



THE PROLETARIAN

A Journal of International Socialism.

Burt



THANKSGIVING!

SPARTACAN SPARKS

At the industrial conference in Washington, the people are represented by such gentlemen as Judge Gary, John D. Rockefeller, Mr. Baruch and Thomas Chadbourne. No better representatives could have been found, and we are now thoroughly convinced that this is truly a government for the people, of the people and by the people.

We think it was Lewis H. Morgan who divided the history of man in three epochs, the age of stone, the age of bronze, and the age of iron. If he had lived until now he surely would have called this the age of junk.

"Capitalism," says the New Republic, "is not a system; it is not a community of interest and action; it is merely a regime like the hypothetical matriarchate, unified only in the logic of its philosophical critics."

This logamachous definition is just as clear as mud.

King Albert of Belgium spent an hour in Toledo, but what about the workers who have to spend their whole lives there? The great ovation he received shows that Toledo still believes in democracy.

Victor Berger wrote in his Social Democratic Herald, October, 1907, the following tit-bit about his dear comrade Morris Hilquit:

"Comrade Hilquit is a prominent lawyer of New York, making a lot of money and owning a lot of property. And while he is a bright fellow—doing a great deal of work for clothing manufacturers, some for the trade unions—he surely is not the man to speak at a labor meeting for the American proletariat, nationally or internationally."

Morris Hilquit puckered his legal brow and penned the following lines in The New York Worker for November 9th, 1907:

"Comrade Berger is a well-known insurance broker in Milwaukee, making a lot of money and owning real estate. And while he is a shrewd fellow—writing insurance for all subscribers of the Wahrheit and some others—he is surely not the man to indulge in violent diatribes in the name of the real American proletariat."

We believe both these "comrades."

In view of the recent emancipation of the Negro at Chicago, Omaha, Nashville, we learn from entirely unreliable sources that the Rev. Thomas Dixon is changing the name of "The Clansman" to "The Great Betrayal."

The California Courts have ordered several books in the Public Library to be burnt—amongst others, John Spargo's "Unionism, Syndicalism and Socialism." Could not they be prevailed upon to burn all of Spargo's books?

(Editor:—No, we are in favor of a free press. Let them put Spargo's books in the libraries, in the department for the blind.)

Home Rule for Ireland is due to become law in November, but what's the good of Home Rule for Irishmen when most of them have no home to rule.

"The Allies sent troops into Siberia to save democracy," says Dean Barrow, of California University. This is a truly Marxian statement, for does not Marx say in the Eighteenth Brumaire that "man makes his own history." Evidently Dean Barrow does, at any rate. A comrade suggests that Dean Barrow got sunstroke while in Siberia—but that's a freezing lie. An easier explanation is that the Dean is an educator.

We understand that Eadmonn MacAlpine, late of the Revolutionary Age, has returned to Ireland,

The Proletarian

Published Monthly at
174 Michigan Avenue
Detroit, Michigan

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

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

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



and that Jim Larkin is contemplating following his example.

It almost makes an Atheist say, "God help the Irish working class."

"What are wages," asked the teacher.

"A vanishing quantity," answered the student of mathematics.

Isn't it funny that a workingman thinks he's lucky when he's exploited—that is, when he finds a master. When he is not exploited he's "unlucky!"—he can't get a boss.

Such is luck today.

The more of us get jobs, the more of us are lucky. The capitalist doesn't seem to compete with us for the luck.

John Skinnum: I saw a murderer running up the street.

Bill Wageplug: A murderer, what's that?

John: Why somebody who kills a man.

Bill: You mean a soldier, then?

John: No—I mean one who kills a man in peace time.

Bill: Oh, you mean an executioner.

John: No, I mean a man who kills another in his house.

Bill: Ah, a doctor, then.

John: Oh, hell—what's the use.

Imagine, if you can, living in a highly industrialized community like Detroit; then let your imagination run a little further and picture in your mind numbers of families unable to secure housing facilities, others dispossessed because of their inability to pay the constantly rising rents demanded, the whole working class of the city struggling to make both ends meet, and then conceive, if you can, the Episcopal Church holding its Fortieth Triennial General Convention amid such surroundings, and discussing such great and momentous problems "whether the perpetual reservation of the Blessed Sacrament with the burning of a light before it, and the singing of the Ave Maria, is inconsistent with the doctrinal position and historic practices of the Protestant Episcopal Church." All this in the twentieth century.

THE PROLETARIAN

Vol. II

NOVEMBER, 1919

No. 7

The Psychology of Militarism

By OAKLEY CALVIN JOHNSON

ALTHOUGH the "war to end war" has been fought and won, yet the proposal of Secretary of War Baker to increase the standing army to over half a million men, with an immediately available war footing of a million and a quarter, excites no surprise in the mind of a Marxian. One cannot, however, repress a mild feeling of curiosity with regard to the inner workings of the great democratic minds which, with one hand, "abolish" military tyranny, and establish it with the other; which proclaim the end of all war and at the same time exhort the people to treble their army and quadruple their armaments; which celebrate the birth of the League of Nations as the sole possessor of world authority, and in the same breath ambitiously declare that "America is to be the greatest power the world will have to reckon with."

There are, in the main, two reasons why militarism, far from declining, is getting to be the foremost demand, in fact, the foremost necessity, for modern capitalism. In the light of these reasons it becomes clear why bourgeois "pacifists" like Baker and Colonel House and William Jennings Bryan, in spite of their "humanitarianism," see the "practical need" of a strong military organization.

One of these reasons, often pointed out since the advent of the socialist movement in 1848, is the need of capitalism for foreign markets and foreign investments. Capitalists are forced to sell their surplus goods in competition with foreign capitalists who want to do the same thing. They must force their way into Africa, into China, into the Balkans; they must subjugate the rising native capitalists; they must force out rival capitalists. For these purposes, both aggressive and defensive, armed force is a pre-requisite; even Wilsonian pacifists can see that. Capitalism evolves into Imperialism.

The second reason for the growth of militarism has to do with the "protection of society" within our own country. With threatened railway strikes, coal miners on the verge of quitting work, and the steel workers of Gary and elsewhere in revolt, it is no wonder that General Leonard Wood's chief duty should be to suppress riot (?)—the same man who helped Roosevelt organize the famous "Rough Riders" in the war with Spain! Even the police, it seems, are a bit unreliable. Everywhere unemployment and the high cost of living are getting in their work, that is, social forces are exemplifying the dialectics of Marx and Engels. Militarism under Capitalist Dictatorship is unavoidable.

Intervention—A Problem in Militarism

Recent propaganda in favor of Mexican intervention is an illustration of the first major cause for the establishment and extension of militaristic sentiment and militaristic purposes. Newspapers have been trying to work up anti-Mexican feeling. Attempts are made to "resurrect" Villa—attempts which thus far are conspicuous failures. Constant repeating of tales of alleged Mexican "outrages" in the American press is too pointed to escape notice, though the public, as yet, pays little heed. Mexico is not, like Germany, a power to be

feared, and, of course, is most unlikely to declare war on the United States. The latter country must, therefore, take the initiative—a process which, although the act of a Hun in the case of Belgium, would merely be "intervention" in the case of Mexico! Every effort is being made to make intervention plausible and popular. Why?

The natural wealth of Mexico is fabulous. Silver mines and other riches have been known for centuries, and for the last couple of decades oil wells have been discovered which are proving a veritable ocean of wealth for enterprising American capitalists. Cheap labor by the peons and comparative freedom from native competition have made Mexico a bonanza for these American financial pirates—except for one thing. The Mexican government, alive to the danger of robbery from these sources (though not averse, perhaps, to exploiting the peons in its own interest), is offering most obstinate and embarrassing opposition.

Post-War Jingoism a Failure

But all this propaganda for Mexican intervention, although not actively opposed by the intelligent (!) American "public," has, nevertheless, fallen flat. The European War has left the people apathetic on the subject of patriotism. Any attempt to start a "hip hurrah" Stand-by-your-Uncle-Sam-campaign at this time would have the effect of an anti-climax. People feel, too, although they do not understand, that legislatures are wonderfully slow in paying soldiers' bonuses, though wonderfully fast in making huge appropriations for building battleships. Soldiers are so busy hunting jobs that they have no time for glory or hollow sentiment. Of course, it is incorrect to imply that Americans would consider it wrong to seize Mexican territory merely because they condemn Japanese "brigandage" in seizing Shantung. Remember the seizure of Texas and Panama! But just at this time the American people are tired of war, and the thinly-veiled propaganda in favor of attack on a neighbor nation has borne little fruit.

Not only in respect to intervention but in every phase of militarism there has been little popular enthusiasm since the war. War stories are already stale, war lectures no longer draw a crowd. The lure of the uniform seems completely overcome.

"Unless more students elect one of the courses offered in military training," says a daily paper, referring to the University of Michigan, "it is quite likely that the government may order them abandoned and withdraw Col. Lucas, who is commandant at Michigan." It seems that scarce a score are enrolling in the course. This confession, taken in connection with the fact that the last student enrollment at the University is thirty per cent greater than any previous year, is strong indication of the present status of war enthusiasm. However, the propaganda for increased armament in general and intervention in particular is steadily carried on.

The WHY of Imperialist Propaganda

One wonders just why this propaganda is necessary.

The reason for intervention is plain. Why do not our masters go ahead and "intervene," if they want to?

The fact is that bourgeois democracy, unlike feudal aristocracy, must take account of public opinion. True, this "public opinion" is a poor, pitiable thing, so far as its intelligence is concerned. It is molded and even manufactured almost at will by the capitalist press, ably assisted by the school and the church. Society is a sort of great psychological laboratory, in which Imperialists are constantly experimenting to control the mind of the people. But for all that, public opinion must be marshalled first, before any important public policy is put forward. People must be persuaded. Capitalism rules us, it is true, as Engels and Lenine point out, through the forms of political democracy; but it rules us **with** this democracy, this public sanction, not, as did Feudalism, **without** it.

This is an important fact, and one of the highest importance to Socialists—to Communists—from a tactical point of view. If propaganda is so necessary to capitalist purposes, it must be vital to our own. We, too, must propagandize our principles; we, too, must reach the "public"—the **working-class** public. The working public can be reached; the development of capitalist democracy, with its correlative universalizing of the ability to read, has made that possible. Capitalist propaganda shows its **necessity** under capitalism. Class-conscious education of the workers, therefore, with constant and parallel work in organization, is, at present, the task of the revolutionary part of the proletariat.

The Big Strike

FOR some weeks the country has been rocked by the greatest strike in its history. The steel industry has been paralyzed by the biggest walkout ever attempted by American Labor and the end is not yet in sight.

Steel being a basic industry, the strike drives at the very heart of American capitalism. If prolonged to a sufficient length, the strike, which is being felt in all lines of activity, will seriously cripple industry. Steel products are essential to the operation of a multitude of factories and the strike may yet endanger the very foundations of American capitalism.

No one appreciates this better than the capitalists themselves, and, for this reason, they are straining every nerve to break the organization of the steel workers. One has but to read the daily papers to realize how the capitalist class, always conscious of its class interest, is working in harmony against the slaves of the mills.

Never has any employer of labor taken a more autocratic stand than did Judge Gary in his refusal to confer with the committee of the steel workers. His attitude in refusing to even consult with the committee demonstrates that he is willing to go to any length to prevent labor organizations from securing a foothold in the "public" industries. As yet we have seen nothing in the "public" press or from the mouths of prominent individuals, including President Wilson, condemning him for the stand that he has taken. Fully realizing that he would secure the conscious and undivided support of the capitalist class of the country Gary threw the gauntlet to the committee and the fight is now on.

Gary's statement, obviously made for publicity purposes, in reference to the strike must be taken with a grain of salt. Anything but the most superficial analysis will show its hypocrisy and malicious intent. If it were not for the fact that many workers will swallow his statement this carefully worded letter of Gary's would be a joke. Gary, himself, knows better. No one but the most gullible would be fooled by his words. He uses arguments that were dead 20 years, as far as the people of understanding are concerned. Talking of the autocracy of unions and their domination over the laboring man is decidedly funny to one who remembers Homestead and other "democratic" acts of the steel barons.

The Government, as the agent of the capitalist class, has, of course, taken an interest in the strike. The steel strike is one of the important matters before the industrial conference in Washington. The strike committee has endeavored to use the government in their interest. But their lengthy telegram to the President shows that they do not appreciate the nature of the government and the struggle in which they are engaged. Some would contend that, for tactical reasons, the appeal to the president to intervene was justified, but a close examination of the facts will show that such actions only serve to confuse the workers and make them easy prey to any clever, so-called liberal, servant of the capitalist class.

Workers who desire a lesson as to the functions of the government and the things that will determine its actions when the interests of labor and capital come into conflict, need seek no further than this strike.

One of the first acts of the ruling class was the mobilizing of the forces of oppression against the strikers. The police of the various cities in which steel plants are located have been used with good results by the capitalist class. The Pennsylvania "Cossacks" are being used with telling effect against the unarmed and helpless strikers. Organized and trained for the express purpose of suppressing the working class, the "Cossacks" are fully justifying their existence. Riding into peaceful meetings, swinging their clubs (their substitute for the knout) at defenseless heads, they are making the country "safe for democracy." These forces have been augmented by hordes of "private" police of the mill owners. Especially selected for this work, these ruffians outdo the Cossacks in their brutality. The murder of Mrs. Fannie Snellins will stand as a monument to their degeneracy when Judge Gary and his like are rotting in their graves. For downright brutality this incident has no equal. Shooting alone did not satisfy the blood-lust of these thugs. They must proceed to crush her skull with their clubs, scattering her brains on the ground. And, to close the orgy, a pervert satisfied himself by placing her hat upon his head and dancing upon her helpless corpse. The coroner's jury has justified this act; yet some would have us believe that this "free" government of ours does not represent the interest of the capitalist class!

A general campaign is now on to discredit the strike. Knowing that the majority of the working class are not ready for a revolution, the public press is carrying on propaganda to make it appear that the leaders of this strike are revolutionists. The only thing that we can say is that we are sorry that they are not. William Z. Foster is the center of their fire at the present time. They have dug up his record in the I. W. W. and are endeavoring to use it against him. True, Foster is a syndicalist, but it does not follow that he is revolu-

tionary. Syndicalism is in reality a reactionary philosophy. Foster stands ready, with the balance of the leaders of the strike, to compromise the demands of the strikers and accept a settlement of some sort. In fact, according to the statements of some of the leaders, the granting of a conference should end the strike for the refusal of a conference was the thing that caused it.

The revolutionary qualities of the strike are nil. Some, there are, who are talking of widening the strike and making it revolutionary. The road is, indeed, long to the revolutionary mass strike and those who talk of such possibilities in this present strike are blinded by their own enthusiasm. It is possible that the strike may be widened, and it should be widened, but the mere widening of the strike will not make it revolutionary. The strike started over the sale of the com-

modity labor-power, and until the workers engaged understand the nature of the struggle and the only way to settle it permanently, it will be nothing else.

If the workers learn the proper lesson out of this strike the next one may have a greater revolutionary potentiality. In order that this may be accomplished the Communists should accelerate their work of spreading revolutionary propaganda among the workers. Intelligent action in such affairs can come only from an intelligent working class.

We must redouble our efforts in the education of the workers in order to speed the day when they will change the slogan upon their banners from "A fair day's work for a fair day's pay" to the revolutionary watch-word, "The abolition of the wages system."

Minority Action

By DENNIS E. BATT

One of the salient points of division at the Communist Party Convention was the question of whether it was possible to accomplish the social revolution with a minority of the working class. In fact, it was the adherence of the so-called Michigan group to the principle of majority action that aided materially in defeating the minority report on manifesto and program. Of course, there were other criticisms of the minority manifesto which we will take up in later issues, but this point of minority vs. majority action was one of the most important.

The criterion of bolshevism appeared to be whether one believed that a few communists without the great mass of the people could affect the transition from capitalism to the co-operative commonwealth. That is, accomplish the social revolution. The opinion of the dominant spirits of the convention was without a doubt, that it could. The question formed the basis of the boggy-man cry of "Mensheviki" against the minority delegates.

It is important that we should arrive at a definite understanding of the question whether the Communists will endeavor to take control without having the great mass of the people consciously with them. It is an important tactical question, and should be approached judicially; for, if an error is committed upon this point it will lead to disaster. The point might be raised that we have no way of knowing definitely that the masses are with us. That, however, is beside the point. The question is not: How are we going to determine whether the masses are with us or not, but must the masses be with us in order that the transition may be made?

It should appear to even the most superficial observer that it is impossible to accomplish a social revolution of the character of the proletarian revolution without the conscious support of the great mass of the people. Upon this particular point all Socialists of International repute agree. Many there are who have come into the lime-light because of the constant reiteration of revolutionary phrases and slogans who contend otherwise, but they can be easily dismissed.

It is true that in the past revolutions have been conducted by a minority conscious of their interests. These revolutions did not call for a drastic change in the structure of society; rather only for a change in the ruling groups. Not so with the proletarian revolution. The

social revolution calls for a fundamental change in the structure of society itself and because of the wide effect of this change it calls for the conscious co-operation of the great mass of the people.

In connection with this Engels says: "As conditions have changed for warfare, so not less for the class struggle. The period of sudden onslaughts, of revolutions carried out by small conscious minorities, at the head of the unconscious masses is passed. Where the question involves the complete transformation of the social organization, there the masses themselves have already grasped what the struggle is all about and what they are to stand for. This is what the history of the last fifty years has taught us. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long and persistent work is needed, and it is just this work that we are now doing, and that, too, with a success that drives our opponents to despair." It is quite evident from the above that Frederick Engels had no illusions in regard to the necessity of convincing the masses that the socialist position was correct.

Things have come to such a pass, however, that the opinion of Engels doesn't have much weight, and it is well to quote other authorities. On pages 174 and 175 of "The Proletarian Revolution in Russia," Lenine says: "In order to become a power, the class conscious workers must win over a majority to their side; as you cannot resort to force against the masses, there is no other way to lead them on. We are not Blanquists, we do not stand for a seizure of power by the minority."

Again, on page 177, he says: "We must formulate criticisms and expose the mistakes of the petty bourgeois parties, the Social-Revolutionary and Social Democratic parties; we must train and bring together what will be the elements of a class conscious proletarian communistic party, we must rescue the proletariat from its mental asphyxiation by bourgeois ideals.

"In appearance this is nothing more than propaganda work. In reality, this is the most practical form of revolutionary activity, for a revolution cannot possibly get anywhere when it stops, gets drunk on words, treads everlastingly the same spot, handicapped as it is, not by opposition from the outside or by bourgeois repression, but simply by the unthinking confidence of the masses.

"It is only by destroying this unthinking confidence (and we can only destroy it by education), it is by resorting to intellectual persuasion, by pointing out the teachings of life itself, that we will succeed in emancipating ourselves from this continuous spree of mere revolutionary words. Then only will we be able to move forward, then will we behold a real proletarian consciousness, mass consciousness, a courageous and resolute spirit of initiative in every local group; then the people will take the law in their own hands and bring forth, develop and fortify freedom, democracy and the principle of national ownership of land." We see from the above that Lenine is pretty strong for the education of the masses as a method of freeing them from their unthinking confidence. However, since those, who have been styled "the Mensheviks of Michigan" by phrasemongers drunk on words, have been so strong for education perhaps Lenine should not have used the word. Nevertheless, we cannot desert the position that the first step must be to convince the majority of the working class that the Communist position is correct.

International socialists of standing have never been indefinite on this question and one might quote almost anyone of them to show that they did not approve of the idea that a minority, at the head of masses who did not understand the nature of the historic work they were called upon to perform, could accomplish the revolution.

A pamphlet published by the British Socialist Party, "The German Spartacists, Their Aims and Objects," is very interesting reading in this connection. The pamphlet is the official declaration of the Spartacus Union and they state their views on this question of majority and minority action.

On page 5 they say "In all preceding revolutions it was a small minority of people who conducted the revolutionary struggle. This minority determined the goal, gave direction to the fight, and used the masses only as tools to secure victory for their own interest, the interest of the minority. The Socialist revolution

is the first revolution which can secure victory for and THROUGH the great majority of the workers themselves.

"It is the task of the proletarian mass not only CLEARLY and CONSCIOUSLY to determine the aim and direction of the revolution. It must also establish socialism step by step through its own activity." (Emphasis mine.)

On page 7 we find the following: "The proletarian revolution is not the desperate attempt of a minority forcibly to transform the world in accordance with its own ideal. On the contrary, it is the action of great masses, of millions of people, called upon to carry out their historic mission and to make a reality of what has become an historic necessity."

We should by all means learn the lessons of the proletarian revolutions in Europe and profit by their mistakes. Where the great mass of the people have not been ready for the revolution, there the revolution has been defeated. This was unquestionably the reason for the defeat of the revolution in Germany. Karl Liebknecht in the "Red Flag," was forced finally to admit that the "masses were not ready."

In Hungary the condition was similar. The Communists came to power not because they were in the majority but because the old regime was so weak. It, too, ultimately fell. From these events we must learn a lesson. That lesson is to disregard the revolutionary troubadours who have become drunk with their own revolutionary phraseology and to accept as our position that of the Spartacus Union (page 14).

"The Spartacus Union will never take over the power of government otherwise than by a CLEAR manifestation of the UNQUESTIONABLE will of the great majority of the proletarian mass of Germany. It will only take over the power of Government by the CONSCIOUS approval by the mass of the workers of the principles, aims, and tactics of the Spartacus Union." (Emphasis mine.)

Blurring The Class Lines

WHEN we read the profound opinions of editors of industrial magazines, we begin to doubt the correctness of the theories of Marx and Engels. The editors of these papers show themselves to be such masters of sociology and economics that we stand aghast at their keen penetration, not to mention their imaginative powers.

We have formerly supposed that society has, throughout the period of civilization, and even prior to it, been divided into various economic classes of persons, and that it is so divided today, but our opinion on this matter has been greatly upset by perusal of a passage taken from a magazine published by E. F. Houghton & Co., of Philadelphia, as follows:

" . . . Socialism has persisted in ignoring a fact on which the sincere students of economics have long ago been agreed, *i. e.*, that the interests of Capital and Labor are identical. What is good for my workmen is good for me, and vice-versa.

"The Socialist, however, has a consuming enmity for the somewhat indefinite person he styles the 'Capitalist.'"

The capitalist, as we see here, is an "indefinite person," consequently there is no capitalist class. It is, perhaps, just as well not to attempt to define the capitalist. In order to have him appear as a person with

interests identical with "Labor" it is probably best for him to be "indefinite." Because there might be some slight difficulty in showing just what sort of useful work is performed by a man who owns stocks and bonds in various industrial enterprises and whose income is derived from dividends and interest. Similarly with the landlord whose property ownership enables him to reside in California for his health. He is best described as an "indefinite person" so as not to show too sharp a line of demarcation between him and a workingman.

Then, too, we learn that the "interests of Capital and Labor are identical." But who are "Capital" and "Labor?" We might suppose that these terms referred to classes of persons, but our brilliant editor surely does not mean to use them that way, otherwise what becomes of the indefinable condition of the capitalist? On the other hand, if they are things, how can they have "interests?" We are quite perplexed at this seeming inconsistency, but, of course, we must assume that it is a matter of appearance only, as no industrial magazine editor would be guilty of advancing any but the most scientific conclusions. In the absence of explanatory remarks, however, we shall be obliged to look into this matter on our own account.

We all know that labor is muscular and mental exertion applied with the object of producing something. Marx defines it as the "expenditure of human labor-power." The average person's idea of capital is money. This is true in the first instance. Capital generally takes the form of money at first. But what happens to it? No sooner is it invested in business than it is spent for other things. It is spent for buildings, machinery, materials, etc. In other words, it is spent for the **means of production**. These means of production are just as much capital as was the money in the first place. In fact, they are more so, because it is only when invested in these things that it becomes capital. Money kept out of use can no more be called capital than can the wood in a tree be called furniture. It is the use to which it is put that gives it its name and character. Now, when men go into business they do so for the purpose of making a profit. This is the prime object of all industrial enterprise when conducted by private individuals or corporations. If you think otherwise, ask any business man what kind of a proposition he would consider it to invest a sum of money for 10 years and receive a return of the exact amount he invested. Your reply will be indelicately worded. We may, therefore, briefly define capital as wealth used in production for the purpose of making a profit. This wealth, which consists of the means of production, is owned by various individuals, who are, therefore, owners of capital. In order to make use of this wealth in production, labor has to be applied to it. Do the men who own the capital furnish this labor-power themselves? Most certainly not. This labor-power is furnished, almost entirely by men who do not own capital, that is, by workingmen. The term "Capital" is commonly used to refer to the wealth used in production for profit and to refer to the class of men who own that wealth and who, therefore, do not have to do useful work, but receive their incomes in the form of profit, interest and rent. The term "Labor" is used to refer to the act of applying labor-power to the raw materials in the production of goods and also to refer to the class of men who furnish the labor-power.

With these facts in mind, the question arises as to why the application of the term "Capitalist" to a man who owns capital is so objectionable to our dear editor. Socialists are not responsible for either the existence of capital or capitalists; they were both here when Socialism as a scientific theory made its appearance and had been recognized and have been recognized since by various economists. Our editor, however, shows clearly why he wishes to blur the class lines and at the same time gives an unwitting recognition of the distinction of the two classes when he says: "What is good for my workingmen is good for me." Our editor is a capitalist himself; if not, if he is a workingman why did he not say: "What is good for my **fellow** workingmen is good for me?" And, pray, how do they come to be "my" workingmen? Smacks of slavery, does it not?

It occurs to us to ask whether workingmen can afford to spend their time reading such drivel? But they do read it and many of them fail to see the utter absurdity of it, hence this article.

Let us consider the findings of some investigators, which we venture to hope will appeal to the reader as somewhat more in accord with the real facts of social development than what we have considered above. Con-

cerning the rise of aristocracy, Lewis H. Morgan, a world renowned ethnologist, writes thus:

"During the later period of barbarism a new element, that of aristocracy, had a marked development. The individuality of persons, and the increase of wealth now possessed by individuals in masses, were laying the foundation of personal influence." (Ancient Society, Kerr ed., p. 560.)

Morgan gives a large part of the credit for the development of aristocracy to the accumulation of masses of wealth in the hands of individuals. Thus we see that the possession of property and the creation of classes are closely bound together. Morgan shows, through a detailed description of primitive society that prior to the appearance of property in masses, strict equality prevailed and it was not possible for an individual or a class to reserve for themselves exclusive privileges. All of which corresponds with what we previously pointed out, namely, that the ownership of property in the means of wealth production is what makes a man a capitalist.

That others besides socialists have recognized the existence of a capitalist class is shown by the following from Gibbons, the well-known English economist and historian:

" . . . a man cannot become a capitalist without capital, and capital cannot be accumulated without labor; though these remarkably obvious facts are constantly forgotten. The large capitalists of earlier manufacturing days obtained their capital, after the first small beginnings, from the wealth produced by their workmen. . . ." (Industrial History of England, p. 176.)

And we might remark that it is no less true today that capital is produced by labor. And having this in mind, how can we help seeing that the men who extract this capital from the labor of their workmen are a class and that they are properly called the capitalist class; further, that the men who labor and produce this capital for their masters, but who never produce any capital for themselves, are another class and are properly called the working class.

The modern capitalists are just as sharply defined to the student of economics, as were the nobility of Feudal times or the aristocracy of the period mentioned by Morgan. But because they are not officially recognized in a social or legal way, they do not appear as distinct to the average man. A lord could not deny—did not wish to deny—that he was a lord. But a capitalist may pretend to be worker and get away with it—with the simple minded. Yet the actual social distinction between a capitalist and his workmen is even greater than was the case in Feudal times between lord and serf or craftsman. On this point William Morris, in his "Art, Labor and Socialism," remarks:

"The craftsman of the middle ages, no doubt, often suffered grievous material oppression, yet, in spite of the rigid line of separation drawn by the hierarchical system under which he lived between him and his feudal superior, the difference between them was arbitrary rather than real; there was no such gulf in language, manners and ideas as divides a cultivated middle class person of today, 'a gentleman,' from even a respectable lower-class man. . . ."

Looking at the matter from still another standpoint let us see in what direction we are tending at present. If the possession of property in large masses furnishes the basis for classes, as Morgan points out, how will this rule apply to present-day affairs? Is property held in large masses today by individuals or is it widely diffused among the population? The Industrial Relations Commission, in its final report, quotes figures compiled by Prof. Willard I. King, a conservative statistician, showing that two per cent of the people own 60 per cent

of the wealth of this nation, while 65 per cent of the people (the working class) own together only 5 per cent. On the same page we read as follows:

"The actual concentration has, however, been carried very much further than these figures indicate. The largest private fortune in the United States, estimated at one billion dollars, is equivalent to the aggregate wealth of two and a half millions of those who are classed as 'poor,' who are shown in the studies cited to own on the average about \$400 each."

Here, then, we have immense accumulations of wealth, not only in the hands of certain individuals but in the hands of a class. These accumulations are far greater than those spoken of by Morgan, and, further, the concentration of wealth is going on at all times. If, then, the massing of wealth in the barbaric period should have aided in producing a privileged class, why should not greater accumulations in modern society form a basis of a privileged class. In fact, it is utterly unthinkable that a society in which some men own so much wealth can be in a healthy condition and he who imagines that billion dollar fortunes and real democracy can live side by side is simple, indeed.

The conviction has been growing among the workers that they constitute a class in society with common interests. This is disturbing to the capitalists, who, as a privileged class, see in it a danger to their privileged position. They, therefore, attempt to smudge over the distinction between a capitalist and a workingman. How amusingly clumsy these attempts are can be seen by a little comparison. For instance, the National Association of Manufacturers uses a pay envelope with several "axiomatic truths" printed thereon, including the following: "Capitalists include every man who has a dollar or more." According to this we are a nation of capitalists, whereas, according to the quotation given at the beginning of this article, no one can be definitely called a capitalist. First the capitalist is everywhere, then he is nowhere, according to the exponents of the

present order of things. These gentlemen should decide on a story and stick to it.

During the time that classes have existed in society there has been turmoil, misery, degradation, in various forms. This was not so before the advent of classes. True, various tribes fought each other bitterly; but within the tribe harmony, such as we do not know today prevailed. Today, the strife exists not only between nations but within each nation. The American Indians lived in a society without classes. Of them Morgan writes:

"All the members of an Iroquois gens were personally free, and they were bound to defend each other's freedom; they were equal in privileges and in personal rights, the sachem and chiefs claiming no superiority; and they were a brotherhood bound together by the ties of kin. Liberty, equality and fraternity, though never formulated, were cardinal principles of the gens. These facts are material, because the gens was the unit of a social and governmental system, the foundation upon which Indian Society was organized." (I. c., p. 85.)

It is noteworthy that in Indian society little attention was paid to the declaration of these equal rights but they observed them in actual practice. Today, we get many flowery speeches and a great deal of brass-band democracy and equality as a substitute for the real thing.

To conclude, we wish to point out that only by the elimination of classes in society can real equality and fraternity prevail. It is to this task that we must direct our energies. But before this can be accomplished we must know the way. The first step is to cease being influenced by the nauseating prattle of the defenders of capitalism, read and study sound literature and attend lectures where these matters are dealt with by men who have given them earnest study from a working class standpoint. We will then be on our way to a clear understanding and the building up of an organization properly equipped to attain our ends.

L. B.

International Notes

By John Keracher

England The industrial and political conditions in England, although closely related, are so complex that it is difficult for those who are not familiar with British life to understand the peculiar aspects of the class struggle there. When we read of six hundred thousand railroad workers being out on strike, and of one hundred thousand miners being idle as a result, we are obliged to consider the effects of these events upon the nation as a whole.

Prophetic expressions that revolution was imminent in England have been plentiful on this side of the Atlantic. The mere magnitude of the strike, and the part the government was compelled to play, led many to believe that the strike was revolutionary in its nature, but this was far from being true.

Those who are familiar with British working class organizations are aware that the revolutionary groups are comparatively small. The labor movement in England is not class conscious. The workers are job-conscious, or industrially conscious, rather than conscious of the nature of their class position. The tenacity of purpose, the unity and solidarity manifested, although practically nation-wide, has, generally speaking, no deeper significance than that of a gigantic wage dispute. It appears that the cost of living is approxi-

mately 110 per cent higher than in pre-war days, while wages have not increased in the same proportion. Hence the strike.

The railroads being under the control of the government, Lloyd-George and his associates were placed in much the same position as are employers or corporations. They accused the labor leaders of trying to foment a revolution, and the charge was promptly and indignantly denied. Despite this, the government called to its aid all the repressive forces at its command. The strike was wide-spread and went into operation speedily; but those in control of the political forces acted with equal rapidity. Armed forces were held in constant readiness and rushed to every strategical point. The roads were kept open, and according to press reports, trains were operated by volunteers from the middle class and the aristocracy, assisted by sailors from the Royal navy.

By these methods, and by placing the country on a war-time food rationing, the British ruling class, through their control of the State, had the general strike throttled practically from the very outset. Compromise was the only way out, and the strikers **gracefully accepted a promise** that so long as the cost of living remained at a certain point above pre-war prices a

certain wage would be granted them by the government. Rather an indefinite settlement, to say the least, so far as the workers are concerned. The class which is in control of the powers of government, as usual, had the better of it in the argument.

It is but a few short months since the workers of Britain had an opportunity of expressing their will at the ballot box. On that occasion they elected to office such staunch supporters of capitalist interests as Lloyd-George, Arthur Balfour, Lord Robert Cecil, Winston Churchill, J. H. Thomas, and his social-patriot labor friends. These men can be depended upon to suppress and betray the workers. These elections were a fair indication of the state of mind of British labor in general. Here and there, however, signs of an awakening show through the dark clouds of reaction and compromise.

In this connection, the action of the insurgent elements within the labor movement in raising issues of a political nature and arousing the rank and file, in opposition to the official leaders, is worthy of note. The recent "Hands Off Russia" movement was a case in point—although it now appears that those in power quieted this agitation with a few promises.

General Ironsides, who was in command of the British forces in North Russia, has recently returned to England. Lord Rawlinson has been placed in supreme command of both the Archangel and Murmansk regions, and, according to War Minister Churchill, he "has been supplied with everything that he has asked for, and has been accorded the fullest discretionary power as to the time and method of evacuation."

On arriving at Liverpool, General Ironsides was asked to express an opinion on the situation in Russia, and replied: "I think a darn sight too much has been said already. We have finished our job and think that the Russian people can now look after themselves." His remark about "too much being said already" is evidently a fling at the revelations of Lieut.-Col Sherwood-Kelly, who served under him in Russia, and who was sent home for "committing a serious offense under the Army Act."

It appears that Col. Kelly had written to a friend in England condemning the North Russian operations. For this offense he was tried before a court martial, but in view of his past record, and also, perhaps, to cover up the incident, he was merely "sent home." This man's courage is evidently not confined to the battlefield alone, for his statements have stirred up a veritable hornet's nest in England, and a bitter controversy has developed between him and War Minister Churchill. A public statement was issued by Churchill, which Col. Kelly answered in the columns of the "Daily Express." Speaking of the letter in question, he said: "I knew that this letter would be opened by the censor, and that I would be brought before the commander-in-chief for it. The offense was committed deliberately and with a set purpose which I believe to be honorable and right."

The "Daily Herald," the leading labor paper in England, has given considerable publicity to the Kelly-Churchill controversy, and also to the Bullitt Report on Russian negotiations, which was recently before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. On the strength of the statements made before the Senate Committee, the "Herald" scores Lloyd-George and de-

mands that he resign his office. It accuses him of "intriguing, vacillating, twisting, misleading; always thinking of keeping office for himself; devoid of conviction, devoid of principle."

This quarrel between the labor politicians, although noisy and spectacular, must not be taken seriously, from a proletarian standpoint. The labor leaders have been smarting for some time as a result of the rebuff they received from the Little Welshman and his colleagues. It was but payment-in-kind for the dirty, truckling policy which these social-patriots adopted toward the Government and the capitalist class during the period of the war. British labor is paying a heavy price for its lessons; yet there is little real evidence thus far of the British workers becoming conscious of their class position and the means of ridding themselves of those who rule and rob them.

Bulgaria The Balkan States have long been the breeding ground of European troubles. Apart from its real causes, the great war had for its starting-point, the assassination of an Austrian Grand Duke at Sarajevo. Although almost constantly warring amongst themselves, these countries are bound together by economic ties; their railroad systems are linked together, while the Danube forms a common outlet for their shipping. The dependance of several of these small nations upon Fiume as a sea-port is the cause of the present conflict with Italy, with the League of Nations acting the part of referee.

Like other Balkan states, Bulgaria is chiefly an agricultural country, with a great number of peasant proprietors. Since the close of the war considerable political changes have taken place: the Agrarian Party, which represents the largest portion of the population, made extensive gains at the expense of other parties in the recent elections. The greatest gain, however, was made by the Communists, who obtained 47 seats as against the 85 of the Agrarians. The government is made up of a coalition of several parties, the Communists alone constituting the Opposition.

The increase in the Communist vote has not been confined to the industrial centers. Out of a total of 160,000 votes cast for Communist candidates, 120,000 came from rural districts, indicating that the peasants are being won over to communism. This situation has alarmed the Agrarian leaders, and efforts are being made to unite several of the Balkan states, including Jugo-Slavia, into one bourgeois republic. The purpose is to erect a strong barrier against Italian aggression—and, incidentally, to meet the "menace of Bolshevism." The working class in the Balkans, as elsewhere, threatens to make things uncomfortable for those who live on rent, interest and profit.

Russia The military fortunes of Soviet Russia have fluctuated from time to time, and it is the unexpected which seems continually to happen. In sections where the enemy has been reported strongest, as in the case of Kolchak, there has been total collapse, while passive sections have suddenly developed offensives of threatening proportions. At the present time attention is centered on the advance toward Petrograd of Russian-German forces, which is being opposed by Lettish bourgeois forces along the Baltic.

Internal conditions continue to hamper the operation of the Workers' Government. There is a great scarcity

of raw materials and supplies, though transportation continues to be the chief difficulty. A member of the Supreme Economic Council states that while Russia formerly had 35,000 locomotives in operation there are only 4,000 available at present; another 5,000 could be repaired but lack of implements makes this impossible. The same authority goes on to state that "other means of production for which we used to depend upon imports are circular saws, etc. We are lacking pulp for paper factories. Up till now we have been able to get along on available reserves but these are being exhausted. Our need for print paper is 200,000 pounds a month (a pound is about 32 lbs.), but we can distribute only 100,000 pounds. You will understand what difficulties are thereby created for our educational activities."

The same is true of many other branches of industry, and the Allied blockade makes it almost impossible to relieve the situation.

In the Baltic provinces, beyond Danzig, General von der Goltz, who is co-operating with Russian czaristic forces, has led his army against the bourgeois armies of Courland and Esthonia. The new masters of Lettland and Esthonia will now have a change from fighting the proletarian armies of Russia to combatting an

army of the old German aristocracy. The new West Russian Government army, with which von der Goltz is co-operating, is nothing but the Baltic barons who ruled that section of the former Russian empire. British vessels have hastened to the assistance of the Letts and Esthonians, and the Entente has threatened Germany with the renewal of the blockade if von der Goltz is not immediately withdrawn. While they have agreed to comply with this demand, Berlin has been thrown into a flurry of excitement by the proposal that Germany join with the Allies in the blockade against Soviet Russia. This would mean that Germany is to assist in doing to Russia exactly the same thing as the Allies did to them, and help starve Red Russia into submission. The press is pointing this out, and also showing what the Allies hope to obtain by crushing the Soviet power. On the other hand, the Germans fear that if they refuse to assist in the blockade they will offend the Russian bourgeoisie, whom they expect will shortly be in power in Russia.

While General Denikin has made advances in the Ukraine, Kolchak has fallen back so far that Turkestan is now joined to Bolshevik territory. On the whole, vast territory is still under Soviet control, but the internal situation is far from being satisfactory.

The Socialist Forum

H. W. T., Washington, D. C., takes objection to statements contained in an article by James Conlan (Bourgeois Ideology vs. Proletarian Action) in the August issue. H. W. T. seems to miss the point that the workers must discard the constantly shifting view-point of the liberal middle class, and acquire a real understanding of their class position, the causes responsible for it and the way out. Due to the unstable position of the middle class in present-day society, their ideology is also unstable and changeable. The working class has been under the tutelage and leadership of liberal and radical groups far too long, and until they repudiate such leadership there is little chance of a truly conscious revolutionary movement developing.

It is contended that liberal and radical papers such as "The Nation" and "The Dial" are "actually favoring and agitating for measures which will make the social revolution easier." But experience has shown such "favoring and agitating" has had the very opposite effect. The socialist movement in Europe, with certain exceptions, has devoted the bulk of its energy to favoring and agitating for measures calculated to make the social revolution easier—and lost sight of the main issue. The same was true of the socialist movement in this country, and is almost entirely due to the influence of the "liberal" leaders who foisted their "radical" ideas upon the membership and forced real socialist principles into the background. The mission of the working class movement is the establishment of a communistic society, and not to advocate measures which will make the transition from capitalism to communism easier.

The objection to such papers as "The Nation" and "The Dial" lies in the plausibility of their arguments and the refreshing news they print, all of which are saturated with petit bourgeois notions of right and justice. If more socialist papers would lay bare the facts, as Conlan did, instead of slavishly following the lead of

these liberal journals, there would be less confusion in our ranks and the workers would secure that knowledge which is essential if the workers are to be successful.

Instead of appealing to "justice" and "right," the workers must base their actions upon the sound social and economic theories of modern socialism.

Who Has the Voting Power?

J. F. B., of Toledo, asks: "How can we capture political power in view of the fact that the working class hold the minority of votes?"

The alleged "fact" is a pure assumption. Even when we take note of the large number of Negroes, women and migratory workers who do not possess a vote, it remains true that the overwhelming share of the franchise is in the hands of the working class. Compared with the ever-increasing number of wage workers in this country, the capitalists are steadily declining in proportion. Take the last census figures and study the groups classified according to occupation; watch the frantic efforts of our masters to entice the working-class voters into their fold by special appeals to their ignorant prejudices, then you will gather additional evidence to the glaring fact of numerical strength of the working class electorate. Henry Laurens Call in his "Concentration of Wealth" states that one per cent of the population owns 90 per cent of the wealth of this country. The result of this capitalist expert's investigation for American Society for the Advancement of Science bears eloquent witness to our view that in spite of all the schemes of our rulers, they have had to yield the greater share of the voting power to their slaves. Down from the exclusive propertied franchise of colonial days to its wider extension of the present, the capitalists have concentrated on capturing the minds of the growing masses they were forced to en-

(Continued on Page 14)

Revolutionary Political Action

The Road to Socialism

(Sixth Installment)

The Lessons of Russia

Has the Russian Revolution influenced Socialist policy? This question is a prominent topic at the present time. Socialist Policy has been outlined in previous sections of this series and every point is sustained by the events of the Russian Revolution. Revolutionary Political Action has been demonstrated as the method of the advance to power of the workers. Education has been shown to be the vital thing to successful working class action. Where the work of education has not included the great body of the subject class, the speedy transformation of society is hindered. In Russia much of the training in scientific knowledge is yet to be given and consequently the transition period to the new social system will last longer. Lenine has demonstrated this in "Soviets at Work."

War and starvation hurried the Bolsheviki into the saddle with very little bloodshed. The weak, effete bourgeois of Russia were unable to retain power even with the assistance of the "patriotic" Social Revolutionaries, Menshiviki and Social Democrats. The great mass of the uneducated workers and peasants of Russia felt enough of the horrors of war and pressure of starvation to support the Bolsheviki. They did not know how to read and consequently were not influenced by a reptile press such as Western Capitalism has used against us.

Some argue from this that in other countries we can do without education and that instinctive rising will be the power sufficient to establish Socialism. They forget, however, that whilst the Russian workers rose without the widespread acceptance of Socialism the work of reconstructing society necessitated the education of the workers in Socialist knowledge. Lenine tells us that the success of the new order in Russia depends upon "the improvement of the educational and cultural state of the masses of the population."

In the advanced capitalist countries the workers can read and write and if we attempt a social revolution without the intelligent support of the majority of workers, we will meet with the opposition of the workers who fall victims to the papers and books so widely circulated by the capitalist press and their institutions.

The capitalists are a powerful, experienced and resourceful class and we can only meet their deep-laid plots and plans to dominate, by the intensive education and organization of the working class as a whole.

We are told by some that the Bolsheviki did without political action and relied upon industrial organization to effect the Revolution. This is entirely false. The general strike of 1905 for a Constituent Assembly resulted in the massacre of the workers and the imprisonment of many leaders and the banishment of all prominent individuals. Trade Unions were illegal bodies and the poorly developed large industry and the mass of small industries retarded industrial organization.

M. Phillips Price, in his masterly pamphlet, "The Old Order in Europe and the New Order in Russia," points

out the lack of industrial organizations and the reasons for it.

"The pure urban proletariat was a wage slave of the most abject type. His conditions of labor were imposed upon him by his employer. Association with the object of bettering his condition was denied him. In the year before the first revolution not more than 300,000 members of the trade unions were registered in all Russia, and they were put under close police supervision and only allowed to concern themselves with such things as insuring, at their own expense, their members against sickness and accident."

Price also indicates the political character of the movement as follows:

"Other circumstances also combined to create at the bottom of Russian society a huge, compact mass of politically explosive material. The urban workers of Russia have never been split up into a number of guilds, crafts, and trade unions, each running their own professional interests, as in Western Europe. Tsarism oppressed even trade unions, while the rapid growth of the European factory system in rural surroundings supplied the owner with semi-serf unskilled labor straight from the land. This type of laborer, conscious of his serf conditions, saw his only hope in direct political action. He, therefore, laid aside hopes of bettering his conditions by the formation of guilds and professional unions for economic ends. He formed a united revolutionary front with his comrade, the skilled laborer and the poor peasant, and did not allow the ranks to be broken by quarrels between professional grades of labor about the economic privileges of one section of the working classes over another, as is so often the case in Western Europe. In addition to this the proletariat mass of Russia was enriched by the presence in it of a considerable intellectual element. In Western Europe the propertied classes have always been quick to draw out from the ranks of labor the best and most capable elements, to induce them by advantageous offers to betray their class and to serve the interests of the class above them. But Tsarism, with an Oriental disdain for all but those who rule by the "will of God," laid down its heavy hand on proletariat and intellectual alike. The closest contact between these two elements of the community was, therefore, maintained, thus adding another social recruit to the revolutionary army."

If we are to avoid the prolonged warfare between different parties of workers we must bring the masses to a common understanding before the Revolution. The struggles between the victorious sections in Russia shows how detrimental differences in principles and policy can be to effective warfare against the common enemy. Lenine's experiences with the opposition and sabotage of the Anarchist and Anarcho-Syndicalist tendencies, demonstrates the importance of strict adherence to Socialist policy.

The July, 1917, general strike was crushed by the powers of the provisional government. Trotsky says: (From October to Brest Litovsk, p. 18) "Despite all that has recently been said and written in the bourgeois press, our party had no intention whatever of

seizing power by means of an armed revolt." The result of the July strike Trotsky tells us: "The Junkers, army officers, policemen, and the St. Georgian cavaliers were now masters of the situation. All these were headed by the savage counter revolutionists. The workers' organizations and establishments of our party were being ruthlessly crushed and demobilized. Arrests, searches, assaults and even murders came to be common occurrences." In "Lessons of the Revolution" (p. 19), Lenine says: "The resentment of the masses upon the removal of the war spoilation naturally grew and grew. On July 3 and 4 the indignation burst forth in an explosion which the Bolsheviks tried to mitigate, of course, attempting to direct it into organized channels."

It was not a general strike in November, 1917, that won power for the Bolsheviks but the political opposition of the Soviets to the reactionary Constituent Assembly. This led to the control of the State machinery by the Bolsheviks. The success of the new government was made possible by the support of the war-weary army.

Political Action was the policy advocated by the Bolshevik leaders. Trotsky, in his book, "Our Revolution" (p. 43), records his continual demand for a Constituent Assembly. In his article written during the first uprising of 1904 he wrote: "A political strike, not a local, but a general political strike all over Russia ought to have a general political slogan. This slogan is: to stop the war and call a national Constituent Assembly."

Trotsky further wrote: "We ought to use all possible occasions to make the idea of a national Constituent Assembly popular among the people. The peasants ought to be called to assemble on the day of the political strike and to pass resolutions demanding the calling of a Constituent Assembly." Later opposition to the Constituent Assembly was due to the reactionary conditions under which it was called together and the continual postponement by the Provisional Government making inevitable the use of swifter methods. Writing in September, 1917, Lenine pointed out that the Soviets were to function pending the promised Assembly. In his "Lessons of the Revolution" (p. 12), we read, "Indeed there could and should have been no other government but that of the Soviets until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. Only then would our revolution securely occupy the position of a really popular, really democratic revolution."

The real power which engineered the change from the Coalition Government to Bolshevik dictatorship was the control of the army so that (in the words of Trotsky): "without any chaos, without street fights, without firing or bloodshed, the government institutions were occupied one after another by severe and disciplined detachments of soldiers, sailors and Red guards." (October to Brest Litovsk, p. 56.)

More reasons for their attitude to the Constituent Assembly are given by Trotsky in the book just quoted.

"When we were declaring that the road to the Constituent Assembly was not by way of the Tseretelli Preliminary Parliament, but by way of the seizure of the reins of government by the Soviets, we were quite sincere.

"But the interminable delay in convoking the Constituent Assembly was not without effect upon this institution itself. Heralded in the first days of the Rev-

olution it came into being only after eight or nine months of bitter class and party struggles. It came too late to play a creative role."

The undemocratic character of the Assembly is pointed out by Trotsky as follows:

"The proportional system of elections still holds full sway, as every one knows in party lists. Since these lists were made up two or three months before the October Revolution and were not subject to change, the Left and Right Social Revolutionists still figured in these lists as one and the same party.

"Thus, by the time of the October Revolution—that is the period when the Right Social Revolutionists were arresting the Left and when the Left were combining with the Bolsheviks for the overthrow of Kerensky's ministry, the old lists remained in full force, and in the elections for the Constituent Assembly the peasants were compelled to vote for lists of names at the head of which stood Kerensky, followed by those of the Left Social Revolutionists who participated in the plot for his overthrow."

"To this should be added that the elections themselves were held during the first weeks after the October Revolution. The news of the change travelled rather slowly from the capital to the provinces from the cities to the villages. The peasantry in many places had but a very vague idea of what was taking place in Petrograd and Moscow. They voted for "Land and Liberty," for the representatives in the Land Committees, who, in most cases, gathered under the banner of populism, but thereby they were voting for Kerensky and Avksentiev who were dissolving the land committees and arresting their members."

All this demonstrates that the opposition of the Left to the Assembly was due to particular circumstances and not to the principle of Constituent Assemblies as such.

Trotsky said: "If, in the final analysis it is to the advantage of the proletariat to introduce its class struggle and even its dictatorship through the channels of democratic institutions, it does not at all follow that history always affords it the opportunity for attaining this happy consummation."

"It is difficult to tell how the course of the Revolution would have run if the Constituent Assembly had been convoked on its second or third month. It is quite probable that the then dominant Social Revolutionary and Menshevik parties would have compromised themselves, together with the Constituent Assembly in the eyes of not only the more active elements supporting the Soviets but also of the more backward democratic masses who might have been attached through their expectations not to the side of the Soviets but to that of the Constituent Assembly. Under such circumstances the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly might have been led to new elections in which the Party of the Left could have secured a majority. But the course of events has been different. The elections for the Constituent Assembly occurred in the ninth month of the Revolution. By that time the class struggle had assumed such intensity that it broke the formal frames of democracy by sheer force." (From October to Brest Litovsk, p. 82.)

Much criticism is leveled at the Russian Revolution because it was not established by industrial action.

Arnold Peterson, National Secretary of the Socialist Labor Party, said: "So long as the Bolsheviks were in opposition it was doing excellent educational work. Now that it is in power it faces failure. The day of its

victory was the day of its defeat." And he further said: "Last, but not least, the industrial proletariat is not—so far as we are able to learn—organized in industrial unions, the condition sine qua non of the Socialist Republic." (Weekly People, November 24, 1917.)

The I. W. W. claim that the weakness of the Bolsheviks is their support of political action. We give some quotations from their official publications, One Big Union Magazine (May, 1919).

"Besides, why should we be in such a hurry to imitate the Bolsheviks? What have they done that should make us jump off our track and follow their lead? They have overthrown autocracy and established political democracy for the proletariat. Political democracy has existed in this country for a long time. We do not have to make a revolution to get it."

"As reports are coming in, it becomes more and more apparent that Bolshevik Russia is far from having established industrial communism. On the contrary it seems that Bolshevism is breaking down on the question of economic reconstruction. If they go ahead on the right patch, they will some day come to the point where they will have to put into practice the I. W. W. program." (Page 11.)

"The plight of the Russian people is a warning to other peoples to immediately start building the new Society, by building industrial unions right now before the structure of the old society topples over." (Same magazine, March, 1919, page 19.)

"Our ideal of a new society is of an industrial democracy. This implies that the workers must have learned the art of self-government. Otherwise the new society will be the same as Russia now is "a tragic dictatorship." (April issue, page 23.)

"Representation is entirely on a territorial basis, exactly as in the United States. This (Russian) constitution provides for no other representation. There is no representative body elected on an industrial basis as the I. W. W. would have it."

"The Russian Socialist Federated Republic, as the Bolshevik Republic is officially called, is a political state, with a political government elected upon a territorial basis." (New Solidarity, February 1, 1919.)

The Workers' International Industrial Union have also pointed to alleged weakness of Bolshevism compared to Industrial Unionism, in their articles on Bolshevism or Industrial Unionism in their official paper.

All our industrialist critics fail to understand the Russian Revolution. Whatever weakness exists in the present order in Russia is not due to lack of industrial unionism, but to the backward economic development and the resulting untrained character of the workers. The economic-military opposition of other countries is a large factor, causing energies to be directed to unproductive channels and leading to shortage of necessities of life. The great work of educating the urban and rural proletariat is a further necessity if a permanent social change is to be made.

The Soviets in Russia correspond locally to municipal councils but in national affairs they are more of an advisory body than anything else. John Reed states that "the Soviets are political organs and have nothing to do with the management of production." (New York Communist, May 31, 1919.) The legislative and administrative functions are vested in the eleven Commissars chosen by the Central Executive and also in the Supreme Council of Public Economy. These are not elected directly by the workers but by the delegates. Many of these forms and functions seem to be

temporary due to the disorganized state of affairs under which the Bolsheviks assumed power.

John Reed states ("The Structure of the Soviet State") that "Lenine has clear-sightedly stated that he considers the retention of capitalist forms a step backward, a temporary defeat for the Revolution but which must be endured until the workers are self-organized and self-disciplined enough to compete with capitalist industry."

Reed further says: "Lenine has even gone so far as to foresee the eventual disappearance of the Soviets in favor of an economic purely administrative body." At present, according to Price, "the chief legislative body in the republic is the executive of the central council" and this last is elected "like a parliament by geographical territories."

Many organizations are copying every act of the Bolsheviks, forgetful of the fact that the workers are not ready and that conditions are different. They overlook the fact that our knowledge of the Russian Revolution is a very fragmentary one and to adopt the detail policy of Russia may be to repeat the mistakes inevitably made.

The formation of Soviets in England and America is an example of this. Without the revolutionary material or power essential to their progress, these bodies are parodies of the Russian Soviets. N. Mescheriakov in the Moscow "Pravda" (see Revolutionary Age, May 24, 1919), says: "Following our example, the English workers tried to form Workmen's Councils. But the English workers do not yet clearly understand that Councils—as organs of the revolutionary struggle and proletarian dictatorship—can work successfully only in the atmosphere of a proletarian revolution. Accordingly nothing has, so far, been accomplished by these councils in England."

Our experience of Soviets in America teaches the same lesson. Representing an infinitesimal part of the workers they could not function to replace other bodies. On the one hand they tended to degenerate into "War Veterans" associations and on the other into centers for promoting direct action based upon enthusiasm for Russian success. Many believed that it was too late for education, the time was for action. In the minds of many this meant street uprisings with the majority against us and an armed force to mow us down. The Revolutionary Age has told us what they mean by "action."

"Get the workers to down tools, in the shops, march to other shops to pull out the workers there, get out in the street in mass demonstration, that is mass action we can use now, whether or not we are in an actual revolutionary crisis." This leads to such things as we saw in Boston on May Day where several were shot and many injured. Running out of the shops does not advance our control over the instruments of production.

Writing in the Revolutionary Age after his visit to Russia, John Reed wrote:

"If anything were needed to demonstrate the value of political action, the Russian Revolution ought to do it. No true socialist denies that the parliament of the future socialist state will be industrial parliament; but the transformation from the political to the industrial system must be expressed by political action, whose value in the class struggle lies in the fact that it creates opportunities for the education of the workers and for industrial direct action, and protects these two essential methods of the struggle of the working class for power." (Jan. 18, 1919.)

JOHN O'LONDON.

(Continued from Page 10)

franchise. Ponder over the fact that the capitalist government uses every device to induce, and even compel, the workers to take out citizenship papers and thus qualify as voting machines. Does not this show that instead of worrying about voting figures we should concentrate on educating the slaves and winning them away from capitalist influences?

Our questioner seems to think that the chief thing about political action is getting votes. **Votes are symbols.** The agitation, education and organization involved in political action is the real work that counts, and those who have not votes are just as vital material in the propaganda of socialism and just as essential to the success of our efforts. Get their minds right and all else will be added unto you.

Does The Salesman Create Value?

J. S., of New York City, sends the two following questions:

(1) Does the store salesman add value to the goods he sells?

(2) If he does not add value how can he be exploited?

(1) The answers to these questions takes us into the field of the circulation of Merchants' Capital, which means the activities of merchants' employes in selling commodities to realize the surplus value contained in them. The only thing that gives value to useful articles is the labor socially necessary to produce them and bring them from the place of production to the point of consumption. The activity involved in obtaining the spontaneous products of nature and moulding them into a saleable form is called the production of commodities, and the necessary transportation, storage, expressage, etc., is called the distribution of commodities. The salesman in the store takes part in none of these activities and therefore does not produce any value. He is simply engaged in the circulation of capital and helps to realize for the capitalist the surplus value embodied in the articles he sells. Whilst profit is made in the factory and not in the store, it is the store where the articles are sold that the profit is realized.

Is He Exploited?

(2) If the salesman does not produce any value or surplus value, how can he be exploited? The answer is simple.

The industrial capitalist specializes in the production and distribution of commodities and leaves the selling of them to a special class of capitalists known as Merchants. The labor embodied in useful articles is made up of paid labor (wages) and unpaid labor (surplus value). Only part of the surplus value (profit) is retained by the industrial capitalist. The latter has to yield some to the Merchant. The commodities at the factory are sold below their value by the manufacturing capitalist to the merchant.

The merchant, however, sells them at their value. The difference between the price at which the merchant buys and that at which he sells represents the average amount for the labor involved in selling the articles. The merchant, however, does not do the work himself but hires salesman, clerks, office workers, etc., for the purpose, and as he pays them less than the total difference between the manufacturers and retailers price, the salesmen are exploited. The wage they receive

represents the value of their labor power, that is, their cost of subsistence. This wage is less than the allowance made by the manufacturer to the merchant for selling the goods. Although the salesman does not add any value to the articles, as far as his employer is concerned, the salesman is a productive worker and enables the merchant to share the surplus value. The rate of the merchant's profit depends upon the amount of capital invested by him in the selling business.

The Materialist Conception of History

WE PRINT BELOW a very interesting letter, written by F. Engels a few months before he died, explaining many of the implications of the Materialist Conception of History. This is one of the letters from which such critics as Bernstein, Seligman, Skelton, etc., quote phrases in a manner to mislead. So far from modifying the original statement of the theory this letter adds further evidence of its truth and should be closely studied. Next month a further letter will appear, giving more applications of the theory. These letters have been specially translated for us from the Italian and are taken from the collection of Marx and Engel's works published by "Avanti" of Milan. We intend publishing in the pages of the Proletarian many of the important documents written by the founders of modern socialism, which are at present practically out of the reach of English readers. It is one of the crying disgraces of the English speaking movement that the so-called socialist leaders of England and America who are familiar with European languages should have neglected to translate so much of the invaluable writings circulated in foreign speaking countries. Students in the study classes of the Proletarian University of America should read the following and succeeding documents in connection with the class books used in studying Marxism.—**THE EDITORS.**

In the course of a discussion that followed a public lecture, given at a Seminary, a student asked Engels to give him precise explanations of the two following points:

1. To what extent do economic conditions act as a causative influence?

2. What part is played by the race and by the individual according to the "historical materialism" of Marx and Engels?
Engels replied:

London, January 25, 1895.
122 Regents Park Road, N. W.

Dear Sir:

Following is the reply to your two questions:

1. The economic conditions, which we consider as the determinative basis in the history of society, we understand to be the manner in which men in a given society produce their means of subsistence and the ways in which they effect the exchange of products among themselves (this, as long as division of labor exists). The entire technique of production and transportation is here included. According to our conception this technique determines the mode of exchange, of distribution of products, and—after the disintegration of the tribal system—the division of society into classes, the conditions of master and slave, of state, of politics, laws, etc. Further, among the economic conditions, under which these phenomena obtain, must be included the geographical environment, and also the actual remains of former phases of economic evolution which often persist by force of tradition, inertia, or because of circumstances which surrounds that form of society.

Even if, as you say, technique largely depends on the conditions of science, yet, in a greater measure does the latter depend on the conditions of and the need for technique. If society is in the need of the development of a certain technique, this helps science more than ten universities. The science of hydrostatics was the sole result of the need that Italy felt in the 16th and 17th centuries of controlling the course of the torrents in her mountains. We began to understand the science of electricity only when we discovered its practical application. In Germany, however, they have become accustomed to treat the history of science as though it had fallen out of the sky.

2. We hold that, in the final analysis, economic conditions constitute the determinative factor in historical evolution. But the race itself is an economic factor. Here, therefore, we must hold in view two points:

(a) That the political, juridical, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic, etc., evolutions are based on the economic evolution. They all re-act upon each other and upon the economic basis. It does not mean that the economic factor is the sole active cause and all the others merely passive effects. But the whole situation presents a mutual interaction among the various forces on the basis of economic necessity, and which latter force ultimately prevails. The State, for instance, exerts an influence by means of protective tariffs, free exchange, good or bad revenue laws; and even the boundless stupidity and impotency of the German petty bourgeoisie—which grew out of Germany's economic misery during the period from 1648 to 1830, and which first manifested itself in piety, then in sentimentality and fawning servility before the nobles and princes—was not without its economic consequences. It was one of the greatest obstacles to the Renaissance and was not shaken off until the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars made the economic wretchedness unbearable. History is not, as some would imagine, for the sake of their greater convenience, an automatic effect for the economic situation, but men themselves make their own history. Certain it is, however, that men act in accordance with the prevailing conditions that dominate their field of action. And among these the economic circumstances, however much influenced by political and ideological forces, are always of chief importance. In the final reckoning they constitute the decisive factor and form the golden thread which guides the student to the correct, all-comprehensive, understanding of the subject.

(b) Men make their own history, but not as the result of a general volition nor in accordance with some general plan,—not even in a given limited social group. Men's aspirations oppose each other. Out of this circumstance, in every similar group, arises an imperative need whose chance concomitant or accidentality is at once the complement and the form of its manifestation. The need or necessity which here underlies every chance appearance is in the end the economic necessity. The so-called great man appears. But the fact that it happens to be a certain great man, appearing at a certain time and at a certain given place, is simply mere chance. But if we eliminate him, there arises an immediate demand for a substitute, and this substitute is in time found (tant bien que mal.) That Napoleon became the military dictator—of which the French republic, exhausted by civil wars, stood in need—was merest chance; but that in the event of Napoleon's non-appearance

there would have been another to occupy his place is proven by the fact that in every instance, in which there was such a need, the man was found; Caesar, Augustus, Cromwell, etc. If it happened to be Marx who discovered the law of historical materialism, yet Thierry, Mignet, Guizot, who up to 1850 were writing English histories, prove that such a notion already existed; and the discovery of the same idea by Morgan further proves that the times were ripe for such an event and that the discovery was an imperative need.

And so it is with every other true or apparent accidentality in history. The farther the field, that we may be examining, recedes from the economic, and the nearer it approaches the merely abstract ideologic, the more we shall find—in its evolution—such accidentalities appearing upon the scene, and the more does the curve of its evolution fluctuate. If one should attempt, however, to trace the axis of this curve, one should find that the longer the time period observed and the larger the field thus treated the more nearly does this axis run parallel to the axis of the economic evolution.

In Germany the great hindrance to a true understanding of these things lies in the inexcusable neglect of this subject by the writers of economic history. It is so difficult to rid oneself of the historical conceptions inculcated by the schools, and still more difficult to collect the necessary materials! Who, for example, has read old J. V. Julich, who includes in his dry collections so many explanations of various political phenomena!

Moreover, it seems to me, the beautiful example given us by Marx in his "Eighteenth Brumaire" furnishes a sufficient answer to your questions—the more so because it is a practical illustration. And I believe myself to have touched upon those points in "Anti Duehring," I, chapters 9-11, and II, chapters 2-4, and III, chapter 1, and also in the introduction and in the last chapter of Feuerbach.

I would ask you not to pass judgement upon this letter, but to consider only the thoughts it conveys. I am sorry I have not the time to write you with that exactness which I should wish to employ when writing for the public.

Kindly give my regards to Mr. _____ and thank him for the _____ which has given me much pleasure.

With profound respect,

Most devotedly yours,

FREDERICK ENGELS.

Suggestions for the Conducting of Study Classes

NOW that the study of Socialism by the class method is becoming fairly general, the need for systematic and perfected methods has made itself felt. It will probably be obvious to instructors generally that a perfect system cannot be devised at once but must be built up by experiment and experience. It would seem advisable, therefore, for each instructor to study this problem on his own account and not depend entirely upon any given program which may be offered to him. Nevertheless, a few helpful hints may be given, which are the result of the experiences of those who have undertaken such work thus far, and the following is offered with that idea in mind.

ORGANIZATION

Not the least important work in connection with class study is the organization of the class. In localities where the idea is new it may be necessary to "talk up" or advertise the project for some time before an actual start can be made. The promoters should, however, not wait for a large gathering, but be willing to begin in a very humble way, say, with two or three students, if necessary.

TEXTS

The matter of texts is highly important. Many attempts have been made to "simplify" the works of Marx and Engels, as they are thought to be too difficult. Up to the present, however, no satisfactory texts of this character have been brought to light. In most cases such text books are no simpler than the standard works and frequently contain important errors, which render them wholly undesirable. The following are suggested as comprising a fairly comprehensive line of study, arranged in the logical order of treatment, and taken together, form a course of study:

"Wage Labor and Capital."

"Communist Manifesto."

"Value, Price and Profit."

"Socialism, Utopian and Scientific."

Capital," Vol. I, Chapters I to IX, inclusive, and Chapter XXXII.

This may be varied from, if desired, say, for example, by

omitting "Value, Price and Profit." It will be noted in this arrangement that the first text-book deals with economics, the second with general principles and the third reverts to economics. The object of this is to alternate the phases of study. By so doing the student is saved from getting into a rut from studying too long on one phase, and thereby becoming one-sided or losing interest. In putting "Wage Labor and Capital" before the "Communist Manifesto," we are simply recognizing the fact that it is economic conditions which first bring the workers to take an interest in socialism and that the subject matter can be illustrated by every-day conditions and events, which the student can appreciate by actual experience, while the "Manifesto" is largely a historical document with many references to historical conditions with which the worker is unfamiliar and consequently it is not so good a text to start with.

PREPARATION

By all means, the instructor should prepare in advance, not only for the first session, but for each session thereafter. He should plan how much of the text is to be covered and map that out as a distinct lesson, endeavoring to have the lesson stop at a convenient point. He should read over the text, note which are the essential points in each paragraph which are to be explained; plan in his own mind what illustrations he will use, and brush up on any points in connection with which his own knowledge is weak, by reference to his own library. It is in order to remark here that a competent instructor must possess a much wider range of knowledge of socialism and science in general than is implied by a study of the texts as outlined above. If he has not such knowledge he should set about getting it at once.

THE FIRST SESSION

The preparation for, and conduct of, the first session will be somewhat different from that of succeeding ones. Assuming that the majority of the students are about to have their first experience in class work and that their enthusiasm for such study must be aroused by the efforts of the instructor himself, he will find it necessary to use all the skill and tact he possesses to conduct the first session so as to leave a good impression upon the students, even though these be few in number.

To begin with, he should have his equipment in good order, otherwise he will be as useless as a carpenter without a saw and hammer. The least equipment with which a class should be started will consist of a table, the necessary chairs, arranged in proper order and a sufficient supply of text books for the students. Never allow the students to sit in the class without the opportunity of supplying themselves with text books. Other remarks on equipment will be made later.

It is not desirable that the text should be immediately plunged into. A few preliminaries are necessary. The instructor should obtain the names and addresses of the students for record. If not already acquainted with the students he should become so as soon as possible by always calling them by name instead of indicating them as "this comrade" or "that comrade." This will make for a more home-like feeling and diminish backwardness in discussion. Try to get everybody acquainted with everybody else.

With the class assembled, the next thing in order is to make some preliminary remarks regarding the objects of class study, the methods to be employed in the class, what is expected of the students, etc. The remainder of the first session may, perhaps, be profitably employed in a general treatment of the text in hand, according to the judgment of the instructor.

GENERAL METHODS

After the preliminaries, the class will settle down to the regular study. The plan here suggested is based upon the methods of successful classes, but may be varied according to circumstances.

The instructor calls upon the student at his extreme left to stand and read the first paragraph, the others following from their own books. If the paragraph contains more than one "essential point," as referred to under "Preparation," the instructor proceeds to re-read the portion covering the first point and then asks the student who read to explain his understanding of that point. The instructor will then call upon any other student he may select to explain his idea of it, and so on until he has obtained several students ideas. Or he may call upon any student who thinks he can explain it, to do so. The instructor then proceeds to give his own explanation, using such illustrations as he has prepared. In doing so he will point out to each student wherein his explanation was erroneous and also recognize any good points scored by any student. He will then ask if any doubtful points remain in the students minds and explain further in connection with such. He will then proceed to the second point of the paragraph, always calling upon the student who read the paragraph to explain first. When the first paragraph is thus exhausted, the instructor will review it as a whole. The second student will then read and so on.

Students should stand while reading; they should not be allowed to interrupt each other; they should be given a fair opportunity to complete their remarks but should not be allowed to occupy the floor for an unseemly length of time nor to ramble away from the subject. They should not be urged to give an explanation of a point when it is apparent that they are incapable of doing so. Ideas must be put into men's minds before they can come out. They must be required to express themselves in their own words. Mere repetition of the phraseology of the text is worse than useless and should not be tolerated. They should gradually be taught to give illustrations of their own composition.

DEFINITIONS

Students should be instructed to ask the definition of any word or term which they do not understand. This applies both to ordinary words appearing in general literature and to terms peculiar to socialist literature. On the first presentation of terms such as bourgeois and proletarian, it will be necessary to define them carefully and thereafter watch to see that these definitions are retained in the students' minds.

ENGLISH AND READING

It will be found that students require a great deal of correction in the pronunciation of words and in their English generally. Also in the manner of reading. But it should be remembered that the human mind cannot undertake a number of new tasks at once. The instructor should, therefore, be patient with these matters at first. The main object of classes is not the teaching of English; rather is it incidental, although, of course, necessary. As time goes on and the students become accustomed to reading, become more familiar with difficult terms and more readily catch the meaning of the text, they will be able to devote more of their attention to good form in reading and should be expected to improve steadily. They should be taught to read in a clear voice, pronounce words distinctly, and emphasize properly. The speed should be moderate, rather slow than fast, but not draggy. The instructor must set the example.

THE INSTRUCTOR

Much depends upon the personality of the instructor. It is hardly to be expected that many instructors possessing the right combination of qualities will be found ready-made. Every instructor should, therefore, endeavor to perfect himself in his task. We cannot cover the whole subject of teaching here but suggest the following.

In the first place the instructor must at all times and particularly at the beginning, get in close touch with his students. He should not set himself upon a pedestal as an oracle, but on the other hand, he should display enough self-confidence to command the respectful attention of the class. He should constantly endeavor to appreciate accurately the mental attitude of each individual student and not deal with them after a mechanical fashion as if they were blocks of wood to be turned into a given form. He should note carefully the progression made by each one and gauge his questions accordingly.

The instructor should display energy and enthusiasm. Listlessness on the instructor's part means an early and painless death for the class. Start the class exactly at the appointed time even if only a few are in attendance. Waiting for the class to begin is discouraging to those who come early. If the class gets the habit of starting an hour late it will presently not start at all. It may be taken as an axiom that any organization must be well managed to retain its vitality.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW

At periodic intervals, the length of which will be decided by the instructor, some kind of an examination should be made to ascertain how much knowledge has been absorbed up to that point. Probably the best method is to require the students to write answers to questions written on a blackboard, without consulting their books. This, of course, requires a complete session to be set aside for that purpose.

EQUIPMENT

In addition to the equipment previously mentioned, a blackboard can be used to great advantage for illustrations. A light wand should be used for pointing rather than a lead pencil or finger. It is preferable to have the blackboard placed upon an easel. This equipment may be supplemented with special charts painted upon canvas or paper and attached to the blackboard, for special illustrations such as the law of value, etc., and sometimes maps are useful to illustrate points of history or geography.

ILLUSTRATIONS

The matter of illustrations should have the earnest study of every instructor. The illustration, pictured or oral, is the key which unlocks the brain of the student and sets it in motion along the desired channel. As far as possible the illustration should refer to something concrete, especially at first. For instance, in illustrating the law of value, a table and chair or other objects should be used in preference to simply speaking of "commodities." The objects should be before the eyes of the students. This can be done by using objects in the room or pictures of objects drawn upon the blackboard or chart. In illustrating historical matters the situation is somewhat different. If the historical occurrence is one which refers to Feudal times, for instance, the illustration must refer to the same period, but if it refers to an occurrence such as the falling of the small capitalist into the proletariat, it may be illustrated by reference to some recent occurrence. The closer the illustration can be brought to the student's own experience, the better.

PATIENCE

There is no short road to a knowledge of socialism. There are no iron-clad rules for conducting a class. The essential thing is to gather together to read and discuss, adopting system and method as you proceed, according to special conditions and opportunities met with.

Some will be slow to learn; some will tend to become discouraged at the apparently slow progress; but the beginning is always difficult, and once the first stages are passed the progress will be more rapid. All students must persevere and remember that one point thoroughly understood, even after much effort, is much better than many points which are but vaguely grasped.

WRITE US!

If you find difficulties or encounter stumbling-blocks in your work, do not hesitate to send your questions to The Proletarian. We do not guarantee to solve your troubles, but whatever experience we have gained in class work is at your disposal. Do not let the difficulties baffle you but get the work started and "carry on."