

THE VANGUARD

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

Vol. 5. No. 11. MILWAUKEE, WIS., SEPTEMBER, 1907. Whole Number 55

The Month's Story

A Socialist Milestone

The International Socialist Congress, held last month in Stuttgart, marks another golden milestone on the road to Socialism. It also furnishes a good occasion for taking stock of our progress.

Since the last International Socialist Congress, two years ago, the movement has made giant strides in many lands. Austria now holds the cup, with 87 Social-Democratic members of the Reichstag, against 11 at the date of the Antwerp Socialist Congress. A grand gain in two years! Moreover, it is most distinctly a "reward of merit." Austrian Socialists have won, because, while the Austrian Empire is torn with internal strife and almost pulled to pieces by national and race hatred, they alone have stood by each other like brothers, irrespective of creed or nationality. Perhaps nowhere in Europe or out of it are the Socialists so well disciplined as in Austria. Their leaders are admirably seconded and are admirably worthy of confidence.

Another most encouraging forward step has been made by England, which now has 31 Socialists in the House of Commons. This is all the more cheering, as even up to the time of the last Congress, England was most unaccountably backward in the Socialist movement. In spite of her splendid trades union organization, spite of her centuries of political training, spite of her love of liberty, England remained almost aloof from the European Socialist movement. Now she is no longer isolated and insular. The very conservatism of the English, their slowness and steadiness, will hold them in line when once they join the Socialist ranks. There will be no straw-fire there. And their excellent organized and drilled trades unions will make glorious recruiting grounds for a class-conscious Social-Democratic party.

Progress of quite a different type has been achieved in Finland. You perhaps, some spring morning, may have happened to turn over a big stone, and if so you have been surprised to find under it any number of dwarfed and blanched grass blades, all struggling towards the light. And after the stone was removed, how these white blades shot up and grew green and expanded into stalk and leaf. Something like this has happened in Finland. Under the oppression of Russia, Finnish Socialism has grown underground. Now, with their new constitution, they have suddenly elected 80 Social-Democrats to their

Chamber, of whom a goodly number are women! Verily, the last shall be first!

And martyred Russia, which has slid back into the clutch of the butcher, still has a proud record to show, The VANGUARD, in its frontispiece this month, shows the group of Social-Democratic members of the last Duma. These men, now mostly in prison, have a special interest to us whose duty leads through smoother paths. Not the least pride of the movement is its band of martyrs!

Other countries have also splendid records. France has 50 Socialist deputies, and a weighty influence in French politics. Germany has 43 Social-Democratic members of the Reichstag and 3,258,000 Social-Democratic voters in the German Empire. Belgium has 30 Social-Democrats in its House, Italy 25 in its Chamber, Sweden 15, Norway 10 in its Storthing, Denmark 24 in the Folketing and 4 in the Landsting.

And America? Every Yankee Socialist should blush and hang his head. Not one Socialist in the American Congress! And only one state in the Union where there are Socialist members of legislature!

Comrades, let us change all that before the next International Socialist Congress.

England ahead of us? Finland ahead of us? *Russia* ahead of us? Oh, shame!

* * *

**Why
Crime
Waves?**

Horror hangs over New York. A "wave of crime," like some mysterious tidal wave, is there doing its deadly work. Young children are assaulted and murdered. Parents are panic-stricken and will not trust their little ones out of their sight. The same increase of monstrous crimes is reported in other large cities besides New York.

The New York police strive to reassure the people with the grewsome consolation that nothing unusual is happening. Just about the same percentage of criminality, they say, is due just about so often. The average number of assaults and murders does not vary much from year to year, in all our great cities. With this cold-blooded comfort they dismiss the horrible subject.

But what a ghastly admission! What an arraignment of our dislocated social "system!"

Every year these crimes are committed. Every year they are punished. Every year they are re-committed. Every year they are re-punished. A vicious circle, in every sense of the word!

Even now society is paying a number of its sharpest-scented detectives to track out these criminals in New York. Then it will pay a number of skillful lawyers to convict them when caught, learned judges to sentence them, jailers to keep them till the hour of punishment arrives, sheriffs to conduct them to the electric chair, and experts to turn on the current. And then society will be all ready to begin again with next year's batch of assaulters and murderers.

Bentham has wisely said, "Every time that punishment is inflicted, it proves its inefficiency, for it did not prevent the committal of the crime."

Were society wise, instead of vindictive, it would seek out the cause of these waves of crime which return year after year with such significant regularity. How are these criminals manufactured? What are the moral ingredients of which these crimes are composed?

In New York city, the Rev. Dr. Behrends, investigating slum tenements, made some hideous discoveries. "In a room twelve feet by eight, and five and a half feet high, it was found that nine persons slept and prepared their food. In another room, located in a dark cellar, without screens or partitions, were together two men with their wives and a boy of seventeen, two women and four boys, nine, ten, eleven and fifteen years old—fourteen persons in all!"

Does not this tell the tale? In such environments, what becomes of the "sanctity of family life?" What of the innocence of childhood?

Human beings reared in such surroundings will be brutes. Such conditions below the level of "good society" will produce crime waves just as surely as the uneasy stirrings beneath the earth's crust will produce tidal waves.

Says Enrico Ferri, the great Italian criminologist, "Want is the strongest poison for the body and soul."

And just as long as we have slums, where children are reared, we shall have criminals, we shall have jails, prisons, handcuffs, electric chairs and gibbets. Such is our "system."

Is it a *system*? Is it not rather a gigantic hotch-potch of crimes and blunders? The brute crimes at one end of the social scale, and at the other the refined crimes of the ruling class who *make the slums*—the crimes of oppression, extortion, and the "grinding of the faces of the poor!"

* * *

**John
D.'s
Cart**

The American public smiled a broad smile—from Maine to California—when John D. Rockefeller recently boasted of his services to the public. "I am harnessed in a cart in which the people ride," said the oily king. "Whether I like it or not, I must work for the rest. I cannot evade the responsibility." Probably the wily John laughed at this himself, in his sleeve. And the people and the press raised a loud howl of derision.

The Socialists laughed too, for a different reason. We laughed because John D., all unknown to himself and his audience, has uttered a golden truth.

For it is actually true that the king of monopolies, whether he "likes it or not," and whether he knows it or not, "cannot evade" the task which evolution has laid upon him. The laws of evolution are often worked out through ignorant creatures who little know that they are links in the long chain of the earth's progress.

The little eohippus who "scampered on five toes o'er the Tertiary rocks" never dreamed that his chief function was to serve as an ancestor of the horse. And the first anthropoidal ape, as he grabbed the cocoanuts from his weaker brethren, little guessed that the survival of the fittest would finally develop him into a captain of industry.

Neither does Rockefeller know that the "cart" to which he is

"harnessed" is travelling straight towards Socialism—that the "responsibility" which he could not "evade" was the vast task of organizing the industries of the country for collective ownership, some day.

And it is well that he does not know it. If he really thought that he was "working for the rest," the chances are that he never would have worked himself into dyspepsia. He would never have organized the trusts, if he could have foreseen that one day they will be owned by the people.

But it is a thousand pities that the people do not know. If they only knew that evolution is at work here, and at work for them, they would not foolishly try to retard it. They would not block the wheels of the metaphorical "cart" with all sorts of foolish experiments in "regulation," which *never can regulate*.

* * *

Jump Into

That Cart!

Yes, it is a thousand pities that the wisdom of each generation cannot begin just where the last generation left off. Then we should never have to try over again the experiments which our fathers made and found to be miserable failures.

If Teddy and La Follette and all the other great "statesmen" who now prescribe regulation as the cure for all the ills of our political and economic system—if they only knew history!

If they only knew that regulation was thoroughly tried by our ancestors even to regulating the width of cloth manufactured, and the market price of all the staples of trade. If they only knew that this thorough regulation completely broke down under the growing weight of capitalism. And it broke down so completely that for centuries economists preached nothing but a "laissez faire," let-alone policy, knowing that the policy of regulation had proved a failure.

And what absurdity to suppose that capitalism, which, in its infancy broke the fetters of regulation like a wisp of straw, will be held by them now when it has grown into the giant of Trustification!

But probably the American public will have to burn their fingers on this regulation experiment before they will learn. And they will not "dissolve" the trusts. The trusts will stay right there—till the American people at last discover what to do with them.

Why not, Oh ingenious Yankees! Just take John D. at his word? Why not jump right into that "cart?"

In other words, why not take over the oil trust and every other trust? Why not make them trusts of the people, owned and operated by the people, for the benefit of the people?

* * *

"Fanatical"

Morocco

The remedy of old-fashioned medicine for every pain was a blister. The sting of the blister made the sufferer forget his other pain. The remedy of modern capitalism for the distress of the working class is a war of annexation. It distracts the attention of the working people from their discontent, makes new political issues and above all gives a chance for newspapers and politicians to preach that jingo "patriotism"

which is capitalism's trump card. Whenever a class-conscious movement is generating, and especially where the Socialist movement is growing, there you may expect to see some luckless savage or semi-savage people suddenly arraigned for their "cruelty," "perfidy," "fanaticism," and other sins (which nobody had ever noticed before), shot and bayoneted to teach them true religion and gentle manners, and finally annexed in the interests of civilization and the gospel.

Thus, when anti-plutocratic feeling first began in this country, at the time of the Populist agitation, our political quack doctors applied the Spanish and Philippine blisters. Thus Kaiser Wilhelm uses his jingo South-African policy as a counter-irritant to the German Social-Democrats.

And thus, it appears, the bourgeois politicians of France want to apply a foreign blister to the working class at home. The French people, cleverest of all European nations, at present are the farthest ahead in the race toward Socialism. In no other country are the Socialists so strong a political factor in national affairs. At the present pace, it would appear that France may be in first at the Socialist goal. And well she deserves the honor, after her century of struggles, revolutions, sacrifice and martyrdom.

Therefore we are not surprised to be now informed that the Moroccans are terribly "fanatical," and therefore should be annexed to agnostic France without delay. The Moroccans are not a whit more fanatical than they have been for the last seven hundred years, but Frenchmen are more Socialistic than ever before—there is the rub! That is the real "casus belli," if the bourgeois politicians would be frank, just for once.

There is no doubt that a French war in and for Morocco would be a temporary set-back to the French Socialist movement. The French are intensely patriotic and absurdly fond of martial glory. The bourgeois politician thus takes them on their weak side.

Yet there is another face to this question. Of all European peoples, the French alone have shown themselves capable of colonizing tropical countries, partly because of their temperate habits of eating and drinking, partly because their African possessions lie so near the mother country. While England, Germany and America have remained mere conquerors and masters in the tropics, France has colonized them with genuine settlers, whose birth rate exceeds their death rate. And Morocco, under French rule, may become a New France, with a class struggle and a Socialist movement.

Thus the French bourgeois politician, in trying to cure the "Socialist germ," may only spread it into another quarter of the globe. Ideas are like thistle-seeds—they fly!

Michigan Czars

By INDEX

Up in Hancock, Mich., some local capitalist "statesmen" have just passed an ordinance to the effect that no person or assemblage of persons "shall carry or exhibit . . any flag or symbol . . teaching against or toward the destruction of the organized government of the United States . . or any foreign government, king, prince, potentate or officer thereof," under penalty. This amusing legislative enactment becomes all the more funny when placed by the side of a certain paragraph of the immortal Declaration of Independence, which reads as follows: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, AND WHEN ANY FORM OF GOVERNMENT BECOMES DESTRUCTIVE OF THESE ENDS IT IS THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO ALTER OR ABOLISH IT, AND TO SUBSTITUTE SUCH FORMS AS SHALL IN THEIR OPINION BEST SECURE THESE ENDS."

And it becomes funnier still when the last words of the Hancock law are fully digested. Think of some liberty-loving American citizen dropping into Hancock and displaying a paper in which appeared in black type something disrespectful about the good Czar, for instance—think what would happen

to him! And on American soil, too! Of course, that part of the state of Michigan belongs to the steel barons, but still it was politically under American jurisdiction at last accounts.

The people of Hancock have something to blush for, and the local lawmakers who put such a piece of legislation on the local book of ordinances will doubtless be the butt of ridicule for many a day to come.

The occasion for the passage of this funny ordinance was the carrying of a red flag by Finnish Socialists in one of their parades. Now the red flag has been christened the "age-long flag of labor." Its history extends into the days of the ancients and it was always the flag of hope to the oppressed of earth. These Finnish Socialists, like all other members of our party, are not enemies of the republic at all, and certainly not when compared with the class that is seeking to legally scourge them. Socialism is revolutionary, not in the sense of being violently "agin the government"—indeed, we propose to capture and be the government before we get through—but it is revolutionary in the sense that it stands for the next higher phase of society, the Socialist republic, and intends to make it as easy as possible for that higher state to develop out of the present one. And the efforts of puny politicians to make it appear otherwise will avail them nothing in Hancock, or anywhere else.

Give Them Hope!

By VICTOR L. BERGER

THE most formidable obstacle in the way of further progress—and especially in the propaganda of Socialism—is not that men are insufficiently versed in political economy or lacking in intelligence. It is that *people* are without *hope*.

Popular effort has so often been thwarted by selfish cunning—great moral enthusiasm has so often been dissipated by the suspicious organization of the ruling classes that men have *lost heart*.

Despair is the chief opponent of progress.

Our greatest need is hope.

* * *

The majority of our fellow workers know of public measures that would be beneficent—if an upward step were possible. But they claim it is impossible under the present system. Some of them wait for some great “revolution” that is to come “some day.” Others do not wait for anything. They do not expect anything. They have lost hope. Why?

Both the so-called “revolutionists” and the “let-it-go-as-it-is-men” are overwhelmed by a multitude of incidental obstacles which are in themselves of small account.

Petty disappointments cloud the small horizons of these people. Thus they are shut off from the sight of the great universal and historic forces that are working for progress—for Socialism—and *even for progress beyond Socialism*.

Only these forces work slowly. Slowly and surely.

* * *

Revolutions—and special evolutions—are brought about in human affairs not so much by the dissemination of a multitude of ideas, as by the concentration of a multitude of minds upon a *single idea*.

And this idea must be near enough and be of importance enough and comprehensive enough to stir the very souls of the masses.

Mere theoretical or dogmatic phrases—no matter how “clear cut”—are not capable of producing the universal enthusiasm required to institute any fundamental innovations.

Besides, doctrinarism and dogmatism lead to split and to the formation of political sects. But when people are constantly absorbed in *doing things*, and in preparing for still greater things, the petty jealousies and small causes for strife and dissension disappear.

* * *

Furthermore, I say, we ought to have “uniformity” in *general principles* and *general tactics only*. We ought to leave minor details to the different state organizations. Especially where the movement is old and well rooted, where there are plenty of tried leaders and where the membership is experienced, they are fully capable of the righteous settlement of all incidental questions without interference from the outside.

Instead of more uniformity we ought to have *more unity*.

And we can gain this only when we leave details to the various subdivisions—and concentrate the efforts of our propaganda to the simple realities, self-evident and capable of being understood by all.

The first such central truth, to be proclaimed tirelessly by every Social-Democrat, is that the earth is large enough and wide enough to supply all the good things of life to every human being born on it.

Add to this that the triumphs of modern science make it possible for men to satisfy every natural craving, every healthy desire, every reasonable hope and dream, without any man being compelled to sacrifice another being for his purpose.

This means that this world, now made a *hell* by human greed, abetted by ignorance and prejudice, might as well be a *heaven*.

It means that the misery caused by capitalism on one hand and poverty on the other, can be displaced by happiness and plenty for all.

* * *

Following this, one can demonstrate from history that this capitalist system did not always exist, but succeeded the feudal system, which had followed a system of slavery—each of these succeeding systems being better and more humane than its predecessor.

And we can also easily show then that the trusts are the natural outcome of capitalism and competition and cannot be legislated out of existence as long as capitalism exists.

* * *

The immediate effect of the practical acceptance of these self-evident truths is always wonderful.

Convince men that our country is large enough and rich enough to give them all an opportunity to work and earn enough to support their families in comfort, to educate their children properly and to be absolutely secure in sickness and old age.

Convince men that their present poverty is unnecessary.

Proclaim that Capitalism is simply a phase of civilization as Feudalism was and Socialism will be—that nothing that is, lasts forever.

Convince them of this and you have them “for good.”

Only take care not to have them tie their hopes for the future to any catastrophe that is to bring the millenium “at one stroke.” Take care not to have them hope for any Messiah.

It invariably leads to fatalism of one kind or the other and destroys the incentive for continuous and hard work at the present time.

Fatalism is always fatal to real progress.

* * *

Therefore, Social-Democratic propagandists, do not weary your hearers with statistics or the definitions of “surplus value.” Do not confuse them by trying to explain all the intricacies of the capitalist system and by describing the beauties of the co-operative commonwealth.

Teach them that in order to get a better world we shall have to work for it and fight for it.

Work and fight are the “Messiahs” of proletarians.

Teach the proletariat that the highest patriotism consists in work-

ing and fighting for the new world. And that to work and to fight for it is the sublime mission of *this generation* and possibly also of the *next*.

Nothing else in this world can compare with this work in importance.

Jaures On the Land Problem

Translated by HELEN MINTBURN SCOTT

The economic movement does not take the same form in the country that it does in the city. In the first place, the rural population is decreasing, while the urban population is increasing. In the second place, and this is very important, it is especially the proletariat in the country that is diminishing in numbers. Clearly those who are drawn to the towns are the non-owners, the day laborers, the sons of *metayers*.* The owners of small farms are firmly tied to the soil.

Lastly, the introduction of machinery has had exactly opposite results in the country and in the town. In manufacture, the machine does sometimes do away with hand labor, but only momentarily. It makes new forms of activity possible, and thus it is that the number of the working population increases proportionately with the development of machinery. And since the small artisans are transformed into proletarians, the effect of the machine is to add directly to the industrial proletariat. In agriculture, on the other hand, the machine (sower, reaper, harvester, binder, thrasher), simply does away with hand-labor entirely. And it eliminates the proletarians. The small

farmers, on the other hand, are not thrust down into the proletariat by the machine as the artisans are. The agricultural machine, on the contrary, adapts itself more and more to the system of small farms, and far from destroying the small farmer, it dispenses him from the necessity of hiring extra labor, a burden he had to bear during the harvest, for instance.

Since the rural proletariat is becoming scarcer and scarcer, the great farms naturally do not grow. And this is the explanation of the nearly stagnant condition of agricultural property in France.

In the extraordinary study he made of agricultural property, Gabriel Deville concluded that there was a movement toward concentration, but that it was slow and not well-defined. There are many causes that seem to make for concentration in large farms. It is natural, for instance, that city capitalists should wish to invest a small part of their growing fortune in land. However, there are branches of agricultural production that are becoming more and more industrialized, like beet-root culture, for instance, and these it would seem ought to come under the same law that brings about the centralization of industry.

*The metayer is a tenant farmer who pays rent in kind, receiving part of his stock and supplies from the owner.

But in many places the thinning out of the laboring population, the reduction of the rural proletariat, neutralizes all these forces that would tend to develop great estates. It is, of course, essential for these to have a supply of labor always at their command. Well, there are just enough families of *metayers* to farm the capitalist estates already existing, and where the small farmers who have only one child never work outside their own little property.

This is literally true of the plateau of the Albigeois. And in the vineyards round Caillac, the great estates tend to diminish. The number of small wine growers who own a large enough vineyard to occupy all their working time is on the increase. About one-third of the population is non-owning; that is, they own nothing, or they own a tiny scrap of land not large enough to occupy all their labor or support them. But this class has rather a tendency to diminish. And since, owing to their small and almost decreasing numbers, these country workmen are in a better position so far as wages are concerned (having even raised the rate in the last few years), the great estates cannot increase their activities for fear of having to deal with labor that is too scarce and consequently too powerful.

Observe that I do not assume that these facts are true of all the agricultural districts in France. They are, however, to be observed over a fairly large area.

Now, here are the social results of these economic conditions.

In the first place, it would seem very difficult to start a strong proletarian movement in places where the very substance of the movement, that is the proletariat itself, has a tendency to decrease. I

know very well that there are still many *metayers* in the south. And they are certainly beginning to have a class feeling. They are beginning to understand that it would be possible to have society organized in such a way that they would not be induced to accept one-half only of the fruits of the soil they had tilled. But this class-instinct is often uncertain and confused. They are not pure proletarians; they own a part of the agricultural capital, live stock, machines, manure and fodder—they often have a good deal of liberty in the management of the work. Lastly, since they take to market that part of their product that they do not consume, they have on this point, the same interest as the landed proprietors, that the prices should be kept up. Thus, their *immediate* interests do not clash with those of the land owning class, and many *metayers* have been easily dragged into the protectionist movement. At all events, a district where there are hardly any day-laborers, farm-hands properly so-called, and where almost all the country population is made up of either *metayers* or small farmers, is hardly favorable to a proletarian movement pure and simple. The same thing is true of districts like Gaillac, where two-thirds of the inhabitants own some land to one-third that owns nothing, and where this third is principally preoccupied with the idea that it may become an owner in its turn and where, moreover, this hope is not wholly chimerical.

But if a strong proletarian movement is harder to start here than in other places, it would be, on the other hand, extraordinarily effective when started. Just because labor is scarce it could easily become sovereign. There is no reserve army upon which capitalist

landowners can draw. In certain wine-growing areas they are at the mercy of a coalition of a small number of workmen. And if a few families of well-known and respected *metayers*, whom it would be impossible to replace all at once, would get together in this or that community it would be hard for the capitalists not to accept a labor contract more favorable to the *metayers*.

It is true that some capitalists would rather give up cultivating the land and allow it to be fallow for a year than give up part of their income from their estates, often small enough as it is. But that would mean a sharp economic and social crisis, which would cause far reaching disturbances.

So that the diminution of the country proletariat constitutes a menace to landed capitalist property, just as the increase and concentration of the industrial proletariat constitutes a menace to industrial capitalist property. The only possible outcome of both tendencies is in the direction of a new form of property and of society.

Marx said that the cheapest way to bring about the social revolution would be to pay an indemnity to the present owners of capital. He meant by that that it would be in the interest of revolutionary Socialism to escape the extreme exasperation of the expropriated older society and the long convulsions which are so destructive of riches. There is still time to have recourse to friendly methods for the transformation of the land system. The state, the local governments, the co-operative societies, could begin to transform the great landed estates into socially owned property with a triple character, national,

local, and trades union. They could do this either by short time bonds or by mortgages on the agricultural products, which would be stored in warehouses belonging to the township or the co-operative society.

The small farmers would not be at all alarmed by this gradual transformation, which would not be a menace to them and which would have a legal character. And they would soon come in of their own accord to the great centre of activity which would be formed by the village or co-operative property. At this moment a slow and almost imperceptible change is taking place in their attitude, but one that will ultimately have most important results. In the first place, they have a great deal more faith in science than they used to have. They have begun to make use of agricultural chemistry and machinery. They feel convinced that they will not change this course of action. They have been able to reconcile their ancient passion for the land and for private property and interest in technical progress, because it is possible to apply this technique to even small farms. But once this policy has been adopted, there is no stopping half way. And if, in the future, the perfect application of machinery required them to give up in some degree the narrowest interpretation of private property rights, the separate cultivation of small bits of land, for instance, they would be carried out beyond their narrow individualism by the very force of the scientific movement to which they now belong.

The peasant proprietor is becoming a collectivist for the sale of his products almost without knowing it. He has to put up with more and more terrible crises. For years these have affected wheat. And

now the happy and wonderful resurrection of the vine has had the terrible and paradoxical effect of ruining the vine growers, and obviously the fecundity of the American graft and the excellence of two successive vintages necessitated a great fall in prices. This fall, if it had been kept within due limits, would have been of benefit to everyone. But our economic and social system is so disorderly that the fall, which was suddenly and unbelievably acute, has overwhelmed the producers, who are ruined by the very abundance of the product.

Moreover, the peasants hope to be delivered from this ruinous anarchy of the market. And if wheat and wine were acquired by federations of co-operative societies and federations of townships, and if the price were fixed according to the abundance of the harvest, the cost of scientific production and the normal wage of the laborer employed, the peasant proprietors freed from the evils of speculation, of the parasitic middleman and the anarchy of the market, would work with the cheerful certainty of a just remuneration. This collectivism in exchange has no terrors for them.

So we see that the present land system is undermined by profound causes making for revolution. The

Socialists ought to develop the co-operative stores. They should urge upon them, as one of their most important aims, the acquisition of great country estates, from which they could supply their provisions, at least in part. The Socialists ought to organize trades unions of the country laborers. They ought to spread through the country the idea of a public supply service, which, through the agency of the co-operative societies and townships should be a substitute for speculation, for the great flour mills, and the great wine merchants. They should give the peasant, the wage-earners, the *metayers* and small farmers a more exact idea of the immense role that the townships ought to play in the economic life, thus carrying forward into the needs of modern times the still vivid memory of the primitive and rudimentary communal property of other times. They should little by little impregnate the country townships (community) with the spirit of Socialist communism. If they do this, rural France will evolve a powerful movement toward a free and living communism where labor will be sovereign and where all individual energies will be able to expand without conflicts and without impediments in the harmony of justice.

It is only a question of time until the government of Great Britain adopts a system of old-age pensions. Labor is united in its demands for such a scheme, and it has the support of many other influential interests which believe that something should be done to give

the aged poor assurance that their last days shall not be spent in the darkness of absolute distress.

It is certainly an odd system of society that depends on the work of the workers, yet looks down on the workers that do the work.

Truth Puts On His Boots

By E. H. THOMAS

"A lie," says the old proverb, "can go around the world while Truth is putting on his boots."

When, some weeks ago, the elections in London, England, resulted in the overthrow of the "Progressives," the capitalistic editors of America fairly howled with glee.

"Great Socialist Defeat!" proclaimed the scareheads of the American dailies on their front pages. And inside, their editorials explained that the "Socialists" had been guilty of the most frightful extravagance, had loaded the cities of Great Britain with a gigantic municipal debt and had heaped up the municipal taxes sky high. Hence, the taxpayers had risen in their wrath and hurled the "Socialists" out of the London County Council.

Thus the American capitalistic press. What are the facts?

Why, in the first place, the "Progressives," who were defeated in the London elections, are no more Socialists than W. R. Hearst or ex-Mayor Dunne of Chicago. Out of a total of 118 members of the London County Council, only three or four were actual Socialists. The Progressives of London stand for municipal street cars and electric lighting, and municipal steamboats on the Thames. That is as far as they care to go. Their program, if carried out, would only carry London as far as Glasgow, Manchester, Birmingham and other British cities have already traveled with success along the road of municipal ownership. London is far more conservative than many

British cities of smaller size. The overthrow of the Progressives on the London County Council was no more of a "Great Socialist Defeat!" than the turndown of Mayor Dunne in the Windy City.

"Never mind," says the capitalist editor. "Progressives or Socialists, it is all the same. Municipal ownership costs too much. It has been shown that it creates a colossal debt and lays an awful burden on the taxpayer. Besides, it is inefficient and unprogressive. Private enterprise in the United States is doing the same things better than they are done by the municipalities of Great Britain. And all this without increasing taxes or building up a vast municipal debt."

Very well. We will show that not one of these charges against municipal ownership is true.

But first we protest against the term "municipal Socialism" as applied to the very small degree of municipal ownership thus far introduced in the cities of Great Britain. Only two and one-half per cent of the whole wealth of the English nation is municipalized. Socialism means the collective ownership of *all* the means of production and distribution. Please, Mr. Capitalist Editor, do call a spade a spade! And do not charge Socialism with failure when it has had only two and one-half per cent of a trial.

Yet, even on its financial side, municipal ownership has been no failure. The turndown in London was the result of a systematic cam-

paign for the benefit of a private electricity monopoly that wanted a franchise from London. They and their friends, the so-called "Municipal Reformers," therefore raised the scare against high taxes and a growing municipal debt. They terrified the tax-payers with these two bogies; they succeeded so well, that the London taxpayers turned down the Progressives. The electricity monopoly will get its franchise, and squeeze out of the citizens of London far more than they would have paid for taxes if London had borrowed money to establish an electric plant of her own.

But what are the facts about London taxes?

In the last ten years, the municipal taxes of London have increased one shilling four pence on the pound, that is, 32 cents on \$4.84. Of these 33 cents of increase, 13 cents went to education. This increased sum for education was mainly due to the appropriation of taxes to the church schools, brought about by the conservatives. For 10 cents of the increase the borough councils and guardians were responsible, and for 5 cents the Metropolitan Asylums Board was responsible. These bodies are mostly under control of the "Moderates," who do not stand for municipal ownership. Only 4 cents of the increase can be charged to the County Council, controlled by the Progressives. So much for municipal ownership increasing the taxes.

Four cents is not an enormous increase in taxes in a city like London. And for this the County Council at any rate had something to show. It increased the area of the parks and breathing places of London from 2,500 to 5,000 acres. It placed municipal boats in these parks, which, by the way, are not

only self-supporting, but have paid about \$12,500 toward lessening the taxes. It put steamboats on the Thames, which have been an immense boon to the cooped-up citizens of London—80,000 people availed themselves of this pleasure on the August Bank holiday alone. The boats, as a first experiment, were a financial loss, but a loss that was gradually diminishing, and the advantage was for the people of London. Throughout the summer these boats carried a million passengers a month. The County Council pulled down the worst slums of London. It put in an improved sewerage system. It reduced the death rate in one of the most unsanitary districts from 40 deaths per 1,000 inhabitants before the County Council took it in hand, to only 14 per 1,000 inhabitants. It has also done a great deal toward lessening the overcrowding of congested districts by providing one-cent fares on the municipal street cars. It doubled the fire brigade, thus making life and property doubly secure. And it educated 600,000 children in its schools.

All these things, providing for the life, health and enjoyment of all the people of London, are surely worth an increase of 4 cents per pound on the taxes.

But, taking the financial side of all this, the Londoners have lost nothing by the so-called "Socialist" measures of the County Council. By its method of inspecting the weights and measures of meat, groceries, bread and coal sold to the consumers, it has saved the people of London millions of dollars. In coal bills alone the London County Council saved London householders over \$2,400,000 a year. And the Londoners saved in fares on the municipal street cars about half

what they had to pay on the privately owned lines.

But the foes of municipal ownership, in England or America, always play the same trick to prove municipal ownership a failure. Against the profits of municipal street railways, gas, electric lighting, and other works of production or transportation, they reckon up the cost of parks, street improvements, sewerage, libraries, hospitals, asylums, poorhouses, and schools—things which are necessary to the people, but which from their very nature cannot yield profits.

To judge merely of the financial success of municipal ownership, we must set its enterprises over against the enterprises of private ownership. Take, for instance, the London municipal street railways.

These lines have been a tremendous financial success. They have paid \$2,150,000 to the sinking funds, \$3,000,000 toward redeeming their debt, \$515,000 to the renewals account, and besides this they have paid \$1,500,000 toward reducing the taxes.

While the privately owned street railways of London earned a profit of 4.4 per cent and 4.1 per cent, the municipally owned lines earned a profit of 7.6 per cent. These accounts of the municipal lines can be relied on. They were examined and approved by a committee of Parliament.

Remember, too, that these profits remain over and above the reduction in fares to the passengers, and a shortening of hours to the employes, as well as an advance of wages amounting to nearly \$150,000 a year. Remember also that the service has been greatly improved, the old horse cars having been displaced by electric cars.

Does municipal ownership pay?

But London, as I have said, is conservative compared with many cities of Great Britain. For the best results we must look elsewhere.

In Leeds, the profits on "municipal trading," as it is called in England, were \$250,000 in the year 1903-04, thus reducing the taxes 14 cents on every \$4.84 of taxable property. In Manchester, the profits were \$250,000, reduction of taxes 7 cents. In Liverpool, profits were \$135,000, reduction of taxes about 3 cents. In Glasgow the profits were \$125,000, decrease of taxes 2 cents. In Nottingham, the profits were \$65,000, decrease of taxes 7 cents.

The electric lighting plant of Liverpool, after paying interest and sinking fund and reducing prices 50 per cent, turns over \$50,000 to lessen the city taxes.

Since Manchester took over the gasworks they have paid nearly \$12,500,000 of profits for the reduction of taxes.

This is what municipal ownership administrations have done in Great Britain. I cite these figures to show that, as a matter of administration, municipal ownership is a success. We, as Socialists, are not concerned for the reduction of taxes. If we had control of these municipal enterprises, profits would go to the public in better and cheaper service, and to the employes in higher wages and shorter hours. But we are simply answering the capitalist editor "according to his folly," after the advice of Solomon.

We could also show that municipal ownership in Great Britain has considerably benefited even the city employes. In Liverpool, the employes of the privately owned street cars worked fourteen hours a day.

On the municipal lines they now work only ten hours a day, and have a raise of 50 per cent in hourly wages, besides receiving free uniforms. In Sheffield, the private company paid \$500 for work for which the city now pays \$625. In other cities about the same proportion of increase prevails. When Manchester took over its street railways, it paid increased wages amounting to \$300,000 a year.

But the capitalist editor cares for none of these things. So let us get back again to the financial end of the question.

The tax increase boggy is thus pretty well laid. How about the debt increase?

Really, this is such a transparent trick that I wonder if any one was really scared by it. Every business man knows that the amount of his debt is not the only factor to be considered. It is the amount of debt in relation to the amount of assets that tells the story.

The national debt of England and Wales is 629 million pounds (more than \$3,000,000,000). What is there to show for this? Nothing. It has been used to blow men into eternity.

The municipal debt of England and Wales is 293 million pounds (about \$1,400,000,000). What is there to show for this? Water works and gasworks, street railways, electric lighting plants, improved streets, public buildings, baths, hospitals, asylums, work-houses, schools, bridges, cemeteries, docks, harbors, piers, police stations, sewerage works, markets, dwelling houses, libraries and parks.

Are not these valuable assets?

The city of Manchester is in debt for its municipal gasworks. This debt amounts to four pounds

(nearly \$20) to each inhabitant of Manchester. But the gasworks have paid five pounds (nearly \$25) per inhabitant to lessen the taxes. Query: Is this debt a burden to the citizens of Manchester? Is it as great a burden as is the capital of the privately owned Liverpool Gas Company to the citizen of Liverpool?

The Liverpool citizen has received no profits from the private company. He pays a higher price for his gas than the Manchester citizen. And he owns no municipal plant.

The towns with the biggest debts have lower taxes than the towns with smaller debts. A writer in the *Contemporary Review* shows that forty-two towns with big debts incurred for municipal ownership plants had on an average lower taxes than thirty-two towns with small municipal ownership debts.

Darlington owns gas, waterworks and electric works, markets and tramways. Darlington has decreased its taxes 38 cents on the pound. But the enemies of municipal ownership never say anything about Darlington.

So much for the efficiency of municipal administration. Add to this the real improvement in public service. The capitalist editor loves to compare the British municipal enterprises with American private enterprises. This is clearly unfair. England is proverbially slow. The only just comparison is between British private enterprise and British municipal enterprise. The contrast should be made "before and after taking" over. For instance, Glasgow, on taking over its street cars, immediately placed new cars on its lines, and the London county council has replaced the old horse cars with electric cars.

The capitalist editor will have to change his cry. The municipalities of Great Britain have not made a fizzle of municipal ownership and administration. They have not loaded their citizens with gigantic taxes. They have incurred debts, but to the benefit of the people.

The English people are not going to change their policy of municipal ownership, as far as adopted. The people of London have indeed been scared out of the small beginnings which they had already made and have foolishly listened to the electric monopoly which is now pre-

paring to exploit them. And they will be very sorry for their mistake in a few years.

It is a very small wedge which the municipalities of Great Britain have driven into the gigantic trunk of capitalism. It is not worth all the fuss that the capitalist press is making against it. It certainly is not municipal Socialism in any sense of the word. But, as far as it goes, it does show that cities can manage their own affairs with efficiency and profit. It is one little moral in the teaching of collective ownership and administration.

A Peaceful Revolution

By VICTOR L. BERGER

THE fact is being recognized more and more by scientists that our civilization is in a constant flow, like a river, the current of which is ever changing. Yet one of the greatest obstacles with which Socialists have to contend is the notion that whatever is must be the immutable order of nature. Because the wage system has prevailed as far back as any one can remember, people fancy that this system constitutes the necessary condition for civilized society. Social-Democrats say this is a fundamental error, and history proves it.

The present state of things grew out of feudalism and serfdom, which followed a system of master and slave.

In the ancient states there was no wage system, there was slavery. The master was the absolute lord of the persons of his slaves, of the soil, and of the instruments of labor, which then were crude and simple.

Serfdom constitutes the next great stage. The lords of the soil were the dominant class, but the workers of the soil were personally free, although attached to the soil where they were born. Now, this second stage, although far below our civilization, was, at any rate, much above chattel slavery.

But the progress of mankind demanded another step, and that was capitalism. This was unknown during the former periods of the world—which had wealth, but not capital. This third stage of the development of our race has given occasion for the rise of a class of exploit-

ers unknown to any of the former civilizations. Our plutocracy, our industrial, commercial and moneyed aristocracy are now the masters of all production in all civilized countries, on whose good will, or rather upon whose profits, the laboring people of the world depend for a living.

And all these evils are heightened by cut-throat competition, which not only forces wage-workers into a struggle to see who shall live and who shall starve, but which also compels the employers to pay as little for their labor as possible.

But the laborers are by no means the only sufferers. The small employers and the small merchants are just as much victims of that cruel kind of competition as the wage-workers. The fierce competition lessens the profit on each article, and that must be compensated for by greater numbers of them being produced and sold; that is, the cheaper the goods, the more capital is required.

Precisely then, for the same reason that the mechanic, with his own shop and working on his own account, has disappeared in the struggle between hand-work and machine-work, for the same reason the small employers, with their little machinery, their small capital and their little stock of goods, are being driven from the fields by the trusts.

Our social order, or rather social disorder, may fitly be compared to a ladder of which the middle rounds are being torn away one by one. And this absorption of the smaller fortunes by the large ones is much hastened by the industrial crises, called "panics," which make their appearance every fifteen or twenty years.

The principle involved in "trusts" is the principle of co-operation instead of competition—but it is the co-operation of capitalists only, not the co-operation of the people. The object of a "trust" is greater regularity of production, steadiness of price and a uniform system of credit. It is the shadow of Socialism and it is used for the benefit of a few capitalists, instead of the nation.

And if this goes on, and according to all natural consequences it must go on, for all the great capital wants to be invested, then in a very short time we shall find most of our industries conducted by "trusts" from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

But these phenomena have also another meaning. They bring before the public mind the question whether we are to have organized capital or organized production? For it is perfectly evident that we must in the future have organized business action of some sort. Shall we have it for the capitalists only, or for the whole people?

In other words, the "trusts" prepare the public mind for Socialism.

If our "statesmen" were less blind to the logic of events which are pushing us with railroad speed toward a total and abrupt revolution, they might bring about a state of Socialism gradually and peaceably by a series of measures, each consistently developing itself out of the previous ones. They might begin from two poles of society.

Thus, it is now proposed, even by very conservative people, to take the telegraph system and the railroads of our country under government control and own them like our postoffice department.

Suppose this measure is realized, as it is sure to be in the near future.

Then do likewise with our express business, our steam and sailing vessels, and our mines, and thus onward.

Absorb the Standard Oil company, the steel trust and every other trust, and one great enterprise after another as quickly as possible.

And so from the other pole.

Why should not cities begin by taking under their control and operating their gas works, and electric light, railway and telephone plants? And why should they not operate their bakeries and drug stores? Let cities furnish to their citizens fuel in winter and ice in summer.

For are these things not just as essential to public health as water?

And, furthermore, let the city furnish all the school books and at least one meal a day, free of charge, to all the children, not only the poor, and clothes to such as are needy.

I do not say, nor even think, that the social question will be solved in this manner; our people are neither wise nor peaceable enough to do it. And some of our Socialists are just about as insane in that respect as are some capitalists. But it seems to me that would be the most practical way to solve the social question for a practical people.

Says the editor of the *Milwaukee Sentinel*:

"Here's richness. The Socialist candidate for governor of Rhode Island thus opens his letter of acceptance: 'While the chances of success are seemingly remote, there is much for which we must be thankful; everywhere there prevails a widespread discontent.' Apparently widespread ruin is all that is needed to fill that eminently frank Socialist's cup of gratitude to overflowing."

Since when were *discontent* and *ruin* one and the same thing? Discontent makes for progress, but ruin does not. When the workers of the wage class hug their chains it means ruin for the working class.

When they become discontented with economic oppression they force up the average of good citizenship, and bring nearer the day of their emancipation. If that Rhode Island candidate had said he was thankful for the discontent of the patriots of '76, the *Sentinel* would have smiled approvingly.

Talk of race suicide, what is the working class doing but committing suicide when it allows the capitalist state to put arms in its hands and uniforms on its backs and then on sundry occasions causes it to shoot down members of the working class who are struggling for better citizenship!

Anti-Social Citizens

By WAYFARER

How often have we had the old stuff dinned into our ears that Socialism is a menace to the tax-payers, that it will *benefit* the people by raising the rates and *impoverishing* the people. Funny enough, this cry has been generally set up by men who do not pay taxes, or who escape paying their share, in other words tax-dodgers. As a rule the small owner pays his taxes without much grumbling, but the big fellows both grumble and dodge the greater part of their rightful share of the burden of keeping the community running. There probably is not a city in the United States where the big manufacturers, for instance, do not notoriously get off with under-assessments. If the assessors try to treat them like other citizens, these "great patriots" respond with threats about moving to some other city where their part in giving work and "building up the town" will be better appreciated. With real estate it is not so easy to dodge the taxes, but on the other forms of personal wealth, your average capitalist gets practically scot free.

Milwaukee has just had the spectacle of the unmasking of a master tax-dodger. Circumstances so shaped themselves that he was driven into a corner out of which he could not squirm. He had to, in effect, admit his "moral turpitude," and hope the thing would blow over as soon as possible. This man was John I. Beggs, president of the Milwaukee street railway system, a leading figure in the North American Company; and also active in the management of the traction system in St. Louis.

A TAX-DODGER'S LIE!

Let the newspapers tell the story:

On July 17, the board of review sat around a long table on the fifth floor of the city hall and having nothing else to do bethought themselves that John I. Beggs ought to pay taxes, which he hadn't ever done in Milwaukee. None of them were familiar enough with the magnate to give anywhere near an exact estimate of his worth. Some thought he was worth a hundred million and others thought that twenty-five million was a conservative estimate of his wealth.

Finally, they decided to assess him \$100,000 personal property, money, mortgages, bonds, stocks, notes and so forth, what they call in scientific works on taxation—intangible property.

Monday afternoon John I. Beggs called on the Tax commissioner and said, "See here, Bill, I don't live in Milwaukee. I live in New York. Yes, sure I do. See, here is notice from the tax commissioner that I have been assessed \$25,000. I have never been a resident of Milwaukee, never considered this my home. I never voted here and I don't live here."

The tax commissioner looked at the notice the magnate showed and didn't say a word. It wasn't a receipt for taxes paid, it was simply a notice that he had been assessed—just like the notice the Milwaukee board of review had sent him on July 17.

"I trust you will not give out anything to the newspapers on this," said Mr. Beggs to the board of review, not noticing a newspaper man sitting six feet from him.

THE TAX DODGER LOSES COURAGE!

Then comes Chapter 2:

Friday afternoon, through his attorney, Clarke M. Rosenkrans, the tax commissioner was notified that Mr. Beggs intended to appear before the board at 9 o'clock and formally declare that he did not live in Milwaukee. At the appointed hour there was a delegation of newspapermen and artists and interested citizens awaiting the car chief, anxious to hear his declaration. But they were disappointed.

This forenoon the traction company head changed his mind as to making an appearance in this matter, and word was received by the tax commissioner from the attorney that no appearance would be made. This means that he submits to the assessment and will not take the matter into court for review.

THE EXPOSURE OF THE LIE.

The fact was that the board of review had made an investigation and had received the following telegram from New York:

New York, N. Y., Aug. 1.—Beggs assessed as non-resident for capital invested in New York. Has paid nothing in three years.

LAWSON PURDY.

This tell-tale evidence of his tax-dodging was printed in the papers, and the imperious Mr. Beggs weakened. He was in a corner where the less said the better.

This Beggs incident shows how endless and insatiable is capitalist greed, and it shows up the philosophy of life of our "leading citizens." They are predatory to the last fibre, and absolutely anti-social. Their motto is: Plunder all you can, but don't get caught. Only this time one of them was caught red-handed.

The working class provides the wherewithal. Its demand that the modern city shall be a place that is healthy to live in and that ministers to the wants and aspirations of the people is of itself a small demand, when considered in relation to the wealth it is constantly exploited out of under the capitalist system. If this flagrant exposure of a tax-dodger will silence to some extent the spurious claims of the tax-dodgers that the city must not make improvements because of the taxes it will mean a good deal to the city, and the Socialists say in their platforms that the measures they propose may be readily provided for the benefit of the people by making the capitalist class pay its rightful share of the burdens of city maintenance.

In Milwaukee every third man is a voter of the Social-Democratic ticket. Bebel says that the last elections showed every third man in Germany a Social-Democrat. So that the Milwaukee part of the Socialist movement in the United States is in line with the foremost Social-Democratic movement in the world. When the other parts of the United States swing into line

a Social-Democratic president will begin to be a thing to talk about.

City election in Muenchen, Germany, on the first ballot showed: Socialists, 25,603; Liberals, 20,463; Clericals, 13,939; Anti-Semites, 1,229. On the second ballot the capitalistic controlled parties combined against the Social-Democrats.

Schmitz No Socialist

By R. A. DAGUE

Some of the capitalist papers continue to print the falsehood to the effect that Eugene Schmitz, the convicted mayor of San Francisco, is a Socialist. With this lie for a text, they preach to their readers, telling them that Socialism leads to dishonesty, is opposed to the church, and would break up families, etc. Now as a former resident of San Francisco, I am qualified to state the facts. Eugene Schmitz is a Republican in politics and a Roman Catholic in religion. Abraham Reuf, his long time legal adviser and alleged "boss," is a Republican in politics and a Jew in religion. There is a large Catholic and Jewish population in San Francisco. There was surprise manifested in all parts of the country that Schmitz was elected mayor three times. Residents of that city know how this was accomplished. A political alliance was formed between Schmitz and Reuf. The Rev. Peter C. Yorke, an eloquent Catholic priest, had great influence with many thousand voters. He was an ardent advocate of

Schmitz's candidacy. Abraham Reuf exerted great influence with Hebrew voters. Reuf is a very shrewd political manipulator. Schmitz had long been a musical director—is an accomplished violinist. He was a member of a musicians' union. Reuf "discovered him" and manipulated the labor unions so effectively that they nominated the "fiddler" for mayor. Reuf swung the Hebrew vote to him, also many hundred Republican votes. Father Yorke's eloquence brought to his aid many hundred votes from both the old parties. Three terms he was thus elected as a "Labor Union candidate." At every election the Socialists had a full ticket in the field and did all they could to defeat the "Reuf-Schmitz combination." Prior to his going into politics Schmitz had a good reputation. He should have stuck to his fiddle. He was a cat-paw in the hands of Reuf. He was too weak to withstand temptation.

Let the Republican lie about the San Francisco Socialists be exposed.

"Yes," said a talkative old lady, "I used to be very active in the D. A. R., but I have rather dropped out of it lately. It isn't the distinction it used to be. When we formed the society, it was our idea to get together ladies whose ancestors were men of eminence in the Revolution, like General — and General —, from whom I am descended; but now a lot of people have come in, descended maybe

from lieutenants, or even privates."

So these disappointed ladies had thought to serve an aristocratic motive by celebrating a democratic revolution! Well, their disappointment is the gratification of a much larger number. This business of being daughters of the old revolution is a rather paltry kind of activity, after all; how much better to be mothers of the next revolution! —Rufus W. Weeks.

Shots at Capitalism

By FREDERIC HEATH

There is plenty of coal in the earth, there are plenty of men to do the mining, and they live miserably in order that they may work for low wages; there are plenty of railroads and plenty of cars to haul the coal after it is mined—and yet we are informed that there may be another coal famine this coming winter! This is the inevitable state of things so long as humanity permits the few to control the resources of the many. You have voted capitalist party tickets in the past, and every time you did you voted to sanction this sort of thing. As soon as enough of you get sense enough to desert the capitalist party camps and withhold the sanction of your votes for capitalistic outrages just so soon will the miserable conditions begin to disappear. You used to call us dreamers when we told you this in the past, but you have gotten so many hard knocks since then that you must be about ready by this time to see that we are practical, hard-headed people who have the courage to look facts in the face. We are doing our part, but we cannot do so very much until enough of you come to our support to give us a majority. It is up to you!

A particularly rabid and reckless magazine is the *Open Shop*. The publishers are trying to coin a living out of the fight on labor organization by the predatory capitalists, and the effort, of course, is far-fetched and grotesque. In the current issue there is an article on the "Ten Commandments of Socialism," which is one of the most

shameful appeals to prejudice we have ever laid our eyes on. Each "commandment" is made up of an offensive proposition and is then followed with alleged quotations, forgeries probably all of them, from well-known and unknown Socialists, tending to bear out the "command." To show the silliness of the thing we may state that one of the alleged commandments is to "curse the name of God." Another commandment is to "murder without scruple." And one of the alleged quotations, from a "Socialist writer" we never heard of, is to this effect: "It will be a joy for us to be able to assist at the death-throes of priests, of citizens, of capitalists. Shut up in the cellars of their own houses, they will die slowly, tasting death before our very eyes. This will be our victory." Comment is superfluous.

"The diary of an amateur waitress," by Maud Younger, in one of the magazines, contains a rather pertinent restaurant anecdote: "One of the girls told me about a restaurant where the customers paid the funeral expenses of a waitress who had no relatives. 'She got muscular rheumatism from standing,' said Number 3, 'and she died in the hospital. The firm sent her a grand floral piece with a star and a heart and crescent.' 'Well, that was good of them,' said Number 25. 'They'd better have paid her decent wages while she was alive,' said Number 12. 'She worked steadily at that house for five years and she worked thirteen hours a day every day in the week, Sundays, too. And all

she got was \$6 a week. I used to work there myself." At the restaurant with which the diary is concerned the wages were \$4 a week, and among the texts on the wall was, "I am the Lord which exercises loving kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth." To say the word "union" was to be fined.

The New York *Evening Mail* sadly calls attention to the fact that the establishment of manhood suffrage in Austria has made the Socialists the strongest party in the parliament; that in the Finnish parliament they have almost half the members; that they are not much weaker in the Russian parliament, despite the indirect and juggled elections; that "their setback at the last election in Germany was more apparent than real," since their popular vote was increased; and that in France they compete for power with Radicals whom the *Mail* regards as little short of being themselves Socialists; and it concludes: "It is the worst of folly for defenders of conservatism and individualism throughout the world to blind themselves to the steady advance and ever increasing strength of the Socialistic movement in every country. The Austrian election is merely the latest warning of a peril common to the nations."

"Employers, more than any other class of citizens, receive the largest percentage of protection through the national guard," says the *Milwaukee Sentinel*. Correct, that's what the state soldiery, as at present organized, is for: To intimidate workingmen struggling to raise their status of citizenship. And that new law passed by the Wis-

consin legislature making it a misdemeanor for labor unions to put restrictions in their by-laws against members serving the capitalist owned state as guardsmen will avail little to repress a righteous opposition to the present military system. You may drag the trade union nag to the water but you cannot make them drink, gentlemen. Give us a real citizen soldiery, with every able-bodied man a member and on a basis where the soldiers represent the people and their liberty and are not the tools of the interests of a marauding class thereof, and you will not be forced to the pitiful extremity of passing any more such tell-tale laws.

State Sec'y Nash of our party in Minnesota writes in regard to the "outbreaks" the newspapers have had so much to say about on the Mesaba range, that "the miners are as quiet as church mice, except in the papers, where the indications are made to look as if everything was on the ragged edge and liable to go up in smoke at any minute. All the comrades are trying their best to preserve order and keep things quiet, while the mine owners are calling loudly for troops, and when unable to get them employ detectives and thugs they have armed with rifles and keep them patrolling the roads between Hibbing and Chisholm, bent on the usual mischief these cut-throats enjoy making." When you read the news now-a-days you cannot always mostly tell how much is straight and how much invention.

A Milwaukeean traveling in the West writes: "On the front of a big traction engine hauling a train of logs in the state of Washington I found a big cloth placard which

read: 'Under Socialism the workers will get as much for five hours' work as under the present system for ten hours.' Socialism is sweeping the country from Denver to the coast. Am simply amazed at the progress Socialism is making all over the Western country."

The *Miners' Magazine* of Denver points out that the capitalist government of Colorado has enacted a law by which divorces may be had within its borders for 30 cents. The descent from the 30 pieces of silver of old to the 30 pieces of copper of the present is simply an indication of the fact that the more modern commercialism has to provide bargain-counter inducements. In fact, the modern theory of capitalism is to make small profits but plenty of them—and there are plenty of homes to be sacrificed under the present system.

One of the oddest newspapers in the world is one named the *Wochenblatt*, which is published in Gruningen, a small town of some 1,200 inhabitants in the canton of Zurich, in Switzerland. It is the only newspaper in the place and is at one and the same time the organ of the Liberal Conservatives and the Social-Democrats. Pages one and two belong to the Liberals, and pages three and four to the Socialists, and the two parties abuse one another heartily in its pages.

There is a big difference between a labor union trust and a carnivorous capitalist trust, if you please, Messrs. Special Pleaders for Capitalism. The capitalist trust is bent on getting a good thing for a restricted few and to the divvel with the rest. The labor union "trust" has for its prime object the taking

in of every laborer possible. See the point?

The government by commission reformer is a wolf in sheep's clothing. To the unwary he looks good, but the result of his work will be a blow to true democracy. If he has his way he will undo the work of years' in trying to make this government a government of the people. Look his schemes and "reforms" over carefully, and see where they point to. Eternal vigilance is just as much the price of liberty now as it was in 1776.

A well known writer, who applied and secured a job as strike breaker on a street car line in order to write intelligently on the subject, says that he had no difficulty in getting work and having a car entrusted to him, although he was utterly ignorant of the work. The company did not care how many lives were thus put in jeopardy so long as it could beat the strikers and prevent their bettering their living. Private ownership never does truly serve the people.

How inadequately the German Socialists are represented in parliament has been shown by a statement made by Bebel in the assembly itself. Bebel declared that if there were a proper distribution of seats the Socialists would be in possession, not of 43 seats but of 117. He affirms also that the last election had proved that every third man in Germany over the age of 25 was a Socialist.

If you have been voting a capitalist party ticket you have been sharing in the responsibility for the capitalist system. And every groan of distress, every despairing

cry of your fellow human, ground to death and degradation under capitalism's remorseless wheels, ought to penetrate to your conscience and turn you from a Saul into a Paul.

Have you ever stopped to contemplate the fact that under the capitalist system prosperity and poverty go hand in hand and that there is usually more poverty than prosperity! This fact alone ought to show that the system has outlived the period of its usefulness. It will soon go to the scrap heap to make way for a brighter era and greater happiness among the people.

The people seem to be doing a little reflecting. They are daring today to think about the fact that it is the industrious class in society that is the poor class, and that fact doesn't seem to jibe with the old notion that wealth and contentment came from being industrious.

Where will you find today the same spirit, the same self-sacrifice, that dominated the patriots of Revolutionary days and the heroes of the fight to abolish black slavery, except in the Social-Democratic movement for economic freedom and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man?

The bishop of London says English homes are so overcrowded that "they are not homes at all." Then why do not the people of England get homes large enough, for there is plenty of material and plenty of labor to do the building! Why, indeed!

"Death by pneumonia, accelerated by poverty," was the verdict

given in the case of a child's death in London. That's giving away the capitalist system with a vengeance.

There is enough and to spare of the necessities and good things of life all about us to give every human being a complete life. But a bad system holds these things away from the mass of the people and deals out rewards to shirkers instead of to workers.

Just before adjourning for the summer the parliament of France enacted a bill limiting the hours of labor in the mines of that country to eight hours per day. This is a great victory for the Socialists in parliament, who made a hard fight to force the government to show its hand.

Under capitalism labor saving machinery takes the job of the worker. Under Socialism it would come as his best friend, for he would share in its ownership and consequently its product.

It is said that the soldiers in Italy are so strongly in sympathy with the working class that the government would not dream of ordering them against strikers.

Under the capitalist system it is usually more profitable to work others than to work yourself. Can such a system of society be called moral?

The Socialist party of France now has over 50,000 dues-paying members.

Don't despise the power of the ballot simply because you have misused it so long.



VICTOR L. BERGER