

# THE WORKINGMAN'S PAPER

To Organize the Slaves of Capital to Win Their Own Emancipation

THE SOCIALIST

Tenth Year—No. 468

Seattle, Washington, Saturday, April 30, 1910

Price Five Cents



## A PEASANT'S PARADISE

By Arthur Jensen

In the March magazine number of "The Outlook" is contained an article by Dr. Frederic C. Howe, entitled "A Commonwealth Ruled by Farmers." In this article he relates very interestingly the ascendancy to power of the Danish farmer.

Below are a few extracts of this article with comments from the Proletarian viewpoint. Having lived among Denmark's peasants until nine years ago, I am not at all unfamiliar with the subject.

Dr. Howe begins as follows: "Denmark is a farmer state. It has a farmer parliament, a farmer ministry, a farmer point of view. Its legislation is that of the farmer, too."

"Most countries are ruled by a class. It may be by a landed aristocracy, it may be by a commercial oligarchy. And most people accept the rule of a class as the most natural thing in the world. In Denmark the people really rule, and they rule in the interest of a larger percentage of the people than in any country I know, unless it be in Switzerland."

Dr. Howe is not quite consistent, as will be seen from the following quotation:

"The State of Denmark is a peasant democracy. Its ruling class is the small farmer possessing from forty to sixty acres of land, and with an outlook on life that is exclusively agricultural. The present minister of agriculture was a workingman whose business was that of thatching roofs. Three or four other members of the ministry are small farmers, while all of the cabinet owe their position to the peasant majority."

Comment. In one paragraph he asserts that "the people really rule," while in another he states that the small farmer possessing from forty to sixty acres of the land is the ruling class.

It is true that "Denmark is a peasant democracy" in the same sense that Pennsylvania is a "capitalist democracy."

Denmark is being ruled by the farming class, but the agricultural laborers are subject to conditions of employment which border closely on peonage. While the farm owners are represented in the Danish parliament more strongly than any other class, the agricultural laborers have no direct representation whatever, as they do not even possess the franchise. In Denmark all males over thirty years of age and with independent households have the elective franchise. But practically all farm laborers are members of their employers' households and are thus disfranchised.

A "democracy" very much like ancient Athens, where the slaves had no rights except the right to work!

Dr. Howe is not quite correct when he states that Copenhagen is a Socialist municipality and has been one for years. The fact is that Copenhagen has never been in full control of the Socialists.

At the present time the Social Democratic Labor Party has a larger number of members in the City Council than ever before, twenty members of forty-two. The Socialists form the largest party group, but are not in control.

To quote Dr. Howe again: "One would expect an alliance between the peasant and the Socialist. But such is not the case. Both the Socialist and the peasant seek the political support of the Hussman, that is, the very small landowner, of whom there are 130,000 in the country, and who up to the present time have kept the peasant class in power. There are also the agricultural laborers. They form the lowest rung in the social ladder, with the great estate owner at the top, the peasant farmer in the middle, and the Hussman and the farm laborer at the bottom."

Perhaps the most significant thing about the state of perfection in Danish agriculture, from a sociological point of view, is the fact that Denmark has taken its place in international social production. This little insignificant nation in northern Europe has become established as a very important producer of butter, pork and eggs. It is foreshadowing the time when every nation, when every portion of the earth's surface will be utilized to best advantage for those purposes, for which it was by nature best fitted.

Comment. No, the farmer realizes that the Socialists do not represent his interests. The employing farmer knows that the kind of Socialism which will benefit his farm hands as well as all other Proletarians is not the kind of "Socialism" exemplified by the co-operative dairies, co-operative packing houses, etc. As for the "Hussman" (or, to be correct, Hussmand), he is, as a rule, a wage earner a larger claim of the year. When Dr. Howe claims that the Hussmand makes a

decent living for himself and family on four acres, he speaks of the exception and not of the rule. My father, who was fully as efficient a Hussmand as the average, was compelled to work as a wage earner the greater part of every year.

Because of this his peculiar social position, it is rather puzzling to the Hussmand whether he should ally himself politically with the farmer or the wage workers. It is a fact, however, that an ever-growing number of them are turning toward the Socialists as their political representatives.

As to the farm laborers, they are not considered as a political factor, as they are practically disfranchised as a class, by the manner mentioned above.

Dr. Howe speaks at considerable length of the great efficiency reached by the Danish farmer as a dairy man, hog raiser and egg producer. He shows how agriculture has been made a business of the most technical kind. In short, the Danish farmer is the proprietor of a shop manned by skilled mechanics.

He continues:

"The other great factor is co-operation. The Danish farmer gets all that he produces—absolutely all. The state owns the railways and protects the farmer from exploitation. And he himself performs all of the processes of production, distribution and exchange. He has eliminated one middleman after another until he is almost as self-contained as his ancestor of three hundred years ago, whose only knowledge of the outside world was gained at the local village fair, where he went to barter his goods. The co-operative movement began with dairying. Up to about 1880 each farmer made his own butter. It was very costly and there was no uniformity in the product. About this time a new device was invented for butter-making. A number of farmers got together and purchased one of the machines. Its success was immediate. Other villages followed. Today there are 1,087 co-operative dairies, with a membership of 158,000 farmers. There are also 200 other private dairies. Nearly 95 per cent of the farmers are members of the co-operative dairies, which ship nearly one million dollars' worth of butter a week to England. Then the farmers began to use skim milk for feeding their hogs. The bacon business became a by-product. Then they organized co-operative slaughter houses, which are located in districts. There are now 34 of these co-operative abattoirs, with a membership of 90,000 and an annual business of 1,100,000 hogs."

"The Danish Co-operative Egg Export Society was the next organization. It was organized in 1895. It now has 57,000 members. The eggs are collected and stamped each day in a local circle. Then they are sent to larger circles for export. In 1908 the export egg business amounted to \$6,600,000. Danish eggs bring fancy prices. For they are always fresh. They are better packed than any others, and are carefully graded. By these means the Dane has more than doubled the price which he receives for his butter. He saves the profits which formerly went to the jobber. The same is true of bacon and eggs."

Comment. Note that "The Danish farmer gets all he produces—absolutely all." And the State, by owning the railways, "protects him from exploitation." But the State does not protect from exploitation the Proletarians, who are employed on the farms, in the co-operative creameries and slaughter houses or on the state-owned railroads.

In regard to political conditions, Dr. Howe has this to say, in part: "The peasant also controls the politics of the state. He has only been conscious of his power during the last ten years. The Rigsdag is composed

of two houses. The upper house is indirectly elected or its members are appointed by the king. It is rather more conservative than the lower house, but it does not use its power to revise or check legislation, for it would receive no support from the country if it did. The lower house is popularly elected. Of the 114 members 55 are peasants. There are also 24 Socialists. The others are Liberals, with a sprinkling of Conservatives. The peasants control the ministry, but are largely guided by the experience and wisdom of the permanent official class. The legislation which has been passed is of a decidedly democratic and progressive sort. The government is obviously class-conscious, for the peasant assumes and other classes admit that the state is an agricultural one, and should be administered in the interest of agriculture. Education is generously supported, as are art and the state institutions. About a fourth of the revenues are spent on the army and the navy. There is an excellent system of old age pensions."

Comment. The most significant sentence in this quotation is where Dr. Howe says that "the Government is obviously class-conscious for the peasant assumes and other classes admit that the State is an agricultural one and should be administered in the interest of agriculture."

We may as well admit that Alaska should be administered in the interest of the gold mining industry as it is primarily a gold-producing country, or that Washington should be administered in the interest of the lumbering industry, as it is primarily a lumber-producing state, etc.

Dr. Howe nowhere intimates that Denmark should be administered in the interest of Agricultural Labor no more than Alaska is being administered in the interest of the Gold Miner or the State of Washington in the interest of the Lumberjack and Sawmill Worker.

### SUMMARY.

Summed up, the situation in Denmark is as follows:

The middle class farmer has by his number and shrewdness outwitted all other classes, and is today the ruling class. He is by no means as liberal as Dr. Howe would have one believe. He is as jealous of his power as any ruling class. The disfranchisement of the agricultural laborers proves that.

The Working Class, the Proletariat, on the other hand, is developing class consciousness. The Socialists have been an important factor in the few larger cities for over twenty years. If they, through the support of the "Hussmand" class, should gain control of the machinery of Government the outcome would be difficult to predict. It would be a question whether the Socialists, with a following of this sort, would be in a position to do much for Labor.

However, one thing is promising: Denmark's Labor forces are better organized than those of any other country in the world.

The few important industries outside of farming are quite thoroughly organized, and the agricultural laborers are now being organized with great rapidity.

Whatever else may be said of Denmark, she is a mighty interesting sociological study.

## Philadelphia— Labor Wins

The car strike in Philadelphia is no more. And the carmen's union still exists. And it is being recognized by the company.

It was through negotiations between the carmen's representatives and the company that a settlement was reached. All the men are back at their old runs, and those who were not taken back immediately following the settlement received \$2.00 per day until placed on their runs. The cases of the 173 men, whose discharge caused the strike, are to be arbitrated.

This is a victory for Labor. Labor in Philadelphia displayed a far greater degree of class consciousness than was displayed in Seattle at the time

of the car strike in this city. After the strike which lasted but a few days, there was practically no union. Only last January about forty men were discharged from the employ of the Seattle Electric Co. for talking unionism.

But there was no enraged class feeling calling the other carmen to action. And in Organized Labor circles the fact was hardly mentioned.

Quite otherwise in Philadelphia. There the entire force of conductors and motormen went out on strike Feb. 19, immediately following the discharge of the 173 men. Organized Labor in Philadelphia gave its moral and financial support from the beginning of the strike. And two weeks after the calling of the strike practically every union man and woman, besides many thousands of unorganized in Philadelphia went out on a general sympathetic strike.

A state wide, general strike was on the point of being called, but this movement was abandoned when the settlement of the car strike appeared close at hand.

When the general strike was called off in a perfectly orderly manner the unions in Philadelphia were stronger by many thousand members and a more strongly developed class spirit.

Though the settlement of the strike cannot be considered as anything but a victory for the strikers, the vote for calling off the strike was by no means unanimous. As a matter of fact, a majority of nine over all votes cast in a general referendum was opposed to the settlement. The majority was so insignificant, however, that the executive committee called off the strike.

Those opposing the settlement demanded the unconditional employment of all former employes, including the 173, and a signed contract for recognition of the union. As it is, there is no signed agreement between the company and the men.

Thus ended one of the most momentous strikes in the history of this country. Labor won out in spite of the combined opposition of the forces of capitalism and their agencies. The daily press did all in its power to stifle the labor movement by printing stories of discontent with the management of the unions. The papers were especially bent on creating distrust against C. O. Pratt, international representative of the carmen's union, but of no avail. Pratt retained the confidence of the carmen throughout the trouble, and when the strike was called off the men all returned to work in spite of the fact over half of them had voted against this step. They went back together as they went out together.

As soon as the old employes returned the imported scabs were transported back to where they came from.

During the strike hundreds of accidents occurred, due to inexperienced car crews. Thirty persons were killed and hundreds more or less seriously injured in these accidents.

The Transit company is now attempting to borrow five million dollars for "improvements and extensions," but refuses to specify the improvements, and it is the general opinion that the money is to be used for making up a deficit caused by the strike.

The Philadelphia strike again brings home the fact that workingmen, who have little or nothing to lose, may, when banded together, defeat capitalists who have much to lose.

The Transit company is now almost facing financial ruin, while the carmen are in no worse condition, financially, than they were when they went on strike. They had nothing to lose but their chains, and they weakened a link or two in them.

## Spokane Advertised

(From N. Y. Daily "Call.")

Editor of The Call: The following might be of interest to the readers of The Call. If so, please publish.

The Arcadia Orchard Company of Spokane, Wash., has been giving an exhibit of fruit grown in that vicinity in this city, incidentally selling land.

Comrade Harmon of Beverly called at the office of the above named company, intending to purchase land for fruit raising. While in the office he asked about the attack on free speech recently made in Spokane. Mr. Goodall, the man in charge, said: "Don't the whole Socialist push. They tried to confiscate the property in Spokane, and I am proud that I was a special officer sworn in to shoot to kill, and I am proud of it."

It is needless to say that Comrade Harmon did not buy any land of that company.

This company has now moved to New York, where, no doubt, Mr. Goodall will be glad to do a little more, if he gets a chance.

JAMES F. CAREY.

Boston, Mass., April 18, 1910.

CHAPTER III.

1. Better is a great revenue without right than a little with righteousness.

2. A man's heart deviseth his way; but the Master directeth his steps.

3. A divine sentence is in the lips of the Master; his mouth transgresseth not in judgment.

4. How much better is it for the laborer to get wisdom than gold? And to get understanding rather to be chosen than silver?

5. Better it is to divide the spoil with the proud than to be of an humble spirit with the lowly.

6. Better is the rich that walketh not in integrity than he that is honest in his lips and is poor.

7. Delight is not seemly for the poor; much less for the laborer to have rule over the Master.

The Seattle Times heads the list with \$1,000, or for the Chamber of Commerce to be used in assisting in the Chamber's efforts to obtain a complete census of the city.

Let's see. Wasn't it the "Times" that headed the list a couple of years ago with \$1,000.00 for the housing and helping of the thousands of unemployed that flooded our streets?

Oh, my, to be sure not. That wasn't for the Business Interests of Seattle!

In the "conclusion" at the end of Judge Ben Lindsay's epic on the Beast we read that, while he has accomplished great reforms in his Juvenile Court the "reform" that seems to count for the most is the saving of millions of dollars to the City of Denver. I wonder by how much the wage workers benefitted because of the saving!

A Seattle divine makes this statement: "There is but one remedy for domestic infelicity, and that remedy is Jesus Christ. If husbands would learn their Christian duty, and if wives would practice the instructions given them by the Holy Spirit; if husbands and wives realized the mutual obligations resting upon them and that their union, if perfect, must be a union in Christ, their homes would be happy."

When John has to work like a galley slave from morning until night in order to feed Mary and the Kids, and Mary has to cook and scrub, wash and iron, take care of the children and sew, and scrimp and save to make John's two plunks per go around; when one of the Kids gets pinched for picking coal off the railroad tracks in order to keep warm; because John's out of work in the winter and when Mary has to get work scrubbing out saloons to feed the wee ones—and another one probably coming—well, I'm afraid Jesus Christ is lost in the shuffle some where.

Why is the Proletariat like the "Teddy" Lions and Tigers in Africa? Because both are at the wrong end of the gun.

## Who Said This

The following sounds like Victor Berger, but it is really from an editorial in a Capitalist daily, the Milwaukee "Journal" (La Follette, Insurgent paper).

"There will be disappointment to the zealous Socialist when there comes the revelation that a Socialist administration can do little more than a 'Capitalist' administration in bringing about public ownership. There will be disappointment for the small class of impossibilists that clamor for the 'Revolution' and worship phrases. But to the Conservative body of citizens, including the bulk of the Socialists themselves, who realize that our institutions are a phase of a never-failing evolutionary process, Mayor Seide's message will commend itself for its moderation."

## Solomon Up-to-Date

Editor of The Call: The following might be of interest to the readers of The Call. If so, please publish.

## Russell Wants Circulation.

Russell, when called on, said there was no ill feeling between Simpson and himself. As a newspaper man, however, he thought the circulation could not be increased unless the paper appealed to a wider circle of readers than at present. The paper was altogether too serious. He would run a list of labor union meetings on the editorial page, leave out the letters and place humorous matter there.

## Hillquit Starts Things.

Morris Hillquit started the discussion with an impassioned speech in favor of a change. The working people do not want The Call as now published, he began. The paper is altogether too serious. Dissertations on "The Socialist State" and references to Marx and Engels and other Socialist writers are not understood, and since the working people refuse to read The Call because of this it will be necessary to make a change. One hundred thousand dollars has been sunk with the present policy, he said.

Hardly had Hillquit concluded his speech than half of the members jumped to their feet and demanded the floor. Simpson was the first to answer and he spoke on revolutionary Socialism vs circulation. He said that if The Call was to gain circulation at the cost of propaganda he did not see the wisdom of sacrificing the

## NEW YORK WAVERS

Here is an item of news from New York City which will interest all who are familiar with the history of the Socialist movement in that metropolis. It shows that the management of the Party organ, the daily "Call," is yielding to the Middle Class pressure of the day and joining the reactionary outcry against "Plutocracy," as if this same Plutocracy were not the sign and substance of Progress. Editor Simpson and Manager Solomon represent the traditional theoretical Socialism of New York, while Charles Edward Russell and Morris Hillquit represent the yielding of the old Marxism to the practical pressure of that Great Middle Class "Public" without whose support no newspaper can succeed financially. The Proletariat is so thoroughly bourgeois in its thinking and feeling that it will not support a Proletarian paper.

We do not know what will be the outcome of the struggle between the old Socialist theoreticals and the new Middle Class practicals, but the following extract from the leading editorial in "The Call" of April 21st, written under the editorial control of Simpson, shows that there is really little to choose between the two factions. These words might well have been written by Bryan or LaFollette or Louis Post or Victor Berger or Arthur Brisbane or any other "Insurgent" of the insurgent Middle Class, insurgent against the Trust Class.

Here are the words of "The Call": "There was a time when the American people gave this Plutocracy a free hand. There was a time when the American people imagined that everybody would get rich, or at least make money, but permitting a few people to become very rich. But that time is now past. The few have become very rich. But the great masses are now poorer and more helpless than they ever were before. And the masses—working people as well as the lower Middle Class—demand that the powers of the Plutocracy be curtailed, that its unparalleled freedom of exploitation be curbed, that its iron grip on state and nation be relaxed or broken."

## POLICY OF "THE CALL" DISCUSSED

The Workingmen's Co-operative Publishing Association held an exciting meeting last Friday night at the Labor Temple. A larger attendance than usual was present, many members at other times absent having shown up, knowing that some questions of importance would come before the meeting.

### EDITORS DISAGREE.

The secretary of the board of managers made a report of the activities of that body for the past few weeks, among other matters reported being the election of U. Solomon as manager and Herman Simpson and Charles Edward Russell as co-ordinate editors. Algernon Lee, a former editor of The Call, wanted to know whether Simpson and Russell, since their election, had been working together. Simpson replied that Russell had called at the office and after a conference it was evident that no agreement as to the policy of the paper could be reached. Russell wanted to completely change the present policy. He would eliminate the correspondence articles of the Comrades, the serious articles, cut down the editorials to "mere comments," and even the propaganda articles of Robert Hunter were considered too Socialist by Russell.

### SIMPSON UNWILLING.

Simpson said he was willing to have Russell conduct the paper, but that he was not willing to bear the responsibility for such a policy. His conception of a Socialist paper differed from Russell's, as he believed events of the day should be treated from the standpoint of Marxian philosophy, and Socialism should not be eliminated from the editorials. On such a paper as desired by Russell, he found that he would have no place, as there was no work he could do.

### RUSSELL WANTS CIRCULATION.

Russell, when called on, said there was no ill feeling between Simpson and himself. As a newspaper man, however, he thought the circulation could not be increased unless the paper appealed to a wider circle of readers than at present. The paper was altogether too serious. He would run a list of labor union meetings on the editorial page, leave out the letters and place humorous matter there.

### HILLQUIT STARTS THINGS.

Morris Hillquit started the discussion with an impassioned speech in favor of a change. The working people do not want The Call as now published, he began. The paper is altogether too serious. Dissertations on "The Socialist State" and references to Marx and Engels and other Socialist writers are not understood, and since the working people refuse to read The Call because of this it will be necessary to make a change. One hundred thousand dollars has been sunk with the present policy, he said.

Hardly had Hillquit concluded his speech than half of the members jumped to their feet and demanded the floor. Simpson was the first to answer and he spoke on revolutionary Socialism vs circulation. He said that if The Call was to gain circulation at the cost of propaganda he did not see the wisdom of sacrificing the

one for the other. He said that a Socialist paper must appeal to a Socialist constituency and there would be nothing in the kind of a paper suggested that would appeal to Socialists. "Hillquit mentions that \$100,000 has been sunk, and implies that I am responsible, but this amount had been spent while the friends of Hillquit were in control. Hillquit speaks of editorials on 'The Socialist State.' I deny that any such editorials ever appeared in The Call. I have at all times treated the events of the day in the light furnished by Marxian economics, but the editorials did not mention the names of Marx, Engels and others."

As to the claim that a change in policy would increase circulation, Simpson replied that no Socialist paper jumped to a large circulation in its early stages, and cited the German Vorwarts and the French l'Humanite to show that even with the ablest editorship, in countries of wider revolutionary tendencies, their struggle for existence was not any easier than it was, or is, for The Call.

### CHANGE OF POLICY.

The change of policy was then made the subject for general discussion. J. G. Phelps Stokes urged the members to stand for a revolutionary policy. The Call should remain a Socialist paper, and if in order to live it must become a reform paper, it would be better for it to die now, he argued. Algernon Lee, Dr. J. Halpern, Morris Hillquit, Dr. Yoder, W. W. Passage and Emil Meyer spoke in favor of a change.

### BOTH FACTIONS LOSE.

A motion was made by L. Malkiel endorsing the present policy of The Call. It was then after 1 o'clock and a large number of members had left the meeting. The motion was lost by a very small vote.

After this had been decided upon Hillquit moved that a new policy should be outlined by a committee of five men, to be elected by the meeting. This motion was met with the argument that if a new policy was to be adopted the members would do it themselves. This motion was lost.


### TEMPORARY TRUCE.

Simpson then announced that he did not wish to be the editor of a paper that was not to be revolutionary and stated that he would not be a candidate for re-election. Russell said that he could not possibly give his time to the editorship, because he had contracts to fulfill, and, also, his work takes him out of the city. Simpson was then asked whether he would not stay with the paper two more weeks, when a special meeting of the association would be called for the purpose of settling the matter. He consented to stay.

No other business was reported and the new manager, U. Solomon, who, it was believed, had interesting matters to report of the changes he had inaugurated in his department, did not get a chance to do so, owing to the lateness of the hour.



**Under New Management**



**BANNER DYE WORKS**  
 Professional in Cleaning and Dyeing  
 Suits and Drapes  
 Upholstery and Draperies  
 Remounting and Repairing  
 and Finishing

Phone: 422-1111  
 1111 Pike Street  
 Seattle, Wash.

Go to the  
**Boulevard Cafe**  
 321 Pike Street  
 The best place in Seattle to eat.

**Calhoun, Denny & Ewing**  
 Insurance and Real Estate

Geo. Overton      Pete Reardon  
**Old Crow Saloon**  
 WINES, LIQUORS AND CIGARS  
 Phone—Sunset M 5435; Ind. 1132  
 114 PIKE STREET

**United Dentists**  
 SOUTHWEST CORNER WASHINGTON AND OCCIDENTAL  
 Painless Extraction, 50c; Fillings, 50c up. All work guaranteed 12 years.

**SHOES**  
 OF EXTRA VALUE  
**Raymond & Hoyt**  
 1406 Third Avenue

**Green Lake Drug Co**  
 Pure Drugs and Drug Sundries.  
 Stationery, Cigars and Candy—  
 Phone: North 14; Red 362. Free delivery to any part of the city.  
 Clarence H. Merritt, Mgr.  
 7208 WOODLAWN AVENUE.

J. A. Inman      Phone Ind. 606  
**Inman's Delicates'n**  
 Home Cooking and Baking  
 The Kind You Like  
 509 PIKE STREET

A. A. Patterson      A. L. Patterson  
**Patterson's Cafe**  
 OPEN ALL NIGHT  
 309 Pike Street      Phone, Ind 4871

We buy, sell and exchange books of all kinds, take subscriptions for magazines and papers at club rates, etc., etc.  
**Books**  
**Raymer's Old Book Store**  
 1522 First Avenue      Seattle



Beginning With Oct. 10 There Is Being Issued a Sunday Edition of  
**The New York Call**

This Sunday paper, for which there has been a strong demand, will contain a complete condensation of the week. Being, therefore, partly of the nature of a weekly periodical it will be able to circulate to every part of the Union.

These will be full Socialist and Trade Union news, a full page of W. M. S. S. and the best department "For Young Folks" ever printed. Early issues will contain stories and articles by Prof. Thorstein Veblen, Leonid Andreff, "Hebe," Brigit Stanton, Max S. Hayes, Ewald, Norolenko, Ernest Poole, Robert Hunter, Charles Edward Russell, R. Rives La Monte and others.

Very soon will be commenced the serial publication of the greatest book yet written by Maxim Gorky, which is the noblest and most triumphantly optimistic expression of faith in the power and destiny of the people ever penned.

**"NOT THE BIGGEST SUNDAY PAPER BUT THE BEST."**

Subscription rates are as follows:  
 For one year—Sunday issue only, \$2.00; week-day issue only, \$4.50; Sunday and week-day issue, \$6.00.  
 For six months—Sunday issue only, \$1.00; week-day issue only, \$2.25; Sunday and week-day issue, \$3.00.  
 For three months—Sunday issue only, .50; week-day issue only, \$1.15; Sunday and week-day issue, \$1.50.  
 For one month—Sunday issue only, .20; week-day issue only, .40; Sunday and week-day issue, .50.

In addition to the above rates subscribers in New York City and the Bronx must pay a cent a day to cover postage.

A Socialist Press is an absolute necessity if economic freedom is to be obtained and wage slavery abolished. It is both your privilege and your duty to help in its building and support.

It partly depends on every one doing a little.

Will you not do your share by subscribing for as long a period as you care to the Sunday Call?

Please do not delay but send your subscription at once to

The Subscription Dept.,  
**THE NEW YORK CALL,**  
 442 Pearl Street, New York City.

# WHERE WE STAND

(Reprinted From Our First Issue in 1910.)

In what relation does "The Workingman's Paper" stand to the various organizations of the Wage Class, and to that class as a whole?

This question is frequently asked, now that this paper does not profess to represent any particular organization. It seems inconceivable to some that a newspaper can be non-sectarian, an organ of Proletarianism but not an organ of any exclusive branch of Proletarianism. Yet that is the critical scientific attitude this paper seeks to assume. It is the complete opposite, for example, of the De Leonist attitude, which damns every organization of workmen which does not bear its own brand.

"The Workingman's Paper" sees good in the I. W. W., sees good in the "I'm a Bum" song; but it also sees good in the A. F. of L., and even in De Leon's S. L. P. It also sees evil in all of them. This critical method is also constructive, for the paper seeks to promote the good in all and to remove the evil in all. And on every occasion, this paper seeks the solidarity of all Proletarians.

The following outlines our position exactly:  
 "The Workingman's Paper" does not seek to form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties. It supports the UNION of Wage-Workers.

We advocate no interests separate and apart from those of the Proletariat as a whole. All policies are decided from this standpoint.

We do not set up any sectarian principles of our own by which to shape and mould the Proletarian Movement. We follow, not force, that Movement.

"The Workingman's Paper" is distinguished from partisan journals of the working class by this only: 1. In the various struggles of the wage class organizations with the capitalists, this paper will point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire Proletariat, independently of all apparent divisions, national, industrial or personal. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the Working Class against the Bourgeoisie has to pass through, this paper will always and everywhere, in the future, as in the past ten years, strive to represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

"The Workingman's Paper" therefore, encourages, on the one hand, practically every advanced and resolute organization of Wage Workers wherever found, those organizations which push forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, like all scientific Proletarian publications, we have the advantage over many Labor papers, of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the Proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of "The Workingman's Paper" is the same as that of all other really Proletarian organs, namely: **FORMATION OF THE PROLETARIAT INTO ONE CLASS, OVERTHROW OF BOURGEOIS SUPREMACY, CONQUEST OF POLITICAL POWER BY THE PROLETARIAT.**

Our theoretical conclusions are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer.

These conclusions merely express the actual relations springing from an existing Class Struggle, from an historical movement going on under our very eyes.

We disdain to conceal our revolutionary views and aims. We openly declare that Proletarian ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social foundations. Let the ruling class tremble at a Proletarian Revolution. The Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win!

Workingmen of all countries, unite!  
 To assist in organizing the Wage Slaves of Capital into a union capable of winning such an emancipation, this paper was founded in 1900. It has no other policy in 1910.

The Proletarian elements now scattered in A. F. of L., I. W. W., W. F. of M., S. P., S. L. P., U. W. W., and other bodies, together with multitudes now unorganized in the United States, must some time come together as a **UNITED LABOR PARTY.** To that end this paper is devoted.

# A Proletarian Newspaper

(Reprinted from our issue of March 19, 1910.)

Some of our friends are disturbed over the new attitude of this paper, as described on our second page, under the heading, "Where We Stand." "The Socialist" having been so long a Proletarian paper attached to a party, they cannot now adapt themselves to that new viewpoint of ours which does not regard any specific organization of Proletarians as the sole representative of the Proletariat as a whole.

For instance, some of our I. W. W. readers resent our support of a political organization in Seattle, and consider us guilty of treachery to the Proletariat because we advocate anything "political." Others are distressed when we give the I. W. W.'s so much prominence, since they regard them as part of the "Slum-Proletariat" and hence dangerous to the true working class. Still others condemn us for supporting a "Labor Party" which does not clearly perceive itself as based on the Class-Struggle. In a word, they cannot agree to a policy which recognizes Proletarianism wherever found, but does not venture to select any one branch of Proletarians to the exclusion of all other branches.

Let us remind our critics that this paper has never been dogmatic as to tactics. In fact, the only thing we have been "cock-sure" about is a well-authenticated fact, wherever observed. From the accumulation of such facts, certain conclusions may be drawn, though these conclusions are liable to be erroneous and must be subject to the discovery of more facts and to a better generalization from the facts. That person who has reached positive irreversible conclusions on any subject has practically ceased to live and become a mere automaton. He has "principles" to which the world must conform or the world is wrong. Such a person is unscientific, dogmatic, sectarian, unprogressive, mentally unresponsive and dead. He is one of those men "you can't talk to," he is incapable of argument, because his mind is unapproachable, it is fixed and right beyond the possibility of error; he may let you speak, but he doesn't listen to you; his knowledge is so superior to yours; he has nothing to learn; he is the intellectual Pharisee and all those who do not agree with him are Publicans and Sinners.

Now, the paper hitherto known as "The Socialist" has never assumed this attitude of intellectual Pharisaism, even with respect to its principles, and still less with respect to methods. We are thoroughly convinced, for instance, that the Marxian Law of Value is established as the governing law of Capitalist Economics, as much as we are convinced that the Law of Gravitation is established as controlling the stellar universe; though even in these cases we would not assert with absolute dogmatism that no future revision of these laws is possible. So, too, we hold it incontrovertible at present that the Wage-Class must achieve its own emancipation, though this is a deduction from the Law of Value, the Law of Wages, the Law of Exploitation, the Law of Class Interest.

With this as a fundamental proposition, that the Proletariat must emancipate itself, certain further deductions have to be made with respect to Tactics, that is, with respect to the methods by which the Working-Class shall emancipate itself. On this subject, dogmatism is inexcusable, since it concerns the future, and the best social prophets have been credited by the event itself, both Marx and Engels being conspicuous examples.

It has been the generally accepted belief that Proletarian Emancipation would use, as its chief instrument, the Capitalist device known as the Elective Franchise. The Communist Manifesto refers to the "organization of the Proletarians into a class and consequently into a political party," as a part of social development and shows "the conquest of political power by the Proletariat" to be indispensable, and it affirms distinctly, "Every Class-Struggle is a political struggle."

These expressions have been assumed to mean that the main tactics for the Proletariat are the formation of political parties in the various countries and the conquest of political powers by the exercise of the elective franchise. In accord with this theory of Tactics, the German Proletariat, enlightened by Marx and Engels, and led by Lassalle and Liebknecht, formed a political party some forty years ago and has grown in strength and influence up to the present day. At this very moment, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany is confronted with a crisis in its history and is putting to the test its efficacy as a Revolutionary instrument. The Capitalist Class is determined to limit the Elective Franchise, so that the Working-Class shall not be able to use its majority in numbers to accomplish for itself "the conquest of political power."

It is not for us to say categorically that the elective franchise will be the historic instrument by which the Proletariat must achieve his own emancipation.

Suppose it fails, as a matter of fact. Is then the Proletariat to remain enslaved? Grant that it cannot be freed so long as the Capitalists retain control of governmental forces, that is, so long as the Bourgeoisie, through its political power, can kill and conquer the Proletariat, still is there no other way to capture that power to kill and conquer which is incident to that Class-thing known as the State? Is there no other possible tactic but the Ballot-tactic?

It is puerile to tie the hope of the Proletariat to any method which proves itself impracticable.

Therefore, "The Socialist" has never been dogmatic as to tactics. It has been remarked by many that the promised chapters on Tactics in "Revolutionary and Reform Socialism" by the editor of this paper, have been unaccountably delayed for some three years. The real reason is that the editor has never been sufficiently settled in his own mind on the question of the method by which the Working-Class will achieve its own emancipation, to complete that part of his little book. This attitude of uncertainty may not be satisfactory to those whose minds are so constituted that they require absolute knowledge and partisan limitations to make them contented, but it seems to us the only attitude possible to an open, scientific mind with respect to matters which can be settled finally by the test of evolutionary experience alone.

Therefore, "The Socialist" has never been dogmatic as to tactics. It has been remarked by many that the promised chapters on Tactics in "Revolutionary and Reform Socialism" by the editor of this paper, have been unaccountably delayed for some three years. The real reason is that the editor has never been sufficiently settled in his own mind on the question of the method by which the Working-Class will achieve its own emancipation, to complete that part of his little book. This attitude of uncertainty may not be satisfactory to those whose minds are so constituted that they require absolute knowledge and partisan limitations to make them contented, but it seems to us the only attitude possible to an open, scientific mind with respect to matters which can be settled finally by the test of evolutionary experience alone.

All this is not to say that this paper commits itself to "Direct Action" or repudiates the Political Party method. We have used this illustration taken from contemporary Proletarian history in order to make our point clear, namely, that it is possible to conduct a Proletarian Newspaper which is not partisan or sectarian or dogmatic.

We do not profess to know whether the I. W. W. is sufficiently adapted to present Proletarian conditions in America to become the instrument of universal Proletarian organization and Revolutionary action; but we do recognize it as a part of the Class-Struggle and will report it and encourage it as calculated to develop Class Intelligence, Class spirit and Class action.

We do not know whether the present tendency of the A. F. of L. toward the formation of a political party, composed of Union men primarily, is destined to develop into a Class Party compelling legislative ameliorations of Working Class conditions, or whether it will degenerate into a mere Progressive Party, catering to Middle-Class reactionary elements like the farmers; but we do know that the membership of the A. F. of L. is composed of Wage-Workers engaged in contests with their employers for a greater share of Wage-Labor's product, and that the concentration of Capital is forcing these A. F. of L. Proletarians to act more and more as a Class and less and less as Crafts, and therefore we encourage all these tendencies toward Class action, both as Unions and as a political party.

We recognize the A. F. of L. as the greatest American organization of Proletarians and we do not regard it as controlled by any arbitrary "Principles," revolutionary or otherwise, but by its own interests so far as it perceives them, and it is our place to help it perceive those interests and to avoid reactionary entanglements. We do not deny its Proletarian character nor its part in the historic Class-Struggle. We would like to see it clearer, we will do our best to make it clearer, but we will not be so unscientific as to deny a fact, and affirm that this enormous body of Two Million Wage-Workers is a Capitalist institution, while an organization of One Hundred in Cincinnati or Seattle is the real Proletarian body, inasmuch as it declares of itself, "We can prove that our Structure is the only sound one existing in the Labor World today."

For nearly ten years this paper and most of its supporters have been allied with the Socialist Party in the U. S., believing that that party represented best the Proletarian cause. But the course of economic development led that organization to represent the small Bourgeois rather than the Proletarian, and we finally were driven out of that party, because we continued to insist that the Party was and should be composed of Proletarians. So we are no longer supporting that organization because it seems to us essentially Middle-Class in its constituency and tendencies.

Some of us are now to be found in an attempted new Party called the Wage-Workers' Party which has not yet completed its organization and has never put a ticket in the field. If it accomplishes things and makes itself felt as a real part of the Class-Struggle, this paper will report its progress; but at present, this organization disapproves the course adopted by us as outlined in this editorial and we bear no other relation to it than to any other body of Wage-Workers.

Others of the former supporters of this paper are now allied with the attempt to found a United Labor Party in the city of Seattle and in the state of Washington. At the election last week in this city, this Party, which had the support of none but Proletarians and was opposed vigorously by the old-party "Labor-Leaders" in the Unions, polled some 1,500 votes for its candidate for Mayor and probably elected one of its candidates for ward councilman.

This paper supported that ticket as the only Proletarian Party in the field. But we reserve our right and duty to criticize its development into a

**ALL THE YEAR 'ROUND**  
**Regal \$15 Clothes**  
 Are Worn because they Wear the Year 'Round

**THE HUB**  
 Sole Agents  
 On the Square      Opposite Totem Pole

**LONDON'S STORE**  
 1107 - 1109 - 1111 SECOND AVENUE, near SPRING  
**Seattle's Real Bargain Center**  
 Merchandise sold always at everlastingly lowest prices  
 Watch the evening papers for daily specials

**National Bank of Commerce**  
 OF SEATTLE  
 Capital ..... \$ 1,000,000  
 Surplus and Profits ..... 798,000  
 Total Resources, over ..... 1,798,000

Corner Second Avenue and Madison Street

Telephone or Telegraph Orders Promptly Attended To  
**Bonney - Watson Company**  
 Funeral Directors  
 SPECIALTY—Embalming for Shipments  
 PHONES: Main 12, Ind. 12      THIRD AVE. AND UNIVERSITY ST.

Sunset Main 953      Independent 956  
**Queen City Laundry**  
 ESTABLISHED 1890  
 Branch, Third Ave. near Pike St.  
 Corner First and Bell :: Branch at "Socialist" Office

**WALLIN & NORDSTROM**  
 Well Known Shoe Dealers  
 New Location Arcade Building, 1327 Second Avenue.

**J. H. SHREWSBURY** CASH GROCER  
 Largest Grocery House in North Seattle.  
 2323 First Avenue.      Phones: Main 1455; Ind X14

**Drugs** Help Us and We'll Help You **Drugs**  
 Give us your trade, we will treat you right  
 Both Phones, 982      Free Delivery  
**Swift's Pharmacy**  
 Second Avenue and Pike Street      Seattle, Wash.

**FRANK B. WILSON**

The Road	by Jack London,	\$2.00
The Money Changers	Upton Sinclair's Latest,	1.18
The Metropolis	Sinclair's Latest,	1.18
The Jungle	Upton Sinclair,	.50
Looking Backward	Bellamy,	.50

Archway Bookstore and Kodak Store      Stationery Store, Blank Books, etc.  
 220 PIKE STREET      318 PIKE STREET

Stationery, News and Men's Furnishings.  
 WILSON-MCVEY CO.      104 OCCIDENTAL AVE.

**MARTINE HARDWARE COMP'Y**  
 Successors to ENTERPRISE HARDWARE CO., Incorporated  
 TOOLS - HARDWARE - CUTLERY  
 SPORTING GOODS - KITCHENWARE - GARDEN TOOLS  
 409 Pike Street      Seattle

State Party if it shall be so unwise as to unite, for the sake of a few, or many, votes, with the Farmers' Leagues which are springing up over the country to secure better prices and lower R. R. rates, both of which tend to lower the purchasing power of wages and hence make it harder for the Unions to maintain their standard of living. Ask the Farm-Laborers to unionize themselves and demand an 8-hour day, if you want to see the absurdity of the farmers and wage-workers belonging to the same organization.

We expect our new attitude will lose us a good many friends and supporters, but we have never yet accommodated our views to our subscription-list and we cannot begin now. We shall conduct a Proletarian Newspaper, aiming to give that news which is most significant of Proletarian advances, which will best promote the Class-Spirit, develop the Class-War, encourage Class-Solidarity and hasten the final victory of the Proletarian Class.

We append an extract from a recent letter sent to an I. W. W. official, in response to a friendly letter from him.

**Extract from Editor's Letter**

My Dear S—

I would like you to understand perfectly the attitude of this paper. It will support every contest which it regards as a part of the Class-Struggle of Labor against Capital, though it may not endorse without reserve the organization conducting such contest. Our aim is to unify the Proletariat against the Bourgeoisie. We do not think the I. W. W. the only Proletarian organization engaging in the Class-Struggle, though we are doing a great deal to promote its growth by reporting its activities. But we do not surrender the right to criticize it. Our attitude is the same toward the A. F. of L., though more critical, as that body seems to us less Proletarian in spirit and less revolutionary in form than yours.

If we come to see things differently, as your Branch of the Proletariat develops, we shall not hesitate to change our attitude.

We await the normal evolution of the Working-Class itself, and do what we can to speed on the inevitable war and the inevitable Proletarian Victory.

The unwavering loyalty of this paper, through ten years of loss and calumny, to the interests of the Wage-Workers, is the best guarantee of its future course.

Sincerely yours,  
 HERMON F. TITUS.



# The Middle Class Rebellion

(Reprinted from our issue of April 9, 1910.)

Aside from the Trusts themselves, the most conspicuous phenomenon in the United States today is the Rebellion of Small Business against Big Business.

Pinchot versus Ballinger is at bottom Small Business rebelling against its exclusion by Big Business from all business. Gifford Pinchot himself said last Christmas: "For whose benefit shall the national resources be conserved, for the benefit of the many or for the use and profit of the few? The great conflict now being fought will decide."

Ballinger and Taft have Big Business behind them. There is no practical doubt Ballinger was selected for his cabinet position by and for the enormous Capital invested in Metal Mines, in order to insure to the Guggenheims and their associates the possession of the Alaskan treasures of copper and coal. Pinchot's contention is that these treasures should be retained by the Government so as to give equal opportunity for their use to the "American People"; that is, to the small investor and prospector. He inveighs against "Excessive Profits from the Control of Natural Resources Monopolized by a Few."

There are many theorists who, following Marx slavishly, claim the Middle Class is too timid to put up a fight for itself, that it is disintegrating and has no future. But the American Middle Class has different traditions and training from the "Petty Bourgeoisie" and small traders referred to by Marx. The best representative of this American Middle Class is Theodore Roosevelt, the Strenuous. No one will deny that he is a good fighter. Other words of Gifford Pinchot have the ring of battle in them, as follows: "We have allowed the great corporations to occupy with their own men the strategic points in business, in social and in political life." "The only thing to do with them is to fight them and to beat them." That does not sound like timidity and incapacity.

The "Insurgents" among the Republicans, like La Follette and Cummins in the Senate and Norris and Pendergast in the House, with their Small Business backing of Farmers and Merchants in the West, are only another manifestation of this Middle Class Rebellion.

The Bryan Democrats are another branch, though less capable and more politic.

The vast growth and success of the cheaper Magazines in the last five years is directly due to the fact that they voice the popular discontent with the unparalleled development of the monopolistic trusts. "Everybody's" jumped to a half-million circulation on the strength of Tom Lawson's fierce attacks on "Standard Oil." The swarm of "Muck-Rakers," like Charles Edward Russell, Judge Lindsey and Stannard Baker, are paid for and inspired by the militant hosts of these Middle Class Rebels.

What will be the result? Is it possible for the Rebellion to become a Revolution? Will this American Middle Class, consisting of millions of men who have hitherto been successful in business; men selected and hardened for conflict by their two centuries of experience as Pioneers; will they win this battle against the comparatively small Army of Monopoly, Special Privilege, Incorporated Wealth?

Those who glibly say they have no chance, because the Laws of Combination will defeat them inevitably, may have miscalculated social forces. For the next step in the evolution of American society may be Government Ownership in the interest of the Middle Class. "Conservation" means, as Pinchot says, that "our natural resources must be conserved for the benefit of the many." The Government, by this plan, shall retain its ownership of the coal fields of Alaska and of the power sites on streams, so as to forestall private ownership and monopoly and to insure "Equal Opportunity."

Suppose Roosevelt, on his return, with his immense popularity and genius for forceful leadership, shall openly defy "Cannonism" and "Aldrichism" and Taftism, there is no doubt he can be re-elected as the Napoleon of the Middle Class Rebellion. He will have behind him a Congress overwhelmingly Middle Class and Anti-Monopoly. What is to prevent comprehensive legislation in the direction of Middle Class Socialism? Gifford Pinchot is now on his way across the Atlantic to be the first to consult with the returning Roosevelt on the Conservation Issue.

Bear in mind again what Pinchot said in that remarkable interview of his last December: "The Conservation issue is a great moral issue. When a few men get possession of one of the necessities of life, either through ownership of a natural resource or through unfair business methods, and use that control to extort undue profits, as in the recent cases of the Sugar Trust and Beef Packers, they injure the average man without good reason, and they are guilty of a moral wrong."

Such a call, addressed to the expropriated masses of the Middle Class, appealing to their interests and conscience alike, is certain to be received with militant fervor. What right, it will be demanded, have the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Guggenheims, the Armours, to segregate the vast wealth produced by this Industrial Age and to use it to debauch municipal councils, state legislatures and courts, and even national officials, creating a Reign of Graft unexampled in all history?

To this national question, put in the name of "The Common People," and of "The Right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness," may arise an instantaneous and overwhelming Middle Class vote in favor of the Restraint of Monopoly by means of Government Ownership of the Monopolistic Trusts, including the Railroads, the Alaskan and other Coal Mines, the Oil Trust, the

Meat Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Copper Syndicate, and all other "Bad" Trusts.

This will be "Bourgeois Socialism," the kind that has for its battle cry, "Let the Nation Own the Trusts," the kind of Socialism that Bryan was charged with in the last Campaign, the kind of Socialism that is growing popular, the kind of Socialism that Victor Berger and Samuel Gompers represent, and that the Socialist Parties of both Europe and America are coming to represent.

Undoubtedly, such a Socialism is reactionary both in itself and as compared with the uninterrupted development of Monopoly.

It aims to preserve the present system of Capital and Wage Labor. There is no suggestion in the program of Roosevelt or Bryan or Hearst or of any other of these "Radical" spokesmen of "The Common People," that the appropriation of profit from the employment of wage workers shall cease, that the competitive wage system shall be abolished or that there shall no longer be a Proletariat.

Rather, their ideal is a Middle Class, capitalistic, free-for-all Paradise, like the present, only the tyranny of Monopoly and of the Industrial Giants shall be prevented by Public Ownership of those which have already attained uncontrollable dimensions.

We call this reactionary, because it practically preserves the Status Quo of Wage Exploitation and puts off to some distant future the Emancipation of the Wage Class from its compulsory service to the Capitalist Class. A large competitive Middle Class, based on Capitalist Profit as at present, might maintain itself indefinitely in power, because fortified by the enormous income to be derived from the National Industries taken over from the Trusts, thus relieving the Government from all necessity of dependence on Taxation and legislative Budgets; a condition which now exists in a modified form in Russia, Prussia, Japan and in all countries where Public Ownership already finds a partial exemplification. Tzar Nicholas and Kaiser William are both enabled to sustain their oligarchies, in spite of popular dissatisfaction, because of the money obtained by their governments from the administration of the State owned Railways, Telegraphs and other "Natural Monopolies."

On the other hand, if the Trusts are allowed to proceed to their "natural" conclusion, then the organization of industry into larger and larger units, completely eliminating the "Little Fellow" by precipitating him into the Proletariat, will go on apace, with accelerating speed. At the present rate, how long will it take for the Harriman and Hill systems of Railways to effect a combination which will be able to crush and absorb all the other Railroads in the United States? Attorney F. B. Kellogg, arguing for the Government before the U. S. Supreme Court, stated recently: "The Standard Oil Co., if permitted to go on undissolved, will own the business of the Nation in five years."

It may be that even now their economic power is so great that no possible union of Middle Class elements in society can be effected strong enough to withstand the purchasing and disintegrating influences of wholesale bribery. The well known alliance of Big Capital and the Slum in our cities, like New York and San Francisco, point in this direction.

If such an economic supremacy of Great Capital has already been achieved, and hence, if the Middle Class Rebellion shall prove abortive, then Aldrich and Cannon and Taft and Ballinger, and all the rest of the tools of Great Capital in the State, are indeed the servants of Progress, unconsciously hastening the industrial organization of American society under the lead of the Captains of Industry.

To be sure, such a progress is won at the expense of personal liberty and the extension of wage slavery, and the utter extinction of the entire class of splendid fighters who have built America out of the wilderness.

Yet it is better that one Middle Class generation should perish than that ten generations of Proletarians should live and die in slavery.

When the Trusts have developed into The Trust, when all productive industry in the United States has been unified under one management, and the Government is nothing but the repressive power of this centralized, syndicated Oligarchy of Wealth, then the "Common People" and the exploited Proletariat will be identical and have identical interests, and consequently will form a vast and irresistible Revolutionary Class.

The sooner this centralization of economic and political power is accomplished, the better the prospect for such an exploited class being competent for united and revolutionary action; for the present American Middle Class or their children will make poor slaves and rebellious subjects.

Consequently, we regard it as desirable and progressive that the Present Middle Class Rebellion should not succeed, that Bourgeois Socialism should be exposed for what it is, an attempt to help the Class of Little Business to perpetuate itself and to postpone indefinitely the day of Wage Labor's Emancipation.

The key to the immediate situation lies with the American Working Class.

The Middle Class Rebellion depends for its success on the co-operation of the Wage Class.

The victory of Big Business and the abolition of Little Business also depends upon the action of the Proletarians.

It is announced that Gompers is contemplating the formation of a political party to be composed of the Unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, in combination with certain Farmers' organizations, alleged to number some three million voters. If this be true and such a party is formed, it will be in direct line with the Middle Class Rebellion outlined in this article. For these Farmers' Unions are not organizations of the Farm Laborers, but of the Small Farm owners. Their program goes no further than Public Ownership of Public Utilities; combined with the Utopian demand for the Initiative and Referendum, as if this method of voting were not more susceptible to control by Big Capital than the present representative system.

The reactionary character of a Gompers political party, composed of Proletarian Labor and Agrarian Small Capital, is sufficiently obvious. It would easily form a basis for the Middle Class Rebels to build their political rebellion on.

If the American Working Class is so little enlightened as to its own interests and so lacking initiative as to follow such alien proposals, then indeed the Middle Class may succeed in saving itself and in prolonging Wage Slavery. It were far better to have the combination existing in San Francisco made national in scope, namely, that Labor should unite with Big Capital and the Slum to win political power; in which case, the Middle Class will go to the wall, the Trusts will complete their efficient organization of society and the Wage Class will be consolidated into a mighty, revolutionary and irresistible social force.

And there you are. It is up to the Proletariat.

If it follows the reactionary lead of Gompers and unites its forces with the Middle Class Rebels, it may delay for many years the abolition of Class Rule in society and its own elevation to equal participation in the benefits of human invention.

But if it works with Big Capital to destroy the Middle Class, root and branch, with the greatest possible celerity; or if, better still, the Proletariat shall act together as one man, both industrially and politically, for its own class interests exclusively, then it will display an historic initiative and militant hegemony, which will make for the most rapid evolution out of society burdened with Class Antagonism into that association, sure to come some time, "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

## The Milwaukee Election

(Reprinted from our issue of April 9, 1910.)

Since our editorial on the "Rebellion of the Middle Class" was written, the sweeping victory of the Social-Democratic Party in Milwaukee has occurred, where its majority mounted up to 8,000 over the Democrats, who, in turn, were 8,000 above the Republicans. Emil Seidel was elected Mayor and Victor Berger a Councilman-at-Large. Twenty out of twenty-nine Councilmen are Social-Democrats. The entire country is wondering how it was done and what it means.

In our judgment, it means precisely what has been outlined in the above editorial. It means what the astonishing election of a Democratic Congress-

man in the hitherto strong Republican Brockton district in Massachusetts, means. It means the Revolt of the Middle Class against high prices and the Trusts, which they imagine are the cause of the high prices. The Milwaukee Social-Democrats (not "Socialists," mind) are only a step removed from the ordinary Middle Class Democrats, at least in the popular mind and practically so in reality. Berger's first announcement sent broadcast through the Associated Press the very night of the election was, "We will give a Square Deal;" not a word as to the Working Class. Seidel said, "Capital need have no fear from us." Milwaukee is a city of homes, of Skilled Mechanics and Small Tradesmen, who have united under the leadership of such men as Berger, Seidel, Thompson and Gaylord, two business men and two preachers, for the purpose of buying the necessities of life, like gas, ice, coal, wood, light, street car fares, lunches, bread, water, etc., etc., at cheaper rates. Seidel, the new mayor, says, "We will do nothing revolutionary. We will show the merits of Socialism by insistent and consistent conservatism." Berger says, "This victory is a victory for Progress, a little step toward a higher phase of civilization." These expressions denote the Middle Class and reactionary character of the Milwaukee brand of Socialists, or, as they themselves prefer to be called, Social-Democrats.

Undoubtedly the Socialist Party of the United States will tumble over itself to follow Milwaukee. Already Victor Berger dominates the National Executive Committee of that party, while the Proletarian and revolutionary elements are driven out, as in Washington, or discouraged and divided, as in California. The race of this party is now to outstrip the Democrats in bidding for the support of the great Middle Class, better known as "The Common People." Except in Milwaukee, and in isolated spots, the Socialist Party in this country has hitherto amounted to little as a vote getter, and the sight of the Milwaukee trough will make their mouths water. The result at the coming convention of the Party at Chicago in May will be a stirring anti-trust call, addressed to the working class in form and to the business class in fact. It will be, as Berger says, an appeal for "Progress," for another "step toward a higher phase of civilization." In this new appeal, nothing will be insisted on which will alarm the bourgeois distribution of Property, the Capital-and-Wage-Labor system, in which Labor gets a "Fair Wage" and Capital, small or large, gets the rest of Labor's product.

Such a Social-Democratic political movement, taking the place of the old and discredited Democratic Party, is quite in keeping with the aspirations of the exasperated Middle Class as suggested in our leading editorial. It is also quite in keeping with the economic ignorance prevailing in the American Proletariat, that such a political movement should capture the most of the wage workers organized in the American Federation of Labor, as it has in Milwaukee. The chances are that the various State Labor Parties now springing into existence, as in Washington and Pennsylvania, will follow the same general lines as the Milwaukee Social Democracy. In that case, it will be almost inevitable that these Labor Parties will effect a coalition with Berger's city party and establish a real political power, wherein the Working Class will be used to save the Middle Class and to check the Trust Class.

Meanwhile the Revolutionary Proletarians are more and more combining into industrial organizations which menace the existing order and openly demand the abolition of the Wage System itself. As yet, this class of proletarians has no political organization of the Proletariat for the Proletariat. The two Socialist Parties are both travesties of proletarianism, both led by the small business man and the intellectual. In San Francisco, the "Union Labor" Party means Labor financed and used by Big Capital. In Washington, the "United Labor" Party seems disposed to join hands with the insurgent farmers and thus make a sort of Milwaukee affair, in which case the Socialist Party of this state will lose what few remnants it has left at present. In Pennsylvania, the "United Labor" Party is yet too raw to indicate its real character, though its first declaration in Philadelphia contained a sop to the farmers. Yet it is in this very state of Pennsylvania that the Revolutionary Proletariat in the coal and iron industries is being forced into Class Consciousness and Class organization.

We believe it to be the duty of every wage worker and of every other person who wishes to further the emancipation of the wageworkers, to put himself where he can best discourage the spread of such Middle Class Socialism as Milwaukee represents, and which will only prolong the age of wage slavery; and to ally himself with whatever organization will soonest promote the unification of the working class to abolish Capital and its accompanying Wage Slavery.

Get Another Workingman to Subscribe

MAKER GRANT—Dental Specialist. They do the High Class work that you have been looking for at a price that is reasonable. Office in Pantages Theatre Bldg., Second Avenue and Seneca Street.

A. F. Schacht L. Sannwald Phone, Ind. 1975

Commercial Bar Leading Brands of WHISKIES, WINES AND CIGARS 301 FIRST AVENUE SOUTH Cor. First Avenue and Main St.

Wage Workers who Understand what SOCIALISM means are usually socialists. Better look into the question for yourself. Write your address on the lines below, mail us the coupon with 10 cents, and you will get a hundred-page illustrated magazine and a 64-page illustrated book that will help you decide very quickly which side you are on.

LOU M. PALMER, DAVE BLAKE President Manager The Colonnade Headquarters for Alaskans. Telephone: Main 560, Ind. 560. All outside rooms. Fine marie view. Centrally located. Strictly modern. FIRST AVE & PINE ST.

Dr. Titus, on account of impaired health, has removed his office to a quieter location, 602 Bellevue Ave. North, corner of Mercer St., where he will be glad to meet his patients. He will confine himself mainly to consultation and office practice, giving special attention to Diseases of Women. Hours, 1 to 6 p. m. daily. Take Bellevue-Summit car on Second Avenue or Pike street; get off at Mercer street, and walk one block down hill; 10 minutes ride from Pike street and Second Ave. Phone, Ind. A2187. Advice given by mail.



The "Blanket Stiff" He built the ROAD— With others of his CLASS, he built the road, Now o'er it, many a weary mile, he packs his load, Chasing a JOB, spurred on by HUNGERS goad. He walks and walks, and wonders why In H—L, he built the road.

**Adolf Anderson Importing Grocer**  
Operator of the Jersey Butter Store — Phones: Ma'n 2401, Ind. 463 — Buy your Groceries here—Always Reliable—Prompt Delivery  
2 1-2 per cent Discount on Cash Sales 503 Pike Street

Good Health Assured if You Eat at the **VEGETARIAN CAFE**  
214 UNION ST. SEATTLE

Phone Ind. 4783 Dan Halpin, Prop. **City Waffle and Coffee House**  
Best Workingman's Meal in Town  
165 WASHINGTON STREET SEATTLE, WASH.

Phone, Ind. 3239 J. E. Mansfield, Prop. **The Mansfield Buffet**  
THE BEST LIQUORS AND CIGARS  
Pool Room in Connection 163 Washington Street

**Sour-Dough Agnes Thecla Fair**  
Author  
Now ready for delivery—64 pages, by mail, postpaid  
**50 Cents**  
Trustee Printing Co., Box 1908, Seattle, Wash.



### By Karl Kautsky Editor "Die Neue Zeit"

Editor's Note. "The Workingman's Paper" intends to furnish its readers an outline of the best discussions of the Modern Labor Movement. It intends to print nothing that is not worth reading at least twice over.

In pursuance of this policy, here follows an article by the foremost Marxian scholar in Europe, Karl Kautsky, being a diplomatic criticism of the relation of Labor Parties and Socialist Parties, with special reference to the situation in England and hence in America. Kautsky is an able and adroit thinker, a devoted admirer of Marx, capable of adapting his views to the exigencies of practical politics, in this respect reminding the American Socialist of Morris Hillquit. Both of these men are intellectually guided by the Marxian view of things, though neither of them is a Proletarian and neither possesses the uncompromising, revolutionary, renunciant spirit of Marx.

We intend to follow this article by Kautsky by another next week taking an opposite view of the English Labor Party. This excellent translation of Kautsky's article appeared anonymously in the "Sunday Call" of March 20, 1910. Were it not for carelessness of Socialist editors in giving credit, we should ascribe the translation to the editor, Rives LaMonte.

### Marx and the Political Problems of the Trade Unions in England Different

In his observations regarding the unity of the working class (Neue Zeit, No. 24), Comrade Radek attacks a Belgian Comrade as well as our friend, M. Leer, but I am probably not far from the truth when I assume that he has no view with regard to the resolution admitting the British Labor party to the International, which I proposed at the last meeting of the International Socialist Bureau. This resolution was accepted, but it appeared to some of my political friends to be something of a heresy to my principles. I consequently willingly use this opportunity of stating my grounds for this resolution in greater detail than was possible at Brussels.

### Both Needed

I have no intention, however, of solving the problem as to which is the more important, the organization of the proletariat into one independent class party without any definite program or the formation of a special, though indeed smaller, working class party, but having a definite Socialist program. I do not think there is any such problem at all. There is just as little sense in such a problem as there is in asking which is the more important, the final aim or the movement. The organization of the Proletariat into an independent class party is as inseparable from the necessity of converting them to Socialism as is the movement from its aim. In the long run, the one is quite inefficient without the other. Both must go hand in hand.

The problem is not which is the more important, organization or enlightenment, but how best they can be united. This question, however, can be no means answered definitely for all countries by the various answers depending upon the given political and social conditions, and corresponding, to some extent, with the answers to the question regarding the relations existing between the parties and the trade unions. In general, however, one can distinguish two principal types of movements for the attainment of an all-embracing Socialist class party: The European continental type, which is best illustrated at present in the German Social Democracy, and the Anglo-Saxon type, which can be best studied in England, but which is also strongly developed in North America and in Australia.

### Anglo-Saxon and European

The great difference between the Anglo-Saxon world and the European continent consists, in the first place, in that the political development of the latter took place under the flag of the French revolution which commenced in 1789, whereas the Bourgeois revolution in England was completed in 1688, a whole century in advance, that is. The Bourgeois revolution in England was thus accomplished under less highly developed conditions, and thus could bring in its train no such tremendous upheaval in the material and spiritual life of society as did the French revolution. The subsequent political advances made by the rising classes in England since 1688 until the present time, always took the form of isolated struggles for one particular object. The revolutionary classes themselves held aloof from revolutionary ideas. They were far more violent than the continentals in their action, but their interests concerned not society as a whole, but only single occurrences. The European revolutionary classes of the European continent, whose ideas were influenced by the great revolution, were, on the contrary, far more prone to consider society as a whole and thus to strive to change it as a whole; they were thus revolutionary in their ideas. Consequently they were more ready than the English to look upon the winning of political rights as a means of attaining the special revolution. Beside this difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the European continental conditions there is also this to be added: When the modern working class movement commenced in the sixties of the nineteenth century the trade union movement on the continent found greater obstruction than the political movement; politics were everywhere forbidden to the trade union as such. At the same time the European continent was still living through a revolutionary epoch which only came to an end in 1871, an epoch in which the interests of the Proletariat were entirely absorbed in political struggles and organizations. Thus, in continental Europe, the political organization of the Proletariat developed before their trade union organization; they have, therefore, the sooner formed a mass party under the Socialist flag. For the propagation of Socialism was, from the very first, the only means by which to unite the Proletariat into an independent class party; but it must be added, it was the propagation of Socialism in general, but definite Marxian Socialism, the theory of the Proletarian class struggle

### Interview with Marx

Interesting also is an interview between Hamann, the secretary of the German Metal Workers' Trade Union, and Karl Marx, at Hanover, an account of which was given by Hamann in the Volkstaat, 1869, No. 17. (This account has been printed by Bringmann, "The History of the German Carpenters' Movement," 1903, Vol. 1, p. 364.) Marx said: "The trade unions should never be affiliated with or made dependent upon a political society if they are to fulfill the object for which they are formed. If this happens it means their death blow. The trade unions are the schools for Socialism, the workers are there educated up to Socialism by means of the incessant struggle against capitalism, which is being carried on before their eyes. All political parties, be they what they may, can hold sway over the mass of the workers for only a time; the trade unions, on the other hand, capture them permanently; only the trade unions are thus able to represent a real working class party, and to form a bulwark against the power of capital. The greater mass of the workers conceive the necessity of bettering their

material position whatever political party they may belong to. Once the material position of the worker has improved he can then devote himself to the better education of his children; his wife and children need not go to the factory, and he himself can pay some attention to his own mental education, he can better see to his physique. He becomes a Socialist without knowing it." This quotation is only an interview, not a signed article by Marx, consequently it is possible that it does not altogether accurately represent Marx' meaning. However, it is probable that Marx saw it in print, for it appeared in the Volkstaat, and, if so, he would have corrected it had he found it to be erroneous. Thus, although we cannot vouch for its absolute accuracy, it is yet worthy of attention, and although such an attitude seems to be strange to us now, it is very readily explained by the position of affairs at that time.

### Schools and Sects

Only in England and in France was there then a fairly wide working class movement of some duration, and it was only from the experience of these movements that Marx could develop his ideas on the subject. In France he found, indeed, much Socialism, but only in the form of sectarian societies. There were many Socialist "schools," each swearing to the genuineness of its own patent pill for the cure of all the ills of society, and each trying to rally the workers round itself. The various schools were at war with one another, and were thus instrumental in splitting the working masses rather than uniting them.

None of them had chosen as their basis the class struggle, which alone could unite the whole class. And the same was true of the political movements which appealed to the working classes. When Lassalle's movement first came into being, it also appeared to Marx as a new sect. The ignoring of the trade unions, the prominence given to the demand for universal production, seemed to him entirely sectarian, and no less sectarian also the appeal to state help. When, after Lassalle's death, the new working class party split, he was still further confirmed in his conclusion that such a party was only the means whereby to divide, not unite, the Proletariat. It thus seemed to him that to save the trade unions they must hold aloof from political organizations.

### Kautsky Explains Marx

There has been an attempt to conclude from this interview that Marx was in favor of the political neutrality of the trade unions, but this is quite unjustified. Marx was by no means of opinion that the trade unions should be as neutral toward the Liberals and Clericals as toward Socialists. He says expressly: "The trade unions are the schools for Socialism, but only they are able to form a real working class party." That means, the trade unions should not be neutral toward bourgeois political parties, but should keep away from all political parties because it is they themselves who are to form the Socialist working class party, and as such they must declare war on all bourgeois parties. Thus, explicable though this attitude may be under those circumstances, further developments have shown that it is now not altogether tenable.

### Marx' Opinion

This was also the opinion of Karl Marx, who was so influenced by the English conditions that he propagated a similar development in continental Europe.

Already in his "Poverty of Philosophy," in 1847, Marx indicated the political character of the trade union movement:

"To form a coalition, it is that not pursuing political ends. In this fight (the coalition regarding wages) the elements unite and prepare for the coming struggle." Once this point is reached the coalition assumes a political character (pp. 160, 162). Still more decidedly did Marx insist upon the political significance of the trade unions in the resolution he proposed, and which was accepted by the Geneva International Congress in 1866. Among other things this resolution says: "Indispensable as are the trade unions in the guerilla warfare between capital and labor, and still greater importance as they as an organized means of promoting the abolition of the wage system itself."

"The trade unions have so far laid too much stress upon their local and immediate struggles against capital. They have not yet fully understood their power of attacking the whole system of wage slavery and present forms of production. . . . On that account they hold themselves too much aloof from general, social and political movements. . . . Lately, however, they seem to have awakened to some extent to the consciousness of the great historical problem confronting them. . . . Apart from their original aims, the trade unions must now learn to focus the organization of the working classes for the great purpose of attaining their complete emancipation. They must, therefore, support every social and political movement which has this for its aim, and so on. We see, then, that what we demand from the Social Democracy Marx pointed out as the functions of the trade unions.

### An Aristocracy of Labor

While in Germany the political party has become a real working class party the trade unions in England have more and more lost the ability to become such a party. They have ever more separated themselves from the mass of the Proletariat, thus forming an aristocracy of labor and becoming means of splitting rather than of uniting the masses. Moreover, they have always shown a tendency to political dependence on the bourgeois parties, by whom the unions and, to even a greater extent, their leaders, have been bought and duped by concessions.

So it appeared that the development of events in England proved Marx wrong. His theory of the class struggle and its practical results were mainly deduced from English conditions, and it was just in England that they seemed to be brought to an absurd end. But finally Marx is seen to be right after all.

### The Social Democracy and the Labor Movement in England

At first, indeed, Marxism made its appearance in England in opposition to Marx, when Hyndman, Bax and the other followers of Marx's teachings founded in 1881 the Democratic Federation, later on the Social Democratic Federation, at present the Social Democratic party. According to the intention of its founders, it was to become a working class party similar to that of the German Social Democratic party. It was a product of the great crisis which began in the seventies and which introduced the cessation of England's industrial supremacy. The conditions

which gave to English capital a position of monopoly and allowed it to cede a share of its fruits to the trade unions were coming to an end. Unemployment was raging and the trade unions were declining. At the same time the antagonism between capital and labor was growing; as a consequence, the English workmen began again susceptible to the ideas of Socialism, and the Social Democratic Federation was enabled to achieve considerable success.

### Engels Against S. D. F.

But, strange to say, beyond a certain point it could never go in its achievements. The Social Democratic Federation thought it necessary to point out to the workmen the insufficiency of trade unionism in order to make them realize the necessity for Socialism. But this provoked the opposition of the trade unionists—that element, to wit, which constitutes a portion of the working class, and which is best capable of being organized. It was this, no doubt, which made it impossible for Engels to adopt a friendly attitude toward the Social Democratic Federation. As is known from his letters to Sorge, he judged it and its sectarian character rather severely. It is true that Marx and Engels fought against the corruption and narrow-mindedness of the majority of the English trade union officials in a similar manner, and with no less energy than the Social Democratic Federation itself, but nothing could shake their conviction that, in spite of it all, the only way to treat in England a strong Social Democratic working class party was to propagate Socialism in the trade unions, to loosen the bonds between them and the bourgeois parties, and to unite them into one separate party. Finally, however, Engels did not expect much from the old trade unionists. The new unionism in England, the Knights of Labor in America, seemed to him a much better soil from which a labor party could spring. Experience has shown that Marx has been right after all. The English workingman, insofar as he is at all capable of being organized and of fighting, is very strongly attached to his trade union, which has become an indispensable life element to him. Whoever attacks it, or even belittles it, is his enemy. And, in fact, there is no need at all for either setting the trade unions aside or lessening their importance.

### S. D. F. a Sect

The new economic and political situation dates from the eighties, and, having improved for a time during the nineties, renders the class antagonism in the new century all the more pronounced and violent. This situation can no longer be met adequately by the trade unionist methods hitherto in vogue. The methods, then, certainly should be changed, by widening the sphere of action of the trade unions, and by expanding their forms of organizations, which, at the same time, will occasion a widening of the mental horizon of their members, and morally also of their leaders. But this implies that the trade unions, so far from losing, will, on the contrary, gain in importance.

The English workingman is very strongly attached to his trade union. It is for him to such an extent the all-embracing organ of all his social and political struggles, that he requires no other, and considers any other organ superfluous. A labor party in England, outside the trade unions, can, therefore, never become a party embracing the masses. It is doomed always to be confined to a small circle, and to remain in this sense a sect. In consequence of all this, the S. D. F., as well as the other Socialist organizations, namely, the Fabians (1883) and the Independent Labor party (1893), formed side by side with it, did not grow, in spite of the fact that the new situation made it an imperative necessity to create an independent workingmen's party.

If smallness and an incapability to get a hold on the masses are the essential characteristics of a sect, then these other organizations were no less sects than the S. D. F. When, however, the majority of the trade unions at last made up their minds to form a common political organization, at once a mass-party arose to which the existing Socialist organizations affiliated. Thus the labor representation committee was formed (1900), out of which grew the Labor party now in existence.

### Socialist Party an Educator

By creating this Labor party, the path was at last entered upon, which Marx so long ago designated as the right one, and which proved for England at the present time the only path leading to the organization of the proletariat as a class. And yet we need by no means declare the judgment passed by Engels on the S. D. F. as justified in all points. The S. D. F. committed indeed mistakes enough. Its Marxism was often enough a dogma rather than a method, and mixed up with additions quite foreign to the spirit of true Marxism. But, notwithstanding all this, the S. D. F. has accomplished a good deal, and its mistakes can be partly explained by the difficulties it had to contend against.

The S. D. F. desired to become a party like the German S. D. P., for this, however, the conditions in England were not ripe. Failure was bound to attend these endeavors in spite of the most self-sacrificing work. It only blocked the way to the formation of a real mass party.

But this by no means implied a condemnation of the S. D. F.; it only means that the tasks and functions of this organization lay elsewhere than in the direction in which the S. D. F. itself sought them.

It is, for instance, a mistake to think that the principal thing is to organize an independent working-class party, and that once such a party is in existence, the logic of events will force it to adopt Socialism. One is apt to forget that Socialism, which is alone capable of keeping the Proletariat permanently together, and which alone can lead them to victory—namely, the Socialism of the class struggle—is not a thing which lies on the surface. No, the principal condition enables the Proletariat to grasp Socialism more readily than the bourgeois elements can do; true, also, that an independent class party furishes them with the best basis for it. But for all that, a good deal of theoretical knowledge is indispensable in order to attain

a deeper comprehension of the capitalist mode of production, and of the nature of the class relations begotten by that mode of production as well as of the historical tasks imposed upon these classes. Without such a comprehension it is simply impossible to create a really independent permanent class party of the proletariat, independent not only in the sense that the workers are organized separately, but that their mode of thinking is distinct from that of the bourgeoisie.

We are at present rather inclined to undervalue the importance of spreading Socialist comprehension among the mass movement, because it rests upon propositions which have now become familiar to us for a generation—and are now, by means of a widely spread press, the common property of wide circles, and they appear to us to be enough. . . . In a country, however, where you just start teaching these propositions, they are by no means so readily grasped. The logic of events will not of itself bring them into the brains of the Proletariat, although it will make their brains susceptible to them.

### Mission of Marxists

The striving, therefore, for the organization of an independent mass and class party is not sufficient. No less important is the Socialist enlightenment. If the S. D. F. failed in the former task, it achieved all the more in the domain of the latter. By its Socialist agitation it prepared the soil upon which the labor party could arise, and the Socialist enlightenment and propaganda, which it still pursues is indispensable even now, when the Labor party already exists, in order to imbue that party with a Socialist spirit and to bring its actions for occasional and partial ends into accord with the lasting aims of the struggle of the Proletariat for its complete emancipation. Looked at in this light, the S. D. F. acquires an importance very different from what it seems to be when merely compared to the Continental Social-Democratic parties, which being mass parties are the political representatives of the whole Proletariat engaged in its class struggle.

The task of the S. D. F. is aptly stated in what the Communist Manifesto says in 1847 of the Communists League: "They are practically the most resolute and active portion of the working-class party; theoretically they are in advance of the rest of the Proletariat, inasmuch as they possess a clear insight into the conditions, the progress, and the general results of the Proletarian movement."

It is the endeavor of the Marxists of all countries to be worthy of this position. The peculiarity of England consists in the fact that the conditions there render it necessary for the Marxists to form a separate, solid organization, which in countries where mass parties, with a Social-Democratic program, exist, would be superfluous—nay, more, detrimental—inasmuch as it would only split up the party.

It is unavoidable, however, in a country where the trade unions form the Labor party, at least so long as this party does not accept a Social-Democratic program, and has not yet developed a permanent Social-Democratic party.

### Not Competing Parties

We must be very much on our guard not to look at the English conditions through Continental spectacles, and not to think that the Labor party and the S. D. F. are two parties competing with one another, the one excluding the other. Rather, let us be considered as two organs with different functions of which one is the complement of the other, and of which one can function but imperfectly without the other.

One should not imagine that the relation of the Labor party to the S. D. F. in England is similar to that existing at the present moment between the Marxists and the Social-Democratic Labor party in Holland. The formation of the Labor party was cordially welcomed in England by the Social-Democrats. For a certain time the S. D. F. formed a constituent part of the Labor party, and afterward left it, not because it wanted the Labor party to cease to exist, but because it did not agree with the policy of the latter.

Where two independent organizations exist side by side conflicts between them are always possible, however much the attainment of their common ends makes it desirable for them to work in cordial agreement.

### S. P. May Join Labor Party

But it is still possible for the S. D. P. to join the Labor party, and resolutions to that effect, backed by considerable minorities, are again and again proposed at the S. D. P. conferences. The British Labor party has always desired this union. Unlike the Labor party in Holland, it does not exclude Marxists, and yet it is contended that it is unworthy of being represented in the International Socialist Bureau side by side with the S. D. P.

Although the antagonism between the Social-Democracy and the Labor party is so great at present, the S. D. P. itself has altogether given up the hope of becoming a mass party after the style of the German Social-Democratic party, recognizing as it does that in England the political organization of the Proletariat, as a class, can only be attained by the inclusion of the trade unions.

Since, under the given conditions in England, the functions of the S. D. P., just as those of the other Socialist parties, are entirely different from those of the continental Socialist organizations, injustice is done to it when one compares it to these organizations, and depreciates it on account of its small membership and splits. The importance of the S. D. P. does not consist in its electoral activity, the number of its voters, its parliamentary representation—these are the spheres dominated by the Labor party—but in its propaganda work. The Labor party has no press, has no literature, and its propaganda activity in the form of public meetings is also practically nil.

What is done at all in this sphere in England, is done only by the Socialist parties. The Labor party represents a tremendous ship, but the Socialist organizations are the compass and rudder of the ship—without these it would be tossed hither and thither by the waves.

Entered as second-class matter in 1900 at Seattle, in 1905 at Toledo, Ohio, in 1906 at Caldwell, Idaho, and April 13, 1907, at the postoffice at Seattle, Washington, under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1907.

Subscription Rates. United States and Mexico.—One year, \$1.00; six months, 50c; three months, 25c; single copies, 5c. To Canada and Foreign Countries.—One year, \$1.50; six months, 75c. Weekly Bundles.—5 for three months for \$1.00; for six months, \$2.00; one year, \$4.00. Special Bundles.—2 cents each in any quantity.

All remittances should be made payable to TRUSTEE PRINTING COMPANY.

All business communications should be addressed to TRUSTEE PRINTING COMPANY, Box 1908, Seattle, Wash.

Communications intended for the Editor should be addressed to the Editor. Communications intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach this office not later than Monday.

HERMON F. TITUS, Editor; ERWIN B. AULT, Associate Editor; ARTHUR JENSEN, Assistant Editor; BESSY FIBET, Assistant Editor; HATTIE W. TITUS, Business Manager.

Contributors. RYAN WALKER, New York, Cartoonist; JOHN F. HART, Philadelphia, Cartoonist; THOS. A. SLADDEN, Portland, Ore.; ERNEST UNTERMANN, California; A. B. CALLAHAN, Juneau, Alaska; EDMOND PELUSO, Paris, France.

### THE K. & P. MARKET

All Kinds of Fresh and Canned Meats, Sausage and Lard. Our prices are lowest consistent with quality. Trade with us and avoid worry. NOS. 42 AND 43 PUBLIC MARKET, North End Downstairs, and NO. 26 NEW SANITARY MARKET.

What the relationship between the S. D. P. and Labor party should be depends upon various conditions. The Labor party is far from being an ideal party, and I have no such liking for its political representatives as the whole Proletariat engaged in its class struggle.

### Marxist Propaganda Needed

The criticisms of the S. D. P. may, in many points, be rather overdrawn; still, the Labor party in its present stage can easily sink into confusion and impotence when the Socialism of the trade union masses consists rather in the form of a merely vague desire than in that of a clear understanding of its principles; when the parliamentary and trade union leaders of the Labor party, still largely influenced by the deeply rooted traditions of co-operation with the Liberals, are by no means independent, all their ideas being saturated with bourgeois conceptions of philanthropy, of ethics, of economics and of democracy.

Only by means of the most energetic Marxist propaganda among the masses and the most determined criticism of the errors and entanglements of the leaders can the party be made into a powerful and trustworthy organ, in the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat.

### Kautsky In Doubt

It is, of course, open to doubt as to which is the best form of carrying on this propaganda and criticism; particularly as to whether it would be more effective were the Social Democratic party inside or outside of the Labor party. In general, the former is to be preferred, for when one criticizes an organization from the outside the critic too often appears as an enemy who would gladly wreck it. When, however, it is criticized by a member, the very membership shows that the critic has an interest in its existence, and only opposes its immediate actions in order to make it all the more powerful.

The English worker now considers the entrance of the trade unions into the Labor party as essential, as he formerly considered the trade unions themselves, and as formerly the agitation of the Social Democratic party among the English workers was the more difficult because they carried it out outside the unions, so it is to be feared that it is now committing the same mistake in attempting to criticize the Labor party from without.

### Better Inside

Nothing benefited the Social Democratic party more than that so many of its members could propagate Socialism as trade unionists among the trade unions. Now, too, many of its members are also members of the Labor party in virtue of their trade unions, and as such they take part in the congresses of the Labor party. Why, therefore, awaken the idea that the Social Democratic party sees a rival in the Labor party, which it has to destroy, instead of trying to make it better and more effective? It will be said, on the other hand, that the Labor party refuses to have a program to which its candidates must adhere. This is certainly a great mistake, but it is no reason for keeping away from the Labor party. Were the Labor party so far advanced as to adopt a Socialist program, the question as to the affiliation of the Social Democratic party as a party would no longer arise, the question would rather be as to whether the Social Democratic party had not attained its purpose, and should not sink its identity in that of the Labor party.

Unfortunately, we have not yet reached this stage; the Social Democracy as a separate body is still indispensable for the education of the Labor party, but this could best be done as a member of the Labor party. So long as this work of education is not done, the Social Democracy is not as a separate party so long ought it not to stand outside the Labor party. Whether this is just now impossible it is difficult for the stranger to decide. A very important role is played by the "imponderables," the importance of which can only be more or less accurately estimated by one who lives in the country and works among the people. Within the different Socialist parties there is at present a movement aiming at their unification in one form or other.

### Both Indispensable

Whatever form the Socialist organization may take it will still remain for a long time the fact that the Socialist organization and the Labor party have different functions, each being incomplete without the other; that under present conditions both are indispensable in the struggle for the emancipation of the English proletariat, and that one can very well defend both. The Socialist International itself has every reason to use every opportunity of drawing the Labor party into closer contact with International Socialism, thus subjecting it more and more to Socialist influence. There is no alternative here. It is not a question as to whether we prefer a small, resolute Social Democratic party to a big class party with no definite program indeed, but still independent of all bourgeois parties; the fact is that both form one whole under the given conditions in England. A Socialist organization of the Social Democratic party type is as insufficient by itself as the Labor party. We must encourage both. We must further the spread and growth of the Social Democracy as much as the propagation of Socialism in the Labor party.

### Same In U. S.

In North America things are somewhat different from those obtaining in England. Still, there is some similarity, and it is possible that there, too, the long wished for mass party of the proletariat may be formed into an independent political party in the very near future by the constitution of the American Federation of Labor. Probably this new party will not be a definitely Socialist one at first, and the Socialist party will, therefore, have to exist side by side with it until the trade union party has been fully won for Social Democracy. As in England, so in the United States. The chief sphere of the Labor party will be parliamentary and electoral, while that of the Social Democracy will be theoretical and propagandist.

Attempts have been made in this direction, and we must be prepared one fine day to see the rise of such a Labor party side by side with the Socialist party in the United States, and demanding admission to the International.

### No "Purely Labor Party" for Germany

It would, however, be quite a different question if such a party were formed on the European continent.

Here the new Labor party would no longer be supplementary to the present Socialist parties, but it would be antagonistic. It could only exist and thrive by the suppression of the other. It would not be, as in the Anglo-Saxon world, the only form in which the mass of the proletariat could be formed into an independent party. The Social Democratic parties are already such mass parties, and the new Labor party would consequently enter the field as a wedge in order to disperse the mass organization and to split the proletariat.

Finally, the present form of the English Labor party is only a transition stage which will sooner or later develop into a class conscious Social Democratic Labor party, with a definite Socialist program. With us this object lesson has been attained, and, consequently, the formation of a purely labor party is merely an attempt to crush out an already existing higher form, by a more reactionary party.

In short, although superficially similar in organization, such a Labor party on the continent is just the opposite to what it is in England under the given historical conditions. He who judges both these labor parties, isolated from their surroundings, may think we ought to repudiate the Anglo-Saxon, because the European continental parties must be fought with all the means at our disposal. In their historical connection, however, the labor parties assume quite different characters. What we attack here we must recognize there, indeed, we must joyously welcome it, not, of course, as an ideal organization, but merely as the previous step to it.

The ideal organization is the unification of all proletarian parties, the political societies, the trade unions, the co-operatives, as equal members, not of a labor party without a program, as is at the present the case in England, but of a class conscious, all-embracing Social Democracy.