

"The expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production."—Marx.

The Social Democrat

"ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD WILL TOWARD MEN."

"A State may be very miserable, even though a few individuals gather colossal fortunes."—Siemond.

VOL. V.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1898.

NO. 24

OUR GOVERNMENT

ITS CONSTITUTION FAVORS THE REIGN OF ENTRENCHED PLUTOCRACY.

Constitutional Changes Must Precede Any Attempt at Law Making—A Judicial Despotism.

Before we talk of accomplishing this, that and the other thing by means of law, we must take the measure of our government and learn what we may do and what we may not do in a lawful manner.

The government of the United States is not a democracy. It is an oligarchy.

Most persons erroneously assume that it is only necessary for the people of this country to obtain control of the law-making power to secure any sort of legislation they demand, and on this assumption political platforms are generally burdened with demands for measures of immediate relief which are very good in themselves, but which are not at all possible of attainment under our form of government.

The notion that we are living under laws which emanate from the legislative power of the nation is a fiction. It is a pleasant fiction for our economic masters, because it serves to keep the people quiet, whilst their pockets are being picked, and diverts their attention from fundamental questions by opposing them with the delusion that they may correct the evils from which they suffer by the simple magic of a legislative majority.

We are ruled in this country by a cabal composed of five judges who form a majority of our Supreme Court, and the only valid laws which our legislators can pass are those which meet the approval of our capitalist masters. Whenever a really effective law in the interest of the masses is passed, a law which would abate somewhat the profits wrung from the sweat of the toilers by the inhuman devices of capitalism, it is promptly brought before the cabal for review, and just as promptly declared null and void. This arrangement is a mighty fine thing for the capitalists, as it is only necessary for them to own the five men composing the cabal. They are then fully protected, and the people and their lawmakers may be d—d.

Under no government on earth has the judiciary such power as here in the United States. The judicial despotism under which we live is so complete in character that our legislators no longer even attempt to pass laws which depart in any manner from established precedent, and a custom has grown up of submitting proposed laws to our Supreme judges for an opinion as to their constitutionality before they are even discussed in legislative assemblies. This custom has its root in the desire to avoid the absurdity of passing laws only to have them declared invalid; but its effect is to constitute a set of irresponsible judges, not only the judicial, but also the legislative power of the nation. The judges have usurped all governmental functions, and now have the American people enmeshed in the net of one of the most complete despotisms that ever existed. This is the fact that we must face before we talk of freeing ourselves from industrial slavery by the power of a legislative majority. Something more than a legislative majority is needed. The power of the courts to override the will of the people must be destroyed.

"Free contract" is the shibboleth of our exploiters. This doctrine is solidly rooted in our fundamental law, and all of our legislative enactments must conform to it. Laws of a Socialist nature are unattainable as long as there is a power standing above the law that is not in harmony with the people's will. This is a point on which the people need enlightenment. It is a political issue that far transcends in importance any other that can be presented, because it states the condition precedent to all effective law-making.

The federal constitution can not be amended, and we are only wasting our energies in demanding palliatives of a national character which cannot be attained.

Our state constitutions are easily amended, and our state Supreme courts in the western states, at least, are elected by the people. We can carry on an effective Socialist agitation within State lines, and can hope to secure quasi-Socialist laws within a State long before any such proceeding as a national issue could even be thought of.

We will take advantage of our system of autonomous state governments for the purpose of inaugurating such measures of Socialism as can be obtained here and now. We take our political system as we find it and will conform to its peculiarities as far as may be and adapt its agencies to the end of lifting out of the curse of capitalist serfdom as many of the hopeless victims of power as possible, placing them in positions of economic security where they will be enabled to use effectively the political power which is rightfully theirs, thus finally breaking the meshes of the capitalist net which now renders them helpless. The Social Democracy has raised a political issue that touches the root of things, an issue that will not down until the enthralled millions are set free. Socialism in America has taken on a new lease of life, and will be fought out along American lines.

"Divide and conquer" is the old policy of the capitalists. That is what they are trying to do now. The bolters are their conscious or unconscious instruments. They will not succeed.

A PLAIN STATEMENT.

Chairman Hogan Tells Some Truths About the Social Democracy.

Those delegates who refused to abide by the will of an overwhelming majority in our recent convention have found means to enable them to send circulars to our branches throughout the country. These circulars are false and malignant. They are animated by the same spirit which led most of the delegates in question, in the adoption of their rule or ruin policy, to leave the S. L. P., and it is most unfortunate that they ever became affiliated with the Social Democracy.

It was the decision of the national executive council to treat the seceders in a spirit of brotherhood, and to refrain from criticizing their actions, but now, inasmuch as they have issued their circulars, I shall tell some things which are known to a large number of delegates and which I outlined in my report to the convention.

The Social Democracy, at its convention in 1897, laid down a policy and formulated a platform and constitution. It stood for both political and economic action. It had so able an adviser as Karl Marx to instruct it that economic conditions control all other conditions of social life—that political, educational, and even religious institutions are governed by economic conditions. Therefore the Social Democracy, truly scientific, acting along the lines of least resistance, decided to attempt to secure land and capital in some of the thinly populated states of the west and to mobilize the unemployed therein, thus making them self-sustaining and at the same time giving them political power, of which nearly all of this vast army is divested. Chairman Debs, in closing the convention in '97, spoke eloquently upon the possibilities of such a movement, and as long as the policy outlined was adhered to the organization grew apace.

I was present at a meeting of the executive board in August last when the question of appointing a colonization commission came up in accordance with the constitution. Three members were appointed, all of whom were suggested by Chairman Debs. Col. Richard J. Hinton, of whom I had frequently heard Chairman Debs speak in the highest praise, who was a leading spirit of the emancipation forces before and during the civil war, one of John Brown's coadjutors and author of "John Brown and His Men," an expert on irrigation, holding several splendid papers certifying to his capabilities, who has been editor of several metropolitan newspapers, and who wrote an article in the Arena commending Chairman Debs for his Cooper Union speech, and classing him as the peer of Abraham Lincoln, was one of the commissioners appointed. Cyrus Field Willard, who was labor editor of the Boston Globe and performed yeoman service during the A. R. U. strike, and other strikes, was another. W. F. Borland, who is well known throughout the country as an economic magazine writer, was the other member.

Things went along smoothly for a time. Goodwin, Lloyd, Burns and myself took the field, and were supplied with some funds. But suddenly a change took place. Financial support was withdrawn from the men in the field who believed in carrying out the policy of the organization as it had been outlined, and a tendency towards exclusively political action manifested itself. Suddenly the colonization commission became a target for abuse. I want to say a word for the commissioners. They have done the very best possible. They have been handicapped in many ways. From the time the organization started until December last Secretary Kellher received the colonization funds, amounting to some \$300, and printing done by Campbell and Priebe at from 30 to 50 per cent above the market rate was charged against the commission to help offset this money. Borland edited the Social Democrat and was paid out of the colonization fund, and the money paid him is still due the commission from the general organization.

The convention showed plainly that a conspiracy existed to eliminate the economic feature of the organization, and the conspirators, failing to carry their point, are now trying to retard the work of this movement.

What are they afraid of? Do they fear that the Social Democracy of America, by relieving the sufferings of a number of the helpless and hopeless proletarians and bringing joy and gladness into their lives, may retard the coming of the day when they may gain political power?

We are charged with packing the convention. Is it not strange that we were considered honest up to the day of the convention, and then suddenly turned into a set of rascals?

Again, they charge us with being anarchists. Who ever heard of anarchists packing a convention?

Then they say that we are Republicans, Democrats, Populists, Labor Exchange Patriots, etc. We say that they were, and are now, contending for the field held by the S. L. P. Their action proves our charge to be correct. We stand for the development of the tendency towards Socialism. They contend for the leadership of those people already converted.

The Social Democracy of America, cleaned of its barnacles, will now press bravely forward to carry out the objects for which it was organized, and will proceed unflinchingly to establish economic security for the helpless proletarians of the country, in spite of the splenic mendacity of its narrow-minded opponents.

JAMES HOGAN, Chairman.
Comrades, let us line up for business.

LONDON LETTER.

TERRIBLE RESULTS OF CAPITALIST RAPACITY IN THE MATCH TRADE.

Thirtieth Annual Co-operative Congress—Henry George Lecturing on War—Welsh Miners' Strike.

(Social Democrat Special.)

4th June, 1898.

It is hard enough to work long and wearisomely and to see the products that your labor wrings from nature flowing from you into the hands of the exploiting plutocracy through the channels of rent, profit, etc., but the curse of capitalism rests still more hard upon some sections of the great mud working class. Those brothers and sisters of ours who are inhaling day by day as they work in pottery factory lead shops and elsewhere noxious and death bringing vapors and substances have a heavier cross to bear than we who work under fairly healthful conditions. The cry of the victims of "potter's rot" and lead poisoning bursts but upon us now and then and makes the nation shudder, but most of the time these workers follow their occupations with a heroic resignation to fate that makes one's heart bleed. The gravestones grow more and more numerous in the cemeteries of Staffordshire and Lancashire and the other centers of great industries, and tell a sad and terrible tale of human lives sacrificed to the Moloch of capitalism, but the sons and daughters of the men and women who have perished prematurely from the foul industrial diseases go on working and rotting off. The primal curse of labor, launched by Jehovah at our alleged progenitors, has an added fulfillment in the factories of Hanley and St. Helens. And here in London, despite the vehement denials of Bryant and May, the match manufacturers, that hideous disease, "phosphorous necrosis," still claims its victims. In this one factory there are now discovered to have been six deaths from "phossey-jaw," as the mach workers call it, during the last few years, induced by the use of white phosphorous in match making, and making itself felt by a gradual rotting away of the jaw bones, accompanied by the terrible acute pains that are felt in the most advanced neuralgia, and the feeling that your mouth is full of phosphorous. It strikes down the strongest man or woman in a few months. Now, Bryant and May are high up in their churches, their factory they allege to be a model one, and they assured the government inspectors who visited them that no case of "phossey-jaw" had occurred since 1893, thanks to their care for their employees. But they lied! When brought into court they owned up to six deaths, and owned up to having purposely hidden these cases from the inspectors. Result, fines amounting to the sum of \$150. It also transpired that eleven more of their workhands are under medical treatment for phosphorous necrosis.

The cathedral town of Peterborough has been the scene this week of the thirtieth annual co-operative congress. A large advance is registered upon last year's figures, and the summaries for 1896 and 1897 come out this way:

	In 1896.	In 1897.
Co-operative societies	1,741	1,845
Operatives	\$ 87,734,620	\$ 93,058,290
Shares	286,592,130	311,435,240
Profit	20,687,450	33,589,350

And all this has sprung from the little seed planted in 1844 by fourteen Lancashire weavers who pooled their scanty spare cash. It is a great oak, but the shelter it affords to the oppressed is not much. It is in essence commercial and capitalist, it desires profit and good investments just as the business man does. The co-operative world here requires to be revolutionized just as commercial society does. It has made clear one point, and that is that workmen can do most of those things for themselves which the wise-acre once said could only be done for them by their educated betters. Many societies are hard at work here as elsewhere endeavoring to persuade members of the co-ops with advanced ideas, but it is slow work. The attraction of the "dividend" is very strong and many a co-op cannot see beyond that.

Henry George's son, who is across here hunting up materials for his father's biography, has been speaking out his mind upon the war. Said he: "Those belonging to the working class must bear the brunt of the conflict. They carry the armament, fire the cannon and pay the taxes. Those at home provide the food and the powder for those in the field, and the rich patriot is the gentleman who comes forward with the money to lend to the government at substantial interest." And he might have added that it is not only the poor in America but also the poor in England, Spain and Italy—in fact, the poor everywhere. Bread is still 40 per cent higher over here through the opportunity that the war gave to the wheat speculators.

The trades-federation ferment has now developed into a personal quarrel between P. J. King and John Eyre. King asserts that Eyre has plagiarized his scheme. The Laborer Leader flings itself into the fray with enthusiasm, backing up Eyre. The official scheme is of course laying quiet awaiting probable congressional sanction later on.

The Welsh strike drags on heroically and stubbornly. Starvation is doing its deadly work, and the end is near.

A WEAK ARGUMENT

LAURENCE GRONLUND CONDEMNS THE ACTION OF THE BOLTERS.

Berger's Platform Analyzed and Its Defects Pointed Out—Americans Demand a Practical Movement.

J. T. R.

THE REASON WHY I CONDEMN COMRADE BERGER, of Milwaukee, and his followers for seceding from the Social Democracy is because they thereby intended to break up and destroy a new and splendid instrument for the emancipation of the masses. It is a childish procedure. It is just like a child who refuses to play any more with its play-fellows because it cannot have its will in a particular point. No matter how right they have been on the question of political action vs. colonization, they should for the time being have bowed to the will of the majority and afterwards tried to persuade and convince their comrades. That would have been the proper procedure, simply because the Social Democracy is the only American Socialist movement there is. The Socialist Labor party is, in spite of its pretensions, a German movement; it is now more than twenty-five years old and has just a little chance of winning an American majority as a 50-year-old maiden has of being married. But it is not the way of persuading and winning Americans to kick them.

There are, however, other criticisms I have to make on the platform which Berger presented to the convention. It is in the first place altogether too long and too wordy for a political document; but besides this it possesses certain weaknesses, peculiarly German, and which surely ought in future to be avoided and eliminated.

First, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Secondly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Thirdly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Fourthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Fifthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Sixthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Seventhly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Eighthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Ninthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Tenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Eleventhly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Twelfthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Thirteenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Fourteenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Fifteenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Sixteenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Seventeenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Eighteenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Nineteenthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Twentiethly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Twenty-firstly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Twenty-secondly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Twenty-thirdly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these lead up to general principles. Prove to a German or a Frenchman that the existing system is false and unjust and he is ready for Socialism. Not so the American; he immediately inquires: Is Socialism practicable? Prove to him that the trust must end in Socialism and he is convinced.

Twenty-fourthly, it starts out with the old, threadbare truism that labor, manual and mental, is the source of all wealth, and then follows a string of propositions ending with a demand for public ownership. It is a way of reasoning that is very powerful to the German and French mind, but that has just as little effect on an American as water poured on the back of a duck. It is the old deductive way of argument that was such a favorite with the French philosophers of the last century, but which now in all branches of science is condemned as faulty and everywhere replaced by the inductive method. Instead of starting out with a general proposition, like the rights of man, or the source of all wealth, on which it is by no means evident that all philosophic minds must agree, and then proceeding down to facts, the modern scientific way is to begin with facts which all who can see must admit, like trusts, and from these

Paradise Found

BY RUDOLPH LEONHART, A. M.

Author of "THE WILD ROSE OF THE BEAVER," "TONOQUA" THROUGH BLOOD AND IRON," "THE CHILDREN OF THE OUTLAW," "THE TREASURE OF MONTEZUMA," "DOLORS," "ETHER," "OR," "ATONEMENT," "BRIDGING THE CHASM," ETC.

(Continued.)

Yes, it is Hugh and Aurelia whom we see standing at the edge of that platform, the center of attraction. Both are in their traveling suits, plainly though becomingly attired. Hugh views the multitude with stolid indifference, while a sweet smile plays on the lips of his wife. As she stands there, we think of Kaulbach's illustrations of Homer's "Iliad," where Pallas Athene inspires the Greeks to deeds of valor. Nothing is wanting but the aegis, impenetrable to weapons of all kinds, and the helmet crowning the golden locks to complete the picture. Everything else is there, the regal beauty, the wisdom, the courage, the purity and kindness. Indeed, in gazing at her, we hardly know whether we are more strongly tempted to worship or to admire her.

And now her lips open, and amidst a truly breathless silence she says: "My friends, pardon me for interrupting momentarily your round of pleasure in clothes contrasting so disadvantageously with your elegant attire. We arrived only half an hour ago, and had the alternative of missing this gay carnival or appearing in our traveling garments. We chose the latter, pleading necessity as a fair excuse. It is not my desire to impede your floating on the waves of the waltz, but if you will grant me the privilege of explaining shortly our unexpected appearance at this strange hour, I shall be truly grateful to you."

She paused a moment, gazing thoughtfully over the sea of wondering faces watching her with breathless suspense. Perhaps she sensed a scandal, as the pointer his game at a distance. Perhaps it was only the craving for sensational denouements which has become a second nature, especially in that circle of gambling and speculation. At all events, they would sooner have renounced a dozen balls than be cheated out of the promised explanation.

And Caesar?

We shall not attempt to analyze his feelings, but he shivered, as if one cold shower after another were running over him.

Hark! Aurelia begins again:

"I received a letter of invitation for this festival recently, and also a telegram warning me not to come, since my relatives considered me demented and entertained the kind design of subjecting me to a wholesome restraint so necessary in the case of persons thus affected. The letter of invitation had been misrouted, a circumstance preventing my appearance at an earlier period. As to the telegram, my presence here proves conclusively that I disregarded the warning, although I had good reason to consider its information reliable. Perhaps I am demented, but to establish this fact we must first define sanity. If we looked around in the world, especially in the circles to which you, my friends, belong, the best proof of sanity is the chase after the almighty dollar. The keener and more successful this chase, the smarter, the more intelligent, the saner is the individual. If this criterion be true, I certainly am demented, or, as we more commonly say, crazy. Let us see. I suppose most of you know that I possess exactly fifty millions, which I foolishly invested in Vesperia bonds, bringing merely 4 per cent, while I might possibly have realized 10. Surely this is craziness, is it not? My dear brother Caesar considers it so, and I have no doubt that many others present here now share his opinion. But that is not all, nor the worst. With the greater portion of the interest, the same financier would have bought more bonds or speculated to increase his wealth, while I, crazy girl that I am, spent it all. Yes, crazy girl that I am, need not hide your horror at this plain evidence of insanity. If I had given balls costing hundreds of thousands; courtesied Queen Victoria, Emperor William or the Czar of Russia, it would not have got so bad, for I would at least have got the worth of my money, but to squander my hard-earned money on mankind, and, what is worse, on people so far below me in the social scale, is certainly a phenomenon which can only be explained by assumption of mental confusion. I always tried to be a Christian, believing that the doctrine of that creed was about right, but here again my mental incompetence crops out. Instead of donating hundreds of thousands to stately cathedrals and thus gaining the reputation of saintliness in the eyes of the world, I foolishly studied the Bible, and misinterpreting it, of course, I read Jesus' command: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' and was silly enough to imagine he really meant what he said. In accordance with this foolish conviction, I established the Poor Man's Bank, and carried thousands of poor but honest business men over the breakers of commercial panics. I read the parable of the Samaritan, and was crazy enough to imagine that everybody is our neighbor, and that the obligation to be neighborly increases with the distress of our fellow-beings. In accordance with this stupid construction of Jesus' teaching, I sent agents into Arcadia, purchasing large estates in that rich but undeveloped country, with the view and intention of creating homes for the millions of idle and homeless workers roaming over the land, never dreaming that this is wrong; that it is against the delightful system now in vogue, and unquestionably exposes me to the suspicion of insanity. I thought that Jesus meant what he said, when he exclaimed: 'Suffer little children to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' I suffered them to come to me, kissed them, fed them, clothed them, and did other foolish things of that sort which I surely would not have done if I had

been sane, and which only the circumstances of my craziness can explain and excuse. But there are further evidences of insanity which I must not omit. Instead of studying from morning till night how to increase my wealth, as sane persons would have done, I wrote poems, novels and essays, not under my own name, as a sane person would have done, to get the credit, whatever that may be, but under a nom de plume. Here is a note from the White Owl, which I recently received as an acknowledgment of their appreciation of my poetry. It is short, so I will read it: 'Miss Sarah Jane Smith: Dear Madam—Your poem, 'The Flowers,' came duly to hand, and will appear in our next issue. It is certainly some of the finest poetry we ever received, and if you will favor us with more specimens of your genius, we shall be glad to remunerate you handsomely for your time and labor. Yours truly, the White Owl.'

Now, a sane person would have gone on writing, charging a big price for his work, but crazy Aurelia let the opportunity of making money slip, turning to other branches of literature. Here I have a note praising a novel of mine; here a criticism of an essay on "Will Power," which the writer pronounces as one of the best literary efforts of the day; but why go on? Every new illustration of my lamentable waste of my mental aberration. I think I have already proven my assertion; but will add, in conclusion, that I have been so crazy as to marry a man still crazier than I. Here he stands, and I now take the liberty of introducing to you my dear husband, Hugh Jean Teps, the deepest thinker, the greatest philanthropist, the most energetic promulgator of the happiness and prosperity of his fellow-beings. I am done, and shall descend amongst you to shake hands and receive the congratulations of all those inclined to offer them, to say nothing of my desire to kiss my little nephew, with the ardent hope and wish that he may grow up to be as crazy as his poor Aunt Aurelia Teps. Come, Hugh."

Did the speech take?

Well, I never! Where were you all this time? Don't you hear that clapping of hands, that rushing to our friends, to make or renew their acquaintance? It was the biggest ovation of the season, but this chapter is also the longest of our tale, so we shall request you to look around for yourself, as we must lower the curtain on this scene.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Resume—Five Years Later.

Five years later! What a short period, and yet what a change! Reader, look sharp, or you'll lose your way. Isn't this Saratoga? Yes, but they call it Santa Sara now. Sounds better, don't it? Well, we think so, too; but what a change! Instead of the three or four factories which we knew, there are at least twenty now.

The tanning of hides into leather has assumed truly gigantic proportions. A good deal of it is worked up here into all kinds of leather goods; but quite a quantity is shipped into the northern states, and also east, although not by direct route per railway, the transcontinental lines keeping up their suicidal policy of spite and malice.

All goods capable of enduring a lengthy transportation are taken to the seashore, to load one of the many ocean steamers Arcadia owns. The state has several fine harbors, and from there a lively commerce is kept up with the Asiatic countries, Eastern Siberia being one of her best customers.

Millions of cents of wheat and hundreds of thousands of barrels of flour find their way here, as well as to China and Japan, and wherever there is a chance for exchange of goods, this practice is maintained. The diagonal lines of railway planned by Paul have been completed, and others are now in progress of construction, to say nothing of the many smaller electric roads running in every direction, and being fed by the electricity produced at Santa Sara.

The lake of Gorgeville, and several mountain streams, feed a fine ship canal running first west to Giordana and thence northwest to Blumet Sound, and almost all the grain and flour is shipped that way, to say nothing of the millions of acres of fertile soil made useful that way. Fully one hundred thousand workers have taken up their abode in Arcadia during this period, making the increase in population fully two hundred thousand, if not more.

At first the hours of labor were eight, but during the last year they have been reduced to seven, while the day's wages have been raised from \$2 to \$2.50 with the fair prospect of a further reduction of the time of labor to six hours, and an increase of the wages to \$3. If we take into consideration that the people buy all products of the state at wholesale prices, these wages assume quite different proportions from those to which we are accustomed.

Only foreign luxuries, as tea, coffee, and triple spirits retain nearly their former high price. Tobacco is but little used, and the daily increasing intelligence of the people will probably put an early end to this injurious habit.

Both wine and beer are made in the state, the former forming an article of export, but since the state controls the sale of these liquors, and no saloons for retail are in existence, very little, if any, intemperance is seen in Arcadia.

It is natural to suppose that the salutary influence of the new order of things should make itself felt even in the neighboring states; but this influence for good was much greater than was anticipated by its warmest advocates. Even at the end of the second year, Felicia, Desideria, Concordia and Harmonia began to clamor for a share of the Crusaders, and at the time of our general review every one of them rivaled with Arcadia in progress and development.

Nor was this all. At first the influence of the movement on the East had been merely negative, relieving it of that unemployed surplus population calculated to deteriorate the morals of a community.

Want of employment brings poverty and degradation. So when the unemployed were shipped west by thousands the East felt as if an oppressive burden had been taken from its shoulders, and it began to breathe more freely.

After a while, however, when reports of the universal prosperity flew thick and thick, the people of the East began to argue and say: "What is good for the goose, is good for the gander. What benefits Arcadia is very likely to benefit us. Would it not be wise to make an effort in that line?"

As yet the money power has succeeded in killing all attempts of that sort in the germ, but the time is undoubtedly near at hand when the clamor of the people can no longer be hushed. The workmen have the majority, so if they use their rights judiciously, they can very soon compel a change of the constitution of the entire country in the proper direction.

And our friends? Well, they are happy, and of happy people as little is to be said as of happy nations. They live in Santa Sara, and Hugh and Paul superintend the work in two of the leading factories of the place. Aurelia is the mother of two children, a boy of four and a girl of two, but she is as poor as ever, Marianne having to sew on buttons not only for her now, but for the little ones, too. Paul, the boy, always has patches at his elbows and his knees, and will probably continue to sport them as long as his mamma is crazy enough to interpret the teachings of Jesus as she does.

At first the relation of the Teps and the Croesus family ease was somewhat strained, but recently Caesar has made advances which will probably lead to a greater intimacy. The reason is probably the sudden death of Crassus Ego, who was assassinated in his house by a burglar whose kind intention of relieving the millionaire of a portion of his burden failed to meet with the approbation of the latter. We feel sure that Caesar will profit by the object lessons he cannot profit receiving in Arcadia. Will you, reader?

THE END.

DEATH OF ELEANOR MARX.

In a short statement on the suicide of Mrs. Eleanor Marx Aveling, Mr. Robert Banner of the city council of Woolwich, one of her oldest Socialist friends, says that it has been supposed that she may have been driven to take this step by extreme nervous exhaustion (nervous prostration) brought on by the severe physical strain in nursing Dr. Edward Aveling during his recent illness. But that this could not have led her to end her life in desperation, as it did not prevent her from continuing her collection of material for the preface to a work of her father's now in print.

Neither were financial difficulties the cause, although the greater part of the fortune left to her by Frederic Engels had been squandered. For in a letter (placed at the disposal of the writer, Mr. Banner), dated Feb. 20, '98, she says with regard to this matter: "I can get on anyway."

The following statements, however, are absolute facts with regard to the last hour of Eleanor Marx:

1. That she did not absolutely decide to commit suicide until the morning of the fatal day, March 31, 1898.

2. That on the said morning, E. M. received a letter, which, according to the statement of one who has read the same, "puts a certain person in a bad light."

3. That Dr. E. Aveling, who lived with E. M. as her husband, swore at the inquest that the deceased had repeatedly threatened to commit suicide, and had proposed that they should commit suicide together.

4. That E. M. ordered the poison while Dr. A. was still in the house.

5. That E. M. received the poison while Dr. A. was in the house.

6. That E. M. carried the poison and the book of the druggist requiring receipt of same, as the English law demands, in the room where Dr. A. was, and there signed the same.

7. That the aforesaid facts were not brought to account at the inquest.

8. That E. M., as Dr. A. admitted at the inquest, was opposed to his going out that day.

9. That E. M., before she took the poison, wrote a letter to her lawyer, Arewalt, in which the names of differing persons are mentioned, that E. M. enclosed in this letter the above mentioned letter, received that morning, and addressed the same to her lawyer.

10. That the two aforesaid letters, after the inquest, were handed to Dr. A. by the coroner, Leichenbercher.

11. That the letter intended for her lawyer and directed to the same was not forwarded to him.

COLONIZATION DEPARTMENT

CYRUS FIELD WILLARD, EDITOR
COLONIZATION COMMISSION—COL. RICHARD J. HUNTON, Chairman.
W. P. BORLAND, Treasurer. CYRUS FIELD WILLARD, Secretary.

REPORT OF RECEIPTS.

Amount previously acknowledged	\$2,422.72
J. H. Grannis	3.00
A. H. W.	1.00
Chas. Anderson, No. 2 of Pa.	1.00
C. C. Janney	1.00
Ed. Ehrlich	1.00
John Plummer, No. 9 of Ohio	2.25
Total	\$2,431.97
By error in footing	1.30
Total receipts to date	\$2,430.67

W. P. Borland, Treasurer.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received letters from several places, which bear no name or address. They ask for certain information which can only be given by mail. The letters could not be printed, because they are written on both sides of the paper. We call the attention of our comrades to this rule, and insist that they should observe it. The volume of correspondence is such that it is sometimes necessary to print letters in order to answer them, rather than answer them personally. Correspondents will please bear this fact in mind that they must write only on one side of the paper, and use pen and ink when so doing.

PURPOSES OF COLONIZATION.

The following copy of the charter of the Co-operative Commonwealth Company shows conclusively that this company is organized for agricultural purposes as well as mining. It is a copy of the official charter on file in the office of the secretary of state of Kansas, and will do more to refute misstatements and misrepresentations than any other document.

Read it carefully:

CHARTER OF THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH COMPANY.

The undersigned citizens of the state of Kansas do hereby voluntarily associate ourselves together for the purpose of forming a private corporation under the laws of the state of Kansas, and do hereby certify:

FIRST.—That the name of this corporation shall be The Co-operative Commonwealth Company.

SECOND.—That the objects and purposes for which this corporation is formed are as follows, to-wit:

The encouragement of agriculture and horticulture.

To acquire and own land in different states for the purpose of locating colonists and their families thereon and enable them to earn a living from agriculture and other industries by and through their own co-operative efforts.

To purchase seed tools, live stock, machinery and all other articles or things that may be necessary to improve or cultivate any lands of this corporation to the end that all manner of crops and domestic animals may be produced therefrom, and all kinds of fruit and trees may be grown thereon for the use and benefit of said colonists.

To erect such buildings as may be required for the use, comfort or enjoyment of said colonists.

To erect, equip, operate any and all factories necessary to supply said colonists and their families with food, clothing, shelter or any of the necessities or comforts of life, and transport and distribute all such products for the benefit and convenience of the colonists aforesaid.

To acquire, construct and operate dams, flumes, ditches, canals, water-works and all other things necessary, either to supply said colonists with water for any and all purposes, including the irrigation of the lands of this corporation, or to improve any water-power or water-powers needed to facilitate the industry of said colonists.

To install and operate a printing plant or plants and do a general printing and publishing business.

To establish and maintain a hotel or hotels for the use and convenience of said colonists and others.

To construct and operate warehouses, elevators and granaries for the use and convenience of said colonists.

To own and operate iron, coal, lead, copper, gold and silver mines and mines of any or all other metals or minerals and all quarries of stone and beds of clay and wells of oil or salt that may be needed to supply the needs of said colonists.

To transact any manufacturing, mining, mechanical, chemical, mercantile and produce business that may be needed or necessary to supply the wants or provide for the comfort or convenience of said colonists.

To own, sell, transfer or otherwise dispose of land, surplus crops, animals or any product of labor that may be required for the use of said colonists.

And generally to do and perform all matters and things and to engage in all business of production and distribution which may have for its object the providing of food, clothing, shelter, education and enjoyment for said colonists.

THIRD.

That the places where its business is to be transacted are at Topeka, Kansas, and at such other places as the board of directors may from time to time designate.

FOURTH.

That the term for which this corporation is to exist is fifty years.

FIFTH.

That the number of directors of this corporation shall be twelve.

SIXTH.

That the amount of the capital stock of this corporation shall be two millions five hundred thousand dollars and shall be divided into two hundred fifty thousand shares of ten dollars each.

In testimony whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names this thirtieth day of April, A. D. 1898.

WM. STRYKER,
WM. E. BUSH,
G. C. CLEMENS,
W. P. BORLAND,
C. F. WILLARD.

State of Kansas, Shawnee County, ss. Personally appeared before me, a notary public, in and for Shawnee county, Kansas, the above named Wm. Stryker, William E. Bush and G. C. Clemens, who are personally known to me to be the same persons who executed the foregoing instrument of writing, and duly acknowledged the execution of the same.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my notarial seal this 13th day of April, A. D. 1898.

(Notarial Seal.) A. P. SHREVE,
Notary Public.
My commission expires 26th of January, 1901.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Cyrus Field Willard, Secretary of the Colonization Commission S. D. A.

Dear Brother:—Received the acceptance of my application for membership in the co-operative army and am enthusiastic at the prospect of soon being at work with comrades for common good. It was an oversight on my part to fail to mention my specialty in electrical work. I spent three years in the manufacture of light and power apparatus and five years installing and operating the same.

The colonization plan is growing in favor. Five of the most active, intelligent and skilled members of Massachusetts Branch No. 3, besides myself, have the colonization fever and look forward with eagerness to the time when they can cast in their lot with their comrades, not only to find security for themselves, but as a means of forcing this outside competitive world upon a Socialistic basis. When, after a few years of successful colony life, and we shall succeed, members write home of their security and contentment, the slaves of competition will be powerfully drawn toward Socialism and will strive energetically to throw off competition either by colonization or by the ballot. We can awaken interest and make Socialists by a grand successful colonization movement, such as we are now ready to devote our lives to, and I believe no other method will be so effective.

Two of the five members above mentioned are college graduates, having taken mechanical engineering courses. The others are machinists. Two of us have worked wood to some extent, one as a pattern maker and the other cabinet maker and house building. And there is not a man of them but what will be glad to work where he is most needed, feeling that it is to his own profit as well as to the profit of his comrades that he should do so. Men will be less selfish about the particular nature of their occupation when they are assured that by doing service for their fellows in any department of labor they will receive as good compensation as their fellows in any other department of labor.

We approve of the bond issue, which some have criticized, because we believe it is essential to secure the capital needed and to securing the land and other holdings to the collectivity. We approve of the deliberations of the commission having charge of so great an interest. Any other course must have brought disaster, and yet we hope we may not have much longer to wait.

We have faith in our power to produce wealth co-operatively; to pay the interest on our bonds, and very shortly to pay the principal also. The question has already been asked by some, and it appeals to me as well as them. What provision is made for the families of pioneers? They would be an encumbrance in the promised land for some little time after a start was made, and if a pioneer leaves them behind are they to be dependent upon charity, upon the pioneers' accumulated millions, or are they to be provided for by the trustees until such time as they can be brought into the colony?

These points needs to be determined at once, for there are some that would be pioneers whose families are dependent upon their every day's work, and when the pioneers depart they are without support. In all such cases the support should come from the colony's funds, for the colony reaps the benefit. With the number of pioneers limited, the amount and duration of support also limited, the draft upon the treasury would not be excessive. The matter of transportation is also awakening discussion. We trust you will be able to enlighten us upon these matters at no very distant date.

With great appreciation of the work of the commission, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
C. W. WHITE.

Winchester, Mass.

In reply to the above inquiries as to the support of pioneers we would say, as has been announced in these columns heretofore, it is intended that, as far as practicable, the pioneers who are selected shall be single men without families dependent upon them. Where it is necessary for those having families to be engaged as pioneers, provision will be made in the colony for their support so that they need not be separated. As is stated in the above letter, support should come from the colony, for the colony reaps the benefit.

It is likewise proposed, so far as practicable, to select those as pioneers who are able to pay their own transportation to the colony site, and as fast as others are needed, to make the colony a success, arrangements will be made to provide for their transportation to the colony, if it is deemed that their services are absolutely essential for the colony's success.

Arrangements will also be made through branches who have selected pioneers that they will pay the expenses of their pioneers and transport-

ation. We would suggest that the branches proceed to accumulate a fund for that purpose, which shall be kept separate and devoted to that special end.

"CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS."

We are opposed to the idea that this is a class struggle.

We ridicule the idea of class-consciousness, and say: Is self-consciousness, another term for selfishness.

We believe in the solidarity of the human race and declare for the brotherhood of humanity.

Those who believe in the class-conscious error admit that the millionaire, as well as the tramp, is the victim of and subservient to the present system. We war against the system and not against individuals or classes.

We preach no class war. It is unscientific. The German Socialists in the reichstag are led by men of the so-called upper classes.

Socialism means truth, light and liberation for discouraged humanity. It means for all humanity and not a single class. We stand for the release of the millionaire from the joyless slavery of money getting and the insensate folly of fashion's servitude.

We stand also for the release of the worker from grinding drudgery and starvation and the securing to him of the full results of his labor-product.

We stand for the economic emancipation and freedom of all men and women under the collective ownership and democratic administration of the means of production and distribution.

Standing for all men, we condemn the class-conscious propaganda as a delusion and a snare as being not only ineffective, but totally untrue.

Wendell Phillips was not a negro, neither was a proletarian. Liebnicht and Singer in Germany are not wage-workers. LaSalle and Marx both were lawyers. Engels was a rich man, etc., etc.

I know the assistant cashier of one of the greatest banks in Chicago, who always votes the Socialist ticket, while his wife is an ardent Socialist of unquestioned sincerity, who held the flag of Socialism aloft with unshrinking bravery in the dark days after '36, when Socialists were few and far between in Chicago. I know of another Socialist, once a machinist, who, by his own exertions and talents, has become a prominent lawyer, who is likewise a well known Socialist and preaches the class struggle.

Yet, in these three instances, their own personal examples demonstrate the fallacy of their argument and show if it were a class-struggle they could not be engaged in it on the side they are now taking.

These cases could be cited and multiplied to a great extent if need be. It is not to show that this is not a class-struggle and the talk of "class-consciousness" is mere rot.

We struggle against a system and not a class. We condemn no capitalist individual, as the chances are we would do the same were we in his position.

We point out the injustice of the present system and call attention to its inevitable decay and transition into a nobler and better system.

We show that evolution has brought the competitive system into a system of combination known as trusts, and that the next system is the modification of the trust system so that the people may receive the benefits instead of a few, and we invite those whose talents have built up enormous fortunes for their own benefit to devote these talents to the service of the people and thus become public benefactors.

We recognize society as an organism. Any effort that would split that organism into two parts or two classes must inevitably destroy the organism. This organism must be recognized as an organic unity. It stands for the solidarity of the human race. Any effort to start a class cry is inherently unscientific and contrary to observed facts.

Such a cry can only be started by a Socialist and not a scientist.

"Class-consciousness" is a weak party shibboleth inaugurated by half-educated men who have not carefully surveyed the whole field and seen the contradiction in the other idea that it is the system that Socialism attacks and not a class.

Freedom, economic, intellectual, religious and political, is what all men and all classes of men want.

That is what Socialism demands. Socialism does not postulate that all the poor are good and all the rich are bad. It admits that there are good rich men and bad poor men. Napoleon was poor when he started, while John D. Rockefeller was a store-porter, and all the trust magnates of today began life as poor men.

Socialism seeks to unite all who desire a better system, be they rich or poor, in one grand army marching on to victory, to a successful replacement of the present system by a nobler and better system.

The new system, we believe, will grow up within the old as the result of evolutionary forces with human mental processes, acting, reacting and interacting one on the other.

"Class-consciousness" is the street that leads to the guillotine. It arouses class-hatred. It is false, it is pernicious, it is ineffective, it is reactionary. It produces the man on horseback. Let us have no more of it.

In its stead let us preach the solidarity of the race, the brotherhood of man. Let us insist that the evolutionary tendencies toward collective ownership be recognized. Let us show to the organized Trade Unions that we are striking for the whole instead of a part, as they do.

Let us insist that we shall be treated as men and brothers, and not as members of a class, and we shall make greater progress in Socialism than ever before.

We stand for collective ownership, not class-ownership. Each and every man to share in the collective ownership and administration of the means of production and distribution. This being the case, let us stamp on the "class-conscious" nonsense at every turn.

Let us hold aloft the nobler ideal of the solidarity of the race and the brotherhood of all humanity.

CYRUS FIELD WILLARD.

MR. DOOL WANTS AN ARMY OF MULES.

"I see," said Mr. Dooley, "the first great land battle in the war has been fought."

"Where was that?" demanded Mr. Hennessy with great excitement. "Lord save us, but where was that?"

"The Alger byrds," said Mr. Dooley, "bruk frum th' coral where they had thim tied up atn' whistles an' med a desprate charge on th' camp at Tampa. They daycended like a whur-ri-wind, drivin' th' astonished throops before thim an' thim charged bak again, com-pletin' thim earned iv destruction. At th' las' account th' brave sojers was climbin' threes an' tilygract poles an' a r'giment iv mules was kickin' the pink silk linin' out iv the officers' quarters. Th' gallant mules was be a most courageous jacksass, an' 'tis understhood that me frind Mack will appint him a brigadier-gin'ral jus' as soon as he can find out who his father is. 'Tis too bad he'll have no childer to perpetuate th' fame iv him. He went through th' camp at th' head iv his throops iv mules without castin' a shoe. He's th' biggest jacksass in Tampa today, not icceptin' th' einvor, an' I doubt if they's a bigger wen in Wash-inton, though I eud name a few that eud thry a rice with him. Anyhow, they'll know how to reward him. They know a jacksass when they see wan, an' they see a good many in that peaceful city."

"Th' charge iv Tampa'll go into histhry as th' first land action iv th' war. An' be th' way, Hinnessy, if th' here sociable is fr' to go on at th' prisit rate, I'm str'ong to ar-rm th' wild ar-rmy mules an' the unbridled jacksasses iv th' pe-rary an' give thim a chanst to set Cuba free. Up to this time th' on'y hero kill on th' Spanish side was a jacksass that poked an ear above th' batteries at Matanzas fr' to hear what was goin' on. 'Behold,' says Sampson, 'th' insolence iv th' foe,' he says. 'For-rm in line iv battle an' you hur-r death an' destruction at you Castilian gin'ral.' Wait,' says an officer. 'It may be wan iv our own men. It looks like th' secret iv—' 'Hush,' says th' commander. 'It can't be an American jacksass, or he'd speak,' he says. 'Fire on him.' Shot after shot fell round th' intrepid ass, but he remained firm till th' dinnymite boat Vesoooyus fired three hundred an' forty

