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LEWIS’ FIRST SPEECH

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Barnard, Ladies and Gentlemen:

For the purposes of this debate I shall define science and scientific Socialism. Then I shall make an extended statement as to what these two things are and endeavor to establish a harmonious relationship between them. In defining science I shall follow Herbert Spencer, who speaks of it as “knowledge of a high order of generality,” i.e., a knowledge of those great generalizations which constitute the highest achievements of modern science. Scientific Socialism has already been defined by Frederick Engels, the illustrious colleague of Karl Marx, as being “the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement.” This theoretical expression was first presented systematically in the writings of Karl Marx, and throughout this debate I shall use the terms “Scientific Socialism” and “Marxian Socialism” as being identical.

What is science, and how is scientific knowledge obtained? The chief methods of science are three: observation, experiment, and reflection or reasoning. In order that we may observe, there must be something to be observed. To experiment, we must experiment with something. To reason and reflect, something must be reasoned about. This something which we observe, experiment with, and on, is that great mass of facts supplied by the universe about us, and of which we form a part. Neither the facts themselves nor our knowledge of them constitute science. A man might be a walking encyclopedia and carry in his brain a tabulation of all the facts ever discovered without possessing the scientific spirit. Science consists of all those great generalizations or laws which underlie the facts, which co-ordi-
This man was not the first to gain an inkling of this truth. He was preceded by an Italian, Vico. Vico was followed by the Frenchman, Montesquieu. The theories of these culminated in the work of an Englishman, Buckle, and Buckle may be regarded as the forerunner of the real founder of the theory. Buckle's “History of Civilization in England” is one of the world's great books, just because it devotes an entire chapter to this great problem of the foundations of society. Buckle believed that we must seek the explanation of the differences between one society and another in the physical characters of the country in which the particular society existed. He considered climate, fertility of soil, rivers, mountains, seaboard, geological deposits, and other geographical and topographical characters as the chief factors determining the social structure. As an example of his ingenious reasoning we may take his attempt to explain the lower wages of southern countries as being due to the warmer climate. He maintained that carbonaceous foods which are necessary in a cold climate are dearer than nitrogenous foods which yield sufficient nourishment in warm countries. Buckle achieved immortality, not because he solved the problem, but because he made serious and scientific progress toward its solution. Almost every succeeding scholar has conceded that Buckle moved in the right direction. He sought to base the science of society on known facts, on material factors the existence of which could not be disputed, not on ghosts and other figments of the savage imagination.

In one important particular, however, Buckle's theory completely fails. It is absolutely impossible to explain the "changes" of society by means of his factors. For example, France, in all Buckle's factors, has been practically the same for 2,000 years. Its mountains and rivers have not changed, its sea-board is of the same extent. Its geological deposits, the fertility of its soil, and its climate have remained constant. Yet during that period French society has undergone several complete transformations. It is one of the simplest laws of logic that changing effects cannot be ascribed to a constant cause. If French society had depended for its structure on these factors of Buckle, it must have remained the same so long as the factors did not change. It was therefore necessary to discover some new factor to explain social changes. This new factor which completed the theory was the discovery of Karl Marx.

In the development of this, the important factor, Marx was thoroughly in harmony with the biological science of his day. The biologist recognizes hunger as the greatest dynamic force in the organic world. The method by which an animal obtains its food and the kind of food it consumes has always been regarded by the biologist as of prime importance. Marx maintained that this was quite as true of a society as of an animal. The real history of society consisted for him in the development of the processes by which society produced and distributed the wealth necessary to its continued existence. These processes Marx held to constitute the foundation of any society. Upon this foundation the entire superstructure of the social order was erected. When a new process was discovered and introduced, it ultimately resulted in a transformation of society in all its parts. Society began a new epoch in its career when it adopted a new process of production because that new process in its turn developed new laws, new political institutions, new social relations, new schools of literature, new social customs, new modes of thought—in brief, a new society. Be it observed, however, that Marx never regarded his theory as antagonistic to the views of Buckle. On the contrary, he was careful to include Buckle's factors in his own philosophy. He maintained, however, that among the various material factors constituting the roots of society the economic factor was the most important.

It will be impossible, for lack of time, in my opening speech to apply this to any large number of the great facts of Columbus. Columbus
did not, as we believed in our school days, venture on unknown seas in the mere spirit of romance. The causes which led to that memorable voyage were almost purely economic. In the middle ages that European country which commanded the trade of India and the Spice Islands of the Orient became, as a consequence, the greatest European power because the Indian trade was the principal trade of the period. Spain had been shut out of the trade routes to India and her one chance of supremacy lay in the discovery of some new route to the East. All political philosophers recognize that the political greatness of a country hangs on its commerce. Columbus found opposition to his scheme, not because the end in view was undervalued, but because his opponents regarded that end as unattainable. Portugal owed her succeeding greatness to the fact that Vasca De Gama reached the Indies by the circumnavigation of Africa, while the voyages of Columbus found an impassable barrier in the American continents which were stretched across his path.

This economic theory applied to the same group of facts explains the fall of the Venetian empire. Venice, by reason of a treaty with the Sultan of Egypt, had a monopoly of the Red Sea route to India, but as this Red Sea route involved a change of cargo at the strip of land which has since been opened by the Suez Canal, and was also handicapped by the heavy taxes levied by the Egyptian Sultan, it was altogether inferior to the all-sea route discovered by De Gama and the later one by Magellan. This resulted in the loss to Venice of the Oriental trade. As a consequence of this economic change, the great Venetian empire crumbled in a day and passed into history. If time permitted it would be easy to show how all the great transformations of history find their explanation in economic causes.

This doctrine of the economic interpretation of history is only one of the theories which constitute the Socialist philosophy. The rest are as follows: the labor theory of value and surplus value; the doctrine of the class struggle; the concentration of capital; the disappearance of the middle class; the increasing exploitation of the working class; the overproduction theory of panics; the necessity for political action; and, finally, a social revolution by the working class.

Among Socialist writers there is a difference of opinion as to which doctrine should follow the first in the order of statement and treatment, some of them considering that the class struggle should come second. On this question, however, I agree with Robert Rives La Monte, who gives the second place to the theory of value and surplus value, and regards the class struggle as naturally and logically flowing from this.

If we were considering class struggles in general I should reverse La Monte's order, as class struggles are as old as written history, while the doctrine of value and surplus value is limited to capitalist society. In this debate, however, I shall confine myself mainly to the particular class struggle now existing, unless Mr. Barnard challenges me to do otherwise. The class struggle, as I will show, logically follows from the doctrine of value and surplus value because it grows out of the exploitation of labor by that process. As Mr. Barnard agrees with Marx that value is determined by labor, I shall only consider this theory in so far as it is necessary to show its relation to the theories which follow.

The labor theory of value was held by Adam Smith. It was still further developed by David Ricardo. In the hands of Smith and Ricardo the theory contained an insoluble contradiction. This contradiction led Smith and Ricardo to argue in a vicious circle from which there seemed to be no escape.

Ricardo held that the value of labor was equal to the value of the commodities produced by labor. According to this, the value of 12 hours of labor would be equal to the commodities produced during the 12 hours of working time. As Ricardo believed that labor was normally bought by the capitalist at its proper value, this could only mean
that the laborer, in selling his labor, would be paid by an equivalent to the value of the product of his labor. The English Socialists of Ricardo's day naturally demanded that Ricardo explain why the laborer who theoretically received all that he produced did not also receive it in actual practice. To this problem Ricardo had no answer. The answer was furnished by Marx in the doctrine of surplus value.

Marx denied the existence of any such thing as "value of labor" just as he denied "the productivity of capital." These phrases, he contended, were misleading forms of speech. What the capitalist buys is not labor, but the power to labor—labor power. In capitalist society the value of labor power is determined, not by what labor power produces when expended in the workshop, but by what it costs to produce and reproduce the labor power itself. Labor power is human energy. It is generated by the consumption of food, clothing, shelter, recreation, etc. The sum total of these things constitutes the cost of living. The average price of labor power—wages—will therefore always approximate the cost of living.

The difference between what it costs the laborer to live and what his labor power produces in commodities during his working time constitutes the income of the exploiting class. For illustration, we may say that if the laborer works 12 hours, the first six hours may be supposed to yield his wages. This Marx calls "necessary value." It is "necessary" because it is necessary to the reproduction of the laborer, or labor power. The wealth produced during the remaining six hours is "surplus value"; it is a surplus value above what returns to the laborer in the form of wages. This surplus is appropriated by the owners of capital; it constitutes the source, and the only source of unearned wealth. Out of this surplus value bankers receive their interest and landlords derive their rent. No reform which leaves this surplus value untouched could materially improve the condition of the working class.

The line which divides the total value into "necessary" and "surplus" is not fixed. The working class organizes its labor unions, and, by collective bargaining and labor trusts, is able to raise the price of labor power and move the line so as to increase "necessary" value at the expense of the "surplus" value. The capitalists respond with manufacturers' associations and citizens' alliances, crippling the unions, and move the line back again, increasing surplus value at the expense of necessary value. This struggle to move the line back and forth constitutes the class struggle as manifested in the activities of the labor union.

In the ranks of the working class there is a large sprinkling of men and women who perceive that the only reason why the capitalist class is able to appropriate surplus value at all is that they own the process of production itself. As a result of this knowledge this ever-increasing body of workers, who are the cream of the intelligence of their class, proposes to abolish the capitalist ownership of the mode of production and substitute social ownership. Here the class struggle takes the revolutionary form—a struggle to change the economic base of society so as to abolish classes and class institutions altogether.

Marx undertook to show how this would be accomplished as a result of the natural and logical development of capitalist society. He maintained that capitalist society would go to pieces, not because it ought to, not because it was bad or unjust, but of its own inherent forces. Marx never introduced ethical considerations into political economy. He held that capitalism would dig its own grave and bury itself by the development of principles and forces already in operation.

One of the principles working in this direction, according to Marx, is the concentration of wealth. He believed that the large capitalists would devour the smaller, consequently capital would fall into the possession of fewer and fewer individuals. Thus an industrial plutocracy would be developed at the ex-
pense of the middle class of small independent capitalists, whom he regarded as doomed to disappear. Some of these small capitalists would become members of the plutocracy, others would be driven into the ranks of the proletariat. Concentration of capital and the disappearance of the middle class are but two different statements of the same process, which process is an integral part of the Marxian prognosis. This prophecy has already been partially fulfilled, the balance is being carried out before our eyes. The independent middle class has largely disappeared, and what is left is rapidly following in its steps. I am willing to concede that Marx was mistaken in his measurement of the time necessary for the completion of the process. Marx had this mistake in common with all other men who have undertaken to predict the future. The prophets of new eras and millenniums have always erred in this regard. This question, however, as to whether it would take 20, 50 or 100 years is not a matter that invalidates his philosophy.

Another of the processes, which in the estimation of Marx renders the disappearance of the bourgeois civilization inevitable, is the increasing misery of the working class. Among Socialists themselves there is some debate as to whether the actual condition of the working class in the absolute has improved or deteriorated. This, of course, is an important question, but whichever position is correct the fundamental difficulty still remains. Even if I should concede, for the sake of the argument, that the workers in the absolute enjoy an improved condition, it cannot be disputed that their condition as compared with the condition of the ruling class, is worse than it ever was in the past. The productivity of labor has been incalculably increased. Any part of the increase which may have gone to the laborer is so insignificant as to furnish a controversy about its existence. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that all, or almost all, of the benefit of social progress has been appropriated by the owners of capital.

If, for example, 20 years ago a laborer produced $5 worth of wealth by his labor and received $2 in wages, while today he produces $10 worth of wealth and receives, let us suppose, $3 in wages, he would, nevertheless, in spite of the actual increase, have suffered an increase of exploitation of from $3 to $7. This continual increase in the ratio of exploitation means that the gulf between capital and labor grows wider and wider; social inequalities become more pronounced, and as social inequalities are the root of misery and discontent, and the source from which springs the revolutionary spirit, their continual increase must inevitably end in a social revolution. Marx did not pin his faith to any one specific cause of the collapse of capitalism. He showed that there were many factors, all making in the same direction, and that these combined rendered its break-up inevitable.

Another economic contradiction which makes capitalism a house divided against itself is the panic. Recent critics of Marx have endeavored to overthrow his explanation of the causes of panics. According to these critics Marx attributed panics to anarchy in production. A great host of small capitalists are producing blindly in the dark, with no way of measuring the market, no method of estimating their own total production, and therefore no system of regulating the volume of production in relation to the demand. These critics insist that this condition ceases with the appearance of the trust. The trust controls and regulates production, and, being in close touch with the market, is well acquainted with the strength of the demand. Thus the trusts are able to prevent that overproduction which, according to Marx, is the cause of the panics. So confident of their position were these European critics that they ventured to predict that panics would disappear with the 19th century. Everybody knows how completely this prophecy was shattered.

That which has broken down is, not the Marxian theory of panics, but a misunderstanding of that theory set up by its critics. Marx
never regarded “anarchy of production” as the sole cause, or even the chief cause of, panics. In his estimation it was only a contributory factor. The chief cause of panics in the Marxian theoretical system is the dual position of the laborer: first, as a producer of commodities, and, second, as a purchaser of the commodities he has produced. As a result of his being exploited by the process of surplus value there is a gap between his producing power and his purchasing power, and this gap is the root cause of panics. Panics are those convulsions produced in the social body in an effort to throw off the mass of commodities which labor has produced but has no opportunity to assimilate. Not only is it impossible for the trusts to reduce this gap, but, in the very nature of things, they are obliged to constantly increase its width. Hence, instead of the abolition of the panic, we may look for its periodical repetition with increasing certainty.

According to this reasoning, the foundation on which the exploitation of labor by surplus value, the increasing exploitation of the working class, and the continual recurrence of panics all rest is the ownership of the process of production by the capitalist class. The solution of the social problem, according to Marx, can only be found in the abolition of the class ownership of the process of production. The question of how this is to be accomplished is the first task that presents itself to the mind which desires the emancipation of labor. The supreme problem is the abolition of capital property.

The capitalists, however, are powerfully entrenched. The title deeds to their property are lodged with the state. The state stands ready at all times to exert all its forces in the protection of these title deeds. The policeman and the soldier stand ever ready at the call of capital should the exploited laborer show symptoms of revolt. The entire juridical system is at his disposal and he may have all the injunctions his interests require. This state, which constitutes the capitalists’ chief bulwark, is a political institution. Its capture by the proletariat must be the first step toward ultimate victory. With this end in view, the workingmen and women who understand this philosophy create a political organization which has for its object: first, the capture of the class state, and, finally, its abolition, to make way for an industrial democracy.

We now come to the last question under debate. That question is, Who shall accomplish this revolution? In the estimate of Marx the working class alone would be equal to this task. It is not denied that they will recruit from other classes. The history of the Socialist party up to this date is conclusive evidence of this. The dynamic forces of the revolution, however, reside in the working class. Their exploitation supplies the motive and their consequent rebellion must be the instrument.

This working class in past history has fought everybody’s battle but his own, and we are surely not expecting too much when we believe it will be equally ready to carry its own cause to victory. With the development of bourgeois civilization the working class increasingly becomes the one class essential to the maintenance and continuance of society. The capitalist class, on the contrary, becomes more and more parasitic, therefore less and less necessary, and, as a consequence, it is rapidly losing its virility. In the language of Hegel, its reality depended on its necessity, and both are consequently disappearing together. If all the big capitalists in the world were dropped into the middle of the Pacific Ocean the process of production and distribution would continue as serenely as if these gentlemen had never existed. With the disappearance of their economic utility all justification of their political power vanishes.

In the language of the brilliant Italian, Achille Loria: “While the capitalist class is pursuing its downward course, the working classes, tempered by hard labor and bitter struggles, are gaining every day in intellectual and moral capacity, and acquiring in constantly increasing
measure the qualities that will ultimately fit them to rule. Thus at the moment when the economic basis is being disturbed on which the political authority of the bourgeois has so long reposed, we see also the gradual disappearance of the conditions of intellectual superiority which originally justified their dictatorship. Hence the necessity of wresting political authority from a plutocracy which is sinking into senile atrophy. Bourgeois hands are no longer able to wield political power, and it must therefore be committed to the younger and more vigorous representatives now called on to lead the human race to a higher destiny."

BARNARD'S FIRST REPLY

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lewis, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In his opening remarks Mr. Lewis gave you a definition of science; at the beginning of my speech I wish to call your attention to the difference between sociology, the science of society, and certain other sciences. In a discussion in the field of chemistry an experiment will at once settle most problems, all that is required to determine the issues between the debaters being the necessary chemicals and a suitable place in which to experiment; in a controversy in the field of mathematics a few calculations will make it clear who is right, the differences between those who are disputing dissipating themselves in the fire of exact inquiry; and so it is with many other sciences which might be mentioned: their foundations are easily accessible, their proofs are such as can be estimated and weighed at first hand, and their conclusions being but slightly dependent on the element of time for their demonstration, are the more certain.

With the science of sociology all is different; in building up the science of human association the history of society throughout its long past must be known and digested thoroughly, not only in a general way, but in relation to its several eras, conditions and epochs; the present character of that society must be well understood in all its peculiarities, and in relation to that long past, and this knowledge of past and present must furnish the principal foundations of any prophecy which is uttered respecting the future. Now, sociology is an extremely difficult science because of the difficulty of gathering its materials: the element of time, the remoteness of the circumstances involved in many matters of great moment, the doubtful value of much historic data, and, equally important, the psychological factor involved, making its work the most painstaking and exhaustive, the most elaborate and wide-reaching, and perhaps the least certain, of all the sciences. The psychological factor alone, the influence of the mental and emotional parts of man on his development, presents problems which have made the conclusions of many a "sociologist" seem open to the gravest doubt; and now this psychological factor is taking on greater and greater importance as it is studied, till we are likely to see it take a first place in the sociology written in the immediate future.

Mr. Lewis has stated a certain position clearly enough, but as the burden of proof always rests on the advocate of a teaching or theory, he should, I think, have spent less time in telling us what Marx taught, and devoted himself to the work of proving that Marx was correct in his teachings. We do not need enlightening so much in respect to what Marx believed as we do in respect to what evidences Mr. Lewis has to offer in justification of his declaration that Marxian Socialism is scientific.

An examination of the speech to which this of mine is a reply will show that it is principally made up of dogmatic and authoritative statements, the element of evidence being signally lacking in all but a few instances. A thing is held to have been proved when a reasonable man, having heard the evidence, cannot doubt it; but statements about the "beliefs" and opinions of any man, be he ever so great, cannot stand as evidence outside uninformed or extremely
partisan minds. Here let me add that we humans are so constituted that we are likely, most of us, to hold opinions on the slenderest of evidence or in spite of the evidence, asking only in general that our opinions be accepted by those with whom we discuss them, and caring not a straw whether we came by them justly or not. The attitude of the partisan encourages an advocate to be explicit and dogmatic, and to assume a "Thus-saith-the-Lord" manner, and nothing but the humility which comes from long and exhaustive thought can save him from taking that attitude, or make him the careful and sober investigator which he should be.

Mr. Lewis asserts that Marxian Socialism is scientific. In taking this position he ignores the fact that there are essential differences between those who speak in the name of Marx, differences as to what Marx taught. Lafargue and Jaures, prominent Marxians, do not agree about economic determinism; Bernstein, once an orthodox Marxian, later called into question fundamental principles of Marxism; and Engels, and Marx himself, at times, found it necessary to correct what he called misapprehensions of his doctrines on the part of his prominent followers; and on one occasion, in 1890, Engels gave utterance to something very like an apology for Marx and himself for having unintentionally misled the "younger men" with regard to the importance of the economic factor in social development.

Enrico Ferri and Belfort Bax, both important advocates of Socialism, differ with other advocates in some fundamental respects. Let Mr. Lewis clear this up. Where is the science here? Where there is not practical unanimity in regard to fundamental principles, unanimity between the advocates of a given theory, can we justly declare the principles in controversy and dispute to constitute science? Mr. Lewis should explain these things. In my second speech I shall be pleased to give you page and book for any of these evidences of the lack of science in what stands as Socialism, for which he may be pleased to call.

We must not worship Marx; we must not make a bible of "Capital." We must also remember that there are other names in the field of sociology, to ignore those of previous centuries, which are of great importance; the names of those who are not in agreement with Marx or Marxism, but who are read and studied in our universities and in private investigations—names which carry with them great significance. To mention only some of the most noted, Tolstoi, Henry George, Lester F. Ward, Peter Kropotkin, these names stand for much in the world of thought, and thousands are as devoted to each of them, in the belief that they spell truth, as other thousands are devoted to the teachings of Marx. It will not do for us to dismiss these names with a sniff of good-natured contempt; we must be sure that we know the teachings which they stand for; we must realize that other minds as well furnished as ours hold other views and cherish other convictions. We must not assume infallibility, either for ourselves or for those in whom we "are well pleased."

Now, disabusing our minds of preconceptions and prejudice as far as it is possible, let us look, in the spirit of the critic, at what Mr. Lewis has presented as "scientific Socialism." We may examine his statements and contentions in three ways: from the point of view of pure logic; from that of philosophy, "knowledge of the highest order of generality" (in the words of Spencer), and we finally may look at them from the point of view of pure science, comparing his conclusions with what we know respecting the facts on which they are thought to be based. Taking the position of Mr. Lewis for granted as representing that of Marx, that we may have something to discuss here, let us look at its foundations.

Let us first test it logically. Do the principles of "scientific Socialism" cohere? Is there any necessary logical connection, for example, between the supposed concentration of wealth in the hands of the few and the victory of the proletariat at the polls resulting in
an abolition of all class distinctions and conflicts? Let us put it in this way: would the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few, supposing it to have taken place, of necessity find the proletariat in a condition to wage a successful struggle against those in power. And, further, would the struggle on the part of an impoverished proletariat to attain power tend to cultivate the spirit of brotherhood and fraternity in the world and obliterate class distinctions? It is easy to see that the logical consequences of the factors named might be different from those which were anticipated by such as stood sponsor for them theoretically.

Another test: Is the capture of political power logically the forerunner of "peace on earth and good will to men"? What is known of the character of political struggles and political power might logically lead one to doubt the efficacy of such means. The readiness with which politics assimilates all that is worst and most ignoble in human character and action, the readiness with which it always has assimilated these things might logically lead one to assume that the social revolution would need to be an industrial and social organization with mutual aid for its object, rather than that of a struggle over the power to exercise rulership over men and the actions of men.

But let us leave the fruitful fields of logic, so suggestive and attractive in the present controversy, and apply the test of philosophy to the principles of "scientific Socialism," as laid down by Mr. Lewis.

The theory of evolution, which Mr. Lewis accepts, as I accept it, sums up all particular processes in a general process which is called the cosmic process. In other words, the evolutionary philosophy reduces the forces of nature, so varied and numerous, to a few forces, and the processes of nature to a few processes. Now, in the general process of evolution we see that the involved forces are equivalent to each other, and are again and again transformed one of them into another; we know those forces and can name them; but we do not see any one of them triumphing over and dominating all the other forces, as we are assured by Mr. Lewis that the economic factor triumphs over and dominates all other factors in social evolution. The conditions of the particular factors are the same as those of the general factors: the particular processes are epitomes of the general processes: no one factor in the general process of evolution determines the course of evolution, and therefore it is open to doubt that any one factor determines evolution in the sphere of social life. More: When Mr. Lewis declares in the name of Marx that economic conditions are the final determinants of social evolution he is going contrary also to the conclusions of biological science, moral science, astronomical science, and other sciences which might be named, and is uttering a doctrine which is not only novel, but which is contrary to all that we know of natural processes in general.

Take the field of biology alone as illustrating my contention. There are the forces of environment, with the effects of changed conditions, the forces of heredity, the factor of the struggle for existence, there is the innate force of the germ plasm, and there is sexual selection, to mention no others; which of these factors or forces is, singly and alone, the final determinant in biological evolution? Then, too, to conclude our philosophical inquiries, where do we find in nature, outside of the supposed economic process, the concentration of power in a few organisms so that these few dominate and control all other similar organisms? We are told by Mr. Lewis that power is concentrating in a class to an extent that will give that class supreme control over the lives of all other men in other classes; has he any precedent to show on which to base that contention? The doctrine of class conquest, the doctrine of capitalistic conquest, is singularly lacking of support in other equivalent fields. Nature is at one in all her essential processes; where are the class conquests of nature?

I have it from reliable sources that Karl Marx published several
volumes of verse before he took up the advocacy of the system which stands in his name; to my mind the evidence that Marx was a poet is plentifully scattered up and down his theories, and the presentation of an equivalent doctrine on the part of Mr. Lewis on this occasion is of a part with the imagination of Karl Marx, which read into the processes of nature the peculiar ideas of development which attracted that imagination and set it afire. And this is not uttered in a spirit of reproach, but only to call attention anew to the truth that "the wish is father to the thought" in most of us generally, and that we make a brave show on little material.

The Marxians are fond of the word "utopia"; they apply it to any conception of society and social development which starts from an abstract position, assuming that Marx, and Marx alone, founded his social theories on an examination of the solid facts made plain in observation and experience. I wish to give Mr. Lewis another definition of the word "utopia," which I hope he will heed in his replies to me; that is: Utopia is what we arrive at if we base our theories on a misreading of facts, seeing in them only a justification of our preconceptions. This sort of utopia, I submit, is just as dangerous and ridiculous as that limbo in which the "idealists" are thought to be wandering, guided only by the doubtful stars of their dreams. I welcome the processes of science, and now I will proceed to consider the statements of Mr. Lewis respecting the Marxian theories, using all the time, as well as I may, that touchstone of science, the test of theory by fact.

Mr. Lewis introduces illustrations of the importance of the economic factors in the process of social evolution. Illustrations of its importance are at hand and are accessible with ease. But the proof that the economic factors are dominant in some patent instances is not to be taken as evidence that they are dominant in all or most instances. Let Mr. Lewis account for the development of Jewish life and character on the same theory if he can. Let him show that religious and racial differences were not most fundamental to the unfortunate earlier experiences of the Jewish race. Let him show that the Christian religion grew out of economic conditions principally. Let him demonstrate that Lincoln and Garrison can be accounted for by the economic conditions prevailing in their youth.

Also let him answer this question: What determines the economic conditions? I invite him to consider the psychological factor as essential to the origin of the economic conditions. He has given us a cursory, scrappy statement to the effect that the economic conditions determine all other conditions; let him add fact to fact and evidence to evidence, and not hide behind the name of Marx over this issue. Religion, art, science, morals, climate, the general conditions, the psychological nature of man, are all factors, and there are others. Let us have evidence, evidence, and not mere statements of belief with one or two obvious illustrations of the importance of the economic factor in life. Economic factors have a limiting effect on many other factors, it is true; but that they are final determinants is still to be proved, as far as Mr. Lewis is concerned. The burden of demonstration rests on him, and on him alone.

Now we will consider briefly the nature and extent of the class struggle as conceived by Mr. Lewis. No one can doubt that there is a measure of class struggle, but when we take into consideration the factors which interfere with the development of the class struggle, the contentions of Mr. Lewis are open to serious doubt. Classes are not clearly marked; there is a lack of a definite class consciousness; there are as many poor men struggling to get out of their class and to deny their identity with it as there are men trying to create in themselves a sense of their unity with that class.

We must remember that social consciousness, the sense of being at one with one's fellows, which acts to make us follow custom, and public opinion, is a powerful deterrent
of full class consciousness. Then there is national consciousness, keeping men of the working class from realizing their identity with men of the working class in other foreign countries. I said the classes were not clearly marked; there is a struggle within the classes. Capital today is not a unit; nor is it likely to become a unit as long as individuality continues to exist, and that is a part of man's nature. Do the number of shops carried on by workingmen, argue greater class consciousness?

The board of trade in Chicago does not represent class unity the day after a panic; and the conditions then prevailing are only accentuations of those generally prevailing. In the working class there is also struggle for power, man being set against man in the attempt to get the best job, the easiest position, the opportunity to be an assistant foreman, a little boss. In a few words, Mr. Lewis assumes the development of a class struggle which will result in a political revolution. Let him study the effect of increased wages, of the spread of intellectual culture, let him consider the influence of popular concerts, of more museums, theaters, of increased means of public amusement on the working class mind; let him consider the effect on labor of a heightening of the standard of life, and he will see the social consciousness is developing faster by far than class consciousness is. And then he perhaps will not look to the class war as the backbone of the social revolution, nor think that all that is necessary in a controversy of this kind is to tell us what Marx believed and to adduce an isolated illustration here and there in proof of a most important and sweeping statement. We need proofs, not words.

The greatest of evidences that the class struggle is not developing and will not develop to the proportions assumed by Karl Marx, and in his turn by Mr. Lewis, is that wealth is not concentrating as they will have it that it is; that is, to an extreme extent. I am dealing with the arguments of Mr. Lewis now. Look at them. How much is there of them? What proofs does he offer of the statement that the wealth of the world is passing into the hands of fewer and fewer owners? Not one; not a single proof. He contents himself with a bare remark to the effect that it is so. Is this science? We are here seeking evidence; the burden of the proof rests on Mr. Lewis, and he gives no proofs. Is he carried away by a mere formula? Let him in his next speech adduce the evidence that all wealth is passing into the ownership of fewer and fewer men; then I shall feel it incumbent on me to present facts and figures in opposition to his evidences. Look at the enormous sale of stocks and bonds today, as proved by the continuous advertising of such in all periodicals; yes, look at the advertisements of stocks and bonds in Socialist publications. What does it mean? It means, and other things like it mean, that the middle class is growing larger.

Millions of people live on farms in this country; these people are constantly producing wealth which is being largely spread to offset the accumulations of vast individual fortunes. Is the total number of business houses less in proportion to the numbers of the population than it was at any time in the past? Business houses have vastly increased in numbers. Look at our city streets lined with stores on either hand; and you have the answer as far as the cities are concerned, the cities, where, Mr. Lewis would have us believe, the concentration of wealth is the most noticeable.

Take the building of houses everywhere; note the character of those houses, their superior construction, relatively speaking. Do those houses, whether rented or sold, argue the disappearance of the middle class, the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few? No; and many of them are owned by their occupants. I may tell Mr. Lewis that I have facts and figures respecting manufacturers and farms which will be forthcoming at the proper minute, demonstrating that wealth is passing into more and more hands, and will continue so to pass. It rests with the intel-
ligence and character of the mass of men to make it pass quickly into all hands; but only by understanding the actual conditions and by basing our effects on that understanding and character can we complete the change which is so greatly to be desired.

There is no time to consider all of the several principles which Mr. Lewis has presented here, nor is it necessary to do it. In his opening speech he has, as was said before, contented himself with so much statements of belief and opinion, and has so largely neglected to present the evidences on which belief and opinion should rest, that one need but call attention to a few of the principles, showing that he has left undone what should have been done, and noting briefly some of the more important difficulties with which he will have to deal in answering me.

But before I conclude, let me consider briefly the Marxian formula for a proletarian struggle and victory. The proletariat, we are told, is to capture political power at the ballot box. This victory is to be preceded by a concentration of the wealth of the world in the hands of the few, during which a class struggle of terrific force will educate the proletariat in the means and ways of political power and trustworthiness. And yet politics has always spelled corruption! Let us see what any party must do in order to capture political power: what it has to fight: what it must adjust itself to; and let us see if it is likely that the Socialists (and there are many noble men among them, more, no doubt, in proportion than there are in the other political parties) will succeed in capturing political power and in transforming its character, so that it will harmonize with liberty, reason and order.

The two old political parties control the situation now; it is by means of every trick and dishonorable expedient known to men that they do control it. Taking men as they are, how is power to be wrested from the old parties except by using the very means which they are masters of in order to do the work? And will they let that power be captured? Do not the masses of men vote almost blindly, led on by party orators and a party press? Are not these masses of men the products of conditions which encourage a large measure of ignorance and stupidity in them? How, then, are they to capture political power from the political jugglers and transform it? Would not blood flow and votes be forgotten? Consider, too, what the Socialist party is doing to gain votes; whereas Marx and Engels, and their like, looked on religion in the spirit of men who think of it as an impediment to social progress, we see the Socialist party of today inviting to membership orthodox Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, telling them that religion is a private matter. Is it a private matter, where the social life of the people is involved in a belief which in essentials is opposed altogether to the spirit of democracy, which calls for faith instead of knowledge, and obedience instead of independence?

Already the Socialist party shows the signs of adjusting itself to the conditions around it, a fate fraught with dangers to advanced ideals. The controversies between the opportunists and the orthodox Marxians are fresh in mind; middle class leaders and teachers are multiplying in the ranks of the Socialists; their great men are often lawyers, doctors, clergymen, artists, and now and then a capitalist declares himself a Socialist and is received into the party. There is a Socialist machine. The Socialists also care far more for "respectability" than they formerly did. Will the Socialist party, with such antecedents, and with such a weapon in hand as political power, bring about the fine and beautiful results which the thousands of earnest men and women in it look for?

As far as any demonstration to base his convictions on is concerned, Mr. Lewis has given almost nothing in his speech, and therefore I must pronounce his position a utopian one; that is, a position not really based on the facts, but only supposedly so. It will not do to say that I, and everybody else here, understand the Marxian posi-
tion, and that therefore it does not need demonstrating. That would only beg the question, as the matter at issue is the truth or error of that very Socialist position as conceived by Marx, and after him by Mr. Lewis, with whom I am debating. I await the second speech of Mr. Lewis; then I shall present more of my evidences, the facts and figures toward what is called "Scientific Socialism."

There is a movement in the world of the greatest moment. Revolution is all around us, and we are approaching a time and preparing for a condition in which society will exist in all respects for the sake of all its members, and will no longer apportion benefits to men except as their services merit such benefits. The process of social evolution is bringing this about; and as man is one of the major forces in social evolution, it is well that he should understand his place and his work. It is well that he should intelligently participate in the transformation of life from a thing of mixed beauty and ugliness, of confused utility and uselessness, to one of harmony and order; of general well being. To understand the process by which all this is to come about is a great privilege.

Does Mr. Lewis understand it? Did Karl Marx understand it? I think not. But the outcome of this debate will help to make clear whether they are right or wrong, whether Marx has written, and Lewis has repeated, the program of social development, or whether, as I believe, that program is still being written, one page at a time, by many minds, in many ways, with many truths, with much error; but is being written, none the less, to the hope, to the glory of man.

LEWIS' SECOND SPEECH

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Barnard, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the speech to which you have just listened Mr. Barnard repeatedly complains that in my opening speech I devoted too much time to a statement of the theories which constitute Scientific Socialism and not enough to the evidence on which those theories rest. One of the chief functions of an opening speech in any discussion is to give as full and clear a statement as possible of the principles in dispute. If I had failed in this my opponent would have had good reason to protest. By condensing to the utmost I discharged this obligation thoroughly and in addition presented considerable evidence for my case. Mr. Barnard was by no means limited to a slaughter of the evidence. He was perfectly at liberty to attack the principles. He did not even criticise the evidence I presented for the main theory. After having complained that I did not work the miracle of getting what would easily fill a large volume into a 40 minute speech, my opponent calmly announces in a speech longer than mine, "There is not time to consider all the several principles which Mr. Lewis has presented here."

At the beginning of his search for an opening in my armor he seizes on the difference between sociology and certain other sciences. But here, instead of finding a gaping joint, he shivers his lance on a plate of triple steel. The backwardness of sociology is not to be denied. It is also true that this is, in some measure, due to the immense mass of highly complex phenomena which forms its subject matter. But the main reason is one which only Scientific Socialism reveals. In our educational institutions the physical and biological sciences, which Mr. Barnard contrasts with sociology, are taught with great freedom. This is because these sciences are the breath of life to bourgeois civilization. Astronomy, by giving birth to the art of navigation, made commerce possible. The capitalist manufacturer could never have sold his fabrics had not chemistry taught him how they could be dyed. The search for gold, that king of all commodities, must always have been haphazard but for the science of geology. Therefore the professors of these sciences are encouraged to search thoroughly and proclaim freely whatever they may find to be the truth. But with the professor who has the misfortune to occupy a chair in sociology, it is alto-
gether different. He cannot move a step forward in his researches without observing the class nature of existing society, and if he ventures to apply the scientific methods, so freely used by his co-workers in other fields, he finds himself driven to conclusions which are extremely obnoxious to the ruling class. The universities are dependent on the donations of the economic masters of society and he must suppress all truths which menace them, or imperil his position. This is why sociology does not hold its own with other sciences and it yields a striking illustration and proof of the domination of the economic factor and not an argument against it.

It will be soon enough to deal with the alleged fundamental differences between Marxians, which Mr. Barnard promises to prove by quotation in a future speech, when the promise materializes and the quotations are forthcoming.

There will be no dispute about the worship of Marx or the canonization of "Capital." We shall not discuss the question: Was Marx infallible? but, Was Marx right? "Capital" is only the Socialist's bible in that general nontheological sense in which Shakespeare's works may be called the bible of the drama, or Darwin's "Origin of Species" the bible of biology.

The guns which line Mr. Barnard's deck, and from which he fires his broadsides, are of three types—logical, philosophical and scientific. They have a rather imposing appearance, but their execution is small and out of all proportion to their reverberation.

The great strength of the Marxian theoretical system is the logical coherence of its parts, and it is not surprising that Mr. Bernard's attempts to develop difficulties under this head are rather half-hearted and wholly unsuccessful. If the proletariat, seeing the wealth of which it is exploited concentrated in fewer and fewer hands to the great widening of the social gulf between labor and capital, and believing that the exploitation could be abolished by political action, should act accordingly, they might, or might not, succeed, but there would be no lack of logical consistency in their actions. Again, to take Mr. Barnard's second logical test: If the political power captured by the working class should be used, as is their avowed aim, to abolish classes, it is a highly logical probability that it would result in that "peace on earth and good will to men" which is now rendered impossible by the existence of those class divisions.

After this brief but disappointing voyage in the sea of logic, my opponent steers his frail bark out on the broad waters of philosophy. This free use of imagery on my part may be justly regarded as a proof of the truth of Mr. Barnard's assertion that Marx and his disciples possess that poetic faculty, imagination. But poetry with us is a by-product and not, as in Mr. Barnard's case, the chief commodity. We are therefore so much the less likely to mistake poetic fancies for stern realities.

And now for philosophy: When Mr. Barnard argues that our theories must recognize the harmonious relationship between all the parts of the cosmos, he is on solid ground; but his feet sink in a bog when he contends that a thing cannot exist in one field unless it can be paralleled in other domains. My opponent has no more right to lift the doctrines peculiar to physics into the world of social phenomena, as though they must of necessity be equally true in both, than he has to explain the attraction of the sexes by the theory of gravitation. The superiority of the economic factor is hardly disposed of by Mr. Barnard's doctrine of equivalent forces. Language would have no meaning if we could not say that the cause is superior to the effect and determines the effect. Why are we forever telling the reformer that he should cease dabbling with the effect and aim to remove the cause? To reply that there is a sense in which the effect is equal to the cause and determines the cause is like arguing that lead and feathers must have the same specific gravity because a pound of each will turn the scale at the same point.
When Mr. Barnard, dealing with biology, asserts that "no one factor in the general process of evolution determines the course of evolution," he places himself in a difficult and easily assailable position. It was the discovery of just this factor which gave Darwin the foremost place among all the sons of science. According to him, after heredity and variation have played their part in the production of life forms, environment, selecting the fit for the survival, rules like an absolute czar and "determines the course of evolution." The scientific world has been continually stirred by controversies about heredity and variation, but all the parties to the dispute recognize the dominance of environment as the selector of the fit, and so the long dispute about heredity was well styled "the battle of the Darwinians."

Mr. Barnard is extremely unconvincing when he asks "where do we find in nature, outside the supposed economic process, the concentration of power in a few organisms so that these few dominate and control all other similar organisms?" Does my opponent imagine that when I assert the existence of classes and their resultant class struggles in our society I am thereby obliged to prove the existence of class struggles in the moon or among fishes? I admit freely that there are no social classes among the lower animals. And the reason is clear; so--social classes grow out of forms of property, and among lower animals no small group of any species is allowed to own the sources of the life of the whole species.

We now come to what Mr. Barnard calls "the point of view of pure science." The theories of Scientific Socialism are to be dealt with on their own individual merits. I submitted as proof and illustration of the Marxian theory of historical causation the voyages of Columbus, De Gama and Magellan, and the fall of the Venetian empire. Instead of overthrowing this evidence my opponent calmly accepts it in the following sentence: "Illustrations of its importance are at hand and are accessible with ease." He then challenges me to apply the theory to cases of his selection, evidently believing that some historical events support the theory while others contradict it. The cases selected by Mr. Barnard are: The Jews, Christianity, Lincoln and Garrison.

It is impossible to understand the story of the Jews unless we note the economic processes behind the drama. The earlier Jewish society was pastoral. Around the Jews were civilizations that were highly commercial. In the struggle for supremacy between nations the commercial nations have always been victorious. A recent writer has well said: "There was no handwriting on any wall, civilizations rise and fall according to the laws of trade." When the Jewish people refused to adapt itself to the demands of the Roman world power it was divested of its nationality, scattered abroad and compelled to adapt itself to commercial pursuits to avoid extinction. And it was this transplanting to a new economic environment which transformed a pastoral people into the world's leading financiers.

Christianity, with its "Slaves, obey your masters" and its "Women, be ye subjected to your husbands" bears plainly the marks of its origin in a chattel slave society. However clearly it may have voiced the needs of an oppressed class in the beginning, it has been "on the side of the big battalion" ever since. It lived through the monarchial period by emphasizing "Fear God, honor the King." Now it is the friend of capital and advises labor to be content with its miserable shacks in this world on the promise of mansions in a world to come. Whether labor will welcome a friendship so belated is another matter. One must have given little attention to the Christian church if he cannot see the operation of economic forces in all its most important acts.

Mr. Barnard could hardly have selected more striking confirmations of the Marxian philosophy
than are presented by the names of Lincoln and Garrison. These men were the mouthpieces of an economic conflict. This country was endeavoring to accomplish the impossible—to make one form of government serve two distinct economic systems. This was, is, and must forever remain, impossible. Economic processes must dominate political institutions. Economic rulers must be political rulers in order to preserve their economic mastery. The civil war was only secondarily a struggle of liberty lovers for the abolition of property in human beings. Primarily it was a conflict between two economic systems in which the younger and more progressive was naturally the victor. Lincoln and Garrison would have been great men in any society, but their being abolitionists was determined solely by the economic conditions of their day.

As to "what determines economic conditions?" there is room for a wide and interesting discussion, the outcome of which would be hardly likely to injure the Marxian theory. All that Marx maintains is that modes and processes of wealth production and distribution constitute the groundwork of any social order and are the chief determinants of the political, legal, religious and other social institutions which thrive in that environment. That they are the "only" or "final" determinants is merely an imputation of my opponent. While I am more than ever convinced that Mr. Barnard cannot shake the Marxian theory I do not deny his ability to explode his own exaggerations.

The argument that the various forms of collective consciousness, named by Mr. Barnard, will prevent class-consciousness from developing to the point required by Scientific Socialism has a double edge. Just because we realize that we all come from the great cosmic mother, are united by ties of race and nation we are the more likely to demand the abolition of class divisions which keep us at each other's throats.

It is true that struggles within classes tend to obscure the struggle between them. But competition is rapidly yielding to combination among capitalists, while among workers solidarity is increasing: in some countries slowly, in others rapidly, but everywhere increasing. If this were not so "Scientific Socialism" would indeed be a utopian fantasm.

I am invited to "study the effect of increased wages" and to "consider the effect on labor of a heightening standard of life" as preventative to the development of class-consciousness. If Mr. Barnard means "nominal" wages, the actual amount of cash, the increase might be conceded, but if "real" wages are intended, the things the wage will buy when expended, it would be more to the point to ask me to consider the effect of decreasing wages and a lowering standard of life. And now let me ask Mr. Barnard to contemplate the effect on laborers of the rising standard of life among their masters. There is no room for dispute here, the rise here is so great and rapid that only the balloon will serve as a figure of speech. As a result of this enormous rise the social gulf between capital and labor grows ever wider, and I should be interested in Mr. Barnard's views as to the effect of this undeniably increasing social inequality on the probable development of class-consciousness.

Like, Mr. Barnard, I have so far refrained from statistical arguments. They are notoriously treacherous. While they cannot be "made to prove anything" as is commonly asserted, they can be made to "appear to prove anything." A well defined tendency has other ways of impressing itself on the general consciousness. The inhabitants of a district know when they have had a short summer without tabulating the hours of sunshine. Of course, figures are valuable when scientifically collected and impartially recorded. But how is this to be done as to the concentration of wealth when the concentrators keep double sets of books and observe "gentlemen's agreements." This will not prevent me from giving close attention to
any figures my opponent might choose to bring before us.

Mr. Barnard leans heavily on the theory that politics and corruption are synonymous—"politics has always spelled corruption." He argues that this, always having been so, must always so remain. This is another example of my opponent's peculiar brand of logic. Because there is no ruling class among lizards there cannot be one in human society; because there has been no pure politics in the past there cannot be any in the future. This is the logic of the charity organization society, "the poor ye always have with you and therefore always will have." What never was, and is not now, can never be! Does Mr. Barnard regard this as the scientific method of reasoning? If so, what is to prevent me from arguing that inasmuch as industry has always been based on robbery (at least this is as near the truth as Mr. Barnard's charge against politics) and industry is today a process of robbery, therefore, industry must always mean robbery and therefore industrial action and political action should be tied together and thrown into the sea.

What Mr. Barnard cannot see is that industry and politics are already tied together in the closest bonds. So close is this relationship indeed that the corruption of politics is the legitimate child of the robbery in industry and when the robbery is abolished the corruption will disappear. It is another instance of the economic factor dominating political institutions. There is no need for me to pile up the evidence for this. Even the magazines and newspapers recognize that the congressmen and senators represent, not their respective states, but "the interests.

As to "the spread of intellectual culture"—and, of course, Mr. Barnard uses the word culture in its best sense as including scientific education—I have considered it long before Mr. Barnard invited me to do so, and I view it with great satisfaction. I regard the exploitation of labor as destined to disappear because I believe the intellectual development of the proletariat will enable it to understand the process by which it is robbed and how to abolish the robbery forever. When the bourgeoisie unleashed science from the bonds of the feudal social order, while it served its immediate necessities, it sealed its own future doom.

The whole Marxian system implies the increasing social intelligence and expanding political capacity of the working class. Without this Scientific Socialism would indeed be a baseless dream, but given this—and the history of the working class for the last half century abundantly proves that we are justified in the assumption—we may await with confidence the sounding of the knell of capitalism and the dawn of a classless civilization.

**BARNARD'S SECOND REPLY**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lewis, Ladies and Gentlemen:

One of the fundamental requisites in a debate is that of keeping the issues clear, so that discussion may not wander away in digressions of little value, and so that the matter in dispute may be dealt with thoroughly and conclusively, leaving a clear-cut impression as to the truth. Mr. Lewis, unintentionally, I am sure, has considerably obscured the things in controversy, and it will be part of my task now while answering his various arguments, to call attention to his several digressions, and to point out that more than one of his statements have little or no bearing on the things discussed.

To begin with: In answering my complaint that he had devoted too much time to a statement of what Marx believed and taught, Mr. Lewis has told you that "The chief function of an opening speech is to give as full and clear a statement as possible of the principles in dispute." Mr. Lewis errs: principles are not in dispute here. In a discussion of the question, "Is 'Scientific Socialism' Scientific?" "the chief function" of an opening speech is the presentation of the evidence that "Scientific Socialism" IS SCIENTIFIC. If the question were, "What Are the Principles of
Scientific Socialism?" the time which Mr. Lewis has devoted to principles would have been well spent; as it was, his opening remarks were made up mainly of historical data as to the history of science, and statements of what Marx believed; things of little purpose when the subject of debate is taken into consideration. Mr. Lewis has only obscured the issues in his rejoinder.

In reply to my argument about the difficulty of coming at the truth in the study of sociology, Mr. Lewis makes a statement remarkable both for its assumptions and the naivete with which it is made. "The main reason," he tells us, "for the backwardness of sociology is that bourgeois civilization has not encouraged devotion to the science of sociology, because study of that leads to a knowledge of the class struggle, and to conclusions obnoxious to the ruling class."

Let Mr. Lewis visit any public library, and see whether there are fewer volumes of sociology than there are of those devoted to other sciences. Mr. Lewis should know, too, that writers on sociology have not been all highly salaried occupants of chairs in universities, and that they have written, many of them, without fear or favor. Let Mr. Lewis go over the many volumes of sociology extant, and then say that their errors are due mainly to the fact that capitalism opposes the truth in sociology. Let him remember the names of the many thinkers who have labored to understand this subject, giving their time, their lives to it, without fear, without hope of reward, because they loved the truth.

My antagonist is working the "economic determinism" theory to death in this instance. In connection with this matter he tells us that his "armor" is invulnerable and that I but "shiver my lance upon a plate of triple steel" in looking for its joints to penetrate it. I find his armor to be, not steel, but something very like pasteboard painted to look like steel; and armor easily pierced by one who depends on a lance of argument and demonstration.

Now, let us go on to the third point in discussion: as to whether leading Socialists are and have been in disagreement as to the fundamental principles of "Scientific Socialism." In a controversy with Jaurès, Lafargue asserted that economic conditions are the sole determinants of progress; Bernstein, who roused such a storm of discussion in Germany, and whose book on Socialism has been translated into English, called into question the class struggle, the concentration of capital, and other principles of Socialism; Enrico Ferri, on page 161 of "Socialism and Modern Science," declares that the Socialist theory must be cleared "of that species of narrow dogmatism with which it is clothed in Marx and still more in Loria"; and this same writer traces the economic conditions to something still further back, on page 164, namely, "the ethnical energies and aptitudes," stating that the economic conditions are "the resultant" of these ethnic conditions, and "the physical environment."

In his reply to my questions as to logic of Socialist principles, my antagonist again confuses the issues. He tells us that, "if" the proletariat "understood everything necessary to be understood, and tried to change the conditions," that "there would be no lack of logical consistency in its action." I had asked Mr. Lewis this question: "Would the concentration of wealth, supposing it to have taken place, of necessity find the proletariat in a condition to wage a successful struggle against those in power?" This question he ignores, and answers me with an "if"; a reply to what would have been a different question, viz.: "If the proletariat became wise, would it act wisely?"

My second enquiry as to logic he avoids, as he did the first. I had asked, "Is the capture of political power logically the forerunner of peace on earth and good will to men?" Mr. Lewis replies that "If the political power captured by the working class were to be used, "as is its avowed aim, to abolish classes," then it is probable that peace on earth and good will to
men would result. There we have the "if" again. And still he calls my logic "half-hearted." I must call his logic sophistry; no other name can as fittingly characterize it.

The talk about poetry and philosophy, coming just after the marvelous logical feats with which Mr. Lewis has entertained us, has a delicious quality, which the epicure of intellect will not fail to appreciate. Mr. Lewis standing as a representative of "stern realities" is amusing.

Now we come to his objection to my philosophical considerations of "Scientific Socialism." Let us see what these are. He begins by impugning my argument from the cosmos, in which I had contended for an essential unity in all things, and denied that any one factor dominated in evolution.

Let us quote Socialist against Socialist. In this connection I will read from Enrico Ferri. Says he on page 164 of "Socialism and Modern Science," that economic determinism rests "on the best established results of geology, and biology, of psychology and sociology."

But we are dealing primarily with the question: Is there anything in nature corresponding to the economic factor as conceived by Socialists? That is, does any one force dominate in the general process of evolution? My antagonist declares that the environment is the one factor which dominates in that general process. The economic factor is a single factor, expressed in the production and distribution of wealth. But is the environment of organic life in general a single factor? Certainly not. It is made up of many factors, each as individual and separate as the economic factor is individual and separate from other factors. Again, in biology, is the environment treated as one factor, as the economic factor is treated in sociology? No; it is presented as a great number of factors.

Moreover, even if the environment were supposed to be one factor, as science develops psychology we see that its literature concedes increasing potency to organisms, and tends to lessen the force of the claim that the environment is supreme. Of course, this does not help the cause of Socialism, pledged to the assertion that environing conditions are dominant over organisms, but the truth is the truth nevertheless.

Bearing on this, let us quote from Lester F. Ward, who is greatly admired by my opponent. He says, "The biological sociologists," those who attribute to the environment all the principal results evolved in the organism, have made a great mistake: "A great psychic factor has been left out of account." He declares that MAN IS MORE POWERFUL THAN HIS ENVIRONMENT. Note his words: "The environment transforms the animal, while man transforms the environment." So much for environment; which, Mr. Lewis says, "rules like an absolute Czar."

My point, that nature knows no triumphant classes, and my denial that there are among men, classes completely and absolutely dominating, Mr. Lewis meets by saying that he does not contend that there are "class struggles in the moon" or that there are class struggles "among fishes," and goes on to deny the class struggle among animals. The carnivorous animals stand in relation to the herbivorous animals as do the capitalists to the masses of the people, and so it is with the carnivorous birds; but these carnivorous classes do not dominate to more than a limited degree the lives of other similar organisms. That is the point.

Now we come to the purely scientific aspects of the matter in hand. We are to test Socialism by the facts as observed in the study of man.

Mr. Lewis has tried to do this in his second speech; how well has he done it? I asked him to explain the history of the persecution of the Jews on the theory of economic determinism. He replies that the Jews were a pastoral people, and that when they refused to submit to Rome they were scattered abroad over the world. Does this prove that economic conditions have been the principal influences determining the status of the Jews throughout history? The Jews were a religious
race. They sternly held a unique religion; one which taught them to believe that God had specially chosen them for his people above all other peoples. They proudly held to a political theory which was in harmony with their religion. They refused to be assimilated therefore. They separated themselves from other races in strict national seclusion. That, then, is why they did not want to yield to Rome; that, then, is why they were persecuted; that is why race prejudice developed so strongly against them. This explains their sufferings and their disadvantages, and these are what I asked Mr. Lewis to explain. I did not ask him to tell me how the Jews became financiers.

The observations of Mr. Lewis in his attempt to show that economic conditions were triumphant in the origin of Christianity, are unworthy of him. He dismisses Christianity with the remark that it stood principally for slavery, the subjugation of woman, and the promise of happiness hereafter in payment of shame and sorrow now. Then, without offering a single iota of evidence, he announces that economic conditions were dominating factors in its origin. Is this argument? Is this proof? Does Socialism rest on such evidences?

The principal teaching of Christ was "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself." Leaving out God, if you will, is not that a worthy principle? And the sufferings of the early Christians under all conceivable torture, in which they refused to give up their teachings of brotherhood, shows that they were not slaves in spirit, and that Christianity is not a slave religion. My question was, did the Christian religion grow "out of economic conditions principally." His answer is the frankest admission that he cannot answer in the affirmative.

So with Lincoln and Garrison. These men were idealists. Lincoln, an obscure lawyer, in 1835, was opposing slavery from the point of view of the principle of national unity, saying that we could not remain half slave and half free. Garrison was a Christian, essentially; opposing slavery as a non-resistant. His work began in 1831 with "The Liberator." The whole abolition movement grew out of the unaided efforts of two or three men who felt little of untoward economic conditions, and spoke less of them. Were the ideas of these men the results of economic conditions? Let Mr. Lewis keep to the question, and not confuse the issues. The later developments, the civil war, and the abolition of slavery, are other matters, the consideration of which would not help us in these test cases.

My opponent's arguments in defense of the class struggle are next in order for consideration. He admits that social consciousness has a limiting effect on class consciousness. Here he unconsciously concedes nearly all that I ask, in an admission to this effect: we all "come from the great cosmic mother"; we are "united by ties of race and nation"; and are therefore "more likely to demand the abolition of class divisions which keep us at each other's throats." This is not a proof of the power of the class struggle, but just the contrary. No class can solve the problems involved in the life of the mass; all the factors involved must co-operate.

He concedes that struggles within classes tend to obscure the class struggle proper; but declares that among workers solidarity is increasing. But that solidarity in its essential strength is a solidarity of trade unionists, who, through experience alone, are learning how to conquer their rights by exacting more and more of their products from the "Captains of Industry," and who are learning how to increase their demands and their economic power, till they can come into complete possession of the results of their industry; for such is the natural evolution of the trade union movement.

At the same time, it must be remembered that the working class follows the lead of the class above it in wealth and opportunity. Note how it seeks the same amusements; note how it imitates that class's customs, its morals, its culture, the furnishing of its homes; note how
it keeps up appearances. See the workingman of today, what care he takes of his clothes. There is more than one side to all this. It gives men a larger view of life, and makes them realize their social identity with other men, of whatever class, making them recognize no superior; but it also tends to keep men from fully recognizing Socialist class distinctions.

Let us hear from Karl Kautsky on this subject; a Socialist against Socialists. What does Kautsky say? "Laborers are scarcely more than a little bourgeois, and are distinguished from them only by a somewhat greater lack of culture. Their highest ideal consists in aping their masters and in maintaining their hypocritical respectability, their admiration of wealth, however it may be obtained, and their spiritless manner of killing their leisure time. THE EMANCIPATION OF THEIR CLASS APPEARS TO THEM A FOOLISH DREAM." (Capitals mine.)

Wealth is not concentrating in the hands of a few to the extent that Socialists would have us think that it is. Mr. Lewis shows but a languid interest in this matter. Where, I may ask, does Mr. Lewis get his evidence except from statistics? Does it come down out of the air? Is it a revelation? I will give him some figures demonstrating that capital is not concentrating to an extreme degree or anything like it. These statistical figures come from the last census report, and were prepared by Professor Wilcox of Cornell University, statistical expert of the Census Bureau.

In 1890 there were, east of the Mississippi River, 3,072,000 farms; in 1900 there were 3,678,000. There we have an increase of 600,000 farms in 10 years. How many farms were of 1,000 or more acres in 1890? There were 14,708. How many were of 1,000 acres in 1900? Only 10,000—a loss of nearly 5,000 of the farms of 1,000 acres or more; nearly one-third of the entire number, while the number of small farms increased by 600,000. Is there concentration of wealth in the sphere of farming?

Let us look at manufactures. One-fourth of our workingmen are engaged in manufactories and mechanical work. Now, the manufacturing establishments of the country number about 300,000. Of these, 41,000 have no employes at all being carried on by their owners; 125,000 have from one to four employes; 79,000 have from five to 20 employes; 24,000 have from 21 to 51 employes; 11,000 have from 51 to 100 employes; 8,000 have from 100 to 250 employes; 2,800 have from 250 to 500 employes; and so on, only 1,000 having from 500 to 1,000 employes, and but 403 having above 1,000 employes. Of this total, then only 17 percent employ more than 500 men. Does this look like the concentration of capital in the hands of the few?

Extreme concentration is prevented by the vast wealth produced on farms, by the number of new industries constantly springing into being on a basis of small capital, by the love of individual enterprise moving men to venture in business, as we see in the increase of small shops and stores, by the sale of property on the time payment system, by the vast amount paid out in salaries to those in positions of more than slight importance in large scale production, by the sale of stocks and bonds in small parcels, and in the tendency of industry to decentralize, spreading in new countries like wildfire. There are other causes, too. I hope that Mr. Lewis will now see the importance of doing what he thought hardly worth doing in his previous speech, and take up these proofs.

Politics do not "become corrupt," they are corrupt in their very nature. The comparison which my opponent makes between industry and politics is not sustained. Industry has not "always been based upon robbery," industry has always been based upon the wish to live. Politics, on the contrary, has always been based on the disposition to dominate and rule others, if, even, for their good. This is a novel doctrine to Mr. Lewis. Let him remember that Marx and Engels both contemplate a time when the state will have disappeared, when men will
live on a basis of social consciousness in an atmosphere of liberty; united, but individuals still. Then, perhaps, he will grasp my thought, that the state tends to pass away as men become more and more social.

To sum up: The economic factor is not supreme in social evolution; no one factor is supreme. The class struggle is a limited struggle of an almost purely economic character. Wealth is not concentrating enough to throw society into a revolution which will transform society; nor is political action the hope of the proletariat. Classes struggle; the war of wealth with poverty goes on; but, containing it all, seethes the social revolution; now helped or hindered by this or that class movement, now helped by the idea of brotherhood, or hindered by a crass individualism; now in the light, and now in the darkness. The spirit of mutual aid rises higher and higher; rises out of the mists of narrow individualism and the fogs of family and national sympathies. It grows with human experience, and augments in power through test and trial. And this spirit of mutual aid is the very soul and body of the social revolution, revealing as it does, the higher nature of man, developed in the long travail of evolution.

LEWIS' THIRD SPEECH

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Barnard, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is rather unfortunate that Mr. Barnard should have based the opening argument in his last speech, quite unintentionally I am sure, on a misquotation of what I said. He quotes me as having said: "The chief function of an opening speech is to give as full and clear a statement as possible of the principles in dispute." I agree with my opponent that this is not true. But I never said it was. I did not say: "the chief function" but "one of the chief functions." A rather important difference especially as it is against the difference that Mr. Barnard makes his argument. I do not believe that any student or master of debate would quarrel with my position as I stated it.

In his second argument, about the backwardness of Sociology my opponent is the victim of his faulty system of taking notes. I did not ascribe that backwardness to the scarcity of books on the question, nor that "bourgeois civilization has not encouraged devotion to the science of sociology" in the sense of giving time to its consideration. What I argued, and still maintain, is that no matter how much the professors in the universities may discover, they must suppress anything that directly impeaches the economic masters of society, or imperil their positions. And Mr. Barnard should know that the mass of books on sociology are coming from the university men, as witness in this country Ward, Small, Giddings Ross and a host of others.

Mr. Barnard's attempt to show that leading Socialist thinkers disagree sufficiently to impair the scientific character of Socialist thought need not detain us long. Ferri, Lafargue and Jaures are all believers in the economic interpretation of history and only differ as to its "sphere of influence." Just in the same way Haeckel, Welsman, Kropotkin and De Vries dispute as to whether the Darwinian process of "natural selection" works by "the hereditary transmissions of acquired characters," "the continuity of germ-plasm," "mutual aid," or "mutation." In spite of their radical differences all these men are Darwinians and it would be just as useless for Mr. Barnard to cite their disputes as evidence that Darwinism is unscientific as it is for him to quote the differences of Marxist thinkers to prove Marxism unscientific. This covers all but Bernstein, who is not crying nearly so loudly as he did and whose cries are ceasing to attract attention.

I must confess my astonishment at Mr. Barnard's reception of my answer to his "tests of logic." Surely he knows the difference between a test of logic and a test of fact. Before we can proceed a single step with a "test of logic" we must waive any dispute as to fact for the time being. Thus I have a perfect right to "suppose" and my "if" was perfectly in order. My opponent set certain Socialist positions side by side and asked where was their logi-
cal coherence? As he forgot to mention the intervening factors, which make the positions logical, I did all that was necessary in my answer by supplying the missing links.

When Mr. Barnard returns to the defense of his philosophical objections to Socialism he argues that "environment" includes many things while "the economic factor" does not. I wonder how long it would take me to recite a mere catalogue of the things and factors which go to make up "the economic factor." Those in this audience who know anything of biology must have been greatly surprised and entertained by Mr. Barnard's assertion that in biology environment is not treated as "one factor."

While still dealing with this question of environment, Mr. Barnard discovers a great contradiction between Karl Marx and Lester F. Ward. I believe I have read both these great writers much more thoroughly than my opponent and I can assure him the contradiction exists only in his own imagination. When Ward says, as correctly quoted by my opponent, "The environment transforms the animal, while man transforms the environment," he is using the words man and environment in a widely different sense than is the case with Marx. By "environment" it is clear that Ward here means only cosmic environment. By "man" he means the human race, and he presents a picture of the human race struggling to conquer insentient nature and succeeding where the lower animals failed. Ward has devoted hundreds of pages to this question and there is no excuse for any misunderstanding of his meaning. One of his greatest books is written solely to make this clear. And what, according to Ward, are the weapons used by man in his struggle with the cosmos? They are inventions, achievements, appliances, all those things which Ward sums up in the one word "civilization." This includes the steamship, the locomotive, the use of fire and electricity, a great and complex mass of social institutions with their underlying economic processes. When we turn to Marx we find "environment" used in its general sense. Here the things which compose civilization cease to be treated as men's weapons against his environment, they become and are dealt with as part of environment itself. If I had no other arguments to answer in this speech I should be glad to develop this fertile field. I must be content with having cleared the confusion from which Mr. Barnard seemed unable to extricate himself. The doctrine of determinism is too well established to be overthrown by Mr. Barnard at this date and only a complete misunderstanding of Ward could lead him to expect any support from that quarter.

"The carnivorous animals," says Mr. Barnard, "stand in relation to the herbivorous animals as do the capitalists to the masses of the people." I have seen many grotesque analogies drawn between the animal world and human society, but none so fantastic and unfounded as this. I wonder how much thrift and enterprise would be necessary on the part of a goat to enable him to rise out of his own class and become a lion; and having risen, how much extravagance and high-rolling would be needed to reduce him to his former station? And how long would it take that universal brotherly love, which in Mr. Barnard's poetic philosophy takes the place of the class struggle, to transform all the herbivora into carnivora so that the lion and the lamb would lie down together without the former having first dined on the latter?

While still dealing with this question of environment, Mr. Barnard discovers a great contradiction between Karl Marx and Lester F. Ward. I believe I have read both these great writers much more thoroughly than my opponent and I can assure him the contradiction exists only in his own imagination. When Ward says, as correctly quoted by my opponent, "The environment transforms the animal, while man transforms the environment," he is using the words man and environment in a widely different sense than is the case with Marx. By "environment" it is clear that Ward here means only cosmic environment. By "man" he means the human race, and he presents a picture of the human race struggling to conquer insentient nature and succeeding where the lower animals failed. Ward has devoted hundreds of pages to this question and there is no excuse for any misunderstanding of his meaning. One of his greatest books is written solely to make this clear. And what, according to Ward, are the weapons used by man in his struggle with the cosmos? They are inventions, achievements, appliances, all those things which Ward sums up in the one word "civilization." This includes the steamship, the locomotive, the use of fire and electricity, a great and complex mass of social institutions with their underlying economic processes. When we turn the persecutions of the Jews were, as my opponent contends, largely due to differences of character and religious belief. What Mr. Barnard cannot see is that these differences in character and belief are due to their having lived for centuries in different economic and social conditions.

The chivalrous manner in which Mr. Barnard comes to the aid of Christianity will greatly interest and edify those who have been accustomed to attending his lecture courses and listening to his views on religion.

The rejoicing of Christians, however, will be shortlived when they
discover that my opponent is defending a Christianity "leaving out God." I explained Christianity as it was and is, and not with the central figure removed.

Mr. Barnard says: "The whole abolition movement grew out of the unaided efforts of two or three men who felt little of untoward economic conditions and spoke less of them." This conception might serve well as the basis of a popular song, where a little goes a long way, or it might fittingly adorn a book of verse, but it has had no place in scientific thinking since Herbert Spencer wrote "The Study of Sociology." My opponent evidently thinks that the conditions of the Negro slaves were not "economic" conditions at all.

I held that if I conceded the improvement of the working class in its conditions the disparity between any improvement of theirs and the tremendous increase in the magnificence of the capitalist class would still show a great increase in the social gulf between them. Mr. Barnard has made so much of this hypothetical concession that it will be necessary for me to show him that even here he is building on sand. All economists recognize the difference between nominal wages, the money wage, and actual or real wages, what that money will buy. The figures published by the Bureau of Labor at Washington, and such figures are never stretched to help a Socialist argument, show that during the 10 years from 1897 to 1907, the nominal or money wage in this country rose 23 percent while during the same 10 years the worker's cost of living rose 25 percent—a fall in real wages of 2 percent. How long will it take the workers at this rate to realize Mr. Barnard's program of "exacting more and more" "till they can come into complete possession of the results of their industry?"

The attempt to show that Karl Kautsky had no confidence in the ability of the working class to solve its own problems is rather disingenious.

Mr. Barnard forgot to mention that Kautsky in the passage cited was not describing the workers of all countries but only the English laborers of nearly a decade ago. He was contrasting their stupidity with the intelligence of even "the laborers of the most economically backward country in Europe—Russia." And there has been a great change in the English laborer since then as everybody knows.

Mr. Barnard's figures on farms are based on the exploded idea that concentration in agriculture must be reckoned by the increasing size of the farms. This was all well enough 10 years ago when Mr. Barnard's method was in order but we know now that the size of the farm throws no light on concentration in agriculture. The control of agriculture and the appropriation of its results fall into fewer and fewer hands as A. M. Simons has shown in his "American Farmer," and this is the real nature of the "concentration" process. Between the big dairy companies, the agricultural machinery trust, the money-lending bankers and the railroads, the "independent farmer" is about as independent as an unskilled laborer in a steel mill.

Mr. Barnard seems to have bungled his figures about manufacturing establishments, for according to his figures the number of establishments employing over 500 would be less than one-half of 1 percent, and not 17 percent as he makes it.

In any case the figures are misleading. They are intended obviously to show that small plants are increasing, which is not the case. The volume on "Manufactures" of the United States census of 1900 shows the precise opposite: In the 30 years from 1870 to 1900, agricultural machinery establishments fell from 2,076 to 715; iron and steel from 726 to 668; leather from 7,569 to 1,306; woolen goods from 2,891 to 1,035; malt liquors from 1,972 to 1,509. True, in some industries there was an increase in the number of establishments, but this is more than offset by the doubling and trebling of the output.

There is not, as my opponent seems to think, any escape from this concentration in any international aspect of the question. Indeed the reverse is the case, for
trustification is rapidly assuming international proportions.

Mr. Barnard's explanation of the alleged essential difference between industry and politics in favor of the latter shows how deep are the difficulties in which he is involved.

"Industry," says my opponent, "has always been based on the wish to live, politics, on the contrary, has always been based on the disposition to dominate and rule others, if, even, for their good." And says Mr. Barnard: "This is a novel doctrine to Mr. Lewis." He is right on this latter point, only "novel" is hardly the word. He should have said "amazing" or "astounding." Mr. Barnard's "novel" doctrine would convey just as much truth and sense if he were to reverse it and say: "Politics has always been based on the wish to live. Industry on the contrary has always been based on the disposition to dominate and rule others if, even, for their good." It contains as much truth one way as the other. It is all very well to say that there is a difference between the circulation of the blood and respiration because these two functions are discharged by different organs—the heart and the lungs; but—Mr. Barnard's truly "novel" idea that politics and industry rest on the exercise of different mental faculties or proclivities must have entered his mind during a poetic reverie.

I need no reminding that "Marx and Engels both contemplate a time when the state will disappear," and I already thoroughly grasp Mr. Barnard's really great thought that "the state tends to pass away as men became more and more social." But Marx and Engels also knew what Mr. Bernard cannot grasp, that the state cannot disappear so long as society retains that exploiting class of which the state is the creature.

Mr. Barnard's proposals to remove effects without in any way disturbing their causes will attract only the utopian dreamer. Those great utopians who preceded Marx held much the same views as my opponent. The great-souled Robert Owen believed that brotherly love and human kindness were in themselves enough to solve the social problem. And it was precisely because Owen and his contemporaries fail to grasp the significance of the class divisions in bourgeois society, with their consequent class struggles, that their school of thought was completely abandoned, and Scientific Socialism, recognizing these important facts and founding itself on economic and social reality, took its place. Men cannot "become more and more social" when the social gulf between them is constantly widening and class antagonism grows ever sharper. Social development must follow economic changes of which it is the expression. Marx and Engels saw this clearly enough and they therefore held that the abolition of the state could only follow the dethronement of that ruling economic class in whose interest the state was born.

BARNARD'S THIRD SPEECH

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lewis, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the course of this debate I have been careful to follow my antagonist point by point and argument by argument, so that no contention, explanation, or conclusion should escape me. Now I am called on in a final speech to sum up my results and I shall pursue the same method, presenting an ensemble of my denial that "Scientific Socialism" is entitled to the name "scientific."

Here let me observe, as I have before, that Mr. Lewis is not only extremely dogmatic, but that he also continually avoids the conclusions of logic by shifting the grounds of the argument while professing to leave them unmoved. In addition I must call attention to a new departure on his part; the banter and derision which he substitutes for argument in his just finished remarks. Is Mr. Lewis so lacking in means to defend himself and his views that he must needs call in the adventitious aids of cheap wit and tawdry invective? I am perfectly willing that he should monopolize the flow of wit and invective; what I desire is that when this debate ends truth and demon-
stratification shall be found on my side of the contention.

Through inadvertence I made a minor misquotation in my previous speech, but that error has no bearing on the question at issue. The subject of this debate is well understood. Let those who have listened then, judge if I was justified in objecting to the paucity of argument in the opening speech of Mr. Lewis.

So with the discussion of the difficulties of sociology. My demonstration of the necessity of a labor involving a more exhaustive investigation than that involved in the building up of any other proved science; a labor involving an exhaustive study of all history, as well as the mastering of psychology, to speak of nothing else, this Mr. Lewis makes little of in the name of bourgeois opposition to the treacheries of Socialism. It is not true that sociological literature emanates principally from the universities; nor could Mr. Lewis persuade the university professors to admit the impeachment of their honor as men and thinkers which is involved in his contentions. How does Mr. Lewis know that university professors in general fail to meet the truth of sociology for mere sordid reasons, such as he offers? The reasoning of Mr. Lewis in this matter is of a piece with his method of the twisting of all things to make them harmonize with "Economic Determinism." Let it pass; I am content to leave the argument as it stands.

As I anticipated, my opponent was contented to walk softly in the region of disagreement on fundamental matters among Social Democrats of prominence. What Marx and Engels have to say about controverted matters, what Balfour Bax, Ferri, Jaures, Lafargue say, does not make pleasant matter for him to ruminate; and when the name of Bernstein is mentioned Mr. Lewis becomes positively disconcerted. I take it that Mr. Lewis has not yet heard of Revisionism and the Revisionists. What he says about Bernstein is merely denial of fact. Bernstein's great criticisms of the principles of Marxism has recently been translated into English and is being read by thousands of Socialists everywhere.

Mr. Lewis now tries to shift the issues here by comparing the differences of Socialist thinkers with the differences of Darwinians. The comparison is sophistical. Socialist thinkers differ on fundamental principles; Darwinians, on Lewis' own statement, differ only on minor principles, and not on the major one, natural selection.

Mr. Lewis is "astonished" at my reception of his reply to what I had said about the logic of Socialism. Perhaps what I am about to say will astonish him the more. I am not "astonished" that he changes my questions in the fields of logic so that they do not mean what I intended they should mean, and then answers his substituted questions instead of mine. The "intervening factors," which Mr. Lewis admits having thrust into the controversy, are matters in dispute in this debate, and to introduce them was therefore to assume as true that which stood in need of proof. Mr. Lewis has not answered my questions as to the logic of Socialism, however cleverly he may have answered those which he crowded into their places.

Over the question whether the economic factor in social evolution is equivalent to the whole environment in the field of biology, there has been quite a deal of controversy in this debate, and I shall ask Mr. Lewis to quote from one standard biological writer who treats the general environment of sentient life as though it were a unity in the sense in which economic factors compose a unit. One! He will find biologists dividing the environment into climate, food conditions, the nature and position of land, character of adjacent life, and many other things, all of which are as separate as the economic factors are separate from other social factors.

I find Lester F. Ward opposing the crude notion that environment dominates organisms. With Mr. Lewis environment "rules like an absolute czar," and it is true that formerly the "Darwinians," so-called, held the same views; it is also
a matter of common knowledge among the students of contemporary thought that Darwin is not the great figure that he was when he first promulgated the theory of natural selection. It is a fact that today the scientific world considers the organism as a much more powerful factor than formerly, and there are many prominent men of science who give natural selection but small credit as one of the factors of evolution.

With Ward it is not as it is with Marx; nor as it is with Mr. Lewis. He says "the biological sociologists," Those who believe that the environment transforms man, do not understand the process of human evolution. Here let me quote Engels too, who, in "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," page 73, says, speaking of "active social forces," that "they work exactly like natural forces: blindly, forcibly, destructively, so long as we do not understand and reckon with them. But when once we understand them, it depends ONLY UPON OURSELVES to subject them more and more to our own will, and by means of them to reach our own ends."

In his three speeches Mr. Lewis will have it that there is no class struggle, or anything to compare with it, in the animal world. In addition to the evidences that I offered, which he only superficially and sarcastically considers in his just finished remarks, I will call his attention to the classes existing among the buffaloes, where the strong bulls lead the herd, and subject the weaker, smaller bulls to all kinds of humiliation and indignities, the class dominance of the lordlier cockerels among the domestic fowls, and the enslaving of certain tribes of ants by other strong, or wiser ant tribes. And the point that classes do not completely dominate in society, just as they do not completely dominate and control in the lower animal world, stands unshaken; I may say, unchallenged.

The results of this debate as far as economic determinism is concerned may be summed up in a few words: Mr. Lewis has contented himself by presenting instances of the power of economic conditions as obvious as would have been that of the settling of the Klondike, or the building of a great railroad. I called his attention to the persecutions of the early Jews, the origin of Christianity, the early development of the principle of abolition in the minds of Garrison and Lincoln. In his various speeches Mr. Lewis has not produced one particle of evidence to show that these things were principally determined by economic conditions.

Race hatred, based on racial and religious and political differences, determined the early history of the Jews, not the economic factor. Christianity, like other idealistic systems of religion, rose among the Jews, as Buddhism rose among an entirely different people in a different economic environment, out of the idealistic, emotional and philosophical tendencies which are common to oriental races, and whose causes are obscured largely by our ignorance of the psychological factor. Christ was the son of a carpenter; one of an obscure and persecuted people; Gautama Buddha was a prince among a united people; one not persecuted by foreigners, and given to thought and contemplation. Both these men produced religions which meet and agree at vital and essential points. Lincoln and Garrison were idealists.

Mr. Lewis' dismissal of Christianity as a religion of cowardice and slavery may stand as an example of his logical method. Both Engles and Kautsky say that Christianity was a religion of violent revolt against oppression. Indeed Engles called early Christianity the "dangerous party of revolution," while Kautsky says that "the throwing off of the Roman rule was the first condition of all emancipation," as taught among the early Christians. Shall we accept Mr. Lewis' inaccurate and unhistorical utterances in this connection or shall we rather stand with those who see in the early history of Christianity one of the most heroic struggles for freedom which the world has known; which, carried to Rome, won its legions part by part; enduring all
things and daring all things, even torture and death; till Rome, the world, was won for the Nazarine conception of life?

I am not a Christian. I know no god. So far as I am concerned "Man is the master of things" for better or for worse; but this does not keep me from reading the facts of history aright when the story of Christianity is up for consideration and judgment.

The summing up of our arguments on the class struggle shows that Mr. Lewis has not dealt with the fact, patent to everyone, that the more intelligent among the workers are in a better condition than that they formerly knew, thanks to increased opportunities for education and the growth of trade union influence among them. With these the class feeling tends to diminish, and a mass feeling begins to take its place. They feel united, if not in respect to possessions, in respect to customs and thought, with those above them in opportunity.

As unions develop and as wealth does not concentrate beyond a limited degree, the conditions of the mass of workers tends to slowly improve, just enough to keep that mass looking to wage increase and industrial organization for relief. Mr. Lewis, as I told him at the beginning, has left the psychological facts out of his calculations in theorizing on the class struggle. Men move in the mass to any great social transformation; no class has ever solved a race problem. The abolition of slavery in the United States, the conversion of a large part of the world to Christianity, the triumphant wars of Napoleon, are all examples. The mass decided the issues, not a class.

I will deal but briefly with the theory of concentration. Mr. Lewis alleges that wealth is concentrating in the hands of the few to an extreme degree; I contend that it is concentrating thus to only a moderate degree, and that therefore the concentration of wealth will not throw the world into revolution. My figures are authoritative. Mr. Lewis responds with figures which show, not that wealth is concentrating, but that in some few industries, where large scale production is inevitable, a great mass of individual stockholders have displaced a great mass of individual manufacturers.

He has not dealt with the farmers scientifically. The president of Cornell University recently stated that whereas that university formerly owned several million dollars in mortgages on the farm lands of Kansas, it can not get a dollar of mortgages on these lands today, the farmers having paid off the mortgages, thanks to their wonderful crops, gathered during recent years.

Here let me call your attention to the Farmers' Unions, which already number their tens of thousands of members, and which are increasing in power every day. At their recent convention an enormous strength was displayed, and they considered ways and means to establish relations with consumers agents direct and sell their products to the people from their own warehouses without the intervention of the trusts.

Mr. Lewis will probably say that the farmers are slaves because of the mortgages which, he will allege, they have been forced to put on their property. My reply is that under existing economic conditions a mortgage is not necessarily an evidence of poverty; it may be an evidence of wealth in prospect. A man may borrow money to improve his holdings of any kind, and those holdings may pay that money back when their increased profits are applied to the debt. Thus with the farms of Kansas, thus with the houses owned by men of little property, which have been paid for by putting a few dollars down, giving a mortgage, and then renting part of the house or one flat so that the principal was paid in rent saved and the income from the other rented rooms.

As to politics, my final word is that Marx, Engels, Kautsky and Mr. Lewis all concede that the state is a superfluity and will pass away with the growth of social life. The "grotesque" is found, not in my position then, but in that of men who would work for the abolition of the state by creating a new state and
putting it into the hands of a class which they allege has been an enslaved class. Yes, the "grotesque" lies with these.

We do not know politics! The wish to rule has not always been the dominant note in political life! The people have not always been forgotten by the lords of power! The proletariat will handle power with love, tenderness, forebearance! They will use power to destroy power! The history of the Socialist Party is my answer to the claim that Socialists will use power in a different way from that in which other classes have used it. The state does tend to pass away, but only to the extent that the social feelings develop in humanity. Class consciousness raised to its highest power is nothing less than the spirit of a new tyranny. Mr. Lewis has failed to justify the ballot.

But I must conclude. The development of the class struggle is conditioned by the struggle of the mass against customs and practices which involve the whole people without regard to class. The state, which, in the language of Spencer, "began in aggression," tends to diminish in power and authority, as the development of industrial and fraternal organization follows from the massing of human units in close social aggregates.

The social problem is more than an economic problem, nor does its solution depend principally upon economic conditions. There is no economic man. All men are involved in social evolution and their co-operation is essential to it. The monopolies will pass away through the working of the forces involved in the decentralization of industry and through the development and perfection of unionism. Strikes, particular and general, will fill for a time the vision of economic study, industrial organizations for the purpose of freeing man from the power of speculator and the exploiter will spring up. Politics will be more and more neglected as the results of organized efforts of other kinds are observed and understood.

The times are ripe for the shaping of a new world. In the shaping of that world all will not be love and kindness, it is not in the nature of things that it should be. But the moral, religious, and social conceptions of the masses of men must change; and the great struggle will lie mostly in the effort to throw off old systems of religion, and morals, which dominate all men more or less, old habits and customs, which rule in all classes, and old superstitions, like the political superstitions.

My faith lies in the race, not in a class. Man is the arbiter of destiny; not kings; nor yet slaves. Karl Marx has not written the history of social evolution in advance; no one has written it; no one can. There are hints, signs, indications, understood in part and in part only; but, given intelligence and experience, the human race will solve the social problem in a strike against all things unsocial and in the name of mutual aid, which is but another expression for the brotherhood of the race. In the words of Swinburne, "Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things!"

CLOSING SPEECH BY LEWIS

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Barnard, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is to be regretted that my opponent lives so much in the past that he does not know that Bernstein's revisionism has run its course into intellectual bankruptcy and that the swing of European Socialist thought is more than ever toward Marx. Indeed the present tendency is to out-Marx Marx.

Mr. Barnard complains that I try to "shift the issues" and yet in spite of all my efforts to keep him to the class struggle in human society, the only struggle there is, he will wander off and look for one among lower animals; in his last speech he imagines he has found it among cockerels and buffaloes. What a waste of ingenuity! Class struggles are the effect of private property and as there is no private property among the lower animals, Mr. Barnard might as well look among cockerels and buffaloes for typewriters, boiled shirts, panics caused by overproduction, or any other purely human phenomena.
In dealing with Christianity Mr. Barnard has hopped from twig to twig, and finally landed squarely in the Socialist position. Christianity was a religion of "violent revolt." Revolt against what? Economic conditions, of course. The tyranny of Rome, even, was economic; the extortion of heavy tribute under threat of the Roman broadsword. The slaves wished to escape their slave conditions and be treated as "brothers." Their slavery was an economic condition, if words have any meaning. Then Christianity was a revolt against certain economic conditions, even according to Mr. Barnard. Then Christianity must have grown out of those economic conditions, against which it was the revolt.

In his last speech Mr. Barnard shows no disposition to renew the statistical battle though he introduced it in the teeth of my warning. The whole of our discussion of "environment" resolves itself into a question of fact. Mr. Barnard has again and again denied my assertion that in the animal world environment "rules like an absolute czar." I would be willing to stake the entire debate on this question.

It has been made a big question in this discussion and all biological science is on my side. I will now demonstrate how ill-informed Mr. Barnard is on this question. He says: "I find Lester F. Ward opposing the crude notion that environment dominates organisms." And this is how Ward opposes it: "In any and every case it is the environment that works the changes and the organism that undergoes them."

My opponent has done well considering the weakness of his case. My faith like his lies ultimately in the race. But since the beginning of private property progress has moved by class antagonism. To some economic class has fallen the task of carrying the race one step forward. In our day the interests of the exploited proletariat are identical with the real interests of the race. The working class, therefore, incarnates social progress and by the very laws of its development it cannot emancipate itself from class subjection without at the same time abolishing all class divisions and ushering in that era of human brotherhood in which we all ardently believe.