

THE VANGUARD

"We're beaten back in many a fray,
Yet never strength we borrow,
And where the Vanguard camps today,
The rear shall rest tomorrow."

Vol. 5. No. 3. MILWAUKEE, WIS., JANUARY, 1907. Whole Number 47.

The Month's Story.

Playing

For Time

The messages of our presidents in former years used to be sleepy affairs, and the conscientious editor who waded clear through them was in danger of dislocating his jaws with yawning. But this year the president's message was quite a different matter. It was a highly amusing document. In fact, if an American citizen had not just been fined for prefixing to Roosevelt's sacred name an adjective beginning and ending with the letter "d," we might call His Majesty the President—as Josh Billings used to phrase it—"an amooosin' cuss."

For Teddy the Terrible is scared. The "sinister demagogues" and "foolish visionaries," the "preachers of mere discontent," the "base creature who appeals and panders to the lowest instincts and passions in order to arouse one set of Americans against their fellows," the "men who seek to excite a violent class hatred against all men of wealth," the "purveyors of sensational slander in newspaper or magazine," the "dangerous and wicked agitation against the men of wealth as such," and "the deadening and degrading effect of pure Socialism," occupied a large part of the presidential message.

Most of the remainder was taken up with antidotes for these awful dangers. For, said the president naively, "as a matter of fact, it is the reactionaries and ultra-conservatives who are themselves most potent in increasing Socialistic feeling." Thus, while Roosevelt poses as a reformer, he is really a conservative—a scared pilot, who will throw overboard part of the cargo in order to save the ship.

The truth is that Roosevelt, like all rulers who see the red spectre coming, is simply playing for time. Just so Kaiser Wilhelm has played for time with labor legislation and old age insurance, and all the other sops which he has thrown to his people, in the vain hope of bribing them to forsake the Social-Democracy.

The sops which Roosevelt advises congress to fling to the American workingmen are of much the same nature. After all the reproaches heaped upon American Socialists for getting ideas from Europe, it is funny to see the president borrowing the Kaiser's prescriptions for their cure.

And it is still funnier—immensely funnier—because the Kaiser's remedies have *not* cured his Socialists at home, as every German election makes more alarmingly apparent.

Thus Roosevelt recommends an accident insurance for workingmen, to be paid exclusively by the employers, which goes even beyond the German law. He recommends an eight-hour working day—where it will not bother the employers—arbitration of labor troubles—but here “it is well to advance cautiously”—and an “investigation of the conditions of child labor”—how many babies will be murdered before the investigators get ready to report? Also he is for an income and inheritance tax, and against the “careless use” of the injunction in labor troubles—if anybody knows what that means.

Clearly, the president and the Republican party are simply playing for time against the red spectre. It is coming—the ruling class of every land now sees that terrible fact. But they will stave it off as long as they may by sacrificing a little of their privilege. Socialism is still so young and weak in America that the concessions they offer to it are more in pretense than in fact. But the nearer the peril comes, as in Germany, the more substantial will be the measures conceded to the working class.

And, at any rate, it is a great victory that “laissez faire”—the let-alone policy—is dead at last. Admit the right to the regulation of capital by the people, and the right to ownership of capital by the people must logically follow.

Meantime, the way to gain further concessions is clear!

If we want good labor legislation, if we want accident insurance, sickness insurance, old age pensions, an eight-hour day, all the sacrifices which capitalism will make rather than lose its last grip, we shall gain it by this “dangerous and wicked agitation” which has scared our rulers into considering the working class.

Not love for us, but fear of us, has set them to thinking. If congress at this session passes some favorable labor legislation we should thank neither congress nor Roosevelt, but the “base creatures” who “excite class hatred” and “preach discontent.”

Up and at it, then, Social-Democrats! Ye “wicked agitators.” Ye “sinister demagogues!”

Just in proportion to your activity will be the amount of justice wrung from the unwilling hands of our terrified masters. Push the Social-Democratic propaganda and gain the advantage inspired by fear!

* * *

The Yes, the immense progress which Socialist sentiment has
Enterprising made in America within the last eighteen months is
Burglar marked by capitalistic uneasiness.

Not only the president, but every orator at political meetings, public banquets, college commencements, anniversary celebrations, cornerstone layings, and what not, takes a whack at Socialism. A mighty change from the contemptuous silence of only two years ago!

These oratorical Jeremiahs who warn us against the rising Socialist peril are chiefly concerned about two things.

First, they charge that the Social-Democratic system would discourage “genius and enterprise.” It would destroy “individual effort,” which they insist is the “backbone of enterprise.”

But how about the present system? Does it always reward genius? Does it always encourage initiative?

For instance, the enterprise and industry of the average burglar have never been duly appreciated. While the honest citizen is slothfully slumbering, the strenuous knight of the jimmy goes forth to pursue his "individual effort." He shows considerable "genius and energy" in prying open windows, picking locks and blowing up safes. He displays a great deal of "initiative" in appropriating other people's property. It should also be borne in mind that he assumes a heavy risk, and according to all rules of the present system should be remunerated for this risk. Moreover, his labor may be classed as brain work. It requires considerable planning and forethought, and therefore should be more highly compensated than mere mechanical toil.

Incidentally, it may be noted that he provides employment for a large number of persons. But for him, the lock-making industry would sadly dwindle. Men engaged in the manufacture of safes and burglar alarms would be thrown out of work altogether and left a burden on the community. Thus it is clear on all counts that the burglar is a benefactor to society.

It is to be feared that this would be one of the cases of individual effort—"the backbone of enterprise"—which would be destroyed by the introduction of the Socialist system. The initiative of the burglar and other enterprising characters who derive their wealth from appropriating that of other men would be so thoroughly discouraged under the co-operative commonwealth that it would disappear altogether.

In fact the Social-Democrats have a strange way of estimating the value of enterprise and initiative. They hold that only work which is productive of good to the community is to be considered as work worthy of remuneration. They insist that enterprise which is directed toward the expropriation of the fruits of other men's labor should be repressed instead of encouraged. This, of course, would eliminate both the burglar and the capitalist.

The "singleness of purpose" of the energetic burglar is beyond all praise. He has but one thought—to acquire the property of others, by any means that come to hand. But the singleness of purpose of the great capitalist is equally surprising.

The labors of Rockefeller are stupendous. They scarcely leave him time for food, sleep and proper exercise. He is hurried and worried to such an extent that he has become a chronic dyspeptic and "his complexion is that of a plucked chicken," as the French paper *Figaro* graphically describes it. But his labor is not productive work. It is warfare—a combination of forces against rivals at home and abroad. He certainly shows "genius and energy" in conquering his competitors and grasping the control of many industries. But he is not a producer. With the real process of manufacture he has nothing to do. The production of oil would go on after his death in exactly as large quantities, and all would remain unchanged in the Standard Oil company, providing his competitors kept their hands off.

The same is equally true of all the large trust magnates, and to a considerable degree of the smaller capitalists. They are much more

concerned, as a rule, with ingenious methods of advertising than with the process of production. To down a competitor is of more importance than the improvement of the quality of their goods.

This sort of enterprise will indeed disappear under the Socialist regime. But will productive enterprise diminish on this account? Will the community lack for inventors of new industrial processes, or for managers of its great co-operative industries?

It is a notorious fact that inventors receive little compensation for their services, as a rule, and that the pecuniary benefits of their inventions go to the capitalists who buy them up. Neither does the public always profit by the inventions of the present day. Almost every large plant contains what is known as "the grave-yard," where are stored patents bought by the company to keep them out of the hands of competitors, but never put to use. Thus a large part of the inventive genius of the country is lost to the world.

As for the management of great industries, they are no longer in the hands of their owners. The salaried manager does the real labor of directing the process of production. And why should he not labor as faithfully in the employ of the nation, the state or the city as on the salary of a Carnegie, a Schwab or an Armour?

Energy and enterprise are inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race, and the introduction of Socialism cannot deaden them.

On the contrary, it will stimulate them. At present, while energy is encouraged in the capitalist class, it is discouraged in the masses. The life and spirit are all taken out of the wage worker by his hopeless struggle. The Socialist system will give a man a chance to live. The shorter hours of work will allow him opportunity to recuperate his energy.

The man who is worked every day to the last limit of his powers cannot be expected to have much enterprise. Have you not observed the new activity which even a vacation of a week or two in the country can give a worn worker? You feel as though you could move mountains and would enjoy the task. The energy of the college student, not yet harnessed into the machine of money-making, has to be expended in football and various mad-cap tricks which in themselves are labor.

A world of healthy, well-fed and well-bred men and women will not lack for enterprise.

* * *

Are We Materialists? The other great card of anti-Socialists of another type is the charge that Socialists are materialists, that they look only on the grosser side of life and expect to settle everything by solving the economic question. This charge is false, although like most charges which receive general acceptance it has a little grain of truth.

Socialists care for other things besides the material interests of humanity. Indeed, one of their main reasons for struggling toward a better economic system is the fact that this will clear the way for the settlement of other questions, social, moral and intellectual. This may be gathered from the writings of all Socialists. Their criticism of capitalistic morals and educational processes forms a large part of their arraignment of modern society. Capitalism has not merely

failed in making men comfortable and healthy. It has fallen short in supplying humanity with an intellectual and moral basis of happiness.

But can this basis be supplied by altering the economic system? Will the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth mean nobler and wiser, as well as better clothed and better fed, men and women?

At first sight, the connection does not appear. What has the collective ownership of capital to do with moral and intellectual life?

But on closer examination it will be found that the tie between the two is very close. In fact, from the study of the world's history, we find that human progress has always traveled on the line of intellectual development following material development.

Take for example one of the very first human inventions—the invention of the bow and arrow. The savages who first learned to make them at once gained a better or more certain food supply than those lower savages who to this day live by fishing and on wild fruits. Our savage with the bow became a higher type of man, he had a new and changed life, and his thoughts and morals, though still very primitive, were a degree higher than those of his wilder neighbor.

Another great invention was the taming of wild animals. The tribe that had a little flock or herd was sure of a stock of provisions in the bad seasons of the year. They no longer had to rely upon the uncertainties of the chase. The consequence was that this material change in their condition brought about a total change in their ways of thinking and living. The pastoral or patriarchal age began. The men who "lived in tents with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" were far beyond the savage in all their thoughts and feelings.

Again, agriculture was invented, and again the race was provided with a still better and surer food supply, and changed all its ways to correspond with its new material conditions. Then came the birth of the arts, crude and simple at first, but beautiful even in their beginnings. Then Homer sung, and the real intellectual life of the race had its bright and wonderful dawn.

Yet all these eras of thought and development had their origin in some material change of the conditions of living. Indeed, students of history tell us that every period of intellectual improvement has been a period when the food supply was good. And this is perfectly natural. A hungry man has only one thought. When our lower wants are supplied, we become conscious of higher needs.

The introduction of Socialism will ensure to all men the product of their labor. For all who work there will be a comfortable competence. And all will have an opportunity to work. No anxious cares for tomorrow's daily bread will drive away all other thoughts and deprive men of all their zest for intellectual pleasures. People will no longer crave the sensational and highly spiced entertainments that make them forget their troubles for a little time. A calmer and healthier thought will succeed. Intellectual and moral life will take a new turn.

Just what course the new thought, the new art and literature, the new morals and new social development will adopt under the benign influence of the Socialist system, no one can foretell. That there will be something far higher and more beautiful than anything that the world has yet seen, must be expected from the natural course of human progress. The savage could not have foreseen the life of the patriarch, nor the patriarch the life of the present age. Neither can we foresee the enjoyment and the culture which posterity will attain under a rational and just distribution of the products of labor.

It is our privilege, however, to pave the way for that better time. And this work is the best enjoyment that our present unhealthy society permits.

Trial Marriages

By "F. H."

Again we smile. The comments of the press on the "trial marriage" proposal of Mrs. Parsons, daughter of Henry Clews of Wall street and wife of Congressman Parsons, have nowhere called out more violent disapproval than from the Catholic clergy and Catholic papers, although their utterances would have been much more excited had it been possible in any way to connect the new recipe for marital happiness under capitalism with the old enemy, the Socialists. The trouble is here: That Mrs. Parson comes from a Catholic family, and is, so far as we know, a Catholic herself.

The utter bankruptcy of the capitalist system, so far as ability to preserve good morals among the people goes, is always shown in these recurring schemes to save the disintegration of the modern family. People are reared to marry for economic advantage, and naturally in many cases it is discovered after the ceremony that no real love exists. What follows is set forth in the interminable number of divorce proceedings that swell the calendar of every civil court in the land.

Remedies for the divorce evil range from whipping posts for wife deserters to "trial marriages," and still the ugly situation goes on increasing.

And so we must smile—pityingly. They do not dare strike at the root. For the root of all the trouble is the capitalist system, and the capitalist system is sacred to rich prelates and congressmen's wives who are born in Wall street families. But the divorce evil will be gone once the capitalist system has been toned down far enough so that people are economically independent and free to marry for love and not for place or social advantage. The divorce evil will die out just in proportion as the system of society permits young men to dare to marry and undertake home building. There are "trial marriages" today—every city teems with the places of assignation wherein this abnormality is consummated—but the wreck that follows them, especially for womankind, is the foulest blot on our present capitalist system.

Some Errors Nailed

By A CATHOLIC

I. SOCIALISM AND PROPERTY.

It is unfortunate that in all human affairs the points at issue are often obscured by misapprehension. Some of the acrimony that has characterized discussions on Socialism has its source in misapprehension arising from a faulty historic perspective.

Like all great human movements, Socialism is a matter of growth. It has a right to insist that too much stress shall not be laid on the imperfection and mistakes in its past history. The vagaries and errors of some of its adherents, of some of its leaders, even on matters pertaining to the vital questions, do not detract from the value of its principles. In the forum of public opinion, Socialism must be judged by its present intentions and the value of its practical aims.

It is important to distinguish Socialism from some movements with which it is sometimes confounded.

Socialism is not communism. The latter is the denial of the right of private property. Socialism is based on the principle that a man has a sacred right to the product of his labor.

Property is a sacred right, but there are rights more sacred. It has important limitations which are sometimes forgotten. There are different kinds of property.

First, there is the right of a man to the product of his labor. In all ages, religion has declared it a "heaven crying" sin to deprive a laborer of his just compensation. Yet even this kind of property has a moral limitation. It must not be used to the detriment of others.

Secondly, there is the property in land and the resources of nature. This right is limited by the right of every one to use the gifts of God, the common heritage of the children of Adam. Every state has the right of "eminent domain." A man's property in land is exclusive only against another individual, but must give way to common right of all. The joint owners have a right to insist that the resources of nature shall be used in such a way as to bring the greatest returns to society.

Thirdly, there is the right to the services of others. In the complex economic organization of society this is the most extensive form of private property. It has a vital limitation. In extent it ought not to exceed the value of the service rendered in return. Can a man render a service that shall entitle him to the extent of millions of dollars to the services of his fellow men and their children? Can a mature man lay a moral claim on the service of his fellows, because his father accumulated a million?

These are some of the fundamental limitations of property that Socialism is emphasizing. It denounces the present economic system because it does not recognize these limitations and because it is based on many of the ruthless exploitations of the ignorant and the poor.

Social discontent is justified. The demand that economic conditions shall be governed by the principles of justice may to some seem utopian, but deserves the hearty approval of every Christian.

II. SOCIALISM AND GOVERNMENT.

Socialism must be distinguished from anarchism. Anarchism denies the right of government and seeks to destroy it. Socialism makes government the supreme agent to accomplish social reforms necessary to preserve the economic rights of individuals.

Therefore, it is today represented by a strong political party in every civilized country.

But what have economics to do with politics? Everything.

A learned jurist assures us that there is a vital correspondence between the economic conditions of a people and its political institutions.

When De Tocqueville, in the middle of the last century, made a study of American institutions, he came to the conclusion that political equality was the outgrowth of the equal distribution of wealth then existing in the United States.

Those conditions no longer exist today.

Dr. Spahr, as a result of his analysis of the census returns of 1890, came to the conclusion that seven-eighths of the American people owned only one-eighth of the property.

Thomas Spearman, a noted corporation lawyer, and an able economist, stated in the Forum in 1889, that the United States was practically owned by 250,000 people, and he predicted that in thirty years it would be owned by 25,000.

A New York financial journal stated in 1902 that the "steel trust", which represents one-twelfth of the nation's wealth, is controlled by twenty-four men.

Robert Hunter in his work "Poverty in the United States" assures us that ten million American citizens are unable to procure sufficient food, sufficient clothes, and suffi-

cient shelter.

It is not necessary to multiply quotations. These are typical of the present economic conditions.

If we look on the political side of the question, the outlook is not assuring. In his book on Constructive Democracy, Dr. Smythe speaks of the following four evils that threaten our institutions.

1. The abuse of the colossal power of monopoly to rob consumer and producer.

2. The monstrous corruption in business and political life.

3. The ominous strife between employer and employee.

4. The misery and hopelessness of those who on account of new methods in business and industry are unable to procure profitable employment.

On all sides we hear the question "What is the remedy?" Every one applauds the vociferous cry of President Roosevelt for "a square deal". Judge Grosscup of Chicago, who is not a Socialist, states that our free institutions are doomed unless we secure to every citizen "an equality of opportunity."

But how shall it be done? Some say, "Do nothing." "Let things alone." "*Laissez Faire*" as the French say. They are not Socialists. Socialists insist that something should be done; that it should be done by the government of the people, for the people, and by the people; that economic conditions should be so controlled as to secure the greatest return to society, so that every worker shall receive full value for the product of his labor, so that everyone shall have an equal opportunity to labor.

To secure their aims, they propose two things. First, the legal enforcement of the collective ownership of the resources of nature. Secondly, the public management

of the agencies of production and distribution.

Can these two things be accomplished? and how?

These two are the only questions that Socialism has to answer.

III. SOCIALISM AND RELIGION.

The aim of Socialism is economic justice, its methods are political. The legal enforcement of the collective ownership of natural resources and the public management of the agencies of production and distribution are the means proposed.

"But," say some of the opponents of Socialism, "how about the church, the family, personal liberty?"

Socialism is not inimical to the integrity of the family. It insists that conjugal relations should not be based on sordid considerations, but on a free choice based on affection. The rational aim of matrimony is the rearing of healthy children, healthy physically and morally. It cannot be accomplished without the permanent and loving co-operation of both parents. Socialism does not in any way interfere with the moral and religious basis of matrimony. It seeks to give it a firm economic basis. Its strongest argument is that many a father, in spite of unremitting toil, is not able to provide properly for his wife and immature children, especially if he has followed the Christian ideal so strenuously advocated by President Roosevelt. How

many parents are not anxious about the future prospects of their daughters, either as wives, or as independent workers without compensation sufficient to secure them against want and temptation?

Socialism is not opposed to religion. If there are some Socialists who do not believe in revealed religion, there are more opponents of Socialism who violate the moral teachings of religion in private, business and public affairs; who have no respect for the authority of the church; who have no faith in her doctrines; and who relentlessly persecute her if she is not subservient to their selfish interests. The difficulties in Europe arising from the historic association of ecclesiastical and political affairs cannot arise in this country where the church is free. There can be no serious danger to the church in a co-operative commonwealth, where men will be free to associate and devote their means to the promotion of scientific, literary, social, political, or religious aims.

Socialism is not opposed to personal liberty, but would add to it economic liberty. It leaves everyone free choice as to the manner and extent of his labor, and secures him in the enjoyment of its fruits. It seeks to make every citizen responsible for the welfare of his fellows, and gives him a voice in the management of the common interests. It does not aim at equality of station, or equality of possession, but equality of opportunity.

No wonder the Milwaukee *Free Press* has editorial paroxysms when the Social-Democrats can increase their percentage of the total vote in Milwaukee county without the aid of a single daily newspaper. What would become of the old capitalist parties if it were not for the daily

papers and the capitalistic campaign dough! The *Free Press* scolds Gen. Bragg and some Eastern capitalist newspapers for getting frightened at the advancing wave of Socialism, but by all the signs the *Free Press* is not without its tremors!

Self-Made or Luck-Made?

By INDEX

If the real lives of our proud "self-made" men of this country were searched, too many of them, we are afraid, would have to be put in the "luck" class, for riches do not always go to the scheming and thoughtful. Often we meet with ex-rich men, who once downed by some unlucky circumstance or mistake are seen to be incapable of rising again, in spite of all their smartness and knowledge of the capitalist game. One of the early millionaires of this country once told how he got up in the world. The story was told by the millionaire himself to the some-time editor of the *Knickerbocker Magazine*, and has been retold later in a recent issue of the *New York Sun*. And this was the millionaire's story:—

"I should be as poor as a church rat, but for one incident in my life. I had come from the backwoods of New York and a dollar looked like a big sum to me. I was a raw and struggling young lawyer, and paid four dollars a week for my board and washing, and found it hard to make both ends meet. It looked as if I should starve at the law, so I was looking for work outside of it.

"Just then a friendly lawyer in the office where I had desk room said to me: 'Here's a chance for you to buy a farm, Bixby. I want to sell it to close up the estate. You can have it at the appraised value, \$200. I think you will be able to get more for it in time.'

"No, thank you,' said I; 'I have no money.'

"But,' said he, 'I will take your note for it, and renew it till you sell it.'

"The upshot was that I took his advice, and gave him my note for \$200 for the farm. I felt very nervous about giving my note for such a large amount, and once offered to sell the farm back to him for the note. But after two or three renewals of the note New York had grown so fast northward that I was able to sell a small part of the farm for more than enough to pay the note and interest and taxes. The rest of the farm was then free and clear, and if I had kept it all I should now be worth about \$7,000,000. As it is, I have sold parcels of it that have brought me more than \$1,500,000 in cash, and I value what I have left at two or three times as much—all made out of nothing, by giving a note for \$200, almost against my will, and when I was practically not worth a dollar."

In this millionaire (Bixby's) case it was a lucky speculation in land. In many another case it is a lucky and chance investment in some manufacturing affair that has the luck to "catch on." Unsuccessful enterprises are often financed by men who are really much smarter. In fact all investment is the taking of the gambler's chance, the sure-thing investment being parallel to the sure-thing game of the gambler who has the cards stacked. Leave the element of chance out and your "self-made" men would most of them be in the poverty list.

The Motives of Men

By ROBERT BLATCHFORD

Non-Socialists are in the habit of saying that Socialism demands a complete change in human nature. They say Socialism is very pretty in theory, but that it is wrong because human nature is not good enough for Socialism. They tell us that we Socialists are mistaken because we have built up a scheme without first considering human nature. They are entirely mistaken.

The fact is that we Socialists have studied human nature, and that our opponents only object to Socialism because they do not understand human nature at all.

"Socialism," say these critics, "is impossible, because it would destroy the incentive of gain." The incentive of gain!

And then they quote the dogma of the political economist:

"The social affections are accidental and disturbing elements in human nature, but avarice and the desire of progress are constant elements."

Avarice, they say, is a constant element of human nature, and they proceed to build up what they foolishly call "a science" of human affairs upon this one single element. They ignore the second element, "The desire of progress," and the only conclusion we can come to, after reading their stupid books and shallow articles, is the conclusion that they recognize avarice, that is love of money, as the ruling passion of mankind.

The last refuge of Gradgrind, when he is beaten by Socialistic argument, is the assertion that human nature is incapable of good.

But this is not true. Men instinctively prefer light to darkness, love to hate, and good to evil.

The most selfish man would not see a fellow creature die or suffer if he could save him without personal cost or risk.

Only a lunatic would wantonly destroy a harvest or poison a well, unless he might thereby reap some personal advantage.

It is clear, therefore, that men will do good for its own sake; but they will not do evil except with the hope of gain. And this may be said of the lowest and the basest types of mankind.

Major Burke, of the Wild West, told me one day that on the prairies the cowboys went about finger on trigger, ever on the qui vive for an ambush. If a leaf stirred they fired, if a twig snapped they fired; and in about five cases out of a hundred they shot an Indian.

This is the state in which men live under a competitive commercial system. It is a war. The hand of every man is against every man's hand. Men move finger on trigger, and fire at the falling of a leaf. But in a Socialistic state of society they would no more go armed and in fear of their fellow-creatures than did the Wild West cowboys in London.

It is no use arguing whether or not man is bad by nature, and without respect to circumstances. Man is a creature of circumstances.

The question asked is whether human nature is bad. We must begin by asking under what circumstances? Will a peach tree bear peaches? Yes, if planted in good

soil and against a south wall. Will a rose tree flourish? Not if you set it in an ash-heap and exclude the light and air. Is a river a beautiful and a wholesome thing? Yes, when it is fed by the mountain streams, washed by the autumn rains, and runs over a pebbly bed between grassy meadows decked with water lilies, fringed with flowering rushes, shaded by stately trees; but not when it is polluted by city sewers, stained by the refuse of filthy dye-vats and chemical works; not when its bed is slime, its banks ashes, and when the light falling upon it is the flame of forges, and the shadows those of mills, and manure works, and prisons. Is human nature sweet, and holy, and fruitful of good things? Yes. When it gets light and air and culture, such as we give to the beasts of the farm and to the lilies of the field; but when it is poisoned and perverted and defiled, when it is crushed, cursed, and spat upon, then human nature becomes bad.

We know how a man grows selfish and cruel. We know how he sinks to sottishness, to gluttony, to torpid, savage boorishness. We know we have with us vast numbers of rich and poor, of respectable and disreputable liars and rogues and beasts and dastards. Is that the fault of human nature? Or is it the fault of the evil influences that choke and poison human nature?

Gradgrind tells me that greed is the chief motor to the human heart. It has been so called by generations of shallow cynics and stupid dunces before him; and, as he never thinks for himself, he has never found out the error. But let any man look about him and think of what he sees, and I believe that he will agree with me that what phrenologists call "Love of approbation" is a hundred-fold a stronger force than

greed. What observer of life will deny this? Is it not plain to all when the eyes are opened that the desire to get praise or admiration is a stronger motive than the desire to get money? Nay, this desire to get wealth is only one out of a thousand consequences of the love of approbation. Only a miser loves money for its own sake. The great bulk of our graspers and grubbers value money for what it will bring. A few and to a small extent because it brings them luxury, ease, indulgence. A larger number, and to a greater extent, because it saves them and theirs from the risks of penury and degradation. A great preponderance, and to the widest extent, because it wins them the admiration, the wonder, the envy, and the service of their fellows.

As society is at present constituted nearly every man gets as much money as he can. What are the ordinary motives for this conduct? Plutocrat says, "I can make a fortune out of the cotton trade, and why should I not? If I don't make it some other man will; and perhaps the other man will be a rogue." You see, men cannot trust each other. Under the operation of unfettered individual enterprise, life is a scramble. A man knows he could live on less than ten thousand a year, and he knows that multitudes are hungry. But if he foregoes the making of a fortune it will not benefit the poor. Some other man will seize on what he relinquishes, and the scramble will go on. So men amass wealth because they think they might as well do it as let another do it in their stead.

There is another thing. Plutocrat will tell you he has a wife and family to provide for. He knows the world too well to leave a widow and children to the tender mercies

of his brother graspers. It is every man for himself and the weakest to the wall. So he will grind other people to make money to prevent other people from grinding his children. He is right in a great measure. It is his duty to provide for his wife and children. And under our present system of robbery and murder by individual enterprise the widow and the orphan will find none to pity and defend them—unless they can pay for value received.

Again, in a commercial era and in a commercial nation, wealth is the reward of merit, the crown of honor and the sign of virtue. Every man dreads failure.

The Gradgrind supposes greed to be the ruling passion because in the Society he knows most men strive to get money. But why do they strive to get money? There are two chief motives. One the desire to provide for or confer happiness upon children or friends; the other the desire to purchase applause. But in the first case the motive is not greed, but love; and in the second case it is not greed

but vanity.

For the sake of love, for the sake of duty, for the sake of pity, for the sake of religion, and for the sake of truth, men and women have resigned their bodies to the flames, have laid their heads upon the block, have suffered imprisonment, disgrace, and torture, and starvation. Who will do as much for money?

Money never had a martyr. In Mammon's bible the text of the Christian Bible is altered. It reads, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own life?" Men will fight for money; but they will not die for it. Now millions have died for honor, for love, for religion, for duty, for country, for fame. And how then can any sensible person stand by the base and brutish dogma that greed is the chief motor of the human heart?

It seems an amazing thing to me, this persistence in the belief that greed is the motive power of humanity. The refutation of that error is forever under our noses.

About Private Property

By FREDERIC HEATH

"It is just as well to be fair, even to the Socialists," says the editor of the *Portland Oregonian*, in an editorial on the attack on us by Archbishop Ireland, the millionaire prelate of the Roman Catholic church of America. He says that, in attacking the Socialists, Archbishop Ireland is following the usual custom with the men high up in his church, but that he gains nothing by misrepresenting his opponents. The misrepresentation consists in saying that the Socialists are opposed to private property. "It is a fundamental idea of Socialism," says the *Oregonian*, "that to every man must be accorded absolutely and indisputably the whole of what he produces by his labor. This the Socialists hold is rightfully his own property and the state sees to it that he gets it." In the main this is a correct statement and it disposes of the archbishop's charge completely. It is the exploitation of man by man that the Social-Democrats seek to stop. Under the capitalist regime the foundation facts of personal enrichment are plun-

der and the exploitation of the labor of others. If the combined labor of a certain group of men in a certain industry, working with modern machinery, produces a certain amount of wealth, capitalism gives the men a "living wage" and then divides the rest of the wealth that has been produced among the capitalist owners of the machines. The owners of the machines get the wealth and the workers get just enough to keep them going and in working condition, generally speaking. This fact led Victor Hugo to say that in modern society "we *produce* wonderfully, but we *distribute* abominably." The abominable arrangement is that the men who do the work do not get the wealth. And it will be impossible to change this so long as the machinery and forces of production remain private property. This is the kind of private property we are opposed to, and the *Oregonian* is to be thanked for trying to set the archbishop right in the matter.

But while defending us against misrepresentation, the *Oregonian*, being a capitalist newspaper, cannot see how Socialism can be practicable. "The extreme demands of Socialism will be met," it says, "and their causes removed, only by removal of the evils of which not only Socialists, but the whole body of the people, complain." Under Socialism, it says, the income of the individual would be derived from his labor and he could not make profits from trade, promote productive industry, or receive profits therefrom, and could have no personal income from other sources. Such an arrangement as Socialism comprehends is not adequate to the requirements of a complex civilization, the editor thinks.

But the present complex system—there isn't much system about it—is simply the result of capitalism. Carlisle said our modern society reminded him of a basket of vipers, each struggling to reach the top. Such a struggle is complex—and no wonder. It is essentially predatory, each one trying to better himself at the expense of his fellows, and "the Devil taking the hindmost." To the man with the capitalist mind this seems natural and proper. To us the idea of a person getting an income he does not earn with his labor is simply immoral, for an income under such conditions means loss for someone else. The players in a poker game cannot all come out ahead. No wonder present society is complex, when every man is scheming to trap his neighbor.

The Socialist sees the key to the situation in the fact that the unequal and scandalous distribution of wealth follows as a consequence of the private ownership of the machinery of production. Production is social, but its ownership is individual, therefore wrong relations exist. Right relations can only exist when the social act of producing the wealth of society shall be also socially ordered. Each individual worker cannot own the factory or shop where he is employed, the workers must own it collectively, through society. Such an ownership would stop the piling up of private fortunes at the expense of the working class. The proposition is simple. There is nothing so "impossible" in it that it need frighten anyone who honestly desires an end to the present wretched and murderous conditions of life.

Mr. Gompers' Convention

By VICTOR L. BERGER

TO understand fully the fight made by Socialistic union men in the convention of the American Federation of Labor, one must take into consideration how the convention is made up. The American Federation of Labor is a voluntary confederation of national and international unions. If a national union wants to withdraw there is really no way to force it back into the fold—especially if such a union has no “label” to boom.

For instance, the Mine Workers and the Amalgamated Iron and Steel Workers have withdrawn in the past without suffering much injury from such act. The big railroad brotherhoods are still out, and all attempts to coax them into the fold have failed so far. Of course, for unions with a “label” that depends on the patronage of other union men, a charter from the American Federation of Labor means something. And as capitalism developes, *all* unions will sooner or later be welded into one big labor organization.

Under the present conditions the national and international officers of the various unions are by far the most important element in the convention. They are usually reelected every year—some of them are even delegates by virtue of their offices. These unions have one vote for every one hundred members of their respective unions, so it can be seen that they have a large voting power. For instance, the miners' delegation has over 2,379 votes, and the carpenters have 1,637 votes. The miners' delegation has not changed more than one or two men in ten years—and the same condition prevails in most of the other unions. Now all the big unions are represented in the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, the council having enlarged whenever the occasion required it, to make this possible. It is even claimed that at least one national union is paying a per capita for 50,000 members without having the membership, in order to retain “the prestige” and the seat in the Executive Council.

Another very numerous and very influential element in the convention, is made up of the general organizers of the American Federation of Labor. They are men who are doing very necessary and very good work in the trades union movement. But they seem to find it necessary to have themselves elected to the conventions, and there they form as effective a “claque” for Mr. Gompers as any actor in a Bowery theater ever had.

These general organizers do the “hissing” and the applauding, move the “previous question,” and attend to all the other little but telling work of the machine. The general organizers depend upon Gompers, by whom they are appointed, for their living, and naturally he controls them entirely.

The third and last element are the delegates of the central bodies of states and cities, of the Federal Unions, and of unions not having a national organization. They have only one vote each. The State

Federation of the state of New York and the central body of Kenosha have the same vote.

Now, under these conditions, while we had over 313 delegates in Minneapolis, I was told that about a dozen men controlled the voting power of the convention.

It is true that as a rule the vote is simply an "aye" and "no" vote, yet everybody knows that if there was any proposition of importance, or one where the power of the executive council would come into question, a "roll call" would be demanded. And while there were a goodly number of Socialists and Socialist sympathizers in the convention, most of them did not dare to open their mouths, because they depended on favors from Gompers and the executive council—they had "axes to grind," as one of them who is a member of the party expressed it.

* * *

The principal issue in the last convention was the declaration of Gompers concerning the part that the trades unions should take in politics.

It has been the avowed policy of the American Federation of Labor not to mingle in politics—that is, on the face of it; because in reality the American Federation of Labor always was in politics head over heels.

But this time Gompers held that the policy forbidding politics in the trades unions meant that it forbids partisan politics. He said the Federation ought to go into politics on what he called non-partisan lines, which means that a unionist should vote for a Republican in one district, and for a Democrat in another.

We held that the moment a union man votes either the Republican or Democratic ticket, he is voting a partisan ticket, only he is voting for partisans of the capitalistic class, which both parties represent, standing for the existing system. In our opinion if the Federation was to go into politics at all, it was to be politics on class lines. A unionist should vote on election day just for the interests of the working class, exactly as he is working for his class in the trades unions, and this would require, since we do not want the trades unions to be used as a political machine, an independent labor party.

Gompers' position meant that we ought to get promises from the representatives of the old parties, the congressmen and other office-holders, and to support those on election day that promise most.

We declared that before election *every* capitalistic politician would promise everything, and has promised in the past, but the moment he gets to Washington, he is under the control of Joe Cannon on the Republican side, or John Sharp Williams on the Democratic side, both of whom are party whips for the capitalists. The Republican or Democratic congressman could not do anything for labor even if he really tried. Therefore we told Mr. Gompers, if he only wanted promises, he could get all he wanted.

Gompers then made personal attacks upon the writer.

He picked up a statement that appeared in the *Social - Democratic Herald* in December last year, describing him as a "self-complacent old fool," and he tried to make the most out of that

phrase instead of answering our arguments. Gompers vehemently charged the Socialists with trying to disrupt the trades unions, and, of course, the whole crowd of his supporters applauded. He had not only the advantage of a good "claque," but as the last man to speak—he always is—he was allowed to take practically all the time he desired for his speech, without anybody troubling himself about making a motion to suspend the rules. In fact he held the entire convention after the time of adjournment had arrived, just to listen to his harangue. The whole affair was not only very undignified and actor-like, but a keen observer could notice all afternoon how the scenery was being built up. Yet it was unnecessary, since Gompers had the votes and the crowd with him to begin with, and he could well afford to be dignified. But it appeared as if Gompers wanted to show the world, and especially the reporters present, that he was the czar and the omnipotent ruler of the American Federation of Labor.

* * *

I will give Gompers credit for several things, though. He is changing his position, and not only so far as the participation in politics is concerned. For instance, he was always considered a "craft autonomist", who believed that every national union had jurisdiction over its craft only. But this time when Victor L. Berger's resolutions in favor of industrialism came up, he took special pains to explain that he was not a craft autonomist, and that most, if not all national unions, are more or less based on industrial lines and comprised all kinds of crafts working in that industry.

And Gompers had mighty good reasons for changing his position on the question of craft autonomy.

The big and strong unions are swallowing the smaller and weaker organizations in spite of all the American Federation of Labor can do.

A striking example is that of the carpenters who at this convention benevolently assimilated the woodworkers, although all decisions of the Federation during the last ten years were in favor of the woodworkers. But the carpenters swallowed them up by sheer strength.

So it is clear that we are bound to get "industrialism" of some sort. There is a tendency toward the formation of a huge labor trust. This cannot be stopped. It will come, without question. Now we want to bring about this inevitable unification of labor forces by civilized and constructive methods, instead of by a continuous warfare and jurisdiction fights.

Therefore we want some sort of plan of industrial organization of the trades unions. We do not care particularly by what plan this is brought about. We proposed a plan to the convention, which was to create allied trades councils and to have interchange of union cards, but we do not insist that this is the only plan.

But the entire idea was opposed and voted down by the wizards in convention assembled, because it was supposed to be "Socialistic"; although as a matter of fact Socialism has no more to do with "industrialism" than it has with "craft autonomy." Such questions are purely trades union matters.

Victor L. Berger.

Morals and Capitalism

By WAYFARER

Says a Milwaukee preacher, who holds forth from a "people's" pulpit supported by the corporation scalawags of the city, "Vice and its correlative, poverty, are still in evidence. No prosperity can eradicate the misery which depraved life brings upon the innocent." So it is vice that makes poverty? We always supposed the reason the working class had to live in poverty was because the capitalist system did not permit them to keep the wealth they create. Or, in other words, that under the capitalist wage system the wage to labor is too small for labor to buy back the things it itself produces. But this capitalist preacher says vice is at the bottom of poverty. If there were no vice, then, would the working class be the rich class, as in all justice it ought to be? Would ten hours' hard work in a factory mean that the worker's family would dress in silks and ride in automobiles? There are lots of men who do not work at all, unless traveling for pleasure or clipping coupons may be called work, and yet whose families live in superabundance, and if this class has a superabundance out of the common store without work, wouldn't it follow that many others get less than a necessary abundance, with almost all members of the family out as bread earners? The great social question is up for discussion and cannot be dodged. Trying to lay the fault of poverty at the door of vice is not a very honest thing to do, but then we have never considered this particular preacher a very honest man.

Here's a woman accused by the police with poisoning three children to get their insurance. Here's a Denver girl accused of running down a man on the street with her automobile and refusing to let him be taken to the hospital in the auto for fear his blood would stain her finery and the man dying while waiting for a regular ambulance to be secured. Here's a lot of more leading business men arrested for gigantic land frauds out West by which the people at large were despoiled. Here's a report that manufacturers and jobbers in adulterated, painted and tainted foods are scrambling to work off the poisonous stuff on the people before the new pure food laws go into effect. And so on. Pick up any paper and this is the sort of thing you see.

The heart is taken out of vast numbers of people by the sharpness of the struggle for existence under capitalism. A daily newspaper is a daily record of crime, of deceit, of sharp practice and of demoralization. It is a picture of human degradation, and it is all because we live under a system that stifles the good impulses and develops the bad. The capitalist mouthpieces lay it all to human nature and say that human nature must be changed before we can have Socialism or any perfect form of society.

It is a gross libel. Human nature is all right. It is the system that is wrong. And that we are going to change.

A probate judge up for re-election in Kansas City told the voters he had saved many a small estate from despoilment. From despoilment! Why should anyone want to despoil widows and orphans? But this judge talks about it as if it was a very common thing, which, in fact, it is. Where is the peace on earth, good will toward men? There is none. There is none because under the capitalist system there is always the incentive to despoil. The predatory instinct is always uppermost. Socialists want a change in the system. They want a system under which the promptings will be for good instead of for evil, where the incentive for wolfishness will be absent. And we do not want to change human nature, either. We want to give human nature a chance to really be human. When it pays to be good, human nature can afford to be good. There is good human nature today, but it is good *in spite of the capitalist system.*

Indignation has been aroused in Chicago by the action of the telephone company, now out after a new franchise, forcing its hello girls to hustle among men residents of the city for signatures to petitions in favor of the granting of the new rights. The prettiest employees are picked out for this degrading service and forced to make themselves agreeable to men in public places under penalty of losing their chance to earn bread and butter. It is only another evidence of the fact that capitalism is preeminently the "dirty bird that befouls its own nest," for in its mad greed for profits it is willing to tear down womankind, blight the home, and pollute the race. Nothing is too sacred for its leprous hands to clutch at.

The curator of the Milwaukee public museum says it is not practicable to maintain a coin collection on exhibition as it would form a continuous temptation to those in "desperate financial straits." Trying to "knock" the capitalist system, again! It's a fine system of society that produces "desperate financial straits" in the midst of loudly vaunted prosperity!

Under the capitalist system people live a sort of topsy-turvy justice. The workers are the poor and the shirkers are the rich, and the shorter work-hours go to the workers who have the least hard jobs and the longest hours of labor are required where the work conditions are most dangerous—the Panama canal, for instance. Oh, the capitalist system is a most moral affair!

The *Ohio Penitentiary News* has been suspended after a career of many years. The reason for the suspension is that there is not a single printer in the penitentiary at the present time to set the type. On the other hand there are said to be plenty of bankers, lawyers, brokers, and other "eminently respectables" in the institution.

The German Social-Democratic parliamentary group has just celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. Of the seventy-eight men now in parliament, Comrades Singer, Dietz, Frohme and Stolle are the only members who have served continuously since Socialism first invaded the reichstag. Bebel would be included, but he was out of service three years while in prison.

Facts From the Inside

From "APPLETONS"

One of the worst blotches on our modern civilization is the private detective agency which makes a specialty of supplying strike breakers and armed thugs to capitalists when they have dirty work to be done during labor conflicts. A writer in *Appleton's Magazine* for October who is said to be an American representative of the Scotland Yards detective force, has the following to say as information from the inside, on the private detective system that flourishes in manufacturing centers in this country:

"There is another phase of the private detective evil which has worked untold damage in America. This is the private constabulary system, by which armed forces are employed during labor troubles. It is a condition akin to the feudal system of warfare, when private interests can employ troops of mercenaries to wage war at their command.

"Ostensibly, these armed private detectives are hurried to the scene of the trouble to maintain order and prevent destruction of property, although this work should always be left to the official guardians of the peace. That there is a sinister motive back of the employment of these men has been shown time and again. Have you ever followed the episodes of a great strike and noticed that most of the disorderly outbreaks were so guided as to work harm to the interests of the strikers? It is not going too far to state that many of the great strikes have been lost to the workers because after a time public sympathy and support were withdrawn. And this change of public senti-

ment invariably follows the alleged lawless and violent acts of the strikers. Therefore, instead of preventing these acts, it is to the interest of the employers that they should occur.

"In this, perhaps, lies usually the reason why private detectives are brought on the scene. Before every duty to the public as a whole, their duty consists in bringing the result desired by their employers—that is, breaking the strike. Time and again it has been shown that private detectives employed every effort, fair or foul, to accomplish this end by turning the public against the strikers. Private detectives, unsuspected in their guise of workmen, mingle with the strikers and by incendiary talk or action sometimes stir them up to violence.

"In one of the greatest of our strikes, that involving the steel industry, over two thousand armed detectives were employed supposedly to protect property, while several hundred more were scattered in the ranks of strikers as workmen. Many of the latter became officers in the labor bodies, helped to make laws for the organizations, made incendiary speeches, cast their votes for the most radical movements made by the strikers, participated in and led bodies of the members in the acts of lawlessness that eventually caused the sending of state troops and the declaration of martial law. While doing this, these spies within the ranks were making daily reports of the plans and purpose of the strikers. To my knowledge, when lawlessness was at its height, and murder ran riot, these men wore little

patches of white on the lapels of their coats that their fellow-detectives of the "two thousand" would not shoot them down by mistake.

"In no other country in the world, with the exception of China, is it possible for an individual to surround himself with a standing army to do his bidding in defiance

of law and order. The conditions I have outlined could never under any circumstance obtain in England. During labor troubles the government looks after the policing, and under no circumstances permits the meddling of private detectives."

On We March!

By WATCHMAN

Gen. Bragg has been speaking out in meeting again. He declares that the Democratic party has vanished north of the Mason and Dixon line, and that Socialism is in the air. It was Bragg who electrified the country when Cleveland was nominated the first time by declaring in the convention that the people loved him for the enemies he had made. The old Iron brigade commander has just returned from his consulate in South America. He has evidently kept posted. Thus he says: "The fact that Hearst was given such a tremendous vote in New York state *indicates clearly to me that Socialism has a greater hold on the American people than the conservative element has ever dreamed of before.* The New York election shows that Socialism is a thing to be reckoned with. Money controls government. We will never have relief until we send men to congress whose skulls are thick enough on top to protect their brains from the heat reflected by the shine of gold. The remedy is in the hands of the voter. I am almost forced to the conclusion that we have not the capacity for self-government. WHAT HAS EVERY INVESTIGATION INTO THE DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT REVEALED? EV-

ERY DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATED HAS BEEN SHOWN TO BE HONEYCOMBED WITH GRAFT AND CORRUPTION." And then the old man added, by way of hedging on the effect of his words, that government ownership would mean still more officials to watch, which is certainly a danger against which the people must also be watchful so long as capitalist parties, without civil service, fill the offices. "But I want to say," he added, as if the thought that was uppermost in his mind could not be kept under cover, "that when you consider the effort that was required to defeat Hearst, the personal influence of Pres. Roosevelt, and that speech of Root's charging Hearst with the murder of McKinley, you cannot escape the conclusion *that Socialism has a tremendous hold on the American people.*" Such an utterance is a sign of the times, surely, especially as it is from a man who does not believe in Socialism, one who has become petrified in the old time doctrines of the Democratic party. Compare the present with only a few years back and then ask yourself if Social-Democracy is not clearly the irrepressible question of the present age.

The Social-Democrats of France have just held their congress at Limoges. A great white streamer was stretched across the hall over the platform reading "Workmen of all the World, Unite." There were 289 delegates, representing sixty-nine federations. M. Jaures spoke on the general political situation. He said that if Clemenceau was in earnest in his radical program the Socialists would help him to realize it, and would help him vote the funds for the new Ministry of Labor. His remarks were warmly commended by Guesde. The debate on trade unionism came on during the second day. Jaures said co-operation with the unions should be an easy matter. Political action was necessary in order to achieve the final victory. Surely the unions could not hope to gain it by the general strike. He also appealed to the congress not to leave the peasant proprietors of France to their fate. Guesde said he did not deny the efficiency of the trade unions, but trade unionism was not all sufficient. What they had to fight was the wage system and they would have to have recourse to political methods. A motion by Jaures to the effect that the trade unions and the Social-Democratic movement should travel hand in hand, each having its particular part to play, was carried, 148 to 130 were in favor of a motion of Guesde which held to much the same thing but insisted that they must not be allowed to oppose themselves, the one to the other. A committee was appointed to draw up a declaration for the country districts, following a discussion of the agricultural question. A resolution was passed in favor of the general strike as a means of thwarting war. The utmost harmony prevailed, showing that the former

division in the party are now completely ended.

In Paris, the other day, there was an election to fill a vacancy in the national chamber of deputies, and of the five candidates in the field only one did not claim to be either a radical Socialist or an independent Socialist, or something of the sort. The regular party Socialist led on the first ballot and was elected on the second. He is a leather worker.

Says the *Cleveland Citizen*: One of the most surprising facts in connection with the growth of Socialism that has come to our notice is the information that the *Citizen* has received from a student in the college of the City of New York to the effect that a majority of the 5,000 students in that institution are Socialists. The one live topic among the students is Socialism. There are a number of clubs in existence and books, papers and pamphlets are widely circulated.

The *Chicago Tribune* is getting bewildered. In one column it writes editorials to show that the Socialists can never amount to anything as a major party, and in another urges a change in the voting system to count the Socialists out before they can get strong in the legislature.

Hanna said that the time was near at hand when the fight would be between the Republicans and Social-Democrats. In Milwaukee the fight has already taken on that phase.

Some rather dizzy "official" returns from Wisconsin counties are being printed in the daily papers. In some instances the real official returns give us a third more and sometimes double the votes of the "official" reports in the press.

The Canadian trades unionists, in convention at Vancouver, B. C., have endorsed the Socialist party. It was at first planned to form an

independent labor party, but wiser counsel prevailed.

It must have been a bitter pill to Gompers to have to sit and listen to the British fraternal delegate to the A. F. of L. convention tell what great things had been accomplished through the Socialist movement in England.

A Socialist monthly in the Japanese language will be started soon on the Pacific coast.

Shots at Capitalism

The American conscience is threatened with fatty degeneration.

The American heart is beating too rapidly to stand the pace.

The American brain is awirl with money-madness.

These three complications are the principal ones which make up Americanitis, a disease with which the nation is suffering at present.

Speaking as a doctor I should say this is a very complicated disease. I find, as I lay my hand upon the patient's heart, that it is beating with abnormal rapidity. It cannot keep up that pace very long.

I find extreme nervousness and restlessness. The American does not walk, he runs. When he eats he does not masticate. It is no wonder men who are dying long before they grow old are traveling around trying to keep the spark of life in their bodies. In one block not far from where I am standing are 34 widows whose husbands burned out their nerve force and hearts by overwork.

There is another complication in this disease of the nation. As I examine the conscience I find a strange sluggishness. It does not

respond to the touch. It seems to be threatened with fatty degeneration. And it is not surprising when one considers all the terrible recent exposures of graft and dishonesty among insurance companies, among the packers, among the railroads. One does not know where to look for absolute integrity. Graft of all kinds seems to abound—commercial graft, educational graft, political graft and medical graft. But back of the other complications of Americanitis is the trouble with the brain. The American head is turned on the question of greed and gain. Without question we are getting money mad. Gold is our great besetting sin. The simple fact is that unless some cure is speedily found, the nation will perish.

Dr. John Balcom Shaw.

Almost fabulous in their extent are the figures made public November 22, 1906, by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the earnings of the American railroads for the year ending June 30, 1906.

This was in the nature of a preliminary report on the income account of the railways of the country, and it covers returns for railway companies operating 220,026.44 miles of lines. These include the lines operated under trackage rights, or about 99 per cent of the mileage that will be covered by the final report on the statistics of railways for the year. The total gross earnings of the roads as shown in the report under consideration were \$2,319,760,030, being equivalent to \$10,543 per mile; passenger earnings were \$618,555,934, or \$2,811 per mile, and freight earnings \$1,640,942,862, or \$7,458 per mile. Operating expenses were \$1,532,163,163, or \$963 per mile. The net earnings of the roads were \$787,596,877, being \$3,850 per mile, and nearly \$97,000,000 more than the corresponding amount reported for the previous year. The amount reported as income from sources other than operation was \$132,624,982. This amount includes a few duplications due to the method of accounting followed by certain of the carriers. Adding this amount to net earnings from operation gives \$920,221,859. Against this amount were charged as interest, rents, betterments, taxes and miscellaneous items, the sum of \$590,386,554, and as dividends the sum of \$229,406,598, leaving a surplus for the year of \$100,428,707. The taxes paid during the year were \$68,903,288. The final report of the year ended June 30, 1905, showed a surplus of \$89,043,490. The amount of dividends declared in 1906 was \$34,248,605 more than that shown for the dividends of practically the same roads in 1905. This preliminary report relates to operating roads only, and does not include the statements of any dividends paid by leased lines

from the income they received as rent. The dividends declared by the subsidiary released lines for the year 1905 were about \$35,750,000. Where does our American sovereign, Mr. Wage Slave, come in?—*St. Louis Labor.*

A report on the conditions of living among the poor of this country in a recent bulletin of the Department of Commerce and Labor, contains this startling observation deduced from the facts and figures contained in the report:

"After the rent has been paid and food has been bought the very poor have but little left for anything else."

The figures in the report are not taken from pauper families but from those of workmen's families where every effort at thrift and economy is made, and where the wife and children work as hard as they can to help keep the wolf from the door. In America where the people are "free", where there is plenty of room for the oppressed of the world to "grow up with the country", and where every native boy has a "chance" to be president, we have now reached the period of our proud prosperity and development toward a people's government when thrifty, hardworking people merely exist, with no hope for the future and a consciousness of no participation in the wonderful increase of wealth all about them—wealth that increases because there is a working class to make it increase.

This is the situation, and if it were inevitable, if it were unpreventable, the common crowd would probably manage to put up with it. It IS preventable; it is NOT inevitable and hence the mighty unrest, and the demand of the people

that the system be altered and that there be a new deal.

They demand a new deal in which every worthy living soul shall have the chance to live decently and without having to bear the terrible burden of the support of the modern capitalistic parasitism.

Hence: Social-Democracy!

Upton Sinclair has met the "worker with the capitalist mind," as what Socialist has not? He thus describes him:

"You would begin talking to some poor devil who had worked in one shop for the last thirty years, and had never been able to save a penny; who left home every morning at six o'clock, to go tend a machine, and came back at night too tired to take his clothes off; who had never traveled, never had an adventure, never learned anything, never hoped anything—and when you started to tell him anything about Socialism he would sniff and say, 'I'm not interested in that—I'm an individualist!' And then he would go on and tell you that Socialism was 'paternalism,' and that if ever it had its way the world would stop progressing. It was enough to make a mule laugh to hear arguments like that; and yet it was no laughing matter as you found out—for how many millions of poor deluded wretches there were, whose lives have been so stunted by capitalism that they no longer knew what freedom was! And they really thought that it was 'individualism' for tens of thousands of them to herd together and obey the orders of a steel magnate, and produce hundreds of millions of dollars of wealth for him, and then let him give them libraries; while for them to take the industry,

and run it to suit themselves, and build their own libraries—that would be 'paternalism!'"

Juneau, (Wis.) *Independent*: The searchlight of investigation was recently turned onto the operators of the tobacco trust in some of the Southern states, especially in Georgia. The facts resulting from this investigation are appalling. The investigation shows conclusively that the American Tobacco Co., of which James B. Duke is president, is the absolute master of the tobacco industry in this country and is rapidly becoming an international affair. From the plant in the field to the finished product, there is not one person connected with the tobacco industry but is compelled to pay tribute to this trust. In the tobacco fields of Georgia, where the work of harvesting the crop is done by women and children, this trust is guilty of crimes of the most atrocious character. From the report of the investigation it is evident that the tobacco trust is, if possible, more avaricious than John D.'s oil trust. One cannot read this report without fully realizing that the trust question is one of the great questions before the people today. It is not remarkable, when such conditions exist as are depicted in this report, that there are many who have already reached that point where faith in the present order of things ceases, and doubt takes up the trail.

Bishop Potter says the founders of this country had no right to expect that no caste would develop in America, and that is was a "grotesque" expectation. It was grotesque, wasn't it! To expect that the capitalist system could go on robbing the many and loading

up the few with economic power and yet not stratify society, was a funny expectation. Still the Revolutionists of 1776 were courageous according to their lights. They met the big problem of political injustice that confronted them and they certainly thought that their descendants would inherit enough spunk and humanity to tackle the other problems when they developed to the right importance. However, it took the colonists some time to get ready to tackle *their* problem, and even to the last they did not expect to do as much as they did when they really got down to business. The present time is a sort of making-ready time, and we may yet honor our American ancestry by proving to be as much the right kind of revolutionists for our time as they were the right kind for theirs.

A little group of Socialists in Oakland, Cal., are preparing to issue a small paper devoted to Social-Democratic propaganda among Uncle Sam's soldiers and sailors. They can be addressed at 528 Telegraph avenue, Oakland. In a prospectus they say among other things: "Do you realize that there exists in the United States today two of the most feudalistic institutions in the world? We refer to the United States Army and the United States Navy. The discipline in these two institutions is such as to render them the most powerful and at the same time the most servile tools in the hands of the capitalist class. It is simply appalling to contemplate the damage these two institutions could do the working class in case the present revolution assumed a violent aspect. The men composing the rank and file of the army and navy are trained to MURDER without the slightest

provocation, merely on command of their officers—and often without that command, if they think their orders received from headquarters require them to do so."

"Many a foreigner, living on our side streets, in what our reformers call poverty, graduates into business which gives him independence, the fruit of his years of simple self-denial." So says one of our preachers. Did you ever notice that such men are careful never to picture a man becoming wealthy on mere wage labor! In all such cases of alleged workingmen getting rich it is always by means of alleged savings put out at speculation or put into trade! But as to the quotation above, it is arrant misrepresentation—unless he is referring to the saloon business, and even that business produces a good many failures. The real fact is that, while the ranks of the small tradesmen keep filled up, it is only because new victims venture into the places made by the many who are unsuccessful. The proletariat is full of men who have staked their all in little stores and then been forced to the wall.

Pierpont Morgan told a Chicago reporter that the "prevailing prosperity" would continue "unless some agitator is successful in arousing public clamor and public passion against the property interests of the country." But how public clamor could be aroused if the people were really sharers in the "prosperity", he conveniently neglected to state.

By the way, the Social-Democrats of Wisconsin have elected a "walking delegate" to the state legislature. Now what has capitalism to say!



THE COUNTESS OF WARWICK.