

FIFTY CENTS A YEAR

FIVE CENTS A COPY

THE VANGUARD

WISCONSIN
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

NOVEMBER, 1905.



HOW IT IS DONE.

To rob the public, it is
necessary to deceive them.
To deceive them, it is neces-
sary to persuade them that
they are robbed for their own
advantage. — Bastiat.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT MILWAUKEE, WIS.

THE BLACK HILLS

Region is rich in mineral deposits and also in Class-Conscious SOCIALISTS. At the last election, held in Lawrence County, the socialists cast 20% of the votes. Much of the credit for this remarkable showing is conceded due to the good work of

THE REGISTER

the foremost Socialist paper published in the Northwest. It is a sixteen-page paper and is sent to any address in the U. S. or Canada for \$1.00 per year, in advance; six months, 50c. Address,

THE REGISTER, Central City, South Dak.

WHAT TO EAT

MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Awarded **Grand Prize** and **Gold Medal** at World's Fair, St. Louis, 1904, as **Dietetic and Health Magazine**. **State Food Officials** also endorse "WHAT TO EAT."

It was recently read in the **United States Senate** during the discussion of the proposed **Pure Food Law**.

Iowa Health Bulletin, says: "Our homes would be healthier and happier if the inmates were readers of this **worthy publication**."

In the leading advocate for Pure Food and the most unique and interesting household and club magazine. Its editorials speak for Pure Food, rational living and good health. Articles on **What to Eat to Keep Healthy** by prominent physicians are published each month. Men and women who entertain will find "WHAT TO EAT" replete with **original, practical ideas for all sorts of entertainments**. Its Department "Answers" is devoted to smoothing the way for puzzled entertainers. **Short Stories, Original Poems, Toasts and Sentiments** by popular writers are found in each number. **Recipes and Household Hints** by well known authorities on household topics continue to be a practical feature. **Poster Covers clever and artistic**, adorn the magazine and are much in demand for dining room and den decorations.

SUBSCRIBE NOW.

ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR.

THE PIERCE PUBLISHING CO.,

171-173 Washington Street, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

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. 4. No. 2. MILWAUKEE, WIS., NOVEMBER, 1905. Whole Number 34.

What kind of Society is it which has for its base inequality and injustice? Would it not be well to take up the whole thing by the four corners and send it pell-mell up to the ceiling, the cloth, the feast, and the orgie, the gluttony and the drunkenness, and the guests; those who have their two elbows on the table, and those who are on all fours under it, to spew the whole lot in God's face, and to fling the whole world at heaven? The hell of the poor makes the paradise of the rich. Not only has happiness not come, but honor has fled.

—VICTOR HUGO.

These are great times in which to live. The spirit of revolt against all forms of tyranny is growing and finding expression in a variety of unexpected ways. The overthrow of the autocracy in Russia, the unparalleled Socialist demonstrations in Austria and other parts of Europe, the smashing of the corrupt Republican and Democratic machines by the voters in America are all magnificent and inspiring spectacles. What does it all mean? It means that everywhere the power that causes despotism, the power of one class of human beings to exploit another class, the power of privileged wealth and greed is being broken and the people are coming to their own. It means the awakening and united action of the working class and those who recognize the justice of their claims to the wealth which they create. It means the birth of a new freedom for humanity—"another deal in human rights." It means that the future belongs to Social-Democracy. Now is the time to work for it.

In view of the rising tide of public sentiment the preachers are "getting wise" and some of them are venturing an opinion in favor of public ownership. But even in such cases the habit of compromise and the limitations of knowledge are so manifest as to usually discredit the utterance in the eyes of intelligent men. In a recent sermon, Rev. A. A. Ross of Ryder Memorial church, Chicago, ventured the assertion, "Time will come when public utilities will be under public control, but that will be when we have eliminated the corruptionist and grafter from controlling influence in our politics and honest men are honest enough to enter the public service for the public good. That time has not yet come." How profoundly "judicious" this sounds! Yet how stupid it is! To the man who has given unbiased study to the subject it is perfectly clear that the influence of the grafter is due to the private ownership of public utilities and that the corruption in our public life is always found at the point of contact between the private corporation and the public service.

Public ownership is the remedy for nine-tenths of the political rottenness that exists. A preacher ought to know this. But it would scarcely be "wise" to say it just yet. It is safe enough to talk of public ownership or Socialism or anything else in belonging to the "sweet by and by." It is another thing to advocate it here and now.

The late elections have dealt a stunning blow to the political boss, notice has been served that the grafter must go, the people have awakened to the possibilities of the ballot-box as a weapon for rebuking corruption. Such, according to widely expressed opinion, is what the results of the late elections portend. We are among those who gladly recognize what has taken place and cheer it on as a most hopeful sign of the times. But let us not be deceived into supposing that the indignation of the people, however righteous and powerful, which merely ousts one set of office-holders and installs another, means the doom of the boss. The boss is a symptom, not a disease. He is not primarily a political but a business representative. And he represents not the few individuals to whom he is directly responsible, but the whole system of private profit public plunder. The progress, therefore, which we are making towards deliverance from the boss and boss rule is to be measured not by a hasty victory snatched at the polls, but by the extent to which the people are having their eyes opened to see the true inwardness of the system by means of which the privileged capitalist boss is enabled to hold up the producers of wealth on every side and dictate to the masses of the people the terms upon which they shall exist on the earth.

Maxime Gorky, the Russian Socialist, recently made public his views concerning the crisis in the Caucasus. He writes in such a manner that his words might well be applied to the conditions prevailing in our own country, for after all the struggle is the same everywhere, the struggle of the people to free themselves from the yoke of capitalist class rule. Gorky says: "These men are accustomed to power. Life is pleasant to them while they can dispose of the fate and riches of our country, the strength and blood of our people, and that without giving account to any one of their acts.... The parasites feel that the hour of their agony is approaching, and their end is near, but they wish to live and so they struggle on as far as they are able against the will of the people, cowardly, dishonestly, and basely.... We have but one enemy. All men whose reason is clear and whose will is not enslaved must unite against this evil and senseless power which presses on all of us. Let equality and brotherhood be ours. Let the light of reason shine on us and weld us together in one great invincible will, and then, 'Hail, Freedom.'" This has the true ring of Socialist world-politics which the small politician utterly fails to understand. The mightiest revolution of the ages is upon us in the growing solidarity and conscious power of organized labor. The immortal words of Marx are reverberating around the globe, "Workers of all countries unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain."

If you believe in comradeship instead of strife, daily peace instead of daily war, your place is in the Socialist ranks.

Our Modern Pharisees.

The church has been getting some hard knocks of late, but nothing quite so jarring as John D. Rockefeller's article in the London Daily Mail on "How I Became the Richest Man in the World." "If I were to give one reason among others for securing my first position in business," he says, "it would be that I had the good fortune to be associated in early boyhood in church and in school with good young men. I beg every young man not to put off identifying himself with the Christian church. It was the greatest blessing that could have come to me." The "good young men" to which Baptist John refers could no doubt corroborate his statement and tell how it was their "good fortune" to be trained in the same "school" as he. They are to be found, as recent disclosures show, among "prominent business men," our "choicest gentlemen," our "pillars of church and state"—the men most responsible for the cesspools of iniquity that are being uncovered. They are the power behind the boodlers and grafters, a little more concealed, but there nevertheless. They stand for the "system." True, when the evils of corruption become too unblushing and when a "reform" movement is started to clean out petty grafters and nickel-in-the-slot gamblers, these "respectable" and "influential citizens" come to the front as upholders of "law and order" and affect a holy horror, a social conscience and a civic virtue. In some instances these men are doubtless sincere in the double role they play. Even Rockefeller believes he is a Christian, and the Jekyls and Hydes of the business world are legion. But the farce cannot go on forever. The truth will out. The average man

is beginning to see "things as they are." And when he does, aided by the keen logic of Socialism, the game will be up with these pious pretenders. Meanwhile the church must suffer if it continues to shelter and sanction "our thieves in broadcloth."

No Peace With Capitalism.

Advices from Los Angeles indicate that the work of the Los Angeles Fellowship, an organization formed a year ago with a thousand members under the leadership of Benjamin Fay Mills, is broadening out and that Mr. Mills is taking more advanced ground on economic questions. He has repeatedly avowed himself a Socialist, though hesitating to assent to certain political phases of the movement. The Fellowship recently issued what is called "Seven Rules of Life," designed to furnish a practical program for unselfish and honest living under present conditions. The editor of *The Vanguard* received a copy of these rules with the request to comment thereon. After expressing hearty approval of the principles set forth in a most excellent fashion, the editor replied as follows:

Can you not amend rule VII, changing the clause which reads, "to the abolition of all forms of war between classes, etc.?" Frankly, I do not desire the abolition of the present war between the classes. I want that war to continue until its object is attained. To me it is the divinest thing on earth today—the "fire" which the Prophet of Nazareth said he came to fling among men. It is the evolution, in its latest phase, of our age-long struggle up the slope toward freedom and manhood. We must get rid of the assumption that the war itself is the

thing to be deplored and abolished. It is Nature's method of righting wrong; "every good has its birth of pain." The real evil is to be found in the conditions which necessitate "the war of the classes"—the false and iniquitous relations of master and slave, of ruling class and obeying class, of capitalist and laborer. So long as these relations exist, not only will it be impossible to abolish the class war, but it ought not to be abolished. It must go on until it issues in the elimination of these artificial distinctions and all classes merged into one—the working class.

Why not say something like this: "To the abolition of those conditions which create classes and class antagonisms?" Without some such proviso the program seems to cry "peace, peace, where there is no peace." To do this is to ignore the facts in the case and counsel the working class to submit rather than fight for justice. And this would mean the perpetuation of the vile conditions which make an honest and unselfish life so difficult as to overtax the ingenuity and devotion of even the members of the Los Angeles Fellowship.

J. M. A. Spence.

Senators Getting Shaky.

Senator Lodge has recently stated his objections to Socialism in an address in Brookline, Mass., which is said to be the wealthiest town in the world. It may be inferred that his audience was quite in "sympathy" with his remarks, though the rebuke which the Senator received in the late election shows that the people are taking his measure. Speaking of the government ownership of railroads, he said it would mean in its fulfillment "the

destruction of the institutions we have known and loved and under which our liberties have been won and preserved. We should have an oligarchy composed of a few office-holders, a despot at their head, and all below on one sordid level." The absurdity of this statement is so plain to the student of Social-Democracy and its falseness so apparent to one conversant with experiments already made in applying Socialist principles that the Senator's words convict him of either ignorance or insincerity. This becomes more apparent as he goes on to cite Russia as "a fairly complete example" of the working of Socialism, whereas almost every school boy knows that the Social-Democrats are the most relentless foes of the Russian autocracy and are everywhere opposed to centralization of power. In fact the objection which the Senator raises is precisely that of Socialism against the present system and is being voiced today in the protest of the American people against the oligarchy of wealth which has grown up and entrenched itself in our institutions and is destroying individual liberty. There is no bureaucracy of the old world that wields such power over the lives of the masses as that exercised by a score of American money kings today. Socialism is the demand for individual liberty. It is the protest of the working class against "one sordid level." It is their demand for better food, homes, clothing, education, culture and the pleasures of life. The Senator's alarm is the old trick of the privileged classes when the people are seeking a larger measure of liberty. Socialism means the extension of democracy to industry, and it is idle to hope to check the spirit of democracy by raising the cry that the people will thus enslave themselves. The

simple truth appears to be that the Senator is afraid of Socialism, as all Senators might well be, for the reason that it will put an end to his craft or graft as the case may be. He has been so long a member of the "ruling class" that he cannot readily reconcile himself to any other vocation. In pointing out the "dangerous" features of Socialism he shows how truly "class-conscious" he and his kind are. If the producers of wealth were half as class-conscious as the capitalists and their retainers there would be a speedy settlement of the social problem. The time is rapidly approaching when they will be. The march of events is toward that end. Socialism is not far distant. The Senator's fears are an encouraging sign.

Wants Socialism Looked Into.

The following is from an article in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* by the Rev. John Thompson, a Methodist preacher:

"Social reform is in the air. It is no use to hide our heads, ostrich-like, and think it is not coming because we do not see it. We can no more arrest the movement than we can sweep back the ocean tide with a broom, or catch the lightning flash in a net. What shall we, then, as churchmen, do with it? What shall be our attitude toward it? We ought, first of all, to study it so as to get a better understanding of its aims and methods. We must not judge it by what we hear on the street corner. Benjamin Kidd says: 'True Socialism has always one definite object in view, up to which all its proposals, directly or indirectly, lead, namely—the final suspension of that personal struggle for existence which has always been waged.' It seems to me that any world move-

ment which has for its end the reducing to a minimum of the fearful, crushing struggle for life which affects us all, is worth studying. It is our business to get the best possible understanding of it."

Do You See the Point?

A comparative study of the statistics of this country will show how great labor's share in the product has been and what it now is. Although the amount of wealth is constantly increasing, as will be seen from the following, taken from the statistics compiled by the government, it will also be seen how rapidly labor's share is decreasing:

In 1850 the wealth of the nation was \$8,000,000,000. The producers' share was 62½ per cent; non-producers' share, 37½ per cent.

In 1860 the wealth increased to \$16,000,000,000. The producers' share fell to 43¾ per cent; non-producers' increased to 56¾ per cent.

In 1870 the wealth was \$30,000,000,000; producers' share was 43 2-3 per cent.; non-producers' increased to 56¼ per cent.

In 1880 the wealth increased to \$48,000,000,000. The producers' share went down to 24 per cent, while the non-producers' share increased to 76 per cent.

In 1890 the wealth was further increased to \$61,000,000,000. The producers' share fell to 17 per cent; the non-producers' share increased to 83 per cent.

The greater the amount of wealth production increased, the greater was also the corresponding decrease of the producers' share in that wealth. —*Ex.*

The capitalist system is a crime-impelling system.

What Socialism Proposes.

By EUGENE V. DEBS.



IN THE United States, as in other countries, International Socialism is making tremendous strides and its millions of supporters, spread over all the belts and zones of the globe, and the most active propagandists ever known, will in the next few years be multiplied into controlling majorities in all lands which have modern industry as the basis of their civilization, Socialism being wholly a question of economic development. This will mean the end of the present capitalist competitive system and the introduction of its successor, the co-operative commonwealth.

The movement is international because it was born of and follows the development of the capitalist system, which, in its operation, is confined to no country, but by the stimulus of modern agencies of production, exchange, communication and transportation, has overleaped all boundary lines and made the world the theatre of its activities. By this process all the nations of the earth must finally be drawn into relations of industrial and commercial co-operation, as the economic basis of human brotherhood.

This is the goal of modern Socialism and it is this that inspires its disciples with the zeal and ardor of crusaders.

What is Socialism? To answer in a single sentence, it means the collective ownership by all the people of all the means of wealth production and distribution. It is purely an economic question; the evolution of industry has developed Socialism. Man can only work, produce wealth, with tools. The mere hand tools of former times have become ponderous and costly machines. These machines, Socialists contend, represent progressive social conceptions. These and the factories, mills, and shops in which they are housed, as well as the lands and mines from which the raw materials are drawn, are used in common by the workers, and in their very nature are marked for common ownership and control. Socialism does not propose the collective ownership of property, but of capital; that is to say, the instruments of wealth production, which, in the form of private property, enable a few capitalists to exploit vast numbers of workers, thus creating millionaires and mendicants and inaugurating class rule and all its odious and undemocratic distinctions.

Socialism proposes equal rights and opportunities for all without reference to sex, color or other conditions. Equality is the vital principle of Socialism. Its mission is to abolish class rule by making all equal proprietors of the means upon which all depend for employment, and without which there can be no "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness." This insures economic freedom for every human being. As no one would have private property in that upon which another depended for employment, industrial mastery and slavery would disappear together and competition for profit would give way to co-operation for use.

The rapidly changing economic conditions are paving the way for the transition from competitive capitalism to co-operative Socialism. Socialists are simply indicating the trend of evolution, and seeking to prepare the way for its orderly reception. The coming of Socialism is with them not a debatable question. That is not a matter of doubt or conjecture, but of scientific calculation.

The evolution of the social organization is a fact in nature. In the ceaseless process one state of society follows another in the sequence of succession. Capitalism, the present system, was warmed into life in the womb of feudalism and sprang from the medieval system. Within the span of two centuries this system has practically reached the climax of its development, and the marvelous material progress of that period exceeds the achievements of all the centuries since the slaves of Pharaoh built the pyramids.

The rapid centralization of capital and the extensive co-operation of labor mark the high state of economic development. Individual initiative and competitive efforts are becoming less and less possible. The day of small production has passed never to return. Notwithstanding all outcry, trust and department stores, these great modern agencies, increase in number and power. They are the inevitable outgrowth of the competitive system. The efforts of the small capitalists to destroy trusts will prove as fruitless as the efforts of the workingman to destroy labor-saving machines when first introduced in the last century.

Socialists take the ground that the trust in itself is not an evil, that the evil lies wholly in the private ownership and they propose to transfer all such agencies from private hands to the collectivity, to be managed and operated for the good of all.

In the last century millions of workers were exploited of the fruit of their labor under the institution of chattel slavery. Work, being done by hand, ownership of the slave was a condition necessary to his exploitation. But chattel slavery disappeared before the march of industrial evolution, and to-day would be an economic impossibility. It is no longer necessary to own the body of the workingman in order to appropriate the fruit of his labor; it is only necessary to own the tool with which he works, and without which he is helpless. This tool in its modern form is a vast machine which the worker cannot afford to buy, and against which he cannot compete with his bare hands, and in the very nature of the situation he is at the mercy of the owner of the machine, his employment is precarious, and his very life is suspended by a thread.

Then, again, the factory and mine are operated for profit only and the owner can, and often does, close it down at will, throwing hundreds, perhaps thousands, out of employment who, with their families, are as helpless as if in the desert wastes of Sahara.

The few who own the machines do not use them. The many who use them do not own them. The few who own them are enabled to exploit the many who use them; hence a few millionaires and many mendicants, extreme opulence and abject poverty, princely palaces and hid-

eous huts, riotous extravagance and haggard want, constituting social scenes sickening to contemplate, and in the presence of which the master hand of Hugo or Dickens is palsied and has no mission.

The Socialist party is organizing in every village and hamlet, every town and city of every state and territory of the Union. It is appealing to the people. It will neither fuse nor compromise. It proposes to press forward, step by step, until it conquers the political power and secures control of government.

This will mark the end of the capitalist system. The factories and mills and mines, the railroads and telegraph and telephone, and all other means of production and distribution will be transferred to the people in their collective capacity, industry will be operated co-operatively, and every human being will have the "inalienable right" to work and to enjoy the fruit of his labor. The hours of labor will be reduced according to the progress of invention. Rent, interest and profit will be no more. The sordid spirit of commercial conquest will be dead. War and its ravages will pass into history. Economic equality will have triumphed, labor will stand forth emancipated, and the sons and daughters of men will glorify the triumphs of Social-Democracy.

What Graft Exposures Mean.

By VICTOR L. BERGER.



E hear a great deal now-a-days about graft and graft investigations.

We all know about the investigations in New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Louis and more recently in our own dear Milwaukee. We are absolutely convinced that other cities are no better—that the magnitude of the graft depends upon the size of the city and upon being found out. If some cities seemingly got more than their share, it is due simply to the fact that they are found out more than the others. We also know that there is no little graft in the state and national business. Vide: graft in the postal department, the navy department, the war department, the department of the interior (the land graft) and even the graft in the attorney general's department.

Nor is this all.

With all this public graft—or rather graft in public business—there seems to be no end to the graft in private business. The country at large is astonished and shocked at the exposure of the life insurance companies. And we could go further and say that there is undoubtedly a tremendous amount of graft in the railroad business, and even the department stores. We could say that the heads of the departments in the big stores are "on the make" continually—that the buyers for the large stores are themselves continually bought.

Therefore it is absolutely **wrong** and unjust to say that the **graft** in public life is worse than the graft in private business. Or that the morals of our public life are worse than the morals in private business affairs.

* * * * *

It is true for instance that vice-president Fairbanks, secretary of the treasury Shaw and a score of United States senators, all men of considerable wealth, apportion salaries to sons and nephews.

But this is petty graft compared with the same evil of nepotism in the insurance companies of New York. More than two millions and a half in commissions has been paid within a few years to the son and the son-in-law of the president of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, seemingly for no other reason than that they are the near relatives of the president, McCurdy, who himself receives a salary of \$150,000 per annum. In the same way members of the family of president McCall of the New York Life have been enjoying the luxuries of millionaires. And we all know how vice-president James Hazen Hyde and president Alexander of the Equitable considered that institution simply a Jersey cow to be milked exclusively by them and their nearest relatives. And the investigations of the asphalt trust, of Schwab's ship-building trust, of the steel trust show very much the same condition of affairs all around. It shows that graft is permeating our society and that graft is really the system of all the systems. It is therefore very unjust to raise such a "holler" about the graft in our city affairs and say nothing about the graft in private business.

* * * * *

It is also nonsensical to claim that *graft* is a specific *American* institution. It is not. Graft in monarchical countries is fully as bad. I will admit though that in Germany—where graft in public business if found out is punished twice as hard as graft in private life, and where there is a remnant of the old feudal loyalty to the king combined with a modern sense of duty (*Pflichtgefühl*)—that there may be less graft in some circles. Yet there is a great deal of nepotism. The minor offices are filled with nephews, uncles and cousins of the influential men, and there is a great deal of graft that is simply covered up in order not to disgrace "great men."

There is graft from one end of the world to the other and it is by no means characteristic of our democracy. It is rather a redeeming feature of the democracy that one can discuss it publicly, while it is characteristic of monarchies to conceal and excuse it. Probably there are no countries in the world where there is more graft than in Russia and China. Yet, if any one were to talk about graft in China he would risk his head. And in Russia he might suddenly find himself a denizen of eastern Siberia.

* * * * *

Graft is not a modern or even a capitalist idea. We find the story of graft chiselled into the stones of the pyramids of old Egypt. The same pages of history that tell of the fame of Athens and of the heroism of Sparta tell us of stealing and of graft there. The graft in old

Rome was so tremendous that when the republic went down and the empire was established, about 1,200 families virtually owned the civilized world. Surely, graft did not get any less under the shameless regime of the absolute imperators who made gods of themselves and consuls of their horses and asses. Furthermore the institutions of the middle ages were based upon graft. A man could own and hold only as much as he could defend by the sheer force of his fists or the fists of his retainers. And as for the Roman Catholic church, it simply grafted all it could. So much so that several of the best kings of France and England had to take back by force from the church some of the wealth of the people. The reformation was more of an *economic revolution* to get possession of the wealth of the church, which amounted in some countries to two-thirds of the wealth of the nation, than it was a church reformation.

And, to come nearer to our time, there was never any more graft in France than in the epoch of the Bourbons and in Germany in the period of the unlimited power of the rulers. The story of the honesty in the so-called "good old times" is a fable. The "good old times" were bad old times in this respect as in every other.

* * * * *

Nor did the great French revolution stop graft and grafting. While the heads of the Royalists and aristocrats were flying into the dust right and left, Chabot, Fabre d'Eglantine and others were making millions through graft. Their heads went also, but the guillotine seemed to have lost its terrors, whenever and wherever graft could be made out of speculation with the paper money of the revolution.

There was no little graft in our own revolutionary war, as any one who reads the memoirs of those days can find out. Many of the "old sires" of the "dames" and of the "daughters" and of the "sons of the revolution" were such shameless grafters that had they lived today they would unquestionably spend their time in Sing Sing, Joliet, Waupun or Leavenworth, Kan.

* * * * *

So we have no reason to despair about our own grafters. The world is not getting worse,—it is getting better. And the graft investigation in Milwaukee, the graft exposures in other cities, the outcry against the life insurance companies, etc., are not signs that we are disappearing in a morass. On the contrary, it is a sign that business matters and business morals that passed unchallenged just right even a generation ago are today considered criminal.

Of course modern capitalism has its debauches. And since modern capitalism works with infinitely larger means than did the ruling class of any previous time, these debauches appear to be so extremely great. But to anybody who knows history it is clear that things were a great deal worse in the past. And besides, there was no publicity, no free press in the past. As long as we have the free press and publicity we need not fear corruption.

Yet it is our duty as Social-Democrats to sharpen the conscience of the people and to open up the vista of a civilization where corruption will be infinitely less and graft will disappear. Not because we will have angels, but because it will not pay a man to look out for himself only; in order to help himself he will have to help the collectivity. Conditions will force altruism (the multiplied egotism of all) into the place of personal egotism.

And we will have no angels under Socialism either. Surely not if we are to judge from some of the elements that we have in our party now. But men are the outcome of conditions. It is the conditions that will make graft impossible under Socialism.

What Shall We Do With Our Lawyers?

BY SAMUEL E. MOFFETT IN COLLIER'S.

Some time ago I contributed a few casual observations upon "Lawyers as Public enemies." I called attention to the fact that the chief bulwark of corruption in our government was the existence of a class of intellectual condottieri willing to sell their brains to the highest bidder, even though the work required by that bidder should be the robbery of the public and the debauching of its servants. Among other things I observed: "Formerly the very liberal code of legal ethics drew the line at complicity in the commission of a crime. The lawyer might become an accomplice after the fact, but not before it. He could help a thief to keep out of jail, but he could not directly help him to pick a pocket. * * * The modern Captain of Criminal Industry robs the public instead of an individual, and he takes every step under the advice of his attorney." In a little supplementary discussion I added: "And the worst of it is that when a corporation hires a man as a lawyer, it hires him as a citizen as well."

For some reason these remarks gave offense to a few lawyers. One of them stopped his paper. Others

wrote letters politely explaining the theory of legal ethics, with which they assumed me to be unfamiliar. According to one of these explanations:

When a lawyer publishes an opinion on a matter of public interest without suggesting that he represents clients in so doing, he is presumed to speak as a citizen merely, and as an expert on the legal side of the question. Speaking thus, the profession would regard it as dishonorable and contrary to legal ethics for a lawyer to publish aught but his honest, individual and candid views of the law of the case.

"Under the law the attorney has no more right than any other class to advise, assist or procure a person to commit a crime.

"If he does so, he is subject to criminal prosecution—as any other citizen would be—and his profession would not uphold him in such conduct."

Recent events have put these beautiful theories to the test. In Philadelphia certain notorious robbers prepared to commit a crime of unexampled magnitude. They arranged to steal public property worth at least

\$100,000,000 and probably very much more, and to bind three generations of their fellow citizens to the payment of extortionate prices for one of the necessities of life. This crime, which was only the latest and worst of a long series of similar thefts, was planned in all its details by some of the leading lawyers of Philadelphia, just as its predecessors had been. When the patient city revolted against this crowning outrage, and the spark of civic virtue glimmered even on the Stock Exchange, the Philadelphia bar remained the last stronghold of the beleaguered ring. Mayor Weaver and the Committee of Seventy had to draw upon New York for counsel, because most of the legal talent of Philadelphia *was either in the pay of the public enemies OR HOPED TO BE!*

Incidentally, it is of interest to note that the leading New York counsel on the side of honesty and the leading Philadelphia counsel on the side of dishonesty had been associated just before in the Northern Securities litigation. Retaining fees made them allies in one case and adversaries in the other.

When it looked as if the people of Philadelphia were in a fair way to save their property from the robbers, "the best lawyers in town"—I quote a typical New York press dispatch—"were started to work tying up the revolution in a legal tangle." It was "a brilliant exhibit of counsel fighting for the life and perpetuation of the political machine which the late Matthew Stanley Quay made the most powerful in the United States."

The mayor removed the officials whose power had been used to bribe or intimidate councils into voting for the steal. Thereupon an able attorney promptly procured an injunction the purpose of which was to cause a delay that would enable the thieves

to get away with their plunder before the hands of the owners of the property could be untied. When this failed, the beaten plotters had one last hope. As Mr. Paine said in last week's *Collier's*, "a cloud of lawyers fluttered to them, and out of the war councils was evolved a desperate scheme to impeach the mayor."

How do the apologists of legal ethics explain these incidents? If "the attorney has no more right than any other class to advise, assist, or procure a person to commit a crime," and "his profession would not uphold him in such conduct," why have not steps been taken for the disbarment of the attorneys who advised, assisted, and procured the attempted theft of the Philadelphia gas works? In the lists of the Committees of Seventy and of Nine, of the orators at the town meetings, and of the thousands of citizens who united to restore the purity of their government and preserve the birthright of their children, you will find no name of a United Gas Improvement Company attorney. Does not that confirm the assertion that "when a corporation hires a man as a lawyer it hires him as a citizen as well?"

No newspaper in Philadelphia, except one despised organ of the gang, was an accomplice in the attempted betrayal of the city, and even that one tool of the criminals gave them only a half-hearted support. No minister put his influence at their service, or could have done so without branding himself with infamy. But when the ablest lawyers in the city sold themselves not merely to protect the bandits from punishment, but to help them to commit their crimes, nobody was surprised and nobody expected to see those lawyers incur any professional penalties.

There were similar experiences in New York about the same time. All

through the late session of the legislature of that state the people had to sleep on their arms to prevent the theft of Niagara Falls. The corporation that planned that crime had its attorney among the lawmakers, engineering an attempt to rob the people who paid him a salary as their representative. In the same legislature the attorneys of the Consolidated Gas Company of New York, on and off the floor, blocked the effort to give the consumers cheaper gas by methods that are believed to have made a

number of the legislators financially independent.

The situation naturally recalls that classic colloquy of Mr. Steffens:

"I asked one of Folk's confessed boodlers, once, whether, if he had it all to do over again, he would boodle again.

"'Yes,' he answered thoughtfully, 'but I would study law.'

"'Why?' I asked.

"'So as I could take fees instead of bribes,' he said without humor."

Steady Advance of Social-Democracy.

[We take the following editorial from *The Papyrus*. Michael Monahan, the editor, is a well known litterateur, author of "Benigna Vena," and a recognized authority on Heinrich Heine, the poet.]

Socialism is the most positive, aggressive force in the world today. It is more: it is the next hope of mankind and perhaps the sole inheritance of the disinherited. Whether it shall turn out to be an *ignis fatuus*, a false light, like so many a beacon that has shone along the toilsome path of humanity, I know not, but sure am I that men will give it a trial. Socialism is to be.

There are thousands of Socialists who have never turned a page of Karl Marx, never attended a Socialist meeting and who seem to stand outside the Socialistic propaganda. This fact declares the potency of Socialism as an Idea—it is in the air and men involuntarily imbibe it.

Socialism is the ultimate conclusion and definition of democracy. As such it may be staved off a long time, may be temporized with, bribed with concessions and half-measures; but

it can not be effectually halted, and in the end it is bound to prevail. We shall not see that day, but our children's children shall surely see it and celebrate it.

The power of Socialism lies, first of all, in its purposes to redress the inequalities of the social state, which are ever becoming worse, even in a country of alleged equal opportunities like our own. This program carries an irresistible appeal, not merely to the submerged or down-trodden classes, but also to many more fortunate who have the ills of society at heart. It is daily clothing itself with practicality and convincing by its perfect alignment and unswerving advance. The old bugaboo conception of Socialism has been displaced; the conception of idleness and beggary against industry and wealth; a revolution of the *sans culottes* against all decency, government, prosperity and order; an anarchistic rising of the House of Want against the House of Have.

This idea of Socialism no longer holds with any great body of people. Socialism has made its greatest gains

in Germany and France, among the most thrifty and industrious people in the world. Many of its leaders and many more of its followers are men of substance, social position and wealth. It is essentially an intellectual movement; the Socialistic leaders, advocates and doctrinaires include some of the ablest men in Europe, and even the humblest Socialists, factory workers and the like, are men who have learned to think. The advance of the Socialistic idea, in spite of hostile governments, time-hardened prejudices, class bigotries, religious intolerance and all the unnameable forces of brutal ignorance, alarmed cupidity and threatened power—is I think to be viewed as the most significant triumph of mind in modern civilization. A cause so derived, so trained and developed, overcoming such obstacles, will not take one backward step. Socialism is inevitably coming on.

Over fifty years ago the poet Heine, who was one of the keenest social observers of his day, noted the beginnings of this movement and announced its possibilities. But Heine, with all his prophetic vision, did not venture to forecast such a future for Socialism as a quite uninspired watcher of events may draw without misgiving today. To talk of the coming conquest of Socialism is now to advance a commonplace. The only question is, When?

Another thing which powerfully promotes the cause of Socialism, is the fact that it is not identified or involved with any religion or religious idea, save in so far as the grand idea of the brotherhood of man may be deemed religious. Every religion in the world is more or less committed to some existing political system and, therefore, in a sense, responsible for the evils which Social-

ism is pledged to cure and the iniquities it seeks to overthrow. Socialism alone is free. This is its grandest title.

Unaccounted generations of men have accepted a hard portion of this world, have swallowed injustice and worn out their lives in bitter, hopeless toil at the bidding of religion, solaced by the dream of a future Paradise to reward their cares. This was very convenient for those who drove them like laden asses, and religion got much credit as well as some profit for keeping the peace. The same thing is going on today in many parts of the world, but yet it does not work so smoothly as in those times called the ages of faith—the toiling, over-burdened men are more and more bent upon getting a bit of heaven for themselves on this earth.

Socialism makes war upon no religion, but it does not preach a God of favorites—mark that!—and it announces what no religion dare announce in absolute honesty—the brotherhood of man! Every creed in the world, by which I mean every organized church, dissolves before this touchstone.

I repeat: Socialism is to be!

“It is a noteworthy fact that the government of China, while in theory more or less despotic, places no practical restrictions upon the right of free assemblage by the people for the consideration of their own affairs. The people of any village can if they choose meet every day in the year. There is no government censor present, and no restriction on liberty of debate. The people can say what they like, and the local magistrate neither knows nor cares what is said.”—Dr. Arthur H. Smith, in “Village Life in China,” page 228.

An Inlook for the Editor of "The Outlook."

By ALLAN L. BENSON.

[The following letter was sent to the editor of *The Outlook*, in reply to an editorial in that magazine, containing statements giving a false view of Socialism and the nature of which the letter shows. The letter was returned to Comrade Benson, with an explanation that it was too long to be available. Rather than do injustice to his subject, Comrade Benson decided not to attempt a condensation but has permitted us to print it in its original shape.]

A number of years ago, I read in the Chicago Record-Herald an interview with Dr. Lyman Abbott in which the doctor was quoted as having said that "Nothing could stop the progress of Socialism and nothing ought to stop it." Whether Dr. Abbott ever made this exact remark, I have no means of knowing. But I do know that as a result of the statement attributed to him, I began the study of Socialism and became a Socialist.

I feel, therefore, that *The Outlook* should bear with me while I enter a mild protest against some of the statements of alleged fact as well as against some of the conclusions in the editorial published in *The Outlook* on September 2, entitled "The Moralization of Property." The general tone of the editorial was so excellent that it may appear unkind to call attention to some of its statements of alleged fact which appear to me to be at least misleading, or to dissent from some of the conclusions drawn from what I conceive to be these erroneous statements of facts. Yet the statements are so vital to what I consider

to be the fundamentals of a great economic truth that I can not refrain from calling attention to them for the purpose of setting *you* right, if you be in the wrong, or of having you set me right, if it be I who is in error.

In the editorial mentioned, *The Outlook* says: "There is a school of Socialists whose motto is that 'property is robbery' and whose purpose is to abolish it."

This statement, shocking as it must have been to all Socialist ears, would have been less shocking if it had been used by any publication that is less careful with its facts than *The Outlook* is well known to be. It might have been explained, for instance, on the theory that the writer of the editorial had confused Proudhon's famous statement that "property is theft," with the beliefs of this alleged "school of Socialists." Another possible explanation would be that the writer had arbitrarily branded as "Socialists," this "certain school" whose motto is that "property is theft" in the same manner that other careless speakers and writers arbitrarily bestow the term upon those whom it fails to describe.

But the necessity for resorting to either of these possible explanations is brushed away by a subsequent paragraph in the editorial in which the writer says that, "To recognize this morally limited ownership of 'our own' is the prime requisite for the moralization of wealth which christian Socialists like Maurice and Kingsley oppose to the demand of the 'Reds' for its abolition or distribution."

Assuming that the writer is as familiar with his subject as he seems to be, his use of the word "reds" seems to settle the matter as to what "school" of Socialists he charges with the belief that "property is theft." The emblem of the International Socialist party of the world is red, and by many, its members are called "reds." There are 3,000,000 "reds" in Germany; 400,000 in the United States who voted at the presidential election last fall, nearly 70,000 in Illinois, while every third voter in Milwaukee votes "red." Wherever members of the International Socialist party of the world are to be found, there will also be found red buttons and red banners, all emblematic of the peaceful revolution in industrial and economic conditions that these men who are called "reds" are trying to bring about. And since it is to the International party—millions strong in the world—to which the flaming, historic color of revolution has been applied by others and accepted by the party itself, the conclusion seems justified that the writer in *The Outlook* meant the International Socialist party when he said that a certain school of Socialists believed that "property is theft" and that property should be destroyed. Because, if he had meant any smaller "school" who might call themselves Socialists, he would hardly have used the appellation that is given to and accepted by millions of members of this great party throughout the world.

Now here is where I wish to make my protest. If the writer in *The Outlook* intended his readers to understand that the members of the International Socialist party believe that "property is theft" and that it ought to be "abolished," he did a grave injustice to those whom he

wished to enlighten, as well as to those millions throughout the world who are laboring to lighten the burdens of bending backs, with a zeal that is only equalled by their self-sacrifices. Because, if there be anything in the world in which these same "reds" believe, it is that the growth of private property not only should be encouraged but made much more easy of accomplishment. In fact, the whole complaint of these "reds" against existing social and economic conditions is that they make possible the accumulation of *so little* private property. The average American citizen owns no "property" except the clothes on his back and the few old chairs and other bits of furniture that he has in his home. The census reports for 1900 show that 53.5 per cent of the American families rent the houses in which they live, while only 31.8 per cent of the families occupy homes that are wholly paid for. If a tree is to be known by its fruits, I should say that it is more likely to be the capitalists than the "reds" who believe in the destruction of the right to hold private property. Socialists merely object to the private ownership of *capital*, or that part of wealth which is used by the holder to acquire *more* wealth, which is quite another thing from believing that "property is theft" or that it should be "abolished."

Of course, if the writer in *The Outlook* had all of these indisputable facts in mind when he wrote the editorial in question, he merely erred, as I see it, in being less specific in his statements. If he wished to denominate as "reds" a small body of men who may perhaps call themselves Socialists, he should have said so, in my opinion, instead of making his statement in such a way

that many of his readers might misunderstand. As a matter of fact, it is mis-leading, for all practical purposes to apply the name of "Socialist" to anybody who cannot express the cardinal doctrine of his belief in the statement that he stands for the public ownership of capital and private ownership of all property that is not used as capital. This is the test of Socialism.

Passing from the realm of facts to that of opinion, I must differ from you in the belief that relief from present admittedly unjust conditions lies rather in the "moralization of property" than in what might be called the "mutualization of capital." I can readily understand that something very nearly approaching exact justice would be reached if the capitalists, foregoing interest, rent and profit, would take for themselves only reasonable wages of superintendence and divide the rest of the products of their plants among the workers who created the products and the society that made it possible for the workers to do the work. But seriously to expect relief from such a source seems to me to be reversing the order of human experience. If I have read aright, wrongs have usually been righted by the actions of the victims in wresting justice from those who would withhold it. This has been true up to this time at least, possibly for the reason that those who, to descend to the vernacular, have a "good thing" are loath to give it up. And while it is at least theoretically possible that the moral force of the world might be so concentrated upon generation after generation of Rockefellers that eventually they would permit their property to become "moralized," it appears to me that there is a shorter and better method to accomplish eco-

nomie justice among men. Under existing conditions, most men are without capital. No man without capital can labor to produce the things necessary to life without using the capital of another. In other words, a few men own all the jobs. No man can get a job—*the chance to work and make a living*—without making terms with a capitalist. Making terms with a capitalist means agreeing how much of the worker's product shall be given to the worker in the form of wages, and how much shall be retained by the capitalist in the form of profits for the use of his tools—his capital.

The right to live is supposed to be sacred. Socialists believe the right to create with one's labor those things without which life cannot be maintained, is just as sacred as the right to live itself. No one is yet cringing enough to believe he should ask permission from some capitalist to draw the breath of life, yet nearly all who are not Socialists seem to believe it is entirely proper that we should go to capitalists and get permission to apply our labor to the earth and its products to create those things without which no one can long draw the breath of life.

The remedy of Socialism seems to me to be rational and just. Simply wrest from capitalism the right of every man to labor and create the necessities of life by taking from capitalism the power by which it now confiscates part of the product of labor.

This power lies in the ownership by a few of the land and tools with which all must work or starve. In other words, let the government hold the title to all these things and charge nobody a profit for their use.

Perhaps this, as *The Outlook* says, would be to "burn the house to drive

out the rats." But I believe if my house were full of rats I would use force—even fire, if necessary—to drive them out. At any rate, I do not think I should be optimistic enough calmly to sit down and wait

until such time as the force of my moral powers should develop within the rats such an overwhelming consciousness of their rudeness in intruding that they would slink away into the night.

Spartacus and the Helots.

Perhaps the most picturesque of the ancient strike-war leaders was Spartacus. Being of handsome physique he, like thousands of other workers, was condemned to be a gladiator; but being also of noble mind he refused to fight his brother workers unto death to amuse the rich and profligate.

In the year 74 B. C. Spartacus and his wife Varina, accompanied by 78 others, escaped from the Amphitheatre in Rome and within a year's time was at the head of an army of 100,000 workers, with whom he won ten consecutive battles over the Roman generals. But in the year 70, surrounded by three hostile armies, he was defeated and slain at Silarus.

Among almost all peoples there early existed a system of industrial slavery, wherein the many were chattel workers and the few were owners. The slave ranks were recruited from debtors and from captives taken in war. Their status became hereditary.

The chief human significance of the familiar "Exodus" of the Israelites from Egypt, about 1400 B. C., is their escape from industrial bondage to an alien race, in which they "had to make bricks without straw" and endure galling oppression.

Moses, who led forth 40,000 of them after having himself smitten an Egyptian oppressor, was an "agitator" and a leader of the workers toward a "Promised Land."

As typical of the lot of the ancient workers one may consider the condition of the "Helots" or industrial slaves of Sparta. Though outnumbering their citizen-masters three to one they were flogged once a day, were made to constantly assume stooping postures, lest by standing erect they might come to feel themselves the equals of their owners, and were daily driven in herds to their work in the fields.

Plutarch tells of the "Ambuscade" ordered periodically by the magistrates, in which the free Spartan youths fell upon the Helots by night with daggers and, by assassination, kept the multitude intimidated.

Thucydides describes a massacre of 2,000 Helots in the year 424 B. C. For valorous military service during the Peloponesian war they had been emancipated and were invited to a temple, ostensibly to be garlanded, but were treacherously butchered there by order of the magistrates.

The slaves-workers of the ancient world could have no property, no religious recognition and no legitimate family ties. The prevalent religion being mainly ancestor-worship, the workers came to be considered as "earth born" as contrasted with the "divine origin" of their masters. Even the philosopher Plato conceded the toilers but "half a soul."—*Rev. John Ellis.*

Economic Interpretation of History.

BY W. J. GHENT IN "MASS AND CLASS."

The doctrine that the prevailing mode of production and exchange is the main determining factor in human affairs is known as "the economic interpretation of history." This doctrine was formulated by Karl Marx, who is coming to be recognized even by those who do not accept all of his social beliefs as one of the really great geniuses of the nineteenth century. Marx chose an unfortunate name for the doctrine; he called it "the materialist conception of history;" and most of his militant followers continue so to speak of it. The name is unfortunate in that it seems to ally the doctrine with the philosophy of materialism, the doctrine "that matter is the only substance, and that matter and its motions constitute the universe." Marx's doctrine has, however, nothing to do with the claims of philosophic materialism as against those of monism or of theism. It is historic materialism as opposed to historic idealism, the latter being the interpretation of historic phenomena as the work of great minds and powerful individualities, and carrying with it an exaggerated hero-worship. Historic materialism is concerned with the play of causes and effects among social phenomena, but it does not touch the question of the primary cause of the cosmic process. Theists, monists, agnostics and materialists may thus, in considering it, meet upon common ground.

The economic interpretation of history is the doctrine that the relations of men to one another in the matter of making a living are the main underlying causes of men's habits of thought and feeling, their

notions of right, propriety and legality, their institutions of society and government, their wars and revolutions. Under the stress of the economic motive men seek to satisfy their needs; and to do this, throughout the period of the institution of private property, they have had to compete with one another. In its last analysis the struggle is one of individual against individual. But since in all times the individual has recognized or sensed his own weakness in the struggle against other men and against nature, he has had to make common cause with his fellows of like needs and aims. The history of mankind is thus resolved into a series of group struggles, including, in the main, tribal and racial conflicts as well, growing out of the desire for economic advantage. With the development of industry from its primitive or barbaric forms, these groups, evolved into economic classes, striving to obtain, or when obtained to hold, the prevailing form of capital and the political mastery which insured its retention. Petty groups, of varying interests, have persisted within the several classes, but the determining struggle throughout history has continued along class lines.

Expressed in the words of Frederick Engels, the friend of Marx and his collaborator in *The Manifesto of the Communist Party of 1848*, the doctrine is:

That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone



Socialist Headquarters.

To achieve the objects of Socialism, the American Socialists have formed the Socialist Party, now organized in all the States of the Union. In New York and Wisconsin, this party is known, for legal reasons, as the Social Democratic Party and in Minnesota as the Public Ownership Party.

NATIONAL SECRETARY: J. MAHLON BARNES, Boylston Bldg. 269 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes.

Since from the beginning of human life, in all but the garden spots of the earth, men have had to spend the greater part of their waking time and their energy in securing food, warmth and clothing, it is almost a matter of course that the methods they have had to employ in this urgent pursuit have prompted, more than anything else, their habits of acting, feeling and thinking on all subjects, have determined in great measure the form of their institutions, and arrayed mankind in conflicting divisions.

It is now officially reported that the operations based on the cotton leak in the Agricultural department produced private profits of two hundred thousand dollars. The ship of state, under capitalist party management, is a pretty leaky old hulk and mighty expensive to keep afloat.

“Thou shalt not kill.” Except by locked exits, subway explosions, adulterated food, slums, fire-damp, fast trains, sweatshops. In short, in the regular course of trade.—*Life*.

Zola's Estimate of Jaures.

During his exile in London, at the time of the Dreyfus affair, Emile Zola, in conversation with his English translator, Vizetelly, expressed himself about Jaures as follows:

“In the course of the last 40 years I have heard all the French orators of note, even the much belauded pulpiteers. Gambetta was our last great orator. When he died there was not one left in any party or any profession. But since then Jaures has arisen, a born champion, leader of men, and one who knows how to charm the ears of an audience. He is at least the equal of Gambetta as an orator, and certainly as upright also. The French Socialists have never before possessed such a leader; and you may rest assured that Jaures, like Mirabeau and Gambetta, will leave his stamp on our time.

“I think him the cleverest, the most far-seeing, and at the same time most interesting man I know in the political world today.”

With a sigh, Zola concluded: “The pen is undoubtedly a mighty weapon, but oh! the power of the spoken word; without that a people can seldom, if ever, be led.”—Ex.

A machine for milking cows has just been invented. That's nothing. A machine for milking insurance company treasuries has been invented and in successful operation these many years.

SOCIALIST PLATFORM.

Adopted by the National Convention of the Socialist Party,
Chicago, May 5, 1904.

I.

WE, the Socialist Party, in convention assembled, make our appeal to the American people as the defender and preserver of the idea of liberty and self-government, in which the nation was born; as the only political movement standing for the program and principles by which the liberty of the individual may become a fact; as the only political organization that is democratic, and that has for its purpose the democratizing of the whole society.

To this idea of liberty the Republican and Democratic parties are alike false. They alike struggle for power to maintain and profit by an industrial system which can be preserved only by the complete overthrow of such liberties as we already have, and by the still further enslavement and degradation of labor.

Our American institutions came into the world in the name of freedom. They have been seized upon by the capitalist class as the means of rooting out the idea of freedom from among the people. Our state and national legislatures have become the mere agencies of great propertyed interests. These interests control the appointments and decisions of the judges of our courts. They have come into what is practically a private ownership of all the functions and forces of government. They are using these to betray and conquer foreign and weaker peoples, in order to establish new markets for the surplus goods which the people make, but are too poor to buy. They are gradually so invading and restricting the right of suffrage as to take unawares the right of the worker to a vote or a voice in public affairs. By enacting new and misinterpreting old laws, they are preparing to attack the liberty of the individual even to speak or think for himself or for the common good.

By controlling all the sources of social revenue, the possessing class is able to silence what might be the voice of protest against the passing of liberty and the coming of tyranny. It completely controls the university and public school, the pulpit and the press, the arts and literatures. By making these economically dependent upon itself, it has brought all the forms of public teaching into servile submission to its own interests.

Our political institutions are also being used as the destroyers of that individual property upon which all liberty and opportunity depend. The promise of economic independence to each man was one of the faiths in which our institutions were founded. But under the guise of defending private property, capitalism is using our political institutions to make it impossible for the vast majority of human beings to ever become possessors of private property in the means of life.

Capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property. Its development is through the legalized confiscation of all that the labor of the working

class produces, above its subsistence-wage. The private ownership of the means of employment grounds society in an economic slavery which renders intellectual and political tyranny inevitable.

Socialism comes to so organize industry and society that every individual shall be secure in that private property in the means of life upon which his liberty of being, thought and action depend. It comes to rescue the people from the fast increasing and successful assault of capitalism upon the liberty of the individual.

II.

As an American Socialist Party, we pledge our fidelity to the principles of international socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the socialists of all nations. In the industrial development already accomplished, the interests of the world's workers are separated by no national boundaries. The condition of the most exploited and oppressed workers, in the most remote places of the earth, inevitably tends to drag down all the workers of the world to the same level. The tendency of the competitive wage system is to make labor's lowest condition the measure or rule of its universal condition. Industry and finance are no longer national but international, both in organization and results. The chief significance of national boundaries, and of the so-called patriotisms which the ruling class of each nation is seeking to revive, is the power which these give to capitalists to keep the workers of the world from uniting, and to throw them against each other in the struggles of contending capitalists for the control of the yet unexploited markets of the world, or the remaining sources of profit.

The socialist movement therefore is a world-movement. It knows of no conflicts of interest between the workers of one nation and the workers of another. It stands for the freedom of the workers of all nations; and, in so standing, it makes for the full freedom of all humanity.

III.

The socialist movement owes its birth and growth to that economic development or world-process which is rapidly separating a working or producing class from a possessing or capitalist class. The class that produces nothing possesses labor's fruits, and the opportunities and enjoyments these fruits afford, while the class that does the world's real work has increasing economic uncertainty, and physical and intellectual misery, as its portion.

The fact that these two classes have not yet become fully conscious of their distinction from each other, the fact that the lines of division and interest may not yet be clearly drawn, does not change the fact of the class conflict.

This class struggle is due to the private ownership of the means of employment, or the tools of production. Wherever

and whenever man owned his own land and tools, and by them produced only the things which he used, economic independence was possible. But production, or the making of goods, has long since ceased to be individual. The labors of scores, or even thousands, enter into almost every article produced. Production is now social or collective. Practically everything is made or done by many men—sometimes separated by seas or continents—working together for the same end. But this co-operation in production is not for the direct use of the things made by the workers who make them, but for the profit of the owners of the tools and means of production; and to this is due the present division of society into two distinct classes; and from it has sprung all the miseries, inharmonies and contradictions of our civilization.

Between these two classes there can be no possible compromise or identity of interest, any more than there can be peace in the midst of war, or light in the midst of darkness. A society based upon this class division carries in itself the seeds of its own destruction. Such a society is founded in fundamental injustice. There can be no possible basis for social peace, for individual freedom, for mental and moral harmony, except in the conscious and complete triumph of the working class as the only class that has the right or power to be.

IV.

The socialist program is not a theory imposed upon society for its acceptance or rejection. It is but the interpretation of what is, sooner or later, inevitable. Capitalism is already struggling to its destruction. It is no longer competent to organize or administer the work of the world, or even to preserve itself. The captains of industry are appalled at their own inability to control or direct the rapidly socializing forces of industry. The so-called trust is but a sign and form of this developing socialization of the world's work. The universal increase of the uncertainty of employment, the universal capitalist determination to break down the unity of labor in the trades unions, the widespread apprehensions of impending change, reveal that the institutions of capitalist society are passing under the power of inhering forces that will soon destroy them.

Into the midst of this strain and crisis of civilization, the socialist movement comes as the only saving or conservative force. If the world is to be saved from chaos, from universal disorder and misery, it must be by the union of the workers of all nations in the socialist movement. The socialist party comes with the only proposition or program for intelligently and deliberately organizing the nation for the common good of all its citizens. It is the first time that the mind of man has ever been directed toward the conscious organization of society.

Socialism means that all those things upon which the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered. It means that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users; that all production shall be for the direct use of the producers; that the making of goods for

profit shall come to an end; that we shall all be workers together, and that opportunities shall be open and equal to all men.

V.

To the end that the workers may seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the co-operative commonwealth, the Socialist Party pledges itself to watch and work in both the economic and the political struggle for each successive immediate interest of the working class, for shortened days of labor and increases of wages; for the insurance of the workers against accident, sickness and lack of employment; for pensions for aged and exhausted workers; for the public ownership of the means of transportation, communication and exchange; for the graduated taxation of incomes, inheritances, and of franchise and land values, the proceeds to be applied to the public employment and bettering the conditions of the worker's children, and their freedom from the workshop; for the equal suffrage of men and women; for the prevention of the use of the military against labor in the settlement of strikes; for the free administration of justice; for popular government, including initiative, referendum, proportional representation, and the recall of officers by their constituents; and for every gain or advantage for the workers that may be wrested from the capitalist system, and that may relieve the suffering and strengthen the hands of labor. We lay upon every man elected to any executive or legislative office the first duty of striving to procure whatever is for the workers' most immediate interest, and for whatever will lessen the economic and political powers of the capitalist and increase the like powers of the worker.

But, in so doing, we are using these remedial measures as means to the one great end of the co-operative commonwealth. Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry, and thus come into their rightful inheritance.

To this end we pledge ourselves, as the party of the working class, to use all political power, as fast as it shall be entrusted to us by our fellow-workers, both for their immediate interests and for their ultimate and complete emancipation. To this end we appeal to all the workers of America, and to all who will lend their lives to the service of the workers in their struggle to gain their own, and to all who will nobly and disinterestedly give their days and energies unto the workers' cause, to cast their lot and faith with the Socialist Party. Our appeal for the trust and suffrages of our fellow-workers is at once an appeal for their common good and freedom, and for the freedom and blossoming of our common humanity. In pledging ourselves, and those which we represent to be faithful to the appeal which we make, we believe that we are but preparing the soil of the economic freedom from which will spring the freedom of the whole man.

FOR THE DAWN OF A BETTER DAY!

The Workers all over the World are Banded Together
in the International Social-Democratic Movement.
If you are interested in the subject you will get the
whole situation and all the arguments in the most
representative Socialist paper in the United States, the

Social-Democratic Herald

FREDERIC HEATH, Editor.

Which presents each week Special signed contribu-
tions from the pens of

VICTOR L. BERGER

===== **AND** =====

EUGENE V. DEBS,

And a host of the best Socialists on both sides of
the Atlantic.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

12 Months,	- - - - -	50 cents.
6 Months,	- - - - -	25 cents.
10 Weeks,	- - - - -	10 cents.

Remittances should be made to the

Social-Democratic Publishing Co.

344 SIXTH STREET.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Books on International Socialism

Avelling, Edward. The Students Marx.....	\$1.00
Berger, Victor L. What Shall We Do to be Saved. 2c, per 100	.50
Bax, E. Belfort. The Ethics of Socialism.....	1.00
Story of the French Revolution.....	1.00
The Religion of Socialism.....	1.00
Benson, Allan L. Confessions of Capitalism.....	.05
Socialism Made Plain.....	10 cents. By mail .15
Bernstein, Edward.. Ferdinand Lasalle.....	1.00
Blatchford, Rob't. Britain for the British.....	.25
Merrie England	.10
Brown, W. I. Open Letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo XIII	.02
Carpenter, Edward. England's Ideal.....	1.00
Civilization, Its Cause and Cure.....	1.00
Debs, Eugene V. Liberty.....	.10
Prison Labor	.05
DeVille Gabriel. State and Socialism	.10
Dawson, W. H. Bismarck and State Socialism.....	1.00
German Socialism and Lasalle	1.00
Engels, Frederick. Conditions of the English Working Class	
in 1844	1.25
The Origin of the Family.....	.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.....	.50
The same in paper.....	.10
Heath, Frederic. Socialism in America.....	.50
Kautsky, Karl. Life of Frederick Engels.....	.10
The Social Revolution	.50
La Fargue, Paul. The Evolution of Property.....	1.00
Liebknecht, Wilhelm. No Compromise.....	.10
Memoirs of Karl Marx.....	.50
Socialism, What it is, and What it Seeks to Accomplish ..	.10
Loria, Achille. The Economic Foundations of Society.....	1.25
Marx, Karl. Capital. Cloth, 847 pages.....	2.00
Revolution and Counter-Revolution	1.00
Wage Labor and Capital.....	.05
Marx and Engels. The Communist Manifesto.....	.10
Massart and Vandervelde. Parasitism, Organic and Social..	1.00
Morris and Bax. Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome.....	1.25
Plato. The Republic. Book I.....	.15
The same. Book II.....	.15
The same. Book III.....	.15
Rodbertus, Karl. Over-production and Crises	1.00
Rogers, J. E Thorold. Work and Wages.....	1.00
Schaeffle, Dr The Quintessence of Socialism.....	1.00
Simons, A. M. The American Farmer.....	.50
Sombart, Werner. Socialism and the Social Movement in	
the 19th Century	1.00
Vail, Charles H. The Socialist Movement.....	.10
Vandervelde, Emile. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution	.25
Wilshire, H. Gaylord. Trusts and Imperialism.....	.05

Send for complete catalogue of socialist books, free for the asking.

**THE VANGUARD, 344 Sixth Street,
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.**