



CHAPTER IV

Present-Day Socialism

I.—THE FORMATIVE FORCES OF PRESENT-DAY SOCIALISM

MANY events in the industrial and political life of the nation during the closing decade of the last century contributed to the spread of the socialist sentiment in this country. The tendency toward concentration of industry had never before been so marked. "Not less than \$500,000,000 is in the coal combination," reported Lloyd in 1894,* "that in oil has nearly, if not quite, \$200,000,000, and the other combinations in which its members are leaders foot up hundreds of millions more. Hundreds of millions of dollars are united in the railroads and elevators of the Northwest against the wheat-growers. In cattle and meat there are not less than \$100,000,000; in whisky \$35,000,000, and in beer a great deal more than that; in sugar, \$75,000,000; in leather, over \$100,000,000; in gas, hundreds of millions There are in round numbers \$10,000,000,000 claiming dividends and interest in the railroads of the United States. Every year they are more closely pooled."

These immense combinations of capital had the effect of uniting vast armies of labor in each of the lines of industry mentioned. The gigantic trusts called forth formidable trade-unions. The class lines were drawn more distinctly, and the class struggles grew more embittered and assumed larger proportions. Hardly a year passed without witnessing one or more powerful contests between capital and labor.

The earlier part of the remarkable decade was particularly replete with such contests, and, without attempting to give anything like an adequate account of them, we will mention a few of the most noteworthy strikes of that period.

* Henry D. Lloyd: "Wealth *vs.* Commonwealth."

The first of this series of strikes to attract universal attention was that which broke out in the iron- and steel-works of Carnegie & Co., at Homestead, Pa., in July, 1892.

Homestead was a town of about 12,000 inhabitants, founded by Andrew Carnegie and his associates, and its population consisted chiefly of employees of the steel-works. These were organized under the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, and it had been their custom to fix their wages by periodical agreements with their employers. The last of these agreements expired on June 30, 1892. When that date approached, the owners of the works announced a reduction of wages and demanded that the new scale be made to terminate in January instead of June. The employees rejected the proposed terms principally on the ground that they could not afford a cessation of work in midwinter, and would not be in a position to resist further reductions of wages, if such were to be made upon the termination of the agreement. A lockout followed, and the battle was on.

The employers were by no means unprepared for the struggle. Weeks in advance Mr. H. C. Frick, the active manager of the concern, had surrounded the works by a fence three miles long, fifteen feet in height and covered with barbed wire. The fortification was dubbed by the operatives "Fort Frick."

The next step of the employers was to import a force of 300 Pinkerton constables armed to the teeth, who arrived by water in the early morning hours of July 6th. The coming of these men precipitated a scene of excitement and bloodshed almost unprecedented in the annals of the labor struggles of this country. As soon as the boat carrying the Pinkertons was sighted by the pickets, the alarm was sounded. The strikers were aroused from their sleep, and within a few minutes the river front was covered with a crowd of coatless and hatless men armed with guns and rifles, and grimly determined to prevent the landing of the

Pinkertons. The latter, however, did not seem to appreciate the gravity of the situation. They sought to intimidate the strikers by assuming a threatening attitude and aiming the muzzles of their shining revolvers at them. A moment of intense expectation followed, then a shot was suddenly fired from the boat, and one of the strikers fell to the ground mortally wounded. A howl of fury and a volley of bullets came back from the line of the strikers, and a wild fusillade was opened on both sides. In vain did the strike leaders attempt to pacify the men and to stop the carnage—the strikers were beyond control. The struggle lasted several hours, after which the Pinkertons retreated from the river bank and withdrew to the cabin of the boat. There they remained in the sweltering heat of the July sun without air or ventilation, under the continuing fire of the enraged men on the shore, until they finally surrendered. They were imprisoned by the strikers in a rink, and in the evening they were sent out of town by rail. The number of the dead on both sides was twelve, and over twenty were seriously wounded. After this incident Homestead was placed under martial law, and state troops were stationed in the town for several weeks, displaying great severity. The contest ended with the defeat of the strikers. 14 1/2

The strike at Homestead was still in progress when a struggle of almost equal intensity broke out in the far Northwest, in the Cœur d'Alene district in the State of Idaho. The rich silver- and lead-mines of the district had for a long time been operated by the miners themselves, individually or in small groups. But with the onward march of civilization the mines attracted the attention of enterprising capitalists. They were purchased and syndicated, and the former independent miners were reduced to wage-workers, whose wages were besides steadily on the decrease. The miners organized, and their demand for higher wages having been refused, they struck. Their places were soon filled, and an armed battle ensued between the strikers and strike breakers, as a

result of which several men were killed and wounded on both sides. The strikers remained in control of the situation, driving those who had taken their places from the mines. They were 1,200 strong and well-armed, while the entire state militia consisted nominally of 196 men. In this emergency the governor appealed for federal troops, and the latter were promptly and liberally furnished. The strike was suppressed, the leaders arrested and thrown into prison, and suit was instituted to dissolve the miners' union as an unlawful combination.

Within less than one month from the occurrences described two new labor struggles of large dimensions broke out simultaneously in widely different parts of the country—Buffalo and Tennessee.

✓ **THE BUFFALO STRIKE.**—In 1892 the legislature of the State of New York enacted a law limiting the work time of railway employees to ten hours a day. The passage of this law had been warmly agitated as a measure of relief to the overworked employees as well as a measure of safety for the traveling public. But when it had finally been enacted, it was found to contain a "rider" in the shape of a provision permitting the companies to exact from their employees overtime work for an extra compensation. This provision had the effect of nullifying the entire law. The companies reduced the wages of their employees more than sufficiently to allow for the extra compensation for overtime, and as a result the wages of the railroad workers had somewhat decreased while their hours of labor had remained unchanged.

The employees to suffer most from this state of affairs were the switchmen, who not infrequently were kept at work thirty-six hours in succession without as much as an intermission for meals. In Buffalo the number of switchmen employed by the several roads amounted to over 400, and on the 13th day of August, 1892, these struck for shorter hours and better pay. The attempts of the companies to fill the places of the strikers were unsuccessful, the strike gained

in extension, and railroad traffic around Buffalo was blocked. The switchmen had the sympathy of the population, and the local militia, which was called into requisition at an early stage of the contest, did not seem inclined to interfere with their "picketing." The prospects looked bright for the strikers, when the railroad officials by threats and cajoling forced the somewhat reluctant sheriff to call on the governor for troops. Within forty-eight hours almost the entire militia of the State—about 8,000 in number, as against the 400 strikers—appeared on the scene of the battle, and the situation was at once changed. Under the protection of the militia the companies procured men to take the places of the strikers; picketing and other methods of warfare usually employed by strikers were not tolerated, the backbone of the contest was broken, and the strike was declared off on the 24th day of August.

A substantially different state of facts led to the labor struggles in the coal regions of Tennessee at about the same time. There the trouble arose over the employment of convict labor in the mines. Under the prison system of the State the authorities had for a number of years been in the habit of hiring out convicts, principally of the colored race, to the mine-owners on yearly contracts, and, as a rule, convict labor and free labor were employed in the same mines. This competition and humiliating associations were a standing source of grievances for the miners, and more than once the sturdy Tennesseans had rebelled, and with armed hand driven the convicts out of the mines.

The troubles of 1892 were a repetition of the same occurrences, except that the operations were conducted on a larger scale. The first skirmish took place at Tracy City, where the free miners captured about 300 prison workers, set them at large and burned their barracks. Two days later the same procedure was reenacted at the iron-mines of Inman, on August 17th, in the coal-mines of Oliver Springs, and on the 18th in Coal Creek.

Several troops of militia despatched by the governor of the State were captured on the way, disarmed and sent back; telegraph wires were cut and railroad tracks demolished. The miners were in absolute control of the field, until finally the entire state militia was concentrated in the mine regions. Then the strikers were defeated and unmercifully punished. Warrants were out for all leaders of the movement. No less than 500 arrests were made within a few days, churches and schoolhouses were converted into prisons, and indictments for murder, riot, conspiracy, etc., were found by the score. The rebellion was quelled, and quiet was restored in Tennessee.

But the most far-reaching and sensational of the strikes of that period was the Pullman or Chicago strike of 1894.

Pullman was founded in 1880 by the famous palace-car builder, George M. Pullman, in the vicinity of Chicago. It is a factory town provided with "model" tenement-houses, schoolhouses, churches, stores, and a library, all owned by the Pullman Palace Car Company and rented to the company's employees. It was not a philanthropic experiment like the famous New Lanark of Owen, but a pure business enterprise, and a very remunerative one at that. The company furnished not only the rooms, but the gas, the water, and all other necessaries and comforts of the tenants—at high prices. At the same time the wages of the operatives were very low, and the entire town was at all times deeply in the company's debt. In the spring of 1894 the employees owed the firm the sum of \$80,000 for rent alone, and not infrequently the former, after a deduction of rent from their payrolls, had nothing left for other living expenses.

It was under these circumstances that the Pullman Palace Car Company announced another reduction of wages, amounting to no less than about twenty-five per cent. on the average. The employees refused to consent to the reduction, and were locked out. Numerous efforts were made in behalf of the men to induce the Pullman Company to submit the

controversy to arbitration, but all such overtures were met by the unbending and unvarying declaration of the company, "We have nothing to arbitrate."

This situation had continued for many weeks, when the American Railway Union took the matter in hand.

The American Railway Union was organized at Chicago in June, 1893, through the tireless efforts of Eugene V. Debs. It was a combination of different organizations of railway employees, and, in 1894, was said to number no less than 150,000 members. The organization of the Pullman employees was affiliated with the union, and when the annual convention of the latter met at Chicago, in June, 1894, it appointed a committee again to request the Pullman Company to submit the grievances of their employees to arbitration. No heed was paid to the committee, and the convention, amid cheers of enthusiasm, decided to boycott the Pullman cars, and to refuse to do work on any trains to which such cars might be attached.

The battle now grew general. On the part of the employees the strike was conducted by Eugene V. Debs with great ability and courage, while the campaign of the railroad companies was directed by the General Managers' Association. The strike grew in dimensions and intensity from hour to hour. Within a few days all railway traffic in Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Omaha, San Francisco, and in many other important points of the Middle and Western States, was paralyzed. The transportation of meat and agricultural products was seriously impaired, and many industries all over the country were crippled. The American Railway Union seemed sure of victory when the United States courts stepped in by issuing injunctions, forbidding the strikers to prosecute the boycott of the Pullman cars. The first injunctions were issued by Judges Wood and Grosscup at Chicago, and their example was followed by judges in other States.

The situation grew still more acute when the President

of the United States, over the protest of Governor Altgeld, sent federal troops into the State of Illinois, and when right thereafter he issued proclamations to the good citizens of the city of Chicago, the States of North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, Colorado, and California, and the Territories of New Mexico and Utah, to preserve the peace and to withdraw to their houses. The proclamations and the presence of federal troops and state militia placed a vast territory of the country practically under martial law. But notwithstanding these strenuous measures, or, perhaps, on account of them, serious disorders and acts of violence occurred in many places.

In the mean while the United States district attorney at Chicago, under the directions of United States Attorney-General Olney, had impaneled an extraordinary grand jury, which found an indictment for conspiracy against Debs and other strike leaders. These were immediately arrested and released under heavy bail. Immediately upon their release they were rearrested on the charge of contempt of court. This time Debs and his comrades refused to furnish bail and were sent to the Cook County jail to await trial. The strike was broken. "It was not the railways, nor the armies that beat us, but the power of the United States courts," Debs subsequently testified before the United States Strike Commission, appointed to investigate the famous labor war.

The number of persons killed during the strike was 12, 515 persons were arrested by the state police, and 190 by the United States courts. Bradstreet's estimated the loss occasioned by the strike to the country at large to be about \$80,000,000.

In September of the same year Debs was tried on the charge of contempt of court, found guilty and sentenced to six months' imprisonment in the Woodstock jail.

The strikes thus briefly described by no means exhaust the list of violent struggles between capital and labor which marked the closing years of the nineteenth century. Simi-

lar strikes occurred from time to time in various parts of the country, and most of them presented substantially the same features. They were conducted on a large scale, and not infrequently shook the entire industrial foundation of the country. For the greater part they were as brief in duration as they were intense in character, and in a majority of cases they were quelled by the aid of the local police force, state militia, or federal troops. The injunction which had first shown its great effectiveness in the Chicago strike grew rapidly in favor as a method of settling labor disputes, and became the regular concomitant of every important strike. The phrase of "government by injunction," which played so prominent a part in recent political history, owes its origin to this fact.

With few exceptions the strikes resulted in the defeat of the working men.

These events created a certain dissatisfaction with the existing order of things in large sections of the working-class and made them more accessible to the teachings of socialism. Nor was the social discontent wholly limited to the city workers. The rural population of the country had its own grievances. The closing decades of the last century had wrought great changes in the economic situation of the farmer. The development of the great railroad lines and the marvelous improvements in the transportation facilities had created one national market for farm products in this country, and the farmer was drawn into the mill of industrial competition as effectively as the manufacturer of the city. What made the competition still more disastrous for the ordinary American farmer was the advent of the huge bonanza farms of the West. These farms, established on large tracts of land, frequently acquired by their owners from the Government for a nominal consideration, were tilled and worked with perfected machinery on an immense scale, were well stocked, and could easily afford to undersell their smaller competitors. The prices of farm products fell steadily, while

the implements of farming became more complicated and expensive.

Thus the farmers found it harder and harder with every year to make both ends meet, and the money lender was called into requisition. The practise of mortgaging farms spread with alarming rapidity—in 1890 the total mortgage indebtedness of the farms in this country was no less than \$1,085,995,960, and the indebtedness bore interest at a rate exceeding 7 per cent. In the same year only 47 per cent. of the farmers owned their farms unencumbered, according to compiled census returns. Of the remaining 53 per cent., 34 per cent. did not own the farms which they were working, and 19 per cent. owned them subject to mortgages. Rent and interest reduced the meager income of the farmer to a minimum, and the statement was made on good authority that the average net income of the American farmer was \$200 per year or less.*

Alongside of these industrial movements, and no doubt partly in consequence of them, a new and radical tendency was rapidly developing in the social and political life of the country. This tendency manifested itself in a variety of ways, but found its most pronounced expression in the Nationalist and Populist movements.

The Nationalist movement was the immediate result of the appearance of Bellamy's famous utopian novel, "Looking Backward."

Edward Bellamy was born in 1850 at Chicopee Falls, in the State of Massachusetts, as the son of a clergyman. He studied law, but soon discarded that profession for the more congenial vocation of the journalist, and wrote several novels, which met with but moderate success. In 1887 he published his "Looking Backward." The original conception of the work, it is related, did not contemplate the treatment of present social or industrial problems. The author merely intended to write a playful fairy tale of universal harmony

*"The American Farmer," by A. M. Simons, Chicago, 1902.

and felicity. But as he progressed with his work his subject assumed a more realistic tendency and direct application. The novelist gradually yielded to the reformer, and the work of fiction turned into a social and political treatise.

Bellamy was not familiar with the modern socialist philosophy when he wrote his book. His views and theories were the result of his own observation and reasoning, and, like all other utopians, he evolved a complete social scheme hinging mainly on one fixed idea. In the case of Bellamy, it is the idea "of an industrial army for *maintaining* the community, precisely as the duty of *protecting* it is entrusted to a military army." "What inference could possibly be more obvious and more unquestioned," he asks, "than the advisability of trying to see if a plan which was found to work so well for purposes of destruction might not be profitably applied to the business of production, now in such shocking confusion?"

The historical development of society and the theory of the class struggle, which play so great a part in the philosophy of modern socialism, have no place in Bellamy's system. With him it is all a question of advisability and expediency; he is not an exponent of the laws of social development, but a social inventor.

But this feature, which would have been a source of weakness in a work of science, by no means detracted from the success of the novel. "Looking Backward" was written in an easy and pleasing style; it had the charm of originality, and touched a live cord in the heart of the nation. The book at once became the literary sensation of the day. Within a few years it reached a sale of over half a million copies in this country alone, and it was translated into almost all modern languages.

A "Bellamy Club" was organized in Boston soon after the appearance of the book, and in 1888 the club was renamed the "Nationalist Club." This was the beginning of the Nationalist movement. Other clubs patterned after the Boston

prototype were formed in all parts of the country, and in 1891 no less than 162 Nationalist clubs were reported to be in existence. The origin of the term "Nationalist" is accounted for by Bellamy in the following manner:

" . . . This is called Nationalism because it proceeds by the nationalization of industries, including the minor application of the same principle, the municipalization and state control of localized business. Socialism implies the socializing of industry. This may or may not be based upon the national organism, and may or may not imply economic equality. As compared with socialism, nationalism is a definition, not in the sense of opposition or exclusion, but of a precision rendered necessary by a cloud of vague and disputed implications historically attached to the former word."

The Nationalist clubs were principally organizations of propaganda. In politics they displayed but little activity, occasionally nominating independent candidates, but more frequently cooperating with the Populists.

The Populist movement originated in the State of Kansas, where a call for a convention of all the radical element with the view of forming a new political party was issued in April, 1890. The convention met in June of the same year, and was attended by ninety delegates, representing the Farmers' Alliance, Knights of Labor, Single-Tax clubs, and other reform organizations. The "People's Party of Kansas" was organized, and in the ensuing state elections it succeeded in electing a majority of the lower house of the state legislature. The movement spread rapidly to all Western, Middle, and some Southern States. In 1891 a national convention was held in Cincinnati. It was attended by no less than 1,418 delegates, who were, however, chiefly recruited from the States of Kansas, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Nebraska.

The next convention of the party, held at Omaha, Neb., in 1892, was of a more representative national character. Delegates were present from all parts of the country. An

independent presidential ticket was nominated and a party platform adopted.

The People's Party was chiefly an organization of and for the small farmers, and thrived principally in the agricultural West and middle West. But while the leaders and promoters of the movement recognized this character of their party, and in all their platforms and public declarations laid particular stress on the interests of the farming population, they appreciated that the party could not expect to attain significance in national politics without the aid of the industrial workers of the East, and they endeavored at all times to gain the support of the latter.

"Wealth belongs to him who creates it," declares the Omaha platform, "and every dollar taken from industry without an equivalent is robbery. . . . The interests of rural and civic laborers are the same; their enemies are identical."

In the presidential elections of 1892 the People's Party united over 1,000,000 votes on its candidate for President, General Weaver, and in 1894 its vote rose to 1,564,318. But in 1896, when Bryan was nominated by the Democratic Party on a platform favoring the free coinage of silver, the Populists refrained from nominating a rival candidate and indorsed Mr. Bryan's nomination. This was practically the death of the People's Party, and the further history of the movement is one of rapid disintegration. After the fusion of 1896 the greater part of the Populists practically remained an appendix to the Democratic Party, while the more radical elements, known as the Middle-of-the-Road Populists, seceded from the parent organization, forming a political party of their own. In the elections of 1900 their candidate for President of the United States, Mr. Barker, polled a little over 50,000 votes.

In connection with the reform movements above described the schools of Christian Socialism and Fabian Socialism must also be mentioned. Both schools appeared in the

United States at the period under consideration, and, while they did not influence the social and political views to the same extent as Nationalism or Populism, they still contributed in some degree to the formation of modern socialism in this country.

In the countries of Europe the school of Christian Socialism was in existence for more than half a century, and assumed a variety of forms and attributes. In the United States the movement made its first definite appearance in 1889, when the Society of Christian Socialists was organized in Boston; it soon branched out to several other cities, principally in the East.

The doctrines of Christian Socialism in the United States may be summed up in the following statement, taken from the declaration of principles of the society:

"I. We hold that God is the source and guide of all human progress, and we believe that all social, political, and industrial relations should be based on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, in the spirit and according to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

"II. We hold that the present industrial and commercial system is not thus based, but rests rather on economic individualism," etc.

And the objects of the society were stated to be:

"(1) To show that the aim of socialism is embraced in the aim of Christianity.

"(2) To awaken members of Christian churches to the fact that the teachings of Jesus Christ lead directly to some specific form or forms of socialism; that, therefore, the Church has a definite duty upon this matter, and must, in simple obedience to Christ, apply itself to the realization of the social principles of Christianity."

The society never gained much influence, and after a struggling existence of a few years it disbanded.

The most prominent figures of the movement in this country were Rev. William D. P. Bliss, Prof. George D.

Herron, and Prof. R. T. Ely. Mr. Bliss was one of the organizers and most active workers of the Society of Christian Socialists. For several years he published *The Dawn*, a monthly magazine, in which he advocated the usual political measures of the socialist program along with the general principles of Christian Socialism. Professor Herron occupied the chair of Applied Christianity at Iowa College, and expounded his views in numerous books and pamphlets, in public lectures and from the chair. He was outspoken in his denunciations of the existing order of things, but steadfastly refrained from offering a positive program of action. His socialism was rather of an ethical than political nature. In later years Professor Herron declared himself unreservedly for revolutionary socialism, and he is now an active member of the Socialist Party.

In the summer of 1894 Professors Ely and Herron organized at Chautauqua, N. Y., the American Institute of Christian Sociology, which was designed to furnish literature and propaganda for the Christian Socialist movement among churches and colleges. Professor Ely was president, Professor Herron was principal of instruction, and Prof. J. R. Commons was secretary. The Institute had a considerable influence and literature, but finally failed through the protests of the clergy and of various college instructors against the radicalism of Professor Herron's teachings. The Christian Socialist League, of Chicago, organized by Edwin D. Wheelock, also exerted a measure of local influence. The resignation of Professor Herron from Iowa College practically closed the chapter of Christian Socialism in America.

The Fabian movement in the United States can hardly be considered more than an unsuccessful attempt to emulate the activity of the Fabian Society in England. The latter was organized in London in 1883 by a number of well-known socialists for the special purpose of promoting the educational side of the socialist movement. Its members deliv-

ered many lectures before clubs and societies, and published and circulated numerous tracts and pamphlets, among them the famous series of "Fabian Essays on Socialism," and brought about several important measures of municipal reform in London and in other cities of the United Kingdom.

The American Fabian Society was organized in 1895. It had branches in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and in several other places. The society issued a few tracts, and for some time published a monthly under the title, *The American Fabian*. The leading spirits of the movement were Rev. W. D. P. Bliss and Lawrence Gronlund.

All these, and other reform movements of that time, were but short-lived and fleeting, but they left their mark on the political life of the nation.

Owing to the rise and agitation of these movements thousands of American citizens in all parts of the Union acquired a taste for the study of social problems. They discarded their traditional views and severed their old party affiliations, and when the reform movements collapsed one after the other, many of their former votaries turned to socialism.

II.—THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

THE Socialist Labor Party was founded at a time when socialism in this country was an academic idea rather than a popular movement. The socialists were few in number, and consisted largely of men who had formed their social views and philosophy in European countries, principally in Germany. They were but little in touch with the American population, and moved almost exclusively within their own limited circle. This character of the movement reflected itself on their organization: the mode of administration and methods of procedure of the Socialist Labor Party were

those of a society of students and scholars rather than of a political party of the masses.

The organization was, however, quite sufficient for a period of about twenty years. The movement had during that time made but little progress among the native population, the party grew but slowly, and whatever new members it acquired were gradually assimilated.

But the events described in the preceding chapter worked a great change in the character of the socialist movement in America. The movement grew out of the narrow bounds within which it had been confined up to that time, and the Socialist Labor Party was fast becoming inadequate for the new requirements. Its highly centralized form of organization did not suit the political institutions and traditions of this country, and its dogmatic adherence to all canons of scientific socialism and strict enforcement of party discipline were not calculated to attract the masses of newly converted socialists. A radical change had become necessary if the party desired to maintain its hegemony in the socialist movement. But, unfortunately for the Socialist Labor Party, its leaders did not appreciate the situation. The prolonged activity within the vicious circle of their own had made them men of an extremely narrow vision. They had become used to regard their party as the privilege of the chosen few, and were rather reluctant to open it to the masses. They eyed all newcomers with ill-concealed suspicion, and refused to relax the rigidity of the party requirements in any way.

Nor was their attitude toward the trade-union movement of the country any more conciliatory. When the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was first organized and sprung as a surprise on the convention of 1896, some delegates had considerable misgivings as to the innovation. Fear was expressed that the organization would only serve to antagonize existing trade-unions, while accomplishing little itself, and that it would ultimately lead to an estrangement

between the party and the rest of the labor movement in the country.

But these fears were allayed by the repeated assurances of the spokesmen of the Alliance, that the latter did not intend to interfere with existing organizations, and would confine its activity to the task of organizing the unorganized.

As soon, however, as the convention adjourned, these promises were forgotten. The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance accomplished hardly anything by way of organizing unorganized working men, and whatever little strength it ever attained was drawn from existing unions. The Alliance was besides not always very choice in its means and methods of organization, and it has even been charged with organizing strike breakers during the progress of some strikes. This course naturally provoked the hostility of organized labor toward the Alliance, and the hostility was extended to the Socialist Labor Party, which was considered practically identical with it. Thus the administration of the Socialist Labor Party within a few years succeeded in placing the party in a position of antagonism to organized labor, as well as to all socialistic and semisocialistic elements outside of the party organization.

This policy of the party officers was by no means always approved by the membership, and voices of protest were occasionally raised. But the opposition only served to accentuate the unbending attitude of the men at the head of the party. A relentless war was opened on everything within and without the party that did not strictly conform to their conception of orthodox socialist principles and tactics. The columns of the official party paper, *The People*, edited by Daniel De Leon, and the *Vorwaerts*, edited by Hugo Vogt, were filled from week to week with violent tirades against the "corrupt pure and simple labor-unions" and their "ignorant and dishonest leaders," and against the Populist, Nationalist, and other reform "fakirs."

Side by side with this crusade against the "fakirs" outside of the party a process of "purification" of the party members was inaugurated. Had the party officers heretofore been strict disciplinarians, they now became intolerant fanatics. Every criticism of their policy was resented by them as an act of treachery, every dissension from their views was decried as an act of heresy, and the offenders were dealt with unmercifully. Insubordinate members were expelled by scores, and recalcitrant "sections" were suspended with little ceremony. This "burlesque reign of terror," as Lucien Sanial subsequently characterized the régime, continued for several years, and in 1899 it reached such an acute stage that the members finally rose up in arms against it.

The first to sound the note of open rebellion was the *New-Yorker Volkszeitung*, which engaged in a controversy with the official party organs. The immediate occasion for the dispute was the *Volkszeitung's* adverse criticism of the party's attitude toward the trade-unions; but as the controversy continued, the whole range of the policy and methods of the party administration was drawn in. The discussion waxed more heated with every issue of the papers. The members took sides with one or the other of the combatants, and the socialists of the City of New York, where the headquarters of the party were located and *The People* and *Volkszeitung* were published, were divided into two hostile camps—the "administration faction" and the "opposition faction."

Under these circumstances the month of July, 1899, arrived, and with it the time for the election of new delegates to the general committee of "Section New York." This election was of more than local importance for the opposing factions. The convention of 1896 had delegated to the City of New York the power to elect and to recall the national secretary and the members of the national executive committee, and the latter in turn elected the editors of the party organs. Thus the New York socialists held the key to the

entire situation, and the election was to demonstrate the relative strength of the factions.

The contest was a spirited one all along the line, and its results were awaited with intense interest. The new general committee met on July 8th, and it became at once apparent that the opposition was in the majority. The committee did not proceed far in its business. The nomination of a temporary chairman precipitated a violent clash between the hostile camps, and the meeting broke up in disorder.

That very night the opposition delegates issued a call for a special meeting of the committee. The meeting was held on the 10th day of July, attended by the opposition delegates only, and it proceeded with the party administration in a summary manner. The offices of the national secretary, of the members of the national executive committee, and of the editor of *The People* were declared vacant, and their successors were then and there elected. Henry L. Slobodin, who had taken a very active part in the overthrow of the old administration, was elected national secretary, and guided the much troubled course of the party during the succeeding period with great skill and circumspection.

The war within the Socialist Labor Party was now on in earnest. The deposed party officers repudiated the acts of the general committee as invalid and continued in office. The party officers elected by the general committee insisted on the legality of their election, and proceeded to the discharge of their duties. Each side styled itself the Socialist Labor Party, each side had its own national committee, its own secretary and headquarters, and each of them published a paper called *The People*.

The situation was somewhat analogous to the one created just ten years earlier by the deposition of Rosenberg and his associates, except that in the present case the battle was more perseverant and intense.

In the beginning the administration party had decidedly the better end of the contest. The insurgents were practi-

cally confined to the City of New York, while the sections in the country knew little about the merits of the controversy, and many of them adhered to the old party officers on general principles. The latter, however, did not possess the requisite skill to follow up their advantage. Their dictatorial tone toward their own followers, and their policy of abuse toward their opponents, repelled the sections wavering in their allegiance between the two committees, and one by one these sections turned to the opposition.

This was the state of affairs when the general elections of 1899 approached. Each of the two factions had nominated a ticket, and each side claimed its ticket to represent the only regular nominations of the Socialist Labor Party. In the State of New York the contest was taken into the courts, which decided in favor of the faction headed by the old party officers.

This was a severe blow to the faction of the opposition. The faction had at that time undoubtedly the support of the large majority of the party members, some of the most prominent ones among them, and it had almost the entire party press on its side. The organization was building up steadily, and it soon regained in some quarters of the labor movement the sympathy which the party had forfeited through the perverse trade-union policy of its former officers. But with all that its legal existence and identity had always been enshrouded in much doubt, and now that the courts had decided adversely on its claims to the party name, the faction was thrown into a state of indescribable confusion. To put an end to the chaos, the national committee issued a call for a special convention of all sections supporting its administration. The convention was held in the city of Rochester, and the character of the gathering and the efficiency of the work accomplished by it exceeded the most sanguine expectations of its promoters. The convention was attended by fifty-nine delegates, and remained in session five consecutive days. All questions of principle, organizations, and policy were

subjected to a most searching scrutiny. The methods and tactics of the party were revised, and the party was reorganized on a basis more nearly in accord with the modern requirements of the movement.

Almost the first act of the Rochester convention was to repudiate the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance and to proclaim its sympathy with the struggles of all trade-unions regardless of national affiliations.

The convention also adopted a new platform, which, with very few changes, remains the present platform of the Socialist Party, and enacted a new set of by-laws for the administration of the affairs of the party.

But by far the most momentous act of the Rochester convention was the adoption of the following resolution, paving the way for the unification of the party with the Social Democratic Party (see next chapter):

"The Socialist Labor Party of the United States, in national convention assembled, sends fraternal greetings to the Social Democratic Party of the United States.

"*Whereas*, The course of development of the socialist movement in the United States during the last few years has obliterated all difference of principle and views between the Socialist Labor Party and the Social Democratic Party, and both parties are now practically identical in their platform, tactics, and methods;

"*Whereas*, Harmonious and concerted action of all socialist elements of the United States is expedient for a successful campaign against the combined forces of capitalism;

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this convention that the interests of socialism will be best subserved by a speedy union of the Socialist Labor Party and the Social Democratic Party into one strong, harmonious, and united socialist party;

"*Resolved*, That we call upon the earnest and intelligent socialists of this country in the ranks of both parties to discard all petty ambitions and personal prejudices in the face

of this great purpose, and to conduct the negotiations for unity of both parties, not in the sense of two hostile camps, each negotiating for peace with a view of securing the greatest advantages to itself, but in the sense of equal parties, hitherto working separately for a common cause, and now sincerely seeking to provide a proper basis for honorable and lasting union for the benefit of that cause;

“Resolved, That for the purpose of effecting union between the two parties on the basis outlined, this convention appoint a committee of nine to act as a permanent committee on Socialist Union, until the question is definitely disposed of;

“Resolved, That the said committee be authorized to delegate a representative or representatives to the next national convention of the Social Democratic Party in order to convey this resolution to said party and to invite the said party to appoint a similar committee; and

“Resolved, That any treaty of union evolved by the joint committee on union, including the question of party name, platform, and constitution, be submitted to a general vote of both parties.”

The resolution was adopted by a vote of fifty-five to one, and the committee of nine, provided for by it, was forthwith elected.

Before adjournment the convention took up the nomination of candidates for the ensuing presidential campaign. Job Harriman, of California, a brilliant speaker and untiring worker, who had become widely known in party circles through his agitation on the Pacific coast, was nominated for the office of President of the United States, and Max Hayes, of Ohio, equally popular in the socialist and trade-union movement, was nominated for the office of Vice-President.

But in view of the pending negotiations for unity with the Social Democratic Party, the nominations were not consid-

ered final, and the committee on unity was authorized to make any changes in the ticket that might be required by the exigencies of the situation.

III.—THE SOCIALIST PARTY

THE narrow policy of the Socialist Labor Party described in the preceding chapter had the double effect of disgusting many old-time workers in the movement who withdrew from the party in large numbers, and of making the organization unpopular to the majority of newly converted socialists.

Thus around the middle of the nineties of the last century a new socialist movement gradually sprang up outside of the ranks of the Socialist Labor Party. It was scattered all over the country and assumed the most variegated forms. It was grouped around such enterprises as the weekly papers of J. A. Wayland, *The Coming Nation*, and subsequently *The Appeal to Reason*, both of which reached a circulation unparalleled by any socialist publication in this country; it expressed itself in the foundation of socialist colonies, such as the Ruskin Cooperative Colony of Tennessee, and in the formation of a number of independent socialist and semi-socialist clubs and societies.

The movement, however, lacked clearness and cohesion, and stood sorely in need of an energetic and popular leader to collect the scattered elements and to weld them together into one organization. The man to accomplish that task finally appeared in the person of Eugene V. Debs.

Debs had always been a man of radical views on social questions, and his experience in the great Chicago strike had only served to intensify this radicalism. He utilized his enforced leisure in the Woodstock jail for the study of social problems and the theories of modern socialism, with the result that he left the jail with decided leanings toward socialism.

In the campaign of 1896 he still supported the candidacy

of Mr. Bryan, but in January, 1897, he publicly announced his conversion to socialism.

The American Railway Union had by this time practically ceased to exist, with the exception of a small group of men who remained true to Debs. This remainder of the once powerful organization was reorganized on political lines and decided to unite with the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth, a socialist organization of a utopian coloring, which had then recently been called into existence by *The Coming Nation*.

A joint convention of the two organizations was held in the city of Chicago on June 18, 1897, with the result that a new party, the SOCIAL DEMOCRACY OF AMERICA, was created.

The aims and views of the party were originally somewhat raw and indefinite. Its declaration of principles was substantially socialistic, but its main feature of activity was the promotion of a rather adventurous plan of colonization. The new scheme launched by the party was to colonize in some Western State, to capture the state government, and introduce a socialist *régime* within the limits of the State. A colonization committee, consisting of Col. R. J. Hinton, of Washington, D. C., W. P. Borland, of Michigan, and C. F. Willard, of Massachusetts, was appointed. Funds for the purchase of territory were raised, and in May, 1898, the committee announced that it had completed arrangements by which the party would acquire about 560 acres of land in the Cripple Creek region in Colorado for the sum of \$200,000, of which a cash payment of only \$5,000 was required.

The colonization schemes of the Social Democracy had opened the doors of the party to all varieties of social reformers, and even a number of prominent anarchists joined the organization in the hope of exploiting it for the propaganda of their theories.

But side by side with this movement the clear socialist element within the party grew in numbers and strength.

Many former members and several entire sections of the Socialist Labor Party joined the new organization, and these, together with some prominent leaders within the Social Democracy, headed by Victor L. Berger, of Milwaukee, Wis., inaugurated a movement to substitute ordinary socialist propaganda and politics for the colonization scheme of the party.

Under these circumstances the first national convention of the Social Democracy was held in Chicago on June 7, 1898. The convention was attended by seventy delegates, representing ninety-four branches of the party, and it became at once evident that a pitched battle was to be expected over the question of politics as against colonization.

The debate was opened on the report of the platform committee. Two reports were submitted, a majority report favoring the abandonment of the colonization scheme and the adoption of the usual methods of socialist propaganda, and a minority report advocating colonization as the most prominent feature of the activity of the party. The debate lasted until 2:30 o'clock in the morning, when a vote was taken, showing fifty-three in favor of the minority report and thirty-seven for the majority report. As soon as the vote was taken, the defeated minority withdrew from the convention hall in a body, in accordance with a prearranged plan, and the field was left clear to the colonization faction. The latter adopted its platform, elected its officers, and adjourned. The organization subsequently established two insignificant communistic colonies in the State of Washington, and quietly dropped out of existence.

In the mean while the thirty-seven bolting delegates met and called into life a new party under the name of "SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AMERICA." Freed from the presence of the troublesome colonization advocates, the new party proceeded to eliminate all utopian elements from its platform. It organized on the lines of a socialist political party and elected a national executive board, consisting of

Eugene V. Debs, Victor L. Berger, Jesse Cox, Seymour Stedman, and Frederic Heath.

The following two years witnessed a rapid growth of the young party. The party nominated state or local tickets in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Connecticut, Maryland, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, and California. In the fall elections of 1899 it elected the first socialist representatives in the Massachusetts state legislature—James F. Carey and Lewis M. Scates, and in December of the same year the Social Democrats of Haverhill, Mass., elected John C. Chase to the office of mayor of that city, while C. H. Coulter was elected mayor of Brockton, Mass., also on a Social Democratic ticket. The party also succeeded in electing to office a number of aldermen, councilmen, and school commissioners in several towns of Massachusetts and Wisconsin. When the first national convention of the party assembled in Indianapolis, on the 6th day of March, 1900, it claimed an enrolled membership of about 5,000.

The system of representation devised by the party was a rather novel one for political conventions. Each member had the right to append his signature to the credential of the delegate or proxy of his own choice, and each delegate had as many votes in the convention as the number of signatures attached to his credential.

The number of delegates who attended the convention was sixty-seven, and the total number of individual signatures attached to their credentials was 2,136.

The all-absorbing topic at the convention was the question of amalgamation with the Rochester wing of the Socialist Labor Party. On the second day of the session a committee of the latter, consisting of Max Hayes, of Ohio, Job Harri-man, of California, and Morris Hillquit, of New York, formally opened the negotiations. Their earnest plea for the unification of the socialist forces and their glowing description of the advantages which the movement as a whole would derive from the union were interrupted by round after round

of applause. The great majority of the delegates had come to the convention with their minds firmly made up on the subject. They needed no arguments or persuasion; they were enthusiastically for union, and urged immediate measures for the accomplishment of the object.

The enthusiastic desire for union without reserve or qualification was, however, confined to the mass of the delegates only. The party leaders were more cautious in the matter. The name of Socialist Labor Party had an unpleasant ring for them; they were somewhat apprehensive of the motives and sincerity of the new allies, and they proposed to surround the negotiations for unity with all possible safeguards. They consented to the appointment of a committee of nine to meet with the similar committee of the Socialist Labor Party and to evolve a plan of union as called for by the Rochester resolution; but they recommended that the results of the deliberations of the joint committee be submitted to a referendum vote of each party separately, so that if either of the parties should not approve of the plan as a whole it might reject it and thus frustrate the proposed union. They also insisted upon the retention of the name Social Democratic Party for the new organization.

These recommendations were the subject of a prolonged and heated debate, at the conclusion of which they were rejected by a vote of 1,366 against 770. A committee of nine was thereupon elected with full power to arrange the terms of union with the like committee of the Rochester faction. To seal the treaty of peace, a presidential ticket was nominated, with Eugene V. Debs, of the Social Democratic Party, for the office of President of the United States, and Job Harriman, of the Socialist Labor Party, for his running mate, with the understanding that the nominations would supersede those made at Rochester.

The joint conference committee of the two parties met on the 25th day of March, 1900, in the City of New York, and

the practical work of merging the two organizations now began in earnest.

The Social Democratic Party was represented by John C. Chase, James F. Carey, Margaret Haile, Frederic Heath, G. A. Hoehn, Seymour Stedman, William Butscher, and W. P. Lonergan. Victor L. Berger, who was also a member of the committee, did not attend.

The Socialist Labor Party faction was represented by Max Hayes, Job Harriman, Morris Hillquit, F. J. Sieverman, J. Mahlon Barnes, G. B. Benham, C. E. Fenner, W. E. White, and N. I. Stone.

The conference lasted two full days, and the questions of party name, constitution, candidates, and platform were discussed with much earnestness. The last two points were disposed of with practically no debate. The Indianapolis nominations were ratified, and the Rochester platform was readopted as the declaration of principles of the new party, while the "demands" formulated by the Social Democratic Party were appended to the document.

But the questions of party name and headquarters gave rise to prolonged and, at times, heated controversies. The representatives of the Social Democratic Party insisted upon the retention of their party name for sentimental reasons and on the ground of expediency, while the others urged the name of United Socialist Party as more expressive of the character of the new organization. A compromise was finally effected by the decision to submit both names to the vote of the combined membership of both parties.

The party headquarters were located in Springfield, Mass., and a provisional national committee of ten was created to be selected from the membership of the two parties in equal numbers. The work of the committee was on the whole harmonious, and when the joint meeting adjourned, the union of the two parties was practically accomplished save for the formality of submitting the results of the deliberations to a general vote of the members for ratification. But

the unexpected was to happen again. Hardly a week had passed since the members of the joint committee had closed their labors to the apparent satisfaction of all concerned, when the national executive board of the Social Democratic Party issued a manifesto, charging the Socialist Labor Party representatives with breach of faith, and calling upon the members of their party to repudiate the treaty of union.

The document provoked a storm of protests within the ranks of both parties, and gave rise to a prolonged and acrimonious feud between the adherents of the national executive board and the supporters of union. When the vote on the manifesto was finally canvassed, the officers of the Social Democratic Party declared that union had been rejected by the members of their party by a vote of 1,213 against 939, and that the party would hence continue its separate existence.

But this declaration by no means disposed of the controversy. The adherents of union within the ranks of the Social Democratic Party, the majority of its committee on unity among them, denied the legality of the procedure adopted by the board, and refused to recognize its authority to represent the party any longer. They went on voting on the treaty recommended by the joint committee on union, and the treaty having been ratified by the Rochester faction of the Socialist Labor Party and the pro-union faction of the Social Democratic Party, they proceeded to carry its provisions into effect.

Whether it was in the hope of disarming the anti-union elements or for any other reason, the name Social Democratic Party was adopted on the general vote, not only by the pro-union members of that party, but also by the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Labor Party members, and the new party consequently assumed that name. The climax of confusion in the socialist movement in this country was thus reached. The Socialist Labor Party as well as the Social Democratic Party were torn in twain. The

former maintained its headquarters in New York; the latter had one in Chicago and one in Springfield, each of these parties and factions and a separate set of national officers, and each was making war on the other. And, as if to emphasize the absurdity of the situation, the presidential elections drew near with the various socialist nominations in a state of indescribable chaos. The administration faction of the Socialist Labor Party had nominated a ticket of its own—Joseph F. Malloney, of Massachusetts, for President, and Val. Rimmel, of Pennsylvania, for Vice-President.

The Rochester faction of the party had originally nominated Harriman and Hayes for its candidates, but, as related above, these nominations were abandoned for those of Debs and Harriman. The latter ticket, however, was nominated on the assumption that complete union between the Rochester faction and the Social Democratic Party was an assured fact. But now, when the negotiations for union had failed, the anti-union or Chicago faction found itself with Job Harriman, a member of a rival organization, on its own presidential ticket, while the pro-union or Springfield faction was in the same position with regard to its candidate for President, Eugene V. Debs. The warring factions of the Social Democratic Party decided upon the only course possible under the circumstances—the retention of the joint ticket and the maintenance of a tacit truce during the campaign. Notwithstanding this inauspicious situation, both wings of the Social Democratic Party conducted an energetic and enthusiastic campaign, and the vote polled for their joint ticket at this their first national campaign was 97,730, more than the Socialist Labor Party had ever succeeded in uniting on its candidates in its palmyest days.

The harmonious work of both factions of the Social Democratic Party for a joint ticket during the brief campaign had accomplished more toward effecting real union between them than all the prolonged negotiations of the past. The members had learned to know each other more closely, and

their vague feeling of mutual distrust was dispelled. After the campaign there was no more reason or excuse for continuing the separate existence of the two factions, and the Chicago board issued a call for a joint convention of all socialist organizations for the purpose of creating one united party. The Springfield faction, several independent local and state organizations, and, in fact, all socialist organizations, except the New York faction of the Socialist Labor Party, responded to the call. When the convention assembled in Indianapolis, on the 29th day of July, 1901, it was found that the organizations participating in it represented an enrolled membership of no less than 10,000. The system of representation was the same that prevailed at the preceding Indianapolis convention. One hundred and twenty-four delegates held 6,683 credentials from individual members. Of these, the Springfield faction was represented by 68 delegates, holding 4,798 credentials; the Chicago faction by 48 delegates, with 1,396 credentials; while three independent state organizations, with a total membership of 352, were represented by 8 delegates.

Mindful of the disappointing results of the labors of the former joint committee on union, the convention decided not to take any chances again, but to complete all arrangements for the final amalgamation of the organizations represented, then and there.

With this end in view, a new platform (see Appendix I) and constitution were adopted. The headquarters were removed from the seats of former troubles to St. Louis, and Leon Greenbaum, who had not figured very prominently in the former controversies and was acceptable to all parties concerned, was elected national secretary.

The convention was the largest and most representative national gathering of socialists ever held in this country. Among the delegates there were men who had been active in all phases of the socialist movement, and alongside of them men of prominence who had recently come into the

movement. The socialist organizations of Porto Rico were represented by a delegate of their own, while the presence of three negroes, by no means the least intelligent and earnest of the delegates, attested the fact that socialism had commenced to take root also among the colored race.

The composition of the convention also served to demonstrate how much the character of the socialist movement had changed during the last few years: Out of the 124 delegates no more than twenty-five, or about twenty per cent., were foreign-born; all the others were native Americans. Socialism had ceased to be an exotic plant in this country.

The convention had assembled as a gathering of several independent and somewhat antagonistic bodies; it adjourned as a solid and harmonious party.

The name assumed by the party thus created was the **SOCIALIST PARTY.**

IV.—PRESENT CONDITION OF THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

THE socialist movement in the United States is to-day represented by two parties: the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Party, which is also known politically as the Social Democratic Party in some States (notably New York and Wisconsin), owing to the peculiar requirements of the election laws of these States.

The Socialist Labor Party never recovered from the effects of the split of 1899. Altho the "administration faction" had gained a legal victory over the "faction of the opposition" in the litigation over the right to the use of the party name, its victory was of but little practical benefit. The great majority of organized and unorganized socialists had lost their confidence in the leadership of the party and turned their sympathies and support to the Socialist Party. And the further actions and policy of the Socialist Labor Party were by no means calculated to regain the lost confidence.

Its hostile attitude toward the trade-unions and its fanatic rigidity of discipline, which had provoked the open schism within its ranks, now became the sole excuse for its separate existence, and was intensified to ludicrousness.

In June, 1900, the party held a national convention in the City of New York, which lasted a full week. The proceedings of the convention were characterized by almost childish abuse of the seceders from the party, and of all "pure and simple" trade-unions, and the climax of hatred toward the latter was expressed in the following resolution adopted by a practically unanimous vote:

"If any member of the Socialist Labor Party accepts office in a pure and simple trade or labor organization, he shall be considered antagonistically inclined toward the Socialist Labor Party and shall be expelled. If any officer of a pure and simple trade or labor organization applies for membership in the Socialist Labor Party, he shall be rejected."

In the presidential elections of 1900 the party's vote fell to 34,191 from 82,204 polled by it in the general elections of 1898. At the same time the process of "purification" went on within the party in an ever-accelerating rate; state organizations, "sections," and individual members alike were being expelled from the party for various acts of heresy, and as the influx of new members was but slow, the ranks of the party thinned steadily.

Information concerning the present membership of the Socialist Labor Party are very meager, but 3,000 is a generous estimate.

The party publishes a daily newspaper in the English language (*The People*) in the City of New York, and several weekly papers in foreign languages.

With no support from the labor movement and with a state of perpetual strife within its own ranks, the Socialist Labor Party is distinctly on the wane, and its ultimate disappearance from the political surface seems to be only a question of time.

In the mean while the Socialist Party has been progressing with large and rapid strides ever since the Indianapolis convention of 1901.

As this goes to press I am informed by Mr. William Maily, national secretary of the party, that the latter has perfected state organizations in no less than thirty-four States, and that it has local organizations in all other States and Territories of the Union. The number of locals affiliated with the party is estimated to be about 1,200, and the total number of its enrolled members exceeds 20,000.

But the enrolled membership and formal organization of the Socialist Party are hardly a fair measure of its actual strength. To form an adequate idea of this we must also consider its political standing, its influence on the labor movement of the country, and its press.

As related in the preceding chapter, the party made its *début* in national politics with a vote of almost 100,000, cast for Debs and Harriman in 1900. This vote was materially increased in the spring and fall elections of the following year, but owing to the local character of these elections the vote was never fully reported or tabulated.

In the congressional elections of 1902, however, the vote of the Socialist Party, to the surprise of all, reached very closely on the quarter-million mark.

The Socialist Labor Party vote in the same elections was a little over 50,000.

A part of this unexpected success must, of course, be ascribed to the effects of the popular excitement produced in the summer and fall of that year by the prolonged and far-reaching strike of the Pennsylvania coal-miners. But it would be a mistake to consider the large socialist vote as purely accidental on account of that fact. The socialist gains were almost as much noticeable in places which, from their geographical location, were practically unaffected by the coal strike as they were within the immediate theater of the great labor contest.

Moreover, when the local spring elections of 1903 arrived and the strike sentiment had completely subsided, it was found that the socialist vote had not abated, but, on the contrary, had very substantially increased.

Nor would it be safe to draw an analogy between the present socialist vote and the votes of the various fleeting reform parties of the past.

The socialist vote differs from that of other political reform parties in several essential points. In the first place, it is not confined to any one particular section of the country. The main strength of the Populists, for instance, was in the West, that of the Greenbackers in the Middle West, while the United Labor Party drew its principal support from the East. The socialist vote, however, is pretty well distributed all over the country with an even and uniform preponderance in industrial districts, as should naturally be expected from the character of the movement.

The reform party votes, as a rule, swelled on to immense numbers in an incredibly short time, and dwindled down to insignificance as rapidly; but the socialist vote is of a comparatively slow but normal and steady growth. And it is, no doubt, this even distribution which accounts for the phenomenon that with 250,000 votes the Socialist Party has thus far not succeeded in electing its candidates to any important national or state office.

In 1848 the Free-Soil Party cast about 300,000 votes and elected a number of Congressmen, among them Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, and in 1880 the Greenback Party with a similar vote sent eight representatives to the lower house of Congress. The Socialist Party with a vote exceeding the total combined votes of the States of Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Nevada, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming, has not a single representative in the house of Congress, and only eight members of state legislatures—three in Massachusetts and five in Montana.

The party has, however, been more successful in local politics. During the last year it has elected its candidates for mayor in Brockton and Haverhill, two shoe manufacturing towns in the State of Massachusetts, and also in the towns of Sheboygan, Wis., and Anaconda, Mon. It has also elected about fifty of its candidates to the offices of aldermen or councilmen in a number of towns in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas, Iowa, Indiana, Montana, and Colorado, and a score or two of other municipal officers in the same places, and it is quite likely that the first practical application of socialism in this country will be found in the field of municipal reform.

Hardly less significant than its success at the polls are the gains made by the party in the trade-union movement. The growing sympathies of the trade-unions for the Socialist Party have in recent years been manifested in a variety of ways, but on no occasion were they so clearly demonstrated as in the last national conventions of the two largest bodies of organized labor in this country.

In the month of June, 1902, the Western Labor-Union, a confederation of most trade-unions of the Rocky Mountain States and Territories, with a total membership of about 150,000, met in Denver in annual convention. At the same time and in the same city two of the strongest organizations affiliated with that body, the Western Federation of Miners and the United Association of Hotel and Restaurant Employees, also held their annual conventions. The principal topic of discussion at all three conventions was the relation of the organizations represented by them to the Socialist Party, and the result of their deliberation was that all three declared themselves in favor of independent political action of the working class, indorsed the Socialist Party as the representative of the working class in the field of politics, and adopted the platform of the party.

The Western Labor-Union at the same time rejected the overtures of the American Federation of Labor for the

amalgamation of the two bodies on account of the conservative views of the Federation and changed its own name to "American Labor-Union," thus indicating its intention to extend its operations beyond the limits of the West. The organization is almost as active in the socialist movement as it is in that of the trade-unions, and its official organ, *The American Labor-Union Journal*, is the advocate of both movements alike.

In the month of November of the same year the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor was held at New Orleans. The socialist delegates introduced a resolution indorsing socialism, as they had been doing at all previous conventions of the Federation. The resolution this time read as follows:

"Resolved, That this twenty-second annual convention of the American Federation of Labor advise the working people to organize their economic and political power to secure for labor the full equivalent of its toil and the overthrow of the wage system."

The resolution provoked a lengthy and heated debate, and was finally rejected by a vote of 3,744 to 3,344.

The resolution had not aimed at any practical measures, and whether it was accepted or rejected was of no practical importance to either side. But it was a test of the strength of the socialist sentiment in the ranks of the American Federation of Labor, and the fact that almost a full half of all the votes of the convention was cast in favor of it was conclusive proof of the rapid progress of socialism within the organization.

Another strong proof of the spread of the socialist sentiment is the development of the party press. In bygone years the Socialist Labor Party found it hard, and at times even impossible, to maintain a single weekly paper in the English language. Now the Socialist Party is represented in the press by four monthly magazines: *The International Socialist Review*, *Wilshire's Magazine*, *The Comrade*, and

The Southern Socialist, and by twenty weeklies in the English language. The latter are distributed as follows: CALIFORNIA, *The California Socialist*, *The Los Angeles Socialist*, and *The People's Paper*; COLORADO, *The Alliance of the Rockies*; ILLINOIS, *The Chicago Socialist*; IDAHO, *The Idaho Socialist*; INDIANA, *The Toiler*; IOWA, *The Iowa Socialist*; KANSAS, *The Appeal to Reason*; KENTUCKY, *The Newport Socialist*; MINNESOTA, *The Referendum*; MISSOURI, *The Coming Nation* and *St. Louis Labor*; NEW YORK, *The Worker*; OKLAHOMA, *The Oklahoma Socialist*; OHIO, *The Ohio Socialist*; PENNSYLVANIA, *The Erie People*; WASHINGTON, *The Socialist* and *The New Times*; and WISCONSIN, *The Social Democratic Herald*.

Of these, *The Appeal to Reason* alone is reputed to have a circulation exceeding 250,000.

Of the German party papers three are dailies: *The New-Yorker Volkszeitung*, *Philadelphia Tageblatt*, and *Cincinnati Arbeiter-Zeitung*, and seven are weeklies.

The party is also represented by one newspaper in each of the following languages: French (*L'Union des Travailleurs*, Charleroi, Pa.), Polish (*Robotnik*, Chicago), Bohemian (*Spravedlnost*, Chicago), Italian (*Lo Scalpellino*, Barre, Vt.), Swedish (*Arbetarn*, New York), Hungarian (*Nepszava*, Cleveland, O.), and Jewish (*Forward*, New York).

Plans for the establishment of daily papers in the English language in the most important cities of the United States are being seriously discussed in Socialist Party circles, and a beginning is soon to be made in New York, where the party is now engaged in raising funds for the purpose.

Outside of the strict party publications enumerated above there is a large number of trade-union journals and radical papers and magazines of all kinds which are more or less outspoken in their sympathies for socialism, and in political campaigns support the candidates of the Socialist Party.

The Socialist Campaign Book of 1900* enumerated over

* Published by C. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.

thirty of such publications, and the number is no doubt much larger to-day.

Thus the socialist movement in the United States has grown immensely in extent and influence during the last few years. It has penetrated into the broad masses of the American working men, it is gaining adherents among other classes of the population, and rapidly invading all parts of the country. And still the movement has apparently by far not yet reached the full measure of its development. New gains in members and supporters, new acquisitions in the press, and new victories at the polls are being reported steadily, and if all indications do not deceive, socialism will be a potent factor in this country within a very few years.