

Title	An economic interpretation of the socialistic movements in the United States. IV.
Sub Title	
Author	Takagi, Senjiro
Publisher	慶應義塾理財学会
Publication year	1919
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.13, No.6 (1919. 6) ,p.737(73)- 759(95)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	論説
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19190601-0073

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

貨物所有者の國性の如何に依て捕獲權の有無を定むるものに外ならず。故に余は此主義を略稱して貨主々義と云はんと欲す。

果して然らば中世の頃、南歐諸國民間に行はれたる慣例は貨主々義を採用したるものなることを推知するを得べし。然らば北歐諸國民間に於ても此主義が一般に認められたりやと云ふに少なくとも敵船内の中立貨物に對する取扱ひに關しては貨主々義に全く反對したる慣例の存したるを證す可きものあり。即ち一四六八年七月二日英國王エドワード三世と Bretagne 公フランスアとの間に締結せられたる條約中には敵船内に發見せらるゝ中立貨物は沒收せらる可きを規定したるに徴するときは *Consolato del mare* の主義の北歐には必ずしも一般に行はれざりしものなるを見る可し。而して此英國王と Bretagne 公との間に締結せられたる條約は後に至り「敵船敵貨」(enemy ship, enemy goods) の主義とて敵船内の貨物中、中立性を有する所有主に屬するものありと雖も該貨物は敵船に搭載せられたるの故を以て敵性に感染したるものと見做され拿捕沒收せらる可きものと爲せる後代の新原則の爲めに其先驅を爲すものと認むるを得べし。

AN ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIALISTIC MOVEMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES. IV.

Senjiro Takagi.

In the national election of 1906, according to Robert Hunter, the French socialists polled 900,000 votes throughout the country. There were then seventy different federations of various socialist organizations distributed in eighty out of the ninety-seven departments with 52,000 affiliated members. They elected as many as 2,160 municipal councillors, 149 mayors and 219 vicemayors. In the national legislature, moreover, there sat 52 deputies, representing the interests of socialists.¹

Again, compare the American socialist vote with that of the German Social Democratic Party, as given in the following table:²

¹ Socialists at Work, pp. 80-81.

² Barker: Modern Germany, Chap. XIII, p. 296.

Election	Social Demo- cratic Vote	Total Vote	Percentage of Social Demo- cratic Vote
1881	312,000	5,097,800	6.12%
1884	550,000	5,663,000	9.68 "
1887	763,100	7,540,900	10.11 "
1890	1,427,300	7,228,500	19.74 "
1893	1,786,700	7,674,000	23.30 "
1898	2,107,076	7,752,700	27.18 "
1903	3,010,771	9,495,586	31.71 "
1907	3,259,000	11,262,800	28.94 "

In the very successful campaign of 1904, the socialist vote was a trifle less than four per cent. of the total votes cast for the Presidential candidates. But twenty-three years before that, the German socialists cast more than six per cent. of the total votes. Since that time both the absolute and the relative increase were steady until, in 1903, they polled as many as nearly fifty per cent. of the votes

Democrats in this country cast for Mr. Bryan in 1900, or nearly sixty per cent. of what Judge Parker received in the election of 1904. Even in the German election of 1907, when the irresistible tide of Imperialism was sweeping everything before it in the Kaiser's realm and the percentage of the socialist vote dropped from 31.7 to 28.9, the absolute number of socialist votes increased from 3,010,771 in 1903 to 3,259,000.

But what are the causes that seem to retard or at least seem to interfere with the rapid growth of Socialism in the United States, where there is no government or any other organized opposition against it, and at the very time when it is making such progress in France and Germany?

In studying the history of Modern Socialism in the United States, one is inevitably struck by the preponderance of foreign, and especially German, elements in various movements. In fact, the General Working Men's Union, the Socialistic Gymnastic Unions and the Communist Club may be said to be entirely German in their origin, membership and sympathies. Even the later movements, some of which have continued to flourish until the present day, are largely foreign in their various aspects. Writing in 1885, Professor Richard T. Ely says that "An attempt is being made to win English-speaking followers, and the National Executive Committee (of the Socialist Labor Party) advertizes pamphlets and a series of tracts in the English language. Some progress has been made in winning

English-speaking adherents to the party, and large success has met their efforts to diffuse their ideas among the laboring classes, but, as the "Socialist" frankly acknowledges, they are still a 'German colony, a branch of the German social democracy.' Indeed, one bond of unions holding them together is their interest and active participation in the election of members to the Imperial Parliament of Germany."¹

Nor did these movements, in which German and other foreign elements predominated, receive much encouragement from the native population. In the earlier days, almost all leaders and adherents were new arrivals from the Old World. The source of the recruits, however, that these movements received was, of course, not confined to Germany. For "in 1871," says Prof. Ely, "a new impulse was received from the French refugees who came to America after the suppression of the uprising of the commune of Paris, and brought with them a spirit of violence. . . ."²

But, naturally, it is from the ranks of the German Social Democratic Party that the American movement received most of its strength. Especially after the campaign of oppression was instituted by the Iron Hand of Bismarck against socialists, a constant stream of refugees sought the freer shores of the

¹ Ely: Modern American Socialism, in Johns Hopkins studies, vol. 8, p. 283.

² Ely: Labor Movement in America, p. 227.

United States to realize their hopes and ideals. "The 'Exceptional Law' passed against socialists, by the German Parliament in 1878," remarks Prof. Ely, "drove many socialists from Germany to this country, and these have strengthened the cause of American socialism through membership in trade-unions and in the Socialist Labor Party."¹

It was also in the very same year that S. E. Schewitsch, a Russian of noble birth, and Herrman Schlueter took up their editorial work with the "New Yorker Volkzeitung." Two years later, Wilhelm Hasselmann, a Lassallean and a former deputy to the German Imperial Diet, migrated to the United States and became a prominent worker in the Revolutionary branch of the Socialist Labor Party. In 1881 F. W. Fritsche and Louis Viereck, then deputies to the Diet, followed them to collect funds for their fellow socialists in Germany. In the following year, we see John Most going to the United States and plunging into an activity of which he soon became leader. In 1886, Wilhelm Liebknecht, the then well-known leader of the Geaman Social Democratic Party, Elenor Marx Aveling, the brilliant daughter of the father of Modern Socialism, and her husband, Edward Aveling, went from one end of the country to the other on a lecturing tour, by which they aroused great enthusiasm.

The predominance of foreign element in the American socialist movement may be made still more clear

¹ Ely: Labor Movement in America, p. 228.

by referring to the languages in which the socialist papers were published. Writing in 1885, Prof. Ely mentioned¹ thirty-four publications, of which sixteen were socialistic, ten semi-socialistic, and eight socialistically inclined. Of these journals, only one, published by the Internationals, was in English.² The "Sozialist", the "Tageblatt" and the "New Yorker Volkzeitung," on the other hand, which were the most prominent organs of the Socialist Labor Party, were, as their titles suggest, published in German. As to the proportion of natives among the socialists, it is more difficult to receive any reliable information. Morris Hillquit estimates, however, that, during the early career of the Socialist Labor Party, not more than ten per cent. of its members were native Americans.³ As late as 1881, the "New Yorker Zeitung" complained that "A socialist campaign is useless. . . ., unless the American vote can be reached by it. But as the party is constituted at present[1881], it can only reach the German working men."⁴

Since that time, however, the proportion of native elements seems to have steadily, though slowly, in-

¹ Mod. Am. Soc., p. 54, Johns Hopkins Studies, vol. 3, 1885.

² Hillquit says there were two.

³ Hillquit: History of Socialism in the United States, p. 213. Hunter: Socialists at Work, p. 358.

⁴ Hillquit: History of Socialism in the United States, p. 269.

creased. According to Hillquit,¹ there were founded between 1889 and 1893 one hundred thirteen sections of the Socialist Labor Party. Of these, forty-three were German, thirty-nine American, fourteen Jewish, and the rest were composed of Poles, Bohemians, Frenchmen, Italians and other nationalities. Even with this increase, the proportion of the "American" sections was only a trifle over one-third of the total number of sections. The socialists have since made more gains in the native population, and are beginning to claim that Socialism is no longer an imported movement. "The composition of the convention"[of the Socialist Party held on the 29th day of July, 1901], says Hillquit,² "also served to demonstrate how much the character of the socialist movement had changed during the last few years: Out of the 124 delegates, no more than twenty-five, or about twenty per cent., were foreign-born; all the others were native Americans. Socialism had ceased to be an exotic plant in this country."

Even Prof. Ely, whose conservatism may be better relied on than the enthusiasm of an out-spoken socialist, says, writing in 1905, that "Socialism has begun to excite alarm in America and its advocates are found in all parts of the country; but it is a gross mistake to treat it as purely artificial or imported

¹ Hillquit: History of Socialism in the United States, p. 258.

² Idem, p. 339.

product.”¹

But has socialism been really acclimated in the United States and become a genuine American product? N. P. Gilman, the author of "Socialism and the American Spirit", may be wrong when he represents the native elements among the American socialists as sentimental sympathizers. For Stokeses, Londons and Sinclairs are not the only native socialists, but there are also Hunters, Hillquits and Simorses. But, after all, has Socialism such strong hold upon the native population? According to Prof. Ely himself, who claims that Socialism is no longer an "artificial or imported product", such does not seem to be the case. For he says that "To-day [1905] one of the principal reasons why our socialists are for the most part foreigners is because our laboring population consists chiefly of men and women of foreign birth or parentage, and the bulk of the socialistic parties is always composed of working people."²

Let us now turn to the more concrete evidence of the strength of Socialism among the native Americans as it has been presented in the returns of the elections in which it has played its part. For, after all, it is through the ballot that the socialist hopes and expects to attain his cherished object.

In 1900, according to the Census of that year, there were 22,063,506 males who were twenty years

¹ Ely: Labor Movement in America, p. 216.

² Idem p. 286.

older. Of these, 16,874,980, or twenty-six per cent. of the total number, were native born. Of the native born males, 11,036,129, or fifty per cent. of all males over twenty years of age, were of native white parents. There were also 3,622,515, or sixteen per cent. of the total number of males over twenty, who were born of foreign white parents. If we combine the number of native born of foreign white parents with that of the foreign born males over twenty, we shall have forty per cent. of the total. Yet they are still outnumbered by the native born of native white parentage by 5 to 4. The voting population as a whole, may thus be considered, not overwhelmingly, but distinctively native in their composition.¹

Next, let us turn to the towns where the socialists have been successful in electing public officers, and see whether their success is significant from the native point of view. First we may take up the town of Haverhill, Mass., which has had a number of socialist mayors. The following table of an analysis of the voting population of this socialist town has been compiled from the Census Reports of 1900.

¹ The number of men given in these calculations is larger than the actual voting population, as males of twenty years of age are included. The "native born of foreign white parents" include all men who had either or both parents foreign. An objection may be raised that men with American fathers and foreign mothers would be practically native in their political sympathies. But the number of those having such mixed parentage is small and that of those having native fathers and foreign mothers is much smaller than the number of those in the reverse situation. Some allowance

Haverhill, Mass.¹

All males over twenty	11,494
Native born	7929 (72%)
Native white parents	6042 (55%)
Foreign white parents	1779 (17%)
Foreign born	3465 (28%)

As seen in the table, the number of foreign born is smaller than that of the native born. That of the combined forces of the native born of foreign white parents and the foreign born, is also smaller than that of the native born of native white parents. But comparing these figures with the corresponding figures for the entire country, it is found that, although the number of the native born of native white parents in Haverhill is proportionally larger than that for the United States, that of the foreign born is much larger, as is also the percentage of the combined strengths of the foreign born and the native born of foreign white parentage. Here it may be concluded, however, that Socialism has made some progress

should also be made for those foreign born who were new arrivals and had not yet acquired citizenship. But, on the whole, it is assumed that the proportions are nearly correct. This applies to all similar tables that follow.

¹ The negroes are omitted in these classifications. They are practically the same as native whites in politics.

among the natives in this town, as, without their assistance or acquiescence, it would not have received the majority of votes. Yet, its success in this Massachusetts town is not as significant as it might have been if it had a larger population.

In the next place, we may take up Brockton, Mass., which has also had its socialist mayors. The following table gives the proportions of the various elements in its population as they existed in the Census year of 1900:

Brockton, Mass.	
All males over 20	11,727
Native born	8,600 (73%)
Native white parents	4162 (37%) ¹
Foreign white parents	2244 (20%)
Foreign born	3,127 (27%)

Here the proportions are very much the same as in the case of Haverhill with the exception of that of the native born of native white parentage which is smaller than that of either Haverhill or the entire country. In this factory town, the combined votes of the foreign born and the native born of foreign

white parentage would outnumber the votes of the native born of native white parents by five to four. In so far, therefore, as the children of foreign parents have inherited their parents' ideas and sympathies, it may be said that Socialism has been naturalized in this shoe-manufacturing centre.

Coming now to Anacorda City, Mont., which was carried by the socialists in the election of 1903, we find that the foreign element in that city as reported in the Census of 1900, was predominant in that year. According to the Census Reports, the population of the town in 1900 was 9,453, which was classified as follows:

males	females	native	foreign
5514	3939	5975	3478

Giving the male population the same proportions of classification by nativities for both sexes, we obtain the following figures:

Native males	2922
Foreign males	2592

Again, by taking for the classification of population by age the same proportions for the population of the entire country, we find that, in 1900, there were

1461 native males over 20 and

2332 foreign " "

The foreign born would thus outnumber the native born by 1.7 to 1 at the polls, although the total number of natives was more than forty per cent. in excess of the total number of foreign born.

We may now take up New York City, where the socialists have not been successful in electing public officers, but, yet have had their headquarters and the recruiting station for half a century. An analysis of the population of the City is given in the following table:

	New York City.	1900.	
All males over 20.		1,047,855	
Native born.		479,590	(46%)
Native white parents		185,354	(18%)
Foreign " "		275,411	(27%)
Foreign born		572,265	(54%)

It may be noticed that the number of the foreign born was far in excess of that of the native born. The combined votes of the foreign born and the native born of foreign white parentage would have beaten the votes of the native born of native white parents by four to one. It is rather surprising that Socialism has not reaped a richer harvest in this fertile field, where it has not even begun to convert any

respectable portion of the foreign element.

The City of Chicago, where Socialism has produced some practical results and has made its presence felt, now claims our attention. A similar table as for the foregoing is given below for the Windy City :

Chicago, Ill.,		1900.
All males over 20.		525,391
Native born		147,313 (28%)
Native white parents		106,808 (21%)
Foreign white parents		17,954 (4%)
Foreign born		378,078 (72%)

This table shows that the number of the foreign born outnumbered that of the native born of any parentage by 2.5 to 1. If we combine the number of the foreign born with that of the native born of foreign white parents, it is seen that this combination would beat out the number of the native born of native white parents by 3.5 to 1. While it may be safe to refrain from concluding that the socialist movement in Chicago is purely a foreign affair, the preponderance of males of immediate or recent foreign extraction in this great city is very significant.

We shall now study that state of the Union where Socialism has been most successful. The following table has also been compiled from the Census Reports of 1900.

Wisconsin,		1900.
Males over 20		589,650
Native born		327,657 (56%)
Native white parents		122,086 (20%)
Foreign " "		205,571 (35%)
Foreign born		260,974 (44%)

The number of the native born in this state, as seen in the table, is in excess of the foreign born. But the combination of the foreign born with the native born of foreign white parents outnumbers the total of the native born of native white parents by 3.5 to 1. Thus it is seen that Socialism has still abundant room for expansion among the foreign elements before it may be compelled to invade the native territory.

Lastly we shall turn our attention to the City of Milwaukee, where the socialists claim they have been more successful than in any other city or town in the United States. The table for this city is also given below :

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1900

Males over 20	77,533	
Native born	35,385	(45%)
Native white parents	8,343	(10%)
Foreign " "	27,673	(35%)
Foreign born	41,148	(55%)

The number of the foreign born in this city exceeds that of the native born by twenty per cent. The number of the native born of foreign parents is two hundred fifty per cent. more than the number of the native born of native white parents. The combined votes of the foreign born, on the other hand, with the votes of the native born of foreign parents would outnumber those of the native born by nine to one!

If it is at all safe to draw any conclusion from these figures for the various cities we have studied, it would seem safe to conclude that the success of Socialism in any locality appears to depend on the presence of a large foreign element in its population. While it may be amiss to infer that the socialist movement in the United States has not made any impression on the native population, there seems to be little doubt that this new social activity is entirely foreign in its origin and is still largely

exotic in its character, membership and influence.

It is, perhaps, in this very exotic character of the movement that one of the causes of the retardation of the progress of Socialism is found. Anything foreign has disadvantages, *ceteris paribus*, in its very foreignness. The fact that Socialism is strongest in Germany and among the Germans in the United States, stamps it as a foreign theory or doctrine and serves as a presumptive evidence of its usefulness for other peoples, who are not similarly situated. The social and economic conditions of Germany gave rise to such social doctrine, but those of the United States were different and did not give birth to any social or political theory similar to that of Modern Socialism. They have not succeeded in even nourishing and rearing a theory, which has been adopted by, or rather thrust upon, the United States as a ward.

Of course, if the conditions in that country are ripening for its reception and fostering, or the conditions are becoming similar to those in Germany which gave rise to the modern social theories and ideals, the fate of Socialism may be expected to be similar to that in its fatherland. But are the social and economic conditions in the United States becoming similar to those in Germany?

We may first take up the characteristics of the American to see whether they are receptive of the impressions of Socialism. In this connection, we shall quote the six terse sentences in which N. P. Gilman

sums up the American character: ¹

“Love of personal liberty is the first distinctive feature of the American spirit.”

“Practical conservatism is now a second prominent mark of the American spirit.”

“The American is supposed by foreigners, and by himself as well, to be nothing if not enterprising.”

“The love of competition which characterizes the Anglo-Saxon race has probably reached its utmost pitch in America.”

“Public spirit is one of the foremost of national characteristics in America.”

“The American is constitutionally an optimist.”

We see these American characteristics daily revealed with all their advantages and disadvantages. Where, in the world, are any people who are such stout defenders of personal liberty and freedom, such energetic enterprisers, such keen competitors and yet so optimistic and good-natured as the Americans? Professor Sumner, in his little book entitled “What Social Classes Owe to Each Other”, says, “Every man and woman in society has one big duty. That is, to take care of his or her own self.”² And in the United States, every man and woman does take care of his or her own self to the extent that no other

¹ Socialism and the American Spirit, chap. XIII.

² p. 13.

people have ever done in the whole history of civilization. America is the home of Individualism in its best sense. If Socialism is to flourish, it must first subjugate Individualism, especially the Individualism of the American which has been developed by two centuries of favorable economic conditions.

Religion is also in the way of the socialist's success in the United States, for the people, on the whole, are still religious, and all religion is conservative. In 1906, there were no less than thirty-two million communicants of various faiths and denominations in the United States.¹ That makes one communicant for every three men, women or children in the country. Of these thirty-two million believers in different religions, eleven millions were Catholics, who are the most conservative of all. What is the influence of fifty socialist newspapers and magazines compared with the fifteen thousand priests whose dominating influence over their devotees is notorious.

The peculiar political situation in the country is also unfavorable to the growth of Socialism. There are to-day practically no national issues which might create sectional or class struggles. Neither in the South nor in the West is there such bitterness expressed against the protective tariff as did exist in the South during the first half of the nineteenth century. The slavery question, as far as the country as a whole is concerned, has been settled for ever and forgotten. The Southern people are already beginning

¹ Tribune almanac for 1908; p. 205.

to celebrate the birthday of the martyred President and the Northerners are louder in their praises of General Lee than his own fellows in the South. Whatever class feeling may exist among the people, it is almost lost in their intoxication over the general national prosperity. Nor are even the few discontented compelled to agitate themselves for the introduction of a new order of things, when political leaders seem to be just as zealous as they are in trying to curb the aggressiveness of the capitalist and to minimize the evils of accumulated wealth. There was the Peerless Mr. Bryan who brandished his proposals for the state ownership of railroads and for the annihilation of all trusts and monopolies. Next came Mr. Roosevelt with his soothing suggestions for graduated income tax and heavy taxes on inheritance to prevent large accumulations of fortune. There was Mr. Hearst who offered numerous proposals for municipal ownerships, cheap lighting, short hours, etc., to compensate for his election to any office. Where should Socialism stand in this company?

The state-right doctrine, which has been lately revived, is another enemy of Socialism. Although most leaders of the Republican party favor a greater concentration of power in the Federal Government, the rank and file of the party as well as the Democrats are zealous defenders of the states. In the process of evolution for the last one hundred and twenty years, a certain equilibrium has been established between the States and the Federal Government. It may be eventually disturbed,

but not until the forces which established that equilibrium have themselves been counteracted.

The composition of the political parties is also unfavorable to the progress of any radical movement. The Republican and Democratic parties have had and still do have the absolute control of the national and state politics. But neither of them can be called a richmen's party or a poormen's party either in the nation as a whole or in any State. A respectable percentage of voters are Republicans in the presidential elections and Democrats in the State and local elections, and *vice versa*. They seem to vote for the best men available and not for particular parties. N. P. Gilman says, in "Socialism and the American Spirit", that "there is no horizontal line of party cleavage in the United States between rich and poor. So far, indeed, as there has been an approximation to such a division, the situation in one part of the country has been precisely the reverse of that in the other part. The Democratic party in the South has been the party of property, as well as the Republican party in the North; but the Democratic party in the North, enrolled the great multitude of Irish immigrants; it includes much the larger number of persons, who might be ranked in the 'proletariat' of America, if we had any considerable body of persons deserving such a name, as we have not."¹

¹. Chap- v, p. 176.

These enemies of Socialism in the United States, however, are more or less negative in their character. But there is another which is positive in its nature and in which every man and woman, socialist or not, is interested. It is the great problem of marriage on which much of the man's happiness and the whole of the woman's happiness depend. But unfortunately for Socialism, it has treated this grave question with levity and contempt. The Communist Manifesto declares that there exists an actual common ownership of wives and that it should be openly recognized. Most of the socialist manifestoes since then reiterate the declaration and advocates the abolition of marriage and the institution of "free love." But do the facts sustain them and warrant such attacks on the institution of marriage and home in the United States? "The modern marriage, in the average, says a woman socialist," is founded, not upon mutual esteem and affection nor upon a concern for the welfare of future citizens, but it is, for the woman, a means of escape from the struggle for a living; for the man, a means of providing himself with a useful companion at the lowest cost, and for both man and woman, an escape from the worries and torments of life into an oblivion of sexual indulgence which the law allows and court awards,' and which has received the sanction and blessing of the Court and council of Heaven."¹

¹ Ethel Snowden: The Woman Socialist chap. VII, p. 47-8.

Such a view of marriage may be correct in some of the European countries where means of livelihood are difficult to obtain and marriage is almost impossible without a respectable dowry on the part of the woman. But in the United States many women have independent means or have lucrative trades or professional positions, and are rather reluctant to surrender their independence except when the discounted value of matrimony seems to them to be greater than the discounted value of their independence. Nor is the American wife a useful companion supplied at the lowest cost. Instead of escaping from the jaws of "the worries and torments of life", of which there are only few in the United States, into "an oblivion of sexual indulgence", most men seem to shrink from the mouth of the care and responsibility of a husband and father. If a man and woman enter into the sacred bond of matrimony, it is because they are impatient to realize the culmination of their hopes and desires in a communion of hearts that their courtship has fostered, and to share its joys and sorrows in the secluded sanctum of their home. Socialism, which is an avowed enemy of home, is bound to repulse the men and women of normal mental development in any country where the sanctity of home is upheld.

(To be Concluded.)