

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. 4. MILWAUKEE, WIS., FEBRUARY, 1907. Whole Number 48.

The Month's Story.

A Socialist Countess In our frontispiece of this issue we give the portrait of one of the world's greatest women, Lady Warwick, the Socialist countess.

We have not yet heard of any English lord who is devoting his time to sawing off the bough of the social tree on which he is comfortably seated. But women, as a rule, are more inclined to self-sacrifice. The Countess of Warwick, unblinded by her class interests, has thrown all the weight of her rank, beauty and social powers into the struggle for economic freedom. She has well earned the title of "the most ardent Socialist in England."

Lady Warwick was born in 1861, and in 1881 married Lord Brooke, who succeeded to the title of Earl of Warwick in 1893. Lady Warwick was distinguished for her beauty and her charities. She served on the board of poor law guardians. She founded a college for training the daughters of professional men in horticulture, dairy, bee and poultry keeping, etc. She founded a technical school for boys and girls. She established and still maintains a home for crippled children.

But, like all sincere and intelligent workers through private charity and private benevolence, Lady Warwick at last came to see that all this was no better than dipping up the Atlantic with a teaspoon. She was clear-sighted enough to penetrate to the bottom all the woes of society. And she was honest enough to take up the fight against the system which causes them.

When several years ago, Lady Warwick came out as a clear-cut Socialist, the papers sneered at her as a woman who had taken up a silly fad which she would soon drop for some new folly. But time went on, and she did not drop Socialism. On the contrary, she devoted herself to it with increasing energy. She joined the Social-Democratic Federation. She labored for it with voice and pen. During the campaign preceding the last general election in England, Lady Warwick toured the country and spoke nightly in behalf of the Labor and Socialist candidates for seats in parliament. She had her share in the splendid triumph which sent to parliament 53 Labor representatives.

In an age of greed and selfishness, it is a joy to contemplate such a character. Here is a splendid specimen of the social con-

science. Here is a woman, unbribed by self-interest and class privilege, who sets the welfare of the collectivity above her own. So long life to the beautiful and noble Countess of Warwick!

And yet—and yet—somehow the thought pains. For where are the Lady Warwicks of the proletariat? Where are the Socialist working women and workingmen's wives? The women of the working class have a thousand fold more reasons for cursing the present system than have their husbands and brothers. Why are they silent?

The yoke on their necks is too heavy. It strangles their throats till their voices come only in whispers. It bows their heads so that they cannot look upward or forward.

The workingman's wife—the slave of a slave, as Blatchford has well said—lives under economic conditions fully five hundred years behind those of her husband. While his work is social and done by machinery, she performs nearly the same labor process as did her great-great-great-grandmother, twenty generations back. Cooking and scrubbing are much the same as they were in those days. And as for her general condition, in many cases she works harder and gets worse food than did the black slaves of the South before the Civil war.

The women wage-workers, on the other hand, are mostly a part of the modern industrial system. But can we expect agitators from these dragged-out, leaden-eyed, anemic slaves, utterly crushed by low wages and long hours? The heaviest end of the capitalist system weighs on them. It is much to ask of physical human nature, that these shall throw off such a terrible incubus, and rise up as the world's emancipators.

And nevertheless just from these we may get some of our best agitators. Women have a stronger motive even than their own wrongs for joining the Socialist movement. The wrongs of her children may rouse the most cowed woman worker. "The wren, the most diminutive of birds, will for her offspring fight against the owl."

The capitalist system is eating up the lives of little children and destroying their future. When the mother heart of our proletarian women understand this, we may expect from them some of our most impassioned agitators—more "ardent Socialists" than even the Countess of Warwick.

* * *

A Child Suicide A child suicide! Consing fact for our social system than society sometimes driveing one—that the present state of this awful and astounds even children to suicide?

Is there any more damnder it well. The little cold hands crossed on the breast, that should be busy with happy play. The young eyes forever closed that have seen so little of the world, and found that little so evil.

Such a case occured in Milwaukee a couple of weeks ago. Pretty little Erma, aged fourteen, was employed in a department store. She had always been a good little girl, modest, quiet and dutiful to her mother. One day she received a letter which her mother opened and read. It was couched in the vilest language and arranged a rendez-

vous for the child with a young man. The mother, horror-stricken, carried the letter to the police.

While she was gone, the little girl went to the neighboring school to bid her younger brother good-bye, then bought carbolic acid, and locked herself in her room. When her mother returned, her little daughter was a corpse.

A ruined child of fourteen! Can these things be? Is this a land of civilized human beings, or is it hell?

Why was this lamb turned out among the wolves, at an age when she should have been at home under a mother's protection and guidance? Why were these innocent feet, and this child's heart pure as the snowflakes, sent to the moral contamination of life in a department store?

Because capitalism needed her. Because it wanted to grind its profits out of the poor little body, which now lies in a suicide's grave. Because her labor was CHEAP.

And every day the power of capitalism is tearing the little ones out of their homes. And still, in one form or another, the slaughter of the innocents goes on.

Fathers and mothers, what do you think of this story?

Does it give you only a passing shudder? Or will you register a solemn vow that from this day on you will do *all within your power* to overthrow this modern Moloch which feeds on the bodies and souls of the little children?

If each one of our readers will take upon himself this covenant and keep it, the blasted life of poor little Erma will be avenged.

* * *

Moral Fresh Air in The School It is a cheery sign of the times that the teachers of Wisconsin have taken up a course of studies in Socialism. And it would be a good thing if the public school teachers of all the United States would follow this bright example.

Our public school system is the finest example of a Socialist institution to which we can point today. Nevertheless, the poison germs of capitalism have entered even here. From their very school-books, from the very instructions of their teachers, our little ones are breathing in the moral bacteria of the profit system.

If the child is confined in an ill-ventilated room, he becomes physically stunted and sickly. If he is shut up in the foul odors of a false ethical system, he will become morally small and deformed.

For the future's sake, for the nation's sake, give the children air!

Half a century ago, American boys were at least fed on the ideals of democracy and freedom. On "last day," the little urchin, clad perhaps in homespun or "jeans," but with flashing eyes and shining face, declaimed Patrick Henry's burning plea for liberty or Warren's address:

"Stand! the ground's your own, my braves!"

Nowadays, most of the little proletarians would have to parody the line:

"The ground is the property of the landlord, the real estate speculator or the building loan shark, ye slaves!"

What is the ideal held up before the American boy today? Success, success, success! The lowest and most ignoble of all success—skill in stealing and hoarding money!

The pattern set to the children in our schools is the captain of industry, who at best, after fattening off the laboring class all his life, on his death-bed founds a hospital or a college—like the generous highwayman, who used to fling back a few coins to the traveler whom he had just robbed of a fat purse.

With such base standards in our public instruction, is it strange that every year presents a new set of grafters and boodlers, who have just a little too logically followed the maxim of individualism?

We are therefore right glad that the Wisconsin teachers are going to study Socialism. They will *learn to teach*. They will find better principles to present to the little ones committed to their guidance.

Not that there is any peculiar system of "Socialist ethics." That is a common notion, but a mistake.

But the Wisconsin teachers, if they really and fairly study the principles of Socialism, will find better standards than the pigish ideal of the individualist. They will never again teach their boys to admire the triumph of the one overfed big man riding on the backs of the hungry and defeated many. The child will be taught that the only worthy triumphs are those in which his brother man can share—the triumphs of the collectivity.

And so we hope that this course of studies in Socialism will be like a whiff of moral fresh air in the school-rooms of Wisconsin. If continued thoroughly, it will result in a crop of young citizens with *real* "public spirit"—the spirit of the *social conscience*.

* * *

You Are Not In It, Mr. Workman

The law factories of the various states opened up last month. The state legislatures are now in full blast, and with congress also grinding out bills as fast as it is able, we shall have our usual avalanche of new laws before the end of the season.

Well, what of it? What interest have they for the workingmen?

Did you ever take the trouble to follow a debate in congress or the legislature? If so, you must have noticed that the whole wordy war was merely the clash of opposing property interests. Different classes of property-holders, through their representatives, presented their wants and defended their claims.

But about the interests of the class without property, not one word was said.

All last winter a furious fight was waged in congress for and against the railway rate bill. Some proletarians were foolish enough to be well pleased at its passage. It had nothing more to do with them than the laws passed by the House and Senate of Mars—if that bright little planet is stupid enough to use our cumbrous form of law-making. The railway rate bill was merely a question between the big shippers and the little shippers.

The same may be said of the bills which are before the state leg-

islature and congress this winter. Even those measures which might affect the working people are not discussed from their standpoint, but from the interests of the propertied classes only. The regulation of corporations, which is now cutting so large a figure in the public view, is nothing but a middle class measure. Nobody proposes to regulate the corporations in the treatment of their employes. No, no! That would be "interfering with private business."

One exception to this rule passed the United States Senate last month. The excessive working hours of railway employes have been shortened. But the debates brought out very clearly that this was done, not for the benefit of the railway employes, but to secure the public from the risk of accidents caused by overworked engineers, brakemen and flagmen. As usual, the working class interests received no consideration.

Whose fault? Yours, Mr. Workingman. You have never taken the trouble to send representatives to congress and legislature. In the case of the railway hours bill, you actually allowed the railway kings to bulldoze you into signing remonstrances against it, and some silly railway employes even declared that they were grown men, could take care of themselves, and needed no special legislation!

They certainly will not get it just as long as they are in that state of mind.

The railway kings want special legislation, and they have got it ever since the grants of the first railway lands. Every big trust wants special legislation, and gets it. The middle class, who are trying to "curb" the trusts, wants special legislation and gets it. All the propertied interests get special legislation, because they have their representatives in the legislative bodies. The workingmen get no special legislation, because they don't want it, and because they have no representation in congress or legislature.

They don't even know that they are paying all the taxes which support this queer system of law factories for grinding out laws to please all the owners of property, big and little.

And until they understand that they are paying the piper for the other fellows to dance, they will continue to be a sort of neglected "wall-flowers" at the nation's great carnival of prosperity.

Wake up, Mr. Workingman! Send your own representatives to Washington and the state capitol. Look out for your own interests. Nobody else will give them one single thought.

* * *

Our Best Thunder Untouched

Where, but in Wisconsin, which has 6 Social-Democratic members of legislature, 18 Social-Democratic aldermen in four different cities, and 35 Social-Democratic officials all told — where, we ask, except in Wisconsin would such a governor's message be issued as that which Gov. Davidson sent to the Wisconsin legislature last month? A message recommending laws to end all public service franchises in 1930? That no new franchises be given for more than twenty years? Calling for an income tax? For legislation permitting cities and villages to establish public utilities or to acquire them by the right of eminent domain? And stipulating that the

value of franchises shall not be included in the purchase price?

Is not this about as near to semi-Socialist measures as any American capitalistic politician ever yet came? In fact, is it not the most interesting case of "stealing socialistic thunder" which American politicians have as yet presented?

And far from regretting our stolen thunder, we are chuckling with satisfaction. We have plenty of thunder left, and by far our loudest peals are yet to come.

Moreover, we are only too glad to have Gov. Davidson and the Republican party—if they will—do a little of our preliminary work for us. Municipal Socialism will necessarily be the first step of Socialists in America. If the Republicans want to do some agitation at least along the line of municipal ownership, why, let them. We have so many other things for which to agitate, that we are quite willing to divide the labor. We are not in this movement for agitation, but for Socialism. We do not agitate just for the sake of agitation.

Therefore we say to Gov. Davidson: Come again. Our *best* "thunder" you have left untouched. Municipal ownership is not municipal Socialism.

Help yourself freely. We should like it best if you and your party or any other big party, would steal ALL our thunder, provided you would really use it.

But we have a strong fear that you and your political confreres never intended to actually use our thunder, but only to make a noise with it. Yet, even in that case, it is well that you preach the preliminary measures of Socialism, even if you have no notion of practising them.

We have lots of other work to do. Your Excellency is welcome to carry on at least a part of our propaganda.

The Social-Democrats of Wisconsin may pride themselves on being the first American Socialists to force a few semi-socialistic measures upon the capitalist parties. They are bidding against us. And at any rate, this shows that the "red spectre" is giving them a good scare!

By bringing a suit for back wages in a Milwaukee court it developed that a girl named Rosa Kobs, 16 years of age, had been taken into a house of questionable reputation ostensibly as a domestic but really for the purpose of leading her into immorality so as to make her shame a source of gain. The judge of the civil court recognized it as a case for criminal proceedings and the proprietress of the "boarding house" and an old soldier friend of her dead father, whom she had trusted to get her

employment, were placed under arrest. The capitalist regime demands a "statistically ascertainable" amount of female prostitution, and this is one of the ways in which it reaches out for its unsuspecting victims.

"Had I said that it was hard for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven I would be decried as a Socialist, but it was Jesus Christ who said it."—Bishop Mercer, at Melbourne, Australia, Church of England conference.

The Situation in France.

By Victor L. Berger.

THE Roman pontiff claims to be the vicar of Christ, and the representative of the almighty God on this earth. The Roman Catholic Church at no time since Pope Gregory VII. (1073-1085)—who was the first to formulate this dogma—has ever renounced its claim "to rule the world." The pope and his spokesmen say that they mean "spiritual rule" of course, but as they construe the word "spiritual," it includes the regulation of every function of civil life, from birth to death.

The history of the Middle ages tells us of terrible wars fought out on these lines. Untold millions of men, women and children were killed, and whole nations perished—for the greater glory of God, as they put it. The best thinkers of those ages died by the faggot or rotted away in dungeons "where no ray of the sun or of the moon ever could reach them," all for the greater glory of God and of this church.

With the invention of the printing press slowly came education and enlightenment and humanitarism, which had disappeared—or had sought refuge with the Arabs—since the church had become all-powerful. The Reformation played havoc with the power of the Roman Catholic church among Germanic nations. Changed economic conditions resulted in making the Reformation almost as much of a social revolution as it was a religious upheaval. The "church" and its adherents resisted. But the Thirty Years war (1618-1648) was the last great "religious war." It cost many millions of lives and German civilization was retarded for about 150 years. And it is significant that the Roman pope *protested* against the *treaty of peace* that put an end to it. But that was the *last* great religious war.

* * *

We recall all of this here, because without a knowledge of what happened in the past, the struggle between church and state cannot be understood.

Very few American newspaper readers realize that the Roman Catholic church has never given up its claim that the church is above the state, and that the pope is above the government, whether monarchy or republic, or whatever the form may be. The church still claims jurisdiction, not only over Catholics, but over non-Catholics as well. The church simply submits to the inevitable, because it has not the power to have things its own way.

Theoretically, the church stands today where it stood 800 years ago. If it could get back its old power, we should get back the same old conditions that we had then, which were only a little degree removed from Dante's description of Hell. But all the chants, masses, and pilgrimages in the world will not be able to bring that time back again as long as men and women will be able to *read print*, provided they are permitted to read whatever they please, and to do their own thinking.

And the church knows that. Therefore the church has always tried to control the schools and the printing press—which, by the way, the monks first described as the *invention of the Devil*. The church not only demands the right to tell what is to be taught in the schools and what is not to be taught—but it wants jurisdiction over all matter that is to be printed. The church wants the right to say what people are to print, to read, and to think. The works of Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, etc., are still on the “Index” of the books forbidden by the pope.

* * *

The result of the domination of the church we have seen during the middle ages all over Europe, but of late only in Spain, Belgium, Austria, and such parts of Italy as were under that influence up to 1860, and also in some of the South American republics.

France is a Catholic country. There are 35,377,000 Roman Catholics, and only 560,000 Protestants, and 49,000 Jews in France. The Roman Catholic religion was until now the state religion and the archbishops, bishops, and priests were paid by the state. France is subdivided into 17 church provinces, each under the rule of an archbishop. These provinces were again subdivided into 67 bishoprics, with about 50,000 priests. There were also, in 1900, about 1663 different monasteries and nunneries. So the pope has quite an army in France.

* * *

In France, atheism was always exceedingly strong ever since Voltaire, Diderot, and the Encyclopedists. The educated and professional classes are atheists, almost without exception. The masses in the large cities have grown up in the tradition of the Great French Revolution and also have no religion. The main stronghold of the church is the French peasantry, especially in districts where they are still illiterates and can neither read nor write. And its other stronghold is the women.

The Great French Revolution (1789-1795) went as much against the Roman Catholic church (which was in alliance with the monarchy) as against the Feudal system. The church at that time lost all its property—it owned over one-third of France. Some church dignitaries even lost their heads—not speaking figuratively either.

Napoleon I. tried to pacify the church by a treaty (July 15, 1801) but in 1802 he also published the so-called “organic articles” which declared the supremacy of the state over the church. This the pope rejected. The restoration of the Bourbons, in 1815, brought the church to the top again. But times had changed. In 1830 the July Revolution made an end to the Bourbon rule and to the predominance of the church. Before Louis Phillip (1830-1848) could re-establish the old relations between the church and state, the February Revolution of 1848 swept him away.

Napoleon III. (1851-1870) tried before all things to strengthen his rule by a concordat—a treaty with the pope—which was very favorable to the church, and which was based on the treaty of 1801.

After the fall of the second empire, the republicans thought that the regulation of church matters in France was an *internal affair* and

not to be settled by a treaty with a "foreign power," which the pope considered himself, being represented by an ambassador. Republican Frenchmen resented this so much the more because the church in France was strongly anti-republican and inclined to favor monarchy. Every pretender to the throne of France, from "Henry V" to "Napoleon V," and every military conspirator, from Boulanger to Mercier, found a ready ally and friend in the clerical portion of France.

* * *

The war between the Republicans and the Church began in 1884, when the government passed a law forbidding the monks and nuns to teach in the public schools of France without passing the regular examination. Since then the breach has continually widened until the separation of church and state became the watchword of French radicals and, of course, of Socialists. The great majority of the members of the last chamber of deputies were elected on that platform.

But the charge has been made that the French government is an enemy of religion and is seeking to destroy religion, and that the government has brought on the present issue to get control of a large amount of property belonging to the church. That charge is not true.

The new French law does *not* provide for the taking over of the church property by the government. It vests the control of the property in the *church membership*, as it is in Protestant denominations in this country, for instance.

This is surely not a scheme to rob the church, while it may take away such capitalist power of the bishops as the *control* of the church *property* gave him *personally*.

But the congregation must incorporate, very much the same way as in this country. The government turns over to the incorporated congregations the churches and the church property. About 2,000 priests and congregations have done so. But the majority of the priests have refused, being forbidden by the pope to comply with the law. The government, on the other hand, will keep possession of all the churches and the church property, until the congregations to take them over have been formed. This is the situation in France.

* * *

To the fair-minded American all this ought to be plain enough. We have had separation of church and state in this country from the beginning of this commonwealth. Yet all the churches, and particularly the Roman Catholic church, fared well. The Roman Catholics have not only grown in number, but their clergy much more so in influence. The pope, just a few days ago, claimed that the United States are "the great center of Catholicism in the world" and his "only consolation." Archbishop Quigley of Chicago predicted that within 20 years this country will be entirely Roman Catholic. And other church dignitaries make similar claims.

And surely they know what they are talking about. Just lately Cardinal Gibbons proved to be strong enough to stop American interference against the Belgian atrocities at the Congo—whether that

was because King "Cleopold," the biggest scoundrel and child ravisher in Europe, happens to be a Catholic and a friend of the cardinal, or whether because Gas Trust Ryan of New York received a big land grant at the Congo—we don't know.

But the same cardinal now upbraids America for lack of sympathy with the church in France. I suppose if France were a smaller country the cardinal would demand that warships be sent to France to enforce the edicts of the pope. The time may come when our church dignitaries will make such demands.

* * *

The secret of the whole matter is this: The Roman Catholic church is, of course, everywhere in the whole world the friend of the capitalists, but nowhere in the world is this alliance getting to be closer than in America. Conversions among the wealthy are nowhere as numerous as here—the Stors, who tried to get the cardinalship for Archbishop Ireland, are only one example out of many. Only in rare cases a change of religious conviction is responsible for the proselitism. Marriage with the scions of the rotten European aristocracy, love of sensation and of display and in most cases the intuition that the Roman Catholic church is the last bulwark of capitalism—are the real reasons for the rapid growth of Roman Catholic influence among the wealthy in this country.

* * *

But to go back to the situation in France. The pope could, of course, have accepted the new law without any damage to the church. But he *desired* a conflict with the French government, hoping thereby to create there a Catholic party similar to the "Centrist" party in Germany.

But Pius X. is making a mistake. In Germany, Pius IX. had a monarchy to fight, which had a special interest in religion as a means of keeping the masses of the people in obedience. But France is a republic. The radicals who rule that country now, do not care to use religion as a "police measure." And the Socialists in France, as everywhere, demand a separation of church and state. So there can be no doubt that separation of church and state will win in France.

Victor L. Bergh.

Says the N. Y. *Mail*: "Parents and guardians should not be alarmed because it has been discovered that four professors in Columbia University are 'sympathetically interested' in Socialism and a students' Socialist league is being formed. Our opposition to Socialism, as a practical working scheme of civilization, needs no reaffirmation. But a brief period of belief in the doctrine is apt, on the whole, to do a boy more good than harm."

Is this a case of making a virtue of a necessity?

Just a Child.

By MAY BEALS.

All night she had walked back and forth between flying spindles. The roar of the machinery was still numbing her tired brain as she sat down by the road to rest a minute for the long walk homeward. She was a very little girl—one of those who are ceremoniously bundled out of the mill while the inspector is being entertained in the office; one of those whose pitiful and well proven wrongs would take many men from legislative halls and the pews of fashionable churches to spend long terms behind prison bars if our laws were enforced against the rich as they are enforced against the poor. She could not understand, she could only feel, the injustice that was crushing the life from her frail little body. Her blindness and ignorance caused the worst of her suffering.

For she was not yet past suffering the sharp mental anguish that is so much worse than any physical pain. You can work a child until it grows incapable of thought—in-capable of any feeling save physical sensations. She had not worked long enough for that.

The sun had risen more than an hour before she had been freed from the machines. She basked in its rays for a moment, stretched out on the hard ground, then taking up her tiny dinner pail she started down the long, red road between the rows of box-like shanties where many of the mill operatives lived. Her home was in the country, three miles out across low, red hills. She had not been used to walking alone. Her older sister had walked with her and worked beside her in the mill, but one day her sister had been

too sick to work, and a few days afterward they had put her down in the ground and had told the child she was in heaven. The child could not understand, but then all grown-up people are hard to understand. They told her in Sunday school—these strange, grown-up people—that God loves little children and that he had put it into the good capitalist to build the cotton mill so that they have work. The child accepted it all with a child's faith, doubting nothing, but it was like some strange puzzle to her mind. If God loves little girls why does he want them to work in the mill? He knows everything, so, of course, he knows how it hurts.

The child was not rebellious, she was only puzzled—and tired, so tired. She heard the far off whistle of the morning train as she neared the crossing and thought of how careful her sister had always been to keep her off the track when the train rushed past them. There was a sharp curve in the track just above the crossing, so near that the man could not stop the train, so her sister had said, even if he saw them on the track. The child remembered it now and the memory tore her heart, for she had loved her sister better than anything in the world.

She stood on the track and looked at the interminable red hills stretched out between her and her home. She was tired, so tired. Do you know what it is to be so tired that each step you take is torture and each breath a long-drawn-out agony? The child stood still for a moment with bent head, then she

turned and walked deliberately up the track a little nearer the curve. She knelt on the track and turned her little old face with its hopeless eyes toward the clear morning sky.

"Dear Lord," she said. "I'm plum beat out. I don't want to work in the mill no more and I do want Janey so bad. I've prayed and prayed for other things and none of 'em ever comed, but I won't pester you no more for nothin' if you'll let me be with Janey. For Jesus sake, Amen."

She lay down on the track with her small hands folded beneath her and her eyes shut tight that she might not see it coming. She felt the rough timbers shuddering beneath her and the distant roar of the train grew louder, more deafening, more like the machinery that roared around her all night.

And then the engineer, who was wildly cursing his own powerlessness, felt the sickening crunch as her little life was ground out beneath the wheels, so much more mercifully than it would otherwise be ground out in the wheels of the mill. As soon as the train could

be stopped the trainmen ran back to the rear where the scattered fragments lay. The engineer laid his hand on the largest piece of the child and felt that it was warm and quivering. He turned on the others furiously, his hard features drenched with tears.

"There's her dinner pail," he said. "She's laid down here and went to sleep after working all night in that hell of a mill."

And then he cursed the mill and its owner and the civilization that produced them both with such rare and savage profanity that the ladies in the rear car, who had looked out at the window to ascertain the cause of the delay, turned away disdainfully and summoned the porter to close the windows. When a little later they learned the cause of his outburst they felt sorry, of course, for the child, but then—such perfectly shocking language could not help it.

They wondered as the train again moved forward why an inscrutable providence ever permits such people to come within earshot of the respectable and refined.

Monarchical capitalism is cutting off the hands of the blacks in the Congo and the world is shuddering at the awfulness of it. But what is capitalism doing in *this* country? Last week three women were burned to death in molten ore at Pittsburg, others were being minced up on the railroads, hands, arms, feet and legs were being chopped off in the great industrial plants all over the country and so on, and scarcely a shudder from the public. It was taken as a matter of course by newspaper readers, who are so used to such things that they

habitually shrug their shoulders when they chance upon some little two line notice of industrial casualties or fatalities and turn to more pleasant reading.

H. H. Rogers says Rockefeller's annual income was sixty millions of dollars for 1906. This is \$114 a minute, or \$6,840.98 an hour, rain or shine, sleeping or waking. This is a wonderful country and we are living under a marvelous system that can give a man such good returns for his saintliness and business acumen.

The Way Out.

By JEAN JAURES.

The main idea of Socialism is simple and noble. Scientists believe that the present form of property-holding divides society into two great classes. One of these classes, the wage-earning, the proletariat, is obliged to pay the other, the capitalist, a sort of tax, in order to be able to live at all, and exercise its faculties to any degree. Here is a multitude of human beings, citizens; they possess nothing, they can live only by their work. But in order to work they need an expensive equipment which they have not got, and raw material and capital which they have not got. Another class owns the means of production, the land, the factories, the machines, the raw materials, and accumulated capital in the form of money. The first class is, then, forced to put itself into the hands of the second, and naturally this capitalist and possessing class, taking advantage of its power, makes the working and non-owning class pay large forfeit. It does not rest content after it has been reimbursed for the advances it has made and has repaired the wear and tear on the machinery. It levies in addition every year and indefinitely a considerable tax on the product of the workman and the farmer in the form of rent for farms, ground rent, rent of land in the cities, taxes for the payment of the public debt, industrial profit, commercial profit, and interest on stocks and bonds.

Just as the old feudal road was blocked and cut up at every step by toll-rights and dues, so, for the proletarian, the road of life is cut up by the feudal rights imposed upon him by capital. He can neither

work nor eat, clothe nor shelter himself, without paying a sort of ransom to the owning and capitalist class.

To have responsibility without authority, to be punished without having been even consulted, such is the paradoxical fate of the proletariat under capitalist disorder. And if capital were organized, if by means of vast trusts it were able to regulate production, it would only regulate it for its own profit. It would abuse the power gained by union to impose usurious prices on the community of buyers, and the working class would escape from economic disorder only to fall under the yoke of monopoly.

All this misery, all this injustice and disorder result from the fact that one class monopolizes the means of production and of life, and imposes its law on another class and on society as a whole. The thing to do, therefore, is to break down this supremacy of one class. The oppressed class must be enfranchised, and with it the whole of society. All difference of class must be abolished by transferring to the whole body of citizens, the organized community, the ownership of the means of production and of life which today, in the hands of a single class, is a power of exploitation and oppression. The universal co-operation of all citizens must be substituted for the disorderly and abusive rule of the minority. This is the only method by which the individual can be enfranchised.

In the present state of humanity, where our only organization is on the basis of nationality, social property will take the form of national

property. But the action of the proletariat will assume more and more an international character. The various nations that are evolving toward Socialism will regulate their dealings with each other more and more according to the principle of justice and peace. But for a long time to come the nation as such will furnish the historical setting of Socialism; it will be the mold in which the new justice will be cast.

Let no one be astonished that we bring forward the idea of a national community now, whereas at first we set ourselves to establish the liberty of the individual. The nation, and the nation alone, can enfranchise all citizens. Only the nation can furnish the means of free development to all. Private associations, temporary and limited in character, can protect limited groups of individuals only for a time. But there is only one univer-

sal association that can guarantee the rights of all individuals without exception, not only the rights of living, but of those who are yet unborn, and who will take their places in the generations to come.

If, then, we invoke the nation, we do so in order to insure the rights of the individual in the fullest and most universal sense. Not a single human being for a single moment of time should be excluded from the sphere of rights. Not one should be in danger of becoming the party or instrument of another individual. Not one should be deprived of the sure means of laboring freely without servile dependence on any other individual.

Social ownership of property is merely opportunity of action brought within the reach of all.

Socialism will exalt and ennoble humanity. It will level up all men and give new meaning and dignity to life.

Down in Mexico there has just been a tragic ending to a big strike involving nearly seven thousand men. The strike resulted in rioting. The government troops interfered. They took the secretary and vice-president of the union and five other leaders in the organization prisoners, quelled the strike and then, as the factory whistles were blowing, and the men were going in to work, marched the prisoners to a space in front of the factory. Then the members of the working class comprising the military squad in charge of the prisoners stepped back the desired number of paces and shot them down in cold blood. The throngs of dazed workmen who unwillingly witnessed the horrible sight waited for a moment until the

smoke cleared away and then entered the mill. They had been given a lesson in class mastery as a warning to them not to revolt again for better conditions. Workingmen should know their place! Otherwise they run the risk of being murdered. This horrible affair in Mexico shows what capitalism will do where it has the power and is not opposed sharply by a humane and awakened public sentiment. The same murderous methods would be used in this country if the masters dared (Colorado bull pens and Idaho "justice" indicate this), and the soldiers here, we are afraid, would commit the same murder on command, just as readily as in the republic to the south of us!

Senator Rummel's Report on Life Insurance.

Wisconsin has had its life insurance investigation and the reports are now in. The commission was appointed by the legislature, one member being our Social-Democratic Senator, Jacob Rummel of Milwaukee. While the general committee of the senate made a report recommending state supervision, Senator Rummel, in a minority report, urges state ownership, and his report is attracting really more attention than that of the majority of the committee. Owing to the length of the minority report, we can only print the first part in this issue.

The minority report of the senate committee on state insurance by Senator Rummel is a lengthy Socialistic document and comes out in favor of conducting insurance by the state. It makes many charges not contained in the joint committee report. The following digest was furnished the press by Senator Rummel:

"Other countries have been much quicker to realize the advantage of government insurance and the possibilities of protection and benefit to the common people, especially the working classes, in the matter of government insurance than have the American states. At the present time the entire field of insurance against sickness, accident, and old age and invalidity has already long ago been entered and occupied by the various cities, states, and nations of foreign countries.

"In America, however, this field has so far been left entirely open

for exploitation by private companies."

I.

INEFFICIENCY OF PRIVATE LIFE INSURANCE.

The report then goes on to recite the results of the investigation of life insurance which was made in the east last year. It mentions the following points:

"1. Salaries of the officials have been all out of proportion to the services rendered—so much so as to amount to a gigantic fraud and theft, the officials receiving as high as \$150,000 per year, or three times as much as the president of the United States. This item alone amounts to multiplied millions.

"2. That the affairs of the companies were manipulated so as to put the relatives and personal friends of the high officials into positions where they also would draw vast sums of money. At this point the report mentions a long list of noted officials of the private insurance companies and their relatives who have been drawing enormous salaries amounting in all to multiplied millions.

"3. That the funds of the company were used to influence the law-making bodies of the state to secure legislation favorable to the companies, as well as for the political purposes. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were used in this manner. 'The House of Mirth' in Albany and the 'Yellow Dog' fund have become proverbial.

"4. That funds belonging to these companies have been diverted by the officials to improper, illegal,

and reprehensive purposes for the personal advantage of the officials and at the expense of the members and the company in general.

"In other words, the investigation of our great private life insurance companies, operating in America, has shown that they have practiced upon the American people dishonest appropriations of funds, menacing manipulations of the political affairs of the country and gigantic fraud. It has therefore demonstrated that the private ownership and operation of the life insurance business, when viewed from the standpoint of the interests of the people, is a failure. And its continuance will assure and assume the proportions of a national peril.

II.

LIFE INSURANCE IN WISCONSIN.

"Turning now to Wisconsin, we find quite a similar condition here. While the results of our investigations are not so startling in their exposures, yet we see the beginning of the same practices.

"The report of your committee that has investigated the conditions of the Wisconsin life insurance companies shows the following abuses:

"1. Salaries are out of all proportion to the services rendered. For example, H. L. Palmer, the president of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance company, draws a salary of \$25,000 a year. W. Merrill, as second vice president, received \$17,000 a year. J. W. Skinner, as secretary, received \$15,000 per annum. The late Charles E. Dyer, as general counsel, received \$18,000 per annum. J. W. Fisher, as assistant medical director, received \$12,000 per annum. W. P. McLaren, as third vice president, received \$18,000 per annum. G. G. Markham, as first vice presi-

dent, received \$18,000 per annum. While the great ability of these men may be urged, we hold that the service which they render is not proportionate to the salaries which they receive. While this is insignificant in proportion to the New York case, it nevertheless discloses the presence of the evil.

"2. The relatives of personal officers in the employ of the Northwestern Mutual company also receive salaries which are out of proportion to the services they render. For example, C. H. Palmer, son of President Palmer, receives \$3,000 per annum as a clerk. Thomas Balding, clerk of executive and finance committee, husband of a niece of President Palmer, receives a salary of \$6,500. W. A. Adams, auditor of the company, and son-in-law of President Palmer, receives \$6,500 per annum. J. H. Dyer, son of the late general counsel of the company, receives \$9,000 per annum as assistant counsel. And so on through a long list of relatives and special favorites.

"Here again is evidence of the same kind of abuse, although admittedly of not so great a degree as has been so notorious in the case of the New York companies.

"3. The testimony given before your committee above referred to shows the same tendency on the part of the Wisconsin life insurance companies to defraud the policy holders out of their rights, by means of the fraudulent lapsing of policies.

"4. Your committee reports that premiums on most classes of policy are unnecessarily high.

"The report recites that the present average charge for life insurance, on the private management, is about \$35 per \$1,000 a year and holds that under state insurance,

with the charges brought down to the actual cost of efficient management, with full provision against possible and unforeseen contingencies, such as epidemics, etc., the cost of insurance should not exceed an average of \$20 per \$1,000, and could possibly be reduced considerably from that figure.

"5. Unjust discriminations have been used by the company in such ways as to advance its interests and to the detriment of certain of its policy holders. The report, quoting from the general committee's report, recites the case of a certain judge in California whose policy was paid promptly and in full. He had just previous to this rendered two decisions decidedly in favor of the company. And in contrast to this was the case of a man, without influence or standing, whose insurance the company refused to pay.

"6. It also appears from a report of your committee that for a great many years the officers of this company were profiting by loans on securities of the company's policies, opposed the correction of this abuse and succeeded in deferring it for several years.

"7. It is also apparent that the same methods of evasion and deception have been used by the officers of these companies in giving testimony before this committee as are generally used by private corporations under such circumstances where the state is trying to get at the truth in regard to their business.

"At this point we again wish to emphasize the fact that while these abuses, on the part of the Wisconsin life insurance companies, as far as found out by the committee, are not so glaring as those of the New York companies, they are, nevertheless, of the same nature, arise from the same causes, and are inevitably

inherent in the private operation of life insurance.

"The minority of your committee is therefore of the opinion that the experience of the American people with private life insurance companies, both nationally and in the state of Wisconsin, has proven the private operation of life insurance to be excessively expensive, inefficient, inadequate, fraudulent, and oppressive and having a tendency to corrupt legislation.

III.

Government Insurance in Foreign Countries.

"In contrast with the above experience which the people of this country have had with the private management of the insurance business we present below a few facts in regard to the public or government management of insurance business in foreign countries.

New Zealand.

"New Zealand has successfully conducted national life insurance since 1860. The business is directed by a government insurance commissioner, who determines the various details of the business.

"The total salaries of the head office were less in amount than that paid to a single officer in some of the old line companies. This fact is admitted by the majority of your committee, thus showing the tendency to correct one of the most glaring abuses of private management.

"The government issues policies at a low rate and all the savings are returned to the policy holders in dividends, thus correcting another of the most offensive features of private management.

"New Zealand also insures its working classes against invalidity and old age, as many other foreign countries do.

"Any person who has been a resident of the country for twenty-five years, whose income is less than \$260 per year, or whose property amounts to less than \$3,000, is entitled to a pension. Provided, however, he has led a sober and reputable life for the last five years, has not been convicted of idleness or drunkenness, has not suffered dishonorable imprisonment, nor been guilty of desertion of wife or children.

"This form of insurance is carried on by the New Zealand government in connection with their postal system, and has been handled with eminent success.

2. Germany.

"During the last twenty years, during which period the various forms of insurance have been established, the German government has expended for workingmen's insurance alone \$965,466,040.

"According to the reports of 1901:

"10,319,564 persons were insured against sickness.

"17,366,000 persons were insured against accident.

"13,196,000 persons were insured against invalidity and old age."

"The benefits of the insurance against sickness include the usual medical service for sickness and one-half wage for a certain period of disablement.

"The receipts from this branch of the German insurance of 1901 amounted to \$50,087,555. The expense of administration was only 10 per cent of the receipts. The law requiring insurance against accident applies to wage workers with an annual income of less than \$750 and includes the same classes as in the preceding case. Seventeen million three hundred and sixty-six

thousand, or over one-fourth of the entire population, were carrying such insurance in 1900.

"The working men's indemnity for temporary injury consists of a payment of the cost of cure, with an allowance during incapacity for a period of six weeks. An indemnity for permanent disability consists of a payment of two-thirds of the workingmen's wages.

"Insurance against invalidity and old age is obligatory on all wage earners with an annual income of less than \$500. In 1902 the receipts from this branch of insurance amounted to \$52,669,278, the amount of pensions paid \$25,971,054, and the expense of administration about \$3,000,000.

"It appears, therefore, that under the system of government insurance in Germany, the cost of administration is about 10 per cent. Over 41,000,000 are thus insured by the government in one way or another, or about 70 per cent of the entire population.

"On the whole, the government operation of the life insurance in Germany has been so satisfactory that the present emperor and the government are at the present time preparing to considerably enlarge this sphere of the governmental activity.

"So successful and economical has been the administration of this state insurance by the German government, in contrast to the enormous waste and extravagance of the private management here in America, that even the majority of your committee are led to exclaim in their report, 'the prodigious waste existing under some forms of industrial insurance sold in this country, becomes significant when compared with these statistics furnished by the German government.'

3. *England.*

The British government through its postal savings banks insures any one over five years of age for amounts ranging from 1 pound (\$4.87) to 100 pounds (\$487.00). It also sells ordinary life insurance ranging from 5 pounds (\$24.35) to 100 pounds (\$487.00) on the life of persons between 14 and 65 years of age. Children between 8 and 14 may be insured for 5 pounds (\$24.35).

The total number of annuities issued in 1894 was 1565, amounting to \$201,250. In 1904 the total number issued was 1768, amounting to \$198,850. The issuance of the annuities seems to have been stationary. A less number of annuities were issued by the post office department. In 1904 there was a total of 1128 amounting to \$71,648.

The English government seems to have given little attention to government life insurance, and yet even with this meagre experience it appears that the insurance is cheaper and more liberal than that issued by private companies.

The present Campbell-Bannerman Liberal government, however, is pledged to the enactment of an old-age pension for workingmen, and to state insurance against accident, invalidity and death.

4. *Austria.*

"Austria has followed resolutely in the footsteps of Germany in the introduction of compulsory insurance of workingmen. She has now in practical operation general systems for the insurance of workingmen against accidents and sickness, and measures looking to the organization of the third branch, that against old age and invalidity, are now pending before the imperial parliament.

"About 175,000 people in Austria were insured against accident in 1893. The insurance provided that in case of death there shall be paid (1) the sum of \$12.06 for funeral expenses, and an annuity to the widow, if there is one, equal to 20 per cent of the annual wages of her husband; (2) an annuity to each legitimate child until 15 years of age, equal to 15 per cent, or in case the child has no mother, equal to 20 per cent of the father's wages; and (3) an annuity to the father or mother if they were depending upon their son for support equal to 20 per cent of his wages.

5. *France.*

"France has had one form or another of old age insurance since June, 1850. Scientific workingmen's insurance has been in operation about ten years.

"The total number of pensions on the roll at the end of 1893 was 189,498. The total expenditure for that year was \$6,451,295.

"The present premier of France, Clemenceau, is at the present time proposing to the French government an elaborate extension of the principles of state insurance, and there is no doubt that France will soon have the most thorough-going system of government insurance in existence. Clemenceau's plan, when carried out, will go far beyond the system now in operation in Germany.

6. *Other Countries.*

"Several other countries also have systems of state insurance more or less extensive. Among them are Hungary, Belgium, Italy, Norway, Finland, and Roumania.

7. *Florida.*

"The only state in America to attempt anything in the line of life insurance so far as your committee has been able to learn, is Florida.

"In 1905 a bill, providing for state insurance, was introduced in the Florida legislature. After consideration it passed the house with only seven dissenting votes. It never reached a final vote, and the governor of the state has publicly charged that the measure was purposely stifled by insurance influence working in the state senate.

IV.

Summary and Conclusion.

"From the general survey of the experience of various states that have carried on government insurance, as outlined above, it is clearly evident that the management of insurance business in the hands of the government, is in every way superior to private insurance.

"We concur with the majority report in stating, as they do, the following conclusions:

"We find that government management insures—

"1. Reasonable salaries to officers.

"2. Economical administration.

"3. Liberal forms of policies.

"4. Absolute security."

"So much has been clearly proven. And it shows a striking contrast to what has been found to be true with reference to the affairs of the private companies.

"The government operation of insurance seems in every respect superior to private, but the following points may be emphasized:

"1. Every individual insured is absolutely secure, the payment of his insurance being guaranteed by the state.

"2. Reserve funds are conservatively invested by the state.

"3. All investments by state government insurance are made by the state locally, thus assisting the state as well as the policy holders.

"4. The cost of insurance is everywhere much lower under government management than is charged by private companies.

"5. The expense of operation, especially in relation to salaries and management, are a great deal lower, under government insurance than in the case of private companies.

"6. The insured under government management secures practically all of the benefits of the insurances.

"7. No lapses of these policies occur. Provision is made under government insurance against the possibility of lapse.

"8. No large initial cost is incurred by government management since much of the machinery for the inauguration of life insurance is already in existence. In New Zealand, England, and France, for example, the government makes use of the postoffice department for the carrying on of its government insurance.

"It is thus clearly shown:

"1. That the private management and operation of insurance has been disastrously inefficient, oppressive and unjust.

"2. That state or government insurance has been efficient, safe, and whenever tried, eminently successful.

V.

Recommendations are Made.

"In view of these facts the minority of your committee therefore recommends:

"First, That the state legislature of Wisconsin at once appoint a commission consisting of three assemblymen and two senators, who shall employ one or more insurance experts, as they may see fit, and secure such other scientific advice as may be required, and recommend

at the next session of the legislature, a system of state insurance to cover sickness, accident, invalidity, old age, and death, this committee also to submit a bill outlining the details of system of insurance such as they shall deem most practical. This system should embody:

"1. Provisions for life insurance upon the usual basis of scientific knowledge of risks and liabilities, such as are well known.

"2. Old age and invalidity insurance for all who have been resident of the state of Wisconsin for a period of ten years, who have led a sober and industrious life for the

last ten years preceding their application for pension, and who have not been guilty of any civil or criminal misdemeanor.

"3. Accident or sickness insurance with proper provision and restrictions.

"The minority of your committee also recommends:

"Second. A committee be appointed at once to draft resolutions to the national congress of the United States requesting that body to take the necessary steps for the organization of national insurance, which shall also cover the various forms outlined above."

Why the Pews are Empty.

By R. A. DAGUE.

The separation of church and state in France, the revolt against churchocracy in Russia; the unrest of the people throughout all Europe; the frequent heresy trials and growing non-attendance at church of the people of America; the general discontent everywhere, over religious and economic systems, would seem to indicate that the old order of things, theological and economic, is passing away.

Surely great changes in our theology and economic system will come in the not distant future. The time is nearly ripe for a change. A new cycle began about sixty years ago. Since the days of ancient Egypt the farmer gathered his grain by hand-tools, and threshed by a flail. There had been but little advancement for thousands of years

in methods of wealth production. Then, quite simultaneously, inventors sprang up in all civilized countries, and marvelous machinery began to do the work of the world. Who can believe that the age of invention came by accident? By the aid of machinery one worker now produces more wealth than forty could create sixty years ago. A child attending a spinning and weaving machine, can produce more cloth than could be made in the same time by fifty grandmothers. The problem of production has been solved, but the problem of the equitable distribution of wealth remains to be solved. That is being threshed out in all the more civilized countries of the world. The cry is going up in Europe and America: "Every man and woman

must have the full product of their labor." The contention of Socialists, "that all the means of production and distribution must be owned by all the people collectively," denounced as anarchy a few years ago, is meeting the approval of earnest, clear-thinking men in all the stations of life, from the proletariat to the most learned and profound student of political economy. Unquestionably this is a transitional age. A new order of things is struggling to be born. That it will not be ushered in without travail is certain. Those who have not caught the glimmerings of the rising sun of the new era, and who still believe in large armies and navies, and in the necessity for prisons and the rigorous application of brute force and severe punishments, will go on advocating war and the old methods, and will look upon the new as rank heresy, and as visionary and impracticable propositions; but as the intolerant bigots of the past were left behind, so will these men see nations march by them, while they frantically prophesy sure destruction of their fellow men who have dared to abandon the ignorant and cruel religious and economic systems of the dark ages, and taken up their march toward a higher and better civilization. Even now, while all Europe resounds to the tread of immense armies, the rulers are clamoring for an increase of their fighting forces. In the United States we are expending vast sums of money in building great war ships in a time of peace, and it is but a few days ago, that Rear Admiral Evans said: "We want more war ships, more soldiers, and more guns. I prophesy that in ten years we will have the greatest navy in the world." Evidence is not wanting that our chief executive and our

congress is in sympathy with the sentiment as expressed by Admiral Evans. To those who believe in the law of kindness and love, it would seem that it were better to expend money to put a stop to child slavery in the factories and mills, and in other similar acts of kindness, than to build war ships, and swords, and other implements of death and destruction. In all of the first decades of the transitional periods of the world's history, while a few illuminated minds were leading the more progressive of their fellow men from the old to the newer order, they were surrounded by those who regarded them as visionary fanatics, and dangerous agitators and heretics. So it is today. The Socialists are advocating the inauguration of a pure democratic government under which no forms of tyranny and wrong could legally exist, and in which every man, woman and child would have the full benefit of their labor, and all be given a "square deal;" and yet they find almost solidly arrayed against this proposition the kings, the emperors, and generals, and monopolists, and plutocrats, and exploiters of every name, and in a large measure the clergy of the so-called Christian churches. To one religiously inclined, as is the writer, this attitude of the church is anomalous; for, while Socialism is purely an economic movement, and has nothing to say about religion, yet a careful examination of its cardinal principles reveals the fact that it is proposing to put into active operation all the essential principles which the Christian church professes to stand for, but most lamentably fails to practice.

Who does not know that the Christian church, once leading its contemporaries, is now far in the

rear of the marching processions? Its pews are largely empty, the students in its theological schools are few in number, and are each year diminishing; the poor no longer feel welcome at its meetings, and they stay away; the clergy, with rare exceptions, frown upon all progressive ideas. Those who are in sympathy with progress, and who would preach against mercenary and cruel wrongs inflicted upon the poor, dare not, for they know if they should, they will be persecuted as heretics, or their means of support taken from them. Apathy, love of display, insincerity, permeate the membership. At a late ministers' meeting held in this city, the Rev. John B. Reid said "that of the 100,000 people in Tacoma, only 25,000 go to any church." A similar condition exists in all the cities of the Union. The ministers fail to see the real cause of non-attendance, and of the lack of sincerity and spirituality in the churches. The fact is, the working people and the poor are fast losing faith in the church, for they find it upholds and tenaciously defends the competitive system of business with all its greed and injustice, under which system the workers are exploited out of five-sixths of the products of their toil, and under which the few scheming idlers are growing immensely rich while those who create all wealth are steadily growing poorer and poorer. They are coming to know that, while the total wealth of the United States is one hundred billions, the workers own but ten per cent of that colossal sum, and that half of the American people are propertyless. As the laity come to the knowledge of these alarming facts, they do not understand why the clergy persists in slandering

and defaming Socialists who are doing all in their power to displace this kingdom of Mammon and of unrighteousness, and establish in its stead the co-operative commonwealth, under which the observance of the golden rule would be possible—under which child-slavery would be abolished, and "an injury to one would be the concern of all." It is not at all surprising that the church pews are empty. Unless the clergy comes to a correct understanding of the trouble, and "right about faces," still more empty pews will confront them.

It would seem that Infinite Intelligence, or Nature, or God, or whatever moving power is behind or in matter, has so planned the earth that it shall go forward and upward and when the planet reaches a certain age of refinement or unfoldment, the old order of things fade away and disappear, and a new order is ushered in. The old always dies hard but die it must, for when inventors give to the world marvelous machines, and scientists discover and apply heretofore unknown forces in nature, and when profound thinkers come forward with new and better systems of religion, or put new interpretation on the old dogmas, and when statesmen and political economists, of honest hearts and clear brains, show the injustice and cruelty of old systems of economics, and point out better systems, then no pope nor body of ecclesiastics, nor doctors, nor politicians, nor captains of industry, nor congresses, nor kings, can long delay the movement of man to a higher plane. It behooves us in our day and generation to get in harmony with God and take up our march toward a juster and more humane civilization.

Straus and Labor.

By FREDERIC HEATH.

No sooner had Isador Straus gotten warm in his seat in Roosevelt's cabinet, as commissioner of commerce and labor, than he rendered one of the most infamous and capitalistic decisions that has been handed down by the reigning plutocracy for years—the decision that the alien contract labor law does not prevent state governments from sending agents abroad and bringing human work machines over to this country under contract or promise of employment. The appointment of Straus, a Democrat, to the cabinet by a Republican president made quite a sensation and we were told that it indicated the passion of Roosevelt to serve the people, no matter what party barriers were in the way. But party barriers as between the capitalist class mean nothing so far as the people at large are concerned; the "big men" of the two capitalist parties are equally capable of weird work for the capitalist class and against the people. This Straus instance shows this clear enough for the most thoughtless work drudge to see through.

Some idea of to what fell uses this new decision will be put may be had from the article published elsewhere in regard to the peonage system in certain Southern states.

In those states capitalism runs rampant. The whole state government is a dread conspiracy against the common class that must eat bread in the sweat of its face.

The state is simply the big corporations and the little proprietors who ape the methods and exploitations of the corporations banded together to get cheap and even free labor out of the people.

It is not hard to see that these corporations, masked under official state organization, will at once flood Europe with their agents in search of cheap labor. The late decision will bring about a slaving trade that will only be less embarrassing than black slavery later on in that imported white slaves will not produce a color question or one of real or fancied injurious miscegenation.

Let there be no question as to the fact of the Southern peonage. Only recently the *Atlanta Constitution* printed a special dispatch from Columbus, Ga., to the effect that "A. Q. Campbell, superintendent; A. L. Bradshaw, general foreman, and William Matthews, commissary of the Atlanta & Birmingham Construction Company, who are building the Atlanta, Birmingham & Atlanta railroad, were arraigned before United States Commissioner Nathan A. Brown here today on a charge of peonage. The complainants in the case are a party of laborers who were brought from New York about six weeks ago. The men claim they were told that they would be put on the chain gang if they did not work long enough to pay their transportation expenses. One witness said he saw a man whipped in camp because he would not work."

A Washington dispatch in the New York *World* recently stated that "Fresh allegations of the existence of slavery in southern Florida, below Tampa, have been made to the department of justice, and it is alleged that hundreds of men in the state, both whites and negroes, are held in virtual slavery." We need not give space for further citations.

And there are other outrages on labor to which the decision of the "reformer and philanthropist" Straus will contribute. And Straus is a big toad in the Civic Federation puddle, and the Civic Federation pretends to be organized to bring more mutual feeling on the part of labor and capital. And it is a Northern affair and it is said that a great deal of Northern capital is invested in the Southern phosphate mines, turpentine farms and lumber camps.

Is an Alliance Possible?

By VICTOR L. BERGER.

I

AT the recent convention in Minneapolis, a national farmers' organization, called the *Sons of Equity*, sought an alliance with the American Federation of Labor. The farmers promised to patronize union-made goods. On the other hand, they demanded that the trades unionists should help them to get better prices for farm products.

The Sons of Equity did not try at all to hide the fact that they were simply after more money for grain, meat, butter, eggs, etc. This in the last analysis the city workmen would have to pay, although the farmers did not say so. But they told the delegates at the convention that by making money on the farm, boys and girls would stay on the farm and not flock to the cities. Thus they would diminish competition for labor in the factories.

So far, so good.

* * *

The difficulty in this case is, however, that the farmers will not be able to keep their boys and girls on the farm as long as the farmer's life is what it is—dreary and lonesome and lacking the advantages of modern civilization. The farmer boys and farmer girls hunger for modern life—for theaters, concerts and other entertainments. The farmer boys and girls read of these things in the papers and they want to see and enjoy them. They are not satisfied with an occasional circus or a revival meeting—as were the old folks who did not read papers and magazines.

This is one reason why the young folks do not wish to stay on the farm.

* * *

But there is another reason. Hope eternal springs in every human breast, and false hopes are kindled in every school building and every

class room of this country. The pupils hear and read of some farmer's boy who went into the city and became a millionaire or a railroad president, although starting as a molder's helper or street car driver. So the boy goes into the city and becomes a molder's helper or looks for a job on a street car. And in 9,999 cases out of ten thousand he will stay on that job all the rest of his life, and make competition for the city proletarian.

The Sons of Equity can do nothing to help this, no matter what they promise.

* * *

And now let us take up the second proposition—in regard to getting higher prices for their products.

The farmers, just at the present time, get better prices for their products than ever before in the history of America since the Civil war. Eggs are 35 cents a dozen, wheat is over a dollar, meat is more expensive than it ever has been since the war. And mind you, all this is not on a *cheap* money basis, but on a *gold* basis.

Many farmers all over the country have paid off their mortgages. Many have money in the banks. Many have pianos, fine carpets and other luxuries which they never had before. This is an epoch of unparalleled prosperity for the capitalist and a period of *money-making* for the farmer.

* * *

But what do the wage-workers have? They are, as a rule, just as poor now as they were eight or nine years ago, although they are constantly employed. And the standard of living of the man and woman working in the shop, and the man and woman working for a "salary" has absolutely gone down, although many of them do not realize it. The necessities of life have gone up 55 per cent since 1897, while wages have only gone up from 10 to 15 per cent.

The workmen eat less and poorer meat, and they get more oleo-margarine and less butter. They wear more shoddy and less woollen goods than they used to wear. If the prices of wool and of meat and of butter should go up still further, then their standard of living would go down still further.

As for the promise of the farmers to patronize only union made goods, that, of course, in the first place, would help the *manufacturers* of those goods. And, in the second place, the wives of the farmers do most of the buying, and it is one hundred to one that they will buy where they can buy the cheapest, union or non-union. The farmers' wives are known to be very thrifty. And, in the third place, a large part of the buying is done through catalogue houses, and the rest through country stores. There is no union sentiment in those places.

The promise of the Sons of Equity to buy union goods and thereby raise the wages of the proletarians *amounts to virtually nothing* in practice.

* * *

The truth of the matter is that these two classes—the agriculturists and the city proletarians—are much *too large in numbers* to get together for the purpose of plundering the capitalist class in its *capacity as a consumer*.

By putting up the prices of the necessities of life they would inevitably plunder *each other*, never the capitalist class, which, owing to its small numbers, consumes only a very small percentage of the total product of either farm or factory.

Therefore the idea that the trades unions and the farmers should get together on the basis of the *present system* and on the basis of keeping up the present *competitive methods*, each simply grabbing all they can, must surely be a *failure*. And for a while at least, the workman in the city (and the man working for a salary) would get the worst of it. But in the end *both* sides would get left.

* * *

All this does not say that the farmers have no good reason for complaint. While they are enjoying a period of prosperity just now, they are exploited by the railroads, the elevator trust (which in a good many instances means the same thing as the railroads), by the bankers and by the commission houses. So the fact is that the farmers are really exploited by the *middle man*. Therefore the *elimination* of the *middle man* is the actual basis on which they can unite with the proletariat.

* * *

In order to be successful, such an alliance must closely *follow the economic development* of the country. It can only be done by each class *honestly* taking care of its own class interests. And it can only be done on a political basis.

Now, to begin with, I am frank to say that the Socialists of this country will have to give up some of their illusions and some of their cast-iron phrases.

Karl Marx' theory about the concentration of industry and the big fellows eating up the small ones and the trusts being the final outcome of capitalist individual ownership has not proven true in the *field of agriculture*. At least not up till today, nor for any time that can be foreseen today. We do not know whether it will be true in a hundred years or not, nor are we figuring on that.

The average size of the farm in America has not changed materially within the last thirty years. And, if anything, it has become no larger, but a little smaller.

* * *

But fortunately Social-Democrats have other *facts* in their favor. Socialist measures will benefit the farmers as they benefit the city workers. We can show the farmers where and how far the national ownership of the means of transportation and communication, of the railroads, telegraphs, boat lines, elevators, etc., would benefit them immediately. We can also show that collective ownership of all the trusts, big iron industries, and mines would help to raise the farmers to a standard of culture, comfort and civilization of which they dare not even dream today.

And on that basis, on the basis of the national ownership of transportation facilities and national ownership of the trusts, there is a close *alliance possible today* between the farmers and the city proletariat, with tremendous benefits for both sides.

And for generations to come, there is no other basis possible. Especially since we do not know whether the economic development in the farming industry will finally wind up in the "bonanza farm" or in "intensive small farming" or in both.

II

A way must be found to get the producers of the country together, to get the farmers and the city proletariat into close touch. But it cannot be done on the trades union basis.

* * *

To begin with, we have in this country no class of farm laborers who have been wage laborers for generations, nor even of those who have to remain wage laborers for life. It is easy for a farm laborer who is willing to work hard to become a farm renter, and later on a farm owner. If he has saved one or two hundred dollars, he can start out to rent a farm. Even the negroes down South who are not very provident, usually succeed in this. In fact, almost every real farmer can soon start out to buy a farm, for there is still plenty of land in Wisconsin and other Northwestern states and in the South to be had for five dollars an acre. In the eastern states he can at least rent one for little money. So if a man stays a hired farm hand all his life in this country, there is something the matter with him.

As a matter of fact, it is exceedingly hard all over the country to get hired farm help. In Waukesha county, Wisconsin, hired men are offered thirty dollars a month and their board and washing. Yet help is scarce at this price. So it is nonsense to figure on an established class of farm hands which as a fixed class does *not* exist.

Of course, people ought not to study the farm question on the east side of New York or on the west side of Chicago or from books. They should go out and observe with their own eyes.

* * *

I will not try here to explain this phenomenon, and why, in spite of the introduction of machinery, concentration has not taken place in the farming industry as it has in the factories. I will mention only one or two points.

The first is that the introduction of machinery in farming has *not changed the entire mode* of production as it has in the factory.

In the factory, the introduction of machinery has resulted in a tremendous division of labor, one article sometimes going through fifty hands, before the product is finished. Furthermore the big and costly machine has absolutely pushed out of existence the small manufacturer and his shop.

This has not been the case in agriculture. After the introduction of machinery, the mode of production has more or less still remained the same. The wheat is growing in very much the same way as before, and cattle require just about the same kind of care. The machine has so far helped only the *middle sized* farmer. It has made it possible for him to run a farm of about 120 to 160 acres with the help of a grown son and dispensing with a hired man, where formerly he had to have a hired man besides his son for a farm of that size.

So the introduction of machinery has not worked the revolution on the farm which it made in the factory.

* * *

The other point is that while capitalism has found it profitable to go into cattle and sheep raising on a large scale, and into beet sugar and vineyards, *capitalism has failed* whenever it has tried other branches of farming on a large scale.

The bonanza farms have failed or are not paying.

The cause of this is pretty plain. The introduction of costly machinery in factories pays because the capital invested is *used all the year around*. In other words the machinery is used every day in the year, sometimes even in two or three shifts.

In farming this is not the case.

Most of the machinery can be used only a few weeks in the year, and the rest of the time it lies idle.

The farmers help themselves to the more expensive machinery either by having co-operative threshing machines, co-operative creameries, etc., or by simply renting the service of a threshing machine that is continually going from place to place. These circumstances, of course, are not favorable for the growth of capitalism in agriculture.

* * *

On the other hand, this *co-operation of the farmers*, of which we have hundreds of examples in Wisconsin, and just as many in other states, is bound to form the second bridge that will connect the farmer with the proletarian movement.

The first bridge necessarily will be the *political* movement—the movement for the nationalization of the big *transportation* facilities, the *mines* and the *trusts*.

Co-operation, although still in its infancy, will have a great and beneficial influence on the laborers in the cities, and very soon it will be fully as important as the political and the trade union movements. At the same time co-operation will be as wide spread and as valuable for the farmers as for the city workers.

So here is another link.

* * *

Electricity makes it possible to use small machinery and transport power from great distances to the farm. And we do not as yet know the possibilities of this for the farmer—if the state or the collectivity in some form should own the electric power.

* * *

Therefore it would be useless to ask the farmers to stand for a collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution that would require them to give up their farms. Socialism wants to restore property to the propertyless, not to take property from those who make good use of it. Socialism wants to restore property to the factory workers, and *there* it can be done only in a *collective* manner. But it would be criminal and absurd to try to take away the land from the farmers as long as they are the only ones who can use it for themselves and for the nation, and as long as they are fairly prosperous.

Besides, it *could not be done*. Any attempt of that kind would very soon end with the worst disaster for the city proletariat that the world has ever seen. The failure of the Paris Commune would be child's play compared with that catastrophe.

* * *

In political affairs and especially in class politics, it is useless to deal in hollow phrases. We have to consider realities and facts. It is foolish for one class to try to get the support of the other by promising it the millenium in the distant future. Promises for the distant future will not go. Intelligent men want realities and want them today. And that is something that "impossibilists" at least have never considered.

* * *

I will close with a quotation from Wilhelm Liebknecht. He says: "It is true that both farmers and small shopkeepers are still in the camp of our adversaries, but only because they do not understand the causes that underlie their condition. It is of prime importance for our party to enlighten them and bring them over to our side. *This is a vital question for our party, because these two classes form the majority of the nation.* It would be both stupid and ingenuous to insist that we should have a majority sealed and ready in our pockets before we begin to apply our principles. But it would be still more ingenuous to imagine that we could put our principles into practice against the will of the immense majority of the nation."

So the way must be found.

Victor L. Berger

The biennial report of the Wisconsin Dairy and Food Commissioner is an interesting one, as it contains the results of analysis of various commercial preparations and tends to show the widespread "sophistication" which is practiced by the modern manufacturer of foods. Out of fifty-eight samples of baking powder analyzed FORTY-THREE were found fraudulent and tricky. Out of thirty-one samples of buckwheat flour, TWENTY-FIVE were adulterated. Out of seven samples of honey FIVE were adulterated. EIGHT out of eleven samples of jelly were found to be manufactured abominations, from the food standpoint. FIFTY-ONE out of eighty-eight samples of lemon extract were found unfit for the human stomach. FIFTEEN samples of maple sugar out of twenty-five were found to be doped or colored with poisonous dyes. OF ELEVEN SAMPLES of SPICES ALL WERE FOUND TO BE ADULTERATED. SEVEN out of nine samples of vanilla extract were found to be dishonest—and so on! How many commercial saints, how many captains of triumphant democracy, how many holy deacons were concerned in the rascalities thus laid bare? No wonder some ministers are turning in disgust from subsidized churchianity, from the gospels according to Oily John and Saint Ryan of Wall street, and looking to the Socialist movement for the true spirit of the Nazarene!



CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN-