



# THE PROLETARIAN



WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!



No. 1

DETROIT, MICH., MAY, 1918

Price, 5c.

## The Policy of This Publication

**A**T NO TIME IN THE PAST have the conditions in this country been as propitious as they are right now for the publication of a real Socialist paper. Therefore THE PROLETARIAN makes its appearance to give expression on current events, as its name would imply, from a proletarian standpoint and from no other.

This paper is dedicated to the exploited AMERICAN WAGE WORKERS in their POLITICAL STRUGGLE for emancipation from the rule of the Capitalist Class.

The editorial policy will be based squarely upon the recognition of the CLASS STRUGGLE, and adhere to the philosophic principles expounded in the works of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Paul Lafargue, Antonio Labriola, Joseph Dietzgen, and others of the revolutionary school of modern Socialism. No wilful sacrifice of accuracy for the purpose of increasing the circulation will be tolerated by those responsible for this paper.

The stultification of the Materialistic Conception of History, which has become so fashionable in many so-called Socialist sheets, will have no place in our columns. We will, on the contrary, strike at all brands of hyphenated Socialism just as strongly as we will oppose the "pure" and simple defenders of Capitalist Society. No institution, no matter how venerable or "sacred," that supports the perpetuation of Capitalism will be exempt from our attack.

We will leave reforms of all kinds to those who think the present social system worth reforming. For our part, the revolutionary watchword, "the abolition of the system," will be the keynote.

That there is a field in this country, for a paper of this character, has long been our opinion, but it has taken this World War and the collapse of the so-called International, to demonstrate to many the futility of the reform policy. The absurdity of the idea, still persisting in some minds, of the gradual "growing out of Capitalism into Socialism," is pointed out in the now widely circulated book by Leon Trotsky, "The Bolsheviki and World Peace." Writing of the Revisionism, that so permeated the German movement, he says:

"The gradual growing into Socialism, that is the basis of Revisionism, proved to be the most miserable Utopian dream in the face of the facts of capitalistic development." (Page 200.)

To help lift the American movement out of its Utopianism and purge it of its manifold forms of reaction will be the function of this monthly SOCIALIST paper. It will continually point out to the American proletariat the way to raise itself to the position of ruling class of this country by the conquest of political power. The workers must gain political power in order to get possession of the government. It will then be possible for them to use the institution of the State for its final function—the abolition of all classes by the socialization of the means of wealth production, to the end that the toilers, both intellectual and manual, will reap the full reward of their social labors.

To the readers who are in sympathy with our policy, we look for support. Make "The Proletarian" your paper. Boost its circulation. Send us your suggestions. Send us your criticisms and send us your list of subscribers.

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

## The Political Activities of the British Labor Movement

One might imagine, from the reports in the daily press, that the capitalist world was becoming greatly alarmed over the part that Labor is going to play in the "reconstruction that is to follow the war." The spectacle of "horny handed labor" sitting in the councils and dictating the terms is very shocking indeed. In the case of England, it has even been asserted that, either at the next election or immediately after the war, organized labor will be in the position of power. Some writers have gone so far as to predict that Mr. Arthur Henderson, leader of the Labor Party will be the next premier.

Inasmuch as the press of the entire country has devoted a great deal of space to the British Labor Party and its now famous program, which the Socialist press of the country has, almost without exception, indorsed and praised to the skies, it will be necessary to go to the trouble of inquiring a bit into the history and character of the British labor movement in order that we may be able to judge just what revolutionary possibilities are to be found in the Labor party, as at present constituted.

The American reading public, as a rule, is not very well acquainted with the labor movement in Great Britain and the initials designating the different political parties, which are generally used in the place of the more cumbersome names, are so many meaningless symbols to them.

The avowedly capitalistic parties are three in number, the Conservative, Liberal and Irish Nationalist parties, representing different kinds of capitalistic interests.

Of the "Socialist" parties now in existence, the first to appear was the Social Democratic Federation, now known as the British Socialist Party. Mr. Hyndman has always contended that the workers will never be able to emancipate themselves but will need the assistance of the intellectuals, such as himself, as he recently pointed out in an open letter to President Wilson. The policy of this party has ranged all the way from an anti-reform stand to hobnobbing with the Tories and Liberal

The Fabian Society was organized in 1884 by a group of middle class intellectuals, of whom George Bernard Shaw, the playwright and adherent of the "marginal utility" theory of value, which, we are informed, "adds lustre to the name of Marx," was one. Shaw and Sidney Webb, the historian of the trade unions, are probably the best known of this group. The Fabians have never pretended to stand on the CLASS struggle.

The Independent Labor Party, familiarly known as the I. L. P. was organized in 1893, at a conference of trade union delegates, local branches of the Social Democratic Federation, Scottish Labor Party members, etc. The late Mr. Kier Hardie, Ramsey MacDonald and Mr. Philip Snowden have been the most prominent leaders of the organization. It is not necessary for the purposes of this article, to go into all the details of the questionable political alliances with the capitalist parties, which have characterized the I. L. P. since its inception. Its policy has always been one of political expediency.

All these parties were alike in the respect that none of them took up a sound position but followed the policy of attempting to capture the labor movement by the method of "permeation." By "permeation" is meant the gradual penetration of the movement with their ideas, a method that is known in this country "as boring from within." They also clung tenaciously to the policy so dear to the heart of the "permeator," the "reformation" of capitalism by the method of immediate demands.

In the mean time, in order to seat trade union representatives in Parliament a Labor Representation League had been formed in the trade union movement. This organization endeavored to work through the Liberal party but failed to be recognized. In 1885 eleven members were elected to the House of Commons by the Labor Representation League. These however, acted and voted with the Liberals. A move was set on foot to unite the various co-operative societies, socialistic, trade union and other working class organizations, in order

to secure an increased number of labor members to the next parliament.

At a conference in which sat delegates from the Social Democratic Federation, the I. L. P., Fabian Society and the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, the Labor Representation Committee was formally inaugurated. Among the resolutions adopted the following is decidedly significant:

"That this conference is in favor of establishing a distinct Labor Group in Parliament, who shall have their own whips, and agree upon their policy, which must embrace a readiness to cooperate with any Party which for the time being may be engaged in promoting legislation in the direct interest of Labor, and be equally ready to associate themselves with any party in opposing measures having an opposite tendency; . . ."

We refer the reader to Wilhelm Liebknecht's "No Compromise—No Political Trading" in which he eloquently deals of the tendency toward trading with the enemy always present in a labor organization not standing squarely on a sound, class conscious program.

The weakness of the position was evidently recognized, as the attempt was made to patch it up in a resolution passed in 1903 which we quote as follows:

.. "this conference regards it as being absolutely necessary that the members of the Executive Committee should strictly abstain from identifying themselves with or promoting the interests of any section of the Liberal or Conservative parties; inasmuch as if we are to secure the social and economic requirement of the industrial classes, Labor representatives in and out of Parliament will have to shape their own policy and act upon it regardless of other sections in the political world; and that the E. C. report to the affiliated association or bodies any such official acting contrary to the spirit of the constitution as hereby amended."

How far "the spirit of the constitution as hereby amended" was maintained will be brought out later in this article.

It was at this time that the present leaders of the party among them Arthur Henderson and Mr. Barnes were compelled to swallow the alleged "Socialist" doctrine in order to hold their jobs in Parliament. It is noteworthy that Mr. Bell, the president of the Amalgamated Railway Servants, who represented the city of Derby, refused to be converted to "Socialism," by this method and consequently was obliged to conform to the British law and appeal to his constituency in a special election.

In the election of 1906 following the Boer war, which was so brilliantly conducted by the Conservative party, twenty-nine of the Labor Representation Committee were wafted into power along with the Liberal landslide. It was at this time that the L. R. C. was metamorphosed into the Labor Party of today.

A number of the trade union delegates, however, still remained outside the fold, most of them from the Miner's Federation, who continued to sit with the Liberal Party, tho co-operating with the Labor party in labor measures, such as the Trades Dispute Bill. The various intrigues to "capture" the trade union movement for "Socialism" continued until the trade union congress previous to the election of 1910, when a resolution was put through which compelled all candidates for office to run under the auspices of the Labor Party.

The Labor party, formed after such superhuman efforts on the part of "radicals" would have had the opportunity of functioning as the political expression of the working class, had it been a class conscious organization, which would have necessitated an unrelenting fight against the representatives of capitalism. Instead of which, they merely acted as the "wing" of the Liberal Party in the noble efforts to destroy the last remnants of Feudal prerogatives. An example of which, we give government's action on the question of the Veto Power of the House of Lords and Labor Party's amendment to it.

That in order to give effect to the will of the people as expressed by their elected representatives, it is necessary that the power of the other house, to alter or reject bills passed by this house should be restricted by law as to secure that within the limits of a single Parliament the final decision of the Commons shall prevail."

The following was the Labor party's amendment: "That the Upper House (Lords), being an irresponsible part of the legislature and of necessity representative only of the interests opposed to the general well being, is a hindrance to national progress and ought to be abolished."

In other words the Liberals wished to shift the veto power from the House of Lords to the Commons, which they controlled, whereas the Laborites were willingly to go a step further and abolish the Lords as an altogether superfluous body.

Not only did the Laborites vote with the Liberals on the floor of the Commons but they supported the Liberal candidates and policies at the polls, as for instance, the Licensing Bill and the famous Lloyd George Budget, in 1910.

In return for the consistent support of their representatives the working class was granted such "revolutionary" measures as old age pensions (\$1.25 a week for slaves with a "clean" record), The Labor Exchange (an institution to keep the slaves "on tap" awaiting the capitalists' convenience), compulsory health insurance, industrial insurance (which gave a rebate to labor unions that paid out unemployment benefits), etc., etc.

The Labor members in Parliament continued to vote loyally with the Liberals in spite of the hostility of the Liberal government, as exemplified in the general railway strike of 1911, at which time Mr. Asquith, the premier, told the assembled executive committee of the railway men that his proposals for the settlement of the disputed questions had to be accepted or the military would be called upon if the men dared to call the strike. The issue being forced the strike was called and Mr. Asquith conveniently fell sick and left the situation for the astute Mr. Lloyd George to solve. Lloyd George succeeded in persuading the strike committee to accept the services of a Royal Commission to arbitrate the differences between the strikers and the

railway companies. The findings of the Commission were entirely satisfactory to the employers, the men receiving in lieu of their original demands a few shillings increase in wages and the balance in specific promises and high-sounding platitudes.

Mr. J. H. Thomas, Labor M. P., who figured largely in this affair, returning to England after a trip to America in 1917, brought back the astonishing news that there were no classes in the United States.

The trades unions received the same shabby treatment at the hands of the Government in the coal miner's strike in 1912 and the transport strike of the same year, conducted by the well known Mr. Ben Tillet. The Labor leaders do not seem to have learned anything by their previous experiences as we find them complaining on this occasion, that the government lined up solid behind the port of London authorities. One wonders what else they expected from a capitalist government.

At the outbreak of the war the Labor members hastened to take up the "Socialist" position, and when the Coalition Government was formed, consented to take office in the cabinet with the old "enemy," the Conservatives. We observe the wierd spectacle of the "Socialist" Arthur Henderson, seated by the side of Mr. D. A. Thomas, now Baron Rhodnda, the food controller, who will be remembered as the spokesman of the coal barons in the strike of 1912, already referred to.

The defeat of Germany proving to be a task of greater duration than had at first been anticipated, a war board of three was formed to take the place of the rather unwieldy cabinet. Mr. Lloyd George could find no worthier helpmates than the Labor members, Arthur Henderson and Mr. John Hodge.

It would be impossible, at this time, to follow all the ramblings of the Labor party during the war; however, the following are fair samples of the general attitude:

"That in view of the serious situation created by the European war, the Executive Committee of the Labor party agrees with the policy of the Parliamentary party, in joining the campaign to strengthen the British army, and agrees to place the central office organization at the disposal of the campaign, and further recommends the affiliated bodies to give all possible local support."

In case of the death or resignation of a member of Parliament, in order not to embarrass the government, an agreement was reached whereby the vacated seat was to be filled, without contest, by the party in possession.

Mr. Arthur Henderson tells us in a special article entitled "Labor after the War":

"From the commencement of the war the forces of industrial democracy rallied in support of the cause of the Allies with unprecedented unanimity and determination. Today generally speaking, their one concern is to see the war through and not to fritter away their opportunities in futile discussion as to its causes nor as to the conditions on which an insecure and artificial peace might be obtained."

Naturally, in accordance with the "eternal fitness of things," the workers should leave such "futile discussion" to their Parliamentary representatives and preserve the dignified silence that so becomes the well behaved wage worker the world over.

After the fall of the imperialist cabinet in Russia, Mr. Henderson, along with a group of other "radicals" was permitted to visit Russia in the hope that it would be possible to lead the Russian workers to the "safe and sane" position of the British Labor parties, for instance. Neither Mr. Charles Edward Russell nor Mr. Henderson nor even the feminist, Emmeline Pankhurst, was able to make any more favorable an impression on the "deluded" Russian masses than Mr. Root. Quite to the contrary, the success of the revolution so turned Mr. Henderson's head that he returned post-haste to London to force a break with his friend and associate, Mr. Lloyd George. In order to reinstate himself in the affections of the working class, which had been showing signs of a deplorable dissatisfaction with the Government, he resigned from the war board just in time to avoid being kicked out, as the premier had already used him about to the full extent of his capabilities.

It is the notoriety gathered from this incident as well as his connection with the long-winded

reform program recently issued by the Labor party, that has brought his name so much to the fore and threatens, in the newspapers at least, to make him the next premier.

The problem of after-the-war reconstruction is looming up as a very serious matter indeed and one that will demand all the ingenuity that the capitalists can bring to bear. The worker coming home empty handed, will be expecting to derive some benefits from the struggle he has been helping to wage "against autocracy." From the published utterances of numerous industrial overlords (we refer the reader to the now famous prophecy of Charles M. Schwab, the steel king) it can be seen that they are genuinely disturbed over a situation pregnant with disastrous possibilities. The important role to be played by the Labor Party now becomes apparent. The activity of the labor movement must be lead into harmless channels. As examination of the program of all the Labor Party, issued as mentioned above, will convince the reader that no revolutionary reconstruction of society is anticipated, or indeed desired, by those who drafted it, as we are assured that the proposal to "expropriate" life assurance companies is in no sense a "class measure." The labor misleaders are much concerned over the present "peddling" of electricity on a "contemptibly" small scale and urge the erection of a "score of gigantic super-power stations which could generate, at incredibly cheap rates, enough electricity for every industrial organization in Great Britain." One of the most humorous things in the program is the discovery of the "key of temperance reform" which is found to rest "in taking the entire manufacture and retailing of alcoholic drink out of the hands of those who find profit in promoting the utmost possible consumption." The government is to run the "pubs" (saloons) and doubtless, for the moral effect on the drinkers, the Honorable David Lloyd George could be induced to handle the taps on the day of the inauguration of the "new society."

We know of nothing more desirable to capitalism than cheaper power, unless it be a working class that would not have to be fed, and the singular unanimity of the capitalist class demand the world over for a sober proletariat makes the inclusion of some sort of provision for working class prohibition a necessity in any program meeting the approval of the master at this time.

The greater part of the program, if put into effect, could not serve in any other capacity than as a rehabilitation of capitalism, and the majority of its provisions haven't the slightest promise of any benefit to the workers.

From all that has been touched upon, it can be easily understood why the capitalist press is so warm in its approval of the Labor Party. Its history is one long record of usefulness to capitalism and the recent editorial in one of the well known dailies which compares the "practical" Labor Party with the "visionary" Bolsheviki in no uncertain terms, serves as a handsome little appreciation which might well be copied in all the daily papers of this country and Great Britain.

Those who look to the Labor Party as it is now constituted to take any part in the work of preparing the way for the Social Revolution, are suffering under a "Great Illusion." More likely it will stand, as always, in staunch defense of the present order (amended in conformity with the changing needs of capitalism) and will continue to dissipate the energies of the workers in the pursuit of reactionary reforms.

Though at present much in the minority, there is a genuine Socialist party in Great Britain and it is a pleasant relief to turn from the humbugs listed above to the record and literature of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, which has functioned from its inception as the uncompromising political expression of the interests of the working class and its official organ, "The Socialist Standard," publishes more matter of vital importance to the workers than all the insipid sheets of the Labor and so-called "Socialist" parties put together.

This paper endorses the Bolsheviki slogan of "No Compromise. All power in the hands of the workers." It is neither pro-German, pro-French, pro-English, pro-American, pro-Ally. It is pro-International and pro-letarian.

# The Month's Events Reviewed

## GERMAN PEACE (?) TERMS.

March 14th, all eyes on Russia, the German peace terms are up for final adoption or rejection by the All Russian Soviet at Moscow, where the capital has now been established.

The violent upheaval and absolute rejection of Germany's peace terms that American press reports declared imminent, did not materialize.

The two American presidents, Mr. Wilson for the government and Mr. Gompers for the American Federation of Labor, sent their respective messages of sympathy, regret and promise. We learn that the first was received courteously with a vote of appreciation and the second with "applause" but no other response, M. Sveroloff of the Central Executive Committee remarking that the message to the AMERICAN PEOPLE in response to President Wilson's message was sufficient. The press reports inform us that the President's message was cheered wildly by about one-third of the delegates, comprising the "Moderates" and the Social Revolutionists, producing a current of Nationalistic feeling against the International nature of the Bolshevik reply, which was as follows:

"The Congress of Soviets expresses its appreciation to the American people, particularly the toilers and those who are being exploited, for their sympathy toward the Russian people at a time when the Russian Socialist Republic is experiencing its greatest hardships.

The Republic takes advantage of President Wilson's message to express to all peoples, perishing and suffering as a result of this imperialistic war, its warm sympathy and confidence that the time is not far distant when the masses will overthrow Capitalism and establish a Socialist society, which alone is capable of giving a lasting and just peace and assuring the well-being of toilers."

The outstanding fact in the Russian situation is that the Bolshevik government has been strong enough, in spite of all obstacles and opposition, both within the country and outside, to maintain their dominance. While pledged to a policy of peace, as far as other countries are concerned, they refuse to give up their purpose of carrying on propaganda in all countries that they can reach. This feature of Bolshevism, true to the international principles of Socialism, will be sure to manifest itself again in world affairs.

## THE METHOD OF THE METHODISTS.

The one hundred and thirty-first Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took place recently at Philadelphia, with 400 ministers of that denomination in attendance. The humble (?) followers of the lowly Nazarene, who commanded them to LOVE THEIR ENEMIES, cheered lustily upon the adoption of the following resolution:

"We urge the speedy enactment of a law, which will mete out to German propagandists and traitorous Americans the full penalty of spies."

We have no sympathy with propagandists of any kind, who attempt to justify or condone the crimes of THE GERMAN RULING CLASS, or any other RULING CLASS, for that matter. People who are in that deplorable mental state have an intellectual standard which is on a par with that of the above mentioned followers of the "Gentle Jesus."

Under the guise of "patriotism," there is an element that is endeavoring to bring about the total suppression of free speech and free political expression. The charge is being hurled at Socialists that we are anti-American. If those who are pledged to strive for the socialization of all of America's sources of wealth production, (that is, America and all it contains for all the people, instead of a small part of the population, as is the case now), are anti-American, then we are guilty.

The only "anti" about Socialism is its ANTI-CAPITALISM.

## WHO IS PAYING FOR THE WAR?

A refutation of the charge that this is a rich man's war appears in one of the leading dailies. A Collector of Internal Revenue points out that a married man with an income of 2,500 a year, will pay but \$10 war tax on \$500 of his earnings. While on the other hand, a business man with \$25,000 income, will pay \$1,780. That is, the man with the \$25,000 income, (ten times as much as the man with the \$2,500 one), pays 178 times as much war tax. In the case of the very wealthy man whose income is \$5,000,000, the income tax amounts to more than \$3,000,000.

These are interesting figures for workers who THINK. A choice argument of Capitalism is that those who pay for a thing are its owners. This gentleman thinks otherwise. He says, "Rich man's war? Not yet."

The question of taxes is an interesting one, many superficial thinkers contending that the working class should worry about the rate of taxation. But the great mass of wage workers have nothing to tax, their wages being only sufficient to meet the cost of food, shelter, clothing, etc., necessary to the reproduction of their labor power.

Taxes are paid by the owners of property. The millions of dollars necessary for this purpose, are paid out of the SURPLUS VALUES already exploited from the workers. How much or how little of this surplus is given up by the Capitalists, does not in any way effect the status of the wage worker, any more than the price of milk effects the amount of feed that the cow must have before it can be milked again.

In the case of the workers, who have the liberty of buying their own feed—if the prices of commodities have risen and nominal wages have not advanced accordingly, then they are faced with a reduction in the REAL wage, their food shelter and clothing!

## IT'S A GREAT SYSTEM.

### ALEXANDRA KOLLANTAY.

Much has been said about the Bolshevik leaders, Nicolai Lenin and Leon Trotsky, but very little mention has been made of the "woman in the case." Alexandra Kollantay, who is a very important person in the Revolutionary government.

Prior to the revolution of November, while the Kerensky government was still in power, an order for her arrest was issued. This order was never executed and at the formation of the Bolshevik cabinet she was made Minister of the Interior.

From the meagre reports that come through from Russia, it is impossible to follow all the activities of those who hold the important offices in the revolutionary government. From a recent dispatch, however, we learn that she, together with twelve assistants, fell into unfriendly hands in Finland while enroute to Sweden with some tons of revolutionary literature which was, no doubt, intended for the awakening of the Scandinavian wage slaves. It appears that the party was put aboard a ship by the Finnish White Guard and turned loose in a waters infested with mines. They finally made their way to the Aland Islands over the ice floes, where they were placed under arrest by the Swedish government officials. The Bolshevik government demanded the immediate release of the party, threatening that the failure to comply would cause the arrest of every Swede in Russia.

Because of her knowledge of languages, Alexandra Kollantay acted as interpreter at the last Congress of the International that met before the war. She toured this country and lectured under the auspices of the Socialist party in the winter of 1915-1916. The writer of these notes had pleasure of acting as chairman at a meeting which she was the speaker. Her address was a liant one, full of constructive criticism. She seemed to be amused with the make-up of the Socialist Party of America. In her opening remarks she

she had been introduced to her audiences on several occasions by reverend gentlemen acting as chairman. One of these in introducing her hoped that "the spirit of Nicodemus would be with her." "Now," said Kollantay, "when I make a good speech I like to claim full credit for myself, but when I am tired and have not delivered a talk up to the standard, it is handy to have Nicky to blame for it."

Throughout her entire talk she showed a wonderful understanding of Socialism and took up quite a revolutionary stand on party tactics.

## THE CASE OF NEARING.

Scott Nearing, apostle of democracy, has been indicted by the federal grand jury in New York. The specific charge against Nearing is the writing, printing and distributing of a pamphlet entitled "The Great Madness."

Nearing sees in present day society two groups, the "Democracy" and the "Plutocracy." The "democracy" being composed of "the people" or the general public, who, to use his own terms, derive their income in the form of wages or salary in return for services rendered to society, while the "plutocracy" is that group which receives "unearned income" through their "special privilege" as owners of the socially operated machinery of wealth production. To one who looks upon bourgeois society from an idealistic point of view the conclusion is that such a state of affairs is in violation of the eternal principles of justice, equality, and the inherent rights of man. In short, it is undemocratic.

The pamphlet referred to is written from this point of view. It is a scathing denunciation of the "plutocracy" who have deliberately, willfully, and with malice aforethought placed upon the "democracy" the yoke of militarism.

To the Socialist who applies the material conception of history to current events, this so thing is, to say the least, amusing. Modern are not to be explained by attributing them a general cussedness of any group in society. On the contrary, they are the normal result of the economic rivalries developed through the necessity for expansion which is inherent in modern Capitalism. As Marx puts it: "My stand-point, from which the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains."

Nearing's sincerity and honesty of purpose cannot be questioned. He is an enthusiastic crusader in the cause of humanity. A believer in the efficacy of the ethics of Christianity as a social force, the democracy he strives for would be the realization of the "kingdom of heaven" on earth.

It is indeed strange that one who is guided by such lofty ideals should come into conflict with the American government, which entered the world war for the avowed purpose of advancing the cause of democracy. Not being familiar with the provisions of the Espionage act we are not qualified to pass on the merits of the case, but it is evidently another instance of a prophet being without honor in his own country.

## THE WILY JAP.

A bargain has just been struck between the Japanese and the U. S. Government, whereby Japanese ships representing 150,000 tons can be transferred to the United States in exchange for one ton of steel for every 100 tons of dead weight ship capacity.

Japanese propaganda is touring the East,

# Working Class Education

The editor of this publication has issued an edict against pathos. Nevertheless, I intend only to exercise my "constitutional" right of free (?) speech to the extent of declaring that, in my opinion, the most pathetic thing about the proletariat in this country, is its lack of working class education.

In all that capitalism requires him to know, the average American stands second to none, but in the elemental understanding of present-day society and his function in it, he is a babe-in-arms. The American probably knows less about what he needs to know for his own interests than the worker of any other modern country. His stupid conceit in the face of his almost abysmal ignorance forms, at the same time the most exasperating and the most pathetic feature of his character. It would not be too much to say that the majority of workers in this country do not even know that they are of the working class.

There are many factors that contribute to this deplorable paucity of comprehension but the most efficient of them is probably the curriculum of the public schools which not only quietly ignore matters of the most vital importance but spend billions of dollars and the energy of thousands of instructors in teaching things that are quite untrue.

To the average American the term "working class" designates the inhabitants of the slums of perhaps those uncouth animals who build and repair railroads, sewers, etc., and jabber in strange tongues at the profane orders of the "boss." He has not the faintest notion upon what basis classes exist and will indeed, warmly protest that "there are no classes in America."

Down through all ages, since the institution of property arose, classes have existed and there has been a never ceasing struggle between the ruling classes and the dominated class or classes for the territory. The former striving always to hold its territory and stamp out the incipient revolt that is usually breaking out or in preparation among the latter.

All this condemnation of Socialists, in vogue at this time, for the alleged, "stirring up class hatred" is silly and quite futile. The classes exist and the struggle between them will continue without the intervention of agitators and in spite of the best efforts of those who are interested in keeping the truth from the workers.

Unlike the American, the European worker, with the traditional class subjection of centuries behind him, entertains no delusions about the class nature of society. This truth—that he who sells his labor power belongs to a definite class, viz., the working class, and he who buys labor power, directly or indirectly, is of the capitalist class,—must first be taught the American wage slave before it is possible to enlighten him further on the nature of modern society and the worker's place in it.

In the past, the Socialist movement, in this country, has busied itself mainly in the work of arousing the minimum degree of class consciousness necessary to make the individual vote the ticket. After that he is generally allowed to drift along unless accident or circumstance happen to get him interested in the classic literature of Socialism.

It would be impossible to designate just where, in the process of the change that takes place in the workers mental makeup, that working class education begins; suffice to say, if he gets to the stage where he individually takes up the actual study of Socialism, he is fairly well along.

The general run of the speakers, and I do not exclude the majority of speakers, are in so hopelessly ignorant that they are externally and ultimately in

The founding of this paper is part of the recognition of this deplorable state of affairs and the partial object of the publication is to assist in the encouragement and organization of systematic Socialist study, in order that the membership shall know what Socialism is and be enabled to purge the Party of the reactionary tendencies that are only too prevalent on every hand.

It is at last being recognized, that to be Socialist, the party must be composed largely of Socialists who understand the nature and objective of Socialism. Socialists are neither born full fledged nor "converted" to Socialism. "The old order passeth" and the new day demands UNDERSTANDING, as well as sentiment and passion. Today something more is required than the prompt payment of dues to entitle one to be designated a "good Socialist."

This is now so generally recognized that already there is a well defined study movement to be discerned all over the country—a movement that is destined to eventually make a radical change in the make up of the Socialist Party of America.

The value of study class work can not be overestimated. There is a constant and urgent need for speakers and organizers who are sound and well informed. Study classes, besides equipping the general membership to better carry on the work of personal agitation among their fellow workers, develops speakers and teachers, of which we now have only too few.

Every Local should maintain at least one weekly study class, not for advanced students alone, but more important, for beginners. In the case of small Locals some have found it a good plan to turn the regular meetings into study classes, with occasional short business sessions to take care of the necessary routine work, with now and then a lecture by a local or visiting speaker.

Experience has shown that the best method of study consists in the selecting of one of the elementary books, such as, "The Communist Manifesto" by Marx and Engels for beginning the systematic study of Socialism. A class director should be selected from among those who have done the widest and most thorough reading.

We will imagine the class assembled, director selected and all are ready to proceed. The director calls on one of the students to stand and start reading. After a few paragraphs are read, the director, who by the way, should be a good reader, reads the passage over again carefully and calls on the student to explain what has been read, after which he asks for additional explanation from the class. If the students are a bit slow he should try

to get it out of them by questioning before proceeding to cover the points missed. This is important—as no effort should be spared to develop the keenness and thoroughness of the student's understanding and powers of explanation. If the student knows that he will be required not only himself to understand, but to analyze and explain what he has read he will be much more attentive and think harder and that is the prime object of working class education—to add thinking capacity to direct and objectify the workers resentment toward capitalist society.

After the class has finished with one of the two above mentioned books or both, if enough members can be gathered another beginner's class should be started to go over the same books while the old class goes on with the study of Marx's "Value, Price and Profit" or "Wage Labor and Capital," by the same author. Engels' "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" has been found to be an excellent work for intermediary study followed by LaFargue's "Social and Philosophical Studies," or his "The Evolution of Property."

It requires considerable elementary study before anything much can be gained from the study of Marx's Capital and we would advise a thorough course of general study before taking up this most important of all the classic literature of Socialism. We publish, in this issue, a list of books from which selections can be made that will save the reading of erroneous, as well as unimportant literature, of which altogether too much has circulated in the past for the good of Socialism.

The student will not have gone very far in this sort of systematic study before he gets into the habit of using his head in an entirely new way. Social phenomena, hitherto puzzling to him, appears in an entirely new light and he wonders at his previous lack of comprehension. The underhand work of the capitalist politicians and journalists become as an open book to him and the glib sound-biting phrases of the intellectual lackeys no longer have any effect.

He laughs at the things he formerly worshipped in ignorance and has only contempt for "sacred" institutions, of which he stood in awe.

His life has changed with the development of his intellect, he has become a thinking man instead of the unprotesting cog in the capitalist machine he formerly was. Surface appearances no longer deceive him. He is now a class conscious, deep thinking proletarian who knows and who will be ready to hit, and hit hard, at the very foundation of the capitalist system when the time comes. In short, he is a man who has gained and will continue to add to his store of Working Class Education.

## Should Socialist Women Fight for Suffrage?

The vast army of women now employed in industry has made the woman suffrage question "practical politics." Great Britain has already extended the vote to six million women under certain conditions and Canada has given the right to vote to relatives of soldiers. Here in the U. S. A. the question is being given wide publicity and a great deal of support.

What, then, must be the attitude of the Socialist woman toward this agitation? To the average person it may seem quite natural for the Socialist to support the movement for women's votes but to us the point calls for careful examination. Things are not always what they seem.

We shall be told that as Socialists are for democracy we must help women to get the vote. If we do not, then we are against the freedom of women, but such "female logic" is at fault.

We do not believe in "natural rights." Such utopian ideas as the inalienable right to this, that or the other thing do not belong to a scientific conception of affairs. If we hold to the value of every individual having a voice in control it is because of its necessity in a society to assist the common welfare

of its members. The vote is the means to an end. We regard the worker's vote now as useful if used to express a worker's desire for Socialism.

We are for real democracy. We are for the economic and political freedom of men and women to enjoy the benefits of social life and social progress. By "freedom" we mean the opportunity to exercise their faculties and develop all their powers provided they do not interfere with the like freedom of others. How can we secure such a society?

We must inaugurate the Socialist system—the common ownership and democratic control of the resources of production and distribution. The first and essential step is the control of political power by a Socialist working class. Must we get woman's suffrage before we can do this?

This is not necessary. The lines which divide worker and parasite, rich and poor, possessor and dispossessed are not drawn through sex lines. The lines of division are not drawn through sex but class. Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "Man Made World" is the one-sided picture a feminist usually paints.

Continued on Page 8.

## The Nationalist Party---A New Factor in American Politics

The period immediately following the Civil War in the United States witnessed the development of two definite groups, each represented by a political party. In general, the Republican party can be said to have been the political expression of the economic interests of the then rapidly developing industrial class. The Democratic party, on the other hand, represented the small business and land-owning classes, its main stronghold being in the South.

During the last twenty years the struggle between these two groups has become less keen, and the consequent political differences almost effaced. It is true that independent organizations have been maintained and independent campaigns conducted, but the differences between the Republican and Democratic parties have become almost imperceptible.

Since 1901 there have been two Socialist parties in this country, the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Party of America. These do not differ radically in their fundamental principles, but in regard to the tactics or methods to be followed.

These two Socialist parties being on the one hand the political expression of the working class, and the Republican and Democratic parties being on the other hand the reflection of the interests of the various employing classes, the line of demarcation between the two groups has been clear. The one stood staunchly for the present capitalist system, justifying it; the other stood in opposition, and advocating change.

There comes upon the scene a party which comes from either, having a program which demands its overthrow. A party of Social evolution is rife as to the part the new party will play in American politics. Will it grow? Whence will come its support?

These questions are being discussed both

selves with the Socialists, not because they endorsed the fundamental principles upon which the Party was based, but rather because there was no other place for them. Large numbers of professional men, radicals, social reformers, and trade-unionists who were dissatisfied with conditions in the A. F. of L., have joined our ranks and taken an active interest in our affairs. It would be indeed strange if an organization so controlled were other than reformistic in its politics. With the advent of the Nationalist party, however, there is a possibility of the situation taking a different aspect.

A hint as to the policy of the new organization is contained in the newspaper reports of its national convention held recently in Chicago:

"The British Labor Party and the National Party agree on practically every platform of their respective programs, John Spargo, of the resolutions committee, told the convention.

The Party unanimously adopted a resolution which read:

"In consideration of the very close accord of their aims and ours, the National Party, through its national convention, recommends that one or two members of the British Labor Party be invited by our national executive committee to tour our country under our auspices to interpret more fully to the American people their purposes and methods."

On another page of this paper appears an article which deals with the political conditions in England, and the part played by the British Labor Party therein. What is there related is to a large extent applicable to the situation now developing in this country. Conditions in both countries being about the same, we can learn much by studying the trend of affairs in England, and derive much benefit by familiarizing ourselves with the political experiences of the British labor movement. Especially as the new

to reduce the Socialist vote of 900,000 in 1912 to the bare 600,000 of 1916 through the use of cleverly worded campaign slogans such as "He Kept Us Out of War."

What, then, is to be our position in regard to the National party? As we are opposed to the theory of great men and "leaders," whose function it is to decide all questions of importance for the rank and file, we believe that this question should be carefully considered by every member of the party.

Several possible solutions to the question present themselves. One way would be to continue, as in the past, proclaiming ourselves revolutionary Marxian Socialists and practicing Revisionism; formulate a platform of reforms more radical than that of our opponents, and in that way try to overcome them. This method would in effect be an attempt to out-reform the reformers. Another plan would be to denounce the new-comer as a fake organization, which has stolen the Socialist (?) Platform and is using it as a shield to cover up their real purpose of misleading the working class and delivering it bound hand and foot into the hands of the Capitalist class. This would leave the task of deciding which of the two parties, if either, really represent the interests of the workers, to the voters who have the power to make a decision upon this important point, although they know almost nothing about the questions involved. This method, while risky, would be entirely democratic.

Still another plan would be to discard the whole program of reform and draw up a new platform which would be in harmony with the profession of Marxian principles which we have made in the past but failed to practice. Let the issue be clearly set forth. Instead of advocating reforms that would make our chronic state of misery a little more bearable, we might point out that the conditions which the reformers seek to alleviate are inherent in Capitalist society, and can be abolished

system of

of the St. Louis convention. Those who advocate this change of policy advance the argument that as the German militarists have invaded Russia and threaten to crush the newly established revolutionary government, it is the duty of American Socialists to come to the rescue by giving their support to the "democratic nations" engaged in a holy war against the ruthless huns. "The Russian revolution must be saved" is the slogan of those who advocate this step.

That all Socialists are deeply interested in the success of the Russian revolution, and that it is their duty to give aid and assistance in every way possible to the government of Soviets is beyond dispute. The question is: In what way can we be of greatest assistance?

The war between Germany and the government of Soviets is not a war between nations, but rather between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Natural boundaries are ignored in the class nature of the conflict. While German forces invade Russian territory in behalf of the bourgeois counter-revolution in the West, so too do the French, English and Japanese furnish arms and ammunition to the anti-Bolshevik forces in the East. The bourgeoisie of different nations may quarrel amongst

agrees that wealth is concentrating into fewer hands. That in this machine and corporation age the number of workers gets larger and the capitalists relatively fewer. That the propertyless become more numerous all the time. Obviously then, the worker's share of the voting power increases in proportion.

Pay attention to the tireless efforts of the political bosses to get our support at election time. See how they attempt to induce the workers to vote for their side. What is the lesson to be drawn from this? It is that we have sufficient power if we do but exercise it in our own interest. Intelligently, not blindly. If we vote for anything but Socialism we give our power away to the bosses.

Without women's suffrage; without complete, unrestricted male suffrage, the working class already have sufficient political power to control the national affairs through Congress if they but decide. Our efforts then, your energies and mine, must be directed toward the enlightenment and education of the rest of our fellows. The control of modern society depends not on woman's entry into the polling booth but on the awakening of those who already have votes. We—the working class have sufficient votes already. Our work is not to set out to get more. Our chief affair in politics now is to change

Necessity is "blind" only to the extent that it is not understood. Freedom is not found in the fancied independence from the laws of nature, but in the understanding of these laws and the resulting possibility to make them produce definite effects according to our plans. This applies equally to the laws of nature outside of society and to those that regulate the physical and intellectual well-being of man inside of it, for these two classes of laws, while they may be separated in thought, cannot be held apart in reality. Freedom of will means, therefore, simply the faculty of making decisions based on understanding. The more a man's judgment concerning a certain question is free, the greater will be the necessity by which the substance of this judgment is determined. On the other hand, ignorance engenders a vacillation, which chooses between various opposing possibilities with apparent arbitrariness, but proves by this very lack of freedom, its subjection to the very thing, which it ought to dominate. Freedom therefore, consists of our control over ourselves and nature based on an understanding of natural necessities. Hence it is as a matter of course a product of historical development. —Frederick Engels.

History has been explained by religion long enough, let us explain religion by history.—Marx.

### SUBSCRIPTION BLANK.

THE PROLETARIAN PUB. CO.,  
Room 26, 17 John R. St., Detroit, Mich.

Enclosed please find \$\_\_\_\_\_ for the following subscriptions to the PROLETARIAN, beginning with \_\_\_\_\_ issue.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Amount, \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Amount, \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Amount, \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Amount, \$ \_\_\_\_\_

WRITE NAMES AND ADDRESSES CAREFULLY TO AVOID ERROR.  
Subscription Rates: 10 Issues, 50c; 20 Issues, \$1.00.

Sent by \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_

Current Events

Continued from Page 3.

position to state; but when we consider the matter from the embargo standpoint, it is obvious that the Japanese were asking for more trade advantages than would be in harmony with the business interests of this country. Japan has rapidly come to the front as a capitalist power within the last decade. A commercial rival of American manufacturers in the world market. Apart from the desire to keep as much steel as possible in the country during the war, this competitive factor should not be overlooked.

The changed situation, owing to Russia's withdrawal from the war, and the continued destruction of shipping by the U-boats, makes it imperative that the Allies obtain shipping somewhere. Some one has said that necessity knows no law. The seizure of the Dutch ships (while, we understand, that this act is backed by certain international laws), brought strong protests from the government of Holland. The crying need for more ships is probably the basis for the present agreement with the Japs.

Just as the Class Struggle goes on, in and through the present war, so is the conflict of the business interests of one country as against another ever to the fore, and this in spite of the fact that nations may be bound together by a defensive or offensive alliance. Manifestations of the class nature of society are breaking out on every hand. The heralded entry of Japanese troops into Siberia has not taken place; the diplomatic feelers thrown out by Japan, while seemingly approved by Great Britain and France, did not meet with the endorsement of the United States. It will be interesting to watch further developments.

ADING THE BOLSHEVIKI.

There is a growing demand that the Socialist party execute an about-face and withdraw from the position taken

These and the question of the membership of the Socialist party for the very good reason that those who have been the prime movers in launching the new party have but recently withdrawn from more or less active participation in our affairs. It is, therefore, fitting that we examine the relative positions of the two organizations.

From its inception until the present time the Socialist party has pledged its allegiance to the principles of International Socialism as formulated by Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and others; that school of Socialism which is best known as the Marxian or Scientific. In its activities, however, the Party has not adhered to the principles of Marxism. The "immediate demands" have gradually become the chief object to be attained. Social reform, labor legislation, and measures designed to give relief from the oppression of capitalism have held the most prominent place in both national and local platforms.

The explanation of this contradictory position is to be found in the fact that for years the machinery of the Party has been dominated by decidedly reform elements. Owing to the peculiar political situation, those who in any degree opposed the rule of the industrial and financial groups, aligned them-

THE PROLETARIAN

Published monthly by the PROLETARIAN PUBLISHING CO., Inc. Room 26, 17 John R. St., Detroit, Michigan.

Subscription rates—Ten issues, 50c; Twenty issues, \$1.00. Single copy, five cents. In bundles of 25 or more, three cents per copy.

No advertising matter accepted.

Application for entry as second class matter at the post office at Detroit, Mich., pending.



themselves, yet their interests are identical when confronted by a successful proletarian revolution.

It is manifestly absurd to assume that the workers of America can assist their comrades in Russia by forming an alliance with or giving support to any bourgeois government. It is this very thing which has called down upon the Majority Socialists of Germany the bitter denunciation of Lenine and Trozky. The reply of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets to President Wilson's message is clear and to the point; there is no reference to the necessity of crushing German militarism—the workers are urged to wage a relentless war upon the common enemy everywhere.

To withdraw from the position taken in the St. Louis report, in the face of this call to action, would "give aid and comfort to the enemy," and be a flat rejection of the principles which have been so brilliantly upheld by the Internationalists of Russia.

SHOULD SOCIALIST WOMEN FIGHT FOR SUFFRAGE?

Continued from Page 4.

There is not the slightest doubt that the majority of votes are held by the working class. Every scientific writer on social questions from Marx to Kautsky and from Henry Lawrence Call to the Chairman of the Industrial Relations Committ

English labor movement. Party announces that its policies and methods are to be molded along similar lines.

The Socialist press has, almost without exception, chosen to pooh-pooh the possibility of the success of the National Party. It is a common fault to under-estimate the strength of the opposition. That the founders of the National Party are capable men cannot be questioned; they are no mere amateurs, but old war-horses in the movement, well known, respected, and with some following within the ranks of the Socialist party and the American Federation of Labor.

The support of the new party will probably come from the radical element in the trades unions and the faint-hearted "sympathizers" who have previously supported the Socialist ticket. The "boring from within" tactics of capturing the organized labor movement have not been entirely successful. Outwardly, at least, there is a wider gulf between the A. F. of L. and the Socialist party than at any time in the past. The elections of 1916 demonstrated a great portion of the voters who had in previous years supported the Socialist candidates at the polls did not base their support upon a clear conception of the principles of Socialism, for had that been the case it would not have been possible

the outlook and inform the minds of the present voters.

That is the chief work. Our educative efforts must also be turned towards the whole working class, men and women, voters and non-voters alike! We seek not votes primarily, but to convince the mind, to enlist the understanding and to arouse the activity of all workers. In the Socialist halls and in the party meetings we give equal liberty to women and men to express their views, to participate in voting and to enjoy the education of our movement. The success of Socialism will depend on the devotion and loyalty of all its members without distinction or sex. If we are to have a society worth living in the education of its people is the first consideration.

Does this imply that we should advocate and fight for women's suffrage now? No; surely not.

We want Socialism. We do not set out to advocate and to fight for reform. We do not seek election or support for anything but Socialism. We refuse to barter the 99 points of Socialist policy for the one point of woman's suffrage. Whilst political arrangements and the present constitution continue we can pursue our part of advocating Socialism and leave the extension of suffrage to the reformers, to the capitalists.

An accession of women to voting power does not mean any increase in our vote. Women are not advanced toward Socialism any more than men. Rather less. Our work then, will still remain to be done—to educate the voter. Those who urge us to support women's suffrage candidates, to advocate its adoption, to turn aside from our work and shun "votes for women" are reformers. They are included by the vote. The vote by itself and nothing. What counts is the mind behind the vote used intelligently is useful. If it is in the worker's interests the vote is worthless. It is dangerous. Hence—watch behind the vote. Enlighten and inform it.

FREEDOM AND NECESSITY

only by a complete overthrow of private ownership of industry, the abolition of the wages system, and a re-construction of society based on social ownership; devoting our entire energies to educating the working class along these lines and building a consciously revolutionary party

That such a step must soon be taken is becoming more and more apparent. From several sources have come demands that the resolutions adopted at the St. Louis convention and ratified by the membership be reconsidered. There are several sections of the Party that are about ready to "go over the top." The organization will not be greatly harmed by their withdrawal. Along with those who believe in the policy of reforming Capitalism, they should align themselves with the party of Messrs. Spargo, Simons, Russell & Co. There they can work on old age pensions, municipal coal yards, world democracy and eternal peace unhampered by being attached to an organization that subscribes to a philosophy which reduces such activity to an historical absurdity.

Let us have a Party that will be Marxian in fact as well as in name; a Party that will be the political expression of the aspirations of the class-conscious proletariat of America.

WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM

A list of books on all phases of Socialism, economics, history, philosophy, science, etc. This list has been selected, arranged, and recommended by Branch One, Local Detroit, Socialist Party of America.

Wage, Labor and Capital—Marx.....\$ .10	Vital Problems in Social Evolution—Lewis.. .50	Anarchism and Socialism—Plechanoff..... .50
Value, Price and Profit—Marx..... .15	Evolution, Social and Organic—Lewis..... .50	Positive Outcome of Philosophy—Dietzgen.. 1.00
Marxism and Darwinism—Pannekoek..... .10	Law of Biogenesis—Moore..... .50	Philosophical Essays—Dietzgen ..... 1.00
Evolution of Property—Lafargue..... .50	Science and Superstition—Lewis..... .50	Essays on the Materialist Conception of History—Labriola ..... 1.00
Social and Philosophical Studies—Lafargue .50	Ten Blind Leaders—Lewis..... .50	Ancient Society—Morgan ..... 1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific—Engels.....	Origin of the Family—Engels..... .50	Civil War in France—Marx ..... .50
Paper, 15c Cloth ..... .50	Socialism and Religion—S. P. of G. B..... .10	Memoirs of Marx—Liebknecht..... .50
Right to be Lazy—Lafargue. Paper..... .10	Feuerbach—Engels ..... .50	Theoretical System of Marx—Roudin..... 1.00
Cloth ..... .50	Capital—Three Volumes by Marx, each.....\$2.00	Science and Revolution—Unterman..... .50
Introduction to Sociology—Lewis..... 1.00	Landmarks of Scientific Socialism—Engels.. 1.00	Evolution of Man—Bolsch..... .50

We carry the following literature which we highly recommend to our readers. A careful perusal of these works is essential to a thoro understanding of Socialism. Make all checks and money orders payable to the Proletarian Pub. Co., 17 John R, Detroit, Mich.

## Scientific Socialism---The Theoretical Expression of The Proletarian Movement

Modern Socialism, which had ceased to trouble the mental serenity of the American capitalists prior to the European war, has once more brought itself forcibly to their attention. The threat of working class political ascendancy, once thought safely survived, again disturbs their complacency. The "red spectre" once more stalks abroad.

Hardly any issue of the public press is free from some reference to Socialism or what the author conceives to be Socialism. As is the case with the graveyard or domestic brand of ghost, the observers are too terrified to examine the phenomenon closely enough to know what it is like.

Unfortunately many of the adherents to our cause are as poorly informed as the writers in the capitalist journals and magazines, and consequently add their quota to the general confusion and misunderstanding. It is a question whether some of our friends are not more harmful than our open enemies.

For this reason it has been thought advisable to publish a summary of the origin and development of modern Socialism, and it would be well before going farther to discuss what is meant by the term itself.

Roughly, there are three meanings attached to the term Socialism. First, the one that considers it a future state of society, as capitalism is the name of the present system of wealth production. Secondly, the term is used to apply to the ideology, ethics, literature, political activity, etc., attached to the movement designed to bring about this future society. Thirdly, and this is the sense in which we use the term, Socialism is the science of the history and development of society.

In order to understand Socialism it is necessary to have a thorough comprehension of capitalism. This fact obliges us to trace its development from the period preceding the French revolution as well as analysing and discussing its present institutions.

### The Eighteenth Century Philosophers.

Modern Socialism, in its theoretical form, originally appears as a more logical development of the principles laid down by the great French philosophers of the eighteenth century. These were in their own time of a decidedly revolutionary character, forming the intellectual advance guard and preparing the ground for the impending conflict between the rapidly developing capitalist class and the ruling classes of their day. It must be remembered, when considering the history of this period, that the capitalist class, or the bourgeoisie, to use the French term, was a subject class fighting for a foothold in the government with the ultimate purpose of overthrowing feudalism and bearing a new system in its place.

They wished to destroy the old prejudices, superstitions, injustices and privileges and supercede them by "eternal truths." The society of the future was to be governed by certain abstract principles readily named, such as "Liberty," "Justice" and the "Natural Rights of Man." We know now, that this was only the idealized society of the bourgeoisie in which all business should be on an equal basis before the law. The "Freedom" of this society translates into the free and untrammled conducting of its own peculiar method of exploitation under which "Justice" is meted out according to property qualifications. Indeed men in this sort of a society existed only in relation to their possession of property and were recognized on this basis.

The thinkers of the eighteenth century could go only as far as the limits imposed on them by the times in which they lived. Capitalism itself was only in a transitional state, therefore the propagandists of that class could not go beyond their immediate interests. In the struggle to overthrow the political domination of the feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie could not imagine a more blissful earthly heaven than one in which freedom of property was guaranteed, a heaven in which they would be perfectly free to develop their own method of wealth production.

For political purposes, the French were divided into three classes, called "estates." The First Estate was made up of the Feudal Aristocracy and was the most important and powerful, occupying the dominant position. The Church, next in power, was known as the Second Estate. All other classes were grouped into the Third Estate, with the Bourgeoisie, as the most important group holding a few special privileges.

Forming a part of that oppressed Third Estate, the Bourgeoisie could pose, with some justification, as the saviours of the working class, but what the working classes did not understand, at that time, was that the "class privileges" to be abolished were all those restricting the free development of Capitalism.

The smoke of the revolution had hardly cleared away, when the bourgeoisie incapacity to govern began to manifest itself. Unlike the British, the French had swept the governing classes out of existence. Having no previous experience at government, their state collapsed and the frightened bourgeoisie were obliged to take refuge in the dangerous despotism of the Directorate in order to recover from the Reign of Terror. The Directorate, in turn, became so corrupt and indefensible that the seizure of the State by Napoleon Bonaparte was easy. Napoleon soon turned the promised "endless peace" of the pre-revolutionary philosophers into an endless war of conquest.

The antagonism between the feudal masters of society and the Third Estate was now being transferred to an antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the propertyless workers, the Proletariat. The promised "freedom of property" turned out to be, for most people, freedom from property, as the small bourgeoisie and the peasants were crushed out by the competition of the great capitalists and the exactions of the usurers. The Napoleonic wars contributed their quota of misery to the general fund. Oppression by force, was replaced by bribery and fraud. Money became the great leveler; "the golden age" predicted by the eighteenth century idealists was realized as an age of gold. The social and political institutions following the revolution were disappointing caricatures of the golden dreams that formed a large part of the pre-revolutionary literature.

### The Utopian Socialists

It was at this time that the Utopian Socialists appeared to formulate this disappointment. Capitalism, just getting under way, was still only in a partly developed state. Modern industry, just arisen in England, was still unknown in France and the antagonism developed from the exploitation of labor by capital was only taking root. Inasmuch as capitalism was only partly developed the Utopians could not understand its true nature and their theories were consequently faulty. They attempted to work out in their heads the solution to social problems that, as yet, lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions. They felt that something was radically wrong but did not know what the cause was. They sought to discover a new and perfect social system with the aid of their reason, which was to be worked out in detail and imposed upon existing society by propaganda or, whenever possible, by model experimental colonies.

St. Simon in his Geneva letters pointed out that the victory of the Third Estate was the victory of a part of that Estate only, the propertied part. He thought that the new antagonism lay between the "workers" and "idlers" as he called them. By "workers" he meant, not only wage-workers, but bankers, merchants and manufacturers as well. The "idlers" were those who lived on their incomes and took no active part in production whatever, "Science," the scholars, and "Industry," bankers, merchants and manufacturers were to direct the new society and hold a privileged position in it. But what interested him most was the lot of that class which he designates the "most numerous and the poorest." He lays particular stress on the declaration that all men ought to work.

Fourier was a Utopian of another sort, a critic and a satirist of the first rank. He remorselessly laid bare the moral and material misery of the bourgeoisie world, and showed how completely it had failed to realize the glorious promises of the pre-revolutionary philosophers and propagandists. He completely exposed the hypocrisy and rottenness of contemporary society and especially of the relations between the sexes. He was the first to point out that the degree of woman's emancipation in any given society, is dependent upon a degree of general emancipation.

Fourier took a long stride in advance of his contemporaries in his conception of the history of society. He divided all history into four periods—savagery, barbarism, the patriarchate and civilization, which was the period of his own epoch—the bourgeoisie society of the day. He showed how the state of civilization raises every vice of the simple barbarian to the degree of a fine art. He pointed out that under civilization "poverty is born of abundance itself."

While the bourgeoisie revolution was being ushered in with turmoil and bloodshed in France, a quiet but none the less real revolution was taking place in England. Steam and machinery were transforming society with leaps and bounds. Modern industry was rapidly taking the place of the old artisan and simple-manufacture methods of production. The manufacturer became suddenly and enormously rich. The class grew politically powerful with its increasing wealth. Instead of precipitating an armed counter-revolution, as was the case in France, the Feudalists either went into business themselves or adjusted their ancient privileges to the demands of the new methods. Recognizing their own incapacity to take entire charge of government the bourgeoisie of England left the aristocracy in possession of the most important political offices, relying upon their control of the governmental purse to compel the conducting of the state in the interest of the rapidly developing capitalism. With the advantages of superior natural resources and an earlier start, capitalism in England soon took the lead of the rest of the world and the contrast between rich and poor became even more glaring than in France.

### Robert Owens' Communistic Society.

To correct the distress, a young reformer of twenty-nine years came forward with a few theories that very soon attracted the attention of the whole of Europe. Robert Owen was himself manufacturer and one with a genius for organization and an extraordinary degree of foresight. He declared that a man's character is the product, on the one hand, of heredity, and on the other, of his environment, especially during the childhood or formative period. He saw, in the industrial conditions of his time the opportunity to put his favorite theories into practice and bring order out of chaos. At New Lanark in Scotland, he, as managing partner, directed the cotton mills there with such success as to gain him a European reputation. He turned a town of 2500 people into a model community in which lawsuits, police, drunkards, charity, poverty and all the rest of the noblest by-products of capitalism were unknown.

And all this by placing the people in material conditions worthy of human beings, and especially in carefully bringing up the rising generation. While other manufacturers were working the people twelve to fourteen hours a day, surrounded with the most inhuman conditions, the operatives at New Lanark worked but ten and a half.

In spite of the fact that the material conditions were as nearly ideal as possible under capitalism, and the business in an increasingly prosperous condition, Owen was not satisfied. "The people are slaves at my mercy," he complained. The working part of a population of 2500 was daily producing as much real wealth for society, as less than fifty years before would have required the working part of a population of 600,000 to produce. Owen asked himself, what becomes of this vast difference? He was

gone to the  
The case of New  
... was only one example of enormous wealth being produced all over England. "Yet," he points out, "this new power is the creation of the working classes," and to them belonged, by right, the fruit of this new power. Owen then attempted to organize communistic societies on a business basis. Everything was mathematically and carefully worked out and if one accepted the Owen reform method there was little to criticise in the details of his scheme.

Owen's experimental colonies were tried out in America and, as we can see today, were foredoomed to failure from the very nature of the method. Owen did not understand the social nature of industrial production. He did not realize that all of contemporary society was rapidly organizing on a system based on the division of labor and that any plan attempting to carry on a community production independent of and isolated from the existing society was an attempt to impose a primitive method on a modern epoch.

The Utopians' mode of thought formed the basis of the socialist ideas for a good many years and seems to dominate some people yet: A great many of those who call themselves Socialists today are busily engaged in trying to induce the working-class to help the capitalist patch up their rickety old system. I suppose they like capitalism so well that they want it to last as long as possible.

To make a science of Socialism it had first to be put on a real basis.

When we consider and reflect on nature at large, the history of mankind, or our own intellectual activity, we see what, at first, seems to be an endless entanglement of relations and combinations; nothing is fixed, but everything moves, changes, comes into existence and passes away. We see the picture as a whole with the details vague and indistinct; we see the activity and changing rather than the THINGS which are active and changing. But, tho this conception correctly expresses the general character it does not give us a clear understanding of the picture, inasmuch as it does not explain the details. In order that we may understand the details we must take the parts and examine them detached from their natural connection, in order to understand their nature, construction, etc.

This is, primarily, the task of natural science and historical research. A certain amount of natural and historical material must be collected before there can be any critical analysis and arrangement in classes and species made. This has been, in the past, a slow process and we find that the foundations of the exact natural sciences were laid by the Alexandrian Greeks and carried on, in the middle ages, by the Arabs. The work of the grouping of the different natural processes, once begun, went forward rapidly with the material in hand, but the study of the internal anatomy of organized bodies in their manifold forms leads to the bad habit of looking at everything too much in detail and apart from the connection with the vast whole; in repose rather than in motion, in their death not in life. This method of academic examination had its effect on philosophy as well, giving rise to what is known as the metaphysical method of thought.

The metaphysical thinker forgets the relation between things in the contemplation of the details. In the fascinating study of parts he forgets that the parts have a function to perform, in relation to and in harmony with the entire universe. To him everything is fixed and unchanging, everything is either alive or dead, in motion or at rest. He is quite incapable of grasping the phenomenon of PROCESS. He cannot see the woods for the trees.

#### The Dialectic Method

The most valuable thing that modern science has given us is the revival of the dialectic method of thinking. To the dialectician, everything, instead of being constant and invariable, is found to be but part of an unending process. As the old Greek philosopher said, "Nothing is, everything is becoming." Even those things commonly thought of as immovable and unchanging are found to be only relatively so. The "eternal mountains" are in a slow but steady process of being levelled by the action of the elements, sun, wind, frost, water, etc. A railroad train is a thing that one thinks of as

moving at a great speed, yet, in comparison with the passage of the earth around the sun, it moves at the speed of a snail, which in turn is a race horse in relation with the traveling of a glacier. All things are relative, as Dietzgen shows, and a part of the universal process, never fixed, always changing. Nature works dialectically and it is impossible to understand either nature or society unless we grasp that principle of never-ending change. Nothing remains exactly the same from one moment to another. There is nothing constant but the law of change itself.

The restoration of this method of reasoning to the field of natural science, had a revolutionary effect on the philosophical world as well and a new school arose, having its most important development in Germany where it culminated in what is known as the Hegelian school.

The Hegelians were dialectic thinkers and contended that all phenomena, historical as well as natural and intellectual is represented as a process. The world is, in fact undergoing constant change and development. From this point of view the history of mankind no longer appears as an unconnected series of senseless, aimless deeds of violence, as the pre-revolutionary philosophers saw it, but rather a part of the process of the development of man himself.

In the meantime the struggle between the working-class and the bourgeoisie was coming to the front all over Europe, in proportion to the degree of development, on the one hand, of modern industry, and on the other, of the newly gained supremacy of the bourgeoisie. It became increasingly apparent that the interests of labor and capital were not identical. The promised peace and prosperity that was to follow the overthrow of the feudalists dissolved into an almost incessant war between the classes over the wealth produced by labor. Strikes and labor revolts took place all over Europe and in England even a political movement of the working class took form, the Chartist.

All these things made imperative a new examination of history and it was at this time that Marx brought forth his famous Materialist Conception, which declared that the economic structure of any given society always furnished the real basis from which alone can be explained its whole superstructure of institutions, religious and philosophical as well as juridical and political. Man's ideas were now explained by his material surroundings and institutions instead of, as heretofore, explaining his institutions by his ideas.

#### Modern Socialism a Science.

Socialism was no longer a sentiment or an idealistic scheme, but a science, dealing with two historically developed classes, the working-class and the capitalist-class. The Socialism of earlier days certainly criticised bourgeoisie society but could not explain it and consequently could not get the mastery of it. The more the early Socialists denounced the exploitation of the working-class the less they understood the way the thing was done.

The Marxian theory of "surplus value" gave the key to the mystery. Marx proved that labor-power functions as a commodity and is bought and sold on the market like any other commodity, at its value; at what it costs to produce it. But labor-power has a characteristic possessed by no other commodity. It has the power to create values greater than the cost of its own reproduction. This difference between what it cost to reproduce labor-power and the values created through its expenditure Marx called "surplus value." In other words, the laborer receives wages sufficient for his maintenance—for the reproduction of his labor-power—and in the application of his energy and skill produces goods of greater value than that represented by his wages. From this surplus comes the profits of the capitalist and the continually increasing accumulation of wealth in the hands of the owning class.

With the establishment of the theory of "surplus value" and the materialistic conception of history, Socialism became a science. The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production of the means to support human life and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; that in every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society

divided into classes or orders, is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. When people begin coming to the conclusion that the prevailing institutions are unreasonable and unjust it is a sign that changes have silently taken place in these spheres, and that the institutions, well enough adapted to the old methods are no longer in harmony with the needs of society.

The present structure of society is the creation of the ruling class of today, the bourgeoisie, or, as we usually call it in America, the Capitalist Class. The capitalist method of production was not in harmony with the feudal system, with the special privileges granted to individuals, entire classes and local corporations, so the bourgeoisie broke up the feudal system and built up on its ruins the capitalist order of society of free competition, personal liberty, equality before the law of all commodity owners, and all the rest of the capitalist blessings. Freed from the fetters of feudalism the capitalist system developed with extraordinary speed with the enormously increasing productivity of machinery. But just as early manufacture came in conflict with feudal institutions and the primitive modes of wealth production, so now modern industry comes in contact with the restrictions imposed, of necessity, by the capitalist method. Machine production is hampered by the private ownership of the machine, which cannot be operated unless the product can be marketed at a profit. This conflict then, is not one that merely exists in the minds of men, but exists independently of the will of the class that brought it on. Modern Socialism is the reflex in thought of this conflict in fact.

To be concluded in next month's issue.

#### THE POLITICAL WAR IN WISCONSIN.

At the time of writing, a regular political battle while being fought on the political field of Wisconsin, has its ideal reflex in Congress and the Senate, Washington, D. C. Senator Williams, of Mississippi, makes a bitter attack on Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, urging his expulsion from the Senate. It looks as if the Republicans and Democrats were renewing their political differences, for the time being, at least. All efforts to obtain the withdrawal of one of the old party candidates and prevent a three-cornered fight in the Badger state have failed. Of course the basis of their apprehension rests upon the possibility of the Socialist party candidate being elected. Mr. Wilson has been accused by Republican Senators of partisanship, at a time when the groups that make up that august body are "supposed" to be non-partisan.

The Senator also makes a violent attack on Victor Berger, asserting that he ought to be interned. He also asserted that 100,000 persons who voted recently in Wisconsin, were opposed to America and in love with the Kaiser.

It's great stuff, that the old party politicians and the Plute press are pulling off at present. Those who do not stand where they do politically, especially Socialists, are Pro-Germans, Anti-Americans, etc. All this is very amusing to Socialists who have been pointing out the nature of the German ruling class, as well as all other ruling classes since long before the war was started, and will continue to do so after the war ends—if society maintains its class character.

That there are Pro-Germans, and by that token, Anti-Americans actuated by nationalism and race consciousness, is undeniable. But there will be hundreds of thousands (if present indications do not deceive us), who will vote the Socialist ticket for the first time this Fall as a protest against the present social order.

A politician is the same as a statesman, with this exception: When a politician becomes a senator, supreme court justice or president he is then a statesman. It's a difference in official prefix only.

What use has a Socialist party for a platform except to enable the "leaders" to reach the plums that grow on the political tree?