology; rebellion and individual violence are symptoms of social pathology. Revolution, in its accurate and scientific sense, is the concluding phase of an evolution, and not, in the current and incorrect sense, a stormy and violent revolt. Europe and America are at this time in a period of revolution prepared by the evolution begotten by the bourgeois organization, and promoted by utopian as well as scientific Socialism. Repressive efforts are of no avail, and nothing can be efficacious except laws of social reform and preparation, which, as Marx said, will render less painful the birth of the new society. On the other hand those that think to inaugurate a new social order by preference to rebellion or personal violence are opposing the course of biological evolution, which has no sudden transformations. But scientific Socialism, especially in Germany, under the direct influence of Marxism has completely abandoned those old methods of revolutionary romanticism.

* * * * *

The social revolution cannot achieve its object unless it first becomes a vivid fact in the minds of the workers themselves by virtue of

the clear perception of their class interests, and the strength which union will give them. The transforming power decreases as we descend the scale from one process to another. Socialism is a question of complete transformation of the entire social cosmos in its economic foundation, and consequently in its juridical, political and ethical organization, and the process of transformation is more effective as its social character predominates over its individual character. This is one reason why charity, being necessarily personal, can never solve the problem of the distribution of wealth. Moreover, rebellion and violence are anti-social and anti-human, and deny in the person whom they strike down the principal of respect for human life and of solidarity.

To say to the laborers that without having made ready the requisite material means, but especially without solidarity and without an intelligent conception of the goal and without a high moral purpose, they ought to rise against the classes in power, is really to play into the hands of those very classes, since the latter are sure of the material victory when the evolution is not ripe and the revolution is not ready. Therefore Marxian Socialism in all countries has proclaimed that the principal means of social transformation must be the conquest of the political powers. The further the political organization of the workers shall progress the more we will see realized by a resistless evolution the Socialist organization of society, at first by partial concessions wrested from the capitalist class by the working class, and then by the complete transformation of individual ownership into social ownership.

Whether this complete transformation can be accomplished without violence is a question no one can answer in advance.

However it has been demonstrated that Marxian Socialism is in harmony with modern science and is its logical continuation. And that is the reason why it has made the theory of evolution the basis of its instruction, emerged from the nebulasities of sentiment and taken as its guide the unerring compass of scientific thought, represented by the works of Darwin and Spencer.

The third part of the book deals with sociology and Socialism, and the thirteenth chapter deals with the sterility of sociology.

One of the strangest facts in the history of the scientific thought of the nineteenth century is that, though the profound scientific revolution caused by Darwinism and Spencerian evolution has reinvigorated all the physical, biological and even psychological sciences, when it reached the domain of the social sciences, it only superficially rippled the orthodox surface of that social science par excellence, political economy. It has led, however, through the initiative of Auguste Comte, to the creation of a new science, Sociology, which, with the natural history of human societies, is the crowning glory of the new scientific edifice erected by the experimental method.

In the anatomy of the social organism sociology has made fruitful contributions to contemporary science. But when the political social question is entered upon the sociologists remain conservatives or radicals in accordance with their respective whims. The new science then represents a sort of arrested development in experimental scientific thought.

The secret of this strange phenomenon consists not in the fact that sociology is in the period of scientific analysis and not yet of synthesis, but in the fact that the logical consequences of scientific evolution lead inexorably to Socialism.

To Karl Marx is due the honor of having formulated these logical applications of experimental science to the domain of political economy. The ideas by which he completed the revolution of science are three: The law of surplus value, the materialistic conception of history, or the law of economic determinism, and the theory of the class struggle. The first gives us a scientific explanation of the accumulation of private property. The second corresponds to the biological law which makes each individual the result of the innate and acquired conditions of his physiological organism living in a given environment. The third analyzes history as a succession of class antagonisms.

The law of economic determinism is the most scientific and the most prolific sociological theory that has ever been discovered by the genius of man, unfolding before our eyes the majestic drama of history no longer as the arbitrary acts of great men, but as the resultant of the economic conditions of each people.

The Socialist theory of Marx leads us to this conclusion: Since political parties are merely the mouth-pieces of class interests there can be substantially only two political parties, the Socialist party of the workers and the individualist party of the possessing class.

These ideas of political Socialism, because they are scientific, dispose their partisans both to personal tolerance and to theoretical inflexibility. It is necessary to be on the one side or the other. There is no middle ground, and the only serviceable ground for a Socialist party likely to live is that policy of theoretical inflexibility, of refusing to enter into any alliance.

It is the truth in Socialism that explains to us that unity of intelligent, disciplined, class-conscious solidarity which presents in the world-wide celebration of the first of May, a moral phenomenon of such grandeur that human history possesses no parallel example with the exception of the movement of primitive Christianity, which had, however, a much more restricted field of action than contemporary Socialism.

Henceforth Socialism constitutes the only force which restores the hope for a better future to the old and disintegrating human society, a hope born of rational confidence in the inductions of modern experimental science.

Herbert Spencer wrote a letter after the publication of Ferri's book, expressing his astonishment at the audacity of him who would make use of Spencer's name to defend Socialism.

Ferri replied saying no Socialist ever dreamed of making Mr. Spencer a partisan of Socialism, whose extreme individualism was known to all the world. But he said the personal opinion of Herbert Spencer was a very different thing from the logical consequence of the scientific theories of universal evolution which he had developed, but of which he had no official monopoly.

Ida Crouch-Hazlett.

SOCIALISM NOT COMMUNISM.

By VICTOR L. BERGER.



OUR aim is Social-Democracy, not Communism. We want this understood.

Between Social-Democracy and Communism there is a great deal of difference.

To begin with, Social-Democracy is identical with Collectivism or rational Socialism.

Collectivism is not a negation of property, nor is Socialism. Please keep this in mind.

Socialism simply demands the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution. We will produce in common, but the consumption will remain individual.

Social-Democracy will only control our capital—not our property. A Socialist Commonwealth will not do away with the individual ownership of property, but only with individual ownership of capital.

It is Communism that denies individual ownership of all property. The Communists want to produce and consume in common. There are very few conscious Communists in the world at the present time, at least, very few remain Communists after they understand what the term Communism means.

To make myself still more explicit, "capital" is that part of wealth which is used as means of production, that is, raw materials, as machinery, factories, land, etc. To socialize these is the aim of all Socialists. But all methods of consumption and personal use will remain private property.

It is necessary to state this at this time, because there are some Communists in this party who think they are Socialists. There are even some editors who seem to find it difficult to distinguish between capital and property from a Socialist standpoint.

A Social-Democracy must socialize capital because in the Co-operative Commonwealth the industrial democracy must rule.

Under the present capitalistic system, collective capital—especially as organized in the trusts and big corporations—has practically nullified most of the advantages of political democracy and thus the capitalist class has become the ruler of the people.

It is clear from all this that the people must turn the privately owned capital into collective capital as a matter of self-preservation. The people must do it, because private capital, which was formerly a means of progress, is now impeding progress. In short, the private ownership of capital was for several hundred years an historical necessity; now the collective ownership of capital is becoming an historical necessity.

That such is the trend of the time, we can see at a glance from the discussion that is going on in the daily and weekly papers and in the magazines. But that trend is towards Socialism, not towards Communism.

The measures that the Socialists will take and must take will closely connect with the present system and evolve from it. As a matter of fact, the collectivity—that is the nation, the state and the community—will closely follow along the lines of what people have already long been doing. Only they will do this from a Socialist standpoint.

So Collectivism is not Communism, and Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, for instance, who in their early days were Communists, later on in life became Collectivists and Social-Democrats. Communism has often been tried, and outside of a few small religious communities, has failed invariably.

About 1840 there was a wave of Fourieristic Communism in this country. It was started by Albert Brisbane and some of the most brilliant and best men and women this country has ever produced, participated in the experiments. But all the communistic settlements, where the religious and ascetic elements were lacking, soon came to naught.

Social-Democracy has never been tried, because it will be the outcome of modern conditions—of the invention of machinery and the centralization of capital on one hand and the development of political democracy on the other. Communism would be a step backward, would be a retrogression to a very primitive and low stage of human society. Social-Democracy will mean a step forward towards a higher civilization than history has ever known.

Just to emphasize the difference between Collectivism (Social-Democracy) and Communism—between the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution and the common ownership of everything—there is nothing in Collectivism that will prevent people who are so inclined from *saving*.

They will be able to save just as much as they wish; they will be able to utilize their savings in any manner they choose with one single savings: they will not be able in any possible way to “invest” their savings, that is to say, they will not be able to use their savings to make profit.

Of course, our capitalists will cry out: “What is the use of a man possessing a hundred thousand dollars, if he cannot invest his money?” Which means what is the use of a man possessing wealth, if he cannot use it to work others and live himself without work. This, I will admit, is a grievance that cannot be helped, but it is a grievance that is no grievance. First, because under collectivism, there will not be the slightest necessity for individual saving with a view of providing for the future or old age, for care will be taken of every citizen. Second, there will be no encouragement for saving, for accumulating capital will be looked upon as the function of society and not of the individual.

But it is not my intention to describe the Co-operative Commonwealth, the Socialist Republic, or any other future state in this article. I have simply tried to bring out a few of the differences between Socialism and Communism, and about these a great deal more may be said.