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INTRODUCTION.

Socialism to a certain extent must inevitably bear the mark of the time and country in which it is evolving. Behind and around this, however, is its primarily cosmopolitan nature. Due to this fact of its international character, that it is a movement of the world's proletariat, a pamphlet like the following will contain matter of interest for all socialists.

The entire work consists of two articles, the first of which was prepared in 1875, the second in 1894. Viewed historically, the opening article gives an excellent idea of socialist philosophy at that time. The fundamental principles of socialism are set forth with great clearness and a study of it cannot help but strengthen the sense of the certainty of those doctrines that have endured the attacks of a century.

Some few minor points will be noticed in which the position then taken differs from that of the German movement of to-day.

These are mostly attributable to the influence of Lassalle and will be seen to disappear in the second article, where the reasons for their acceptance at that time and their later rejection are explained.

The final article is a powerful summing up of the argument for socialism, with an exposition of its present philosophy, principles and tactics.

A few passages of local interest only have been omitted in the translation.

The translation of the Erfurt programme is taken from Dr. R. T. Ely's "Socialism and Social Reform"
and is his adaptation of the translation to be found in the "Blue Book," giving the report of the Royal Commission on Labor in Germany, published in London, 1893.

The author, Wilhelm Liebknecht, born in 1826, was a student of the Universities of Giessen, Marburg and Berlin. He early became identified with the German labor movement and in 1850 lived an exile with Marx in London for seeking to unite the labor unions on a socialist basis.

On his return he was made editor of the party organ which eventually grew into the Vorwärts. At the outbreak of the Franco-German war, 1870-71, both he and Bebel wrote and spoke fearlessly against the iniquity of the struggle and pointed out to the German and French workingmen that there was no quarrel between them. For this they were arrested and sentenced to two years' imprisonment in the fortress of Hubertusburg.

On his release Liebknecht, now editor of the Vorwärts, became instrumental in bringing about a union between the Lassallians and Eisenachers on the basis of the Gotha platform adopted in 1875.

During the twelve years from 1878 to 1890 Liebknecht was the most powerful instrument that helped to foil the anti-socialist legislation of Bismarck.

Since this time his history as a leader in the German parliament is well known to the reading public.

In his entire career it can be said of him that "he would sacrifice no principle for the sake of personal gain or advancement." He is satisfied with the merest necessities of life, so long as he can serve his cause.
SOCIALISM.

First of all, a few remarks concerning the name of our party. It is called the social democratic or socialist labor party. Our banner is that of social democracy, or socialism. Social democratic and social democracy signify more than democratic and democracy. Democracy, means, first, a government by the people; second, the society that is the outgrowth of such a government. Democratic demands are those which are sought through the sovereignty of the people.

The word democracy, derived from the Greek, is frequently translated “rule of the people.” This is not, however, wholly correct. At any rate it does not correspond with the logical conception of the idea of democracy. The “people” is composed of all the members of the state, and the whole cannot rule, since there is no one outside them to be ruled. A ruler necessarily presupposes a subject. Where there is no one to be ruled, because all have a part in the governing, there is, as a matter of course, no domination.

It is by all means a reasonable demand that all subjects of the state, minors naturally excluded, should have an equal part in the rule of the state, and, further, it cannot be denied that the carrying out of such a system would bring about the destruction of social misery.

Why not, then, retain the name democracy, which has a history? Just because it has a history. Since the rise of modern industrial society with the opposition of classes and class struggle, the banner of democracy has been made use of many times to veil the eyes of the
people to the chasm that yawns between the divided classes of society. Yes, we have lived to see the enemy of the working people fight them under the flag of democracy. Even in the mouth of those democrats who honestly wish the rule of the people the word democracy has an essentially narrowed sense, covering only the political and governmental sphere. It is this illogical conception, however, which exists at present, and the name democracy cannot therefore satisfy a party which really strives for the rule of the people, but has also perceived that the governing is not the end but the means, that the end of the state is to secure to all its subjects the highest possible sum of well-being and that this end can be realized only through a just regulation of the necessary social labor.

In a word, social democracy, social democratic, expresses this view. Social signifies association (gesellschaftlich), that is referring to society. Social democracy means the rule of the people in the province of the social relations of men as well as in that of politics, the just, wise, dignifying arrangement of state and society. Socialism is the science of society, the science of the irrational regulation of it at present and of the reasonable order to be brought about through us; socialistic, in relation to this science, means developing in that sense; a socialist, one who seeks to reorganize society according to the principles of socialism—so that socialistic and socialist in the essentials mean the same as social democratic and social democrat.

We call ourselves the labor party because the vital interest and the strength of numbers of the working class alone have the power to establish the order aimed at by socialism. And mark well, under working people we do not understand merely the hand workers, but every one who does not live on the labor of another.
Besides the city and country laborers must be included also the small farmers and traders who groan under the burden of capital, even as the laborers proper. Yes; in many cases yet more. There are hundreds of thousands of small masters who are obliged on Saturday to run about for hours in order to borrow the week's pay for their workers and who are happy if their profit is equal to the wages of a factory laborer.

Now to that which we propose to do.

From May 22 to 27, 1875, delegates (127 in number) from the whole democratic body of Germany, met in Gotha and accepted unanimously, after mature deliberation, the following programme:

I. Labor is the source of all wealth and all culture, and since universal productive labor is possible only through society, therefore to society, that is to all its members, belongs the collective product of labor. With the universal obligation to labor, according to equal justice, each should have in proportion to his reasonable needs.

In the present society the means of labor are the monopoly of the capitalist class; the servitude of the laboring class, which is the outgrowth of this, is the cause of misery and of slavery in all forms.

The liberation of labor demands the transformation of the means of production into the common property of society and the associative regulation of the collective labor with general employment and just distribution of the proceeds of labor.

The emancipation of labor must be the work of the laboring class, opposed to which all other classes are only a reactionary body.

II. Proceeding from this principle the socialist labor party of Germany seeks through all legal means the free state and the socialist society, the destruction of the iron law of wages, the overthrow of exploitation in all forms and the abolition of all social and political inequality.

The socialist labor party of Germany, though work-
ing chiefly in national boundaries, is conscious of the international character of the labor movement and is resolved to fulfill every duty which is laid on the workers in order to realize the brotherhood of humanity.

The socialist labor party of Germany demands as a step to the solution of the social question the erection, with the help of the state, of socialistic productive establishments under the democratic control of the laboring people. These productive establishments are to place industry and agriculture in such relations that out of them the socialist organization of the whole may arise.

The socialist labor party of Germany demands as the foundation of the state:

I. Universal, equal and direct suffrage, with secret, obligatory voting by all citizens at all elections in state or community.

II. Direct legislation by the people. Decision as to peace or war by the people.

III. Common right to bear arms. Militia instead of the standing army.

IV. Abolition of all laws of exception, especially all laws restricting the freedom of the press, of association and assemblage; above all, all laws restricting the freedom of public opinion, thought and investigation.

V. Legal judgment through the people. Gratu- itous administration of law.

VI. Universal and equal popular education by the state. Universal compulsory education. Free instruction in all forms of art. Declaration that religion is a private matter.

The socialist labor party of Germany demands within the present society:

I. The widest possible expansion of political rights and freedom according to the foregoing demands.

II. A progressive income tax for state and municipality instead of all those existing, especially in place of the indirect tax which burdens the people.

III. Unrestrained right of combination.

IV. Shortening of the working day according to the needs of society. Abolition of Sunday labor.

V. Abolition of child labor and all female labor injurious to health and morality.
VI. Protective laws for the life and health of the worker. Sanitary control of the homes of the workers. Supervision of the mines, factories, workshops and hand industries by an officer elected by the people. An effective law of enforcement.

VII. Regulation of prison labor.

VIII. Full autonomy in the management of all laborers' fraternal and mutual benefit funds.

Who that honestly wishes the welfare of his fellow-men can refuse his consent to this programme? Who that is not satisfied with his own slavery and exploitation or not interested in that of his fellow-men can deny that the fulfillment of this programme would be a blessing to the world?

Let us examine the state and society as they are. All power and means of life are to be found in the hands of a small minority, and this minority naturally use their power to secure and maintain that monopoly of all advantages which domination in state and society gives, and to prevent the subject majority obtaining political and social rights.

Who exercises the political power? A scanty minority whom birth and wealth have made a privileged class. The great majority of the people are absolutely helpless, and, because helpless, also without rights, for a right to which the power of enforcement is not attached is only a picture, a play, a misleading fantasy. What meaning, for example, has the right to choose a legislative representative who can only speak but cannot exercise the slightest influence on the government of the land? The governing minority rules for itself, not for the subject majority. Between rulers and ruled there exist as little community of interest as between the plantation owner and the negro slave. The interest of the negro does not come in question for the plantation owner; his own interest is determinative for him and he handles the negro as his interest demands.
Just so in the present state. The interest of the people does not come in question, but exclusively the interest of the ruling minority.

To make the interests of the ruled subservient to the interests of the rulers is the foundation and purpose of rule is the meaning of ruling. So long as there are rulers and ruled it must be so, for rule is by its very nature exploitation. It follows therefrom that the interests of the subject people demand the transformation of the state from its foundation, according to their interest. It must cease to be the possession of a few persons of position and class and must become the possession of citizens with full and equal rights, of whom no one rules over the other, and none will be ruled by another.

For this the social democracy strives. In place of the present class rule we will institute a free government of the people.

The clear statement of our party programme stamps as a slander the assertion of our opponents that socialism will secure the ruling power in the state for the laboring class. We have already said that the idea of mastery is above all undemocratic and consequently in opposition to the principles of socialism. All demands for liberty made by democracy are likewise demands of the social democracy. The difference between democratic and social democratic is that the latter sees the consequences which the former, entangled in civil prejudices, has not the courage to see. Social democracy is consequently actual democracy.

It will bring into existence an organization of the state and society, which, resting on the equality of all men, will choke the source of inequality, will tolerate neither ruler nor servant and will found a fraternal community of free men. In order to make this
possible the present manner of production must be brought to an end. The economic basis of society—that is, the system of wage labor—must be transformed.

The mother of all social wealth, of all culture, is labor. Whatever we are and have, we are and have through labor. We have labor to thank for everything. Not our personal labor, at least only to an inconsiderable degree, but the general social labor. It is very possible indeed—and we see it frequently enough—to enjoy the blessings of culture without personal work; but it is also absolutely impossible for the most industrious and efficient worker with the most strenuous toil to live as men of culture live without the general social labor that first created culture and without which we were beasts, not men. From this we see the communistic nature of labor, its essentially associative character, on which all state and society rests. Labor has always had this communistic character, with the ancient slave and the vassal of the middle ages as well as with the modern wage-earner. But he did not have the product of his labor, nor has he it yet. The ancient slave worked for his master, the mediæval vassal for the lord of the manor, and the modern wage slave works for the capitalist. Here is the inconsistency, here the injustice to remedy which is the object of the social democracy. The social communistic character of labor must be extended to the product of labor, the product of labor shall be the property of labor, labor no longer be the companion of misery but of enjoyment.

One can see how absurd the allegation is that we propose to abolish property. Not the abolition of property is sought but the abolition of the deprivation of property, the false property which is the appropriation of others' property; the social thievery. "Expropria-
tion of the expropriator,” Marx has called it. Above all, those who call themselves Christians have no right to cry out against this “division,” for the New Testament preaches communism in the roughest, most primitive form, and the first Christian communities that had yet the “whole pure teachings” carried out “division” with the greatest thoroughness.

Let us look at present conditions. Who will deny that the majority of mankind live in the greatest wretchedness and that only a minority have the means of attaining an existence worthy of human beings? We would refer the doubter to the statistics whose figures admit of no reply and can be ignored only by the ignorant or the evil disposed.

The economic inequality is not, however, the worst thing. Labor creates all wealth, and were those who do not work poor this inequality would have a certain justification; in reality the situation is turned about. As the bourgeois political economist, John Stuart Mill, who is honored as an authority by our opponents, has explained with keen insight, in our present society goods are proportioned in inverse ratio to the heavi ness of the labor performed. He who works the hardest generally has the least; he who does not work at all and can have others working either directly or indirectly for him has much. Poverty is the share of labor, riches the portion of the idle. The workers who have created the so-called national wealth are shut out from it. It is the monopoly of the non-workers. In this way the inequality becomes the most revolting injustice. And this injustice is a scar on our famed civilization, that every one who has a spark of the sense of justice must strive to clear away. Palliative measures that merely touch the surface merely reduce the symptoms, make the evil worse; this must
be seized and torn out by the root. All wealth is the fruit of labor, teaches political economy—labor shall reap the fruit of labor, demands justice, demands socialism. The present inequality springs from this: That labor does not work for itself; that it must sell itself to the idle for wages and by them be exploited. In a word, it springs out of the system of wage labor. The present injustice is only to be abolished in this way, that labor cease to work for the idle and that instead it work for itself.

Individual labor is unproductive. Work, as we have seen, must according to its nature be communistic. Therefore we must have united labor for the advantage of every individual, united labor and united enjoyment of the fruits of labor. This it is which we would establish in place of the present system of exploitation. Socialistic co-operation in place of wage labor!

But what becomes of capital?

It remains where it belongs, with labor. There is no capital but through labor. There shall be no capital except for labor. It has been asserted by charlatans that capital creates value as well as labor—the test can be easily made. The worshiper of capital may sweep together in a heap his capital, he may gather all the capital of the earth, and after the space of a year there would not have grown a penny more of value from it, but indeed the worth of the idle mass would be considerably decreased. Capital is not merely the child of labor; it cannot grow or continue without it. Capital has in relation to labor no rights, while labor in relation to capital has the right of ownership.

The tyrannous manner of production has overturned the natural relation between capital and labor and made labor the slave of capital. Is our wage-labor not slavery? Is the modern wage-laborer, because he can
change his master, in any regard more free than the ancient slave? Does not hunger fasten him more firmly and more mercilessly to labor than the strongest iron chain? Yet our opponents often rejoin: “The worker is in a better condition to-day than in the last century.” Whether the assertion is true or false we leave undebated. Even if true, it would prove nothing. It is not better position the socialist worker demands, but equal position. He will work no longer for another; he insists that each shall enjoy in equal measure the fruits of labor and the blessings of culture. He has enough logic and sense of justice to lay no claim to a favored place; he will also, however, accept no inferior one.

The continuance of the present manner of production is not consistent with the continuance of society. The great capitalist production was an advance. It has, however, become an obstruction. It no longer satisfies the economic needs of society, and by society we mean not the small minority of privileged persons who are pleased to call themselves “society,” but the whole people.

Wholly aside from the unjust distribution of the products of labor, capitalist production is incapable of providing all members of society with the things requisite to an existence worthy of mankind and must be displaced by a higher form of production which fulfills these conditions. And this is possible only through communistic, social production, and the socialist organization of labor which turns the concentrated capital of the community to the advantage of society.

It is an error which arises from the confusing of society with the privileged minority, that is with the ruling classes, that we are charged with the intention of overthrowing all existing things and proceeding
tabula rasa to erect a fantastic structure upon the ruins. We only wish to remove whatever hinders the sound, intelligent development of society and to bring about a condition in which the interests of the great majority shall no longer be sacrificed to those of the minority. And instead of privileged individuals, instead of political social monopolies, we would establish the rights and interests of all and justice as the highest law of state and society. Whatever has outlived itself and no longer satisfies the growing cultured needs of society shall cease to withhold air and sun from the struggling new life. We will make possible the organic evolution of our culture that is prevented by the present class rule.

Whoever would propose to-day to abolish machinery in order to re-establish the small industry of mediæval times would be considered insane, for every one knows that the small industry has been succeeded by a higher, more productive method, the great industry. Whoever in the middle ages, however, or even the first half of the present century, had said that the system of small industries was too costly, too unproductive, and must be wiped from the earth through an industrial revolution that should bring another system of production to the ruling position, would have been considered as—well, much as the fanatics of the present social order, or, more properly, disorder, consider us.

Whoever in fifty years from now should recommend the introduction of our present conditions would be in danger of making the acquaintance of the insane asylum. And we who demand the reform of these present conditions are slandered and persecuted. Yet it is just as certain and just as necessary as the present manner of production should be supplanted by a higher, as that the mediæval manner of production should be supplanted by the present one. It is not we who are
Utopians, impracticable dreamers, as they so gladly call us. Those are rather to be so called who hold outgrown forms to be eternal and believe that they can prevent them from destruction through forcible measures.

We set up no especial principles according to which the movement shall model itself. Our theoretical propositions rest in no way upon "ideas" or "principles" that this or that reformer has "discovered." They are only universal expressions of actual relations of an existing class struggle—of an historical movement going on before our eyes.

After this explanation no one will fail to understand the first part (I. and II.) of our programme. The truth of the statement that the economic dependence of the laboring class on capital is the cause of misery and servitude in all forms (especially of political slavery) may be proven by means of a simple example. Having taken for granted that all political freedom, equal universal suffrage, freedom of the press, right to unite and convene, etc., should be guaranteed to all persons, allow the system of capitalistic production and of wage labor to remain—what would be the consequence? Inequality; the misery of the masses and the disproportionate wealth of the few would continue. The laboring majority of the people would be economically dependent upon the propertied minority, and this economic dependence would make all political freedom purely illusory and rob it of its practical worth.

Have we not learned to our satisfaction, by experience at the Reichstag's elections, that the oppression which the capitalist exercises on his wage-slave is stronger than that exercised by the most reactionary state?

Let us suppose a different case. Political freedom
is withheld from the people, but labor, on the other hand, is set free in the manner in which we demand it should be—that is, through socialistic production and distribution of the product of labor, the full proceeds of his work being assured to every laborer as far as the interests of society allow—what would be the result? The ruling minority would lose its means of power, which has its roots exclusively in the present manner of production and the exploitation of labor through capital. Economic independence would very soon bring the mass of the people into a position to gain their political independence also. This case can no more exist in reality, however, than the other, for the social question is inseparable from the political, and a reasonably organized society is thinkable only in a free state.

On whom does the iron yoke of the present class state not rest, oppressing and dishonoring? What do the people count for to-day? A prince covets his neighbor's land. The people beg in vain for freedom. The wishes and the happiness of a million on one side of the balance, the will and caprice of one on the other, and light as a feather the scale rises with the wishes, happiness and well-being of a million. The fury of war is unchained, thousands are plunged into death and hundreds of thousands into misery. Should this be so? The social democracy insists that no war be carried on except in vindication of the freedom and rights of the people. They wish, therefore, the POWER to declare war—for here we cannot speak of a right—to belong to the people and their deputies.

The strongest part of the nation, the men in the bloom of life, are torn away from their occupation for years, withdrawn from useful productive labor, placed in the standing army and drilled to blind obedience.

What is the outcome? War upon war, by means of
which all violent passions are unchained and all good customs are shaken to their very foundations. Shall this continue? Socialism provides that the standing army, this means of subjugation and conquest, be disbanded, and that it be replaced, so long as the possibility of war exists, by an army of the people. Each citizen, from his youth, shall be exercised in the use of arms and become qualified for military action. If every citizen is a soldier then every soldier is a citizen, and no tyrant will ever be in a position to offer violence to the people.

At present education is the privilege of a few, and for this few it is not a training for humanity but a preparation to exercise class rule. The great majority of the population receive only a shamefully perverted and insufficient education and are systematically hindered in the development of their talents, since an educated people, a truly well-bred, cultured people, would not bear patiently the present tyrannous political and social condition. For education, true education—not the systematic perversion and doggish breaking-in that to-day is pleased to boast the name of education—is the mother of freedom, justice and equality, and therefore not consistent with the existence of the present class state. Social democracy would provide the highest possible education for each and all, free instruction in the best possible common and high schools (polytechnical, professional and grammar schools, academies and universities). It proceeds from the position that it is the end of the state to care for the physical and spiritual welfare of its members. The socialistic state is therefore in its foundation a great universal educational institution.

In the present class state justice is a mockery of the name. Justice means literally rightness. But how can
there be talk of justice in the midst of conditions which in whole and in part, in their nature and in their appearance, strike the smallest demand of justice in the face? Only hypocrisy or thoughtless inconsistency can find that punishable in an individual which either is a recognized practice and moral in the state and society, or is the necessary result of the neglect of duty by the state (defective education) and the wrong social organization (poverty). The present fundamental injustice of the state and society at once stamp what is called justice as injustice (ungerechtigkeit). Is this right? Socialism insists that justice shall become rightness; and it creates the essential preliminary condition for this in the free democratic state for which it strives.

As the right to make and carry out the laws belongs to the people, so likewise they have the right to administer the law.

The giving of judgment and also legislation, rule and administration must be taken from the hands of privileged persons, positions and classes, who sacrifice the general justice and interest to their own peculiar interest. Until an intelligent natural organization of the state and society has removed the cause of the so-called crimes and misdeeds, which in reality, when not arising from physical sickness, are only social illness, socialism demands the popular court (civil and criminal so far as possible) and free administration of justice. The popular court which we insist on is as different from the present jury as the present state is different from the people’s state. The jury shall not be the monopoly of the propertied class, not the stage setting for the performance of a shameful farce on justice—class justice, where the deputies of the propertied class sit in judgment over those of the disinherited people and hide their class hatred and interests under the toga of law.
No; the jurors shall be chosen by free universal election out of the body of the people in order that it be in truth a tribunal of the people.

In a municipality, which is a state within a state, the subordination of the subject majority to the special interests of the ruling minority stands out more plainly than in a great state, since ruler and ruled, physically nearer, are in direct personal contact with each other.

The ruling minority tax, according to their desire, the subject majority, burden them with the principal weight of taxation, turn the proceeds to their own profit and throw down at most only the crumbs to "the wretched tax-paying plebs." From the sweat of labor they erect advanced academies for the children of the wealthy, from which the children of the poor are shut out. In order to indulge to their satisfaction they build theaters, whose entrance price frightens the worker at the threshold, but to be sure this is no great disadvantage to him, since the modern theater (exceptions confirm the rule) does service only to the most corrupt taste, for it has become degraded to a refined brothel by the ruling class. In short, the ruling minority proceed in the city after the self-same egotistic, pernicious principle as in the state. This must be remedied. The social democracy demands, therefore, as for the state so for the municipality, universal, equal, free and direct suffrage, complete privilege and equalization, as for the citizen of the state so for the inhabitant of the city—a free community in a free state.

In order, however, to make the state and community what they should be—that is to say, an association of free and equal men, who in brotherly solidarity and fraternal co-operation, "each for all and all for each," strive for the highest possible spiritual and physical well-being of every individual—it is essential that the
economic foundation of the present society be altered, for on it rest the present state and city whose abuse and injustice are the necessary consequence of the social and economic abuse and injustice.

What sort of picture does present society offer?

War and right of force rule between the people, between classes and between individual men. Through capitalistic production there is war between bourgeoisie and worker; through competition bourgeoisie is in strife with bourgeoisie, the laborer with the laborer. Socialism would set permanently a limit to this war of all against all. It insists on peace between men, peace between nations, peace between classes. No peace, however, is to be hoped for so long as the cause remains which gives rise to the conditions of war.

The cause is the present class rule, with its wage slavery, business frauds, its deceit in all lines of traffic, its adulteration of all physical and spiritual necessities of life, its strikes and lockouts, the murder of the laborers in a mass through hunger, infected dwellings and workrooms.

On the basis of the wage system towers the giant structure of present social and political institutions for the subjugation and exploitation of the laboring people—the Castle of Uri of the proletariat, the gloomy bastile of the class state, which has taken prisoner the bulk of the people, killed thought, broken and destroyed character and directed its cannon threateningly upon every one who did not bow himself in the dust before the ruling injustice.

The wage system must be done away with if peace, order, freedom and justice are to count for anything in the state and society. Thanks to this wage system and the monopolization of the instruments of labor (tools, machines, land, mines, railroads, etc.) by the minority,
labor, which creates all value and wealth, is condemned to poverty and slavery. The employer enriches himself through the labor of his wage slaves, to whom he pays in the form of wages only a part of the proceeds of their work; the unpaid remainder he puts in his pocket as "profit"—a robbery which differs from the usual robbery only in this, that he is not punished by the present class laws. Or is there, forsooth, an essential difference between the employer who withholds from his laborers a part of the product of their labor and himself appropriates this part, and the "humane" highway robber who satisfies himself with relieving the traveler, through the logic of a drawn pistol, of only a part of his goods, but who before the law is not, therefore, less a highway robber?

The present manner of production, resting on the basis of the wage system, has as a result on the one hand the accumulation of property in the hands of a few and the corruption of these few as a result of excessive possessions; on the other hand, there is impoverishment of the masses and pauperism. The worker, in the midst of the riches which he has created, cannot satisfy his smallest necessity; privation, unhealthful workshops and factories steal his life strength, as the employer steals from him the proceeds of his labor; lingering sickness and an early death await him. He has no family life, for, since his wages do not suffice for existence, wife and child must follow him into the factory. For the budding daughter he has the prospect of the short, glittering misery of prostitution, or the long, leaden, sunless misery of the life of a proletariat's wife.

Who that groans under the pressure of these conditions unworthy of mankind will not unite with us in the call: "Down with the wage system!"

"Down with the wage system!" That is the funda-
mental demand of social democracy—the Alpha and Omega of our agitation. Co-operative labor and association shall take the place of the wage system with its class rule.

The instruments of production must cease to be the monopoly of a class—they must be the public property of all. There shall be no more exploiter or exploited. Production and distribution of the produce must be regulated in the interest of the whole. As the present production, exploitation and robbery must be abolished, so likewise must the present traffic, which is only fraud.

In the order of equality the worker will perform all the labor necessary for the whole body of citizens. In place of the employer and his humble subservient or rebellious wage slaves there will be free comrades. Labor will be the torture of no one, but the duty of all. An existence worthy of a human being will be provided for every one who performs his duty to society. Hunger will become henceforth not the curse of labor but the punishment of the idle.

And in order that this may be realized the people's state must exist—the state composed of all and for all, the state, which consists of the wise and just organization of society, the universal guaranteed establishment of happiness and culture, and the fraternal association of free and equal men.

After what has been said it is superfluous to go through one by one the demands arranged in the two parts of our programme. They are very plain to every one who is half-way educated and capable of thought. As with every party and class that ever opposed the ruling abuses and took for their object the removal of those abuses, so it is with the social democracy. It is slandered and abused by the selfish and deluded adherents of the maladjusted state and society; it brings
disorder, class strife, destruction of property, ruin of the family and of culture, most sensual enjoyment, the deepest degradation of woman. The truth could not be more completely and shamefully perverted. The old society throws its crimes at us, for on their account we have condemned it to death.

Disorder rules; socialism demands order.

War and class struggle prevail; socialism insists on peace and harmony of interests, doing away with class struggle through the abolition of classes.

Property is to-day a lie for the majority of men, a robbery for the minority. Socialism would make property the possession of every one. It would convert it into a truth, secure to the worker within society the full proceeds of his labor and destroy the capitalistic system of plunder from its foundation.

The present society separates the family—socialism, since it removes demoralizing class rule, will give value to the rights of the family.

State and society compete with each other to nip in the bud the culture of men, to stunt spiritually and physically the enormous majority of the people and to corrupt the ruling minority—socialism insists on equal and the best possible training for every individual; the systematic advance of art and science, and will make art and science the common possession of the people.

Thanks to the wrong conditions of society and the state, woman is to-day without rights and in countless cases is condemned to wedded or unwedded prostitution. The intercourse of the sexes is unnatural and immoral—socialism will bring the emancipation of woman as well as of man. It insists on her complete political and social equality and equal position with man. It will destroy prostitution, whether it walk
ashamed under the mantle of marriage for wealth or convenience, or whether it run shameless painted and naked upon the street.

Enough. Beginning with real conditions; not following Utopian will-o'-the-wisps, but building on the acquisition of culture, we strive for the abolition of the class state, classes legislation and class rule.

Our end is: The free democracy with equal economic and political rights; the free society with associative labor. The welfare of all is for us the one end of the state and society.

In order to accomplish our object we must organize ourselves. There can be no efficient propaganda or action without organization. Unified organization is the accumulation of strength, its gathering into a focus. Isolation makes each one powerless; divided strength is no strength. Union not only adds to strength but multiplies it many fold.

The economic and, accordingly also, the political conditions are essentially the same in all civilized lands. No state in the present day is shut off from the others by a Chinese wall. Notwithstanding the artificial boundaries, all civilized nations have a common evolution and a common history. Every land affects all others and is affected by them. All parties are, therefore, to-day more or less international. And ours is so in a greater measure than all other parties, since it does not recognize national boundaries, and, standing on the position of pure humanity, adhering in all to strictly human measures, sees in the members of the divided nationalities only men and brothers.

Although we have the nearest direct sphere of our activity in the state of which we are citizens, nevertheless we do not forget the citizens of the world and the universal brotherhood of man. And we know wherever
there is a struggle for the cause of labor and the oppressed people there our cause is at stake.

We seek justice and fight injustice.

We seek free labor and attack wage-slavery.

We seek the prosperity of all and struggle against misery.

We seek the education of all and fight ignorance and barbarism.

We seek peace and order and combat the murder of people, the class war and the social anarchy.

We seek the socialist people's state and attack the despotic class state.

Whoever desires these things, and struggle for them, let him unite with us and work with all his strength for our cause—for the cause of socialism—for the cause of humanity, whose victory will soon be gained.

PART II.

The Erfurter convention of Oct. 20, 1891, formulated the principles of our party into the following strong scientific form:

The economic development of industrial society tends inevitably to the ruin of small industries which are based upon the workman's private ownership of the means of production. It separates him from this means of production and converts him into a destitute member of the proletariat, whilst a comparatively small number of capitalists and great land-owners obtain a monopoly of the means of production.

Hand in hand with this growing monopoly goes the crushing out of existence of these shattered small industries by industries of colossal growth, the development of the tool into the machine, and a gigantic increase in the productiveness of human labor. But all the advantages of this revolution are monopolized by the capi-
talists and great land-owners. To the proletariat and the rapidly sinking middle classes, the small tradesmen of the towns and the peasant proprietors (Bauern), it brings an increasing uncertainty of existence, increasing misery, oppression, servitude, degradation and exploitation (Ausbeutung).

Ever greater grows the mass of the proletariat, ever vaster the army of the unemployed, ever sharper the contrast between oppressors and oppressed, ever fiercer that war of classes between bourgeoisie and proletariat which divides modern society into two hostile camps and is the common characteristic of every industrial country. The gulf between the propertied classes and the destitute is widened by the crisis arising from capitalist production, which becomes daily more comprehensive and omnipotent, which makes universal uncertainty the normal condition of society, and which furnishes a proof that the forces of production have outgrown the existing social order, and that private ownership of the means of production has become incompatible with their full development and their proper application.

Private ownership of the means of production, formerly the means of securing his product to the producer, has now become the means of expropriating the peasant proprietors, the artisans and the small tradesmen, and placing the non-producers, the capitalists and large land-owners in possession of the products of labor. Nothing but the conversion of capitalist private ownership of the means of production—the earth and its fruits, mines and quarries, raw material, tools and machines, means of exchange—into social ownership, and the substitution of socialist production, carried on by and for society in the place of the present production of commodities for exchange, can effect such a revolution that, instead of the large industries and the steadily growing capacities of common production being, as hitherto, a source of misery and oppression to the classes whom they have despoiled, and they may become a source of the highest well-being and of the most perfect and comprehensive harmony.
This social revolution involves the emancipation not merely of the proletariat but of the whole human race, which is suffering under existing conditions. But this emancipation can be achieved by the working class alone, because all other classes, in spite of their mutual strife of interests, take their stand upon the principle of private ownership of the means of production and have a common interest in maintaining the existing social order.

The struggle of the working classes against capitalist exploitation must of necessity be a political struggle. The working classes can neither carry on their economic struggle nor develop their economic organization without political rights. They cannot effect the transfer of the means of production to the community without being first invested with political power.

It must be the aim of socialism to give conscious unanimity to this struggle of the working classes and to indicate the inevitable goal.

The interests of the working classes are identical in all lands governed by capitalist methods of production. The extension of the world's commerce and production for the world's markets make the position of the workman in any one country daily more dependent upon that of the workman in other countries.

Therefore the emancipation of labor is a task in which the workmen of all civilized lands have a share. Recognizing this, the social democrats of Germany feel and declare themselves at one with the workingmen of every land who are conscious of the destinies of their class.

The German social democrats are not, therefore, fighting for new class privileges and rights, but for the abolition of class government, and even of classes themselves, and for universal equality in rights and duties, without distinction of sex or rank. Holding these views, they are not merely fighting against the exploitation and oppression of the wage-earners in the existing social order, but against every kind of exploitation and oppression, whether directed against class, party, sex or race.
Starting from these principles, the German social democrats demand, to begin with:

I. Universal, equal and direct suffrage by ballot in all elections for all subjects of the empire over twenty years of age, without distinction of sex. Proportional representation, and, until this system has been introduced, fresh division of electoral districts by law after each census. Two years' duration of the legislature. Holding of elections on a legal day of rest. Payment of the representatives elected. Removal of all restrictions upon political rights, except in the case of persons under age.

II. Direct legislation by the people by means of the right of initiative and of veto. Self-government by the people in the empire, state, province and commune. Election of magistrates by the people, with the right of holding them responsible. Annual vote of the taxes.

III. Universal military education. Substitution of militia for a standing army. Decision by the popular representatives of questions of peace and war. Decision of all international disputes by arbitration.

IV. Abolition of all laws which restrict or suppress free expression of opinion and the right of meeting or association.

V. Abolition of all laws which place the woman, whether in a private or a public capacity, at a disadvantage as compared with the man.

VI. Declaration that religion is a private matter. Abolition of all expenditure from public funds upon ecclesiastical and religious objects. Ecclesiastical and religious bodies are to be regarded as private associations, which order their affairs independently.

VII. Secularization of education. Compulsory attendance at public national schools. Free education, free supply of educational apparatus and free maintenance to children in schools and to such pupils, male and female, in higher educational institutions, as are judged to be fitted for further education.

VIII. Free administration of the law and free legal assistance. Administration of the law by judges elected by the people. Appeal in criminal cases. Compensa-
tion to persons accused, imprisoned or condemned unjustly. Abolition of capital punishment.

IX. Free medical assistance and free supply of remedies. Free burial of the dead.

X. Graduated income and property tax to meet all public expenses which are to be met by taxation. Self-assessment. Succession duties, graduated according to the extent of the inheritance and the degree of relationship. Abolition of all indirect taxation, customs, duties and other economic measures, which sacrifice the interests of the community to the interests of a privileged minority.

For the protection of labor the German social democrats also demand to begin with:

I. An effectual national and international system of protective legislation on the following principles: (a) The fixing of a normal working day, which shall not exceed eight hours.

(b) Prohibition of the employment of children under fourteen years of age.

(c) Prohibition of night work, except in those branches of industry which, from their nature and for technical reasons, or for reasons of public welfare, require night work.

(d) An unbroken rest of at least thirty-six (36) hours for every workingman every week.

II. Supervision of all industrial establishments, together with the investigation and regulation of the conditions of labor in the town and country by an imperial labor department, district labor bureaus and chambers of labor. A thorough system of industrial sanitary regulation.

III. Legal equality of agricultural laborers and domestic servants with industrial laborers. Repeal of the laws concerning masters and servants.

IV. Confirmation of the rights of association.

V. The taking over by the imperial government of the whole system of workmen's insurance, though giving the workmen a certain share in its administration.

As an introduction to this programme, which was
unanimously adopted, Liebknecht said, according to the official minutes:

The party principles were formulated until the present time in a platform which was no longer up to date, and in its propositions and demands was in many ways defective; however, the party, in its further evolution, has kept to the true spirit, filling the old forms with new meaning.

A revision of the platform, which before the anti-socialist legislation was already necessary, could no longer be delayed, and on Oct. 16, 1890, the party drew up at Halle the following resolution:

"In consideration of the fact that the party platform agreed upon by the unanimous congress at Gotha in 1875 has so excellently stood the test in the conflict of the last fifteen years, especially under the anti-socialist legislation, but notwithstanding which, as formulated by the every party congress, is no longer in all points equal to the demands of the times, the convention resolves that: The board of directors of the party be instructed to submit at the next convention a draft of a revision of the party platform and to make this draft public at least three months before the meeting of the next convention, in order that the party have sufficient time for examination."

I shall not again refer to the debate at Halle. The review which I gave of the old programme in my exposition of it in former years found no opposition; it was proven by universal agreement, however, that the old platform, which was a compromise platform, must be replaced by a new and better one. An old platform could not be plucked to pieces and criticised and the foundation of the new one laid in a more thorough manner than has happened to this in the last year and especially in the last three and a half months since the
draft of the board of directors has been made public. The letter from Marx of March 5, 1875, published by Engels, in an essential manner gave a stimulation and lent an important contribution to this critique. I presume the contents of the letter to be known to you all; it is to be found in the Neuen Zeit and in the remaining party papers, as well as being discussed by the opposition press, and it has been debated in the most thorough manner and considered with all due regard since the draft of the new programme has been perfected.

Concerning this letter I have personally one observation to make—not in reference to its contents. The reproach has been raised by those of the opposition that the few to whom the letter was directed have conducted themselves dishonorably, in a measure, toward the party comrades, since they did not communicate the contents of the letter to the congress in 1875. Had we done so the object of that congress would have been put in danger. And the letter was a strictly confidential one, not intended for publicity.

We have already in the Vorwärts expressed ourselves concerning our position in regard to the letter of Marx relating to the platforms—in an explanation which, coming from the faction, clearly sets forth our opinion of the contents after mature consideration. At the time of the letter affairs were in this condition: The two factions of the social democracy, the Eisenacher and the Lassallian, had for years been involved in a struggle with each other. In the beginning, indeed, we believed on each side that the ends were different, that fundamental questions divided us. In the course of the fight, however, we arrived at the conclusion that for the mass of the members of both factions such questions did not exist; that even if the watchword were different, still the object, the demands and the efforts on both
sides were entirely the same. So gradually all were brought to the conviction that it was necessary to unite the two divided streams into one. Instead of wasting strength in this strife that murdered brothers, we must act together and be directed against the common enemy—this is what every one said.

And this thought stood out so strongly that on both sides, even if the leaders had put themselves in opposition to it, the body of men were not to be hindered from agreement.

A few days ago our oldest comrade, the senior of the party, Tolcke, spoke here. He recalled to mind the grievous times of the conflict. I would bring back to his memory a more pleasant event. As I sat in the editor's office one beautiful morning in Leipzig, not long after I came from imprisonment in the fortress of Hubertusburg, a man came in, who appeared not wholly unknown to me, though I could not immediately say who he was. I worked on, whereupon the man said to me: "Tolcke is here and wishes to speak to you." I arose immediately. Tolcke met me with his outstretched hand, in which I at once placed mine. It required no previous conclusion of peace. We betook ourselves to an adjoining room. "We must have peace," said Tolcke, and I answered: "Yes; we must have peace."

From that moment, for me, peace was concluded, and as about this time similar steps were taken in the north, in Hamburg, in Altona and in other places, it became evident to all of my friends in Germany that now we must unite ourselves, let come what would. A Hotspur on one side or the other sought to hinder the work of peace, but the union had to be; it was necessary for the interests of the party.

We met in conference for the purpose of acquainting ourselves with a programme for union; on this side
and that concessions were made, and at last, after long, long deliberation, we agreed upon the draft known to you, which almost unchanged was accepted by the Gotha congress.

When Marx received information of the plan he wrote this letter, which was intended for a few of us Eisenachers. We went through the letter carefully, I myself, who had lived with Marx, a comrade in struggle, his pupil, who in London had tasted the cup of exile with him, always proud to call myself his pupil and friend—I was obliged to meet the question, Is it for the interest of the party that we should go on in the manner Marx wishes? I knew at that time, as well as to-day, that what he said theoretically against the plan was correct to the last letter. Theory and practice are, however, two very different things. So, though unconditionally I relied on the judgment of Marx as to theory; in practice I went my own way. I asked myself, Is it possible to carry out now such a programme as Marx demands? After mature examination I came to this conviction, that it was not possible, and at the peril of being, for a time, at variance with Marx—whatever happened not for long—I declared: "It cannot be. Marx is dear to me, but dearer to me is the party."

Thus we accomplished the union, and all of my friends, Auer, Bracke, Geib and the others—Bebel was in imprisonment and could take no part in the proceedings—we all, had we to-day the same alternative, would to-day do the same.

And I for myself can say: I believe never in my life to have rendered the party a greater service than at that time, when I rejected the advice of my friend and teacher Marx and consented to the platform of a union. Soon Marx also perceived that his fears were ungrounded and until his death looked with pride on the united German social democracy.
The Gotha programme brought true union. It has been impossible since then to split the German social democracy. Sectarianism has not existed since, nor can it exist. A few immature and suspicious individuals have fallen off, but the labor party has remained one, and, while the fears of Marx have not been fulfilled, all that we foresaw, hoped for and prophesied has been fulfilled.

We Eisenachers, since with our programme we were more scientific at first, reached the hand to the brothers who had climbed the mountain with us but were somewhat behind, and drew them up to us. But it was not for long. Soon the Lassallians stood on the same plane with us and shared in our views.

The old demands of the Lassallians, for productive associations with state assistance, etc., were recognized as outgrown, through the development of the movement and of circumstances, even by the former Lassallians themselves, without the respect for Lassalle being destroyed; and before long every difference between the aim of the Eisenachers and the former Lassallians was done away with.

And if the spiritual, centrifugal force and the life strength of the party, which are accounted for purely through its need for culture, ever appeared great, they did during the supremacy of the anti-socialist legislation. I do not mean the conflict that for twelve years, day by day, night by night, we were obliged to fight—that struggle explains itself; we had been destroyed if we had not fought and won, for it was a matter of life—I do not mean that, but the spiritual, the intellectual activity of the party during the conflict. Throughout the incessant struggle the party along with it developed mentally.

Theory must, by all means, subside behind the re-
quirements of rough practice, and theoretical education was frequently made to suffer in the practical conflict, but through the elite of the party, that is to say the best prepared combatants—immaterial in what position and wholly the same whether a former Lassallian or Eisenacher—its scientific development and its education in scientific socialism, alike under the period of anti-socialist legislation and under the most severe conflict, has not ceased for a moment, but has made encouraging advance.

The unity of the theoretical views was demonstrated at Halle. It was a great moment when at the convention there, after it had been explained that we must break with the last remnant of Lassallianism and must elaborate a new platform adequate to present knowledge, all the delegates enthusiastically agreed and not the slightest opposition was audible.

All were at one in this, that whatever was not in keeping with the spirit of the age and whatever was opposed to science must be done away with.

I have now to speak on the principles that have guided us in this platform that lies before you. Before all things it must not be lost sight of that a platform should be written in clear and universally understood language; it must be short and correct; it must not be scientifically disputable. All of these properties, clear language, conciseness and logic, it is extremely difficult to unite. One is inclined to say more in a platform than belongs there. We must not confuse a platform with a manifesto. The latter, a bill of indictment, reflects present society, as though a mirror was held before it, as did the communist manifesto forty-three years ago.

This manifesto should, moreover, be rewritten—or rather a new one must be written and fitted to the old
one, which is an historical masterpiece of imperishable worth. And he will make himself of service to the party who after we have obtained a new platform will write also a new manifesto—a manifesto of 1891—while the old one bears the date of 1848. What belongs in a manifesto does not belong in a platform.

And though a platform is to be clear, it cannot at the same time be a commentary. The agitators, the journalists and the learned of the party must give the commentary. The platform must be the principles with the demands arising therefrom. However, it must comprise no explanations—it should say merely so much as is absolutely essential in the interest of clearness.

Proceeding from this point of view, we in the commission saw ourselves compelled from the beginning to put aside a great number of demands, because according to our opinion they belonged in a manifesto or in a commentary, but not in a platform.

It is impossible to make a party platform so plain that from the first all propositions and demands shall be clear to every one who has not yet been educated in party science. The comrades must learn and be taught. The schooling is certainly a matter of propaganda, of agitation, of explaining, of educational institutions and of party literature.

* * * * * * * * *

I have one more general observation to make before taking up the different parts of the platform. It is understood, from the manner in which the will of the party was brought to bear at Halle, that the so-called "Lassallian demands" are done away with. And further, in accordance with the views expressed, the "iron law of wages" has been set aside. It is true, the effort is yet being made on one side to retain the expression,
provided with an explanatory sentence, but it can only create confusion. The great majority of the party have reached the conviction that that which constitutes the essential part of the "iron law of wages," the necessary proletarianization and expropriation of the wealth of the producing laborer by the possessors of the instruments of production, is clearly and correctly expressed throughout the whole principal part of the platform.

The idea that those who possess the instruments of production have in these the means for enslaving, exploiting and expropriating their fellow-men who are found not in possession of these things, runs like a red thread through the new platform.

Further, the watchword of "a reactionary body" has been dropped. One or the other side would have been glad to retain it. It is true that all opponents in a class conflict are to us in the relation of "a reactionary body," and that the expression was often pertinent and has done good service. It may stand in a manifesto or it may be spoken of in a commentary, but it does not belong in a platform. First, it is not true that all other parties are "a reactionary body," and, second, the expression is so unscientific that it must be avoided in a platform that lays claim to being scientific. It is a truth which is stated in the platform that all other parties stand on the principle of capitalism and therefore are at enmity with us, who would destroy capitalism.

Further, you will not find in the draft the word "labor product," which had become very dear to the former Lassallians, and, through Lassalle's writings, to the Eisenachers also. The sentence that "to the laborer belongs his product" was long ago discarded, yet many would have retained the expression "labor product." It is perfectly correct to speak of private capitalistic therefore does not belong in our platform.
By one side it was proposed to say "private capitalistic" in place of "capitalistic." That is not practicable. It is perfectly correct to speak of private capitalistic production, but the expression comprehends only a part of capitalistic production. We have to do with the whole of capitalistic production, which may not necessarily be private, but as we have already seen may also be carried on by the state. The state, when it assumes control in place of the private entrepreneur, carries on the capitalistic exploitation exactly as the private entrepreneur. It can, in fact, exercise yet greater oppression. As we expressed it in our first draft—in the present one the passage is lacking—state capitalism is the worst form of capitalism, since it concentrates the economic and political power in one hand, and can exercise the power of exploitation and oppression more sharply and intensely than can private capital.

Another motion was made to say "great capitalistic" instead of "capitalistic," since we are not obliged to consider small capital. Now, capitalism is capitalism. Marx wrote "Capital"; he did not call his book "Great Capital." Capitalistic exploitation is one and the same thing and that it will become the more intense the more capital is concentrated lies in the nature of capitalistic production, which according to its nature must exploit and without exploitation is not conceivable. Therefore we retain the word "capitalistic."

Further, one will observe that the word "state" is not to be found in the draft. It does not occur in the draft of the committee or in other outlines; neither is it in the Magdeburger, which contains many good formulations. I will not expand here upon the question of the state; that is, the question whether the socialistic society would be a state or not. I know that concerning this point I have different views from many of my colleagues, but so far as I am in the affair the difference is
a pure strife of words. That the state corresponds to the form of society, that the industrial society utilizes every form of state for the purpose of exploitation, that the industrial state under all circumstances must be a class state, and that so long as industrial society remains the state will be a class state; that is to say, politically organized exploitation—these are truths that as a matter of course are evident to every thinking social democrat. For me the question is merely this, whether the form and organization which society will take after the class state, together with industrial society and capitalist production has been abolished, can be called a state or not. I have not been able to find—and herein I differ from my various friends—that the idea of oppression and exploitation necessarily lie in the word and idea "state."

The word "state" has a very wide meaning. It signifies generally organized society. One speaks of the "bee-state," of the "ant-state" and of the "learned state," in connection with which exploitation and slavery are not thought of, but only the conception of a closed, organized community is expressed. As it is, however, we cannot use the word "state" in the new social democratic platform; first, because the idea is questionable; second, because we now have to deal with the state only so far as it stands hostilely opposed to us.

What we wish to make clear is that the state now represents, and must represent, the ruling classes, so long as class rule remains it must be a class state; and this state we are obliged to struggle against in a political conflict and to utilize all the weapons that we have, in order to acquire political power and free ourselves from it. We have nothing to do with the state in any other manner.

And now I will enter on the main principles of the
platform. It is not to be expected, of course, that at present I will explain all points of view; I must confine myself to setting forth fully only the general parts. The thought that guided us, and that gradually became evident to the congress, was to show clearly the cause out of which the present critical social conditions arise, to set forth the economic development which has divided the capitalist world and present society into two hostile camps, to explain the necessity of the class strife in a capitalistic society, and to show how it is an absolute necessity that, so long as industrial society remains, so long also the system of exploitation and oppression must remain.

As the cause for the separation of society into two hostile camps it must be stated that the means of production—that is, the land, the raw products, tools, machines, mines and the currency—have been changed from the possession of the whole, the general society, and have become the private property of individuals. If we think of a condition in which the necessary means of production are in the possession of every one, so that each can work independently, then it is evident there can be no production for exchange; each produces for himself. There is no dependence of one on another, no exploitation or slavery. It is the business of the commentator to amplify whether and how far such a condition has existed. It was possible and imaginable only in that form of society where the means of production, at least the most necessary of the same—the mother earth—was the possession of the real producers, the laborers.

From the moment that private possession in the means of production arose, exploitation and the division of society into two hostile classes, standing opposed to each other through their interest, also began. This
process has not been accomplished suddenly, but goes steadily forward. It is to be traced back through the middle ages, even into remote antiquity. In the industrial society, with which we have to deal and with which the platform is concerned, it proceeds with additional speed according to the degree in which the means of production have become concentrated and the monopoly or property of a small minority, and according as the productivity of the means of production has become steadily more perfect. A simple tool has grown into a machine; the machine becomes more and more perfect; capital, and with it the intensification of production, continually increases. Out of the small business develops the great business, which marks the beginning of great industry from which arose the modern giant industry, and this is not sufficient—the giant industry unites itself into trusts agreements, etc.

And with this concentration of capital the means of production take on in equal manner; on one side the intensification of production, that rises to unending height, and on the other side the intensification of exploitation, of expropriation of the middle classes, the uncertainty of existence of the proletariat, the lower grade of misery, of oppression, of slavery.

The process of historical social development and the laws according to which it proceeds must be set forth in the platform; it must be shown how present conditions have their origin in the separation of the laborer from his product; how exploitation has grown and must grow with the greater concentration of the means of production; how the root of the evil lies in the fact that the means of production have become private property; how out of this fact exploitation results as an absolute necessity. Every one who possesses labor power, but has not the means with which to use it, must, if he will
realize upon this activity, bring himself into the "play of economic forces"; without this he cannot live.

He is inseparable from his labor power and if he is not to starve he must betake himself to the service of another who has private possession in the means of production. From this arises and develops economic dependence, economic exploitation, and out of this political dependence and slavery in every form, a process that, as we have seen, goes on with increasing rapidity.

The division of society will ever become deeper and more complete. That which stands between the two extremes—capitalist and proletariat—the so-called middle classes of the population, who still have a small possession in the means of production, but must themselves work, even if they also utilize the labor of others; these middle classes disappear more and more. The whole process of development in the present society goes on irresistibly by virtue of its essential character to this end—that the means of production concentrate themselves in fewer hands, and that the possessors, the monopolists of these means, exploit the propertyless and rob them of their property, so that the whole history of industrial society is a history of expropriation in perpetuity. The possessor of the means of production expropriates those who have nothing, but who must labor for him for wages; he pays them only a part of the value produced for him. The surplus value, the unpaid-for labor, becomes in the hands of the possessor of the means of production, capital, and puts him in a position to draw the fetters of the laborer closer and more firmly and to complete his slavery and exploitation. So the laborer forges for himself the chains of slavery while he works and creates wealth. In this process optimistic dreams can change nothing. All criticisms of capital that do not go to the heart of the matter are
unfruitful; all attempts to remove the “protuberances” while the foundation of capitalism remains are Utopian. These “protuberances” are the logical result, the unavoidable consequence of the capitalistic system. Whoever would do away with them must remove the cause, capitalism itself. Through this demand the social democracy differentiates itself from all other parties and is marked as revolutionary, since all other parties, without exception, stand on the foundation of private ownership in the means of production.

In consideration of its pre-eminent importance we have formulated this point more clearly and sharply in the draft before you than was the case in the first outline. It was said then that all other parties mutually stood on the principle of capitalism and therefore were altogether at enmity to the laboring class. Exception is taken to this and it is claimed that there is an endeavor in Germany that, if not of political significance, yet aims equally with us to clip the wings of capital, so far at least as it has grown to “great capital.” I mean the aim of the members of trades organizations, the guild enthusiasts and the anti-Semites. We cannot designate their aim as capitalistic, but, as we have pointed out in the draft, they stand on the basis of private property in the means of production, and on this ground they are in common with all other parties. The social democracy stands as a compact body opposed to all parties resting on that foundation. There can be no alliance, no compromise. Between us and the army of our united opponents yawns a chasm, a chasm that daily grows more deep and wide; a chasm which to be sure, since yonder bank is higher, can be economically leaped from there here, and daily, hourly, out of the ranks of our opponents, through the weight and logic of economic development, masses that till now fought on the other
side are hurled into the proletariat, while thousands and hundreds of thousands fall into the abyss and miserably perish. But this bottomless chasm is not filled by their bodies, and it remains—it is the dividing line which separates us from all other parties. Every one who would pass this dividing line must give up small industrial Utopias and have clearly before his eye that only the removal of the cause—that is, the removal of private ownership in the means of production, and the whole present manner of production for sale, can make an end to misery, exploitation and slavery. He who believes that through compromise he can gradually, with little industrial ointments and palliative measures, make the evils of present society so mild that one will at least be able to bear them for a time—whoever cherishes such a view has forsaken the revolutionary foundation of the party. It is this we have to bear in mind when we ask: Do you belong to us or not? The most beautiful phrases about improving the condition of the laborer are of no use to us. In that way there is no help for us.

It lies in the nature of present society and production that exploitation must ever become more intense. Can we, through the legislation of the state, be it ever so powerful, be unnaturally set back into the middle ages? Can the great industry be sacrificed to the small business, as the guild enthusiasts would have it? No; it is simply impossible. The present class state, the servant of capitalism, that has never yet had the power in the simple question of the protection of the laborer to tear itself loose from the ruling class—this state is designated by the dreamers as a “social kingdom and empire”! Society cannot be forced back into strange, early, historical forms of production and the new form leads irresistibly to ever greater concentration of the means of production, to ever greater exploitation of its
labor, to more enormous proletarization of the members of society. Therefore the social democracy demands that the cause of these conditions be seized at the root and destroyed from the foundations. We demand this, not as a whim, but as a logical necessity, since we stand on the height of a world philosophy which conceives society as an organism that with irresistible necessity ever grows and develops. We see that the present society has created conditions that will destroy themselves; we see that present society with iron logic pushes forward to a catastrophe, into its own “judgment day,” which is not to be avoided. Socialism is no arbitrary device. The so-called future state with which we have been scoffed, the foundation of which, as a matter of course, we can only point out in general outlines, is the necessary, unavoidable result of the present capitalistic state, as the socialistic production is the necessary result and consequence of present capitalistic production. Thus capitalism, while it ever further increases and gathers in giant grasp its means of power, creates at the same time the enemy and the powerful agencies to which it must succumb—creates, as it says in the communist manifesto, its own grave-diggers and digs its own grave. Capitalism makes, to be its heir, the proletariat, which it creates, prepares for him his heritage, forges the weapons for him, gives him the possibility to realize that for which we strive, produces for him the material condition for the realization of our ideals. In short, the capitalistic present state is the father, contrary to its will, of the socialist future state. In a condition of small industrial undertakings, dwarf businesses, there was possible, to be sure, a so-called socialism, a sort of philanthropic Utopianism, but the scientific revolutionary socialism, that has grasped the law of evolution and looks upon itself as the last product of this develop-
ment, was simply unthinkable. Socialism is the result of modern capitalism—the socialist state the successor and heir of the capitalist state.

Therefore we have not set forth in our platform any misty aim floating in the air. We have stated what is and what will be. We have said society is thus; there are certain laws that we can alter as little as can the present state. They lead irresistibly to socialistic society. Therefore, since socialism is a necessity, we strive for it and summon the worker to place himself under the banner of social democracy.

We have said that this movement accomplishes itself through class struggle. This word, which was first brought by Marx from the English into the German, forms the best refutation of the opinion that the Marxian theory, scientific socialism, excludes persons from taking a part in the social evolutionary process and inclined toward a certain fatalism and passive waiting. This is false. The exact opposite is true. It was Marx himself who explained the whole development of industrial society as a series of class conflicts, that corresponded to unbroken, ever more comprehensive developing economic relation, fulfilling themselves in ever higher forms with deeper and wider meaning. And the class struggle is a struggle of living persons, an actual personally directed struggle, and no one has expressed the nature of this conflict clearer than Marx.

If we announce that we will remove the present class state, then in order to meet the objections of our opponents we must also say that the social democracy, while it contends against the class state through the removal of the present form of production, will destroy the class struggle itself. Let the means of production become the possession of the community; then the proletariat is no longer a class—as little as the bourgeoisie;
then classes will cease; there will remain only society, a society of equals—true human society, mankind and humanity.

For that reason it has been stated in the plainest manner that we should not substitute one class rule for another. Only malice and thoughtlessness could incidentally put such a wrong construction on our meaning, for in order to rule, in order to be able to exercise rule, I must have possession in the means of production. My private property in the means of production is the preliminary condition for rule, and socialism removes personal private property in the means of production. Rule and exploitation in every form must be done away with, man become free and equal, not master and servant, but comrades, brothers and sisters!

Next to these general remarks we will speak of the international character of the party. Since the International Workingmen's Association was established, in the middle of the 1860s, the international character of the labor movement has been acknowledged and given practical proof of by the German workers on every occasion. In the new platform we have plainly given expression to the two phases of this thought; first on the economic side, since industrial development has in its nature an international character, and then on the political side, since out of the international character of economic evolution arises the impossibility of solving the social question in one country, and from whence arises the necessity for international united effort on the part of the laboring class.

And, further, because of misunderstandings and perverted conclusions and occurrences in other lands, that lead to these conclusions, it was doubly our duty to state with particular emphasis and in words that leave no room for doubt that we feel and declare ourselves one
with the class conscious workers of all other lands. The international social democracy is not a phantom to us, not merely a beautiful phrase. No; it is an end, without the attainment of which the emancipation of the laboring class cannot be accomplished. This matter of internationalism is one of sacred seriousness with us. We are well acquainted with the consequences of our declaration and the obligations that it lays on us, and if we have not expressly stated it in this platform, as was the case in the former one, it has been merely for this reason, that we believe it to be superfluous, yes, weakening, after our present existing declaration that we hold ourselves to be one with the social democrats of all other lands.

What we solemnly determine here is for each and all to make a reality in life and to convert into deeds and acts that which stands in this platform. In the international union of the proletariat the German social democracy will always perform its obligations, turned back by nothing that duty requires.

I would now direct your attention to a sentence in the sixth paragraph: “The struggle of the working classes against the capitalist exploitations must of necessity be a political struggle. The working classes can neither carry on their economic struggle nor develop their economic organization without political rights.” Herewith we declare the political nature of our party and separate ourselves from those who advocate the so-called “propaganda of the deed,” who in reality raise “inactivity” to a platform and with revolutionary phrases exercise the propaganda of “nothingness.” We must act and work politically, apply all instruments in order to further our end.

There is much to do and the more strength we employ, the greater the sum of power we put into the work, the sooner will it be accomplished.
To expect the transformation of society and the social revolution to accomplish itself without taking part in the political struggle is childish foolishness. Whoever thinks this has no conception of the difficulty and greatness of our struggle for emancipation.

I spoke in Halle on "The Growth of the Present Society into Socialism." In many ways that expression has become suspicious to me. I have designated with merely the organic character of the evolution of society, which is no machine, but a collective living organism. I have on every occasion, and also at that time, clearly stated that men are not the playthings of fate, and that they dare not stand inactive, anticipating a blessing from above; that circumstances, it is true, dispose of men, but are also in turn through men determined, and that, as the class struggle is a continual strife, so also the realization of our end can only be the fruit of the uninterrupted conflict in which all fight together and every one throws his whole being unreservedly into the balance scale, joyfully setting at stake possessions and life.

"They (the laboring class) cannot expect the transfer of the means of production to the community without being first invested with political power," it reads further in this paragraph. That is to say, we struggle for the power in the state for the "latch to legislation" that is now monopolized by our opponents for their class interests. "It must be the aim of social democracy to give conscious unanimity to this struggle of the working class to indicate the inevitable goal." It is not our task to hold enticingly before the workers a picture of the future state, but to inform them of the process of development and the laws that actuate present society; to point out to them what is necessary in order to bring exploitation and slavery to an end; to show them how
industrial society itself in its further development more and more puts the means for abolishing it into their hands.

Here the double character of our party is plainly expressed; the scientific character, which refuses, according to the anarchistic Bismarckian prescription of blood-and-iron politics, to view the historical movement as an arbitrary one, which man after his own will can lead to revolution or reaction, but recognizes that there exist firm, unalterable laws for the social movement, and the practical character of our party, which is demonstrated in that it would show to the laborer the way to the end that it has already pointed out to him; how only through the attainment of political power we can hasten the decomposing process of present society, and, organizing ourselves more and more, can accomplish our object.

I come now to the separate demands. At the head we have placed, as in all early platforms, the fundamental demand for universal equal suffrage. It is known to every one of you that we have not rated this too highly and I will not repeat what has been said a hundred times—that this question belongs to tactics and must not be considered here. Since I must study brevity I will only dwell on those points that offer exceptions to the earlier platform, or require mention on other grounds. In the demand for suffrage we have said directly that we recognize no differences on account of sex. In the former platform we advocated the equal rights of women, yet in a somewhat modest form, only indirectly. As we on the whole insist on the absolute equal rights of both sexes, so now we demand clearly the suffrage for women. It will not repay the trouble to waste words over a discussion as to whether there is a separate woman’s question. The emancipation of women in general must come with the emancipation of
the working people. Fifteen years ago this question was an "apple of discord"; now there exists in relation to it not the slightest difference of opinion, and so I pass from this point.

Further, we demand proportional representation. This point is not in the former platform; but the demand is so self-evident and it has been so frequently analyzed and recommended by our papers that I need not dwell upon it. I will merely say that this form of election is the only one which makes possible a representation according to actual voters and does away with the inequality of election districts and the accidents of majorities which defeat the popular will. It makes the representation correspond exactly to the number of voters in the party. The election district being done away with, the whole state becomes erected into one elective body and representation will be determined by means of a simple arithmetical operation; this party has cast so many votes and another so many, so and so many representatives are to be chosen as a whole, and these representatives are apportioned according to the number of voters in each party. This is so clear that every impartial observer must understand it at once. Only the interests of the ruling class are in the way. Our party would gain great advantage from this system, for as you know we are scattered over all Germany. We are not located as the "center" and the other parties are only in definite districts, concentrated in single places. The social democrats are everywhere in Germany as they are everywhere in the world. But we are a young party and the election districts in which we have a majority are comparatively few. By the present system of elections the greater part of our votes are lost. According to proportional representation the number of our representatives would be doubled, perhaps even trebled.
Further, we demand two years' duration of the legislature. This demand also requires little argument. Already we have made a motion to this effect in the Reichstag. On every occasion we have explained in debate—it has also occupied the attention of our press—that annual elections, as the English charter demands, come in too quick succession. When we once have a democratic state it will be possible to compel from a representative who has failed to perform his duty the resignation of his authority, or of the whole representative body, in case it has not the public confidence, and cause a new election to be held.

That the elections should be held on a legal day of rest is self-evident; likewise the removal of all restrictions upon political rights. For us there is only one case in which a person can be deprived of his right of suffrage; that is in the case of a minor, on account of mental incapacity, imbeciles, etc.

Further we demand direct legislation by the people by means of the right of initiative and of veto. That is, we would not have the "center of gravity" of the political life located in parliament. The "center of gravity" according to democratic principles lies in the people themselves, and the people should not be compelled to wait until, condescendingly, laws and bills that are necessary and desired come from their representatives. No; they should themselves have the right of initiative.

Complementary to this right of initiative—that is, the right of the people to make direct motion for law—is the right of veto—that is, the right of the people by means of direct ballot to give validity to the law or to repudiate it. This demand, which is always recognized by us as a principle, was contained in the earlier platform.

Next we demand self-government by the people in
the empire, state, province and commune. The word state means here an individual state, not the state in the general sense of its economic relations in conformity with organized society. We have here for the first time stated that we consider only that state and form of government which rests on the broadest democratic basis, arises directly from the people and is by them controlled, as being in harmony with the principles of the people's sovereignty.

We demand that the people be rulers of their own fate, that the well-being of the people be the highest law and their will be subordinate to no other will. We demand that all laws and arrangements that hinder the practical proof and activity of the people's will be done away with. At a glance every one will perceive that herein is comprehended a complete transformation of the arrangement of the state. It means the absolute democratization of the political conditions in Germany.

Corresponding to this principle we demand the election of the magistrates by the people. The right of self-government by the people makes this demand a logical consequence. But we formulate here a new demand—the accountability and responsibility to the people of the officers elected. That we say accountability and responsibility is not a tautology, no repeating of two words that mean essentially the same. By the accountability of officials it is usual to understand the political accountability prescribed by the constitution and the laws. We wish something more. We require also the personal civil law responsibility of the officers for all that they do.

I said at the time I explained this idea in the Reichstag: "The time will, it is to be hoped, come in Germany when the victims of the anti-socialist laws will be compensated and when the authors of these laws, all those who by means of the same have wronged thousands and
hundreds of thousands in their person and property, will be made personally responsible for it. I do not wish that, as in France, the taxpayers should be obliged to meet the indemnity, but that the ones in fault be proceeded against.” The expression “personal responsibility” was interpreted by certain reactionaries as though I had demanded lynch law. To be sure, I thought of the administration of law, but not of lynch law. The personal responsibility of the official is a necessary postulate of the people’s sovereignty. An officer is not a being of higher order; he has simply to accomplish the will of the people, or to act in harmony with that will. He is accountable for all his actions and must not stand beyond the pursuance of the civil and common law. That is what we wish to express. In England this is already a law and brings excellent results. Every commoner without exception is equal under the civil and common penal law for all his acts, as are also the officers and soldiers in service. Officers and soldiers are, it is true, in England, as with us, under military law, which demands blind obedience to orders, but they are at the same time accountable to the civil and criminal law for all their deeds, including those done in service.

Suppose an officer on the occasion of a riot gave the command to shoot. According to military law he is obliged to do so. He has the commission and is not accountable to military law for the blood and death of his fellow-men. Now comes the common civil law; first of all the post-mortem examination. Here are the dead, violently killed. How did they come to their end? Through the bullets of the soldiers. The officers gave the command, Fire! The soldiers shot and the people were struck by the bullets and killed. Did the officer do this in self-defense? is now asked further, or is it manslaughter or murder? And the law in England concern-
ing manslaughter and murder counts for officers and soldiers exactly as for civil persons who commit murder or allow it. If it cannot be proven that the soldier was absolutely obliged to shoot in self-defense or in justification of legal conditions the jurors simply state there was no satisfactory reason for the shooting; the people had not threatened; the firing was unnecessary. Then in the most favorable case the charge reads manslaughter, and, if the matter is worse, murder. The officer who gave the order to fire is not protected by the command which he holds from above, the jury pronounce his guilt, and, according to civil law, he is either, in case of manslaughter, put in prison, or if murder he is hanged, and the same can occur to every soldier who fires with orders.

One does not believe that such can happen. I recall many cases where officers were found guilty by the jury; directly after, to be sure, they were pardoned by the ruler. Eventually, however, this will be of no assistance. At any rate our demand is throughout a just one. Further, I can describe an example of personal responsibility in Germany—an isolated one it is true; I mean the case of Gen. Vogel von Falkenstein, who at the outbreak of the last French war arrested our then existing party managers and allowed them to be imprisoned. At the end of the war procedure was begun against him by those who were wronged on this account, and, on the civil complaint, he was condemned by all courts of judicature to a considerable indemnity. That was in Braunschweig and there was no further result.

Further, we demand that there be universal military education. Substitution of militia for the standing army. This is the old demand of the social democracy, which was brought forward by Fichte in his "Speech on the German Nation." To-day we have a people with
arms and a people without arms. Every one should be a soldier, however, as in Switzerland, and in order to bring about such a system it is necessary that every one from his youth be exercised in the use of arms, in marching, gymnastics, firing, etc.

In Switzerland every school teacher in every village knows the military exercise. He is at least an under officer in the confederate army; perhaps a higher officer. He teaches his pupils from the earliest age exercising, military gymnastics, to shoot with the cross-bow, and at a certain age the child receives a gun. In short, the youth are educated in all the exercises necessary for military service.

We demand decision concerning war and peace by the representatives of the people. Of this only a word. It was moved to say "directly by the people," the present construction being thought a backward step. No; it is not. On the contrary, it is a positive advance on the road to the reasonable and practicable. Observe once, a war comes suddenly, how would it be possible for all the people to vote concerning it? And in these days wars mostly come suddenly. We free ourselves from phrases and express our demand in a practical way.

Further, we require the decision of all international disputes by arbitration. It has already been sufficiently demonstrated at the congress of Brussels that we are no Utopians in regard to "eternal peace." In our well-known resolution there we have stated that the conditions which bring the permanent danger of war have their roots in the present economic society, in the system of capitalism. We are not like the "industrial enthusiasts," who would leave the cause and merely remove the consequence. We make the demand that an international board of arbitration be established, before which all disputes between states shall be brought. However,
this demand will not be realized, as many others we have made will not be, under the present state. Nevertheless we have declared ourselves on this question which touches so deeply the whole civilized world, and we will show that as a party we support every earnest effort to remove the dangers of war, without, however, falling into the weak industrial peace Utopia.

We demand further the abolition of all laws which subordinate woman to man, whether in a private or public capacity. Before admitting this demand we asked ourselves whether it were not superfluous to make this a separate point after we had already declared the absolute equality of the sexes. But it must be borne in mind that a resolution to this effect was accepted in Brussels and the desire was expressed that it might be adopted in the social democratic platforms of the different countries, and we have acted accordingly.

The two following paragraphs of the platform have given us much trouble in their formulation. To meet the difficulty it was moved to accept the democratic demands as found in the Eisenacher platform: Separation of the church from the school and from the state. That was quite right in its time, but at present it does not comprehend all that we would and must say. In the earlier formulation the church is regarded as an institution equal in rank with the state. This is not our idea. We go much further; according to our view in the free community for which we strike the church is simply a private association, which is controlled by its own laws, as all other private associations are. That is the meaning of the absolute equality to which we have here given expression. Therefore we say: "The ecclesiastical and religious bodies are to be regarded as private associations." And in order that the catholics may not be able to say
that we wish to offer them violence we have added: "Associations which order their affairs independently."

In connection with this passage concerning the church we demand "Secularization of education." This means that the church, that religion, should have nothing to do with the school. We are bound by principle to demand this and the point is so clear that explanation seems unnecessary. However, it is worth while to meet beforehand all misunderstandings and intentional or unintentional misinterpretations to which such a demand in our platform could give occasion. It is well known how stubbornly the ecclesiastical bodies carry on the struggle concerning the school whenever that question comes to the front. One recognizes how much it means to them, catholics, protestants and others, to hold and make their control firm over the intellect. You know how the social democracy is represented as a red specter, how the ecclesiastical associations say of us that we are a party of atheists and that the social democrats would forcibly take religion from every one and violently crush the church. In order to take the foundation from and to break the point of these demagogical slanders and pious falsehoods, we state here that the regulation of religious matters lies with each individual, and we declare religion to be a private matter. I admit that I struggled for some time against taking up these practical considerations, since their meaning seemed so self-evident in the declaration of the platform. But in looking back over the systematic calumny of our position in regard to religion it appears necessary that they be stated. The social democracy as such has absolutely nothing to do with religion. Every man has the right to think and believe what he will and no one has the right to molest or limit another in his thoughts or beliefs, or to allow any one's opinions to be a disadvantage to him in any
way. Opinions and beliefs can only be proceeded against when they become converted into pernicious and unlawful acts, as for example with certain bigoted sects. But the opinions and beliefs in themselves must be free, perfectly free. We as social democrats must respect them, and those social democrats who respect the genuineness and worth of their fellow-men will also avoid scoffing at their beliefs. Above all, scoffing at a prejudice is foolish and impolitic, since it but strengthens it. Only education can be of help here. But if it were our duty to state that we will not rob any one of his religion or hinder him in the exercise thereof, we dare not offer the church any handle by means of which it can come into the schools, and therefore we say “Compulsory attendance at public national schools.” Every child must be sent by its parents or relatives to these secular schools, in which no religion is taught, but by virtue of the fundamental statement that religion is a private matter, it remains to the parents themselves to teach their children, or allow them to be taught, in the religion which they choose. At first we thought to expressly state this in the platform, but we found that such a practical commentary did not belong there.

We demand further that expenditures from the public funds not only to ecclesiastical but to religious objects be abolished. We have added the word “religious” because there are associations of a religious nature that are not ecclesiastical, and also there shall be no expenditure from the public funds, just because religion is a private matter.

The school question was one that engaged us for some time when we drew up the draft of the platform; whether or no we should state that instruction and educational apparatus be free in all schools even to the highest—to the university. It was pointed out by a part
that, according to the criticism of the platform by Karl Marx, only the bourgeoisie, the propertied classes, would gain an advantage thereby, since the laborer under the present conditions could not send his children to the higher grades of school. Hence we have decided on a restriction and demand free instruction and educational apparatus only in the public schools.

With this demand belongs the other, the maintenance of the children at school, incidentally a demand which is found for nearly a hundred years in the famous school law of Lakanal, that was presented to the French convention and accepted by it shortly after the execution of Louis XVI. At that time the fundamental principle was stated that the state which compelled the parents to send their children to school is also bound to care for the physical needs of the children. The school question is a social question. Hungry children can learn nothing.

Our further demand speaks for itself—that those children who show peculiar talents, and by examination prove themselves capable of attending higher schools, professional and other schools, shall have free instruction and maintenance. With this addition our paragraph concerning schools is formulated without falling into excess or leaving the ground of real relations.

A further demand is for free administration of the law, free legal assistance and free medical attendance. In principle both belong together. The possibility to seek justice is to-day in general the privilege of the wealthy. The right to complain is in most cases really taken from the poor, since the complaint and process are too expensive. It is exactly the same with medical help in case of sickness. The physician is not a public officer and if even now in individual cases free medical attendance is assured it is only on certain conditions which every one can or may not fulfill. Hundreds of
thousands at present go deprived of medical help and legal assistance through lack of money and fear of the high cost. No new privileges are created for the propertied classes! All sorts of practical questions were raised concerning this. But we said to ourselves, with the simplification of the forms of justice, many ways can be found in which our demand will be carried out and it is not our affair to establish individual cases. On the contrary, that is the business of the legislator. In behalf of this demand it may be remarked that the state, according to the definition in the "Philosophy of Law," is a great federation for the protection of justice, and the "just state" is always the ideal before the defenders of the present state. And do they not always say to us: "The state guarantees justice to every member of the state and city"? Very well; we demand that the right of defense, which now for the mass of the people only stands on paper, be made a truth for all. Now merely the wealthy, who need no civil defense, since they can help themselves to justice, have this right. To the poor, who are more easily and frequently oppressed, it is unattainable. For them in reality there is no defense by law. This is an injustice that must be ended.

We demand: "Graduated income and property tax to meet all public expenses which are to be met by taxation." The insertion of property tax gave occasion for debate in the commission. But we found that, next to income, property must be mentioned, as, for example, is the case in England with the income and property tax. It is necessary to make a distinction between the income of a person which simply arises from his individual labor and that which he receives without necessarily working for it—for example, from land, capital, bonds, etc. While with the one the income is united to the person and ceases if he cannot work. or if he dies. the other in-
come is independent of the person. With an income of
the latter kind the graduated tax must be higher. In
other words, one who has an income from fixed property
must be taxed more than one who has no property in-
come.

Of the inheritance tax it is demanded that the gradu-
ated increase be measured not merely according to the
extent of the inheritance, but also according to the
degree of relationship.

I come now to the second part of the special de-
mands—namely, those which we make specifically for the
defense of the laboring classes. There is not one among
these that requires minute discussion. I will merely
state that we were obliged to strike out the proposal
which was submitted that we demand political guaran-
tee against unemployment. We did this unanimously,
since we reached the conviction that such a demand
could not be carried through.

The attempt has been made by the miners’ unions in
England to secure a guarantee against unemployment.
There it has been proven that merely in the organiza-
tions of those trades in which on an average the pay is
high and the number of idle small can such a guarantee
be made effective—only in those labor groups that need
it the least. To all other labor unions in which to-day
the idle count to the thousands the attempt is of no avail.
And if we should demand such a proposition of the state
we would do our cause a bad service.

As already said in the demands referring to the la-
boring class, we as a labor party must avoid all mistiness
and that which cannot be carried out. What we de-
mand in this part of our platform is highly practical
and in great part already realized in other lands. We
must not weigh down these demands with such as make
it easy for our opponents to say: “You ask the impos-
sible!" The security against lack of employment belongs, however, in the dreamland of "the right to work."

In the beginning of his rising power Prince Bismarck said to the advancing bourgeoisie: "Flectore si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo. (If I am not able to bend the high I will move the Acheron.) If I cannot deal with you, the party of progress, and the liberals, then I will conjure with the proletariat; I will move the Acheron; I will unchain against you the socialist movement." Prince Bismarck called, but the Acheron, the German proletariat, did not move! Proffers were made to us. They were contemptuously sent back. Then the social democracy called and the Acheron, the German labor movement, arose, and the German labor power, as far as it is class conscious, united and with one mind marches under the banner of social democracy as in no other country of the earth. What Prince Bismarck could not do the social democracy has accomplished. It was stronger than he and along the whole line the social democracy stands as victor over the Bismarckian system.

Mention has been made of the "iron law of evolution." And it is an iron law. No one can alter it, bend or break it by force, and Prince Bismarck, who disposed of all the means of power in the state and society, who said of himself, "I am the realm; I am the state"—and who said it more truly of himself than did the king of France—he is to-day crushed to the earth, while state and society are yet here. Nothing has essentially been altered; a man less on the political stage and nothing further; one man overboard. The social democracy recognizes that, as little as Prince Bismarck could alter the laws of progress, even as little can we alter them. We know that industrial society, do what it will, hastens to destruction. It is like an ancient tragedy of fate—the hero knows he is condemned to be the sacrifice.
It is a decree that he must fulfill. He defends himself against it. He seeks to escape the powers that be, but every step he takes to go away from it brings the catastrophe nearer, till the day of ruin, of destruction, of judgment comes. So it is with our bourgeoisie. They strain every nerve in order to escape fate, but every attempt to turn it aside simply brings the execution of the sentence nearer. They may do what they will against us, they act for us; they may do what they will for themselves, they act for us; and we, we may do what we will, the conditions work into our hands all in state and society; persecutions, concessions, all the same. All incline to our advantage, we, the rising, victorious social democracy. Our opponents may seek what they will, they can only work for us.

I have stated before that industrial society is a society of expropriation; that capitalism is expropriation in perpetuity. The possessors of the instruments of production and labor expropriate those who possess nothing, and this process of expropriation—that is, the robbery of property—must continue as long as the present order of society remains. It calls itself, to be sure, the society of private property, but in reality it is that form of society which destroys personal property. The end of this process of expropriation can only be what Marx has said in his granitic words: "The expropriation of the expropriator." Then for the first time, when this society is destroyed, property in the sense of the equal claim of all to the enjoyment of the goods which have been created by the general organized labor of all will become a reality.

The most beautiful platform counts for nothing, however, if a true energetic spirit is not infused into it. Therefore I beg of you do not quarrel with the words. Do not expect it to be a perfect platform. That platform
which in one moment, according to the universal opinion of us all, is the best, in the next hour will have found a critic who could make improvements in one or the other formulation or sentence. As was said in 1875, we would not create a pope for ourselves in our platform. A platform has only one thing to fulfil; clearly and intelligently to state the object of our party, the evolutionary process of industrial society, to point out the irresistibleness with which it destroys itself and brings the moment nearer when capitalistic production will be replaced by socialistic production. It is our sacred duty to hasten with all our strength this process of development, that the change may come at the earliest possible moment. Attend to it, that the new platform which we create here to-day lead the party on from victory to victory, as the former one did—from victory to victory until the final victory. Put the right spirit into the new platform. Struggle in the right spirit under this new banner. Sustain it, mindful of the lofty duties that arise for us out of the greatness and growth of our party. Manfully and full of energy go on. Fight fearlessly and without rest, as you fought under our old storm-torn flag. Put your whole strength, your whole personality into the realization of this platform and see to it that the time be the shortest possible till the day when the present industrial society ends. For the fall of this society depends naturally on the sum of strength that is used against it. The more power we use in this agitation, the more regardless we throw ourselves into the scales, so much the sooner will we attain our end and so much the sooner the banner of social democracy will rise on the citadel of present society.

FINIS.
PARTNERS WANTED

The publishing house which issues this book is not owned by a capitalist nor by a group of capitalists. It is owned by a constantly growing number of working people (1,910 in June, 1908) who have each put in ten dollars.

They get no dividends; what they do get is the privilege of buying books at half price. Moreover, they make possible in this way the publication of the real books of International Socialism at prices within the reach of laborers.

Whatever profit is made on these books is used to bring out more books, but our prices are so low that this does not provide more than a small fraction of the money that is needed.

That is why we want more partners. A dollar a month for ten months will give you the privilege of buying books at special rates as soon as you have made your first payment. Our latest Book Bulletin, describing all the books we supply, will be mailed to any one requesting it. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
([Co-operative])
153 Kinzie Street, Chicago