

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA




LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

IV

RECENT AMERICAN
SOCIALISM



“Opinio omnis ad eam spem traducenda, ut honestis consiliis justisque factis non fraude et malitia se intelligant ea quae velint consequi posse.”—*Cicero*.

“Das Gewebe dieser Welt ist aus Nothwendigkeit und Zufall gebildet; die Vernunft des Menschen stellt sich zwischen beide und weiss sie zu beherrschen; sie behandelt das Nothwendige als den Grund ihres Daseins, das Zufällige weiss sie zu lenken, zu leiten und zu nutzen, und nur indem sie fest und unerschütterlich steht, verdient der Mensch ein Gott der Erde genannt zu werden.”—*Goethe*.

“The nation and the individual exist in an organic and moral relation, in which the normal development of each has as its condition the development of the other, and their unity is formed after the law of a moral unity.”—*Mulford*.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

HERBERT B. ADAMS, Editor


History is past Politics and Politics present History — *Freeman*

THIRD SERIES

IV

RECENT AMERICAN
SOCIALISM

By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph. D.



BALTIMORE

N. MURRAY, PUBLICATION AGENT, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

APRIL, 1885

COPYRIGHTED, 1885.

JOHN MURPHY & CO, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

P R E F A C E .

“ I presume you have felt, as have I, the sting of criticism and censure—of misrepresentation because discussing this topic of socialism at all.” These are words written to me in a letter recently received, by a friend who is professor of political economy in a prominent Western university. They indicate at once a difficulty in the way of the economist. The topics he discusses are so vital, that any presentation of them is bound to be misconstrued in some quarter. Nevertheless, there seems to be only one course for an honest man, which is to say his word and patiently endure misunderstanding and even malicious abuse. But it may not be out of place for me to state the purpose of this monograph.

The aim of the present paper is so clear that only unfortunate experience in the past leads me to explain it in the preface. When my “ French and German Socialism ” was published, one ill-natured critic complained because my opinions were not distinguished from the opinions I was endeavoring to expound. This criticism was echoed in other places. Now it had not occurred to me that it was necessary to thrust my opinions upon the reader of the history of French and German Socialism. In reading works covering like ground I had often been annoyed by childish criticism such as must occur to every boy, criticism thrust into the midst of the presentation of some theoretical system, so I resolved to abstain from anything of the kind and thought it sufficient to let the facts speak for themselves.

The aim of this monograph is quite similar. It is primarily a presentation and not a refutation. It will be read chiefly by well-educated men, in comfortable circumstances, and of moral natures sufficiently elevated to understand that we ought not to lie, murder, and blow up cities with dynamite to accomplish our

ends. I do not think it necessary to tell them this. I do not think it incumbent upon me to say on every page that I am so far from sympathizing with schemes for destruction, that I regard them as damnable.

I have tried first to understand American socialism, and then to present it in such manner, that others may likewise understand it. I have endeavored to let the parties concerned speak for themselves, as far as possible. Newspapers and magazines are full of arguments against socialism, but it is not plain that the foe is always known.

As to dangers to be apprehended, opinions will differ. The New York *Tribune*, which I have to thank for many generous words in times past, rebukes me rather severely for what it holds extreme pessimism. The basis of this criticism is a few words hastily uttered in an interview and dragged violently out of their connection. However, the writer in the *Tribune* points out the undoubted fact that the distress and discontent were quite as pronounced in the first half of this century in England as now in America, and that, although there was no dynamite then, "incendiarism did more mischief than dynamite has ever done. Famine, riots, organized outrages, brigandage, epidemic diseases, made the country seem a pandemonium." This is true, but the different nature of the discontent at the present time is overlooked. So far were the men of those days from desiring a general destruction of present society, that the terrible "charter" demanded nothing more radical than universal suffrage and annual elections. Discontent then gave rise to a kind of socialism, but of a very different character from that described in these pages. Its leaders were men of large mind and generous nature like St. Simon, Fourier and Louis Blanc, who sought universal peace in peaceable manner. This difference appears to me of importance.

Of course we all hope for the best, but in the meantime it may be safer to fear what is worse, and it can do no harm to be watchful. It is pleasant to believe that no cause for anxiety exists, but it is impossible not to remember the funeral oration Sir John Campbell pronounced over Chartism in 1839. "He spoke at some length, and with much complacency, of Chartism as an agitation which had passed away. Some ten days afterward occurred the most formidable outburst of Chartism that had been known up

to that time, and Chartism continued to be an active and a disturbing influence in England for nearly ten years after."¹

Nor was it merely a return to prosperity which terminated for the time dangerous agitation. It was also the active efforts of noble men like Thomas Hughes, Charles Kingsley, and Frederick Maurice, whose devotion to the cause of labor has in England, partially at least, bridged the gulf between poor and rich, and whose services now live in large movements for the elevation of the laboring classes.


In conclusion, it is proper to state that this monograph is to some extent a second, enlarged, and revised edition of articles which appeared in the *Christian Union* a year ago. These articles have been used freely, both by pulpit and press, sometimes with generous recognition of the source of information, perhaps oftener without mention either of their author or the *Christian Union*. The consequence is that some parts of it may have a familiar appearance to those who never saw the articles in the *Christian Union*. I desire to say that the information in this monograph is taken at first hand from socialistic newspapers and other materials carefully collected for several years, as well as from lectures, addresses, and private conversation.

RICHARD T. ELY.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, April 7, 1885.

¹ McCarthy's "History of Our Own Times," I., 5.





RECENT AMERICAN SOCIALISM.

I.

RETROSPECTIVE.—EARLY AMERICAN COMMUNISM.

The practical character of the American is a matter of common report, and a cause of national pride. The citizen of the New World is not content with mere speculation; his nature craves action, and nowhere else does practice follow so closely upon theory. This trait shows itself in social movements as well as elsewhere. Young as is America she has already furnished a field for the trial of a large number of romantic ideals of a socialistic nature, and promises ere long to outstrip all that has been accomplished by all other nations in all past time in the way of social experimentation.

Confining ourselves to attempts to realize various forms of socialism and communism, the mind naturally reverts to the "oldest American charter," under which the first English settlement was made on American soil. One condition stipulated by King James was a common storehouse into which products were to be poured, and from which they were to be distributed according to the needs of the colonists, and this was the industrial Constitution under which the first inhabitants of Jamestown lived for five years,¹ during which the idlers gave so much trouble that the old soldier, Captain John Smith, was forced to declare in vigorous language, and

¹ Cooke's Virginia, Chap. III. The date of the charter is 1606.

with threats not to be misunderstood that "he that will not work shall not eat." "Dream no longer," continued Smith, "of this vain hope from Powhatan, or that I will longer forbear to force you from your idleness or punish you if you rail. I protest by that God that made me, since necessity hath no power to force you to gather for yourselves, you shall not only gather for yourselves, but for those that are sick. They shall not starve."¹

The first Pilgrims who emigrated to New England, were bound by a somewhat similar arrangement which they had entered into with London merchants, but the issue of the experiment was not more successful, and it was partially abandoned; not wholly, for a great deal of land was long after held in common and, indeed, to-day, there are small parcels of this land still common property.² As is well known, the Boston common is but a survival of early communism, as in fact its very name indicates.

It must be acknowledged that comparatively little importance attaches to either of these experiments. The Jamestown communism seems never to have been regarded as anything more than a temporary makeshift, and the similar arrangement in New England was of a like nature. There exist to-day in America far larger and more important communistic societies living in peace and great comfort, even in wealth. As far as the common lands are concerned, they are part of a large system of early landholding which still survives to greater or less extent, both in America and Europe.

But two years before the Declaration of American Independence there came to this country a body of men and women with the avowed determination to lead a purely communistic life for all future time. These were the Shakers whose first settlement, that of Watervliet, was begun in 1776. Their own

¹ Cooke, l. c., p. 54.

² H. B. Adams, *Germanic Origin of New England Towns*, Studies I., No. 2, p. 33.

statement of their principle of Christian Communism is in these words: "The bond of union which unites all Shakers is spiritual and religious, hence unselfish. All are equal before God and one another; and, as in the institution of the primitive Christian church, all share one interest in spiritual and temporal blessings, according to individual needs; no rich, no poor. The strong bear the infirmities of the weak and all are sustained, promoting each other in Christian fellowship, as one family of brethren and sisters in Christ."¹ It is thus seen that pure communism in America is of the same age as American independence. This is not the place to describe the other peculiar doctrines and practices of the Shakers, as celibacy, confession, and separation from the world. Their numbers soon began to increase and they early founded communistic villages in most of the New England States, in some of the Middle and in a few of the Western States. At one time they numbered between five and six thousand, but when Mr. Hinds wrote his book their membership had fallen to about twenty-four hundred, grouped in seventeen societies, their largest community being at Mount Lebanon, New York, and comprising nearly four hundred souls.

The Shakers are of English origin. Their first leader, Ann Lee, came to America from England with eight followers, but her preaching soon won numerous converts, and the second person who followed her in the ministry was Elder Joseph Meacham, a man of American birth, who seems to have been more powerful as an organizer than either of his predecessors.

Early in this century, another body of communists came to the United States from Germany to escape religious persecution. They are called Harmonists, and after a period of migration settled at Economy near Pittsburgh in Pennsylvania, where they now reside. Their first leader, George

¹Quoted from "American Communities," by Wm. Alfred Hinds, Oneida, N. Y., 1878.

Rapp, a man of great ability and extraordinary force of character, commanded their confidence and governed the community with such prudence and foresight as to lay the foundations of their present wealth, which is estimated at several millions of dollars. But their numbers have declined, while their property has increased in value. At one time their membership comprised a thousand souls; at present they do not exceed one hundred. They are celibates and believe that communism is an essential part of Christianity. The Germans have established other communities, as at Zoar in Ohio, and at Amana in Iowa, in both of which marriage is allowed. The latter is the largest of American communistic societies, and embraced sixteen hundred members in 1878,¹ who owned upwards of twenty-five thousand acres.

The French have established a remarkable community, called Icaria, in which they have attempted to realize the pure non-religious communism of Cabet, the author of the charming communistic romance, "Voyage en Icarie." The Icarians came to America in 1848, and were under the personal direction of Cabet for several years, during which they achieved a remarkable degree of prosperity. Their eventful and picturesque history, the most interesting and instructive chapter in the annals of this early American communism, is narrated in Dr. Shaw's admirable book, "Icaria."² The work, "Icaria," at once pathetic and romantic, gives us such an insight into the nature of the earlier phases of communism in America, as is afforded by no other publication, and to it the reader is referred for further information in regard to this subject.

American-born citizens have also founded communities, of which the most prosperous is that of the Perfectionists at Oneida, New York, whose "builder" was John Humphrey

¹ This, like many of the facts in this chapter, is taken from the works of Mr. Hinds, to which reference has already been made.

² New York, 1884.

Noyes, son of a member of Congress. The family of Mr. Noyes is described as one of the best, while he himself is a college graduate, has studied at the Yale Theological Seminary, and is undoubtedly a man of fine ability.

Space is too limited to permit the enumeration of the many other communities established in America. The two great periods of a revival of interest in communism, and the foundation of village communities based on that principle, are, 1826, when Robert Owen visited this country and received distinguished attention from the American people, and 1842-6, when under the lead of Horace Greeley, Albert Brisbane, Charles A. Dana, and others, Fourierism extended itself rapidly over the country. Mr. Noyes in his work, "History of American Socialism,"¹ mentions eleven communities founded during the first period, and thirty-four which owed their origin to the second revival of communism. It seems safe to say that considerably over one hundred, possibly two hundred communistic villages have been founded in the United States, although comparatively few yet live. Mr. Hinds in his directory of communism mentions twenty-seven communities. In 1874 Mr. Nordhoff, after personal inspection of the communistic settlements in the United States, estimated the wealth of seventy-two communities at twelve millions of dollars, their numbers at five thousand, more or less, and their landed property at over one hundred and fifty thousand acres, which is a great decline from an earlier period in respect to membership at least.

Forty years ago men of high education and large ability thought that communistic villages would revolutionize the economic life of the world. The process, a speedy but peaceable one, was viewed in this way: The community where all live together harmoniously as brothers with no *meum et tuum*, but with all things in common, affords the only escape from the warring, competitive world of the present where some die

¹ Philadelphia, 1870.

of excessive indulgence in luxuries and others of starvation, and where the future of no one is secure. When a few communities have been established, the happy Christian life which men there lead will attract the attention of outsiders and win them to join the brotherhood of communism. Thus community will follow community with ever accelerating ratio until the entire earth is redeemed. Cabet, for example, "allowed fifty years for a peaceful transition from our present economic life to communism. In the interval, various measures were to be introduced by legislation to pave the way to the new system. Among these may be mentioned communistic training for children, a minimum of wages, exemption of the poor from all taxes, and progressive taxation for the rich. But 'the system of absolute equality, of community of goods and of labor, will not be obliged to be applied completely, perfectly, universally and definitely, until the expiration of fifty years.'"¹

All these hopes have been generally abandoned as idle dreams, and it is due largely to experiments made in America that the enthusiasts of fifty and sixty years ago have been disillusionized. It is not that the communistic life itself has in every case proved a disappointment. On the contrary, thousands have clung to it with affection through trial, adversity and evil report, and have felt themselves amply repaid for every sacrifice in their new life, while others who have abandoned it, have looked back upon their experience with fond regret. Thus one member of the celebrated Brook farm community uses these words with reference to their feelings in regard to that experiment: "The life which we now lead, though to a superficial observer surrounded with so many imperfections and embarrassments, is far superior to what we were ever able to attain in common society. There is a freedom from the frivolities of fashion, from arbitrary restrictions and from the frenzy of competition. . . . There

¹Ely's *French and German Socialism*, New York, 1883, p. 50.

is a greater variety of employments, a more constant demand for the exertion of all the faculties, and a more exquisite pleasure in effort, from the consciousness that we are laboring, not for personal ends, but for a holy principle; and even the external sacrifices which the pioneers in every enterprise are obliged to make, are not without a certain romantic charm."

But the communities failed to win adherents, often failed to continue their own existence. Unthought-of obstacles were encountered in human nature. Idleness was an evil to be contended with, though this seems to have been one of the lesser obstacles in most cases.¹ Petty jealousies have proved more serious, and personal differences, such as are bound to spring up between unregenerate men living in any close connection, have been rocks upon which many a community has made shipwreck. During a period of poverty the struggle for existence has often knit the members of communities firmly together into a compact whole, which has become disorganized by the inability to endure the severer trials of a period of prosperity when factions arise and party bickerings become intolerable. Then the life is too small and commonplace to satisfy the cravings of many of larger natures. There is so little scope for ambition, and ambition is one of the chief traits of mankind. Cleverly contrived and fantastic arrangements like those of Fourieristic phalanxes have never been found to exercise any magic qualities either on converts or the sinful world. Men have not been attracted sufficiently to join the communities in large numbers, because, either for good or for ill, the spirit of the selfish world has been too strong to be deeply touched by the spectacle of generous self-renouncing communism. The flesh-pots of the Egypt of competition have proved stronger than the Canaan of communism, though the latter even now often flows with abundance of milk and honey.

¹"The testimony of all communities is that the lazy are easily induced to work by a little friendly criticism and kind persuasion." *The Communist*, July 1, 1878.

Early American communism is antiquated ; it exists only as a curious and interesting survival. Yet it has accomplished much good and little harm. Its leaders have been actuated by noble motives, have many times been men far above their fellows in moral stature, even in intellectual stature, and have desired only to benefit their kind. Its aim has been to elevate man, and its ways have been ways of peace. It is impossible to survey its history without a certain feeling of sadness, and we turn from it with a gentle *requiescat in pace*.

II.

HENRY GEORGE AND THE BEGINNINGS OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

Henry George's work, "Progress and Poverty," was published in 1879. In 1885, not six years later, it is possible to affirm without hesitation that the appearance of that one book formed a noteworthy epoch in the history of economic thought both in England and America. It is not simply that the treatise itself was an eloquent, impassioned plea for the confiscation of rent for the public good as a means of abolishing economic social evils, but rather that the march of industrial forces had opened a way for the operation of ideas new and strange to the great masses. A wonderful epoch of discovery and invention had brought to the service of man the mighty powers of nature in such manner as to accomplish results surpassing the dreams of enthusiasts and the operations of the magician's wand in the fairy tale. This ushered in a period of unparalleled increase of wealth which was sufficient to transform the face of the earth in a single generation, and its beneficent fruits made optimists of men.

But all the products of the age were not beneficent. The new ways required a displacement and readjustment of labor and capital, under which many suffered grievously. Doubtless progress led to the common good "in the end," as people

say, but many perished in the way before the end was reached. Much capital which could not be withdrawn from its old use was lost, to the impoverishment of its owners, and acquired skill was in not a few cases rendered superfluous. To take a single concrete example, let one think of the inns which fifty years ago flourished along the great mail and stage routes. How many were ruined in the improvements which George Stephenson and his locomotive have finally made a daily necessity? Again, advanced processes and labor-saving machinery frequently throw men entirely out of employment, though after a time the demand for laborers may increase immensely, as has occurred in the case of spinning and weaving.

But for the time being men suffer, and the time being is an important factor to men who live from hand to mouth, as is the case with a great part of mankind. Those who suffered, often complained bitterly, and at times uttered dire threats which were occasionally executed in part at least. All this has long been a familiar fact in Europe. From the termination of the Napoleonic wars till the discovery of gold in California and Australia was a period of distress in England, and what Sismondi saw in the crisis of 1819 when on a visit to that country, produced such an effect upon him that he felt compelled to throw overboard the political economy of Adam Smith, to which he had previously adhered, and to write his "Nouveaux Principes d'Économie Politique." The example of England is not an isolated one.

In the United States, however, there was abundance of fertile, unoccupied land on every side, and the undeveloped resources of the country were boundless, both in extent and in their potentialities for production of wealth. While some suffered doubtless, they were comparatively few, and the tremendous strides with which America was advancing in power and prosperity caused them generally to be overlooked. The bloom and fruitage of the age regarded from a materialistic, economic standpoint seemed almost wholly beneficent, and Americans as a rule were optimists. But a change was

impending. A severe crisis in 1873, with all its train of varied disasters, checked economic progress and brought the crushing weight of poverty upon tens of thousands. This was not the first industrial crash in America, to be sure, but it is doubtful whether any other followed on an era of such prosperity.

Then the wealth of a few had increased enormously during the civil war, while luxury such as had scarce entered the day-dreams of our fathers, extended itself over the land. Never before had there been seen in America such contrasts between fabulous wealth and absolute penury. Population was denser and there was not exactly the same freedom, the same ease of movement. In short, from one cause and another, in many quarters bright visions gave place to gloomy forebodings, and six years later the ground was ripe for the seed sown by Henry George, till then an obscure journalist in the "Far West," and the harvest has already been abundant while the promises for the future are overwhelming.

Ten years ago English-speaking laborers were considered too practical to listen to dreamers of dreams and heralds of coming Utopias. The sturdy common sense of English and American workingmen was thought an all-sufficient shield against the speculations of continental philosophers, and the allurements of French and German agitators. Now all that is changed. The models of order threaten to form the vanguard of a rebellious army.

Henry George has rendered two distinct services to the cause of socialism. First, in the no-rent theory, or in other words, the confiscation of rent *pro bono publico*, he has furnished a rallying point for all discontented laborers; second, his book has served as an entering wedge for other still more radical and far-reaching measures. It is written in an easily understood, and even brilliant style, is published in cheap form, both in England and America, and in each country has attained a circulation, which for an economic work is with-

out parallel. Tens of thousands of laborers have read "Progress and Poverty," who never before looked between the two covers of an economic book, and its conclusions are widely accepted articles in the workingman's creed. ✓

Labor papers, otherwise not decidedly socialistic and not long since holding aloof from all radical social reforms, now accept the no-rent theory; and of this sufficient evidence may be found in the representative journals of organizations like the Knights of Labor. Two newspapers devoted to the interests of laborers, lie on the table before the writer. One of them, published in Baltimore, in commenting on the last Congress of the Socialistic Labor Party in that city, declares, "we do not agree with these socialists," and yet it makes propaganda for "Progress and Poverty," which it offers as a premium to all subscribers; while the editor of the other, a Buffalo sheet,¹ makes room in the same number for a long and favorable account of a speech by Henry George and a letter from a New York correspondent, bewailing the discredit brought upon "our movement" by "the ravings" of "advanced socialism." More marked still is the spread of the no-rent theory in England, where indeed Henry George first became famous. It was adopted by a large majority by the Trades Union Congress in that country in 1882, and has been accepted by the miners in the North of England. Even the English monthly "Christian Socialism" leads a crusade in behalf of "Progress and Poverty." Socialists very generally accept the "no-rent" theory as a chief article in their creed, and one of the first to be realized. If they often reject Henry George's statement of his propositions, it is to their form rather than to their substantial purport they object. 0

A New York organ of the Socialistic Labor Party published about two years ago a "Declaration of Principles," of which the first sentence read as follows: "The land of every country is the common inheritance of the people in that 0

¹ Buffalo *Truth*, April 15, 1883.

country, and hence all should have free and equal access to its settlement."

And a little later the San Francisco *Truth*, a rabid socialistic paper, published this "economic" law: "Warning! Land-owners look out! There are breakers ahead! This is the new law governing the price of land in both city and country. The price of land is determined by the sale of Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty,' falling as it rises, and rising as it falls. It is now past its hundredth edition, and it is going faster than ever. In ten years from now, town lots will not be worth more than the taxes! Private property and land is doomed!"

The fruit this book is bearing was seen in the parade of workmen in New York on September 5, 1883, in which according to one account 10,000, according to another 15,000 laborers participated under the auspices of the Central Labor Union. Banners were carried on which such sentiments as these were inscribed: "Workers in tenement-houses—idlers in brown stone fronts;" "Jay Gould must go;" "Which shall it be, the ballot or Judge Lynch." A cartoon was also displayed, called "The Situation," which pictured "Capital" as flying a kite, entitled "Rent," while its tail bore aloft "meat, coal, flour, prices." Another motto was the characteristic one which implicitly represented the labor-crusade as a religion, and the coming government as a church: "Labor is the Rock on which the government of the future must be built."

This parade may be regarded as an epoch in the history of labor movements in this country. So far as the writer is aware it is the first time large bodies of American laborers have acted publicly with out-spoken socialists, and have marched under revolutionary banners. In this occurrence may be seen the two-fold character of Henry George's work. "No-rent" united all and opened the way in the minds of laborers for other features of advanced socialism.

It is then of interest to know the precise nature of this socialism which is being preached to our laborers.

Several questions naturally suggest themselves. What are the ultimate aims of American socialists? How do they expect or desire to attain their purposes? What is the precise character of their agitation? Is any danger to be apprehended from this agitation? If so, what is its extent, and what measures should be adopted to ward off these dangers? An attempt will be made to answer these questions in the course of the present monograph.

There are in the United States two distinct parties of socialists, which may be called revolutionary since they both aim at an overthrow of existing economic and social institutions, and the substitution therefor of radically different forms.

These two parties are known as the "Socialistic Labor Party" and the "International Workingmen's Association," or "International Working People's Association," designated usually by their respective initials S. L. P. and I. W. A., or I. W. P. A. The Internationalists are also called Anarchists and sometimes the "reds," while the members of the other party are occasionally dubbed the "blues." One sees these initials continually in their publications, and upon them incessant repetition seems to have conferred in the minds of socialists a peculiar cabalistic quality.

It may be well to devote a few words to their general characteristics and to a short account of their origin, before passing over to a more detailed description of each.

These parties differ in most important particulars, although they agree upon certain fundamental propositions. Their divergence is first and foremost one of method. The Internationalists are a party of violence, believing in the use of dynamite and like weapons of warfare as a means of attaining their purpose, while the adherents of the Socialistic Labor Party condemn these tactics, and some of them have not renounced all hope of a peaceable revolution of society. The next difference which attracts the attention is the superior character of the men of the latter party as compared with those of the former. The Socialistic Labor Party is composed of more highly edu-

cated and more refined men. It is largely due to this diversity of method and of personal qualities that the members of the two parties have found it impossible to act harmoniously together, and are, indeed, at present at swords' points. There are also important differences of doctrine, but these, as more complicated, will be described in the detailed treatment of the parties.

The points of agreement are, as has been said, fundamental, and it is well at the start to clear away a misapprehension which exists in the minds of many by mentioning a negative particular, in which all socialists agree. It seems, indeed, to be necessary to begin every article, monograph or book on the theory of socialism by the statement that no one advocates, or even desires an equal division of productive property. What they wish is a concentration of all the means of production in the property of the people as a whole, and the distribution of the income, that is, of the products only, either equally or unequally, according to the views entertained of what is just and expedient.

✓ The program of American socialism then includes primarily the substitution of some form of exclusive coöperation in production and exchange, for the present leadership of "captains of industry" in production and exchange, or capitalistic system, as it is termed, and the abolition of private property in land and capital to make room for common property. In other words both parties regarding the wage-receiver as practically a slave, desire the advent of a time when coöperators shall take the place, both of industrial master and industrial subordinate. Both wish to abolish the possibility of idleness, and to make of universal application the maxim: "He that will not work, neither shall he eat."

Both parties are materialists, though the materialism of the Socialistic Labor Party, is less gross than that of the Internationalists. Having abandoned hope of a happy hereafter in which the poor but honest and God-fearing laborer shall find rich reward for all toil and suffering patiently borne, they

have determined to enjoy this life, and, as it is not light to believe that there is no blessedness in the universe, they imagine this earth designed to be a Paradise. They talk of its beauties and of the soul-satisfying delights of life, from all of which they are debarred by a conspiracy of the rich or at least by existing economic conditions. They accept the designation "Godless" and claim that the visible universe is the only God which they know, falling thus into a kind of materialistic pantheism.¹

It is interesting to notice the general view all modern socialists take of society as a growth. Each social form is regarded as an era in the development of society; useful in its time but after awhile becoming antiquated, it must give way to an advanced organism. Slavery, serfdom and wages were not unjustifiable; they hold, but the Internationalists and moderates think that these institutions have all had their day, have fulfilled their purpose and are no longer needed among the nations of civilization, though there may still be regions where they are not yet antiquated. "We do not deny," says one of these socialists, "that there are countries that have not yet outlived the wage-system, but we have certainly outlived it in the United States, and cannot safely continue it."² Socialism is then coming just as the leaves are coming in spring, and just as these will be followed by bloom and fruitage. It is not of human willing, but as inevitable and necessary as the law of gravitation. All that the more sensible among them profess to be able to do is to guide and direct the mighty forces of nature, which manifest themselves in social revolutions and convulsions. Thus it was natural for the resolutions presented to the meeting of Anarchists held in Chicago on Thanksgiving day of last year to begin, "Whereas, we have *outlived* the usefulness of the

¹ V. Two articles entitled "die Gottlosen" in *der Sozialist*, d. 31 Januar, and d. 7 Februar, 1885.

² V. *The Alarm*, Dec. 6, 1884. Article, Coöperation.

wage and property system, that it now and must hereafter cramp, limit and punish¹ all increase of production, and can no longer gratify the necessities, rights and ambitions of man," etc.

It may be stated that in general the teachings of Carl Marx are accepted by both parties, and his work on capital ("Das Kapital") is still the Bible of the Socialists.² This work has not as yet been translated into English, although a translation is announced for the near future; but extracts from it have been turned into our tongue and published; and brochures, pamphlets, newspapers and verbal expositions have extended his doctrines, while H. M. Hyndman has expounded the views of the great teacher in his "Historical Basis of Socialism" in England.

In this country, a young enthusiast, Laurence Gronlund, a lawyer of Philadelphia, has written a recently published work, entitled "The Coöperative Commonwealth," designed to present the socialism of Marx, as it appears after it has been digested, to use the author's words, "by a mind Anglo-Saxon in its dislike of all extravagancies, and in its freedom from any vindictive feeling against *persons* who are from circumstances what they are."

It is difficult and perhaps impossible to trace out the first germs of revolutionary socialism in America, although it is certain that it is not descended from early American communism, to which it has little resemblance. The influence of the later movement on the earlier has, however, been more

¹ The writer gives his quotations *verbatim et literatim*, making no attempt to improve style or grammar.

² Recently one of their papers, the New Yorker *Volkszeitung*, protested against this epithet as applied to the work of Marx, as it was not desired that any book should be regarded in the light of an infallible guide. It was feared that this would hinder progress. Yet the term describes better than anything else the actual feeling towards "Das Kapital," and among the more ignorant of the socialists reverence for a great leader has ere this approached idolatry.

perceptible, but even that has been comparatively slight. It is not unlikely that something of the spirit of revolutionary socialism may have been brought to this country by the German emigrants of 1848, though it did not spread greatly under the unfavorable conditions which it encountered. In 1865 a ripple on the surface of the waters which Lassalle had troubled reached our shores, and a small band of his followers organized in New York. Their union was of short duration, and three years later another attempt at the formation of a socialistic association was made which likewise proved uneffectual.¹ In 1866 there had been formed a "National Labor Union," which was a consolidation of the members of a great part of the trades' unions and labor organizations in the United States. Its membership is said to have numbered six hundred and forty thousand in 1868, and in the following year it sent a delegate, by name Cameron, to the Congress of the International Workingmen's Association,² held in Basle, Switzerland. This led to a connection between American labor and European socialism, which has never since altogether ceased. In 1871 a new impulse was received from the French refugees who came to America after the suppression of the uprising of the commune of Paris, and brought with them a spirit of violence,³ but the most important event of this early period was the order of the Congress of the International held in the Hague in 1872, which transferred to New York the "General Council" of the Association. Modern socialism had then undoubtedly begun to exist in America. The first proclamation of the council from their new headquarters was an appeal to workingmen "to emancipate labor and eradicate all international and national strife."⁴ The following year witnessed

¹Henry A. James: *Communism in America*, New York, 1878, p. 24.

²It is necessary for brevity's sake to assume that the reader is already familiar with the history of the old International. A description of it is given in Ely's "French and German Socialism," chapter X.

³James, *Ibid.*

⁴The authority for this statement is found in an interview which a New York *Herald* reporter held with Mr. Leopold Jonas, a leading New York

the disasters in the industrial and commercial world to which reference has already been made, and the distress consequent thereupon was an important aid to the socialists in their propaganda.

There have been several changes in party organization and name since then, and National Conventions or Congresses have met from time to time. Their dates and places of meeting have been Philadelphia, 1874, Pittsburg, 1876, Newark, 1877, Allegheny City, 1880, Baltimore, 1883, and Pittsburgh, 1883. The name Socialistic Labor Party was adopted in 1877 at the Newark Convention. In 1883 the split between the moderates and extremists had become definite, and the former held their Congress in Pittsburg, and the latter in Baltimore.¹

The separation between the two bodies of socialists is a matter of interest. A similar separation took place in the Congress of the International at the Hague in 1872, between the followers of Marx, who represented in many respects the spirit and methods of the present Socialistic Labor Party, and those of Bakounine, who were anarchists like the members of the existing International in the United States. It is altogether probable that the feeling of animosity between the adherents of the two directions was present in New York from the beginning of the operations of the "Council" transferred in the same year to that city. But for some time they succeeded in working together, and hopes of a permanent Union were certainly not abandoned until after the advent of John Most on our shores in December, 1882. Most has proved a firebrand among American socialists, and was early denounced by those who felt repelled by his mad expressions of violence, and saw that he was doing their cause much harm; but it was still impossible to pass a formal vote repu-

member of the Socialistic Labor Party. V. "Our American Socialists," *New York Herald*, May 19, 1884.

¹ *New York Herald*, *Ibid.*

diating him in the Congress of the Socialistic Labor Party in Baltimore in 1883. During the following year the San Francisco *Truth* and others still thought it worth while to advocate a union of all discontented proletarians, but acrimony and bitterness between representatives of opposing views continued to increase, and when the terrible outrages in London, in January of the present year, were condemned in terms of severity by the Socialistic Labor Party and applauded by the Internationalists, all hopes of united action vanished, and the animosity between the two became so intense that they came to blows in a meeting called in New York by the moderates to protest against the recent use of dynamite. Shortly after that there was a disturbance between the Internationalists and the members of the Socialistic Labor Party in a public meeting in Baltimore, and the warfare between the two factions is as bitter as between them and the Capitalistic Society which they seek to overthrow.

III.

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING PEOPLE'S ASSOCIATION.

The Internationalists at their Congress in Pittsburgh adopted unanimously a manifesto or declaration of motives and principles, often called the Pittsburgh Proclamation, in which they describe their ultimate goal in these words :

“What we would achieve is, therefore, plainly and simply :

“*First.*—Destruction of the existing class rule, by all means, *i. e.*, by energetic, relentless, revolutionary and international action.

“*Second.*—Establishment of a free society based upon co-operative organization of production.

“*Third.*—Free exchange of equivalent products by and between the productive organizations without commerce and profit-mongery.

“*Fourth.*—Organization of education on a secular, scientific and equal basis for both sexes.

“*Fifth.*—Equal rights for all without distinction to sex or race.

“*Sixth.*—Regulation of all public affairs by free contracts between the autonomous (independent) communes and associations, resting on a federalistic basis.”¹

Here we have in a few words the dream of the Anarchists, as these Internationalists call themselves, and it has been well characterized by Mr. Hyndman, as “individualism gone mad.” It may be well to explain the ideas contained in this program under the two heads, political and economic.

First.—Their political philosophy is pure negation or nihilism in the strict sense of the word. It is the doctrine of *laissez-faire* carried to its logical outcome. What say our advocates of the “let-alone” policy about government and the state? They assure us that the less government the better, and that the state is but a necessary evil at best. To this the anarchists reply: Very true, but why should we tolerate the least needless evil? We hold that government of any kind is worse than useless, and that the state is but another name for oppression. We recognize no right of any individual or of any body of men to interfere with us, and we will have neither state nor laws. We are prepared to fight for liberty without restraint or control. Our ideal is anarchy. It is a holy cause, and to it we have devoted our lives.

Each member of society is in this new world to be absolutely free. As gregarious animals, and for the sake of voluntary coöperation, men will naturally form themselves into independent self-governing communes or townships, into which the whole of mankind will be ultimately resolved. These communes will for the sake of convenience be grouped

¹ Free contract, it is to be observed, in the language of the Internationalists, means not freedom of contract in the present sense, but a contract which may be fulfilled or not, according to the good pleasure of the parties concerned. The one who breaks it, suffers no legal penalty.

loosely into federations, which, however, will have no authority whatever. While each commune is at liberty to sever its connection with the common body at pleasure, it is thought that the social nature of man will be a sufficient adhesive force to hold them together. All regulation and control centre in free and voluntary and self-enforced contract.

Second.—The economic ideas of the Internationalists as expressed in their résumé of their aims, are “coöperative organization of production,” and “free exchange of equivalent products by and between the productive organizations without commerce and profit-bringing.” But when developed, these brief propositions imply several radical demands, viz., “free lands,” “free tools” and “free money.” Rent falls away, as there is no authority to enforce its payment, and laborers lay hold of and use freely the means of production (capital), as anarchism recognizes no power to prevent this. Possession takes the place of property and possession lasts only so long as means of production possessed are actually used by their possessor. This ends at once “capitalism” and “landlordism,” and leaves room only for united labor. Workingmen, it is supposed, will naturally group themselves into “productive organizations,” where each one will work as long as he pleases and receive “labor-money,” or credits indicating the length of labor-time. If our present terms should be retained, a dollar might represent the toil of one hundred minutes, and one dollar would always equal another. “Socialism advocates that the time and service of one man is equal ultimately to the time and service of any other man; hence, the nearest approach to exact justice is equal pay for equal time and expenditure of equal energy.”¹

¹From “Socialism” by Starkweather and Wilson in Lovell’s Library, No. 461, p. 29, cf. also pp. 78–80. This doctrine of equality seems to be unanimously accepted by the Anarchists, though it is not maintained by all socialists, and it must in fairness be acknowledged that it forms no necessary part of socialism.

Commerce is replaced by a common store-house to which all social products are carried, and where their value is determined by labor-time. A bushel of potatoes might be quoted at twenty-five minutes, for example, in which case any purchaser presenting a note for one hundred minutes would receive his potatoes, and seventy-five minutes in change.

Thus the laborer receives the full value of all he produces, and profits, called legalized robbery or unpaid labor, are abolished. It is supposed that a few hours a day—one writer mentions three—would suffice to produce all the goods needed by society. In the words of the Pittsburgh Proclamation: “This order of things allows production to regulate itself according to the demands of the whole people, so that nobody need work more than a few hours a day, and that all nevertheless can satisfy their needs. Hereby time and opportunity are given for opening to the people the way to the highest civilization; the privileges of higher intelligence fall with the privileges of wealth and birth.”

Another point worthy of notice is the preponderating influence the Internationalists, even more than other socialists, give to external circumstances in the formation of character. If their attention is called to the crime and wrong-doing in present society as a proof of the need of a repressive authority, they reply that it will be quite different in a condition of anarchy because our existing institutions are the cause of the evil which afflicts us now; in particular do they necessitate the poverty of the many, and poverty is the chief source of what we call sin. “Socialism,” say Starkweather and Wilson, in their pamphlet,¹ “would abolish poverty by preventing it, by removing its causes. As poverty is the cause directly or indirectly of all crime, therefore, by the abolition of poverty, crime would become almost unknown, and with the crime would disappear all the lice, leeches, vampires and vermin that fatten on its filth; such as the entire legal fraternity,

¹L. c., p. 30.

soldiers, police, spies, judges, sheriffs, priests, preachers, quack doctors, etc., etc." Nevertheless, even an Anarchist is forced to admit the possibility of an occasional crime against individual or society, and in such case has nothing better to offer than the unrestrained exercise of brute force. As they now advocate the extermination of opponents and admire mob law, there is nothing left for them save the destruction of those whom they consider their enemies in any and every form of society.

The economic ideas of the Anarchists are so vague that it is difficult to describe them more precisely, and it is the less necessary to do so from the fact that the chief part of their program is a plea for action, for revolution; for destruction, rather than construction, as they hold that the former must precede the latter.

It is to be noticed that they attempt to realize their political ideal as far as possible in their own plan of organization. The International is composed of independent "groups," with no central authority or executive, both of which expressions many of them detest. The only bond of union between them is found in their common ideas, in their press, their congresses and local organizations, and a Bureau of Information, formed by the Chicago Groups, which appears to be the nearest approach to a centre of life and activity.

The manifesto of the Internationalists has been mentioned and quotations from it given. It is, however, necessary to consult their press to obtain a more complete survey of their views. They have several newspapers of which the following are the most prominent: *die Freiheit*, Most's New York weekly, now in its seventh year; *der Vorbote*, a weekly, *die Fackel*, a Sunday paper, and *die Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung*, a daily, all three published by the Socialistic Publishing Company, of Chicago. The *Vorbote*, in its twelfth year, is the oldest of their organs. The *Alarm*, a weekly, in its first year, is published at the same place, and is edited by A. R. Parsons. Its purpose is to disseminate the most extreme

revolutionary teachings among English-speaking laborers. *Liberty*, now in its third volume, edited by Benj. R. Tucker, hails from Boston, and is likewise a representative of the revolution and complete anarchy. Kansas sends us *Lucifer, the Light-Bearer*, a journal of like tendencies. *Truth, a Journal for the Poor*, a San Francisco weekly, was beginning its third year when the first edition of this monograph was prepared for the *Christian Union*. It changed its form last July and appeared as a monthly, and finally ceased to appear with the December number, having made over its "good will" to the *Enquirer*, of Denver, Colorado, which now takes its place. These journals supply abundant evidence touching the doctrines of the Anarchist in respect to the family and religion, and it is these doctrines which are now to engage our attention.

The Internationalists attack both religion and the family, and that with what may be considered practical unanimity. While it is not right to connect this attitude with socialism *per se*, the fairest-minded person cannot blame a writer for holding up to condemnation any concrete, actually existing party which wages war against all that we consider most sacred, and which seeks to abolish those institutions which we hold to be of inestimable value, both to the individual and to society.

Religion and the family are not only attacked by the extremists, but the onslaught on them is made in language of unparalleled coarseness and shocking impiety. Here are two quotations from *Truth*, which are indicative of the general tone of the paper: "Heaven is a dream invented by robbers to distract the attention of the victims of their brigandage." "When the laboring men understand that the heaven which they are promised hereafter is but a mirage, they will knock at the door of the wealthy robber with a musket in hand and demand their share of the goods of this life, now." *Freiheit*, the most blasphemous of all socialistic papers, concludes an article on the "Fruits of the Belief in God" with the exclamation: "Religion, authority and state are all

carved out of the same piece of wood—to the devil with them all!” The *Vorbote* speaks of religion as destructive poison. The Pittsburgh manifesto—unanimously adopted, be it remembered—contains this sentence: “The church finally seeks to make complete idiots out of the mass, and to make them forego the paradise on earth by promising a fictitious heaven.”

There appears to be scarcely the same unanimity concerning the family. It was not directly condemned in the Pittsburgh manifesto, nor does *Truth* say much about it. But there is no doubt about the general policy of their journals. They sneer incessantly at the “sacredness of the family,” and dwell with pleasure on every vile scandal which is noticed by the “capitalistic press.” Especial attention is given to divorces to show that the family institution is already undermined, and they are thorough-going sceptics regarding the morality of the relations between the sexes in bourgeois society. The *Vorbote* for May 12, 1883, contains an article on the Sacredness of the Family, from which these sentences are extracted:

“In capitalistic society, marriage has long become a pure financial operation, and the possessing classes long ago established community of wives, and, indeed, the nastiest which is conceivable. . . . They take a special pleasure in seducing one another’s wives. . . . A marriage is only so long moral, as it rests upon the free inclination of man and wife.” A poem which appeared in *Truth*, January 26, 1884, is in the same spirit. It is entitled

“MARRIAGE

UNDER THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM.

“Oh, wilt thou take this form so spare,
 This powdered face and frizzled hair—
 To be thy wedded wife;
 And keep her free from labor vile,
 Lest she her dainty fingers soil—
 And dress her up in gayest style,
 As long as thou hast life?”
 “I will.”

“And wilt thou take these stocks and bonds,
 This brown-stone front, these diamonds
 To be thy husband dear?
 And wilt thou in this carriage ride,
 And o’er his lordly home preside,
 And be divorced while yet a bride,
 Or ere a single year?”
 “I will.”

“Then I pronounce you man and wife;
 And with what I’ve together joined,
 The next best man may run away,
 Whenever he a chance can find.”

Most’s *Freiheit* habitually attains the superlative of coarseness and vileness in its attacks on the family. It objects to the family on principle because it is the State in miniature, because it existed before the State, and furnished a model for it with all its evils and perversities. *Freiheit* advocates a new genealogy traced from mothers, whose names, and not that of the fathers, descend to the children, since it is never certain who the father is. State up-bringing of children is likewise favored in the *Freiheit*, in order that the old family may completely abandon the field to free love.

We have now a complete picture of their ideals: common property; socialistic production and distribution; the grossest materialism, for their God is their belly; free love; in all social arrangements, perfect individualism, or in other words, anarchy. Negatively expressed; away with private property! away with all authority! away with the state! away with the family! away with religion!

IV.

THE PROPAGANDA OF DEED AND THE EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN.

Our attention must now be devoted to an inquiry into the means by which the Anarchists propose to attain their ends.

Having abandoned all faith in the ballot, their present method is to sow the seeds of discontent, bitterness and hate in the minds of the laborers as a preparation for that violence and revolution which are to inaugurate a new era of peace and good-will among men. The following quotation from their manifesto makes this sufficiently plain.

“Agitation for the purpose of organization; organization for the purpose of rebellion. In these few words the ways are marked which the workers must take if they want to be rid of their chains, as the condition of things is the same in all countries of so-called ‘civilization.’ . . . We could show by scores of illustrations that all attempts in the past to reform this monstrous system by peaceable means, such as the ballot, have been futile, and all such efforts in the future must necessarily be so for the following reasons :

“The political institutions of the time are the agency of the property class; their mission is the upholding of the privileges of their masters; any reform in your own behalf would curtail their privileges. To this they will not and cannot consent, for it would be suicidal to themselves. . . .

“There remains but one recourse—force! Our forefathers have not only told us that against despots force is justifiable, because it is the only means, but they themselves have set the immemorial example.”

In their résumé, they express their purpose in these words : “Destruction of the existing class rule, by all means, *i. e.*, by energetic, relentless, revolutionary and international action.”

The newspapers of the Internationalists proclaim a similar doctrine, of which the following specimen quotation from *Truth* may serve as an example :

“It is beyond doubt that if universal suffrage had been a weapon capable of emancipating people, our tyrants would have suppressed it long ago.

“Here in America, it is proved to be but the instrument used by our masters to prevent any reforms ever being

accomplished. The Republican party is run by robbers and in the interest of robbery. The Democratic party is run by thieves and in the interest of thievery. Therefore vote no more."

Further, the International Labor Association which met in London in July, 1881, declared its hostility to all political action, and their resolution on this subject was printed in Most's *Freiheit* with approval. It is also in keeping with Most's recent advice to laborers in his speeches.

The fact is, the Internationalists put their faith in dynamite and other explosives. Dynamite, a cheap product and the poor man's natural weapon, is glorified and songs are sung in its praise. "Hurrah for science! hurrah for dynamite, the power which in our hands shall make an end of tyranny," is the sentiment of a poem entitled "Nihilisten" published in the *Vorbote*. It is explained that powder and musket broke the back of feudalism and made way for the rule of the bourgeoisie. Fire-arms are, however, too expensive for the proletariat, but just as the proletariat was awaking to a consciousness of its position, in the very nick of time, dynamite was discovered. Consequently such squibs as these may be found in the San Francisco *Truth*: "*Truth* is five cents a copy and dynamite forty cents a pound." "Every trade-union and assembly ought to pick its best men and form them into classes for the study of chemistry."

But we have not yet come to the worst; for there is no conceivable crime or form of violence against individuals or masses which the Internationalists as a party do not endorse, provided these crimes and acts of violence aid them to accomplish their ends. Hypocrisy, fraud, deceit, adultery, robbery and murder are held sacred, when beneficial to the revolution. Not every individual member certainly maintains this view, but it is upheld unreservedly by the extremists and more or less explicitly by their leaders and journals. The following quotations from their newspapers supply abundant proof.

From *Truth*: "War to the palace, peace to the cottage, death to luxurious idleness!"

“We have no moment to waste. Arm! I say, to the teeth! for the Revolution is upon you!”¹

An attack on Mr. Abram S. Hewitt concludes with these words: “Mr. Hewitt ought to be turned over to some recruit, whose services will be paid for out of Patrick Ford’s emergency fund.”

The following characteristic sentiments, a distinct revival of Babouvism, the communistic climax of the French Revolution, are taken from one of their papers: “Plundered as we are by the proprietor who limits our air and light, we must come forth from the cellars and attics in which our families struggle for existence and establish ourselves in those splendid buildings which have been raised at the cost of so much toil and suffering, and in those spacious apartments in which there is an abundance of pure air, and where the sunlight will throw its life-giving radiance upon our little ones. We must take possession of the great warehouses and stores in which the rich man now finds the means of gratifying his caprices, and lay our hands for the common good, on the enormous quantity of products of all kinds necessary for our nourishment and for our protection from the weather.”

Assassination of members of the ruling classes is thus spoken of in one of their journals. “It does not at all appear so terrible to us when laborers occasionally raise their arm and lay low one and another of this clique of robbers and murderers.”² In another issue of the same paper a writer describes the circumstances which would justify the assassination of men like Gould or Vanderbilt:³ “If at present a man should kill Jay Gould or Vanderbilt without special occasion, this would produce a very unfavorable impression, and would be of no use and would not satisfy the popular sense of justice.

¹ *Truth*, November 17, 1883.

² *Vorbote*, d. 16 January, 1881.

³ 14 April.

“If on the contrary a railroad accident should again happen in consequence of the clearly proved criminal greed of these monopolists, and many men should be killed and crippled thereby, and the jury should as usual pronounce the real criminals, Vanderbilt or Gould, ‘not guilty,’ and the husband or father of one of the killed or one of the crippled should arise and obtain justice for himself in the massacre of these monsters (*diese Scheusale*), a cry of joy would resound through the whole land, and no jury would sentence the righteous executioner (*Vollstrecker*). . . . Whether one uses dynamite, a revolver or a rope is a matter of indifference.”

The *Fackel*, German for Torch, is a most dangerous-appearing sheet, inciting by its very appearance to incendiarism. The letters of the title *die Fackel* are in flames, and are printed in a background of fire and smoke. It is plainly not the torch which gives light, but the torch which kindles a general conflagration, as is seen in the accompanying illustration.



Lynching is advocated by these journals, and admired as a form of popular justice. One writer expresses¹ his opinion in this manner: “Judge Lynch is the best and cheapest court in the land, and when the sense of justice in the people once awakes, may the judge hold court in every place, for nowhere is there a lack of unchanging honorables and prominent sharps.”

As one hundred years ago in France, so now, revolution has become a religion. “Our religion, the grandest religion that ever suffered for supporters and propagandists.” There are

¹In *die Freiheit*.

those ready to die for it as there were in the great French Revolution—an eternal witness to the need of the human mind for some form of religion, and a proof that if a worthy one is not accepted, an unworthy one is sure sooner or later to force its entrance into the longing heart and find there a capability of devotion, often grand. The terrible condition of a soul which has thus elevated the trinity, envy, hatred and destruction, to the position of a god to be served, cannot better be brought home to the reader than by means of a quotation from the *Freiheit*. The article from which it is extracted is called “Revolutionary Principles,” and appeared in the issue for March 18, 1883:

“The revolutionist has no personal interest, concerns, feelings or inclinations, no property, not even a name. Everything in him is swallowed up by the one exclusive interest, by the one single thought, by the one single passion—the revolution.

“In the depths of his nature, not only in words, but also in deeds, has he fully broken with the civil order, with the laws currently recognized in this world, with customs, morals and usages. He is the irreconcilable enemy of this world and if he continues to live in it, it only happens in order to destroy it with the greater certainty.

“The revolutionist despises all dogmas and renounces the science of the present world, which he leaves for future generations. He knows only one science, namely, destruction. For this purpose and for this alone he studies mechanics, physics, chemistry and possibly also medicine. For this purpose he studies day and night living science—men, characters, relations, as well as all conditions of the present social order in all its ramifications.

“He despises public opinion. He despises and hates the present social morality in all its leadings and in all its manifestations, for him everything is moral which proves the triumph of the revolution; everything immoral and criminal which hinders it. Severe against himself, he must likewise be

severe against others. Every affection, the effeminating sensations of relationship, friendship, love, gratitude, all must be smothered in time by the one cold passion, the revolutionary work. For him there is only one pleasure, one comfort, one recompense; the success of the revolution. Day and night may he cherish only one thought, only one purpose, viz., inexorable destruction. While he pursues this purpose without rest and in cold blood, he must be ready to die, and equally ready to kill every one with his own hands, who hinders him in the attainment of this purpose. . . .

“For the sake of unrelenting destruction, the revolutionist can, and indeed often must live in the midst of society, and appear to be different from what he really is. The revolutionist must gain access to the higher circles, the church, the palace. . . . This entire lewd official society is divided into several categories. The first consists of those who are forthwith to be consecrated to Death”—and much more like this.

The most violent society in America has recently been formed, and has issued a proclamation. It is called the Black Hand, and its purpose is immediate violence. A few sentences from the proclamation¹ will prove instructive:

“THE BLACK HAND.

“A PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY AN AMERICAN BRANCH.

“BE UP AND DOING.

“Fellow workmen: The social crisis is pointing in all countries of modern civilization towards a fast approaching crisis. . . . Only through daring will we be victorious. . . .

“The masses will only be with us when they trust us, and they will trust us if they have proofs of our power and ability.

“WE WILL GIVE THEM.

“This involves the necessity of revolutionary skirmishes, of daring deeds, of those acts which are the forerunners of every

¹ Published in *Truth*, January 26, 1884.

great revolution. This is the name of our International Organization—the Black Hand.

“Proletarians! . . . We appeal herewith to all our associates in regard to the propaganda of deed in every form. . . .

“War to the Knife!

“The Executive of the Black Hand.”

The power of the revolutionary and violent socialists in countries where they exist in numbers, is a kind of *imperium in imperio*, whose leaders regard reverence for nationality as worthy to rank with old wives' superstitions, and consider patriotism a criminal weakness unworthy of a free man. This socialistic *imperium* is therefore thoroughly cosmopolitan and one and indivisible in all parts of the world, but two or more of its chief seats are evidently in America: for New York, and still more Chicago, seem entitled to such a position.

The Internationalists look at their power as an *imperium*, loyalty to which is worthy of the highest praise, and they confer distinguished honor upon all those who suffer in their cause. Terms are used whose aim is to pervert the mind and blind the eyes of sympathizers to the true character of their deeds. The leaders issue their decrees, couched in language proper to the civil authorities of the State, and pass “sentence of death” upon offenders. Assassination is called “execution,” while the death penalty, when inflicted upon one of their members in due course of law, is called judicial murder. Thus the fulfilment of the mandates of anarchistic committees appears as righteous to those entrusted therewith, as it does to a federal marshal to assist in the enforcement of the laws of the United States. The power in New York, for example, sends instructions to the socialists of Vienna in 1883, admonishing them to pass over to the propaganda of deed and exterminate the Royal House of Austria and all who uphold them,¹ and when their “comrades,” Stellmacher and

¹ V. die Freiheit, d. 24 February, 1883.

others, murder officers of the Viennese police, a grand demonstration is held in Irving Hall in New York, to glorify these heroes of crime.¹ The mind of man has conceived no outpourings of cruel vindictiveness and malignant hate which surpass the utterance of these mad souls, which one is tempted to believe are the spirits of the lost returned to torment the earth for sin. Most tells the faithful followers that what has happened in Austria ought not be called murder, because "murder is the killing of a human being, and I have never heard that a policeman was a human being." Then he goes on to say that spies and all members of the police ought to be exterminated, one after another, they all long ago having been declared outlaws by every decent man. "With shouts of joy," continues he, "does the proletariat learn of such deeds of vengeance. The propaganda of deed excites incalculable enthusiasm. When Hödel and Nobiling shot at the accursed Lehmann,² there were indeed those among the laborers who did not then understand those brave deeds, but to-day the German proletariat has only one objection to raise to them: viz., that better aim was not taken. . . . As for America, the people of that land will learn one day that an end is to be made of the mockery of the ballot, and that the best thing one can do with such fellows as Jay Gould and Vandérbilt is to hang them on the nearest lamp-post." Then a series of resolutions were unanimously adopted, expressing sympathy with the aims of the Austrian revolutionists, approving of their means and urging them to spare no life which stood in the way of the extinguishment of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie, in particular to destroy the emperor. The comrades were told that they must make themselves more terrible than terror itself. The resolutions closed with these words: "Brothers! Your affair is that of the oppressed against their tyrants. It is not the affair of Austria. It is the most sacred affair of the people of all lands.

¹ *V. die Freiheit*, d. 16 February, 1884.

² *I. e.*, the Emperor William.

“Comrades, we applaud most heartily your acts and your tactics. . . . Kill, destroy, annihilate your aristocracy and bourgeoisie to the last man.

“In dealing with this canaille show neither love nor pity. . . . Vive la révolution sociale.”

At the door a collection was taken up to form a “revolutionary action-fund.” The proceeds were stated to be \$36.

When the wretched August Reinsdorf was executed for an attempt on the life of the German Emperor, Most's *Freiheit* appeared with a heavy black border about the first page, on which was an engraving of this “martyr,” accompanied by a biographical notice in which he is raised to the rank of an immortal hero and a devoted saint. “One of our noblest and best is no more. In the prison yard at Halle under the murderous sword of the criminal Hohenzollern band, on the 7th of February, August Reinsdorf ended a life full of battle and of self-sacrificing courage, as a martyr to the great revolution. All who knew the comrade personally, know what this loss signifies. Every one who is able to value manly worth and self-sacrifice, needs only to know how Reinsdorf conducted himself before the court, in order to possess the highest regard for him beyond the grave. As for us, we have taken Reinsdorf into our heart and there he will remain for all time.” Language of this kind is continued through three columns, and it is mentioned with pride that Reinsdorf had been connected with the *Freiheit* from the beginning of its existence.¹

It might be supposed that these Anarchists would have been stricken with remorse when they heard the news of the horrible dynamite explosions in London in January of this year, but their consciences had already been seared as with a hot iron, and the editor of *Liberty* had the audacity to write such words as these: “It is glorious news that comes to us from England; sad enough if it were unnecessary, sad enough that

¹ *Die Freiheit*, 14 February, 1885.

it should be necessary, but having been made necessary by its victims, none the less joyful and glorious. The dynamite policy is now definitely adopted in England and must be vigorously pushed until it has produced the desired effect of abolishing all the repressive legislation that denies the freedom of agitation and discussion, which alone can result in the final settlement of social questions and make the revolution a fixed fact. . . . An explosion that should blow every atom of the English Parliamentary Buildings into the Thames River ought to be as gratifying to every lover of liberty as the fall of the Bastille in 1789. . . . Why, by endangering the lives of innocent people, alienate the sympathy of many who would appreciate and applaud a prompt visitation of death upon a Gladstone immediately after the passage of a Coercion Act? . . . How much better and wiser and more effective in this respect the course of the Russian and German Terrorists! Witness, for instance, the telling promptness with which the police commissioner Rumpff was found dead on his doorstep the other day just after he had accomplished the death sentence of the brave Reinsdorf and his anarchistic comrades? I commend this relentless directness to the Irish dynamiters."¹

While the European practices of the revolutionists have not as yet been adopted in America, they themselves claim that our respite is a short one, since they are waiting for an opportune moment to begin the tactics of violence, and the favorable time is expected in a very near future.²

While one method of preparing for the revolution is, as is seen, the *propaganda of deed*, as the use of dynamite and personal violence to individuals are euphemistically termed, another is the "Educational Campaign" which accompanies it and which some even of the Anarchists think ought to precede it, though the tendency now is strongly in the direction of immediate action.

¹ *Liberty*, January 31, 1885.

² *V. die Freiheit*, d. 18 February, 1884.

In the last days of the newspaper *Truth*, its incessant cry was the "Educational Campaign" which was considered the pressing need of the moment. It was urged that tracts be published, existing journals encouraged, new ones founded and teachers sent out into the four quarters of the earth to spread the doctrines of socialism far and near. Instructions to agitators were published, of which the following are samples:

"Bring right home to him [the wage-worker] the question of his servitude and poverty. . . .

"Create disgust with, and rebellion against existing usages, for success lies through general dissatisfaction.

"The masses must have something to hate. Direct their hatred to this condition."

These instructions and others like them are now being carried out by the propagandists of anarchy. "Groups" are formed to which text-books constituting a course of study in socialism are recommended. It is urged that members of existing groups continue the work by formation of new groups of seven or eight or more, and that these latter in similar manner carry forward the movement which thus becomes self-propagating.

The ingenuity displayed in nourishing hate is remarkable. A number of *Truth* published about a year ago contained the bill of fare of a rich man's dinner, which laborers are advised to cut out and paste on their "old tin coffee-pot at home." Long and apparently accurate lists of rich men in the chief cities of the United States are published with headings like this:¹

"DOLLARS.

"More men in the United States who have robbed us.

"THE GRAND LARCENISTS OF AMERICA.

"THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE LEGALLY STOLEN THE UNPAID WAGES OF THE WORKERS.

¹ *Truth*, January 16, 1884.

“[*Official.*]

“Headquarters Division Executive, Pacific Coast Division, International Workmen’s Association, San Francisco. [Supplement to Circular No. 10, Series B., 1883].”

This also marks out the rich men for attention in the upheaval for which they are preparing. Perhaps they will be turned over to “recruits” to be paid out of emergency funds now being collected, unless, indeed, these should in the meanwhile mysteriously disappear; which fate, it is said, has ere this overtaken certain Irish emergency funds.

A poem in “John Swinton’s Paper,” October 28, 1883, has likewise for its aim the arousal of envy and hate. It is entitled, “Wm. H. Vanderbillion, the song to be sung in the Reign of the Billionaire. Song of the Billionaire.”

The following are three stanzas :

“I’m a bloater, I’m a bloater,
By my millions all are dazed;
I’m a bloater, I’m a bloater,
On the ‘water’ I have raised!

I’m a-drumming, I’m a-drumming
Up the millions, right or wrong;
I’m a-coming, yes, a-coming
With a thousand millions strong!

I’m a-nursing, fondly nursing
Well my wealth in coffers crammed;
Public’s cursing, loudly cursing,
But ‘the public may be damned!’”

V.

THE SOCIALISTIC LABOR PARTY.

The “Manifesto of the Congress of the Socialistic Labor Party,” held at Baltimore in December, 1883, contained these principles which had been unanimously adopted as the result,

both of their own researches and of the studies of their brothers in Europe :

“Labor being the creator of all wealth and civilization, it rightfully follows that those who labor and create all wealth should enjoy the full result of their toil. Therefore we declare :

“That a just and equitable distribution of the fruits of labor is utterly impossible under the present system of society. This fact is abundantly illustrated by the deplorable condition of the working classes, which are in a state of destitution and degrading dependence in the midst of their own productions. While the hardest and most disagreeable work brings to the worker only the bare necessities of life, others who labor not, riot in labor’s production. We furthermore declare :

“That the present industrial system of competition, based on rent, profit-taking and interest, causes and intensifies this inequality, concentrating into the hands of a few, all means of production, distribution and the results of labor, thus creating gigantic monopolies dangerous to the people’s liberties ; and we further declare :

“That these monster monopolies and these consequent extremes of wealth and poverty supported by class legislation, are subversive of all democracy, injurious to the national interests and destructive of truth and morality. This state of affairs, continued and upheld by the ruling political parties, is against the welfare of the people.

“To abolish this system, with a view to establish coöperative production, and to secure equitable distribution, we demand that the resources of life, namely land, the means of production, public transportation and exchange, become as fast as practicable the property of the whole people.”

The form of society which the members of the Socialistic Labor Party desire is quite different from the voluntary association of the Anarchists, since they are unable to understand how there can be social ownership of capital, rational produc-

tion in the interest of all, and an equitable distribution of products without control or regulation. Consequently they are not opposed to the state in itself (*an sich*), but wish to substitute the socialistic state, the people's state, for the present state-form. Combatting anarchy and individualism, they are in the strict sense of the term socialists. While they believe in the state, they do not think that national boundaries should constitute barriers to combined action, either now or hereafter, but hold that the interests of the mass of humanity are one in all lands of civilization. The moderates are as strictly internationalists in theory and feeling as the members of the party bearing that name, and, in fact, more nearly resemble the old International of Marx in their organization.

The Socialistic Labor Party is composed of local sections, of which there may be only one in any city, although this one may be subdivided into "branches." The head of the party is a "National Executive Committee," which is, however, in some respects subject to a Board of Supervisors. The final decision of conflicts, of course, rests with the members of the party, who manifest their wishes by their votes. A wide sphere of action is also reserved for their conventions or congresses which meet every two or three years.

In opposition to the "reds," the "blues" enforce the necessity of unity in organization as the indispensable preliminary of harmonious activity. The workmen isolated, it is held, can accomplish nothing, but combined in a closely united whole they can carry everything before them and reconstruct the world. "Fellow-workmen," thus the laborers are addressed in their Manifesto, "you must rally in one great invincible phalanx, if you hope to gain a foot of ground."

It is to be noticed that this party of socialists is also a political party, which has in times past taken an active part in politics, in a few cases electing their candidates, and which hopes for greater success in the future, though only a few of them indulge the hope that their reforms can be accomplished peaceably by the ballot. But they advise participation in

politics because they regard it as an educational aid, bringing their principles before the people and thus becoming a useful means of propaganda. It is also considered helpful in securing an efficient organization of their own party. "Universal suffrage must be regarded as a weapon in battle, not as a means of salvation."¹ Again, the ballot is the best visible evidence of strength, and the growth which it registers must encourage adherents to renewed efforts for an extension of their principles. They appear to hope further that it may assist them in securing certain reforms not incompatible with existing economic institutions. But this is not all. As the laborers gain political power, they will attempt to use it in their own behalf, and the ruling classes, it is thought, not being able to consent to this, will rebel and bring on the revolution, which is expected in the end.

The difference between the two parties in respect to revolution, then, is this: The Internationalists desire to begin the revolution and do not shrink from an active initiative in deeds of violence. This the moderates regard as madness, holding that a revolution comes in the natural course of evolution and cannot be "made." The Socialistic Labor Party believes in peaceful agitation and lawful means in behalf of their principles until their enemies force the struggle upon them; as their manifesto puts it:

"We must expect that our enemies—when they see our power increasing in a peaceful and legal way and approaching victory—will on their part become rebels, just as once did the slave-holders, and that then the time will come for the cause of labor, when that old prime lever of all revolutions, FORCE, . . . must be applied to, in order to place the working masses in control of the State, which then for the first time will be the representative, not of a few privileged classes, but of all society. . . . We surely do not participate in the folly of those men, who consider dynamite bombs the best

¹ *Der Sozialist*, January 24, 1885.

means of agitation to produce the greatest revolution that transpired in the social life of mankind. We know very well that a revolution in the brains of men and the economical conditions of society must precede, ere a lasting success can be obtained in the interest of the working classes."

The doctrine of the Socialistic Labor Party is not that it is necessary to secure unanimity of opinion, or even the adherence of the majority before their principles can be established, but they think it essential that a large leaven of socialism and a very general understanding of their principles should precede the successful revolution. It is believed that uprisings will occur without their intervention, and these they hope to be able to guide. They desire to raise up leaders for the proletariat who may seize on the fruits of upheavals in society, for they argue that after the masses have hitherto accomplished revolutions, the lack of intelligent, determined leaders with definite aims has enabled others to step in and enjoy the advantages purchased by the blood of the toiling many. Thus the bourgeoisie captured the French Revolution. They do not mean that this shall occur again.

The moderates expect the laborers in the one way or the other to gain the political power of the state, which they will then use to reconstruct the state, both politically and economically, in the interest of the entire people. The state, they hold, is now a capitalistic state, because the small but well-organized class of capitalists virtually rule the large but divided class of wage-workers, who constitute four-fifths of the population, and because they do this in such manner as to promote their own welfare at the expense of the masses. The struggle for power hitherto, it is maintained, has been a class-struggle, and the result has always been the triumph of a class in a class-state. The conflict is still between classes, the only two great remaining classes, namely—between capitalists and laborers. This has been the course of development up to the present time, and there is no reason to quarrel with it. It were as wise to get angry with the laws of motion.

But the evolution of preceding ages is soon to terminate in a higher product than the world has yet seen, for when the masses obtain power there will be constituted for the first time not a class-state, not a form of society designed to benefit any groups of individuals, but the true people's state, the folk-state, designed to elevate all alike.

It is maintained that democracy, to be real, must be economic as well as political, and it is this kind of democracy which it is desired to establish. An inconsistency is discovered in the democracies of the present age which grant equality in political affairs without any attempt to realize justice in distribution of products. But this logical contradiction is regarded as even worse than it appears at first sight, from the fact that economic servitude renders political equality a deceit, a snare for the unwary, since those who control the means of life control the votes. Thus a disastrous climax is reached, the equality of all men is proclaimed, and then the hopes raised are frustrated by the restriction of this equality to the political sphere of action; but it does not rest with this curtailment, as indirect means are soon discerned for robbing the people of even political equality. Democracy thus becomes a *simulacrum*.

It is not necessary to add much to what has already been said in explanation of their economic ideas, which indeed are not peculiar. These socialists believe in a universal system of coöperation, extending itself over the entire civilized world and embracing doubtless in the end those countries which are not now so far advanced as to be included within the regions of civilization. The means of production, the basis of coöperative labor, are to be the property of the people as a whole, like the post-office in the United States now, and railroads and telegraph lines in other lands, and the products for consumption are to be distributed "equitably," which can be differently interpreted according to one's notions of justice. Some would doubtless say "according to deeds," which is socialism; others "according to needs," which might better be called communism.

The Socialistic Labor Party, composed of abler and better educated men, is far more decent than the International. Its adherents do not indulge to the same extent in the so-called "strong phrases" of the Internationalists, which mean vulgar black-guardism, such as would cause a Billingsgate fish-woman to hang her head in envious shame. Again, they do not take such an extreme attitude in regard to religion and the family, neither of which is mentioned in their Manifesto, though the *Sozialist*, their official organ, has rejected all supernatural religion. The abandonment of all hope of a union with the extremists has had a most salutary effect upon the moderates. It is likely that before the separation became final, the better men of the party tolerated much of which they must inwardly have disapproved, in order not to estrange their more violent brethren.

The adherents of the Socialistic Labor Party do not regard the present state as so utterly bad that it is not worth while to advocate specific reforms at once, among which their manifesto mentions the following: "Bureaus of Labor Statistics, Reduction of the Hours of Labor, Abolition of Contract Convict Labor, Employers' Liability Law, Prohibition of Child Labor, Compulsory Education, Factory, Mine and Workshop Inspection, Sanitary Inspection of Food and Dwellings, and Payment of Wages in Cash." They also frequently demand the referendum as in Switzerland, and such arrangements as are calculated to give the people an initiative in legislation. Such constitutional changes are advocated as will abolish the senate and substitute a federal council as in Switzerland for our presidency.

The three most prominent organs of the moderates are the *Sozialist*, the official weekly already mentioned, started January 3d, of this year, the *Philadelphia Tageblatt* and the *New Yorker Volkszeitung*, a daily which also issues a weekly and a Sunday edition. The *Volkszeitung* is in its seventh year, and is decidedly the cleanest and ablest socialistic sheet in the United States. A similar newspaper in the English

language, called the *Voice of the People*, was started early in 1883. It appeared as a weekly, but promised a daily edition, which remained an unfulfilled hope, while even the weekly soon died.

An attempt is being made to win English-speaking followers, and the National Executive Committee advertises six pamphlets and a series of socialistic tracts in the English language. Some progress has been made in winning English-speaking adherents to the party; and large success has met their efforts to diffuse their ideas among the laboring classes, but, as the *Sozialist* frankly acknowledges, they are still a "German colony, a branch of the German social democracy." Indeed, one bond of union holding them together is their interest, and active participation in the election of members to the Imperial Parliament of Germany.

VI.

THE STRENGTH OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM—ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

The character, aims and methods of the two parties representing socialism in America have now been described, but a yet unanswered question is—What have we to fear from them?

The first step in the reply to this query is the ascertainment of their strength. While it is extremely difficult to make even an approximate estimate, and more than this is impossible, there are several indications of the extent of their power which must be noticed.

One of these signs is their press. The number of papers already enumerated is considerable, and others might be mentioned. Starkweather and Wilson, in their pamphlet, give three lists of journals. The first includes those which are "socialistic," and under this head sixteen journals are mentioned, of which three are dailies. The second list is com-

posed of ten "semi-socialistic" newspapers, of which two appear daily. "Socialistically inclined" periodicals, to the number of eight, constitute the third class. While some of the journals enumerated have ceased to appear, new ones have sprung up to take their place. It is a point worthy of note that a tireless, persistent effort is making to disseminate the most radical views by means of a press which appears, on the whole, to be increasing in power. The larger number of pronounced socialistic papers belong to the extremists, which may be considered as ominous an indication as the fact that they appear in all sections of the country, not excluding those which are supposed to offer the most favorable opportunities to the laborer. Denver, Colorado, sends us the *Labor Enquirer*, with the motto: "He who would be free, himself must strike the blow"; and not long ago, the *Tocsin*, a *Herald of the Coming Revolution*, rang out no uncertain war-cry in Dallas, Texas. The only one of the parties having an English official organ is the International, with its *Alarm*, while the *Voice*, representing the Socialistic Labor Party, a comparatively modest and decent newspaper, failed for lack of support. This is one of the reasons for believing that the more violent are drawing by far the larger following.

It is difficult to estimate the strength of the socialistic newspapers. As already stated, the *Vorbote*, the oldest of them, is in its twelfth year. Their advertising patronage is often fair, which would seem to indicate a respectable circulation. *Truth* claimed a circulation of six thousand, which must be placed over against the fact that it finally ceased to appear for lack of sufficient support and the proprietor's statement that he sank \$12,000 of his own money in the concern. The *Sozialist* in its fourth number¹ claimed 3,389 subscribers, in addition to five hundred copies sent in response to inquiries and distributed to different news companies.

¹ January 24, 1885.

But we must not confine ourselves to journals nominally socialistic in our attempts to estimate the influence of the press in the diffusion of socialism among American laborers.

There is the *Irish World and Industrial Liberator*, for example, which the socialists have long claimed as one of their agents, and there is a large number of papers, either organs of the Knights of Labor or of other labor organizations, or independent labor journals, which have many points in common with the socialistic parties, which are drawing nearer to them continually, and which undoubtedly help forward the general movement.

One of these papers, *der Hammer*, the official organ of the "metal-workers in North America," is permeated through and through with the doctrines of Marx, and for all practical purposes may be considered an organ of the socialists. Then there is the *Journal of United Labor*, the official organ of the Knights of Labor, which certainly inclines to socialism and is included by Wilson and Starkweather in their first list.

The number of labor papers in the country has been estimated to be four hundred. Most of them probably have a hard struggle, but one of their editors informed the writer that those which persevered had a great future before them, and this is doubtless a common opinion. Recently twenty or thirty of the papers, claiming altogether a circulation of 125,000, have joined hands in the formation of the *Associated Labor Press*, which is a coöperative movement to assist in procuring advertising patronage and to furnish all members with labor news, each paper sending news of interest to all the others.

These papers have strong ideas as to the rights of labor, and often advocate a reconstruction of society, but it is a more hopeful sign than others which have been noticed, that by far the larger number of labor journals, which are not distinctively socialistic, sympathize with the more moderate party rather than with the extremists.

Finally, it must be mentioned that foreign journals like *le Proletaire*, of Paris, and *Der Sozial-Demokrat*, the central

organ of the German social democracy, published in Zürich, Switzerland, circulate to a limited extent among our French and German laborers.

The socialists in Germany almost universally believe in the ballot and participate in elections very generally, so that the results of the elections for members of the Imperial Parliament give one some notion of their strength and of their progress. It was, for example, an ominous indication, that the social-democrats sent twenty-four members to the German Parliament last fall, while up to that time they had never elected more than thirteen representatives. But in this country a large part of the socialists having abandoned the use of the ballot as a means of agitation, the fact that they have achieved little success as politicians is not so significant, and the constantly recurring elections give no guage with which to measure their growth.

While there may have been those in Congress who sympathized with many of their teachings, the socialists have never had a representative there who was elected nominally as their candidate. They have, however, elected municipal councilors in Chicago, and have elsewhere gained a few victories through the ballot box. In 1879 four socialistic aldermen were elected in that city, and the party's candidate for mayor received twelve thousand votes. Three of their candidates for the House of Representatives and State Senate of Illinois were elected the same year. In 1878 they went into the field in Ohio with a state ticket, which received over twelve thousand votes, and this seems to have been their high water mark in politics in that state. The following year their State ticket in New York received ten thousand votes, or less, and this discouraged them.¹

At their last Congress, in Baltimore, 1883, the Socialistic Labor Party reported the existence of thirty-eight "sections"

¹Report of the Proceedings of the National Convention, held in Allegheny, Pa., 1879-80.

which were united in the central organization, in addition to a few independent sections. Rapid progress appears to have been made since then, however, as fifty-eight "sections" publish notices of their places and days of meeting, in the *Sozialist* for March 7, 1885. There is no means, so far as the writer is aware, of ascertaining the number of members in each section. The one in New York seems to be quite large, as it is composed of four branches, at least, and Branch One recently numbered two hundred and seventy-five members, while there were thirty applicants for membership. But most of the sections are evidently quite small, and an average of two hundred to each section would be a large estimate. It is very doubtful then whether there are at the outside twelve thousand members of the party. There are, of course, sympathizers who are not on their rolls, and if these be included the estimate which recently appeared in the *North American Review*, of twenty-five thousand Social Democrats and members of the Socialistic Labor Party, may not be too large.¹

As already stated, the Internationalists give evidences of greater strength, and they are growing rapidly in numbers. The lowest estimate of their strength which has come under the writer's notice is six thousand members, including several armed and drilled companies, but this estimate was made several years ago and is undoubtedly too small. A prominent Chicago Internationalist at the same time claimed twenty-five thousand men "all armed and drilled." The reported existence of armed companies of socialists in Chicago—about which there appears to be no doubt—has recently attracted a great deal of attention and it has been thought necessary to protect more securely the armory of the national guards. It is said that there are no fewer than fifteen hundred men in these companies provided with Springfield and Remington rifles, and the socialists now claim twenty-five thousand adherents

¹ "American Labor Organizations," by Richard J. Hinton.

among the laborers of Chicago. It seems safe to believe that they are twice as numerous as the members of the Socialistic Labor Party and Social Democrats, which would lead us to estimate their numbers at fifty thousand.

The socialists are great advocates of the rights of women and endeavor to secure their help in the cause. In this they have met with some little success, and the women often seem the most violent. The colored are also sought, and once one of their candidates for member of Congress was a negro. It is doubtful if many of the colored race are sufficiently intelligent to grasp the aims and principles of socialism, but they are said to show great fondness for organizations for various purposes and to display, in cases, even greater fidelity to the rules of labor-unions than white men.

But in the case of trouble, accessions to the ranks of socialists from trades organizations might be expected to swell these numbers largely.

A short extract from the Declaration of Principles of the Central Labor Union of New York will show how correct is the socialistic view, that these labor and other like organizations are only "training schools" which "educate the laborers up" to socialism. It reads as follows: "We hold that the soil of every country is the social and common inheritance of the people in that country, and hence all should have free and equal access to the soil without tribute to landlords or monopolists.

"We hold that labor produces all wealth.

"There can be no harmony between capital and labor under the present industrial system."

This Central Labor Union is a large organization and embraces many separate labor associations, like the Upholsterers' Union, the Laborers' Union, the Coopers' International Union, the Furniture Workers' Union, Brassmakers' Union, Columbia Labor Club, etc., etc. It is said to number one hundred thousand members. The Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, a similar organization, claimed two years ago

over fifty thousand members. The *Voice* enumerated twenty-seven distinct labor unions which had taken stock in the publishing association which issued it.

Mr. Hinton, in the article in the *North American*, to which reference has already been made, estimates that all American labor organizations have 611,533 members, but this, there is reason to believe, is too low an estimate. He credits the Knights of Labor with only 150,000 members, for example, whereas some of them claim over a million members, which may be as far wrong in the other way. One thing can scarcely be doubted, and that is, that the organization of labor is progressing with marked rapidity at the present time. In cities various trades' unions are meeting in Central Labor Unions, and a few years ago there was formed "the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada," designed to embrace "every trade and labor organization in North America." Its fourth annual session was held in Chicago in October, 1884.

Mr. T. V. Powderly, a member of the Knights of Labor, contributes an article to the April number of the *North American Review*, entitled "The Army of the Discontented." In this army he includes laborers without employment, whose number he places at two millions. A more satisfactory estimate was contained in a remarkable article published in *Bradstreet's* for December 20, 1884, according to which about 350,000 men, that is to say, fourteen per cent. of the total employed two years ago, were then out of employment in manufacturing establishments in the United States. This number comprised only a part of the unemployed, as it took no account of agricultural laborers, of clerks, and of other large classes. It must also be borne in mind that many who have work are employed only part time and reductions in wages are general.

On the other hand, discontent is the vaguest of expressions and does not imply desire for rebellion, reconstruction, or even for radical reform. But that there is a great deal of

grumbling of a serious nature cannot be doubted. A gentleman of most careful habits of observation and a representative of the class of large landholders in Illinois assures the writer that although there is no organized socialism or understanding of any theoretical body of socialistic doctrines among the agricultural laborers in his State, three-fourths of them are in such a frame of mind as to be easy converts even to quite radical forms of socialism.

A position has now been attained from which it is possible to estimate the precise nature of the danger to be apprehended. While it is extremely unpleasant to be called an alarmist, it is foolish to underrate the possible disasters in store for us; and it is precisely what people have, from time immemorial, been wont to do. Again and again have leaders of social forces behaved with the wisdom of the ostrich, which buries its head in the sand and believes there is no danger, because it can see none. The Philistine—and the greater majority of the ruling middle class are Philistines—loves the dangerous narcotic in the speech of him who cries: “‘Peace, peace,’ when there is no peace,” and hails him as a wise man; while no one listens with pleasure to prophecies of evil. In fact, it is difficult to name a more disagreeable duty than to be obliged to prophesy misfortune to unwilling ears. Blame or ridicule is sure to be the lot of him who does this—the latter, if danger is successfully averted; the former, if it comes in spite of his efforts to ward it off, for a strange association of ideas places upon his shoulders the responsibility for calamities which he foresaw, and which he has perchance succeeded in mitigating. The word *Jeremiads* calls up a disagreeable picture of Jeremiah, while the gift of Apollo to Cassandra has forever removed her from the long list of Greek heroines of whom we delight to think. But thoroughly persuaded that serious dangers are in store for us, that calamities are ahead of us which it will be impossible for us to escape entirely, although a sufficiently early recognition of them may help to avoid a large part of the evils which would other-

wise overtake us, the writer feels compelled to speak his honest opinion and incur the risk of both ridicule and blame.

First, then, it is evident that there is no danger in any near future, probably not in the lifetime of any who read this, of a total overthrow of republican institutions in this land. Giving the socialists credit for all the forces they can possibly claim, they could muster under their banners only a comparatively small part of the population, and this composed of men scattered from Maine to California, and from Michigan to Georgia, and chiefly raw, undrilled laborers, without competent leaders or the resources which are the sinews of war. But does it consequently follow that they could do no serious damage? Let him who thinks so, remember the loss of life and property in 1877, the latter estimated at not less than one hundred millions of dollars. Now that is exactly what we have to fear, another 1877, and this is precisely that for which the socialists are preparing. It is a refrain which one finds repeatedly in all their publications: "Get ready for another 1877—buy a musket for a repetition of 1877." "Buy dynamite for a second 1877." "Organize companies and drill to be ready for a recurrence of the riots of 1877."

Truth in its number for December 15, 1883, published an article entitled "Street Fighting. How to Use the Military Forces of Capital when it is Necessary! Military Tactics for the Lower Classes." It purports to be written by an officer in the U. S. army, and a military authority informs the writer that the substance of this article, although possessing little merit, is not of such a character as to render this impossible. It suggests new methods of building barricades and improved methods of meeting attacking troops. Numerous and apparently reasonable diagrams are given. "Military knowledge," says the officer in the army of the United States, "has become popularized a little even since 1877, and it would not be hard to find in every large city of the world to-day upon the side of the people some fair leaders capable of meeting the

enemy in some such way as this:" then follows one of the diagrams.

The *Vorbote* has recently published a series of articles on the arming of the people. One sentiment which one often finds repeated is this: "We have shown too much mercy in the past. Our generous pity has cost us our cause. Let us be relentless in the coming struggle."

Truth, in its issue dated November 3, 1883, quotes Félix Pyat to this effect: "We have the right, we have the power; defend it, employ it! without reserve, without remorse, without scruples, without mercy. . . . War to the extreme, to the knife. A question of life or death for one of the two shall rest on the spot. . . . For the good of the people, iron and fire. All arms are human, all forces legitimate, and all means sacred. We desire peace, the enemy wants war. He may have it absolutely. Killing, burning—all means are justifiable. Use them; then will be peace!"

The revolutionists claim that while the first 1877 took them unawares, they will be armed to the teeth and ready for the second, which will usher in the dawn of a new civilization. It is surprising that many of them in their fury and fanaticism expect the present generation will not pass away until all their dreams are fulfilled and not one stone of our old civilization is left on another. There is no doubt about their terrible earnestness. One of them addressed recently an epistle to the writer, demanding of him whether in the coming conflict he would be found fighting on the side of the oppressed or the oppressor; "on the side of socialism or capitalism." In fact, a very little association and familiarity with the socialists is sufficient to convince one of their earnestness, as well as of the fact that property does not by any means invariably make conservatives of men. In Russia there is no lack of funds with which to carry on the revolutionary work; in France it is said that several millionaires belong to one group of socialists—to be sure the most moderate—and that forty thousand francs have been subscribed to further the dissemi-

nation of the views of a Belgian socialist, Colins, while in this country the money to build the Brooklyn Labor Lyceum, a structure devoted to the propagation of social democratic ideas, did not come entirely from proletarians.

Now can there be any doubt about the seriousness of the situation? If it were known that one thousand men like the notorious train robbers, the James boys, were in small groups scattered over the United States, would not every conservative and peace-loving householder be filled with alarm, and reasonably so? Yet here we have more than ten times that number educated to think robbery, arson, and murder justifiable, nay, even righteous; taught to believe the slaughter of the ruling classes a holy work and prepared to follow it with all the fanaticism of religious devotion, ready to die if need be, and prepared to stifle all feelings of gratitude and natural affection, and to kill with their own hands every opponent of the grand cause. It is, indeed, as President White has pointed out, an anomaly in our legislation, that it is lawful for a man like John Most to preach wholesale massacre, while it is criminal for A to incite B to slay C. And this Most is the lion among the extremists in the United States; this man who, on account of his excessive violence, was repudiated by his own countrymen and almost unanimously expelled from the social democratic party of Germany. There are those who, when extensive and riotous strikes again occur, will remember the teachings which are entering into their flesh and blood, yes, into their very soul, and will take their muskets and their dynamite and "descend into the streets" and, thinking the great day has arrived, will cast about right and left and seek to demolish, to annihilate all the forces and resources of wealth and civilization. While the result will be their inevitable defeat, it will cause sorrow and bloodshed to the defenders of our institutions, as well as to the rebels, and will drive further apart than ever before in this land, the two great classes of industrial society, employers and employees.

What we have to fear then is large loss of life, estrangement of classes, incalculable destruction of property and a

shock to the social body which will be a serious check to our economic growth for years to come.

VII.

THE REMEDIES.

Now arises that old question, *Que faire?*—what shall we do about it? Well, there is no simple, easily-applied formula which will cure social evils, and any one who pretends to have at his command a cure-all for the ailments of the body politic is a quack worthy of no respect.

Certainly it cannot be the writer's purpose in the few remaining pages of the present monograph, which has already exceeded the proper limits of a paper in this series, to present an elaborate scheme of social regeneration, nor has he any intention of pointing out minute directions for the avoidance of dangers threatened by revolutionists. His aim is a more modest one. It is only to give a few suggestions, scarcely more than hints which may be useful to the reader, enabling him to contribute to a better utilization of the world's experience and of established rules of moral conduct.

When words give place to violent action, there is no doubt that severe punishment should be meted out to the offender against the laws of the land. But of more importance than severity in the administration of criminal law is certainty and celerity of punishment. This is not likely to be disputed, but when we come to agitation and incitement to revolution in a general way, there is more disagreement in regard to the course to be pursued. However, it is safe to say that the outcome of past experience is against legal interference with theorists before they proceed to overt acts. With ten times more favorable opportunities than exist in the United States, Bismarck has tried the enactment of severe laws against the socialists in Germany, but with very unsatisfactory results; so unsatisfactory indeed that it may be questioned whether he

has not strengthened the social democrats. He has rendered several services to them. He has united hostile factions into one compact party; he has in his persecutions enabled them to pose as martyrs, and actually to feel themselves such—and that is a great source of strength; finally, he has made propaganda for them, and drawn to them the sympathies of well-meaning people.

Every possible obstacle to their political action has had this result. They have elected the largest number of members of Parliament since these laws against them were in force. Russia, France and Germany, all serve as warning against restrictions upon the socialists in the United States.

But from the *Truth* of January 26, 1884, and a recent number of the *Sozialist*, we may gain a hint as to the true policy. In speaking of the indiscriminate use of dynamite as a means of propaganda, *Truth* says: "Its effect would be directly reactionary. Either it would induce repressive laws abrogating the rights we have now, which permit us to spread our doctrines, or it would wring from the fears of the bourgeoisie such ameliorative measures as might postpone for centuries the final struggle for complete emancipation." The *Sozialist* of January 3, 1885, predicts that they, the socialists, will obtain assistance in their propaganda from their enemies, who will increase discontent among the masses, and thus prepare heart and mind for the seed they expect to sow.

The two words used by *Truth*, "ameliorative measures," indicate the correct method of dealing with social problems. We must listen to complaints of those who feel that they are oppressed, and not suppose that the demands of even socialists are unjust, simply because they are made by socialists. Who can object to them when they complain because they are not allowed to rest one day out of seven; because child-labor is tolerated; because families are scattered in workshops, and family life in any true sense of the word becomes an impossibility? It would indeed be well could every rich and well-to-do person be persuaded to listen to their complaints as they

appear in their papers, in order to know how they feel and what they suffer; or if the wealthy could more generally be induced to examine for themselves the way poor and honest people are often obliged to live. Let the careless and indifferent but read the articles now appearing in the *Christian Union* on the condition of the poor in American cities, or a single pamphlet like "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London," describing the life of the London laborer from the observation of city missionaries, and issued by the London Congregational Union! And if he thinks that, as is too often said, the laborers become accustomed to their lot and contented, let him but read their utterances in the labor press, or listen to them in their meetings! There are certain things a man can never get used to, as for example, an empty stomach and a home without fire. When poverty is extreme, it often sinks more and more deeply into the consciousness of the sufferer, and the burden grows with the weight of years.

Then it must not be forgotten that this age is not as other ages. There has been great progress in the intelligence of the laboring classes, and political equality has stimulated the desires of the masses for a larger share of material riches. The means of production have been improved in a marvelous manner, and the increase of wealth has been enormous. The question the laborer asks is not simply whether he receives more absolutely, but whether he receives as much in proportion to what the other classes of society enjoy. His wants have grown, and he is inclined to doubt whether he is as well able to gratify his legitimate needs as formerly. There may have been a time, for example, when he could not read. Then it was no hardship to him that he was unable to buy books. The case is different now.

First, then, let us listen to the demands the socialists and the laboring classes generally make of the present state, and discuss them in a spirit of candor, and grant them in so far as they may be just. It has already been seen what the Socialist Labor Party desires of society in its present form, and

while it may be true that few political economists would assent to the practicability of all the measures they advocate, they are certainly worthy of discussion. Undoubtedly, one often meets with radical and apparently absurd propositions in the perusal of labor literature, but on the other hand one discovers at times a surprising spirit of conservatism, and is obliged to admit that many demands are perfectly legitimate, as the following "Platform and Supplementary Resolutions" of the Federation of Trades and Labor Unions abundantly prove.

"Platform.

"1. The national eight-hour law is one intended to benefit labor and to relieve it partly of its heavy burdens, and the evasion of its true spirit and intent is contrary to the best interests of the nation. We therefore demand the enforcement of said law in the spirit of its designers, and urge the enactment of eight-hour laws by State Legislatures and municipal corporations.

"2. We demand the passage of laws in State Legislatures and in Congress for the incorporation of trades and labor unions, in order that the property of the laboring classes may have the same protection as the property of other classes.

"3. We demand the passage of such legislative enactments as will enforce, by compulsion, the education of children, for if the State has the right to exact certain compliance with its demands, then it is also the duty of the State to educate its people to the proper understanding of such demands.

"4. We demand the passage of laws in the several States forbidding the employment of children under the age of fourteen years, in any capacity, under penalty of fine and imprisonment.

"5. We demand the enactment of uniform apprentice laws throughout the country; that the apprentice to a mechanical trade may be made to serve a sufficient term of apprenticeship and be provided by his employer, in his progress to maturity, with proper and sufficient facilities to finish him as a competent workman.

“6. It is hereby declared the sense of this congress that convict or prison contract labor is a species of slavery in its worst form; it pauperizes labor, demoralizes the honest manufacturer, and degrades the very criminal whom it employs; and as many articles of use and consumption made in our prisons under the contract system, come directly and detrimentally in competition with the products of honest labor, we demand that the laws providing for labor under the contract systems herein complained of be repealed.

“7. What is known as the ‘order’ or ‘truck’ system of payment, instead of lawful currency as value for labor performed, is one not only of gross imposition, but of downright swindle to the honest laborer and mechanic, and we demand its entire abolition. Active measures should be taken to eradicate the evil by the passage of laws imposing fine and imprisonment upon all individuals, firms, or corporations, who continue to practice the same.

“8. We demand the passage of such laws as will secure to the mechanic and workingman the first lien upon property, the product of his labor, sufficient in all cases to justify his legal and just claims.

“9. We demand the repeal and erasure from the statute books of all acts known as conspiracy laws, as applied to organizations of labor in the regulation of wages.

“10. We recognize the wholesome effects of a Bureau of Labor Statistics, as created by the National Government and in several States, and recommend for their management the appointment of a proper person, identified with the laboring classes of the country.

“11. We demand the passage of a law by the United States Congress to prevent the importation of all foreign laborers under contract.

“12. We declare that the system of letting out National, State, and municipal work by contract tends to intensify the competition between workmen, and we demand the speedy abolishment of the same.

"13. We demand the passage by our various legislative bodies of an employers' liability act, which shall give employees the same right to damages for personal injuries that all other persons have.

"14. We recommend all trades and labor organizations to secure proper representation in all law-making bodies, by means of the ballot, and to use all honorable measures by which this result can be accomplished.

"Supplementary Resolutions.

"1. That we urge upon the legislatures of our several States the passage of laws of license upon stationary engineers, and the enforcement of proper restrictions, which will better preserve and render protection to life and property.

"2. That we demand strict laws for the inspection and ventilation of mines, factories and workshops, and sanitary supervision of all food and dwellings.

"3. We demand of our Representatives in the National Legislature that they declare such land grants as are not earned by railroads or corporations forfeited, and to restore the same to the public domain."

The complaints of the socialists are often but too well grounded, when they criticise things as they are. Our laws regulating joint-stock corporations, for example, sadly need reforming, so as to prevent much dishonest manipulation of joint-stock concerns which might easily be avoided. One ought to be indignant when he sees familiar operations like this: A company is established; a few get control of the management; declare an unearned dividend; pay it out of the capital; then unload and acquire wealth at the expense of the widow, the orphan and the toiler. It is needless to multiply examples. If we turn to our governments we shall find in Star Route contracts and Tweed Ring frauds much to help us to understand why some people have gradually come to desire the overthrow of all that exists of human contrivance as preliminary to a new era.

Happily, much is being done to remedy abuses, and in many quarters a most hopeful desire is manifest to bring wealthy criminals to justice and to strive for needed reforms; and if the leaders of society evince an increasing willingness to listen to grievances of labor, to discuss their propositions and redress their wrongs, they will draw away from violent agitators the strongest and best of the workingmen and render the revolutionists comparatively harmless. To cite an example; no one can withstand the devotion of a life like Peter Cooper's, and it was touching to read the evidences of the appreciation of his deeds on the part of the laboring classes. Even *Truth* contained an obituary notice of him, in which the highest and most unreserved praise was accorded to his deeds.

The same journal contained a long and appreciative review of a book which had simply attempted to describe socialism impartially, with these words: "We hope the book will be extensively read by socialists, and that each reader will profit by the unprejudiced manner in which the historical facts and doctrinal matters are set forth, and that we shall learn to emulate the enemy in the coolness of our judgment and the calmness of our criticism." On the other hand, a socialistic journalist informs the writer that only one who has mingled, as he has, for years with the laboring classes can form any conception of the harm done by a recent book, which treated social problems in quite a different spirit, putting the whole question of reform on an unfair basis and treating the discontented with irritating impatience and stinging harshness. In the words of this journalist: "Mr. — I regard as a bad man, one of the most dangerous of 'the dangerous classes.' Unless you mingled as I have done with the proletarians many years and knew by experience their feelings, you could not conceive the infinite injury such a man does to the cause he espouses. It inflames them more than standing armies and Gatling batteries."

It is true; a man was never won by cruel reproaches, and a strong government has its roots in the hearts of the people. It still holds that love is more powerful than hate.

[A wider diffusion of sound ethics is an economic requirement of the times.] Christian morality is the only stable basis for a State professedly Christian. An ethical demand of the present age is a clearer perception of the duties of property, intelligence and social position. It must be recognized that extreme individualism is immoral. Extreme individualism is social anarchy and—to cite a comparison recently made in Hopkins Hall—the first social anarchist was Cain, who asked indignantly if he were his brother's keeper. *Laissez-faire* politics assures us we are not keepers of our brothers, that each one best promotes the general interest by best promoting his own. There are those who tell us in the name of science, that there is no duty which one class owes to another, and that the nations of the earth are mere collections of individuals with no reciprocal rights and duties. It is time for right-thinking persons, and particularly for those who profess Christianity, to protest vigorously, in season and out of season, against such doctrines wherever found. As a friend, a professor in one of our leading colleges, forcibly puts it, the error of this school of political economists is that fundamental one of Herbert Spencer's ethical system, "a determination to ignore law and its sanctions."

A higher and more advanced political economy proclaims all this false, and asserts that within certain bounds we are obliged to concern ourselves about the welfare of others. Even less than law does political economy recognize any absolute proprietary rights, and in a higher ethical sense all our goods are but entrusted to us as stewards, to be administered in promoting the welfare of our fellow-men, as well as our own and equally with our own. If the rulers of our society remember this and act upon it, they surely never need dread the laborer.

A specific vice of our time, and one which political economists of all schools condemn, is extravagance and luxury. It is waste of economic powers, injuring those who indulge in it, and exciting envy and bitterness in the minds of those

who are excluded. The New York *Volkszeitung*, April 7, 1883, a socialistic journal, printed not very long ago a bitter description of a sinfully extravagant ball, given by a wealthy parvenu. It was significantly entitled "Mene, Tekel, Upharsin. Belshazzar in his glory."¹

The social injury of vice is seen in the reproaches made against existing society by the Anarchists. A sad condition of family life is ridiculed and brought forward as proof of the hopeless rottenness of capitalistic society. In the long run, virtue is rewarded in states and in individuals, and that social body is doomed which is essentially immoral.

In conclusion, there are three chief agencies through which we must work for the amelioration of the laboring class, as well as of all classes of society. These are Science, the State and the Church.

One principal remedy against the evils of socialism, nihilism, and anarchism is a better education in political, social, and economic science. The dense ignorance on these questions, even among the better classes, is something astounding. People contend against an unknown enemy. There are very few colleges where any adequate instruction is given in the great social problems of the day. What is the result? Their graduates, instead of converting others from error, often yield to the foe of society. A graduate of a well-known college in New England, a clergyman, wrote not long ago that in his day they had in political economy only what could be learned out of a couple of text books, like Mill and Fawcett, eminently respectable authorities, but hardly containing all that is wanted by the college graduate of our day. It is not surprising, then, that two or three of his class, and among them a professor in a theological school, had become socialists. Education in political and social sciences ought to be given,

¹ For a just estimate of luxury, considered from the standpoint of the economist and the Christian, see an admirable article by Émile de Laveleye in *The Popular Science Monthly* for March, 1881.

not only in colleges, but in every high school and academy in the land.

How is social power, the force which resides in society, to be utilized? The answer is, largely through the State, legally organized society. The individual has his province, the State has its functions, which the individual either cannot accomplish at all, or cannot accomplish so well. But an obstacle to the proper economic activity of the State has been found in the low view men have too frequently taken of its nature. Calling it an atomistic collection of units, some have even gone so far as to speak of taxation for the support of public schools as robbery of the propertied classes. Now it may rationally be maintained that, if there is anything divine on this earth, it is the State, the product of the same God-given instincts which led to the establishment of the Church and the Family. It was once held that kings ruled by right divine, and in any widely accepted belief, though it be afterwards discredited, there is generally found a kernel of truth. In this case it was the divine right of the state. Socrates, who held the laws of the state sacred and inviolable, even when they condemned him to death, had a correcter view of its nature than our modern individualists. The Christian ought not to view civil authority in any other light than a delegated responsibility from the Almighty. When men come to look upon their duty to the state as something as holy as their duty to the church, regarding the state as one of God's chief agencies for good, it will be easy for government to perform all its functions. Questions of civil service, as ordinarily presented, do not go deep enough. A higher conception of the state is required.

The church must claim her full place as a social power, existing independently of the state. It is said that the church is the representative of Christ, whose kingdom was not of this earth. True, but for us the higher life has its basis in the lower life, and that Christianity is certainly defective, which is not a living force in matters of temporal concern. It may

be that the talents entrusted to us here are small compared to the opportunities of a future state, but the attainment of the higher responsibilities depends upon the administration of our earthly stewardship. Now it seems to the writer that the church neglects the enforcement of our duties with respect to temporal concerns.

It is with satisfaction one turns from the study of social problems to the teachings of Christ, which seem, from a purely scientific standpoint, to contain just what is needed. On entering our churches, the painful scene of discord between what one sees and hears and what Christ taught, is by no means easy to describe. It is too frequently difficult to believe that the fashionable people about one are followers of the humble Nazarene, who found it so hard for the wealthy to enter the kingdom of heaven, and bid the rich young man sell all that he had and give to the poor. A great deal is said in criticism of the communism of the early Christians, and it is doubtless true that it proved no brilliant success, but it would be well to dwell more at length on the spirit which that early communism presupposed. A group of men and women, who sell their all and form one fund that they may live in common as brothers and sisters, without those social distinctions so dear to us all, must have been actuated by sincere convictions and unfeigned love. This is what men did who were near Christ and upon whom there had been a wonderful outpouring of God's Spirit. It may not be necessary for men to do that now, though it is not certain that many a man may not be called upon to part with wealth for the sake of Christian progress; but it is necessary that Christians manifest a willingness to do this.

In the harmonious action of State, Church and individual, moving in the light of true science, will be found an escape from present and future social dangers. Herein is pointed out the path of safe progress; other there is none.



RI
TO
LC

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library

or to the

4

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

FI

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing
books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made
4 days prior to due date

AI

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

NOV 04 2006

MR

FO

LD9-30m-4,

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY



LIBRARY OF



8000293524

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFOR



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



