

The Proletariat

IN capitalist production, the capitalist and the wage-earner are not fellow-workers, as were the employer and employed in previous industrial epochs. The capitalist soon develops into, and remains, essentially a merchant. His activity, insofar as he is at all active, limits itself, like that of the merchant, to the operations of the market. His labors consist in purchasing as cheaply as possible the raw material, labor-power and other essentials, and selling the finished products as dearly as possible. Upon the field of production itself he does nothing except to secure the largest quantity of labor from the workman for the least possible amount of wages, and thereby to squeeze out of them the largest possible quantity of surplus values. In his relation to his employees he is not a fellow-worker, he is only a driver and exploiter. The longer they work, the better off he is; he is not tired out if the hours of labor are unduly extended; he does not perish if the method of production becomes a murderous one. The capitalist is vastly more reckless of the life and safety of his operatives than the master-workman of former times. Extension of the hours of labor, abolition of holidays, introduction of night labor, damp and over-heated factories, filled with poisonous gases, such are the "improvements" which the capitalist mode of production has introduced for the benefit of the working-class.

The introduction of machinery increases still further the danger to life and limb for the working-man. The machine system fetters him to a monster that moves perpetually with a gigantic power and with insane speed. Only the closest, never flagging attention can protect the working-man attached to such a machine from being seized and broken by it. Protective devices cost money; the capitalist does not introduce them unless he is forced to do it. Economy being the much vaunted virtue of the capitalist, he is constrained by it to save room and to squeeze as much machinery as possible into the workshop. What cares he that the limbs of his working men are thereby endangered? Working men are cheap, but large, airy workshops are dear.

There is still another respect in which the capitalist employment of machinery lowers the condition of the working class. It is this: the tool of the mechanic of former times was cheap and it was subject to few changes that would render it useless. It is otherwise with the machine; in the first place, it costs money, much money; in the second place, if through improvements in the system, it becomes useless, or if it is not used to its full capacity, it will bring loss instead of profit to the capitalist. Again the machine is worn out, not only through use, but through idleness. Furthermore, the introduction of science into production constantly causes new discoveries and inventions to take the place of the old ones. So, because they can not compete with the improved machinery, now this machine, now that, and often whole factories at once, are rendered useless before they have been used to their full extent. Therefore every machine is in danger of

being useless before it is used up; this is sufficient ground for the capitalist to utilize his machine as quickly as possible from the moment he puts it in operation. In other words, the capitalist application of the system of machinery is a spur that drives the capitalist to extend the hours of labor as much as possible, to carry on production without interruption, to introduce the system of night and day shifts, and, accordingly, to make of the unwholesome night work a permanent system.

At the time the system of machinery began to develop, some idealist declared the golden age was at hand; the machine was to release the working-man and render him free. In the hands of the capitalist, however, the machine has made the burden of labor unbearable.

But in the matter of wages, also, the condition of the wage-earner is worse than that of the medieval apprentice. The proletariat, the workman of today, does not eat at the table of the capitalist; he does not live in the same house. However wretched his home may be, however miserable his food, nay, even though he famish, the well-being of the capitalist is not in the least affected by the sickening sight. The words wages and starvation used to be mutually exclusive; the free working man formerly could starve only when he had no work. Whoever worked, earned wages, he had enough to eat, starvation was not his lot. For the capitalist system was reserved, the unenviable distinction of reconciling these two opposites—wages and starvation—raising starvation wages into a permanent institution, even into a prop of the present social system.

Patriarchal Society

Excerpt from Jenk's "Short History of Politics"

[At the close of the excerpt in last issue, on the above stage of social development, Prof. Jenk stated his view, that the domestication of animals converted the savage pack into the patriarchal tribe; and the adoption of agriculture broke up the tribe into clans. The excerpt this issue, contains his account of wherein patriarchal society has qualities which distinguished it from modern society.]

PATRIARCHAL Society is distinguished from modern society by four leading qualities.

Personal Union. 1. It is personal not territorial. Although as has been said the basis of modern society is military allegiance, (A reading of the context will show that he is speaking of the political superstructure considered apart from the economic base. On page 2 he speaks of military allegiance as the tie which binds communities of the modern type together. Edit.) the great factor that determines that allegiance is residence in a fixed area. Doubtless, for certain purposes, a citizen of State A may reside in the territory of State B; yet he is looked upon as an alien, and he takes no part in the political life of State B. On the other hand, if a man qualifies as a citizen of a State by residence, we ask no questions of his blood or race. "Everyone born in

Industry and the Guild

From Jenks "History of Politics"

(Continued from Last Issue.)

THE Guild. It is totally contrary to the ideas of primitive man to live as an individual, isolated and unprotected, in a large society. Pastoral pursuits developed the tribe, with its strong blood bond, its mutual protection of its members by the blood feud, and its ancestor worship. Agriculture led to the existence of the clan, with its strongly organized family system, its elaborate arrangements of land occupation, (equality of holdings and intermixed plots, etc. Edit.) and its reciprocal duties of protection and service between chief and followers. Just in the same way, the appearance of industrial pursuits produced the guild. The craftsman, finding himself in a strange place, cut off from his own kindred, formed with his fellows an association resembling as closely as possible the association of kindred which he had left behind him. Perhaps at first it was merely a peace-association, a frith-gild as the Saxons called it; then it took on a religious character, doubtless in imitation of the old ancestor worship of the clan. The medieval guild always had its patron saint; and if its members did not really believe themselves to be descended from their patron saint, they often spoke as if they did. Finally, the guild became more industrial in character; busying itself more and more with such matters as the regulation of work and prices, the inspection of workshops, the fixing of measures and qualities, the exclusion of strangers, and so on. But, the

more we study the guild, the more we see its likeness to the old clan. Like the clan, it was strongly hereditary. The best title to admission to the full privileges of a guild was the fact that the applicant's father was, or had been a member. Failing birth, apprenticeship was the only alternative. But apprenticeship is very like adoption. In the days of guilds, the apprentice lived in his master's house, fed at his master's table, shared in his worship, was clothed and taught by him, just like a son. Just as the member of a clan took the name of the founder, and put before it or after it some sound which indicated "son of," so the member of the guild called himself by the name of his craft. While the clansman called himself "Mac-Dowell," or "Billing" or "ap Tudor" or "Benhadad," the craftsman called himself "Smith," "Turner," "Carpenter," and so on. In fact, it is said by some competent observers, that the Indian caste system is merely an elaboration of hereditary craft-guilds. Moreover, the guild in later days provided schools and orphanages for the children of its members, attended their funerals, provided masses for their souls, spoke of its members as "brethren," had an "elder man" (Ealdorman) for chief, settled disputes among its members, and forbade its members to compete with one another, just as a well-conducted association of kinsmen would do. Finally, on its strongly developed social side in its frequent drinkings, feasting and merry-makings, the medieval guild strongly resembled a great family group.

France is a Frenchman," says the Code Napoleon; and, broadly speaking, that is the rule in civilized countries at the present day. But patriarchal society cares nothing for residence or locality. To be a member of a particular group, a man must be of the blood of that group. If he is not, he may pass his whole life in its service, but he will not be a member. In fact, the whole group itself may move its quarters at any time, without affecting its constitution in any way. At least, this is so in the earlier stages of patriarchal society.

Exclusiveness. 2. It is exclusive. Modern society believes in large numbers. In spite of certain grumblings about "immigrant aliens," modern States are really anxious to increase their numbers as much as possible, because they know that an increase in numbers means an increase in wealth and of fighting power. To a community in the patriarchal stage, an Immigration Bureau would appear to be a monstrosity. To its members the immigrant is simply a thief, who comes to stint the pasture and the corn land; a heathen, who will introduce strange customs and worships. If he is admitted, he is admitted only as a serf or slave.

Communal Character. 3. It is communal. In a modern State, the supreme authority deals directly with each individual. Of course there are intermediate authorities, but they act only as subordinates or delegates of the supreme power, which can set them aside. But, in patriarchal society, each man is a member of a small group, which is itself a mem-

ber of a larger group, and so on. And each man is responsible only to the head of his immediate group—the son, wife, or slave to the housefather, the housefather to the head of his clan, the head of the clan to the tribal chief.

No Competition. 4. It is non-competitive. We are accustomed to a state of society in which each man works at what he thinks best, and in the way he thinks best. Subject to certain laws, mostly of a police character, each man "does as he likes." If a farmer thinks he can get a better crop by sowing earlier than his neighbors, he does so. If a carpenter thinks he can make a better box by using nails where screws have hitherto been employed, he does so. If a draper thinks he can attract customers by selling tea, he does so. But patriarchal society would have looked on such practices with horror. Its life was regulated by fixed custom, to deviate from which was impiety. In patriarchal society, everyone found his duties in life prescribed for him; and not only his duties, but the way in which he should perform them. Any deviation from customary rules was looked upon with disfavor.

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

Propaganda Meeting, at Empress Theatre, corner Gore Avenue and Hastings street, Sunday, 8 p.m. Doors open at 7:30 p.m.

Articles are desired on the Socialist Philosophy or on current events interpreted in the light of its principles.