Vol. III. No. 7 JUNE, 1921 Price Twenty Cents

THE PROLETARIAN

The Last Moments of King Capital

Party Activities

Local Chicago of the Proletarian Party, although but a young organization, is giving a splendid account of itself. The membership is steadily increasing and all are active in some manner or other. The available speakers are being worked to their utmost capacity. Comrades Berreitter, Wicks, and Keracher speak on different corners each Saturday evening to large crowds ably assisted by younger speakers, Sarainne Berreitter and Max Master; other comrades helping with the sale of literature. Meetings, both indoor and out, are held every evening in the week in different parts of the City as well as study classes. On May Day Comrade Keracher spoke for the Scandinavian Federation, formerly of the S. L. P. On the evening of the same day the Local celebrated with three speakers. If the same rate of activity is maintained throughout the summer a large and permanent organization will be the result.

* * * *

The comrades of Buffalo are "on the job" with several classes per week and general agitation in cooperation with the comrades of the Industrial Socialist League. The League is made up of former members of the S. L. P. who indorse the Third International. C. M. O'Brien spoke for this Local recently, and besides the audience there was in attendance the usual Buffalo bodyguard of blue and their plain clothes assistants, for Buffalo is one of the leading "law and order" cities of the universe.

* * * *

Rochester as a Local has always been quite up to standard in activities. Their May Day celebration was a hummer; between fifteen and twenty thousand it is estimated were in the parade. It was a joint celebration with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The parade terminated with a monster Mass Meeting in the huge building at Exposition Park. The speakers were Comrades Fenmore, O'Brien and Bailey. Local comrades report it the most inspiring demonstration in the history of the Rochester Labor Movement. For several years the Rochester comrades have been alive to the necessity of close work with and in the labor organizations, and although this is true of our locals in general, there is still room for greater and more systematic work in the union movement.

* * * *

Local Los Angeles, although recently organized, is full of "pep." Several classes are held weekly out of which new membership is continually being recruited. Over $100 has been raised by comrades and sympathizers, for "The Proletarian Fund." That is the sort of support that keeps life in an organization. The Proletarian Party has no other support than that which comes from dues and funds raised by the membership. The growth of the organization could be greatly extended if there were funds to send organizers into other cities where no locals now exist. Our western membership may not be large but is composed of good Marxian students and loyal active workers.

The Jackson comrades, never content with past achievements, report that they are breaking in new comrades to an understanding of Marxism and the tactics that go with the communist movement. Jackson in the past has produced its full quota of constructive rebels, who today are doing their best in different parts of the country.

* * * *

Recently we had a few flashes from Flint to the effect that there was still a deal of kick left in that Local in spite of the difficulty of being active in a small city. Classes have been consistently held in Flint for several years, and have borne fruit to the extent of a small but active Local.

* * * *

Comrades in Ann Arbor are maintaining a local. The secretary reports meetings held regularly. Study classes are held every week as a part of the local's activities. The meetings are well attended in spite of the fact that they are held in close proximity to the University. * * * *

In Detroit the comrades are conducting very successful street meetings. This in face of the fact that the bulk of the work connected with the publishing of "The Proletarian" falls upon their shoulders. Quite a number of the speakers who are now located in other cities are a product of the Detroit group. New material must be found here to take the place of those who have taken up the work elsewhere.

A Challenge

Local Los Angeles issues a challenge to all other locals to the effect that in June it can get more subs for "The Proletarian," sell more single copies, and raise more money for the "Press Fund" than any other local regardless of size.

ATTENTION!

The attention of the reader is called to the fact that "The Proletarian" has moved to new headquarters. To avoid delay in delivering mail address same to 5330 Russell St., Detroit, Mich.

The Proletarian

Published Monthly at
5330 Russell Street
Detroit, Michigan

The Proletarian is the official paper of the Proletarian Party of America.

Subscription one dollar fifty a year; single copies twenty cents. Rates to dealers on application.

No advertising matter accepted.
Make checks and money orders payable to The Proletarian.

THE PROLETARIAN

Vol. III JUNE, 1921 No. 7

"Super-Bolsheviks" or "Kautskyans"

By H. M. Wicks

The Communist party of Russia (Bolsheviki) seems to be able to defend itself adequately against its enemies, who openly wage wage against it. The suppression of the counter-revolution within and the annihilation of the imperialistic armies from without has been accomplished. The physical force elements are being disposed of adequately.

The theoretical assaults of the Kautskys have been disposed of in masterly style by the theoreticians of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. Lenin's reply to Kautsky's twaddle about democracy and dictatorship was crushing and overwhelming. One familiar with the controversy would suppose that the question of minority action had been definitely relegated to its place in the history of the revolutionary movement as a tactic of a bygone age. We did not expect the traducers of the revolution to immediately abandon the lies emanating from the prostituted hirelings of capitalism to the effect that the revolution was a dictatorship of a minority of the people of Russia, but we had a right to believe that all groups of workers calling themselves revolutionary would endeavor to repudiate such infamous slander.

Instead of repudiation of the Kautskyan lies, we find the two "underground" organizations in the United States endeavoring to perpetuate the identical slanders of Kautsky, Axelrod, Martoff, Stein & Co., and denouncing in unrestrained terms those who take the Marxist position that the most important present task of the revolutionary political party is to convince a majority of the people that our position is correct.

In a recent issue of the official organ of the United Communist Party of America some inferiority, masquerading behind a hodge-podge of semi-revolutionary shibboleths, attacks the Proletarian party as a "centrist" organization because we are guilty of the advocacy of proletarian democracy, which implies majority action in the final struggle for power. In thus attacking a principle recognized as a fundamental in the arsenal of revolutionary tactics by every writer and theoretician from Marx to Lenin the writer places himself definitely in the ranks of those who, either through ignorance or viciousness, villify the revolutionary traditions of the socialist movement and play the political game of the master class—the imperialist butchers—of the world which is endeavoring to align the masses of the workers of other countries against Soviet Russia. In the case of the writers for "The Communist" it is a case of palpable ignorance; ignorance of the fundamentals of Marxism and of the history of the proletarian movement.

This writer, whose article appears in No. 16 of the official organ of the United Communist Party, undoubtedly speaks the sentiments of the executive committee of that party, otherwise the article never would have been accepted by the editorial committee, or whatever they call the group that passes upon the articles submitted. In distortion of the principles of the Third International this "communist" excels even the renegade Kautsky. However, it would be inaccurate to accuse the executive of the United Communist Party of being renegades; they cannot abandon a thing they have never accepted. While Kautsky was once a Marxist, the U. C. P. outfit can never claim such distinction, but that the reasoning of the U. C. P. and of Kautsky is identical can easily be shown.

Says the scribbler in "The Communist:"

"The Proletarian Party abjures the revolution if it is not a majority revolution."

Then follows a brainless diatribe to the effect that it is impossible to "convert the great mass of the workers." Such an assertion proves conclusively that the United Communist Party, through its official organ, interprets the revolution in the identical manner in which Kautsky interprets it.

Kautsky, with characteristic pedantry, argues at length to prove that the Bolshevik revolution was a minority revolution. He accuses the Bolsheviks of endorsing the Blanquist ideas of Wilhelm Weitling. Like all followers of Blanqui, Weitling held that a resolute minority would initiate the revolution and bring socialism to the vast majority. To Weitling democracy in any form was a delusion, deserving nothing but unmitigated contempt from the "intelligent minority" that was to lead the workers into a New Jerusalem. This same Weitling, who is mentioned frequently by Kautsky as having anticipated the theoretical basis of Bolshevism was one of the first of an inglorious procession of European agitators who foisted their delusions upon the American labor movement in its infancy. Weitling came to America shortly after the revolution of 1848 in Germany. He continued his minority action agitation here until he was eclipsed by the anarchist, John Most.

That the conception of revolution held by Most and by the present "super-revolutionists" in the underground organizations is one and the same can be proved by a perusal of the works of John Most and his anarchist associates. Most was editor of the German "Freiheit," the English-speaking organs of the Most aggregation were the Chicago "Alarm" and the San Francisco "Truth." Here are some examples of their propaganda, which remind one of the hysterical columns of the official organ of the "undergrounders" of today:

"War to the palace, peace to the cottage, death to luxurious idleness! We have no moment to waste. Arm! I say, to the teeth! **for the Revolution is upon you!**"—"Truth," Nov. 17, 1883.

"Fellow workmen: The social crisis is pointing in all countries of modern civilization toward a fast approaching crisis. . . . Only through daring will we be victorious. . . . The masses will only be with us when they trust us, and they will trust us if they have proofs of our power and ability.

"This involves the necessity of revolutionary skirmishes, of

daring deeds, of those acts which are the forerunners of every great revolution.

"Proletarians, we appeal to you to regard the propaganda of the deed in every form. War to the knife!"—Article by John Most, published in "Freiheit" and translated for "Truth," January 26, 1884.

John Most and his associates have long since crumbled to dust. Subsequently, Daniel De Leon exerted a strong influence on the American working class. He, however, believed in using his intellect in order to convince the majority of the American working people that revolution was the only way out of the agony of capitalism. He was a student, who despised with an undying hatred the fulminations of the apostles of revolutionary hysteria. His intellectual weapons annihilated the delusion of anarchism and minority action, but for the "undergrounders" his existence and achievement has been in vain. His assaults upon these utopians eliminated them for many years, but they have come to life again under a new form and now endeavor to conceal their reactionary tendency by mouthing Marxist terminology. But the **dictatorship of the proletariat** becomes meaningless on the lips of the confusionists, as they interpret it exactly as does Kautsky —the dictatorship of a minority of those who claim to represent the proletariat.

The tirade against the Bolsheviks by Kautsky called forth from the pen of Lenin a reply that can be used with equal force against the **apostles of ignorance** in the American movement, who fondly imagine themselves "super-Bolsheviks." One of Kautsky's charges against the Bolsheviks is that they are opposed to participation in parliamentary elections. To that charge Lenin points to the fact that the Bolsheviks made, perhaps, more successful use of parliament than any other party in the world, having captured the entire labor representation in the Duma in 1912-14. The U. C. P. accepts the explanation of Kautsky by issuing proclamations to boycott the elections, and declaring that elections are delusions, on the eve of an election participated in by twenty-seven million adults in the United States. Evidently the assumption that the American working class repudiates parliamentary activity is a bit of fiction from the pens of the muddleheads of the United Communist Party.

The contempt for democracy, as charged by Kautsky and advocated by the U. C. P. is certainly not shared by Lenin, for on page 30 of the British Socialist Party edition of "The Proletarian Revolution" he says:

"Proletarian democracy is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy, and the Soviet regime is a million times more democratic than the most democratic regime in a bourgeois republic."

The schoolmaster, Kautsky, says that dictatorship is unnecessary in a democracy of any type, and to this stupidity Lenin replies:

"* * * Why do we need a dictatorship when we have a majority? And Marx and Engels explain: In order to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie; in order to inspire the reactionaries with fear; in order to maintain the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie; in order that the proletariat may forcibly suppress its enemies." (Page 35.)

In explaining the attitude of the Soviet government toward the peasantry and the villages in answer to Kautsky's charge of petit bourgeois compromise, Lenin, on page 97 of "The Proletarian Revolution" says:

"* * * if the Bolshevik proletariat had attempted at once, in November, 1917, without waiting and without being able to prepare and carry through the class cleavage in the village, to decree a civil war or the establishment of socialism in the villages, had attempted to do without the temporary union with the peasants as a whole, had attempted to do without the necessary concessions to the middle peasantry, **it would have been a Blanquist distortion of Marxism, an attempt of a minority to impose its will upon the majority, a theoretical absurdity and a display of ignorance. * * *"**

Here we have in plain words without any equivocation, an unqualified repudiation of Blanquism, a repudiation of minority rule, and a restatement of the Marxist position as enunciated in the Communist Manifesto, which has been oft-quoted in these columns and will be quoted in the future as often as necessary to remind the confusionists of their anti-Marxist position. Says Marx and Engels, on page 28 of the Manifesto:

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority."

Lenin, again, in his "State and Revolution" on page 42 of the Marxian Educational Society edition, refers to minority and majority, a position he has certainly not repudiated since the revolution, as he refers to this same quotation in his later writings. He asserts:

"And so the Commune (Paris, 1871) would seem to have replaced the broken machinery of the state, 'only' by a fuller democracy; the abolition of the standing army and the transformation of all officials into elective and revocable agents of the state. But as a matter of fact this 'only' represents a gigantic replacement of one type of institution by others of a fundamentally different order. Here we see precisely a case of the 'transformation of quantity into quality.' Democracy carried out with the fullest imaginable completeness and consistency, is transformed from capitalist democracy into proletarian democracy: from the state (that is, a special force for the suppression of a particular class) to something which is no longer really a form of the state.

"It is still necessary to suppress the capitalist class and crush its resistance. This was particularly necessary for the Commune; and one of the reasons for its defeat was that it did not do this with sufficient determination. But the organ of suppression is now a majority of the population, and not a minority, as was always the case under slavery, serfdom and wage-labor."

We see from all of the above that not only was Lenin very careful to emphasize the fact that the Bolshevik revolution was not minority action, but that he insisted that the proletarian revolution must be the self-conscious movement of the majority.

In Trotzky's pamphlet "From October to Brest-Litovsk" we also learn approximately the process, step by step, by which the Bolsheviki did convince the majority of the people of Russia that their position was correct. From a small group of Bolsheviks the movement grew until almost every regiment in the army in addition to the mass of workmen of Petrograd were aligned under their banner.

The cause for misconception of the alignment of forces in the revolution arises from the fact that the romanticists and confusionists mistake the necessary character and function of a revolutionary political organization. The organization always remains a minority and its supporters constitute a minority of the population until the eve of the revolution, when it succeeds in convincing the majority of the population that its position is correct. To endeavor to seize power prematurely, that is, before the majority are aligned on the side of the revolutionary party, is always disastrous; so disastrous, in fact, that every experienced revolutionist will rather be accused of over-cautiousness than be guilty of precipitating a condition that will mean untold suffering for the workers who par-

ticipate in the struggle. Of course such an explanation will be hooted by the "super-Bolsheviks." But we are not endeavoring to convince them of their error, as such an achievement would not be worth the effort. We are determined, though, that nothing shall remain undone to bring to the attention of the working class of the United States and the world the reactionary character of the confusionists in the American movement.

In analyzing the proletarian dictatorship the American "undergrounders" arrive at the identical conclusions that Kautsky has arrived at. Kautsky built a straw man, out of his own imagination, and then proceeded to annihilate it. The United Communist Party built another straw man, a real prototype of the Kautskyan one, and embraced it as superrevolutionary. Just as Weitling, Most and other utopians and anarchists played the part of rank reactionaries, while mouthing revolutionary phrases, so our modern reactionaries distort the proletarian revolution and denounce as "centrists" the genuine revolutionists and Marxists of America, who accept without reservations the position as established through the theory and practice of the world movement. Kautskyans in theory, but yet stopping short of the conclusions of Kautsky, these imbeciles fondly delude themselves into believing they are preparing to function as the vanguard of the American working class. They crawl "underground," and in general indulge in infantile romanticisms, in the vain hope of making an impress upon the mass of workers in this country. Little do they realize the reception they are to receive when they decide to emerge from their concealment.

I do not mean they have anything to fear from the police; the police know more about their activities than the rank and file of the membership. The thing they have to fear is the working class itself. When that working class learns who they are and the vile tactics they have used in order to perpetuate themselves in control of a machine used to extract support from gullible workers they will have to continue underground for the rest of their lives to shield themselves from the open contempt of the workers. The only thing that today protects the politicians at the head of these organizations from complete exposure of their unspeakable skulduggery is the fact that they claim to be a secret underground organization, and an exposure of them would be construed by them the work of a police spy, an epithet they and their predecessors in the American movement have always used against enemies they could not eliminate otherwise.

The Proletarian party is the party of Marxists in this country and our mission is to apply the Marxist method of critical analysis to every phase of the labor movement and we would be dilatory in our duty to the workers who are sorely in need of correct information, should we neglect to point out the theoretical absurdity, not to mention the viciousness of the propaganda being dessiminated by the combined idiocy of the politicians in control of that odious aggregation, the United Communist Party.

Unemployment

By John Keracher

Quite frequently the quack doctors of social diseases get together for the purpose of tackling the "Unemployment problem." Reform socialists, Humanitarians, Labor "Leaders," "Hobo Collegians" and humbugs of every variety.

On these occasions, the "solutions" put forth are many and varied. The wise ones trot out the "simple" formula, that the solution for the jobless condition is jobs, therefore jobs must be created at once. Resolutions are adopted calling upon Congress or other governmental bodies to start great "public" works for the purpose of giving all those who are **out** an opportunity to get **in.** Then there is the favorite scheme of the "Economic Organization," which is at all times a stock argument, namely, the shortening of the working day so as to absorb all the unemployed. These are only a few of the many "solutions" offered. There are so many, ranging from open attack on City Halls to praying for snow so that the jobless could get a few meals through shoveling the same, as per the solution of the preacher who led the unemployed last winter in New York City.

It is natural that the workers, who individually are the victims of unemployment, should in their ignorance of the nature of Capitalist society, try to find a solution for the jobless condition.

When time is taken to inquire into the nature of the present social system, it will be found that, from a class standpoint, unemployment is a **capitalist class problem.** And again that there is no solution to the problem within the capitalist system.

The greatest menace to capitalism today is the growing army of unemployed. Every country has its quota. The proportion of jobless workers in relation to those employed, and to the populations in general, steadily increases. France, Germany, Spain, England, the United States, and in fact all modern countries, are up against the same problem.

To the casual observer it would appear that if the capitalist class only tried, it could put an end to unemployment. Then again we have often heard superficial thinkers argue that the masters of the means of production purposely create and foster unemployment for the purpose of holding down wages.

Let us now look a little closer into the matter. We are so accustomed to seeing the capitalist class come out on top of the heap and the workers landing at the bottom, that we are inclined to impute to them powers they have not, never had, and more than likely never will have, the power of unified action.

While the workers are being universally forced towards the same low level with nothing of their own to conserve, the master class, on the other hand, is broken and divided by vastly different economic interests. While in a general way their class interests are the same, their national and group interests keep them hopelessly divided. There are those who find themselves in the position of members of their class in a debtor nation while others belong to a creditor nation. Some are finance capitalists with huge investments in foreign resources. Others, manufacturing capitalists in the home market. Then there is the

petty bourgeoisie, storekeepers and small business men of all varieties.

True, the workers are divided through the competition for jobs, but that is rapidly being eliminated as modern industry solidifies them. With the masters, it is not only a struggle against the workers as a class, but a life and death struggle amongst themselves for control of natural resources and world markets as well as the endless competition in the home market.

This **inherent condition** of capitalist production makes it imperative for the capitalists in their competitive struggles to exploit their workers to the limit. Thus, not only is the industrial reserve-army kept intact but actually increased with every improvement in production that these capitalists are forced to make in order to remain in business.

The nation that would try to cut the working day, beyond what intensified production makes necessary, with the object of absorbing all the unemployed, would soon find itself unable to compete with other nations. The result of such an experiment instead of solving the problem would but temporarily relieve it then bring a collapse, resulting, through loss of trade, in a bigger jobless army than ever.

The manner of capitalist exploitation through unpaid labor time makes it necessary for the employers to prolong the working day wherever possible or intensify production through improved machinery or improved methods. This necessity increases the jobless army faster than the extension of industries can absorb them. The false policy, following the World War, of speeding up production to stimulate trade, so strongly advocated in Britain for instance, only hastened the breakdown.

The Capitalist Class has no alternative, they must speed the industries. They must obtain large surplus values to meet the ever increasing expenses of running capitalist society. Much of the surplus wealth exploited from the producing class is used up to maintain standing armies, police forces, court officials and countless "public servants" of all kinds. Then there are the large naval forces maintained at great expense, through fear of each other.

Such is Capitalism ripening towards its decay. It has no alternative in the matter. Like a man struggling in a mire, the greater the struggle the deeper he sinks.

That the capitalists themselves to some extent realize their predicament is evidenced by the fact that they have in the past built "peace palaces" and talked disarmament. Even now while the leading powers are scrambling for the largest navies that have ever floated on the ocean, they are talking about a "naval holiday." With many of the great nations on the verge of bankruptcy, and the same condition threatening the others, they, while talking peace, must prepare to the limit of their financial resources for another World War.

The unemployed question is one of a like nature, capitalism produces it and continually augments it by the very nature of its own operation. The struggle for the foreign as well as the home market forces on continual improvement in the means of production and the consequent displacement of workers.

The "industrial reserve army" is one of capitalism's permanent institutions. During periods of "prosperity" the ranks are thinned a bit, but during periods of depression the ranks assume gigantic proportions. When the jobless mass becomes restive it is kept quiet by doles, by bread lines and soup kitchens, by newspaper promises of "prosperity" coming, appeals to patriotism, etc. Yet in spite of these restraining measures the murmur of discontent breaks out from time to time into riots, which are met by police clubs and often bullets.

The jobless army grows and will continue to grow until it reaches such proportions that all the forces of "law and order" and all the doles, appeals and promises will not hold in check such an immense section of the starving masses. Yes! Unemployment is a **problem** all right, and one that has no solution under capitalism. **A problem for the Capitalists, yet one that cannot be solved by them, but by the proletariat itself.**

It is a curse to the individual workers who suffer from it, but a blessing in disguise for the class to which they belong.

Unemployment carries its own solution as it is the real millstone around the neck of capitalism.

The overthrow of the social order that produces unemployment; the ending of the profit system alone can put to work all the physically and mentally fit. The jobless army will be one of the, if not actually the greatest, forces in the Social Revolution.

What Are The Capitalists Doing?

By Murray Murphy

In these days of "radical propaganda" and "criminal anarchy" it should be interesting to take stock of what the capitalists are doing along these lines, in order to benefit by their example. Surely observation of our betters will elevate our morals, and admiration for their deeds will refine our own actions. Indeed, as an object of contemplation (if we may rely on the representations of bourgeois idealists), nothing, I am sure, could be better than the virtuous conduct of their society.

At the outset, however, we are pained to note that capitalism falls down in one important respect, namely, **efficiency.** This is the one thing in which capitalists are supposed to excel, but if we look for it in their management of society we fail to find it. What is "efficiency" if it is not, socially, the basis for material welfare on the part of the people? But thousands are hungry and homeless. What is "efficiency" if it does not mean a social organization so well co-ordinated and trained that culture, intelligence, and good-will are its natural fruits? Yet we have vice, ignorance, and crime waves from one end of the country to the other.

An "efficient" social order ought not to exhibit such monstrosities of incompetency as, for example, tarring and feathering preachers—or anybody else. American Legion men should be prevented from "rioting and disorderly conduct." Race fights, with their indiscriminate killings, like those we have just witnessed in Tulsa, Oklahoma, should be impossible.

Perhaps, though, it is unjust to find fault with capitalism because of these trifling disturbances. We should remember that capitalism does not care to establish a "dictatorship" like Soviet Russia: it prefers to allow complete "liberty" to its citizens, hoping that in time they will learn to exercise the beautiful virtues of self-restraint. We must, therefore, instead of unkindly gazing upon the palpable failures of capitalism in action, turn our attention to its glorious political institutions, its courts and legal enactments, in order to realize the good intentions it evidently has.

Capitalist "Autocracy"

Curious enough, however, we find that the Capitalist government is busily occupied in making things easy for capitalists at the expense of us workers. The Supreme Court has held that the Anti-Trust Law (monument of the reformers' zeal!) applies also to labor unions, so that in trying to better our conditions we are likely to discover that we are acting illegally in "restraint of trade." The courts have also made the boycott, picketing, and, in some cases, attempts to organize unions, practically offenses against the law!

The law seems, indeed, to be used by its creators entirely as a weapon with which to keep working men in subjection. They "enjoin" leaders of the trade unions, they arrest and jail industrial union organizers, they deport or imprison Communists. They deny mail privileges to our papers, street meeting privileges to our public speakers,—constitutional privileges to all of us.

Still, we ought to rejoice that the capitalists always use "legal" methods to accomplish their aims. They do not, we are told, like revolutionists, try to gain their ends by extra-legal means, or even,—awful thought!—attempt to overthrow the government itself. They work through the duly constituted authorities.

Well,—do they?

Capitalist "Direct Action"

In the Virginia coal fields we have heard for the last few days (the trouble had been going on for a year, but our "efficient" mediums of mis-information succeeded in keeping it from us) that an actual war is going on between the miners and the **private army** of the coal barons. A whole system has been worked out so that thousands of gunmen and detectives in the country are in the steady employ of the big capitalists, engaged for the sole purpose of warring against organized strikers.

This cannot be called action by legal means. It is as far from having constitutional or legal sanction as any of the so-called "conspiracies" of "criminal anarchists." It is simply another instance, added to those of Homestead, Ludlow, and Gary, that capitalists use legal means when convenient, and any old means at all when they feel like it.

Having discovered that capitalists exercise an even more cruel "dictatorship" and far ruder "direct action" than they accuse us of, we are still brought face to face with the old supposition that they are at least "open and above board."

Well,—I wonder!

Capitalist "Underground Activities"

Sidney Howard, writing in "The New Republic," has shown us how gigantic is the system of industrial espionage. In "The Labor Spy" he has shown how paid detectives are kept working among the men in factories and mines, and in the unions themselves, on the lookout for organizers, spotting the leaders, reporting plans for strikes, bamboozling the workers in a thousand ways.

But this isn't all. They are constantly getting out propaganda to influence the workers. The E. C. Atkins & Co., of Hamilton, Ontario, distributes cards among its employees, giving what are called, "Axioms for Unrest." A few are here quoted, indicating their bearing on the proletariat's revolutionary plans:

"1. Under any economic or industrial system, men and women must inevitably continue to work for wages."

"9. Men and women in a free country cannot be prevented from saving money and acquiring property." (Sic!)

"12. Capitalism (or the accumulation of wealth) can never be abolished, for some men will always earn, 'and save' more money than other men."

To spying and hypocrisy they add crafty sentimentality. "Loyal" workmen and foremen are duped into becoming traitors to their class. The following from "The Sante Fe Magazine," under the title, "The Tie That Binds," is significant: "A good foreman is one of the noblest handiworks of God. Combining rare qualities of mind and heart, ... he binds his men in loyalty to himself and the company with fetters of iron."

Dozens of periodicals are published directly by capitalist organizations carrying on propaganda of their class. "Law and Labor," published by the "League for Industrial Rights," (note the name of the publisher!) "The Nation's Business," published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; "Factory, the Magazine of Management;" all these oppose organized working class activity of every kind, being just now occupied with a campaign against the closed shop. "The Open Shop Review," "published by the National Founders Association and National Metal Trades Association in the Interest of Their Workmen," (so it says!) opposes all labor union activities except those which have no relation to wages, hours, and conditions of labor.

That this propaganda is bearing fruit may be seen from the fact that a good many workers are turning away from their own organizations. Even the National Grange (though what farmers should care about the question is hard to see), at a recent convention in Boston, adopted a resolution favoring the open shop.

The capitalists have also a sort of underground organization, which carries on anti-radical propaganda by means of newspaper articles, speeches, pamphlets, motion pictures, etc., these appearing under the guise, not of capitalist argument, but of "Americanization" work, etc. Chamber of Commerce committees, and particularly the "Coalition Committee of Michigan," keep up a secret communication with employers of labor, pass out information obtained by their system of espionage, and carry on an insidious anti-labor propaganda. (Editor's Note: See example of this elsewhere in this issue.)

Well, our original quest was for polite and moral tactics, the supposition being that we might find these exemplified in the conduct of our American capitalists. But alack and alas! we find that the **lies** they told about us are **true** of themselves.

International Notes

By John Keracher

Germany Between pressure from without and within, the present German Government is putting up a desperate struggle for existence. The Shylock part that France is playing for the "full pound of flesh," is straining German Capitalism to the breaking point.

Their aim is to destroy Germany's industrial power and to place themselves in her former strong position.

The iron mines of Lorraine cannot be used to their full extent, shut off as they are from the great coal fields of Germany. The exorbitant reparation demands, if accepted, which seems to be the case, leaves German Capitalism with a millstone around its neck. If, on the other hand, Germany had held out against these terms, France was ready to seize and hold the Ruhr district with the rich coal fields of Westphalia. The Sarre Valley coal mines are already in French hands. While this blow is being struck in the Southwest, the Poles, under French patronage, aimed to seize the coal fields of Upper Silesia. By this policy France hoped to pull the fire from under the boiler of German industry.

The attitude of Great Britain, while not openly hostile to their French Ally, is far from being in harmony with it. After the great struggle to cripple Germany's capitalist imperialism, Britain is not anxious to find France occupying the same strong industrial position that Germany held before 1914. Hence, the attitude taken by Lloyd George on the Polish situation in relation to Upper Silesia. The British Premier has not suddenly turned pro-German, he is simply upholding the interests of the class he represents, the British Capitalists.

The sword-rattling exhibition that took place at the funeral of the ex-Kaiserin is proof that the fires of German imperialism still smolder. On the other hand, the sneers of the revolutionary elements amongst the working class on the same occasion, though recently crushed in the Communist revolt, shows the undaunted spirit of the proletariat. The "Red Flag," the official organ of the Communist Party, although suppressed by the Government continues to appear with appeals to the workers to overthrow the existing order of things.

Egypt On Saturday, May 21st, there broke out in Egypt a violent revolt. It appears to have been a part of the struggle for national independence that has been smoldering since machine guns were used to crush the Egyptians in the early days of the Peace Conference. It will be remembered that the Egyptians selected four representatives soon after the signing of the Armistice. On their way to the Peace Conference they were arrested by the British and imprisoned on the Island of Malta. Then followed an outbreak that the British crushed, killing about a thousand and wounding thousands more of the Egyptian people.

The uprising this time seems to be centered around Alexandria, where the Nationalists made an attack upon the police and British troops, and the infuriated populace marched through the streets looting the stores.

England has promised to restore their independence several times. "They were not to violate Egypt's freedom," etc. Recently, as a substitute for independence, they had foisted upon them **a British made Constitution** giving them **theoretical** liberty. It was Lord Milner, one of Britain's leading "Empire Builders" who carried through the little scheme. The noble Lord with a staff of "experts" journeyed from London early last year "to find out what the Country needed." It was later heralded through the Bourgeois press that the British had conferred an exceedingly liberal Constitution upon Egypt, etc., etc. Evidently this liberal constitution is not working smoothly as at the time of writing there is fighting going on at Cairo to which the riots have spread and many Egyptians as well as Europeans have been slain in the streets.

Japan The price Japan is paying to hold her position, as a first-class power, is taxing her severely. For some years back the United States and Japan have been watching each other closely. So much so that rumors of impending war between them does not surprise us at this time. The greatest safeguard against war has been the vast expanse of ocean between them. Now that battleships have increased in size and speed, the range of the guns extended, and aeroplanes and submarines brought to their present point of perfection, the Pacific Ocean has grown relatively smaller and the possibility of war brought nearer.

The laws of California aimed at the restriction of immigration as well as the trouble over the Island of Yap is tending at the present time to strain relations and speed military and naval preparations.

Meantime, what is the attitude of Japan? Faced with a tremendously increasing population, overflowing into the islands of the Pacific, into California, into China and other Asiatic territories, the Japs are forced to meet the many problems arising therefrom. These imperialists of the far East have no alternative but to compete in building up huge naval and military forces. They are obliged also to resort to intrigue, secret agreements and diplomacy of every variety. "His Imperial Highness" the Crown Prince Hirohito paid a visit to England at the beginning of May. He is but 20 years of age and it is the first time that an heir to the throne has ever left Japan. His visit no doubt is part of the diplomatic scheme of things to bring about a closer friendship between Britain and Japan.

The steps Japan has been taking to fortify her island kingdom are only beginning to be understood. Manchuria has been overrun, and since the Chinese have not got the power to eject them it has been reduced to the position of a Japanese province. All the coast north of Korea, that is the maritime province

from Vladivostok to Nikolaievsk and the northern half of the Island of Sakhalin, has been occupied by them.

A glance at the map will show what the wily Japs have been up to. By mining across the lower entrance of the Sea of Japan from Nagasaki to the coast of Korea and in the same way closing the northern entrance between the head of Sakhalin and the Siberian mainland, the Sea of Japan becomes practically an inland lake. In this great natural harbor their fleet could lie in safety if attacked by superior navies. Again by closing these narrow entrances all the inner coast line of Japan would be unapproachable and their entire fleet thus made available for operation in the open Pacific. By diplomatic moves and military aggression Japan has put herself in a stronger position than she held at the victorious close of the Russian-Japanese war. The territory completely surrounding the Sea of Japan is now under her control. One of the penalties of her imperial expansion is the attitude of Korea which has turned out to be a sort of Ireland for Japan. In March, 1919, the Koreans revolted and struck out for national independence, and although the revolt was put down with an iron hand the fire still smolders. The aim of Japan to assimilate the Koreans and mould them into her national life has not been a success. Nor has Korea proven to be an outlet for their surplus population, the Japs being unable to compete with the Koreans and Chinese who inhabit the peninsula. The spirit of national independence is very strong and their sympathies are more in line with the Chinese Republic than with imperial Japan. Nevertheless, for a non-combatant in the World War, the Japanese have gathered up a full share of the plunder, and it is only beginning to dawn upon the Western World that her territorial possessions are huge and her strategic position almost invincible.

Great Britain The Coal Miners' strike continues to be Britain's biggest problem. The forty-third day of the industrial war, which has been political in character since its very inception, drew from Lloyd George the admission that the situation was taking on a revolutionary character.

The split in the Triple Alliance, disastrous enough to the miners' cause, did not break their unity. The rank and file of British labor is loyally supporting them. The Transport Workers are threatening to quit if attempts are made to land coal from other countries. Belgian workers are said to have refused to load coal intended for England. In the west of Scotland railroad workers have been discharged for refusing to move coal. Some of the points that led to the big strike were not available when I wrote last month. It seems that August 31st was the date upon which the government control of the mines was to expire. Taking advantage of the depleted state of the miners' treasury, and trade depression prevailing in the coal industry, the capitalists, through their government, precipitated the industrial war by serving notice that their control and the guarantees that went with it would end five months before the stipulated date, namely on March 31st. The strike, or lockout which began April first, found the employers better prepared than the miners as there were huge stocks of coal on hand. The aim of the mine owners was to bring about reductions in wages from 15 to 50 per cent and return to district rates instead of national rates, thus taking away all that the miners had gained during the war. Another point that has been brought out is the fact that during the past six years the owners have cleared the entire capital value of the mines in profits.

The labor leaders, afraid of the magnitude of the pending conflict, temporized by putting back the date for joining with the miners, from time to time. It was quite plain that they were seeking some loophole or excuse for breaking the Triple Alliance. At last they found their opportunity. Frank Hodges, the secretary of the miners, conceded the point of settling the wages first as a basis for settlement and leaving the matter of National wage pool and a National Board till a later date. This the reactionary labor leaders jumped at. The miners' union refused to accept and repudiated this proposition of their secretary. Thereupon the leaders of the Railroad and Transport Workers split the Triple Alliance by calling off the proposition of a joint strike.

Throughout the ranks of the labor movement there are three distinct views. The conservative view of confining the strike to a pure and simple wage dispute, the radical views of forcing labor control of the mines and government, and the revolutionary views of developing the strike into an open conflict against the Bourgeois State.

Lloyd George is either alarmed, or, to suit his political purposes, is pretending to be. In response to a question in the House of Commons as to whether the government's policy was to be one of "wait and see" he replied "No, it is to watch and pray." His "watch and pray" is somewhat like Cromwell's motto "Pray God, but keep your powder dry." The British Capitalist government in a "state of emergency" can be trusted to shoot first and pray afterwards. For the first time, if reports are reliable, the revolutionary spirit is spreading into the navy. If it ever gets a real hold there it will be time for the whole world's bourgeoisie to pray.

Syria When the representatives of the Allied Powers at the "Peace" Table, parceled out "the near East," Syria was turned over to France. Syria is just south of Asia Minor, and north of Palestine which is in possession of the British who also hold Mesopotamia on the East of Syria.

It now appears that the French are not making a success of their eastern colony. Aral tribes make raids upon their trading posts and carry back into the desert everything they can lay hands upon.

This guerrilla warfare, if continued, will make the upkeep of the colony cost more than the French can extract from Syria through taxes and other sources of revenue. The whole native population it is said are in revolt and the French may find it more convenient to withdraw their forces, than hold out under such circumstances.

Norway Big strikes are tying up the industrial life of Norway. The Government has called out military forces in the chief cities. In the capitol, Christiania, 120,000 union laborers are threatening to walk out in sympathy with the steamship engineers and sailors who have been on strike

since early in May, against a 33 per cent cut in wages. The Government fears, or pretends to fear, a revolutionary uprising. Troops have been placed at strategical points in readiness. The workers are holding out courageously against superior forces.

Turkey There has been a lull in the conflict between the Greeks and the Turks in Asia Minor. The Greeks, driven a long way back, have so far been unable to renew the offensive. The Turks on the other hand are reported to have a division in their ranks over the policy to be pursued toward the Allies. Some of the Kemalists desire to fight for complete control of Asia Minor, others are inclined to accept the Sevres Treaty, as amended at London. The leading representative of the "moderate" policy, Sarny Bey, has been forced to resign. His post has been taken by Feizi Pasha who is now President of the council of commissars. The Angora Government has taken the attitude of resisting the Allies' terms. The Greeks, believing the Turks to be split over the attitude of the Nationalist Government, are preparing to renew the attack. The French are inclined to negotiate a settlement, but the Turks refuse to open negotiations until all French forces are out of Cilicia. The Russian Soviet Government is pledged to send troops to assist the Turks if they are needed.

Communism and Christianism

By Bishop William Montgomery Brown, D. D. Paper 25 cents. Published by Bradford Brown Educational Co. For sale at this office.

The most remarkable part of this book is the author who has had a long career in the church. He is a member of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, formerly Fifth Bishop of Arkansas, Sometime Archdeacon of Ohio and Special Lecturer at Bexley Hall, the Theological Seminary of Kenyon College. He is now described as "Episcopos in partibus Bolshevikium et Infidelium." Freely translated Bishop in the lands belonging to the Bolsheviks and Infidels.

In considering the book with the author in mind there are many startling revolutions. It is dedicated by the Bishop and Mrs. Brown to the proletariat "to whose unrequited labors (not to the good providence of a divinity) they owe their wealth, leisure and opportunities." Religion is here described in the words of Marx as "the opium of the people." Throughout the whole work the Bishop does not withdraw from that definition. The work is full of copious quotations from the excellent pamphlet published by the Socialist Party of Great Britain entitled "Socialism and Religion" which the Bishop regards as one of the finest little works upon the question of religion.

That the Bishop is impartial between Protestantism and Catholicism is very evident. He says, page 51, "Protestantism is preferred before Romanism by most of the leading people in the financial world, because it is the child of capitalism, their sister, so to speak, whereas its rival is only a cousin. As to the Protestant orthodoxies they are on the same footing. I would not turn my hand over for the difference between them. If literally interpreted in the light of modern science, both are utterly antiquated and irrational. * * * In my opinion, as in that of all Marxian and Darwinian socialists, every super-naturalistic representation in both must be regarded as having either a figurative or else a superstitious character, for there is not one among them which can endure a scientific and rational analysis; yet this is an age of science and reason. The difference between Romanism and Protestantism is not at all a question of relative supernaturalism, nor of rightness and wrongness, but wholly one of the difference between the systems of economics which gave them birth."

The author bases his position upon a Marxian interpretation of history and a Darwinian interpretation of nature. Materialism is accepted without reservation and the supernatural view is thrown overboard. "Every period in human history has had its determining character from the tools which brought it into being."

The book has certain weaknesses, however, the most outstanding of which is the clothing of materialistic ideas in religious phraseology. Further, while repudiating religion the Bishop seems to look upon Marxism as a sort of new religion. These weaknesses possibly are its real strength for written in the way that it is it should have a good effect upon those that are not yet emancipated from the influence of religion and hold the idea that "Christian Socialism" is not a "contradiction of terms." To one who is still suffering from religion and not yet acquainted with Communism the book is a terrific jolt.

Socialist Party History

By H. M. Wicks

The New York Call, organ of Menshevism in the Eastern metropolis, attacks my criticism of the new "left-wing" of the Socialist Party and endeavors to prove my analysis of current history erroneous, in an editorial appearing in its May 6 issue. In its customary controversial manner it initiates its attack with its ancient weapon, distortion of facts. Its opening statement is a fabrication so obvious that anyone, except a scribbling vilifier of the revolutionary movement, would endeavor to at least find a more plausible method of attack. Says this counter-revolutionary organ:

"The Proletarian Party is one of the many neo-Communist offshoots that have their perfect blueprint marking the road to the New Jerusalem."

If the writer means that insisting upon certain recognized tactics, the accumulation of over a half century of experience, the major portion of which constitutes the basis for affiliation with the Third International, is a "perfect blueprint" then we plead guilty to the charge. Not only are we guilty of that charge now, but in the past we have consistently opposed the utopian policy of reformism, social pacifism, and all the idiosyncracies with which the Socialist Party has been and is now afflicted. But if by "perfect blueprint" the Call means a **wheel of fortune** depicting in detail the Communist society of the future it is badly mistaken. We have always left such romanticisms to the muddleheads of the movement—the reform socialists and the syndicalists—and as a first step toward dispelling that delusion which is today dominant in the Socialist Party I would respectfully recommend that they read what Frederick Engels in his "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" has to say about those who endeavor to draw a "front, sides and bird's-eye view of the new society." The Call has simply resorted, in this case at least, to the Jesuit tactic of accusing its enemies of the very crimes it has long been guilty of. A perusal of the Proletarian Party constitution is sufficient to dispel any such notions as the Call pretends to have regarding our party.

The editor of the Call also finds fault with me for declaring that the Republican party in the last campaign represented the interests of the manufacturing capitalists, while the Democratic party represented the finance capitalists. In attempting to refute that assertion and vindicate the Socialist party position, which is that there is no difference whatever between the two old parties, the Call is forced to perform feats of mental gymnastics that remind one of the logic of the four-minute-men who used to try to convince us that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Here are some of the gems from the editorial of May 6:

"The facts are that the Republican outfit was the original imperialist organization representing finance capital. It gathered the first overseas loot. To gain the affection of finance capital the Democratic outfit marched to the front under its banner. Both are now the property of finance capital. * * *

"If the Republicans opposed the League of Nations it was mainly because of two facts: First, it gave them an "issue," and second they figure that the Western Hemisphere, reserved to American finance capital by the Monroe Doctrine, furnishes plenty of loot for many years to come."

Then follows a half-column of distortion of current history, interspersed with brainless comment that exposes the total intellectual poverty of the writer; all for the benefit of the gullible readers of Socialist party organs who usually mistake piffle for profundity. The tenor of the article exposes its author to be the nincompoop who boasts that he is a "socialist historian," Mr. James O'Neil; no one but he could be guilty of such a brazen perversion of history in order to buttress his preconceived ideas; he has a method of writing peculiarly his own, that he might vainly refer to as his "literary style," but which is merely his lack of erudition exposed in a slaughter of the English language in such a bizarre fashion that one familiar with it can never mistake his effusions. He concludes his article thusly:

"We sometimes tremble before these 'Marxian scientists,' yet more often we feel like the audience in a Bowery theatre that yells 'Get the hook!' when a bum singer croaks a dirge for its entertainment."

Not being an attendant at Bowery theatres in search of diversion it is not possible to understand the feelings of audiences who yell "get the hook," when someone displeases them. Possibly that is where the New York Call editors get their inspiration for their editorials. Their crude efforts to interpret current histoy reminds one of a monologue on the League of Nations by Lew Dockstader, the minstrel—the difference being that Lew considers himself a comedian, while the comedy on the part of the renowned socialist historian is of the unconscious variety.

The New York Call has always been a profound interpreter of history, especially history in the making. It displayed its scholarship when in June-July, 1917, the Bolsheviki were attracting attention throughout the world as the opponents of the Kerensky regime. Every genuine Marxist in the world understood the significance of that struggle, but the New York Call printed column after column of drivel to the effect that Lenin and Trotzky were anarchists who were attempting to overthrow the "socialist" government of Russia. When the Bolshevik revolution occurred in November, 1917, the Call and the entire press of the Socialist party remained silent. They were bewildered by the proletarian movement in Russia. Months after the revolution the Socialist party finally was forced to take a liberal-bourgeois stand in favor of the "Hands-Off-Russia" agitation, but never did it take a revolutionary stand in support of the proletarian revolution.

The question then arises: if the Socialist party and the New York Call knew nothing about the history and tactics of the movement it professed to be a part of, how can it claim to be able to interpret current events in terms of Marxism? What claim to consideration has this aggregation in face of their record during the struggle for supremacy between the social traitors and the proletariat of Russia? One of the

principal weapons of the Mensheviki was their distortion of current history, the throwing of "learned dust" in the eyes of the workers; the constant reiteration of the dogma that Russia was not economically developed —a result of their insufficient understanding of the fundamentals of Marxism. The Call suffers from the same defect and in a more pronounced degree.

Perhaps the most amusing feature of the editorial policy of the Call is its habit of refuting its own assertions from day to day. In the editorial columns of May 12, there appears another effusion, based upon an article appearing in the Daily News Record, which is a complete reversal of the position laid down in the attack upon my article in the last Proletarian (May, 1921). The Call says in part:

"William Allen White has an interesting interview in the Daily News Record which he sends from Washington, a dispatch that is significant of the trend to the new imperial epoch we have mentioned a number of times in these columns. For many years the manufacturers' export of commodities was the chief factor in determining foreign policies. But the world war witnessed the development of the power of finance capital with giant strides. The present situation is outlined in the following paragraph:

"'For the first time in American history there is a division between the great bankers and the great manufacturers of the country. The bankers are seriously involved in the world's debt; America is the world's creditor. The great bankers who have been heretofore the soul of such invisible government as we possessed, are carrying the evidence of this unthinkable debt in their vaults. They want someone to start paying that debt. It can be paid only with foreign goods. And if there is a high protective tariff, shutting out goods which should pay the world's debt, these goods will not enter America and the debt will be unpaid.'"

Further quotations from Mr. White's article describe the manufacturers' side, who do not want to be compelled to compete with the low-priced European commodities. Here is a plain admission in the editorial columns of the Call that there is an antagonism of interests between the manufacturing capitalists and the finance capitalists. There is also ample evidence that the Harding government is framing up a tariff bill that it intends to put through, obviously in the interest of these same manufacturing capitalists, so it must be admitted by the Call itself that the present Republican regime, to that extent at least, is representing the manufacturers as opposed to the finance capitalists. It is equally true that the Wilson regime prevented any legislation detrimental to the finance capitalists and hence was opposed to the interests of the manufacturers. In face of these facts, what then becomes of the statement of the Call in its attack upon my article to the effect that "finance capital and the manufacturers are allied in both organizations (Republican and Democratic) and there is no essential difference between the two"? The editor also declares that both groups will be taken care of equally well by either party.

Despite the conflict that the Call admits exists it persists in the childish delusion that there is no conflict between the two parties, and holds the idea that the opposition to the League of Nations was simply a pretense in order to formulate an "issue" to deceive the voters. What enormities of stupidity! As though it were necessary for the capitalist class to maintain two gigantic political organizations to fool the workers. That is crediting the workers with too much intelligence; they can be fooled with one party as well as with two. It is not a matter of sham political struggles, or fictitious issues to keep the workers fooled. It is the whole ideology of capitalism, and it would be easier to delude them with one party embodying all the ideology of capitalism than with two, like the Republican and Democratic parties who constantly expose the inside workings of each other in their struggle for supremacy.

While there are different interests of the capitalist class to be served, those interests will seek political expression and it is easy for a Marxist to analyze these conflicting interests and parties. To analyze the Socialist party, however, is not so easy, as it is neither fish nor fowl—it represents no definite class interests, but is a sort of hodge-podge of numerous interests of the petit-bourgeois, the shop-keeper, the jay-bird lawyer who endeavors to job a living out of unfortunate workers and semi-proletarians by professing radicalism, the sky-pilot out of a job and all the bungled aggregation of moribund incompetents; a plaything of political failures who are destined to impotence forever.

The petit-bourgeois character of the Call is displayed when it depicts the struggle between finance capital and the manufacturers as something new, as the result of the war, and has to quote a capitalist journalist, William Allen White, as its authority. The facts are that finance capital had gained the ascendency and was responsible for the war, while the main support of the social-pacifists—the American Union Against Militarism, the People's Council, etc.—came from the manufacturing capitalists. We Marxists did not have to wait for a bourgeois journalist to analyze the system for us after it was rotten ripe and could be seen by anyone, except the editors and profound historians of the New York Call. We had analyzed it as far back as 1907, and explained the financial panic of that year in terms of that antagonism that the Call thinks is a phenomenon of the war.

The "money panic" of 1907 was a tightening of finances by the finance capitalists, whose statisticians had informed them that the manufacturing capitalists could not dispose of their commodities because of the overstocked condition of the world market. When the manufacturers asked for loans, as was their custom, from the finance capitalists to carry them over the season they were refused. Upon the basis of the conflict between these two forces every political struggle that has since ensued must be explained.

In my article, which the Call distorted, to make it appear that I claimed Harding and the Republican party would continue to represent the manufacturers exclusively, I clearly pointed to the fact that finance capital would eventually dominate and that Mr. Harding could not long straddle the issue, but must take a definite stand for imperialism or perish as a political factor. Just what form this reversal will take remains uncertain, but the fact that the manufacturing capitalists are doomed in their struggle for supremacy against the imperialists is not in the least uncertain.

And when the capitalist class has been vanquished and some Marxist sits down to write the final record of class struggles he will mention the Republican, the Democratic and the Socialist parties, all, as representatives of various conflicting interests in the ranks of the enemies of the proletariat.

Machinery

The Master and The Liberator

"Labor-saving machinery" is a term familiar to everyone, regardless of class and circumstance in life, but how many ever stop to think of the effect upon the working class when an important advance is made in the perfecting of labor-eliminating devices?

If you will cast back over the pages of history to about the fifteenth century you will find a system of production—a manner of making things—quite different from the one we have today and with which we are so familiar that we take it as a matter of course, and that to such an extent that we are vaguely skeptical when any reference is made to "other days and other ways."

The best the American can do with his imagination, as a rule, is to conjure in his memory the tales told him by his grandparents of the hardships endured by the pioneers in subjugating nature—in turning vast forest and prairie lands into fields and pastures. There are still a few log cabins left and modern plumbing has yet to invade the remoter villages, but the knowledge of the past, as far as the average American is concerned, is confined to the fragments of pioneer history adhering precariously to an incompetent memory.

This lack of knowledge of the long-ago stands between the average person and the understanding of today because he does not realize the never ending process—the constant change and development that goes on in spite of all efforts of reactionary forces to stay the hand of time.

In the period of time generally referred to as the Middle Ages, the making of furniture, clothing, homes, etc., was carried on by organizations of skilled workmen using the simplest of tools, all of which were operated by hand. Steam and electricity were unknown and water power was used only in the grinding of grain. The organizations were known as guilds and the system is referred to as the guild system. The simplest tools were owned by, and in many instances, made by the workman himself, who in most instances, gathered the raw materials necessary to his trade himself, and with the aid (in some cases) of his family produced the article which was bartered or sold by the guild to which he belonged.

There were instances and periods when the worker marketed his own product directly and without the assistance of the guild; but in the height of the prosperity of this system, the guild strictly regulated (through its officers, elected and controlled by the members), the quality, quantity and price of all goods falling within its authority. But the significant points that we wish to call to the attention of the readers is that the tools were owned by the worker or producer as we will refer to him usually, and secondly, that the article being made, whether a chair or a piece of cloth, remained in the possession of and belonged to the producer from the beginning to the marketing of the product. Working for wages was very unusual and for brief periods of time when practiced at all. In other words the worker individually and through his trade or craft organization controlled and managed the production of the goods of that time.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a new system appeared which developed rapidly and drove the guild system out of the field. In the Middle Ages merchants bought their goods from the guilds and took them to different parts of the known world and sold or bartered them off. After the discovery of America there was a tremendous increase in the world's supply of precious metals and a consequent demand for rich furnishings and luxuries that the guild system was unable to supply. The merchants gradually began to go into the business of producing goods in order to get enough to supply the demand. Workmen were assembled in shops and the system of the division of labor was introduced. Different from the guild system, the workers were paid out of money furnished by the merchant and though still owning their simple hand tools the articles they made did not belong to them at any stage of the production. The raw material was gotten together by the master of the shop who supervised the work and turned the goods over to the merchant. Each worker no longer made an entire article from beginning to the end as under the guild system. Instead, each man was given a part of the work and it was found by this primitive system of co-operation that ten men working together, each doing a part, could produce a great many more articles in the same length of time as ten men working independently.

This system is known by the name "early manufacture." The term, manufacture, comes from the Latin and means to make with hands. This system proved itself to be so much more efficient than the guild system that the latter was finally broken down and eventually destroyed in spite of all the workers of the old system could do to prevent it. As long as the merchants were dependent upon a relatively limited supply of skilled workers to carry on the work of creating wealth for a rapidly expanding market, the working class was not so badly off, but the constantly increasing demand for greater and greater productivity brought about the invention of the first crude machinery and the application of water power to it.

The "machine age" is generally considered to date from the invention of the steam engine, but the close student will notice that important inventions in the weaving trades had already been made. It is of little consequence whether the machine age dates from the invention of the spinning jenny or the steam engine, if the worker will only understand the nature and development of the wage system.

The machine age is the age of modern industry and for the working class the age of wage slavery in all its hideous perfection. Now, unlike the system of early manufacture, the worker does not own his own tools of production. Hammers, saws and planes are no longer the dominating instruments of wealth production. All these are incidental and relatively unimportant; their places have been taken by vast and

complicated machines altogether too expensive to be owned by the worker who uses them. In the Middle Ages the worker owned his tools and the product he made belonged to him, as a matter of course. The modern worker does not own the only tools that are important, he does not own the building in which he works, the machine has become so perfected that he does not even have to be highly skilled, as a rule, and the article manufactured, as a matter of course does not belong to him, it belongs to the owner of the machine. The modern worker has been reduced to the position of the most abject slave, doomed to drag out a miserably precarious livelihood, dependent on the vagaries of "good" and "hard times," dumb in acquiescence and without understanding of the forces that enslave him.

At the beginning of the age of machinery, great-hearted people of the literary profession, wrote volumes of prose and sang songs without number in praise of the wonderful machine which was to emancipate the sons of toil from their slavery, as well as the female slave from the needle. But alas, how different the outcome!

The worker has not been liberated from toil and drudgery by machinery—quite to the contrary—the machine has served as an agency to bind him even more firmly to his poverty and degradation. Charitable minded people, at a loss to explain the reasons for the ignorance and sordid want prevalent among the workers, assume that there is something inherently bad or, at least, weak about them that prevents their bettering their surroundings and "rising in the world." And such kind-hearted folk often spend their lives and most of their incomes in the attempt to alleviate the suffering around them. How mistaken the pity and useless the attempt. And how alike are the charity worker and the recipient of charity in their mutual ignorance. The poor are the victims of the machine and do not know it, and the charity worker is the beneficiary of it and is equally ignorant of the fact.

The explanation lies in the history of the machine itself. We have seen how the worker has changed from the simple craftsman of the Middle Ages owning his own tools and making his own product to the modern machinery tender owning neither tool nor product and dependent upon the machine for his livelihood.

When a new labor-saving device is introduced one would logically expect the "saving of labor" to redound to the benefit of the worker. But does it? Not appreciably. The benefit goes to the OWNER of the machine and the "saving of labor" means that he need employ so many less workers to produce the same amount of goods. Those who are displaced go to join that ever-increasing army of men and women in search of employment and competing with each other to secure it. If the worker is married his wife, too, enters the army of out-of-works and the wages of the workers tend, through the increase of the prices, always nearer and nearer to the actually lowest possible amount upon which the worker can keep alive.

Why need this be? Only because the means of life are owned by a class that does not use them, and the class that does use them does not own them—the working class.

Because of the competition between the workers, the owners of machinery—the capitalists—are able to secure their services—their power to labor—at the lowest possible price, which leaves a vast amount of wealth in the hands of the capitalist class, so that we see on the one hand the poverty and degradation of the workers and on the other the vast wealth and extravagance of the capitalist class.

The working class is enslaved by the capitalist class through the agency of the ownership of the machinery and other means of life.

That is the present day condition. Need it remain that way?

No, most emphatically, no!

The workers have, for a goodly number of years, realized that something is decidedly wrong with the world, and for some time back many of them have been looking into the matter and when enough have come to understand, they will TAKE POSSESSION OF THE MEANS OF LIFE FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL and the machinery, now the MASTER, will become the LIBERATOR and SERVANT of mankind.

And this is the task of the Socialist, to show to the worker what is wrong with the world and what needs to be done in preparation for the change that is as inevitable as was the transformation from hand production to that of the machine. M. V. B.

The Crisis In Russia

(By Arthur Ransome. B. W. Huebsch, Inc., New York)

This book deals with the break-down of production in Russia and with the organizations and methods used to rebuild the economic system.

The poor condition of transportation is of course the main difficulty, which means that as Russian industries are widely separated from the sources of raw materials, there is an almost complete lack of even the simplest tools, not to speak of machinery needed to produce under modern methods. Ploughing has to be done with burnt staves in place of ploughshares; instead of harrowing being done with steel-spiked harhows, the ground is merely brushed with wooden spikes bound together with wattles; even knives and forks are becoming rare.

Although Russia is predominantly an agricultural country, foodstuffs cannot be moved to the districts which need them. If the industrial workers cannot get food stuffs, they cannot produce tools for the peasant, and the peasant will not give up his foodstuffs until he can get the much needed farming implements in return.

Two things result:—Agriculture tends to become more and more primitive, and on the other hand the workers desert the factories in order to search for food in the country; which means a shortage of factory workers.

Turning from the actual crisis to the organizations combatting the downward tendency, Mr. Ransome deals first with the Communist Party and is quite sure that it represents a form of dictatorship by a minority, quoting Lenin and Trotzky to that effect. At the same time he explains how this dictatorship differs from that of a military general; whereas a general gives out orders relating to matter that the rank and file have heard nothing about, the Communist Party before issuing a decree has the matter discussed pro

and con at party meetings, in Soviet congresses, in the trades unions and among the peasants. After all this talk and propaganda, the decree is then passed, or if the discussion has shown it to be unpopular held back for a while, or finally shelved.

In examining the role of the trades unions, the author explains how the Russian unions from their inception had a different viewpoint to that of the English unions, they were always desirous of ending Capitalism, and as the proletariat is now the dominant class in Russia, the unions in most cases tend to act "as a gigantic megaphone through which the Communist Party makes known its fears, its hopes, and its decisions to the great masses of the industrial workers."

Although the Communists are making every endeavor to trade with capitalist countries, they are said to be aiming at making Russia as self-supporting as possible because they look for a break-down in all Europe.

The concluding chapter mentions the aim of some groups of Capitalists (presumably in England) to work in every way for the break-down of Russia, so as to leave it a vast area for colonization, and warns them that they will bring a hornet's nest about their ears by so doing.

Much more could be written; there are personal anecdotes and illustrations showing graphically the troubles arising from the break-down of the transport system. Every chapter has interesting material and the book is obviously sympathetic to the Bolsheviks, care being taken to point out that the present conditions are in a very large measure a legacy from the old Czarist regime. Mr. Ransome is also certain that only the Communist Party possesses the ability and the support necessary to pull Russia out of near chaos.

Mr. Ransome's support, however, is not based upon an understanding of the class struggle, the introduction definitely brands him as no more than a liberal pacifist, for he tells us that the struggle of Russia is the same as the struggle of Western Europe —the salving of civilization, and he contends that the interests of both combatants are alike and they should fight together, instead of in opposition. On page 195 present civilization is pictured as a man in delirium and likely to do things tending to aggravate his malady, but Mr. Ransome thinks that "sanity" will reassert itself, and that we can postpone the struggle between Capitalism and Communism. The introduction closes with this sentence, "If we succeed in postponing the struggle long enough, we may well succeed in postponing it until the war-like on both sides look in vain for the reasons of their bellicosity."

No! Mr. Ransome, one thing is certain, with the development of capitalism the condition of the proletariat tends to become worse and as a result the class struggle increases in intensity. Capitalism is in delirium, and certainly does things which aggravate its malady, but as long as commodity production continues, it cannot do otherwise.

This civilization will undoubtedly fall, but this is not the only form of civilization that the world has known, nor will it be the last (unless the workers remain supine forever, which is unlikely), its demise will make way for a Socialist civilization immeasurably superior to any yet known. W. H. C.

Anti-Labor Propaganda

THE CAPITALIST CLASS OF AMERICA HAS ORGANIZED FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF KEEPING THE MINDS OF THE WORKERS ENSLAVED.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States' "Committee on American Ideals," in its "Bulletin No. 2," explains its plan of having local committees all over the country to co-operate in its work of "Americanization." But along with their work of "Americanizing" the workers they also, through means best known to themselves, keep informed as to the methods and activities of labor organizations, and send out this information to all employers of labor. For example, finding out that the I. W. W. was putting a number of its "unemployed members as organizers, sending them into plants in various parts of the Middle West," this "Committee on American Ideals" takes pains to notify employers of the fact.

The "Coalition Committee for the State of Michigan," is a branch of a national organization which is working along this line. An idea of their style of "Americanizing" people may be gained from noting their interpretation of the Ten Commandments: The two most important, apparently, are given thus:

"HERE WE FIND THAT GOD COMMANDS

The sanctity of property:

'Thou shalt not steal;'

The sanctity of business:

'Thou shalt not lie.' "

The above is the kind of stuff thought suited for the common people, and is amusing enough. But the other side of their activities, that of playing the spy on labor organizations and carrying on underground work on behalf of the organized capitalists is an insidious activity which workers should know about.

The following circular, sent in to our office, throws some light on this kind of work. No comment is necessary. We only emphasize the statement: ".....we work quietly by establishing centers of influence in factories and towns...."

COALITION COMMITTEE FOR THE STATE OF MICHIGAN
Detroit
BULLETIN NO. 24

April 2, 1921.

My dear Sir: In Re: ANTI-RADICAL WORK

The Coalition Committee for the State of Michigan now has the work of combatting radicalism very well in hand. After more than two years of experience, we are able to state positively, that we understand the situation and we know how to meet it.

It is not the usual policy of the Coalition Committee to openly combat radicalism, as that often tends to arouse unnecessary antagonism and increased activity; instead we work quietly by educational methods establishing centers of influence in factories and towns, and by so doing automatically displace the work of the radical agitator.

It will greatly facilitate our work if manufacturers will advise us of any disturbances within their plants or of any known agitators or of any radical meetings in the town or community. All such correspondence is treated with the utmost confidence, and, having received the information, we begin at once quietly to send out our counteracting work, and we are thus very often able to nip the mischief in the bud.

It is the purpose of this letter to request you to kindly inform the committee of any agitation or prospective agitation within your plant or district.

It will be gratifying to you to know that the extensive observations of The Coalition Committee carried on in hundreds of plants and industries in Michigan, convince us that our state at the present is among the very best industrially,

and, while we are aware of tremendous activity on the part of the enemies of good government, yet we believe that these forces are well under control.

With best wishes, we are Yours for America,

F. A. PERRY, Secretary.

Science and History

Until comparatively recent times—certainly within the memory of generations yet living—it was customary to conceive history as "the biography of state." Accordingly, the task of the historian was in the main confined to the limbo of "past politics." His occupation in this field centered largely about the annals of military achievement, the salacious court intrigues of pornographic rulers, the personal earmarks and routine affairs of national despots and their numerous retinue of vassal satellites, etc., etc.

Such was the province of the student of history and these were the matters, it was then held, that composed the basis and indicated the advance of civilization. He who proved himself capable of chronicling these relatively trival details in great number and, above all, also clothed them in classically embellished prose or even poetry was invariably accounted a great historian.

It was this clear sighted recognition of this shallow state of historiography which moved Buckle, whom an able historian not inappropriately crowns as "the Augustine of the scientific age," to deprecatingly observe that "any author who from indolence of thought, or from natural incapacity is unfit to deal with the highest branches of knowledge has only to pass some years in reading a certain number of books, and then he is qualified to be an historian; he is able to write the history of a great people, and his work becomes an authority upon the subject of which it professes to treat." This brief quotation, broadly speaking, effectually epitomizes the general content of historical research prior and quite up to the advent of Marx and Buckle from the fruits of whose magistral scholarship and genius we obtain our first glimpse of scientific history. Of their exemplary labors together with those of others in this field we will now take notice.

Even our bourgeois historians of contemporary note, J. T. Shotwell and J. H. Robinson among others, concede that the militant prophet of the proletariat anticipated Buckle by ten years in conceiving the conditions of history upon a sound materialistic basis. This Marx formulated as early as 1845 when he reminded the Young Hegelians that the material surroundings amid which mankind lives, moves and finds its being are the **vera causa** for all that man thinks and does. It is easy to see the material kinship which this view has with that of Buckle's who, after dismissing the free will theory to the limbo of metaphysical entities, postulates, in his erudite work upon "The History of Civilization in England," the hypothesis that the conduct of society is governed by the natural influences of "food, soil and the general aspect of nature."

Accepting the material universe as the **sine qua non** of life Marx went on to enounce his great economic interpretation of history upon which, as one celebrated historian puts it, "rests the whole science of dynamic sociology." From this theory we understand how social systems are conditioned largely by economic processes. That is to say that social evolution hinges upon progressive changes in the structure of production and distribution of the means of life,etc.

Come now the disciples of "The New History," as it is termed by James Harvey Robinson, advancing the claims of science as a major cause of social changes. Accepting the Marxian explanation of the economic influence upon history as in one sense correct it is, they aver, in a larger sense incomplete. For the character of economic structure is, according to their light, conditioned in great part by the prevailing state of science. So that if the birth, growth and subsequent capitulation of a social era is co-extensive with the rise, development and decay of its method of production and distribution it is likewise true that this latter is irresisibly determined by the application of science to industry.

Thus it is shown with meticulous care and keen insight (see F. S. Marvin: The Living Past, third edition), that a sketch of Western progress from the very childhood of the race up to the current era affirms not only the Marxian hypothesis but likewise reveals a striking dependence of economic systems upon the growth of scientific learning. "From the very beginning of cultural history," a protagonist of the new history contends, "science has given shape and direction to economic development."

The founders of scientific socialism have emphasized the fact that the exchange of commodities expresses the social relationships of modern society. The shoemaker, baker and candlestick maker manifest their social interdependence by exchanging the products of their respective occupations. The commodity, or money its ideal expression, forms the nexus between man and man. We further understand that the basis of this is the technology of the machine culture, viz., bourgeoisdom. Its logical development leads, of course, to the internationalism of capital and labor so ideally expressed, on the one hand, by the ultrabourgeois League of Nations and, on the other hand, by the revolutionary international of Moscow. At this juncture we may fitly introduce the claims of science as an important tributary to the development of the class struggle implied in the brief resume above.

Since the commodity culture of today impinges upon the social nature of the means of production the historians of science contend that this means of production expresses the union of science with industry. So that if the internationalism which distingushes our era is the result of the universal exchange of commodities, this in turn rests upon the fruits of scientific endeavor which alone makes possible the technology of production upon an international program. We may therefore say that science through industry brings men together in masses and so moulds international unity.

JULIUS DAVIDSON.

Not the right to work—but more of the things their work creates, with leisure to enjoy them—this is what intelligent wage workers demand.

—**Paul Lafargue.**