



THE PROLETARIAN



Forward Workers! Over Their United Opposition!

THE SECRETARY'S NOTES

Local Rochester is plowing away at the same ground with equally good results. Under the direction of Comrade O'Brien the study class activities in that city are unequalled by any other place in the country. Study classes are being conducted on the first and second volume of Capital; Value, Price and Profit; American History and Philosophy with Joseph Doetzgen's Positive Outcome of Philosophy as a text book. The Open Forum run in connection with Local Rochester is conducting meetings regularly every Sunday afternoon.

Local Buffalo is doing good work along educational lines but is not able to conduct large meetings owing to the attitude of the authorities and hall owners. This condition will probably be corrected in the near future and we expect to have a large and active local there before spring. At present there are six study classes running and they should be productive of good results.

In Detroit the local has been very successful in conducting propaganda meetings in the last few weeks. Four mass meetings have been organized by the local which filled the House of the Masses to the doors with the largest crowds that have been there since the "Red Raids" a year ago last January. One of the most encouraging features about these meetings is the fact that the bulk of the audiences was made up of strangers to the movement. There was a generous attendance of "colored" workers at these meetings and a study class on the Communist Manifesto has been started among the negroes. Six study classes are now conducted by the members of the local and efforts are being made to start more.

In Chicago members of the party working in co-operation with members of the Industrial Socialist League have succeeded in putting on an educational campaign such as Chicago has never seen before. If they succeed in their work Chicago will cease to be the favorite stamping ground for all varieties of freaks. Many study classes are running under the direction of the Marxian Educational League which was organized for the purpose of facilitating the co-operation of the groups that have combined their efforts. Also they are running weekly lectures which are bound to have a good effect upon the city as a contrast to the "junk" that has been handed out there in the past. The Industrial Socialist League, in the various cities where our organizations come in touch, has evidenced a desire to co-operate with us in the work of spreading Marxian education. Where this co-operation has been achieved the results have been good.

The comrades of Los Angeles have been carrying on some very good educational work for some time and have been very active in the support of the party paper, securing subs and donating money to the Press Fund. The situation is rounding into shape there and because of the good educational work there should be results of permanent value.

The Marxian Club of San Francisco is still carrying on the good work of study classes and educational lectures. They have been discussing the question of affiliating with the Proletarian Party and will probably do so. They are a little dubious of the question of affiliation with the Third International and are afraid that taking orders from there will lead to the commission of many errors such as have been committed by the Left Wing Movement in the past year or so.

The comrades of Cleveland have arranged a debate between the Secretary of the Party and a representative

of the Single Tax organization for the month of March and expect that through the debate it will be possible to stir up some more interest in study.

Comrade Keracher has recently returned from a trip east to New York stopping at various cities en route to lecture. He was able to counteract to some extent the false propaganda that has been circulated by some of our alleged friends. Comrade Keracher reports that things look good in New York for a real proletarian movement.

Since the depression has come over the country the Press Fund has suffered accordingly. So much so in fact that it was not possible to get out the February issue. Since the re-issuing of the paper there have been many generous contributions towards its support. It was only because of these contributions that we were able to keep the paper going as the subscription price of the paper, high as it is, does not suffice to meet the operating expenses.

The comrades of Muskegon have done exceptional work and have contributed by far the larger part of the monetary support. The depression, however, has had a very bad effect upon this form of support. With the missing of the February issue the seriousness of the situation has been brought home to some of the comrades and efforts have been made to take care of the matter. Los Angeles has taken the initiative in the matter and come through with sixty-four dollars since the first of the year for the Press Fund. Local Jackson has contributed twenty, Buffalo five and Massillion three dollars and fifty cents. This has been a great help but as yet it is not enough and efforts are being made to increase the support. If we are to publish regularly this support must be coming in. Otherwise we are apt to be forced to miss an occasional issue. Also if we can secure enough support and activity we may be able to satisfy the growing demand for a weekly propaganda organ.

Punch and Judy

Stedman and Harris have gone into vaudeville. From vice-presidential candidate on the S. P. ticket to a common performer. Oh! What a fall was that my countrymen? But then probably the economic depression has hit the law business as well, so we must excuse the illustrious spokesman of the Socialist Party for turning "ham-actor." We are informed that "they didn't even spring a new joke."

The Proletarian

Published Monthly at
550 Michigan Avenue
Detroit, Michigan

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

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

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

THE PROLETARIAN

Vol. III

MARCH, 1921

No. 5

The Carriers of Civilization

By DENNIS E. BATT

From time to time in the history of the human race a section of society is called upon to be the developers and guardians of human culture. This has always been the case in the past. At the time of the decadence of feudal society it fell to the lot of the capitalist class to be the ones to revive and develop civilization. The human race was living in a dark age. Learning was stifled. Superstition reigned supreme. But the capitalist class needed learning. Commodity production demanded the development of science and the dethronement of superstition. Provincial barriers must be broken down in order that the capitalists might exploit the resources of the earth. They carried their message of buy, sell and work to the four corners of the globe. The process has brought the human race together into a gigantic producing unit. The needs of the system of commodity production have caused a wondrous development of pure and applied science. The work has been well done. The capitalist class has finished its hour upon the world's stage and the time of exit has arrived.

Civilization, one time dependent upon the development of capitalist production, is now doomed unless the bourgeoisie is supplanted in their rule by the proletariat. The present system has reached the end of its tether and its further continuance spells misery and ruin to the human race. In prolonging it beyond its time, the defenders of the present order become not only conservative but definitely reactionary. They are forced in their efforts of protection to stifle and conceal the further development of the very science which they were called upon in the beginning to foster. The imperialistic development of capitalism forces its beneficiaries to propagate ideals which hamper the further progress of culture. They must preserve the "status quo."

The inherent contradictions within capitalism are insoluble within the system. Private ownership of the means of production and the consequent private appropriation of the product are in conflict with social production itself. Periodically this conflict expresses itself in "panics," which mean starvation and misery for the working class. The immense product of social effort can not be consumed by society organized upon a capitalist basis. We have the absurdity of starvation in the midst of plenty. Overproduction brings want and misery. Because there are too many of the good things of life the useful mass of the people, the working class, are forced to go without. The constant improvement of the tools of production that is forced upon the capitalists by the competitive nature of capitalism breeds a condition where "panic" is chronic and there is no hope for the workers.

In their efforts to solve this problem the capitalists of

one nation are forced into ever more ruthless competition with the capitalists of other nations. The scramble for foreign markets, for natural resources to exploit, for places to invest the surplus capital created at home inevitably leads to war. The working class is then called upon to fight the battles that make it possible for the robbers to carry on the robbery and dispose of the plunder secured from the working class. Blood letting by millions of workers is forced upon society only to be a temporary relief from the pressure of capitalism.

In this situation the fine ideals that early capitalism fostered, lose all their early meaning and are interpreted in the interest of the imperial class. The most beautiful sentiments are distorted to fulfill the needs of the modern robber barons. "Law and Order" is *their* law and order. "Democracy" means nothing but *their* right to rule and rob the working class. Freedom is but the freedom to continue to enslave the workers. To stand in opposition to them, to protest against the exploitation is to place oneself outside of the pale. One thus becomes an outlaw deserving of the worst that "loyal citizens" can do to them. Lynching and torture become the order of the day against the undesirable citizens—the class-conscious workers.

Likewise all culture is prostituted in the interests of "God's chosen"—the capitalist class. The universities are brought brazenly under their thumb. If instructors, no matter how truthful, speak in the interest of the toiling masses their dismissal is a foregone conclusion. The greatest avenue of public information, the newspapers, being organized upon a capitalist basis, serve the interests of the system loyally. All avenues of information are in their possession. The stage, the screen, are to them but methods by which the workers can be instilled with a capitalist ideology. All art, all culture, civilization itself, becomes but an adjunct to capitalism, serving its needs.

The outlook would be dark indeed if within capitalism there had not been created the class that would destroy it and carry civilization forward to greater achievements and a better day. The proletariat approaches its historic task. The working class is the carrier of civilization. They are about to seize the helm of society at which capitalism stands ossified. Through the efforts of the working class further development will be achieved. They will be able to materialize those ideals that have haunted the brain of man since the breakup of primitive communism. It is their mission to make the human race really human, to destroy for once and all slavery upon the face of the earth by guiding society forward out of this dark night of capitalism into the sunlight of the communist order.

Like all previous ruling classes the capitalists are reluctant to go. They would tarry yet a while upon the stage and prolong their hour. With all the forces of repression at their command they struggle to retain their hold. They jail! They shoot! They torture! But they are doomed. The workers press on. We answer the cry, "Forward, Comrade! Over their united opposition,"

Education

By John Keracher

Every class that has risen in history has expressed its economic requirements, at first thru propaganda and later thru control of the educational institutions. In the ancient civilizations the ruling classes had much leisure and the members of these classes became quite cultured; learning, in many cases, was for learnings sake. While to be educated and refined was the chief object in life with many, yet the nature of their education and cultural concepts were in harmony with the economic interests of these ruling elements.

The learning of Greece and Rome was lost to Europe for a time after the fall of the Empire. In the course of time a new ruling-class arose, the aristocracy, bringing with them cultural concepts and an educational system that expressed the requirements of these warring landlords. The Roman Church was their educational institution. It was the biggest landholder itself and, consequently, found it quite in harmony with its economic interests to teach submission to the landless serfs, and respect to those in authority, the rulers in the Church, pope, cardinals, bishops, etc., and in the State, the king, princes, dukes, counts, etc.

These "great folks" were represented to the masses as of a superior caste, with different blood in their veins, and as holding their power direct from above. The pope was a sort of general manager of God's affairs upon earth, holding jurisdiction over the kings and all other officials in the Feudal State. The aristocracy bowed to this authority of the Church, which controlled not only the "common herd," but formulated the morals of the aristocrats, controlling their education. For centuries the priests were practically the only educators, and their educational methods, as well as what they taught, reflected the economic interest of their class—the feudal aristocracy.

As long as the landed form of civilization remained intact, there was no change in education, but with the development of cities, with a merchant and artisan class whose economic interests were in conflict with the landlords, the demand for a new viewpoint in educational circles arose. The interest of the rising capitalist class at first expressed itself thru religious reformations, such as the Lutheran in Germany and the Puritan in England. Later thru propaganda that led up to a complete break with religion as in the French Revolution. There the Church's control of education was replaced by the secular education of rationalist capitalism. In other countries where the Church has continued a measure of control it has been by modification of its teachings to fit in with the requirements of the new master class—the capitalists.

Thus the educational institutions, originally controlled by the Feudal Church, particularly universities which they founded, have definitely passed under the control of the capitalist class.

Modern schooling under the control of the Capitalist state, has accomplished a great deal that is worthy of commendation. It has rescued whole nations from illiteracy, because an illiterate proletariat could not function in modern industry. The workers must be able to read and write, measure and calculate if their masters are going to compete successfully in the world market. It was not a case of giving the workers education because of love for them, but because of necessity.

If we closely observe social evolution and the changing nature of social institutions, we will find that the early

ecclesiastical education gradually gave place to the classical school, particularly with the Renaissance, when this new school of thought sprung into existence under the patronage of the powerful merchant princes of the Italian republican cities.

With the general development of the bourgeoisie throughout Europe the classical school merged into the technical or scientific school of the present day. The industrial revolution which was brought about by the invention of machinery and the gradual application of science to modern production, has brought education to its present standard. The modern educational system has well served the interests of the capitalist class.

The scientists have been drafted into their service. Science has functioned in the upbuilding of their industries. The educational system, in addition to preparing technical experts and a literate proletariat, now serves the purpose of helping to hold the masses in subjection thru their schooling in patriotism and a general perversion of history.

Just as the classic school arose out of the ecclesiastical and the technical or scientific school arose out of the classic, so does the proletarian school of thought arise within the present educational institutions of capitalism. The bourgeoisie, to serve their own interests, have been obliged to extend their technical education to the proletariat. But this rising class has nothing in common with their exploiters; their viewpoint is just the opposite, and the education furnished the proletarians—their ability to read and write—is being turned against their masters.

The proletariat like all classes that have preceded it, is compelled to struggle for political power; to formulate its indictment against the Bourgeoisie thru propaganda. A definite school of thought has arisen which attacks the philosophical expressions of the capitalist class. Expressions which in their time were revolutionary, when hurled against the ruling aristocrats, but which now do service for the conservation of capitalism—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—and many other brave words such as Justice, Freedom, and Democracy, are for the propertyless proletarians meaningless abstractions.

The working masses are slowly, but surely awakening to a realization of the emptiness of present day liberties. This realization is the first break with the bourgeois school of thought, with its philosophical idealism, and its "great man" theory of history. The only intellectual weapons with which the proletarians can successfully combat present day education are those furnished by the Marxian school of thought, historic materialism and the economics which explain the source of capitalist wealth, and the manner in which it is appropriated thru surplus-value.

These two great principles the Materialistic Conception of History and the Marxian theory (or should we say law) of Value, have laid the foundation of Proletarian Education.

With Historic Materialism we are able to combat the Idealistic Conception of History, with its metaphysical method of analysis. A method that fails to see every action, reaction and interaction as correlations of the universal whole and to explain historic evolution from that standpoint. That is the method of the Historic Materialist, the dialectic method.

The observation of historic evolution as the working out of class struggles in which the rising class in response to its economic needs is absolutely compelled, thru revolution, to conquer political power.

This school of thought like all others, arises naturally from the material and economic conditions under which the class whose expression it is, is compelled to struggle. At first proletarian education was little more than a propaganda, forming in many cases a sound enough indictment of the social system that brought poverty and suffering to the proletariat, but usually "utopian," in fact unsound, in its application of a remedy. The remedy, the abolition of capitalism and the ushering in of a new social order, has the support of millions of workers in all parts of the world today. In this struggle, the thinking vanguard of the proletariat is able to make use of the sciences

even more effectively than the capitalist class. What Darwin and other scientists have written can be, and is, wielded by the proletariat as a weapon of attack upon the capitalists' metaphysical conception of things. Proletarian education is already well established. It is the most complex, yet most thoro form of education that has yet evolved in response to the needs of a class. But unlike all other schools of thought, coming first as a propaganda then perpetuating themselves by stultification, misrepresentation and the inability of the class in power to vision a future social system, the school of thought that we call Proletarian education will cease to play that future role. As the Proletariat thru its self-emancipation disappears, as such, its form of education will be free to develop. With no need of using education to suppress an exploited class, since no such class will exist, Society will use for the first time Free Education.

Lenin On Communist Tactics In England

By William Paul

I have had a long and interesting interview with Lenin. We spoke on various aspects of the movement, and particularly upon the growth and progress of Communism in Britain. Lenin had read the report of the Communist Unity Convention held in London last August. He said that the verbatim report of the speeches and resolutions of the Convention showed that the formation of the Communist Party marked an epoch in the history of the British revolutionary movement. The Communist Party had gone a long way towards unifying the Communist elements in Britain, and he hoped that the Party, which had made such an effort to achieve unity, would assist the Communist International in making the forthcoming Unity Congress a great success. Our greatest weakness is the continued prevalence of sectarian factions in the Left Wing. This spirit must be crushed, he contended, at all costs. The time had long since passed for the existence of narrow, partisan, doctrinaire bodies like the present S. L. P.

He was very much interested in my account of the S. L. P., and of its pioneer advocacy, in Britain, of the industrial form of the Socialist Republic. He said he had never known that there existed a party in Britain which had refused to participate in the various Congresses of the Second International prior to the war. But why, he asked, did a party with such a record—a record which seemed to indicate that it had been working out the theories of the Bolsheviks before the 1917 Revolution—fail to respond to the revolutionary needs of the movement by refusing to attend the rank and file Convention at which the Communist Party was launched? I said that the vital point of difference between the S. L. P. and the Communist Party was the question of affiliation to the Labor Party. The S. L. P. considered any such approach to the Labor Party was a compromise of principles. Those of us who were expelled from the S. L. P., for attempting to secure unity, were equally opposed to Labor Party affiliation, but we were prepared to go and fight out our case on the floor of the Unity Convention and abide by the result of the decision. We viewed the whole question of Labor Party affiliation as one of tactics and not one of fundamental principle. We also considered the need for Communist unity to be of greater importance than minor points such as Labor affiliation. Lenin said that was the proper attitude. But, he said, now that the Labor Party has rejected the appli-

cation of the Communist Party, now that the Labor Party itself has solved the problem which separated the S. L. P. from the Communist Party, would the S. L. P. join up with the Communist Party. I said I did not think so. Such a party, he said, is destined to speedily disappear; the movement has neither time nor a place for such bodies. In any case, the Third International, by organizing a further Unity Convention, which every disciplined group claiming adherence to the Communist International would have to attend, offered a last chance to the various factions in the left Wing of the British movement to build up an united Communist movement.

Lenin then proceeded to discuss the attitude of the Communist Party towards the Labor Party in view of the much talked-of forthcoming General Election. His views on the subject showed that he abhors the type of revolutionary who has a canalised or single track mind. Lenin looks upon every weapon as necessary in the conflict with capitalism. To him, as a good student of old Ditzgen, every weapon, every policy, and every problem must be examined in the terms of its relations to the needs of the moment and the means at our disposal. This explains why he does not go out of his way to extol *one particular weapon*. He clearly realizes the value of revolutionary parliamentary action, but he also understands its limitations as a constructive power in the creation of a Workers' Industrial Republic. To Lenin the test of the real revolutionary Communist is to know when to use a given weapon and when to discard it.

Talking on the Labor Party, Lenin said he was very glad to learn that it had refused to accept the affiliation application of the Communist Party. It was a good move to have applied for affiliation, because the refusal of the Labor Party to accept Communists in its ranks showed the masses exactly where the Labor Party stood. Henderson had thus unwittingly paid a great tribute to the growing power of revolutionary Communism in Britain by being afraid to have aggressive Communists in his organization; and the Labor Party, by its own action, in turning down the Communist Party, had plainly indicated that there was at last a fighting group in Britain which had attracted good mass fighters to its ranks. Of course, continued Lenin, we must not forget that the Communist Party in its application for affiliation to the Labor Party very frankly put forward certain conditions which would have given it full freedom

of action to conduct its own policy in its own way. We must never enter into negotiations with bodies, such as the Labor Party, without demanding full freedom of action. In this respect the Communist Party's attitude in applying to the Labor Party for admission to its ranks differed, most fundamentally, from such organizations as the I. L. P. and B. S. P., which formally accepted the Labor Party's constitution and policy. The strong stand taken up by the Communist Party, in seeking affiliation with the Labor Party, was no doubt arrived at as a result of the B. S. P. policy sharpened by the militant elements expelled from the S. L. P. It was a good omen for the future that these two groups were able to come together. And it was a good thing that the ex-S. L. P. men, who were so keen against affiliation with the Labor Party, realized the value of revolutionary discipline by refusing to split the new party because their own position had not been accepted. Likewise, when the Labor Party threw out the request for affiliation it was the B. S. P. element that was tested and it stood firm. To have passed through two such severe trials, and to have maintained the solidarity of the organization, was a tribute to the seriousness of the comrades who had formed the Communist Party.

Lenin passed on to review the political situation in Britain. The next General Election would be of paramount importance, and the Communists ought to play a most important part in it. As Lenin favored the policy of supporting the Labor Party, in order to assist it to capture political power, this subject was thrashed out in detail. Lenin advises the Communists to help the Labor Party to get a majority at the next election in order to facilitate the general decadence of the Parliamentary system. Already, he reasoned, there are thousands of people in Britain who feel that the Parliamentary system of social representation cannot solve the problems which history has placed before it. These people had become discontented and disillusioned regarding the Parliamentary system of social control as a result of the inability of that machine to cope with the vital tasks of modern society. In other words, the passage of events was providing a series of *concrete experiences* which were educating the masses regarding the general breakdown of capitalism in the sphere of social representation. The toiling masses, who had neither the time nor the inclination to examine social theories, always learnt their political lessons by undergoing *concrete experiences*. The task of the revolutionary Communist is not only to preach his Marxist theories; he must prove that his theories are correct by compelling his opponents to act in such a way that they provide the practical lessons which enable the Communists to test his theories before the eyes of the masses. The test of Marxist and Communist theory is experience. How then can the Communists of England prove to the workers that the Parliamentary machine has broken down and can no longer serve them or the interests of their class? Since the days of the Armistice the Parliamentary system in England has been on trial. During the past two years the political policy of Lloyd George had shown many workers how little they could expect from any Parliamentary form of Government manned by the capitalist class. Since the Armistice, Lloyd George, Churchill, Bonar Law, and Co., have had an opportunity to demonstrate what they could do, and their reign of office has been one trail of disasters so far as the workers are concerned. The Labor Party solemnly assures the masses that they could solve the problems confronting society if once they were in control of the Governmental machine. So far as Henderson, Thomas, and the Labor Party are concerned, they only differ from Lloyd George in that they have never had an opportunity to control the Government. Knowing, as we

do, that Henderson, MacDonald, and their followers cannot solve the immediate problems confronting the masses through the Parliamentary machine, we ought to prove the correctness of our theory by giving the Labor Party a chance to prove that we are correct. The return of the Labor Party to power will accelerate the inevitable collapse of the Parliamentary system, and this will provide the *concrete experiences* which will ultimately drive the masses towards Communism and the Soviet solution to the modern problems. For these reasons the Communists in Britain ought to support the Labor Party at the next election in order to help it to bring on, ever faster, the crisis which will ultimately overwhelm it. At this point, I interposed, and said that if the Communist Party officially assisted the Labor Party to capture political power in order to precipitate a crisis, it was just possible that the indignant masses, remembering that we had urged them to vote for the Labor Party, might sweep us away too when the social crash took place. Lenin pondered over this for a moment and said that the Communist Party, in assisting the Labor Party to capture the Government, must make its own case very clear to the masses. He then advanced the following argument which he pressed forward very strongly, and which he wishes the Communist Party to discuss. He said the Communist Party could easily help the Labor Party to power and at the same time keep its own weapon clean. At the forthcoming elections the Communist Party ought to contest as many seats as possible, but where it could not put up a candidate it ought to issue a manifesto in every constituency challenged by the Labor Party urging the workers to vote for the Labor candidate. The manifesto should frankly state that the Communist Party is most emphatically opposed to the Labor Party, but asks it to be supported in order that Henderson, MacDonald and Co. may demonstrate to the masses their sheer helplessness. Such a manifesto, such a policy, would accelerate and intensify the problem now looming up before capitalism and its Parliamentary system. But, above all, such a policy would provide the *concrete experiences* which would teach the masses to look to the Soviet method as the historically evolved institution destined to seriously grapple with the manifold problems now pressing so heavily upon humanity.

We discussed this problem for some time and viewed it from many angles. I kept raising many points against Lenin's position until at last he, no doubt scenting a good dialectical duel, challenged me to debate the whole matter in the columns of the *Communist*. I readily assented to this, and asked him when he would have his first contribution ready. He looked round sadly at the mountains of work—work involving the solution of international problems—piled up in front of him. I at once said I would write up his case for the Press, as I have done above. To this suggestion he heartily agreed.

I know, said Lenin, that it may seem awful to young and inexperienced Communists to have any relations with the Labor Party, whose policy of opportunism is more dangerous to the masses than that of consistent and openly avowed enemies like Winston Churchill. But if the Communist Party intends to secure and wield power it will be compelled to come into contact with groups and organizations which are bitterly opposed to it. And it will have to learn how to negotiate and deal with them. Here in Russia we have been forced by circumstances to discuss and make arrangements with elements which would hang us if they got the chance. Have we not even entered into alliances and compacts with Governments whose very hands reeked with the blood of our murdered Communist comrades? Why have we entered into such contracts and adopted such a policy? It is because we are realists

and not utopians. It is because, at present, international capitalism is more powerful than we are. Every move, each Treaty, and all our negotiations with capitalist States, are but one side of the Russian Soviet Government's policy to conserve its strength in order to consolidate its power. Learn to meet your enemies and be not afraid. It tests your strength, it creates experiences, it judges the character of your members. And you may find that your most embittered critics are not in the camp of the enemy but are the shallow doctrinaires to whom revolutionary Socialism is a mere manual of phrases instead of a guide to action.

While we were talking, Lenin was continually interrupted by the arrival of cables, despatches and messages. He was frequently called to the phone. Despite these things he could return quite serenely to the point under discussion. I confess that I was slightly agitated when entering the Kremlin; bad news had arrived from the various fronts; Poland was acting strangely at the Riga Conference; France had been indulging in one of her bullying outbursts; and Finland was on the point of signing peace. All these things, I imagined, would make it impossible for Lenin to settle down and have a quiet talk on the various details of the movement upon which I was anxious to have his opinion. When I entered the room he was courteous, cool and tranquil. He eagerly entered into a discussion of many points

on Communist tactics, which, to some people, might have seemed almost trivial. Lenin is always anxious to hear of any new development in Marxism, and to him every aspect of the movement is important. I very timidly suggested the possible application of Marxist theory to a certain subject which had been monopolised by the anthropologists and ethnologists. He became enthusiastic over the problem which he quickly elaborated and extended, made several important suggestions, indicated where some good data could be found, and urged that the matter should be written and published. To Lenin, Communism is a synthetic philosophy.

After having had a talk with Lenin, it is easy to understand why his quiet and humorous style fails to impress middle-class intellectuals. People like Bertrand Russell are in the habit of meeting pompous bourgeois thinkers whose ideas on social theories are so incoherent and vague that they can only express themselves with great difficulty. This ponderous and floundering method of struggling to deliver an idea is, in certain quarters, mistaken for mental ability. Lenin, on the other hand, sees problems so clearly and is able to explain himself with such clarity and simplicity, that his conclusions seem to be the obvious deduction at which anyone would inevitably arrive.

The Communist (London).

Bertrand Russell On Bolshevik Theory

By Murray Murphy

Bertrand Russell fades out weakly and illogically in his third and last article on "Bolshevik Theory" in *The New Republic*. "For these reasons," he says in conclusion, "while admitting the necessity and even utility of Bolshevism in Russia, (Italics mine, M. M.) I do not wish to see it spread, or to encourage the adoption of its philosophy by advanced parties in the western nations." But why, one may ask, does Prof. Russell oppose the spread of Bolshevism among western nations? Simply because, as he says earlier in the article, Bolshevik theory seems to *err* by concentrating its attention upon one evil, namely inequality of wealth, which it believes to be at the bottom of all others."

Now of course in this statement Professor Russell, with what seems to be characteristic obtuseness, again states a truth in so sweeping a fashion that it becomes half a falsehood. Bolsheviks "concentrate" on a good many things besides inequality of wealth; they concentrate even more on the seizure of political power, for example, knowing that this is a necessary preliminary to the gradual abolition of exploitation,—that is, the gradual abolition of the causes of "inequality of wealth." But in a theoretical sense Bolshevik theory DOES emphasize inequality of wealth,—or, to put it more exactly, capitalist ownership of the means of life,—as the basis of present evils. Bertrand Russell, however, does not agree with this. "What are the chief evils of the present system?" he asks, then goes on to say, "I do not think that mere **INEQUALITY OF WEALTH**, in itself, is a very grave evil." Having said this, he goes on to tell us what the objectionable thing is. "The graver evils of the capitalist system," he continues, "all arise from its **UNEVEN DISTRIBUTION OF POWER**." (Typographical emphasis mine in all quotations.) Here we have the gist of Russell's argument. He speaks as though there were no connection between "inequality of wealth" under capitalism and "uneven distribution of power." The first

is of little consequence, he thinks, but the second is the cause of all our trouble.

Well! What is the source of the "power" thus unevenly distributed? Is it not this very "inequality of wealth" that gives power to the capitalist class? If we can abolish private or capitalist ownership of socially necessary property, we will at the same time do away with the condition which gives a preponderance of power to a small section of the people. It is Russell's original failure to understand Historical Materialism, noted in my first reply to him, which is responsible for his confusion here. To speak of "uneven distribution of power" in this way, as though it were not the result of class possession of wealth, is as absurd as to say that the ill balanced enjoyment of leisure or the lack of a universal achievement of culture is—either one of them—the greatest evil of the present system. It should be evident that all three of these conditions are not concurrent with but are outgrowths of the economic inequalities of the present system. In other words the "inequality of wealth" which Russell belittles is really the *cause* of proletarian lack of power, lack of leisure, and lack of culture.

But let us for the sake of argument accept Professor Russell's statement as correct—that "uneven distribution of power" is the great evil of the present day. What does he propose to do about it? "And I should deny," he says of it, "that this is likely to be cured by the class-war and the dictatorship of the communist party. Only peace and a long period of gradual improvement can serve to bring it about."

In this significant passage Russell reveals the two fundamental errors in his own social theory. One is a practical ignorance of the *class nature of capitalist society*, the other is a credulous belief in *passivity and reformism*.

Let us analyze the statement to show this. When he says that the uneven distribution of power will not "be

cured by the class-war," he assumes, in common with all bourgeois thinkers, that the class struggle is a *result* of Socialist propaganda, whereas it is really the *cause* of it. The class war arises as a result of the inequality of wealth, and in itself is merely an evidence of the evil; it is not "advocated,"—it *exists*. The *class struggle* is the inevitable result of *class-ruled* society. Such being the case, it is absurd for Prof. Russell to contend so vigorously that capitalist evils will not be "cured by the class-war," and that nothing but "peace" will bring it about, as if we could stop the class-war before abolishing its cause. This ignorance of the class nature of our present social order is evident from the character of the language throughout Prof. Russell's article. He never refers to the *class* possession of wealth, or the power of the capitalist *class*; it is always, with him, the *inequality* of wealth, the *uneven distribution* of power,—a form of expression which contemplates society merely as an agglomeration of individuals, rather than as a dual organization of opposing classes.

The professor's second fundamental error, a belief in passivity and reformism, stands out nakedly in the statement we are analyzing. When he says that "only peace and a long period of gradual improvement" can correct the "uneven distribution of power" in capitalist society, he is, in effect, advising the workers to cease opposing their capitalist masters, on the one hand, and, on the other, to rely on mild and trivial "reforms." Now, how can we regard such advice? If it were from an avowed capitalist, we should recognize it as an extremely clever trick from the opposition, but coming, as it does, from a so-called "socialist," we can only call it another example of treason to the workers.

To be sure, we can readily admit that "peace and a long period of gradual improvement" are needed to perfect a Socialist society *after the establishment of the proletarian*

dictatorship. But this is far from Professor Russell's meaning. He wants "peace" *before* the proletariat get political power,—in spite of the fact that he condemns the "uneven distribution of power" under the capitalist regime.

This last remark brings us to the real, though somewhat hidden, point in his article. He is opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat because there is still an "uneven distribution of power,"—the power isn't "equalized," isn't divided up with the poor bourgeois! So he says "equalization of wealth without equalization of power" seems to him a "rather small and unstable achievement." His professed fear is that the Communists in power "will see little importance in hastening the transition from dictatorship to freedom." In other words, he fears that the proletarian dictatorship will be permanent instead of transitional. However, without trying to answer this argument, which would require an extended consideration of Lenin's "The State and Revolution," Engel's "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," etc., we may wonder why Russell prefers to accept bourgeois dictatorship which *intends to be permanent* rather than proletarian dictatorship which *has declared itself a temporary transitional condition aiming at the establishment of a classless society*. Why does he prefer to trust the one rather than the other?

Professor Russell, however, has nothing to offer as a solution for social ills, other than an implied policy of non-resistance and *laissez faire*. Such is his answer to the question he asked at the beginning of his article,—"Is it possible to effect a fundamental reform of the existing economic system by any other method than that of Bolshevism?" He opposes Bolshevism, and does not "wish to see it spread" among the western nations,—but, meanwhile, Bolshevism spreads!

International Notes

By John Keracher

Russia From a military point of view, there seems at the present time to be comparatively little gain in Soviet Russia. This is chiefly due to the fact that the small border States have ceased to allow their territories to be turned into battle fields in the interest of Allied imperialism. Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have each in their turn concluded treaties with Russia. Poland is reluctant to resume hostilities and Rumania has hastened to deny hostile intentions.

On the other hand reports indicate a steady peaceful penetration of Asia Minor and a growing bond of unity with the Moslem nations. The economic situation within is rapidly being restored and extensive preparations made for the development of industry as soon as machinery can be imported.

The granting of land concessions to foreign Capitalists raised some opposition to these schemes. Lenin at the All Russian Congress of Soviets expressed his appreciation of the spirit that animated some peasant delegates who declared that they would rather suffer three more years of hardship than see the Country turned over to foreign Capitalists, but he firmly asserted the needs of obtaining machinery and that there was no other way of acquiring the enormous quantities necessary for the development of Russia. An English periodical quotes some of his remarks on this subject as follows: "If we sell Kamchatka the enthusiasm of the American people would force their Gov-

ernment to recognize us. Meanwhile we should only lease the territory for ten years, because there is a danger that Japan might rob us of Kamchatka. In any case we could not exploit the territory with the resources at our disposal. Moreover, we are leasing several million deszatinas of forest divided up like a chess board, in the Archangel Government. In the intervening and now leased districts our workers can learn western technical methods. The granting of concessions betokens not peace, but war in another shape. If the Capitalists deceive us and try to circumvent our laws we have our extraordinary Commission for combatting speculation, and this will know how to defeat their machinations. Should war result the foreigners' property will remain ours. The revolution progresses on a zig-zag path. We have no intention of confining ourselves to force in order to conquer the bourgeoisie."

The decision of the American Government to deport Comrade Martens, the Soviet representative here, has resulted in a cancellation of all orders and breaking off all business negotiations with American firms. Other countries however, will be willing to open trade relations, especially since Britain has reached an agreement with the Soviet Government. Freed from the ever present profit encumbrance of capitalist nations with their armies of jobless workers and parasitic squanderers, Soviet Russia, if once started properly on its industrial development, will be able to show a new pattern to the whole world.

Turkey The Turks once more are on the ascendency in Asia Minor. Their prestige is arising from their new policy and their alignment with Soviet Russia. At Angora the National Assembly elected Mustapha Kemal as people's commissioner. The Turks sent the following message to Moscow: "We express our admiration for the nation which for three years has been carrying on a heroic struggle for the liberation of the whole world, which is enduring untold misery with enthusiasm for the cause of justice. The day is approaching when the workers of the West and the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa will unite to destroy world capitalism. The Oriental peoples are aglow with revolutionary spirit and are beginning to see clearly where the criminal colonial policy of the Western Powers is leading them. The high moral authority of the Russia Soviet Government amongst the workers of Europe and the love of the Moslem world for the Turkish nation give us the assurance that our close alliance will suffice to unite against the Western imperialism all those who love their rule through ignorance and patience." The above message which speaks of destroying world capitalism shows clearly that the "Turkish Nationalists" are not mere nationalists. In spite of their name and probably their original aim to save Turkey from national extinction at the hands of Western imperialism, they are now taking a definite stand for the social revolution, working in harmony with Soviet Armenia and solidifying their forces on their Western front against the European invaders.

A treaty has been completed between Turkey and Russia. As reported in the press the following are the chief points in the agreement: (1) To ensure the territorial integrity of Turkey and restore Turkish administration in the regions inhabited by Turks; (2) Turkish control is to be established in the new states of Arabia and Syria; (3) Facilities are to be accorded Russian delegates with a view to the development of Communism in Turkey; (4) Russia and Turkey agree to liberate Moslem countries, such as India, Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, and Tunis, from the foreign yoke and grant them independence; (5) Russia recognizes the independence of Moslem states in her territory, and guarantees them integrity; (6) Russia agrees to grant financial and material aid to Turkey; (7) Russia agrees to dispatch two army corps, followed by more if necessary; (8) Hostilities may be continued against the Entente with previous reference to the National Councils of both countries.

In some quarters attempts have been made to belittle the policy of Soviet Russia in its rapprochement with subject nations that are not yet definitely under the control of the workers. At the Halle Convention, on October 12th, Crispian speaking for the "right" of the German Independents, attacked Soviet Russia for coming to an understanding with the murderer Enver Pasha. Zinoviev in his speech replied to the attack as follows: "I will deal with the nationality question. Enver Pasha was present at Baku; but he took no part in the Conference. I proposed and carried a resolution against him as speaker, he was merely allowed to make a statement. After that a motion was adopted by the Conference which makes it clear that the Russians told Enver Pasha that he was the man who had murdered the Armenians." In entering into working agreement with such countries as Turkey, it will be observed that Soviet Russia demands and obtains certain conditions before entering into alliance. The wisdom of such a policy should be apparent to all thinking workers. In addition to opening avenues to further revolutionary developments the rapprochement with these oppressed peoples on the borders of Russian Territory prevents these

countries from being used as a basis of Imperial operation against Soviet Russia itself. If Turkey develops completely into a Soviet nation the influence upon all other Moslem countries will be very great indeed.

Great Britain The unemployment situation in Britain does not seem to improve; if anything it becomes even more acute. Recently in the House of Commons, Premier Lloyd George announced that there were one million more unemployed than in 1914, in spite of the great loss of men in the war. *The Daily Herald*, the official publication of the Labor Party, proclaims that a crisis is at hand on account of further increase of unemployment. *The Herald* says that those out of work and their dependants amount to 5,615,000. The Government is beginning to ship out workers to the Colonies in its "empire settlement" scheme, 1,100 have been sent to Australia and it is planned to send out so many thousands per month to other Colonies. The workers at the same time have been denied the opportunity to go to South American countries on free passage offered by some of the South American Republics to British immigrants.

The unemployment problem no doubt has much to do with the acceptance of trade relations with Russia, for it has been announced that the Government had reached an agreement with Leonid Krassin, Russia's trade emissary, the terms of which would be incorporated into a Commercial Treaty with Soviet Russia. The terms of the Treaty it was proposed to work out in detail during the time the House of Commons was taking its Christmas recess.

Evidently the treaty has been completed as reports indicate that the allied authorities at Constantinople have since been ordered to let ships pass into the Black Sea, enroute, with cargoes, to Soviet Russia.

Winston Churchill, the War Minister, made a trip to Paris on January 10th. He claimed that his visit was unofficial, yet the press attributed his presence in the French capital to the trouble arising between France and Germany, over the latter country's failure to reduce their armed forces to the number stipulated in the Peace Treaty.

The French claim that the German Government is hiding artillery, immense quantities of air-craft materials and other munitions, ready for assembly in an emergency. Churchill is charged with desiring to see Germany sufficiently well armed to hold down the working classes and to be able to repel at the same time any Red Armies that might come to the aid of the working class in case of revolution. While these conditions prevail in home territory British Imperialism is being threatened elsewhere. It appears that the British Legation at Teheran, Persia, has ordered that British women and children be withdrawn from northern Persia as their military forces are being withdrawn. At about the same time dispatches indicate extensive rioting in India. The natives around Lucknow have been organizing an anti-rent movement against the landlords. The attempt to break up these organizations by the land-owners is given as the cause of the outbreak. With all these troubles on hand, not to overlook irrepressible Ireland, the British master class are gradually being overwhelmed.

Spain During the "Great War" the Spanish Capitalists reaped a harvest of profits. They obtained high prices and a ready sale for their commodities abroad and a corresponding increase at home. Flushed with their gains they started to assert themselves in Spanish political life. The province of Catalonia, the most highly developed capitalist section of Spain, conducted an aggressive political campaign, for independent constitutional govern-

ment; republicanism flourished for a time.

This struggle between the Capitalist class and the monarchy was hurriedly fixed up for a new struggle began to overshadow the independence struggle of the Catalonian Bourgeoisie. The proletariat had been developing also and the economic collapse in the Catalonian cities following the war has resulted in a condition akin to civil war. Two years ago extensive strikes shook the social life of Barcelona, Cadiz and Valencia. Since then working class organizations have developed by leaps and bounds, the increase in the Socialist Party membership has only been surpassed by the enormous increase in the ranks of the Syndicalists. The past year has been a strenuous one. The class struggle has been open and violent. Martial law with its iron heel methods has brought about similar conditions to those in Ireland. Reports tell how workingmen are found slain in the streets of the industrial cities, at the hands of the military, or the "civic guards" that have been formed from the ranks of the ruling classes. This civic guard is led by business and professional men. In some cases university students make up these forces

which are uniformed and drilled like the regular army.

In Saragossa, the Governor by a proclamation, ordered the suppression of the trade unions. It is a punishable offense to be caught with a syndicalist (union) card. Thousands have been arrested and held in jails, bull-rings and other places. Many had to be released again because of over-crowding and the problem of feeding such numbers. The Capitalists with Republican aspirations have not hesitated to join hands with the Monarchists for the suppression of the workers. The army has been employed to keep the railways and other public works going, and to suppress strikers. The "civic guards" have been given power to arrest suspects, enter and search homes, and browbeat the workers in general. The working class altho unarmed has retaliated against the civic guards, numbers of whom have been killed. Rubber sling-shots with poisoned darts are sometimes used by the syndicalists, and within the last year over 400 merchants and manufacturers have been found slain. If these newspaper reports are not exaggerated then the class struggle in Spain has reached the revolutionary stage of civil war.

The Third International

GERMANY

The reports current last month that the Independent Socialist Party of Germany had voted to affiliate with the Third International were not entirely correct. The Halle Congress held in October was attended by 393 delegates, and when the final vote was taken the Stoecker-Daumig resolution (for affiliation) was adopted. The vote was:

For Affiliation	239
Against	156

Crispien, a former Spartacist, presided at the Congress and delivered the main speech for the Right (against affiliation). Zinoviev, representing the Executive Committee of the International successfully refuted the many objections raised and asked the Right to state specifically their objections to the 21 conditions. Hilferding, speaking for the Right, then pointed out that there were three conditions which they would not accept:

- (1) The provision abolishing the complete autonomy (independence) of the national parties,
- (2) The demand that they assist in smashing the (yellow) Trades Union International;
- (3) The provision providing for the expulsion of known opportunists and reformers.

Indeed, it would be strange if the Right were not opposed to these points of the conditions. Without the old freedom of action, without the support of the reactionary unions, what would be left of their power? But even worse is the demand for the expulsion of the opportunists. To better understand the position of the Right Independents consider what it would mean to our own Socialist Party if it were compelled to eliminate its opportunistic vote-catching, yard-or-so of reforms, and were required besides to expel Hillquit, Berger, London, etc. For Kautsky, Hilferding, Crispien, Dittman and a host of officials and careerists acceptance of the conditions meant the surrender of their power, and this they refused to do.

When the news of the result of the Halle Congress first reached this country details were lacking, and it was supposed that the great German Independent Party had

voted to affiliate with the Third International. True, the resolution for affiliation was adopted by a goodly majority (nearly two-thirds) but the Right had still a trump to play. Previous to the Congress, the Central Committee, prepared for the worst, had decided that the delegates who voted for affiliation with the Third International would thereby sever their connection with the Independent Party. Thus, when the final vote was announced, Crispien read a statement to this effect and he and the minority then left the hall. By this simple expedient the majority was expelled, and the minority continues as the Independent Socialist Party, and retains hold of the property and funds.

While the details are a bit different, this action very much resembles the action of the American Socialist Party in expelling sufficient members to keep the control of the organization in the hands of the opportunists. In both instances it remained for the very groups that are loudest in praise of "pure democracy" to demonstrate that the democracy of which they prate is but a lie and a sham—they who most bitterly criticised what they are are pleased to call the "minority action" of the Communists, do not hesitate to resort to minority action when their positions of pelf and place are in danger.

ENGLAND

Preliminary unity conferences between the various communist groups have been proceeding for some time with the result that a Unity Conference was held at Leeds on January 29th. Details of this conference are not available at this time.

AMERICA

The unity negotiations between the Communist Party and the "United" Communist Party proceed slowly. It is reported that a basis of representation has finally been agreed upon. The proceedings are of course enveloped in deep, dark mystery. Ordinary folks who are not of the elect are supposed to know nothing of these matters. Even the many recognized communist groups that are not part of the C. P. or the U. C. P. were not invited to participate. It is far easier to follow the developments of the move-

ment in far off Russia or Armenia than to know what is going on at home. Of course, if one were a police-spy it might be different.

In his criticism of the German and Dutch Left Wing, Lenin remarks that "every truth if it be carried to excess, if it be exaggerated, if it be carried beyond the limits of actual application, can be reduced to an absurdity." He demonstrates how absurd is the position of the "pure communists," in refusing to participate in bourgeois parliaments and reactionary trade-unions. Much of this criticism applies with equal force to our own super-Bolsheviks.

An example of the manner in which a perfectly sound principle may by exaggeration be reduced to an absurdity is found in the application of the proposition contained in Section 3 of the conditions for affiliation to the Third International. This section deals with the necessity of secret or illegal organizations, and says in clear language that when the class struggle enters the stage of civil war the Communists cannot depend upon the protection of capitalist laws. "They should create everywhere a *parallel* illegal apparatus which at the decisive *moment* should do its duty by the party...." Now, take this proposition, which is in itself entirely correct, and carry it to the extreme of insisting that the entire work of a party must at all times be conducted in secret; and that in order to be truly revolutionary a communist party must of necessity be an outlaw organization, then the principle is transformed and made absurd.

Let us grant for the sake of argument, that at the present time in this country a certain degree of secrecy is necessary. In this case it would be good policy to follow the advice of the International and "create a parallel illegal apparatus" to work in conjunction with the main body which would be the open, legal organization, participating in elections and conducting general propaganda and educational activities. But would it not be absurd to argue, as many do, that because some degree of secrecy is necessary that the entire party should be placed on an illegal basis, and that legal, open work be disguised. If we hide ourselves away how are the masses to be reached? The answer is obvious. To adopt such a plan of organization means simply that we would sever our connection with the general working class movement and turn the workers over to the gentle nursing of the reactionary Socialist Party.

No, it is neither good tactics nor proof of revolutionary spirit to hide the light of communism under a bushel. On the contrary, if to carry on our work openly involves some risk, then we will have to work up sufficient courage to face it. Should it become necessary to create a *parallel* organization for special activities, well and good. But in such matters only the tried and experienced members can be used, and it would be the height of folly to advertise that such an organization existed.

A. J. M.

Exit The Villain

The villain must leave the stage. His part is played!

By "the villain" is meant the wrong-doer of the old-fashioned story-book type, whose punishment is demanded by poetic justice, whose derelictions are regarded as putting him outside the zone of sympathy.

Pleasure—at least a grim satisfaction—in the punishment of "the wicked" has been a matter of course in the past; and, for the most part, bourgeois society continues to give it the nod of approbation.

Yet a new light is breaking. We no longer consider the wrong-doer as an isolated phenomenon. We are learning to correlate him with his surroundings.

Science teaches that individuals are the product of their heredity and their environment. Following the leadings of this truth we see "the villain" from an entirely different viewpoint. We don't have to seek counterbalancing traits. We don't have to rehabilitate him partially in order to have so-called "charity" for him. We no longer pat ourselves on the back for being kind to him. When he passes across the stage of our lives we are fain to adapt the saying of a famous preacher and exclaim, "There goes myself but for the grace of—my heredity and environment!"

At that we don't dare be too complacent. Our own pedestals are wobbly. We haven't had all our environment. In a crisis yet to come we may fall down, while the "devil's disciple" may prove the best of the boiling.

Again, we are no longer sure about the status of the villain. He is not a fixed quantity. There is no absolute idea of a villain, somewhere in space, as a pattern, to which all villains, of all times, places, and conditions must conform, or forever abdicate their claims to villainship.

The villain varies as the social needs he opposes vary; and these social needs differ according to time, place, and circumstances. Chiefly, they shift as economic conditions change.

We mustn't be too prompt about branding as a villain the person whose standards differ from ours. He may be more in line with evolution than we are. Possibly we are relegating him to the limbo of villains because we ourselves are clinging to some dead morality of the past, which no longer answers to a social need, which obstructs, instead of helping human welfare. Perhaps our judgment is biased by our economic environment.

When the young bourgeois society was struggling to overthrow the dictatorship of princes and nobles, it was in line with human welfare for the proletariat to turn against the feudal lords, to join with the bourgeoisie in building up the new society. Feudalism had fulfilled its mission. It stood in the way of further development. The bourgeois revolution meant progress. It was the next step in evolution. The workers' own hour had not come.

Now, Capitalism in turn, has filled its mission. Its artificial perpetuation is spelling chaos and ruin. The method of production demands that workers should take control; that they should develop an economic system based on full co-operation, with every individual doing his part and enjoying the blessings of the new commonwealth. In short, the time is near when human brotherhood is to be realized; and it is through the working people of the world (the proletariat, because it is nearest the heart of the new method of "production on a larger scale") that realization is to come.

It follows that about the chiefest social need at present is working class solidarity of the right kind. The proletariat, closely "welded" together will lead all the "toiling masses," will free humanity. The class conscious working man, with an eye single to the rule of the proletariat, who is making the most of himself with a view to bringing the new day nearer, is, today, the most moral being under the shining sun. He is the salt of the earth, a product of her-

edity and environment that is right in line with human progress.

But bourgeois society acts on the principle that its own transient morality is established forever. Two centuries ago it was "right" for the proletariat to uphold Capitalism. Therefore it is "eternally" right that the workers should be subservient to the old system—even though Capitalism no longer serves human weal, though the woes of anguished humanity are an S. O. S. call for the workers to take the wheel and end the horrors of the present age.

So the toiler that is one with his class is ranked chief of sinners because of his class consciousness. This, in face of the fact that the workers' cause is humanity's cause; that through the dictatorship of the proletariat lies the straight road to world co-operation.

The time is coming when all things must serve co-operation; and, herein lies proof that the idea of the villain must go. Under an economic system based on co-operation it would be a stumbling block. When Society and individuals are wreaking spite on their villains, mobbing them, sending them to the electric chair, they are weakening the capacity of all concerned (including the younger generation) for co-operation.

At the same time Capitalism is running true to form in bolstering up the idea of the villain; for, by so doing, it is acting according to its own ideology, and is also propping up the toppling system.

Fires of resentment against individuals or groups (foreigners, kaisers, profiteers as individuals, negroes, and others) are always kept burning in sight of the workers. With their eyes focused on individuals, and blinded by smoke, they aren't so likely to see the economic forces back of the movements of history.

Capitalism drafts into its service all kinds of "antis" as villain timber. Yet, on this side of the water, the supply of "antis" that are 100% American doesn't seem to equal the demand. So we are importing one from czarist Russia. That is anti-Semitism.

The much-talked-of articles that have been running in *The Dearborn Independent* (Henry Ford's paper) on "The Jew in America" are significant.

Anti-Semitism makes a first rate all-around utility "anti" for the old system. In the first place it keeps race antagonism going; and Capitalism has got to have race antagonisms. Then, too, a goodly proportion of Jews are working people. Anti-Semitism sets their mates in shop and factory against them, thus blocking working class solidarity.

Anything to keep the workers pitted against each other, so busy chasing pseudo-villains when their masters cry, "Sick 'em!" that their ears will be deaf to the call "Workingmen of the World, Unite." Anything to keep them chanting the hymns of hate, lest their voices should burst into the song of solidarity that is to grow into the mighty paean of universal brotherhood!

The capitalist owned story writers and movie makers, acting as nurses to the sick system, never lose their hold of the villain.

They have a new one—The Bolshevik. He is painted very black, individually and collectively. Whenever the paint rubs off and the natural white complexion appears, the pigment has to be daubed on again, more thickly than before.

The lie about the nationalization of women in Russia is the deadest of all slimy dead things. Yet it is getting to be an old joke that newspapers, magazines, and movies desist not from their stunt of trying to galvanize it into factitious life.

Last spring, Geraldine Farrar sang at the May Fes-

tival in Michigan's university town. That same week, one of the local theatres, largely attended by students, put on a picture starring Geraldine Farrar, and featuring the above mentioned myth about the nationalization of women!

In real life, the old society is taking pains that the villain shall go out in a blaze of glory; for Capitalism, in its blind terror at loss of supremacy, seems bound to assume the role of paramount villain of all the ages. This is instanced by the unparagoned atrocities committed against the workers in some countries of Europe.

All this must come to a finish. The dictatorship of the proletariat will bring about the abolition of classes; and, in the new society to come, the villain will find scant room for his activities. The environment won't foster them. The hold-up-causing, crime-wave-boosting, legalized villainies of an exploiting class will be no more. The orbits of varying human interest will not be forever crossing each other. Collisions won't be the foregone conclusion that they are today. Living in the midst of a society based on co-operation, with no exploiting class, the human individual won't have to struggle against the current in order to live true to his character as a social animal.

If isolated cases still occur where individuals otherwise seemingly normal will menace the welfare of the group, Society will protect itself by restraining the trouble makers; but it will not further complicate matters by setting up as their enemies. On the contrary, Society will look after the welfare of the recalcitrants; will study to find the causes of their inability to do team work; will help them to get moral balance; will try and teach them to correlate their interests with those of the pack.

In literature, an especially erring human is featured, the forces that have made him what he is will also be shown up. He will not be placed outside the pale of sympathy, the reader will not be made to gloat over his sufferings. The method of treatment will be characteristic of the new society—even as the old method, with its surface treatment, its penchant for promoting hatred, its practice of considering acts by themselves instead of viewing them in relation to their causes and circumstances, is thoroughly in keeping with the bourgeois habit of thought.

FRANC CONNER.

The Middle Class

Classification is a primary requisite to all who would study and understand. Only when we are able to properly classify things, and place them in their respective categories are we on the correct road to acquiring knowledge. This by no means implies that things can be taken as separate and distinct entities and properly analyzed as such. Even those objects that are most unlike are, still, in some respects, closely allied with each other. Reduced to their elements they have many points of resemblance. At the same time, to bring order out of chaos we must distinguish the difference between things and, that this may be possible, we must have recourse to classification.

One of the problems that baffle the ingenuity of the new student in the Socialist movement is the discovery of the line of demarcation between the classes that comprise society today. Many of those who have expressed themselves on the subject hold to the theory that the middle class is a large, wealthy, influential section of the body politic, and is increasing, rather than diminishing, in wealth and power. Such a theory is easily exploded by an understanding of the facts.

The term—middle class—has its origin in medieval

times. There were two distinct classes in existence—the feudal aristocracy and the serfs. Agriculture was the main department of activity. So long as it remained so, those two classes were all the conditions warranted. But the development of handicraft was gradually bringing about another class in between those two.

This new class possessed tools, workshops, and other equipment necessary to the manufacture of articles which found their way into the markets of the then known world. Neither the landed proprietors nor the villeins operated in this field. The middle class became a distinct entity, owning the requisites of production, and engaged in the manufacture and exportation of things produced.

In the course of time this middle class became the dominant section of society. The upper classes became absorbed into it, and eventually ceased to exist as a separate faction. Manufacture, trade, and commerce became the chief business of society and all sections of the ruling class merged into one. This combination of forces resulted in a large class of producers and a small class of owners.

Even less than a century ago, in the United States, there was a class of independent artisans, shopkeepers, and small business men who could well be classified as a middle class. Today, however, this class has disappeared. It has made way for big business. The conditions of capitalism make impossible any independence or ownership on the part of the producers. The agricultural middle class held its position longer than that of industry but, even here, the big capitalists have recently taken almost complete control. The independent farmer is practically an extinct species excepting in the imagination of Utopian dreamers.

Numerically speaking, the Capitalist class is not large. Less than a hundred men, according to the statement of Senator Works a few years ago, controlled the United States. This mere handful of individuals have the power to dictate the terms of existence to more than one hundred million of people. It is not necessary that they have absolute possession of every industry, or of all natural resources, in order to accomplish this feat. Their control of the basic industries, and finance, is quite sufficient to insure their domination.

What appears on the surface to be a middle class today is, in reality, no such animal. The small manufacturers, business men, and farmers are mere tools, agents, go-betweens, or procurers for those who own and rule. Their function is to collect the surplus values extracted from the hides of the producers in the factory and hand them up to the group at the top. The portion of the wealth which they are able to hold on to is small, and their economic position is neither strong nor stable. Hanging between the few at the top, and the many at the bottom, their place in society is not an enviable one.

Occasionally, we hear of one of those members of the small fry climbing successfully into the ranks of the capitalists. Much ado is made of such a happy deliverance. But the trend of their movement is in a downward, rather than an upward direction. The unending interplay of economic forces causes the little owners to relinquish their hold on private property and take up their abode in the realms of wage slavery from which there is no return.

In the days of "money economy" the owner could see what he owned. It was something tangible that he could either operate himself or have operated by the aid of others. In these days of "credit economy," however, the opposite is the case. The individual cannot possess property in the means of production. This is the function of the trust or partial monopoly. At the head of each of these is some great man, or small group of great men, who shape the

destinies of the concern irrespective of the wishes and desires of the small stock holders. Many persons may have in their possession shares, stocks, bonds, and other claims upon wealth, but they have no *power*. This is where the strength of the few asserts itself. It is *influence* and not *wealth* that counts.

Human society at present is divided into two great classes—owners and producers. Between them is the Class Struggle. This war of the ages can have no cessation while slavery lasts. Attempts to lure the workers from their historic mission, to chase myths and phantoms, must be exposed by the Socialist propagandist. There is only one problem confronting us today and that is the abolition of class society and all it involves.

J. A. McDONALD.

The Facts, Mr. Editor

In a recent issue of the *Communist* the official organ of the United Communist Party of America, Theo. Muenzer has an article entitled "The Socialist Party as a Counter-Revolutionary Force." From that part where he professes to be treating the subject historically I quote the following: "The carriers of this early socialism (into the U. S. A.) were essentially theorists. Though many of them were themselves carrying the burdens of a capitalist exploitation, they did not conceive of the class struggle as a reality created by the social system which pitted class against class on the basis of opposed economic interests. Rather, for them, the class struggle was the result, not the cause, of consciousness. Without class consciousness, no class struggle. To create the struggle, and thereby the revolution, it appears necessary first to spread class consciousness through education, until a sufficient body of the workers could be prepared for that struggle. Exactly this conception finds expression today in the 'Proletarian' group or Party, of Detroit and elsewhere."

He uses two thousand five hundred words, a whole page, but does not quote or refer to a solitary piece of literature to prove these accusations. The "theorists" of "early socialism" in the U. S. A. were often in error but so far as I know they never "conceived" that "the class struggle was the result... of consciousness."

While the rest of the expelled Left Wing were making strenuous efforts to get back into the Socialist Party we the "Proletarian group or Party of Detroit and elsewhere" (thus classified because while we were yet in the S. P. we organized the Proletarian University, under its auspices we conducted, and still conduct, study classes. We also published and still publish the *Proletarian*), issued a call for a national convention to meet in Chicago September 1st, 1919, for the purpose of organizing a Communist Party. To the extent that the other elements of the Left Wing discovered that the S. P. Bosses would not allow themselves to be captured to that extent these Left Wing-ers responded to our Communist call. Being the majority, they took control of the convention and defeated our manifesto and program, a part of which I will now quote: "The class struggle was a fact in history before capitalism was ever known; it is the logical and inevitable outcome of the social development of a certain period. It was not invented. It evolved! The class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie is evident to all the world, manifesting itself daily in more acute forms."

I challenge anyone to quote from any issue of the *Proletarian* or any other part of our propaganda to show that we are guilty of what Theo. Muenzer accuses us of.

Have the officials of the U. C. P. knowingly allowed the official organ of that Party to be used to falsify the efforts of we who have done, and are doing so much to get members of our class to study, teach and apply in the struggle of our class with the rule of capital, the method expounded in the writings of Marx, Engels, Dietzen and their collaborators?

Again a ten cent pamphlet, entitled "Problems of the Third International" in which N. Lenin exposes Ramsey McDonald and his type, on page twenty-two we read thus:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat would be impossible if the majority of the population did not consist of proletarians and semi-proletarians. Kautsky and Company attempt to falsify this truth by presenting the necessity of the 'vote of the majority' in order to accept the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Italics ours—Ed.) Who the editor is we are not told but I suspect that he represents either the C. P. or the U. C. P. of America, anyhow he adds the following footnote:

"We call especial attention of our comrades to a remarkably deep thought contained in this paragraph. How many in our own ranks—of the former (Left Wingers) together with Kautsky & Co. assume the 'same false position'; . . . The whole position of the so-called 'Michiganites' and their followers, for instance, is based on this misconception."

Insofar as this footnote refers to the "Michiganites" and their followers who, for the benefit of new readers, are now the same "Proletarian group or Party of Detroit and elsewhere," now the Proletarian Party of America, it is as Lenin says about "Martov" in the little booklet referred to above, "the argument of a crook." This editor did not give one particle of reference or proof and I defy him to do so.

C. M. O'BRIEN,
Organizer, Local Rochester, N. Y.,
Proletarian Party of America.

The American Empire

The American Empire by Scott Nearing, Rand School, New York, paper fifty cents.

This is one of the most pleasing and instructive pamphlets that have been published in America for some time. So much worthless literature has been published from time to time that one approaches the reading of a new book nowadays with a sense of duty rather than with the anticipation of being pleased or benefitted by it. This sense of duty is rewarded in the case of Nearing's pamphlet by both pleasure and benefit.

Briefly he traces the development of America without neglect of the essential features. The early development of the country is treated clearly yet briefly so that one is not bored by details. We are left with a comprehensive understanding of the main features. The best part of the work shows itself in the development of imperialism in America. Nearing defines the characteristics of empire as being "conquered territory," "Subject peoples," "An imperial or ruling class" and "The exploitation of the subject peoples and the conquered territory for the benefit of the ruling class." He then proceeds to demonstrate that the United States Government possesses all of these qualifications and that the history of the development of these characteristics is just as bloody and disgraceful as that of any other empire, not excepting the "Horrible Hun."

Mr. Nearing has presented us with a comprehensive

analysis of the cumbersome statistics contained in various government reports and shows briefly the development of the big industries of the United States and their influence upon the government. It is a book that we can well recommend for the data that is in it and it should be a part of every agitator's arsenal.

Dogmatism

Dogmatism—a vice or a virtue? That is the question. Is it a mark of distinction or of feeble-mindedness to be able to say with dictatorial positiveness that facts are facts? Is dogmatism, the disputed question, a thing to be guarded against or should we aspire to dogmatic positiveness, compatible with the establishment of definitely known scientific truths? Is it weakness or strength of character to be indecisive and non-committal when there is no question or doubt as to what are the actual facts in the case? Let the metaphysician adhere to his theological dogmas with bull-dog tenacity and stupidity; it is for us to acclaim scientific truths with authoritative boldness—dogmatism. Let us examine further.

The application of dogmas is almost universal. The adherence to any given set of ideas, doctrines, beliefs, facts, superstitions, theories, axioms, or what not is dogmatic. To give a definition to a word is to be dogmatic. To say that two and two equal four, that roses are sweet, that the dead live, that rain falls, that horses like oats, that the world is flat, that blackberries are red when they are green, is to be dogmatic. To have faith in the teachings of Jesus, Confucius, Euclid, Mary Baker G. Eddy, Karl Marx, Thos. Edison, Chas. Darwin, Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir Isaac Newton, Henry George, Max Stirner, or Nikolai Lenin is also to be dogmatic. In fact, to be wholly devoid of dogmas would be to establish a close relationship with the formless amoeba. It is not a question of having dogmas,—all of us are dogmatists to a greater or lesser extent. The question is, "Are our dogmas based upon facts, or upon superstitions?" If based upon superstitions they should be thrown overboard. If based upon facts, they should be upheld by all, except the ignorant and the perverts. But we Communists are accused of being too dogmatic. To this charge we plead guilty and defend our dogmatism and positiveness. However, if by "dogmatic" our accusers imply that we are the sheepishly blind followers of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, believing that we accept them as authority as the theologians do the Bible or "Science and Health," then the accusation is hideously grotesque and only reflects the stupid ignorance of our antagonists and their friendly listeners.

Let us first examine our accusers. They are members of the broadminded liberal bourgeoisie and their naive representatives, the liberal ministers, editors, educators, and advanced thinkers on various and sundry subjects. They half-heartedly advocate first one thing and then another, never advocating anything of paramount importance. They are seldom, if ever, positive for fear of being wrong. Always contradicting themselves and severely criticizing others who do not agree with them, they take pride in the ease with which they change their minds. They congratulate themselves on having a free and open mind, unwittingly admitting that they are either mentally incapable of having positive ideas, or too cowardly to defend them against their antagonists.

These men accuse us of being "dogmatists." It is to these men that we, with pride, acclaim our dogmatism. We say that labor produces all wealth; that present so-

ciety is divided into two distinct and antagonistic classes; that material conditions, the methods employed to obtain food, clothing and shelter, determine the forms of the entire superstructure of society, the religious and political and other ideas. We make many other statements, logically deduced from these fundamental ideas. We are positive of the correctness of these statements, and assert them dogmatically. We defend our position against the most powerful antagonists that society has yet developed. For this we would be stigmatized as dogmatists. But to so style us does not crush us. We are convinced that our position is based upon proven facts. We are sure that Marxian economics is correct. We are positive that there are two antagonistic classes in society. We are convinced that the history of society, since the development of private property, has been the history of class struggles. We adhere to our position with a tenacity and a determination that is akin to religious fervor. But our position is dialectic, our dogma is dynamic; it is our guide to action.

If those who would stigmatize us would crush us, it is for them to prove that our dogma is not based on fact, but on fiction. Let them prove that the evils in society, antagonistic classes and profits, will be abolished by the

good will of the capitalists. Let them prove—if they can—that the history of society is the history of the will of “Gawd,” or of the mentally deficient and physically diseased monarchs, or of Great Men, or of high ideals, all separate and apart from class struggles. Let them also prove that wealth can be produced without labor, and then, indeed we are crushed.

On the other hand, if our doctrines are based on facts, and constitute our guide for actions, then our actions will be correct; they will have in the main the result intended. If, as is the case, a classless society is in line with historical progress and development, then instead of being crushed, we shall be triumphant.

With the aid of our dogma as a guide to our actions we shall establish a new society. We shall make the idle phrases of today’s demagogues the material facts of tomorrow. We shall bring to proletarian realization the bourgeois fantasies of freedom, democracy and prosperity. And our antagonists, the eminently respectable and the best citizens in society today, will receive their due rewards. They will have been lost in the turmoil of the revolution, “unwept, unhonored, and unsung.”

JOHN BALL.

Bolshevism In Spain

Bolshevism in Spain is spreading like wildfire * * *

Spain has for centuries been a Catholic country. Men have been taught to respect authority, human and Divine. If Bolshevism can make headway in such a land, other nations should take warning and educate their people against this moral, religious, social and political heresy.

An impartial investigation of Bolshevism in Spain was recently made by A. Del Castillo. He reports as follows:

“One of the most remarkable and interesting social changes of recent years is the revolution of sentiment among the working classes in Spanish manufacturing and mining districts. Before the war these people supported the Republican party. Some were Socialists, but of the most moderate and democratic type. Today the situation has completely changed. The Republican party has lost its influence. The Socialist party has grown rapidly, and a new Bolshevik party, known as the ‘Syndicalists’ has become very powerful.

“This is due to the contagion of revolutionary ideas, the triumph of the Russian revolution, and propaganda by Russians and other foreign agitators. The new party uses force to gain adherents, but does so secretly. Workers have to enroll in the Syndicalist party and pay weekly dues to its campaign chest, under threat of death if they fail to obey.

“Barcelona is the headquarters of the Syndicalists, from which center that organization spreads throughout Spain. The party has a secretary in every establishment where workers are employed. The organization is so secret, that the rank and file do not know who their own officers are.

“A campaign of terror has ensued. The number of employers or other opponents of the Syndicalists who are its victims constantly increase. Figures tell more than words. Some four hundred employers have been assassinated within a year. More than this, with a few rare exceptions, the murderers remain undetected.

“The same cause explains the incessant local strikes, which occasionally develop into larger conflicts. Troops must be employed to suppress them. Martial law has been declared; civil liberties have ceased. The police arrest and imprison any man having a Syndicalist card upon his person. The army is helping directly to run the railways, the gas works, and the water works. Every effort is being made to force the old employes back, but they obstinately refuse. For a time men were arrested en masse; the prisons were overcrowded. Even the bull rings were used to confine the workers. Eventually, however, they had to be released. It cost too much to feed them.

“Not only the police and the army, but also the better class of citizens, are taking active part in this struggle. The latter have armed and are drilling in military formations. These civic guards, like the police and the army, have unlimited authority to use arms, to arrest suspected persons, to search houses, and to inflict summary punishment. Even the rector of the University of Barcelona, a worthy old gentleman with a venerable beard, who, under ordinary conditions, would not harm a fly, has armed himself to the teeth and taken command of a company of young men, who, elegantly dressed and with brand new rifles, have placed themselves at the service of ‘the cause.’

“As a result of these struggles, wages are constantly rising. Workers apparently earn more in Barcelona than in any other place in Europe. An ordinary mechanic receives sixty pesetas a day. Naturally the cost of living is soaring skyward.

“Class hatred expresses itself in constant assaults by either party. Members of the civic guards are constantly found murdered, struck down by little dart-like poisoned missiles, which the assassins project by means of a rubber sling. At other times, slain workers are found lying in the streets.

“When a strike is concluded, the Syndicate apparently breaks up. In fact, however, it lives on precisely as before. The Syndicalists send no delegates to Parliament, although they undoubtedly could elect members if they

wished to. They know that, powerful as is their following, they would be helpless in a legislative body. Although Moscow orders them to vote, they refuse to do so.

"On the other hand, the regular Socialists have taken an active part in the present campaign. They are just as loyal to the Moscow International as the Syndicalists, although they have made stipulations which somewhat qualify their relations with that body.

"Bolshevism is also spreading rapidly among rural laborers and miners. Both still occupy a sort of mediæval status in Spain. Great estates, sometimes including whole towns, belong to a single owner. The proprietors reside for the most part in Madrid. Sometimes their possessions include countrysides embracing several villages, from which they are in the habit of drawing revenues like the old-time feudal lords. The people on these estates are absolutely dependent upon their masters. So Bolshevism spreads like wildfire, particularly in Andalusia, where the peasantry have resorted to violence and are burning crops.

"The hatred which exists between the Spanish Bolsheviks and their opponents is of unexampled bitterness. They are clinched in a death struggle where neither shows mercy. One of my friends who, in view of the approaching dangers, tried to sell his factory and give up business, was threatened with death by his employes if he ventured to do so. They told him outright: 'You must stay here regardless of consequences, so that we can take over your works when the time is ripe;' and he had to stay.

"In Andalusia the workers on a large estate revolted. When the landlord, who happened to be there, stepped out on the balcony of his home to address the mob, and asked: 'What do you want? Have I not granted you everything you asked?' the crowd answered: 'That's not the point. We insist that you work the way we do. Hereafter we want you to plow alongside of us. We want you to feel the heat and cold out in the fields the way we do. We want you to earn your living by the sweat of your brow, the way we do.'

"This is the situation here. If the police were dependable and well disciplined, and if the middle classes understood how to help themselves, this campaign of hatred which is running Spain might be avoided. As it is, a day of final settlement is coming, and there is no doubt whatever but that it will be a bloody one."

This is a lurid picture, showing what class hatred can do. The 400 employers and proprietors assassinated refused to see the necessity of meeting Bolshevik arguments until it was too late—until the minds of the workers had been thoroughly poisoned.

A dispatch to the Chicago Tribune from Barcelona, under date of January 27th, says:

"The year 1920 was filled with social disorders of all sorts, especially in Barcelona and the province of Catalonia, where most of the industry of the nation is centered. Lock-outs and strikes, with unsettled market conditions, which have forced suspensions in the textile mills and machine factories, have cut productions to such a point that it is less than half that of 1919, and far below the pre-war level.

3,000 MEN SLAIN

"Lack of employment, increased cost of living, and a continuous state of guerilla warfare between owners, the Sindicato Unico, or Red Syndicate, and the Sindicato Libre, or White Workers' organization, have reduced industry and commerce to a dangerously low ebb. Three thousand men have paid toll with their lives to the constant feud between the two syndicates, and between workers and owners.

"Hardly a day goes by but some one is assassinated on

the streets or in the cafes, usually in broad daylight, but not a man has been brought to justice. And the end is not yet."

This shows that Castillo's report was not an exaggeration. The causes operating in Spain are at work in America, and all other countries. Unless friends of the home, morality, civilization and Christianity expose the fallacies of Bolshevistic philosophy, and place the answer in the hands of the workers, they must expect like effects in America.

Bolshevism is the most insidious poison, the most dangerous political, social and religious heresy, ever distilled in the laboratory of Hell.

The above is from an article in the Catholic Paper *Truth and Light*. "Respect for authority, human and divine," has been and still is (except in Soviet Russia) respect for dictatorship of the master class. All the slander against the Bolsheviks is an admission that the master class is losing power and that it fears it will have to submit to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "rector" is "worthy" and has a "venerable beard" because he serves the class that rule and rob. Marx championed the cause of the exploited, therefore he had "ugly whiskers."

"Other nations should take warning and educate their people" means that the slave class must be more carefully misinformed. "An impartial investigation" means favorable to the rule of the master class. "Troops... employed to suppress," "martial law," "civil liberties have ceased," "arrest and imprison" any man with a "card," etc., is not peculiar to Spain. And "bull rings" (pens) have often been used in the U. S. A. Probably "the murderers remain undetected" because they were serving all the master class by killing rebellious slaves and by killing "the 400 employers and proprietors" they were likely serving some part of the master class who were merely disposing of some (perhaps American or other foreign) successful competitors. Note: "If the police were dependable;" also note the distinction between the "police and the army" and "the better class of citizens." Yes "Bolshevism" is "distilled" in the "hell" of capitalist wage slavery.

C. M. O'BRIEN.

The following prayer of thanksgiving appeared in *Life*. It is quoted for the benefit of book-lovers who know "the feeling:"

"I give humble and hearty thanks for the safe return of this book, which, having endured the perils of my friend's bookcase, and the bookcase of my friend's friends, now returns to me in reasonably good condition.

"I give humble and hearty thanks that my friend did not see fit to give this book to his infant as a plaything, nor use it as an ash tray for his burning cigar, nor as a teething-ring for his mastiff.

"When I lent this book, I deemed it as lost. I was resigned to the bitterness of the long parting. I never thought to look upon its pages again.

"But now that my book is come back to me, I rejoice and am exceeding glad! Bring hither the fatted-morocco and let us rebound the volume, and set it on the shelf of honor; for this, my book, was lent and is returned again.

"Presently, therefore, I may return some of the books that I myself have borrowed."

A "hundred per cent American," Oswald, is a working-man who will stand the harpoon without a quiver. The more he is kicked the more he loves his master, the fuller the jails become with his rebellious fellow workers, the louder grow the strains of "My Country" from his loyal throat,