

The New Emancipation

By POLITICUS

Slavery is an ancient institution. It is not, however, the most ancient. Freedom is older.

Researches into primitive history reveal that the eras preceding civilization, so-called, the savage and barbaric, were eras not of slavery, but of freedom. Among families, clans and gentes prevailed a condition of substantial equality. The means of production, the land and the simple tools used in hunting and fishing, were common property. The government was democratic. Substantially equal opportunity to produce the necessities of life and to enjoy them when produced existed among the various members of society. That such conditions existed among our Germanic ancestors, the Germania of Tacitus gives proof. Slaves there were, it is true, and laets or renters; these, however, were but the exceptions that proved the rule. Of the other Aryan peoples—the stream that flowed from the primitive Aryan home beyond the Hindoo-Koosh mountains into India, and the other that flowed westward into Greece and Rome—the same was true. Freedom was the rule; bondage the exception.

Slavery came in time, at the close of the barbaric and the beginning of the civilized era. Its cause was war. Its occasion was expansion among the tribes, necessitating the struggle for territory to sustain the increased number of flocks, herds and human beings. Conquest followed. Captives were made slaves of the victorious tribes.

But war raised up the military leader. With power and authority developed in the field and backed by victorious hosts, he returned to his tribe to establish there like power. Usurpation ensued. The primitive democracy gave way to monarchy. Communal land became the privately owned land of king and chiefs. Women were subjected; communal slaves became royal slaves, and fellow tribesmen followed captive tribesmen into bondage.

Thus arose slavery, the dominant industrial institution of the ancient world. Egypt, Chaldaea, Assyria, Babylonia, Medea, Persia, all rested upon this basis. Greece, with whose annals Freeman begins modern history, was a slave power. Even Athens, in that splendid period, in politics, art, literature, poetry, oratory, philosophy, history so nearly ideal, Athens in the age of Pericles, rested upon a basis of slavery. Plato and Aristotle thought of slavery as an essential feature of human society. Rome, growing from the village by the Tiber into the one world power, was a hideous slave pen. The Roman slave,

often a scholar, poet, philosopher, artist, infinitely the superior of his brutal, corrupt, plutocratic master, had no rights which that master was bound to respect. Life itself hung by a thread which the master might at any moment snap.

FORMS OF SLAVERY.

Slavery underwent transformations. In the closing period of Roman rule it began to merge into serfdom. When the waves of barbarian migration overwhelmed the empire, serfdom gradually became the dominant industrial institution. Its basis differed from that of slavery. The slave was the personal property of his master. The serf, instead, was attached irremovably to his master's land. His condition was, in some respects, better than that of the slave. He had a habitation; he could maintain family life. Like the slave, however, his subsistence came in time to depend wholly upon the will of his lord. When, as the modern trust has developed out of competing corporations, the monarchy developed out of competing feudatories, serfdom received a new and harder status. As king ruled lords by absolute power, so, in turn, he permitted his lords to rule their serfs. Serfdom now degenerated into a species of galling and bitter bondage, whose cry yet reaches us from medieval chronicles and from such a spokesman as "The Mad Priest of Kent."

Serfdom in time waned. The hostility of monarchs toward rival and jealous barons, the growth of towns in which burgherism or modern business took its rise, the invention of gunpowder, "which made all men of the same height," and levelled feudal castles like so many mud huts, the printing press, whereby the absurdities and barbarities of feudalism might be exposed by burgherism, and the discovery of America, opening to the Old World a new, with vaster possibilities, made for the decline of the old regime. Serfs no longer needed by their lords and retainers, no longer tolerated by the monarchs as such, flocked to the towns seeking employment. Here arose a condition unknown either under slavery or serfdom: the battle for a chance to earn one's bread. The wages system was born.

The wages system was slavery in a new form. The worker was neither the property of his master, nor yet was he bound to the soil of his lord. He was free to move from place to place and seek employment. No lash revived his drooping energy. No auction block loomed before him. He was free to accumulate property, to own a home, to marry and rear a family, to become himself a business man. All of these things some wage earners did, and the theory obtained that all might do so.

In fact, but few did accumulate or own. Wages were determined by competition. The "Iron Law," as explained by Ricardo and popularized by Lassalle, fixed the worker's share at the subsistence level—"the natural wage," in the parlance of Ricardo; "greatest economist of the nineteenth century."

That European wage service is equivalent to slavery, is virtually conceded by American leaders of opinion; for who has not heard of "the pauper labor of Europe?" That American wage earners are, however, in like state, America has been slow to recognize or con-

cede. National pride accounts for this in part; the feeling that "America is another name for opportunity" is one that dies hard. Further, American wage earners long enjoyed an advantage unknown to their European brothers.

Our civilization skirted the Eastern coast and spread slowly to the westward. But for distances, seemingly illimitable, farther westward stretched the public domain. To this, the worker dissatisfied with his lot was ever legally free to betake himself, establish a home, rear a family, and acquire a competence and independence. For years this outlet was a real relief. Carlyle, ever skeptical of democracy, saw in this the substantial ground of America's comparative social peace and prosperity. Macaulay foresaw that, with its disappearance, would come in our eastern cities the economic pressure so well known in the Old World, and the familiar contest between "the statesman" urging "patience" and "the demagogue" pleading with the servile hordes to burst their bonds. Later, "The Prophet of San Francisco" pointed out the significance of the public lands as a safety valve from economic stress and painted in terrific rhetoric the conditions which must follow the exhaustion of this empire. Further, until settled and "settled right," the only labor question of which the American people could take serious cognizance was the question of black slave labor.

GREELEY'S DEFINITION.

But that not all were insensible to the fact that the wages system is a slave system is shown by the following striking letter said to have been sent by Horace Greeley in 1845 in response to an invitation to attend an anti-slavery convention:

"What is Slavery? You will probably answer: 'The legal subjection of one human being to the will of another.' But this definition seems to me inaccurate on both sides—too broad, and at the same time too narrow. It is too broad in that it includes the subjection founded in other necessities, not less stringent than those imposed by statute. We must seek some truer definition.

"I understand by slavery that condition in which one human being exists mainly as a convenience for other human beings—in which the time, the exertions, the faculty of a part of the human family are made to subserve, not their own development, physical, intellectual and moral, but the comfort, advantage, or caprices of others. In short, wherever service is rendered from one human being to another, on a footing of one-sided and not mutual obligation—where the relation between the servant and the served one is not of affection and reciprocal good offices, but of authority, social ascendancy and power over subsistence on the one hand, and of necessity, servility and degradation on the other—there, in my view, is slavery.

"1. Wherever certain human beings devote their time and thoughts mainly to obeying and serving other human beings, and this not because they choose to do so, but because they must, there (I think) is slavery.

"2. Wherever human beings exist in such relations that a part, because of the position they occupy and functions they perform, are

generally considered an inferior class to those who perform other functions or none, there (I think) is slavery.

"3. Wherever the ownership of soil is so engrossed by a small part of the community that the far larger number are compelled to pay whatever the few may see fit to exact for the privilege of occupying and cultivating the earth, there is something very like slavery.

"4. Wherever opportunity to labor is obtained with difficulty and is so deficient that the employing class may virtually prescribe their own terms and pay the laborer only such share as they choose of the product, there is a very strong tendency to slavery.

"5. Wherever it is deemed more reputable to live without labor, so that 'a gentleman' would be rather ashamed of his descent from a blacksmith than from a mere idler or mere pleasure seeker, there is a community not very far from slavery. And

"6. Wherever one human being deems it honorable and right to have other human beings mainly devoted to his or her convenience and comfort, and thus to live, diverting the labor of these persons from all productive or general usefulness to his or her own special use, while he or she is rendering or has rendered no corresponding service to the cause of human well-being, there exists the spirit which originated and still sustains human slavery."

THE MASK TORN OFF.

With the destruction of the slave power came the blossoming forth of capitalism in the New World. Factory systems, railway systems, banking systems, mercantile systems, flourished like the green bay tree. A rush, unprecedented, for the public domain followed. Soon came the time of industrial pressure. The Grange movement, the panic of '73, the greenback movement, the labor troubles of '77, the Henry George movement, the Farmers' Alliance, the People's party, the panic of '93, the railway strike of '94 and the never-to-be-forgotten campaign of '96, all followed in their order. And in 1900 the mask was boldly torn off. The pretense that America spelled opportunity for the working man was abandoned. The old notion that, with industry and economy, the worker could climb the golden stair and become a merchant prince or industrial magnate, was thrown to the winds. The bald, brutal fact that the existing system had for the worker no other economic reward than that enjoyed by the slave, a bare subsistence, was acknowledged; and workers were invited to vote for the maintenance of the *status quo* and "prosperity," their reward to be "a full dinner pail."

Then came the opportunity for Socialism. To such a pass had four centuries of New World "progress" come at last. What might be hoped from coming centuries? The time was ripe for American workingmen to seek the mastership of their own destinies, to "protect" themselves, to strike for freedom and opportunity to dwell in houses which they themselves had builded, and sit under vines and fig trees planted by their own hands.

In 1892 the Socialist Labor Party had a national ticket in the field. By 1900 the Social-Democratic party was also at the hustings. In 1901 came the "unity convention," seeking to establish harmony and

union between the come-outers from the first and the members of the second. In 1904 the Socialist party polled nearly a half million votes, and Hanna, then dead, had predicted that the conflict, soon to come, would be between that party and the party which, since the downfall of the slave power in America, had, but for a few brief and inglorious years, been dominant.

For centuries Socialists and their utopian progenitors had theorized. Young men had seen visions and old men had dreamed dreams. Pictures of perfect commonwealths whence all evil had fled and into which all conceivable happiness had entered had been painted, and dreamers and artists had declared them "very good." But now conditions had changed. Socialism had descended from the clouds of fancy. It had emerged from the cloister of the student; it had panoplied itself with the armor and fortified itself with the weapons of a political party. As such, how should it proceed? The question of method had become the paramount, burning issue.

FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE.

Engels wrote of the "Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science." Some day some one may write of the development of Socialism from theory to practice; from talk to work; from declamation to deeds; from perfervid demands for "Revolution" to actual evolutionary attainments.

Dreaming of Utopias, theorizing as to whether sharing shall be based on the principle of equality or on that of "to each according to his deed," "need," "greed," "breed," or "speed," all may have their place, but alone they fall far short of the goal.

To be a class-conscious, uncompromising, militant, revolutionary, scientific, international, Karl Marx Socialist, is very fine, but it "butters no parsnips."

We are told that economic determinism is a Socialist fundamental; that mankind, like the serpent of Eden, proceeds upon its belly; and that the bread and butter question determines race evolution and dominates all human institutions. If so, should we not take this fact into account in organizing a political party and in choosing the tactics whereby that party is to reorganize human society?

Look at things as they are.

Here are the land and tools for producing the bread and butter. On the one hand are a few people who own them, and pretty much everything else worth owning. On the other hand are the multitude who operate the tools, and, in good times, get a living.

Now appears upon the scene a certain type of Socialist enthusiast. To these workers he says: "Make the land and tools yours, and the product will be yours."

"How simple!" thinks the novice. "How delightfully easy! Such a Gordian knot can be cut any morning before breakfast." And so he invites the workers to get together and take control, and do it quick. To him any step-at-a-time process looks childish—or worse.

But as he proceeds with his propaganda difficulties appear. Not all the workers can see his point, clear as it appears to his mind. Not a majority of them can see it; not even a respectable-sized minority.

And those who do agree with him are so few that to help themselves to the land and tools would seem only less difficult than to repeat the labors of Sisyphus or Hercules.

And that is not all. When the masters of the workers who are willing to help themselves to land and tools hear of the program, they take notice; and the places which knew these "undesirable citizens" shortly know them no more. They are no longer "adapted to their environment"; they are "unfit"; hence they cease to "survive"—in that locality.

Other workers who have heard the new gospel and have thought favorably of it now reconsider. A whole loaf is certainly a good thing but a half loaf is better than no bread. "Economic determinism" proceeds to get in its work, and "revolutionary Socialists" fail to multiply like bacteria or Australian rabbits.

Disturbed a little, but not discouraged, our propagandist may now fall back upon the theory of the "economic break-down." Progress is toward centralization. From the individual capitalist producer we proceed to the partnership; thence to the company, the corporation, the syndicate, and the local trust. This develops into the national, and, in time, into the international trust, controlling one line of industry; and, from this, we may expect to see developed the universal trust controlling all lines. This great aggregation will be unable to sell its goods, to invest its profits or to employ the workers, hence the day of its perfection must be the day of its doom. It will of necessity break down. Then, nobody else knowing what to do, the "scientific Socialist" will tell the proletariat to help themselves to the wreckage; which, the world over, they will immediately do, and live happy ever after.

This view, again, excludes "immediate demands," half-loaf proposals, and all step-at-a-time, "compromise" measures. The fruit cannot possibly be plucked until it is ripe; we cannot get anything until we get everything; furthermore, we don't want to, for if the proletariat once get their stomachs full under capitalism they will want nothing else. So, instead of seeking to improve their condition, or help them improve it, we must preach the gospel of *laissez faire* as vigorously as did, ever Nassau, William Senior, or any other apostle of the Manchester school. We must fight every "immediate demand" proposition made by Socialists, gloat over every blow dealt to labor, and wait for the break-down, hoping that when that happy day arrives, the workers will be sufficiently empty and "revolutionary" to take over the whole industrial plant without further parley.

But, after a decade or two of waiting, even this program begins to pall. The centralizing of industry goes on all right, but the break-down fails to arrive on schedule time. Waiting for it seems like waiting with the Millerites for "the end of the world." The capitalistic system manifests a toughness favorably comparable with that of boarding-house "spring chicken," or steak; in ways wholly unexpected it adapts itself to new conditions, and gives promise of possessing more lives than the proverbial cat.

And during all these years and decades the workers have had to have three meals a day, a roof over their heads, and the hickory shirts, overalls and stogies necessary to protect them from the elements. And

all these things have had to be paid for, in the coin of the realm, day by day, as the workers have gone along. To those of them who have taken the time to listen to its exposition from the street corner soap box, and who chance, also, to be familiar with Sunday school lore, this "economic breakdown" and utopia-all-at-once theory strongly suggests the doctrine of the second coming, when all the kinks are to be suddenly unraveled from mundane things, and peace and plenty are henceforth to reign. Both doctrines may sound well, but they pay no bills; and, so far as the worker can see, both are exactly as valuable to him as any other fairy story.

Sooner or later our erstwhile ardent propagandist either surrenders to the seemingly inevitable, and "quits," or he begins to reconsider the question of "tactics." If he accepts the latter alternative, he has at last reached the stage where practical suggestions offered him may not prove merely good breath blown away. He may at last be prepared to consider the significance of the various risings recorded in history, culminating in the mighty effort of Spartacus, and ending in an Appian way bordered for miles on either side with crosses, each bearing a captive gladiator. And in looking for historic "breakdowns" of civilization, he may be led to ponder the fact that, after the apparent breakdown of the Roman republic under Julius Caesar, an empire succeeded it which ran on for five hundred years and, when it did fall, fell not at, nor into, the hands of outraged Roman proletarians or slaves, but before and into the possession of vigorous, unspoiled barbarians from beyond the Rhine-Danube frontier.

EVOLUTION OF THE SOCIALIST.

The Socialist not infrequently passes through two stages in his evolution. First, he becomes convinced that the capitalistic system is wholly bad and must be abolished, root and branch. There must be "no compromise" with it. The tables must be swept clean, and the new order created out of hand. Further, the work can, and must, be done all at once. To suggest anything less than the immediate and absolute reconstruction of the entire social order is nothing less than treason to the working class.

Later, through repeated hard knocks and extended experience with human beings, including Socialists and "proletarians," as they are, our Socialist comes to see that the present system is by no means wholly bad; that, instead, it represents the best that race evolution has been able to produce; that, in a multitude of features, it is good and constantly growing better; that to abolish it wholly would be like throwing the baby out with the bath, or killing the chicken in the egg; that only some features—notably private ownership of the social means of production and the operation of these not for the public good but for individual, private profit—are bad, and that to attack these features and the evil consequences which flow from them in no sense necessitates condemning the whole social fabric, or the whole population which fails to agree with one's own crude notions.

Further, the Socialist learns that, so far from our being able to construct society all at once, our highest, broadest and deepest knowledge, as represented by the evolution philosophy, proves that all funda-

mental social changes take place slowly; that the evolution of society resembles not the upheaval of the volcano, but the slow deposit of geological strata, or, better, the growth of a tree or animal body; and that sudden changes are superficial changes—eddies only on the surface of the great spring tides of human history.

Experience, further, supplementing history, teaches him little by little that the conquest of the capitalistic system by the working class must be like the conquest of Britain by the Saxons; bit by bit. There must be shortened hours here, increased pay there, improved conditions yonder; progressive taking over of industry, enlarged suffrage, the raising of the age limit for the child worker, growing toleration in debate, greater open-mindedness on the part of the public toward labor's cause, progressive insistence by the average man on a fair show for the workers, with a chance on their part to live human lives, and an increasing disposition on the part of the workers themselves to recognize that these things are theirs by right and must be won largely by their own patient, persistent, dogged effort.

To the new convert, pawing and snorting like the biblical war-horse, champing the bit and wild to rush at once into battle with the minions of capitalism, that he may speedily win the Socialist heaven, all this, of course, is gall and wormwood. Experience, however, that hard, prosaic teacher of us all, gradually hammers it into him. This done, as said, he is at last ready to listen to reason, and consider ways and means of crossing the desert which stretches between the Egypt of the present system and the Promised Land of the new social order.

One of the first lessons, now, for the rational Socialist to learn is that of trades unionism. He must see that fraternity on a national or an international scale is impracticable until it can be practiced on a small scale; that if one love not the brother whom he has seen every day, much less can he love the worker a thousand miles away, engaged in a different and unfamiliar calling and whom, thus far, he has not seen at all; that before the working class can win a world they must try, intelligently, patiently, resolutely, co-operatively, and sometimes, at least, successfully, to win a little more of the products of their labor; that before they can shine in the Parliament of Man, or even in the Congress of the United States, they must learn to make motions in the meetings of their unions, observe the elementary principles of parliamentary procedure, and abide by the decisions of the majority, duly registered; and that, before they can control the destinies of the world, they must learn the lessons of self-control and group control which trades unionism inevitably and effectively teaches.

Again, and here we reach the crucial point, he must learn the lesson of political action. How much easier and more exhilarating it is to damn the universe from the street corner, while the gleeful proletariat "throw up their sweaty nightcaps" and howl, than to do the dull, dry, dreary drudgery of the committee room! How much more heroic it is to demand the unconditional surrender of capitalism, and to propose to move immediately upon its works, than to train a body of working-men to turn out in an off year and vote the Socialist ticket when doing so will mean nothing more than standing up to be counted! How much

more glorious to charge uproariously and redhanded up a mythical and metaphorical San Juan Hill, breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the exploiters of labor, than to master the intricacies of government, acquire a working knowledge of the constitution of the United States, the state in which one lives, the charter of his city, and the methods and practices whereby the will of a majority is written upon the statutes of a commonwealth and enforced in actual daily practice!

NO OTHER WAY IN AMERICA.

But there is no other way—certainly not in America. Shouting formulas and rending garments may do elsewhere, but America is hopelessly, irretrievably Anglo-Saxon; and the Anglo-Saxon stubbornly refuses to know any other way of getting ahead socially than the slow, prosaic way of constitutional, political action.

Apparent exceptions there may be, it is true; but exceptions they are only in appearance. Cromwell worked miracles in defiance of the English constitution. He anticipated by two centuries the course of British progress. He did things which the England of today has not yet dared to do, and he made the name of the little British kingdom glorious. But he proved once again the proposition that "one can do almost anything with bayonets except sit on them." Hardly was he cold in his grave until the reaction was on in full tide. Englishmen who, had they obtained them in the regular way, would have gloried in the changed conditions, were heavy at heart and sore of conscience over the fact that, from the constitutional standpoint, they had done evil that good might come. And in less time than it takes to tell it the contemptible refugee, Charles II., was on his way to Whitehall, welcomed by the multitude as their deliverer and savior; the body of the great captain was dug up and hanged in chains at Tyburn, and all the while the Invincible Ironsides, most marvelous of all armies since time began, stood paralyzed and mute, watching their mighty work undone, the wheels of progress reversed, and the hands turned back on the clock of time, for the reason, not that the commonwealth and protectorate had not been vastly better and nobler than the things both before and after, but because they had been irregular, and had defied the Anglo-Saxon sense of orderly constitutional progress.

But granting political action, consider its possibilities. In some city, where conditions are favorable, the Socialist party has developed an effective organization. It goes into politics, not as a matter of form, but seriously. It elects, let us say, a member to the city school board; another to the city council. What now shall these members do? Obviously, they are hopelessly in the minority. Shall they devote their time to obstruction and to mere wholesale condemnation? Not if they are practical Socialists. The school board member seeks to inform himself as thoroughly as possible regarding the condition and needs of the city schools. He consults with teachers, patrons, and pupils. He studies educational reports from other cities, home and foreign. He reads his party program. He ascertains what the European comrades are doing with their schools. Then, without ranting or declamation, he enters the meeting of the local school board like a "safe and sane"

citizen; in company with his fellow members he goes over the questions that arise; he shows himself from the start to be earnestly, enthusiastically and rationally in favor of the best equipped schools that can be had for the money available. He insists that the teachers shall be the best that can be obtained. He is glad to see an occasional Socialist among the teachers, but he does not insist that subscription to the Communist Manifesto or the Erfurt Program is absolutely essential to the teaching of chemistry or mathematics. He does insist that in the teaching of history, economics and politics reasonable regard shall be paid to the truth, and that, at its proper place, the Socialist side shall be fairly presented. He demands this not as a partisan, but as a citizen and as one concerned in truthful, scientific teaching.

Moreover, the Socialist member is solicitous of the material side of the schools. He insists that the sanitation shall be the best; that the light shall be good, the rooms properly ventilated and heated, the buildings clean and in repair. He demands modern, high-grade appliances. He favors gymnastics, manual training, cooking, sewing, and all other lines of instruction that tend to prepare the pupil for the actual work of life. He ascertains what percentage of the pupils in his ward are in school, and compares this percentage with that of other wards in his city and in other cities. If the percentage is low, he inquires the reason, which probably brings him promptly to the question of child labor. Opportunity is here afforded to drive home an important lesson. He proves himself a friend of teachers and pupils. He talks school, in the school and out. He discusses the problems of the city schools in the city papers, not in a rabid, inflammatory way, but in a rational, winning, thought-compelling way. He intensifies the interest of the city in its schools, and gradually raises the level of these fundamental institutions.

BEGINNING AT THE BOTTOM.

And "what good," does our revolutionary inquire, "is there in all of this? What has all this to do with the social revolution?" Much, every way. Building the co-operative commonwealth is like building a coral island. We must begin at the bottom; we must work continuously, unceasingly. Here a little, there a little, line upon line, precept upon precept, we must proceed through the months and years till the work is done. That the co-operative commonwealth may be what it should be, we must have sound minds in sound bodies, we must have a healthy, well-rounded, balanced people. The schools are among the greatest constructive forces in creating this coming population.

Again, work of this character, rational, intelligent, practical, makes friends for the movement. It convinces. Fair-minded people are likely to comment: "I do not know much about Socialism, and I cannot say that I care very much, but if the Socialist member of our school board is a sample of the party, I think we have been unduly scared. For my part, the more of such Socialists that are elected to office, at least to places on the school board, the better the results will be."

Then take our member of the city council. Here the field is vast. He is only one in a crowd. He cannot carry measures all by himself. He certainly cannot hope to inaugurate the co-operative commonwealth. What can he do?

Like the school board member, he can be rational and constructive. He can prove that Socialists are not necessarily madmen, or even doctrinaires. Like him, he can promptly and diligently begin the study of the field in which he is to operate. A leaky sewer is spreading contagion. He calls attention to this nuisance, and insists upon proper repairs. Handsome shade trees along the avenue are being butchered by the local light company to make room for wires. He protests against such vandalism. Employees of the street railway company are being shamelessly overworked and underpaid; poor service at high rates is being rendered the public; and the corporation is demanding, "What are you going to do about it?" The Socialist member secures data as to municipally owned and operated street railway systems, home and foreign, and insists upon their being given publicity. Perhaps the street railway company's charter is soon to expire. The Socialist member insists that this charter shall not be renewed, but that the city shall take over the existing system or provide a new one. He proves from his figures the substantial gain from every point of view to be expected from such a policy. He shows that where municipal ownership has been tested it means increased pay, shortened hours and better treatment and conditions for the employees; it means improved service and lower rates for the public; and it means one less corporation to control and debauch municipal affairs.

And so, all along the line, our Socialist members are showing themselves to be not destroyers, but builders, not ignorant fanatics, but the best informed and most highly efficient officers in the city. All this makes for improved conditions at the time; it sets an example, and it makes friends for the party. Where originally it seemed impossible to elect one Socialist, it now becomes easy to elect many, and to re-elect them when their terms of service have expired.

A LESSON FROM TAMMANY.

Let us for a moment consider this subject from the standpoint of "practical politics." The preceding, of course, represents politics of a most practical type. This, however, does not end the story.

Reference has been made to "economic determinism." Why has Tammany a grip upon New York City that is rarely loosened, and never permanently broken? Is it because New Yorkers love corruption, or because the working class of that metropolis are totally depraved? Is it because a monarchy has been established there which all the wealth of the capitalists and all the patriotism of the laborers cannot overthrow?

Rest assured that if any institution stands for long, there is good in it. Unless all reports are false, there is good even in Tammany Hall. Tammany professes to "stand by its friends," and its profession seems to be borne out in practice. True, not all New Yorkers are its friends; nevertheless it has enough generally to carry the municipal elections. Grant that some of these friends are law-defying capitalists enjoying immunity through Tammany Hall. Are there enough of these to carry an election? Grant that under Tammany rule, not to mention other types of rule, the city hall is in partnership with gamblers, dive-keepers, and saloonists. Are there enough of these to carry an election?

Tammany has the reputation of standing by such members of the working class as are enrolled in its legions. If a Tammany worker wants work, he sees his local representative of the machine, and the work is provided. If he is sick he is visited. If he is in hard luck he is helped. If he wants promotion he knows where to apply for it. Tammany Hall becomes for him his guardian angel; his practical, everyday, working deity. Its success is his success; its failure is his calamity.

If such practical helpfulness, such substantial goodness, can abide in a notoriously corrupt, thieving political organization, standing not for a new social order but for the perpetuation of the present one, and if such qualities can make this organization practically invincible, what are not the possibilities of a Socialist municipal organization?

Consider them. To carry a city election requires votes. The workmen have votes—votes galore; votes to repletion. In the city they are almost the only class whose votes do mount into large figures.

The Socialist party is *the* party of the working class. It is such not for demagogical purposes, not simply to carry elections, not simply to hold office, not certainly that it may inaugurate a reign of graft; but from principle, as a matter of philosophy. From the beginning the Socialist party has been specifically and avowedly the wage earners' party. Whomever else might be interested and willing to help, the party has been glad to receive; but, in the cities especially, its appeal has been made directly to the wage earning class.

Now what can the Socialist party offer the wage earner in a modern city? How does its offer compare with that of Tammany Hall?

Tammany offers jobs; the Socialist party offers, ultimately, emancipation from job mongers. But for practical politics, "ultimately" is too far off. The wage earner believes emphatically in economic determinism, although he has never heard of it. He wants something now. He has a family to care for. He has rent and grocer's bills and fuel bills and doctor's bills to pay; he must have money. He does not ask this money as a gift; he does not ask to receive it as graft; he asks for the opportunity to earn it by honest toil. What can the Socialist party say to him?

The Socialists can point to the street railway system above referred to. They can say; "Elect the Socialist party to power, and as soon as the franchise expires we will establish municipal street railways. This done, we will raise the pay, shorten the day, and improve the conditions of the employes on the street railway line."

"What evidence," will be asked, "have we that this is possible?" The Socialists point to the records of municipal street railway lines elsewhere. The facts, easily available, are indisputable. The same line of argument is presented with reference to lighting plants, waterworks, telephone systems, and public utilities in general.

Promises, however, without performances prove boomerangs. Performance must keep full pace with promise. And time must elapse before the conditions of the workers in the city, as a class, can be materially improved by the Socialist administration. Improvements, however, can be made. Furthermore, there is much in spirit and disposi-

tion. The Socialist administration can prove itself the workingman's friend. If a strike occurs, it can promptly demonstrate the difference between strikes under capitalist administration and strikes under Socialist administration. To do this it is not necessary to destroy industry. It is only necessary to investigate conditions and insist that so far as the power of the municipality lies, capitalists shall treat their wage earners with reasonable fairness and consideration. All this means much. The wage earners are not demanding Utopia now; they are only demanding fair play; they are demanding opportunity to live like human beings. No administration can compete with the Socialist administration in its power to help them do this. For the Socialist administration understands the labor question as no capitalist administration can understand it. Its sympathies are on the side of the working class rather than on the side of the capitalist class.

I know the objection that will be raised. The powers of the municipality are limited. It operates under a charter. This charter is obtained from the state. The state is under capitalist control; and capitalism, through the state, and even possibly the nation, will use its power to hamper and harass and hedge about Socialist municipal administration, defeating its ends, embarrassing its operations, paralyzing its arms, and rendering it impotent and contemptible. If all this is true, the case is hopeless. If Socialism cannot succeed along the lines indicated it can never succeed at all. It must make a record in the municipality, or surrender and disband.

It need do neither. Socialism is not without experience. Numerous foreign municipalities have been and are still under Socialist control. Foreign comrades are working along the lines indicated. They are scoring. They are making a record; and critics, studying this record, are forced to admit its significance.

As stated, to manifest a rational and helpful spirit means much. The working class will not demand everything of a Socialist administration. They will demand reasonable accomplishments, and will consider limitations and difficulties. For proof, look at two American cities under radical administrations not Socialist: Toledo and Cleveland. Golden Rule Jones convinced the common people that he was their friend; he became invincible, and died in office.

Tom Johnson holds Cleveland in a grip as sure as was that of Croker in New York.

Neither Jones nor Johnson inaugurated the millenium; neither proposed to. Each attacked predatory wealth; each was hated by the corporations; but each held his place by his grasp on the hearts and the confidence of the common people. If Jones and Johnson could do this, a Socialist administration can do the same.

Reasonable success in the city will mean success outside the city. The reputation of the city administration will spread over the state. It will make friends for the Socialist movement. It will convince workingmen and others sympathetic with the workers' side, or disgusted with corporation rule, that the Socialists are not wreckers but builders. Campaigners will have in the successful city administration a convincing object lesson. Nothing talks like deeds. The result will be that

Socialists will be sent to the two branches of the legislature to proceed on lines similar to those indicated for the city. In time they will carry the state. When they do this they will have virtually conquered a kingdom.

WHAT CAN THE STATES DO?

Strange, how little the average American, and especially the average "revolutionary Socialist," sees in the American state.

In point of area West Virginia is nearly as large as Greece. Oklahoma is larger than Portugal or Bulgaria, and almost as large as the republic of Iceland. Either Pennsylvania or New York is almost as large as Roumania. Nevada almost equals Italy in size. California is considerably greater than Norway. Kansas is nearly half as large as Spain. And Texas is greater than Austro-Hungary, far greater than France or Germany, and more than twice as large as the British Isles.

Note next the populations of some American states as compared with those of some European states.

The population of New York state exceeds that of Belgium, and almost equals that of Norway and Sweden combined; the population of Pennsylvania is in advance of that of the Netherlands, of Portugal, Sweden or Roumania, and nearly equals that of Belgium; Illinois outranks Scotland or Ireland, while Ohio falls but little behind. The population of either Missouri or Texas nearly equals that of Bulgaria or Switzerland, while the population of Wisconsin is but little less than that of Servia, Finland, Denmark, Norway, or that country of deathless history, Greece.

Under the American constitution, the state is an independent commonwealth. In respect to its own individual affairs it is as independent of other powers as is France, or Germany, or Austria. If it minds its own business, neither other states nor the nation itself has any more right to interfere with its operations than has Mexico, or Canada, or Japan.

True, the nation may usurp the state's powers; it may infringe upon the state's rights and prerogatives. Similarly, a European nation may infringe upon the rights and prerogatives of another nation; or a coalition of European nations, as in 1793, may be formed to crush one nation, as the allies united to crush revolutionary France. Such courses, however, are exceptional. To assume in advance their inevitability is to surrender in advance, to prove our own impotence, incompetence and unworthiness of the confidence and suffrages of the working class. It is the duty, instead, of the Socialist party to assume its right, on carrying a state election, to use all the powers guaranteed to the state administration by the state constitution and not delegated to the national government.

These powers, I repeat, are vast. In respect of its own private concerns the state is an independent sovereignty. It possesses powers legislative, executive, and judicial, as ample and complete as the powers of the national government or of the British empire. By faithfully and intelligently exercising these powers, a Socialist state administration may make a record that will live in history by the side of that of Pericles in Athens or of Savonarola in Florence.

What are some of the things that a Socialist state administration could do if in full control of the state government?

First, what does a Socialist state administration want to do? What does its platform and its program indicate?

The object of the Socialist party, according to its express official declarations, is to transfer from private ownership and administration to public ownership and administration the socially necessary means of production. What are these? Land and such capital as has attained a degree of economic development and concentration that makes it socially necessary and desirable. Now what field has the state with respect to these? Consider the question of land. In the states occupying the western quarter of the Union, the nation, it is true, holds considerable areas of land. In the three quarters of the Union lying east of this area, the nation owns but little land. Practically all the remaining land is subject to the jurisdiction of the states. This includes not simply agricultural lands, but mineral lands—lands underlaid with coal, zinc, lead, iron, copper, salt, gas, oil. Like the nation, the state enjoys the right of eminent domain. Any of this land which it may desire to make public it can take over. True, this may involve condemnation and purchase; but so let it be.

And now what? Do we suggest that the Socialist state administration shall immediately take over all of the lands in the state and make them public property? Not so fast.

A Socialist fundamental is democratic government. This it would realize through the initiative and referendum, the recall, proportional representation, and every means which increases the power of the people over their government. One of the first acts of a Socialist state administration should be the provision of a comprehensive, practical, effective initiative and referendum law. With this in existence and operation, it should be possible for the state administration to keep in close touch with the people; to avoid offending them, outrunning them, or failing to measure up to their desires and aspirations.

Now, to proceed. Assume that there are coal lands in the state. The Socialist administration should promptly proceed to establish a state coal mine. Whether the electorate favor this proposal can be readily tested by a referendum. If not, the administration must wait, and Socialists must agitate and educate still further. If, however, the people are willing, the state mine should be established. Labor should be employed by the state, coal should be mined by the state, and sold by the state, to the people of the state.

And at what price? At such a price as will gradually extinguish the cost of the mine and plant, meet all the expenses of mining, pay the operatives at least union rate of wages, and put the coal on the market.

But, says the objector, there is your crux. How can you put this coal on the market without availing yourself of the railways? The railways will be against you. They will refuse to haul your coal, or they will charge you such rates that you cannot sell in the same market with corporations.

This is the old style line of argument of the constitutional objector, the Socialist to whom all things are impossible. He is the one man in all the world who insists that the part is greater than the whole. He is sure that a Socialist administration, whether municipal or state, must be absolutely impotent; and yet he expects the working class, apparently in the twinkling of an eye to capture the whole United States and transform it into a co-operative commonwealth!

But this objection leads naturally to our next constructive step. Highways are essential to the public well-being. Local highways, village streets and footpaths, city avenues and boulevards, national thoroughfares, all are indispensable. A Socialist state administration must see that the state highways are open and in working condition.

What is the Socialist position as to highways? Are they to be left in private hands? Not if Socialist platforms and programs are worth the paper upon which they are written. The state administration must proceed promptly to provide the people of the state with state-owned and state-operated railways.

But here arises the objector who thinks that under the co-operative commonwealth everything in the United States is to run from Washington. He demands to know what power the state Socialist administration will have over highways in the state.

The reply is, there is no more reason to assume that when Socialists have their way everything will be run from Washington than to assume that everything will be run from London or from the New Jerusalem. Whatever form of administration may prevail Americans, whether capitalists or Socialists, insist that national affairs shall be nationally controlled, that state affairs shall be subject to state control, that municipal affairs shall be municipally controlled, and that local affairs shall be locally controlled.

In America there are unquestionably highways which, by their nature are national; these are the great trunk lines, the transcontinental thoroughfares. Whole systems of lines, interstate in character, also fall under the national system. This fact, however, does not bar state highways. Do not imagine the era of railroad building is ended; it is but begun. The steam railway is far from a finality. Already the electric railway, in states like Ohio and Indiana, is crowding it hard. The electric railway has a magnificent future. Its lines and systems are now multiplying. They are proving their popularity. They are increasing transportation facilities and reducing rates. They are binding country to city. They are hastening the day when farmers and farmers' wives will not through isolation lose their minds. But must these improved transportation facilities first be created by private capital to domineer over the people and necessitate the repetition of the struggle already beginning between the government and the steam railways?

The assumption is absurd. The people should promptly build these lines for themselves, own them, and operate them, as they build and operate schools, water, lighting, and street railway plants, and other public utilities.

One of the early duties of the Socialist state administration should be to consider in all its aspects the question of establishing a state sys-

tem of electric railway lines. A bill inaugurating this policy should be drafted and referred to the people for their acceptance or rejection. If the vote is affirmative, the state should proceed at once to construct the system.

But what bearing has this upon the coal question? It is this. Interference on the part of private railway lines with the marketing of its own coal by the state would thus be ended. Furthermore, the price of coal to the consumer could be reduced by the saving in what otherwise would have gone as profit on account of private transportation charges.

This advantage, of course, is the least which would attend the establishment by the state of a system of transportation within its borders. The increased facility for intercommunication, the improved service, the lower charges for fares, and furthermore, the enormous boon to labor as opportunity for employment at such wages as the state would pay for such short hours as the state would exact, and under such conditions as the state would provide, would render this step a memorable advance in the history of Socialist administration in the world.

Still we have but started. There are in the state iron mines, salt mines, lead and zinc mines, oil wells, gas deposits, and other natural resources. Under capitalistic administration these are left for private exploitation. Even the Roosevelt administration is beginning to revolt at a policy so insane. Should the Socialist administration of the state do less?

Instead, it should boldly proceed on the lines of its program. One by one, or group by group, as fast as its capacity and resources and the affirmative votes of the people will permit, it should resolutely and unhesitatingly take these up, and establish them on a Socialistic basis.

But for the fact that he has repeatedly fought over every inch of this ground with impossibilists, "DeLeonites," and revolutionaries, the writer would assume that all of this would go without saying. As a matter of fact, he knows that every step will be contested by capitalists and bourbons on the one side, and on the other by the type of Socialists to which he has referred. The constructive Socialist must fight them both and do his work besides.

HOW ABOUT AGRICULTURE?

Again, there is the problem of socializing agriculture. Here Socialists may hesitate. At the same time the problem is not beyond solution.

Each state now has a state agricultural college and an experiment station. These represent Socialist principles as applied to agriculture. Here a beginning may well be made. Agriculture, both scientific and practical, may here be demonstrated. The experimental field may gradually be enlarged to whatever limit judgment and the public intelligence will sanction.

Here the question promptly arises, what will be done with these agricultural products? Shall they be sold upon the competitive market? If so, a clash will at once be precipitated between the state administration and the farming class.

The answer is twofold. The clash must always come sooner or later between the publicly owned and administrated industry and privately owned and administrated industry. However, the difficulty in the case in hand can long be avoided by disposing of the products, not by throwing them upon the competitive market, but by distributing them among the state institutions. The consumptive power of these institutions in any considerable state is great. One state now operates a coal mine, and disposes of its coal in this way. A socialistically administrated state could, in the same way, dispose of a very large volume of agricultural products without incurring serious difficulty.

But we have not yet finished with the city. In fact, when the Socialists have obtained control of the political machinery of the state, the time for real Socialist municipal administration has but begun. The reason is this. Almost every city in America now, as intimated, is hampered by the limitations of its charter. With rare exceptions, American cities do not enjoy home rule. They should. One of the first duties of a Socialist state administration should be to grant to every municipality within the borders of the state the complete and unquestioned right and power to manage all its own affairs. This is but in line with the principles of democratic government and of the American constitution. The principle, as earlier stated, is this: national control of national affairs, state control of state affairs, municipal control of municipal affairs, local control of local affairs, and individual control of individual affairs. This is a proper division of labor; a proper distribution of power and responsibility; the principle that makes for efficient administration, and that conforms with theoretical justice. It is nothing more nor less than the principle of home rule, of self-government. In establishing state autonomy for the control of the party, the Socialist party recognizes this principle.

That American cities do not enjoy home rule is an anomaly. The explanation is in the fact that when towns grew up in the midst of the feudal system they at first had no rights. They were despised by the surrounding lords. Their only hope lay in the king, partly because they could serve him in supplying his wants, partly because they could aid him as makeweight against the rebellious lords. They applied to him for privileges and immunities. These he sold to them, the contract of sale being called a "charter." Many of these may be found in Stubbs's *Select Charters*, illustrating English constitutional history. Thus the principle became established whereby the city looked to the central government for the right to live, move, and have its being; and only such privileges and immunities as came to it from the central government could it enjoy in peace. This medieval custom has continued to the present time an absurd and mischievous anachronism. The Socialist platform declares against it, and for municipal home rule. The Socialist state administration should promptly establish complete municipal self-government within the borders of the state.

This done, the field for municipal Socialist administration immensely broadens. Everything now which the city ought to do for itself it can promptly begin to do. As state referendums will suffice to keep the state administration and the electors in touch, and avoid clashes and political upheavals, so municipal referendums will serve the same purpose in the

city. Does the city want a library? Let the citizens say so by a referendum, and let the city administration proceed to provide this utility. Is the city tired of the telephone monopoly? In the same way let it put in a municipal telephone, improving the service and cutting the rates to a fraction of those now paid. Does the city want a department store run on a Socialistic basis? Let the citizens say so by a referendum, and let the administration provide the store. Similarly with municipal shops, bake-houses, factories, mines, and the rest of the things recognized by the Socialist platform and the Socialist municipal program. Now, many of these things are impossible. With municipal home rule, and the protection and backing of a Socialist state administration, all, and more, will become possible.

WHO WILL PAY THE BILLS?

But now comes the burning question of the budget. Where is the money to come from? As one astute capitalistic editor inquired, "Who is to pay the bills under Socialism?" In our forecast we have not reached complete Socialism. Nevertheless the question is appropriate and essential. Take first the city without home rule and without the state administration behind it. The Socialist city administration still has all the powers of taxation enjoyed by the present city administration. These, of course, are material. From the socialistic standpoint, however, they are quite inadequate. The large things which a Socialist municipal administration can do, and must do, cannot be done until its powers of taxation are materially enlarged. We must be content with the day of comparatively small things in the city until we get control of the state.

But assume that we have obtained as complete control of a state as the Populists obtained in Kansas, when legislative, executive and judicial powers all were in their hands. How shall the state pay **its** bills?

As of the city, so of the state; the Socialist state administration has all the powers which the capitalist state administration enjoys, and these are far from meager. But the Socialist state administration is by no means content with existing powers of taxation. The Socialist party stands for taxation of incomes, inheritances, franchises and land values. Now its time has come.

The impossibilist objection is perfectly understood. Here, as always and everywhere, it thrusts itself into the foreground. We cannot do anything till we can do everything. There are lions innumerable in the way. The Socialist state administration is impotent; the capitalist national administration is omnipotent. The capitalists in power at Washington and in all the great trust offices will environ and beleaguer this one poor Socialist state and overwhelm it, and sink it too deep for resurrection. The thought of using the power of taxation is treason, and so forth and so on to the end of the chapter.

But since, from the impossibilist standpoint, all things are impossible that are worth while, the Socialist who means business will pass the impossibilist by and proceed with his work. As earlier indicated, the powers of **the state now** in purely state affairs are complete, unlimited, and absolute. Only by abdication or shirking on the part of the state, or by usurpation on the part of powers capitalistic and political outside of the state, or by both, can the state Socialist administration be prevented from proceeding with the Socialist program. Usurpation may, indeed, be tried, and may temporarily succeed: as a permanent policy, however, it cannot succeed. The American people have only to understand it, and they will repudiate it and crush it. Witness, for example, the Hughes demand, reluctantly conceded by the New York state legislature for a recount of the contested mayoralty vote. The American people, whether Socialist or non-socialist, are not hopelessly corrupt. Nor will they stand permanently for usurpation and unconstitutional rule by any party or political aggregation. The Populists in Kansas, it is generally understood, had their first governor counted out. Their subsequent governors were not counted out. They engaged in a physical contest with the Republicans to insure control of their first legislature; but afterwards they enjoyed undisputed control of both branches of that body,

the executive office, and the state supreme court. The Republicans themselves had only to be convinced that the Populists were within their rights, and the mass of them were prepared to insist that until voted out they should enjoy those rights. A sane, practical, law-abiding Socialist administration will enjoy equal respect and equal opportunities to exercise its constitutional powers.

And now for taxation. The Socialist state administration must sedulously guard against encroaching upon national territory. Where interstate questions are involved it must be on its guard and keep well within the limit. These precautions taken, it may, and should, proceed boldly on its way. Here are state monopolies, which the state may not yet be ready to socialize. Let it tax them. The state constitution forbids? Perhaps not; examine it. We have a Socialist state supreme court to interpret it. Perhaps it does. What is your referendum for but to change your state constitution? Now tax your monopolies. You have rich men in your state. The Socialists have long declared for a progressive income tax. Do they mean what they say? If so, let them tax these incomes, and let them tax them hard. The people will not stand for it? Are the people standing for what Roosevelt is doing now, little as that may be? Are they standing for what Hughes is doing, for what Hadley is doing, for what Folk is doing, for what Tom Johnson is doing? Did they stand by Pingree? But remember, you have the referendum. The referendum enables you to know in advance whether the people will back you up. If they will not, educate them a while longer. If they will, go ahead.

The Socialist platform stands for taxation of inheritances. You have them in your state. Go after them. And franchises? Who is not aware of their existence? Even half-way and quarter-way Socialists will concede that these should be taxed. Tax them.

And there are the land values. A De Leonite organizer expressed profound astonishment at discovering in the Socialist national platform a proposal to tax land values. Did he ever hear of Henry George? Did he ever hear of Tom Johnson's report on taxation in the District of Columbia? Of the Schilling-Altgeld report on taxation in Illinois? Who so blind as not to see the gold mine existing in land values, especially in the land values of cities? For fifteen years and more English Socialists have persistently, at every opportunity, and in every way, demanded the taxation of English land values. And the present prime minister was elected in part on his demand for the taxation of land values.

PLENTY OF MONEY.

In the light of these suggestions, and with wealth surpassing that of Golconda lying at the hands of the Socialist state administration, is this administration to halt, falter and fail for lack of funds? If so, it deserves to fail and to be buried beyond all resurrection. A party which in such circumstances cannot succeed is beneath contempt. The scorn of the historian who records its fiasco should blister the page; and the curses of a betrayed working class should sink it into eternal and undying infamy. With its hands on the lever of taxation, the Socialist party can fill its treasury. With funds, administrative capacity, and the backing of the people, tested constantly by the referendum, it can do the things the Socialist party stands to do. It can buy — If here again the impossibilist shrieks, we have only to let him shriek and pass on — The Socialist party can buy the coal, oil, gas, copper, iron, and other lands, and equip its mines and wells. It can buy the land on which to build electric railways. It can buy the land on which to conduct its agricultural experimentation. It can buy whatever else it may need to carry out the Socialist program. And in buying it keeps itself safely within the constitution of its state and of the nation. Fanatics may prate of "confiscation"—fanatics will not build the co-operative commonwealth. Let a Socialist state or city administration once start on the line of confiscation, and its doom is sealed. It will bring down upon itself all the powers of capitalism, industrial and political. "Private property" must not, according to our national constitution, be "taken for public use" except for "just

compensation." Capitalist courts uniformly stand for this interpretation, and will continue thus to stand. And back of them is the army. A Socialist administration which defies this fact thereby commits suicide.

But every Socialist save those so blinded by fanaticism as to see nothing aright can see that, from the working class standpoint, there is absolutely no difference whether the land and capital are confiscated, or whether they are purchased with the proceeds of taxation laid on monopolies, incomes, franchises and land values. What difference does it make to the proletariat whether the funds be collected with the left hand or the right so long as they are collected from the capitalist class? And such funds are infallibly collected from them.

In the city, again, the enlarged powers of taxation above referred to are now at hand. With municipal home rule, the municipal administration has the same powers within its limits that the state enjoys. The city, too, can tax incomes, inheritances, franchises, and land values. Legislation, of course will be necessary to avoid double taxation. Socialists in the state capitol, Socialists in the city council, and Socialist voters scattered through the state and expressing themselves through the referendum, should be able to adjust details like this.

Now, with the municipal administration enjoying ample and adequate powers of taxation what can it not do for the working class? What excuse longer for slum dwellings? Why longer delay the establishment of homes for the working class, comfortable, sanitary, light and convenient homes, connected by adequate and cheap transportation facilities with working places and shopping districts? Why should schools remain inferior, teachers underpaid, appliances meager? Why should children be excluded from school privileges from scarcity of school buildings? Why should any child grow up untrained from lack of training schools? Why should capitalistic medical practitioners exploit the necessities of the sick and helpless? Why should opportunities for art, music, and entertainment of all right kinds be lacking to the producers of the city's wealth? Why should municipal monopolies continue to rob within the city limits? Why should long hours and soul-destroying toil deprive the worker of opportunity and capacity to enjoy something of the largeness and fullness of life?

And now talk of "political machines"! With a Socialist administration, sane, rational, practical, competent, and working on the lines of the Socialist platform and municipal program, actually in power and doing business, where in comparison are your Tweeds, your Crokers, or your Quays? What capitalistic political machine could for one moment rival in popularity or strength such a Socialist administration? Tweed's machine was a pyramid poised on its apex. It fell. Such a Socialist administration as described would be a pyramid resting on its base. With a state government behind it and a constituency informed and enthused as its constituency would, in time, become, no power on earth could overthrow it, without at the same time creating a reaction which would miserably destroy itself. Talk of "practical politics!" No politics since time began, not even the magnificent politics of Pericles, can equal the politics possible by a Socialist administration proceeding on Socialist lines. Graft exposures? Scandalous revelations? There is no occasion for these. Monopolistic wealth need not be obtained by a Socialist administration by corrupt methods; constitutional methods abundantly suffice. Socialist officials would have no occasion to plunder and rob the municipality; a grateful and enthusiastic constituency would vote them salaries far beyond the needs of want or anxiety.

NATIONAL SOCIALISM.

Thus far we have discussed only municipal and state Socialist politics. The magnificent empire of national politics has been left untouched. Suffice it here to say that such work in city and state makes national success inevitable. Once let one city set such a pace, and other cities will insist on following in its wake. Let such a state administration once become established and demonstrate the possibilities of practical, working So-

cialism within its borders, and other state populations will shortly be off the reservation. Capitalist politicians will find their old-time leading strings snapped like the cords which bound the mighty Samson. Were the people of neighboring states unable to follow the example of the Socialistically administered state, they would desert their states and flock in such numbers to the Socialist state as to force a political revolution at home.

With the states going Socialist, one by one, and bunch by bunch, the national problem would fade away like a dissolving view. Socialist representatives would first go to the lower house of Congress and repeat, on a larger stage, before a vaster audience, the work already done in city and state. The Socialist state legislatures would send Socialists to the United States Senate. In time a national election would place in the lower house a majority of Socialist representatives and in the White House a Socialist president.

Here is where revolutionaries who attempt to think along political lines begin. We have already begun far back. We have laid the foundation. We have blazed the way. We have prepared the ground; now the time is almost at hand for national results. The Socialist president and house, assisted by a handful of Socialists in the Senate, can do substantial things. They can push through the Senate, capitalistic though it still remains, many important laws. The capitalist supreme court may at first turn these down; but the murmurs of disapproval from sea to sea and from lakes to gulf will warn this surviving bulwark of capitalism to have a care. As Mr. Dooley wisely said, "Whither or not the consticthewsion follows the flag, the supreme court follows the election retoorns." Public opinion will influence judicial decisions, for even now in the United States the majority can rule if it will.

Soon other states go Socialist, and send their senators to the upper house. In time the Socialists will control this body also. Vacancies will occur on the supreme court bench. Further, that body can be enlarged. Precedents exist. The Socialist president can appoint Socialist judges, and the Socialist Senate will confirm them. With the circle narrowing about this lingering representative of a vanishing regime, it may not be necessary to wait until a majority of the supreme court are Socialists.

Who can estimate the enthusiasm which will accompany a general Socialist administration, municipal, state, and national, which through the referendum constantly keeps its fingers upon the pulse of public sentiment? Before it the capitalist system will melt away like snowdrifts in a balmy springtime, and, in America, the new order in all its beauty will blossom forth.

What bearing will this experience have upon the progress of Socialism in other lands? For the sake of argument assume the Socialists in these lands thus far to have done nothing. Even then Socialism in America would force the issue throughout the civilized world. America now would be indeed another name for opportunity. It would at last begin to fulfill its natal promise. It would become, as earlier styled, the best poor man's country on earth. The statue and torch on Bedloe's island would be big with meaning. Liberty on Columbia's soil would indeed enlighten the world; and the oppressed and crushed, the bruised and broken, from Orient to Occident, would seek our shores, fill the channels of our industries, and enhance our national wealth and prestige.

For, immigration to a Socialist republic would be widely different from immigration to a capitalist empire. Under a Socialist administration overproduction, glut, and unemployment would be needless, and hence non-existent. So vast is our national domain, so unlimited our national resources, and so admirably effective would be a real Socialist administration, local, municipal, state, and national, that labor would be fully employed, the toiler would be brought into contact with mother earth, machinery, the most effective the mind of man has devised, would be at our command, and wealth would be poured forth as from the stream of Pactolus.

Overproduction could not be until every material want was satisfied, every hungry mouth was filled, every naked back was clothed, every homeless head was sheltered, and every human need to which material wealth could minister had been satisfied.

What effect would such an example produce upon other nations? Cast the mind's eye again upon revolutionary France in 1793. By the side of what has here been indicated, France had done nothing for the toiling multitudes, and had promised them but little more. Yet so tremendous was the enthusiasm over the mere shell of freedom gained and the hope of more, and so great was the dread excited in the breasts of despots of results which might ensue within their own domains, that united war was declared upon the devoted republic, that the frightful specter of a free, republican Europe might be dispelled.

But against the United States, especially against such a United States, what coalition would be conceivable? The bare suggestion would be insane. Other courses must needs be sought out. To hold their fleeing populations, old world governments, even assuming that there no Socialist party had yet been born, would be forced to grant reforms so far-reaching, so fundamental, so substantial, that but the ghost of political despotism and capitalism would remain.

In fact, however, in all foreign countries the same movement would have been in progress. Every forward step on our part in city, state or nation would have been heralded in the Socialist press abroad. With every victory on this side, Socialist courage would have risen on that, until by the time we had won, some foreign countries would doubtless have also won, the international character of the Socialist movement and the solidarity of the brotherhood of toilers would have been proved, and victory in America would be accompanied or swiftly followed by victories in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea.

As faintly foreshadowed in 1848, that year of revolutions, world-wide revolutions, but bloodless, enthusiastic, and joyous, will, under such a policy, take place. Gradually the dark and dreary night of capitalism will draw to its close, and the rising sun of that glorious, coming day will begin to glint the horizon. Wars and strife will have ended, swords will have been beaten into plowshares, and spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not lift up its hand against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. Labor will have been transformed from a curse into a blessing, brotherhood will at last have become possible, and life a worthy and noble thing.



A "Dissolved" Trust

By Víctor L. Berger

THE meat trust is smashed, annihilated by a court injunction. It exists no longer.

This was official. So we were told three years ago.

As everybody knows, President Roosevelt selected the meat trust as a scape-goat in his anti-trust campaign and accomplished all that he desired.

* * *

Judge Grosscup, before whom the case was brought in Chicago at the time, ordered the meat trust to disband in the name of the law. "And Messrs. Armour, Cudahy, Swift, Morris, the Hammond Co., Schwartzschild & Sulzberger declared that as good and law-abiding citizens they would, of course, comply with the command of the court." They declared, through the public press, that they had given orders to their agents, of whom there are over 4,000 in this country, "to uphold the combination no longer."

We said then and there that the dissolution of this bad trust was a humbug. That the meat magnates were lying. That they were cheating the courts and the government as they cheated the consumers and the cattle dealers. That the meat trust still flourished. That the combination would continue secretly in the future as in the past. And that by outward appearance of compliance they simply wished to soothe the public opinion, which was strongly inclined to demand *very radical measures* against this trust.

* * *

Everything developed as we predicted. In fact, everything is still going on in the old way.

If the retail meat-seller—falsely called a "butcher", for he never butchers—wishes to change from one wholesale dealer to another, he must sooner or later have a "clean bill" from the first. And even then it is doubtful whether the other packing house will sell to him. He gets a definite answer as to this only some days after he has made application. Thus the fate of this "free" business man is decided in the office of the trust.

Besides, the *prices* of all wholesale meat-dealers *are the same*. They handle their customers with the insolent assurance of men who know that their customers cannot escape them.

Choose what they want? Not much!

They *must* take what is offered them or go without.

* * *

And the result? Meat is all the time going higher.

Especially within the last few weeks it has gone up with a jerk. Whoever wants to feast on the tough muscles of a Texas steer, must now pay a good big sum.

Of course there is also a natural cause for this rise in meat, and for its poor quality.

In consequence of the belated spring there is a scarcity of fodder. The cattle, therefore, cannot be fattened. What is brought to market is the lean stock, with more sinews and gristle than flesh. The farmers, who are not obliged to sell their cattle, are still keeping them in the hope that they may yet get fat in this wet, uncertain and god-forsaken year.

* * *

But this is not all.

The "dissolved" meat trust is now at *war* with the cattle-raisers. The question is whether the cattle-men shall be paid for cattle condemned by the officials after slaughter. The slaughter-house barons maintain, since so many cattle are condemned under the present "strict" inspection, that *they* cannot stand the loss.

This may or may not be true.

But it proves that the "dissolved" trust still exists on the quiet. The great butchers put their rules into force *on the same day* in Chicago, Omaha, Kansas City, St. Joseph, etc., thus clearly proving a combination. If they do this on one thing, they can surely do so on others, in regard to regulation of purchase and sale, prices, etc.

* * *

In short, the meat business stands exactly on its old basis. The gigantic capitalistic organization of the meat trade is just as it was before.

This capitalistic organization has not yielded to the anarchy which Roosevelt wanted to introduce. The concentration in this field has already *gone too far* and could no longer be turned aside. The proof of the failure of Roosevelt's campaign is most evident and striking. His campaign was directed against the exorbitant price of meat and the extortion practiced on the public. And now, after the trust's "dissolution," meat is considerably higher than before and is getting higher and higher. That is the outcome.

* * *

We predicted this.

We have all along shown the absurdity of Roosevelt's trust smashing.

The trusts (and in this instance the meat trust) are only doing what every business man does, not excepting even the smallest.

The trusts are in business to make money, and they naturally try to receive just as much as possible for their goods.

Every small merchant does the same.

The *principle* is the same.

The *motive*—the desire to make as much profit as possible—is also the same.

The difference is only that the trust does on a larger scale what the small business men do on a *petty scale*. The rate of profit for the trust is as a rule not even as large as for the small business man.

* * *

And the principle of the trusts—concentration instead of division, co-operation instead of competition—is also a *perfectly correct* prin-

ciple. It gives great advantage to those who avail themselves thereof, in other words, to those "who are in it."

* * *

And yet the alarm about the trusts is quite comprehensible.

Under the present industrial system a small number of capitalists have it in their power to decide how much meat and how much bread we shall eat, how much we shall spend for coal and how much for oil, how nicely or how poorly we shall be clothed and housed—in brief, how well or how ill, how long or how short a time we shall live.

* * *

The question is only, what can be done?

Shall we enact laws to regulate the *prices* which the trusts demand for their wares? That would be meddling with the rights of the private individual. It would really be partial *confiscation*.

To ruin the trusts by special legislation is also very difficult. Every increase of taxes is followed by an *increase* in the *price* of the products controlled by the trusts.

Laws treating them as conspiracies are equally valueless. It is easy enough for them to prove that they are carrying on their business in exactly the same manner as other business men.

Besides, there is no law, and under the present economic system none can be enacted, effectually forbidding them to unite into *one great single firm*.

In short, a government which stands on the basis of the present economic system is powerless against the trusts.

* * *

But the question is, do we wish to leave the products of this country in the control of a small number of irresponsible men, whose only interest is to exploit us up to the last limit of our endurance?

The trusts are a benefit to those who own the trusts.

Yet the trusts are large enough for the *whole people* to feel this benefit if the whole people should own the trusts.

Therefore we contend that the whole people collectively—as a *nation*—should take the place of the trust magnates and become the owner of the trusts.

Until that is done the trust will continue to do business at the old stand.

The Washington *Herald* quotes Prof. Ernest Schnabel, of Berlin, as saying: "The most finished and effective speaker in Germany is Herr Bebel, the leader of the Socialist party. This man had no advantage of early training, no university education, and; indeed, gained his knowledge of literature through his unaided efforts. He worked at the trade of a wheelwright in his younger days, but even while struggling for a living he was a close student, particularly of governmental affairs and political economy. His views are obnoxious to a great majority of his fellow members of the Reichstag, and yet he commands the closest attention of the legislators. He is a man of austere life and is said to be without even the smaller vices of mankind."



Соц. Дем. Фракция. Нов Гос. Дума

THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF THE LAST RUSSIAN DUMA

(From the New York Daily Forward)