

# Democracy vs. Imperialism

By Dr. H. S. ALEY, Lincoln, Neb.

A Review of Modern Society in the Light of Ethnology and Economics, Showing that the Tendency of Capitalism is Toward a Revival of Democracy on a Higher Scale, in Which Imperialism Will Be Inconceivable.

"Leads Them All."

## THE VANGUARD

A High-Class Monthly.  
An Independent Exponent of

### Constructive Socialism and Rational Religion.

No matter what other periodicals you take you still need THE VANGUARD.

### It is Vigorous, Fearless, Inter- esting, Unique,

and is doing splendid service in the cause of humanity.

"Every article in it is a gem," says the Toledo Independent

"The warmest magazine that comes our way," says the Socialist Voice.

### 50c a Year. Try It.

#### SPECIAL OFFER.

To readers of this Carl Marx Edition of the Nebraska Independent we will send THE VANGUARD one year for only 25 cents. Order at once.

Address:

### The Vanguard Press,

Box K, Green Bay, Wis.

#### THE TEACHINGS OF SCIENCE.

Modern science, in the domain of ethnology, supplies ample evidence to prove that primitive man began his career on this earth as an extreme individualist or anarchist, if you please. It also proves that the Aryan and Semitic races, who, unassisted, worked their way from savagery to barbarism and thence to civilization, each passed through many phases of economic and political development. This science also proves that there is a law of development that, in the last analysis, dominates all social institutions; such as the moral, religious, domestic and political life of the individuals comprising the body social. Ethnology teaches that, no matter how remotely two races may be situated from each other, that, making allowance for variations in natural surroundings, in the same stage of social development, the thoughts, acts and characteristics of these two races, as made manifest in their social institutions, will be much the same. In the light of the above teaching, we contend that all races, who, unassisted, have reached the stage of civilization called capitalism have passed from anarchism to communism, thence to a higher status of individualism, and that all those who have reached a high state of capitalist civilization, like England, France, Belgium, Germany and the United States, are now ripe for the change back to a higher form of communism.

Among all primitive societies the form of government was some type of democracy, and the unit of such societies was the gens, but as soon as gentle society, that was based upon communal property, gave way to political society that is based upon private or individual property, then did the form of government change from that of democracies to republics and monarchies as we now know them today.

Taking the above facts as the basis of our argument, and at the same time viewing the future in the light of the past, our conclusion is that the tendency in all highly developed capitalist states is not toward imperialism, as personified in monarchy, but, on the contrary, toward a higher type of democracy, to harmonize with the higher type of communal property that, in the near future, must take the place of the present system of private property in all capitalist countries if social progress is to continue.

The history of the Aryan and Semitic races proves beyond doubt that the line of least resistance, socially, has been from individualism to communism, from communism back to individualism, and the logic of events now goes to show that the line of least resistance, socially, for the further progress of these two races is from individualism back to communism. If this proposition be true, then all savage, barbarian and semi-civilized nations must follow in the footsteps of the Aryan and Semitic races would they live in harmony with the law of social development.

#### GOVERNMENT UNDER GENTILE SOCIETY.

In order that we may show clearly, in fact, prove, the above thesis, we shall draw very freely from Lewis H. Morgan's "Ancient Society." He divides the prehistoric period into six ethnic stages—three of savagery and three of barbarism, the last stage of barbarism ending with the discovery of the phonetic alphabet that, in turn, ushered in the historic period, or civilization. He shows, after the first stage of savagery up to the advent of civilization, that all property practically was held in common by the unit of gentle society, usually the gens, and that, as we stated in the beginning, the government was some form of democracy.

Under primitive society the gens was the unit and it was composed of a consanguine family, with the same name and the same language. A phratry was composed of a number of gens that spoke the same language. A tribe was composed of a number of phratries speaking the same language. A confederation was composed of a

number of tribes speaking different dialects of the same language.

Morgan shows that government under savagery and barbarism passed through three stages, the first stage or form being a council of chiefs elected by the members of the gens; the second was a government co-ordinated between a council of chiefs and a general military commander, one representing the civil and the other the military functions of government. Both the council and chiefs were elected by the members of the gens. The third stage was a form of government that was composed of a council of chiefs, an assembly of the people and a general military commander, who, toward the end of gentle society, evolved into a king.

The Spaniards took the Aztec confederacy for a monarchy but in this they were mistaken. These people were in the second stage of barbarism and the gens of the Aztecs held their lands in common. Montezuma, the supposed king, or monarch, was simply the general military commander of the Aztec confederacy. This confederacy was composed of three tribes and was governed by a council of chiefs and a general military commander. Each of these three tribes was supreme in the administration of its own local affairs; in fact, stood in much the same relation to the confederacy as do our states to the federal government.

In primitive society, the gens was prior to the phratry, the phratry to the tribe and the tribe to the confederacy. The phratry was the unit of worship, also the unit of military organization. While the general military commander was at first elected by the members of the tribes, for life usually, after a time the office became hereditary in one particular gens, hence it was but a short step to monarchy. When discovered by the Spaniards, the custom of the Aztecs was to elect their general military commander from the Aztec tribe, but the power of electing their commander had already passed from the hands of the people into the hands of the council of chiefs, who, in turn, was supposed to represent their respective phratries. The general military commander could take no decisive step without first consulting the council of chiefs. This council had the power to depose its head or military commander and elect his successor.

Their form of government was a modified military democracy, as the council of chiefs was elected by a general council of the more influential people. The Peruvians when conquered by Pizarro was in about the same status of barbarism as the Aztecs when conquered by Cortez.

Aside from the Aztecs, all the other aborigines of North America in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were in the last stage of savagery and the first and second stage of barbarism. The form of government in all was much the same. At this time several confederacies had already been formed, the more prominent of which were as follows: The Iroquois, composed of five tribes; the Creeks, composed of six tribes; the Ottawa, composed of three tribes; the Dakota League, composed of seven council fires, and the Moque in New Mexico, composed of seven pueblos. All these were military democracies, in which the members of the gens ultimately ruled. The higher they were in the scale of development the nearer they approached the types found in Mexico and Peru, under such chiefs as Montezuma and the Incas. These two confederacies were rapidly approaching the same stage of social development when discovered by the Spaniards as was Rome at the time of Romulus, B. C. 753, and Greece under the leadership of Solon, B. C. 594.

#### GREECE UNDER GENTILEISM.

In primitive Greece, the same as among the aborigines of North and South America, the gens was the unit of the social system, not the family, as many suppose. Under gentle society the family was not and could not be a unit, as the husband and wife, save in rare exceptions, belonged to different gens.

At the time of Solon, descent was in the male line; the property of a deceased citizen went to his gens, as, under gentileism, he could not will it to one not a member of his gens. With slight modification the gens, phratry and tribe regulations of the Greeks were the same as the Iroquois. The Grecian phratry was a combination of several gens for religious and fraternal purposes. It was also the unit

of military organization. In other words the tribe went to war by phratries. The gens had its Archon, or chief, who also officiated as priest in the religious observances of the gens, and each phratry had its patriarch who presided at its meetings and officiated in the solemnization of its religious rites. Each gens, phratry and tribe spoke the same dialect of the same language. The Basileus was a chief who stood at the head of each tribe. He also possessed priestly functions, but it is not known that he had any political power. During the heroic period of Greece—B. C. 800 to 750—the Athenian government bore a close resemblance to the Aztec and other American confederacies that had reached the second status of barbarism, as it was composed of three parts, viz: first, a council of chiefs, that was doubtless selected by the chiefs of the gens from their own number; second, the Agora, an assembly composed of all the people who desired to participate in its deliberations, and, third, a Basileus, or chief, who possessed the attributes of a judge, priest and commander of the military forces. In the Agora, or assembly, all questions of general interest were discussed and then voted upon by a show of hands, and such vote usually influenced the council in its final decisions.

The Athenian gentle military democracy was transformed into a political democracy under the leaderships of Solon (B. C. 594) and Cleisthenes (B. C. 509), and as a result property ceased to be communal and became individual.

The economic or industrial revolution that made this change of ownership possible had been going on for 200 years. Not, however, until Cleisthenes had discovered the idea of the deme or township was the political revolution that changed the system of ownership made possible.

In short, the system of production was individualistic before private property in land was a possibility.

#### ROME UNDER GENTILEISM.

Previous to the time of Romulus (about 753 B. C.), the Romans comprised a loose confederation of thirty tribes. They were then in the upper status of barbarism. The Roman gentle society was composed of gens, curia and tribes that finally united in a confederacy. Ten gens made a curia and ten curia made a tribe, but, under the leadership of Romulus, all the curia were combined into three tribes. The government comprised an assembly of the people, to whom all important matters were submitted; a council of chiefs or senate, composed at first of 100 members or one for each gens, but after, the number of senators was raised to 300, that is, 100 for each tribe; lastly, there was a head war chief, or Rex, who also possessed certain religious functions.

In short, the Roman government, in this status of barbarism, was practically the same as that of the Aztecs, Peruvians and Greeks in the same stage of social development.

#### SOCIAL CUSTOMS COMPARED.

To bring out more clearly our contention that the social customs of mankind are, in the main, determined by a law of social development, we will briefly compare the leading social characteristics of Rome, Greece and the Iroquois confederacy in the same status of barbarism. They are as follows:

#### RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE IROQUOIS GENS.

(1) The right of electing its Sachem and chief; (2) the right of deposing its Sachem and chief; (3) the obligation not to marry in the gens; (4) the mutual rights of inheritance of property of deceased members; (5) reciprocal obligations of help, defence and redress of grievances; (6) the right of bestowing names upon its members; (7) the right of adopting strangers into the gens; (8) common religious rites; (9) a common burial place; (10) a council of the gens. (From Morgan's "Ancient Society," page 71.)

#### RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE GRECIAN GENS.

(1) Common religious rites; (2) mutual rights of succession to property of deceased members; (3) a common burial place; (4) reciprocal obligations of help, defence and redress of injuries; (5) the right to intermarry in the gens in the case of orphans, daughters and heiresses; (6) the possession of common property, an archon and treasurer; (7) the limitation of descent to the male line; (8) the obligation not to marry in the gens ex-

cept in the specified cases; (9) the right to adopt strangers into the gens; (10) the right to elect and depose its chiefs. (Ibid, page 223.)

#### RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ROMAN GENS.

(1) Mutual rights of succession to property of deceased gentiles; (2) the possession of a common burial place; (3) common religious rites; (4) the obligation not to marry in the gens; (5) the possession of lands in common; (6) reciprocal obligations of help, defence and redress of injuries; (7) the right to bear the gentle name; (8) the right to adopt strangers in the gens; (9) the right to elect and depose its chiefs. (Ibid, page 285.)

Taking Rome as the best example of what course political institutions took in ancient and classical times, with the Aryan race, and we find they evolved, under communal property, in the strictest sense of the word from pure democracy to military democracy. About the time of Romulus the military democracy was gradually transformed into a monarchy, which form of government lasted for about 250 years. It was during this period of Roman history that the economic revolution was completed through which communal property was transformed into individual property. In the year 508 B. C., the Roman republic was established, which lasted until the year 27 B. C., at which time the Roman empire came into existence; it, in turn, lasted until A. D. 476, when Rome as a nation ceased to be. Be it remembered that the political institutions of Rome, under the republic and empire (a period of 984 years), was based upon private property, while under the kings, the system of ownership was mixed, being part communal and part individualistic.

When the barbarians came in—who were still gentiles, and as such held their lands in common—the institutions of Rome became blended or mixed with those of its conquerors, and civilization was deflected from the straight course it had been pursuing for nearly 1,000 years and resulted in a new social system—the feudal—that was a mongrel or cross, economically, in that it was semi-communal and

