



THE PROLETARIAN



Peace on Earth, Good Will Toward Men

THE EDITOR'S CORNER

In the White Terror of Hungary the capitalist class has built for itself a monument that will not soon perish. No greater example of the perfidious character of the Versailles diplomats can be found than this product of the "Peace Conference." In Hungary we can see what the Allies have tried to do in Russia and what they will do in any part of the world if the working class is unsuccessful in its revolutionary attempts.

The battle that the Hungarian working class is engaged in against its masters is the battle of the world proletariat. It is a struggle that we can not view complacently. We can not look upon it with indifference for we know that once the Hungarian workers are disposed of, the turn will come for the workers of some other nation. The capitalists are the same the world over and what they have done and are doing to the workers of Hungary they will do to workers of other lands if the occasion arises.

What they have done in Hungary is not the mere arresting of comrades and the dispersing of the movement. They have attacked the masses with a Sadistic joy that finds not its equal in the pages of history. Thousands have fallen before the blood lust of the White Guard. Not content with the mere killing and imprisoning of our Hungarian comrades they torture their enchained bodies. The bloody debauch of these counter-revolutionary Sadists, beggars description. Women have been raped with sharp sabers. Pins have been pushed under the finger-nails of our comrades. They have been burned with red-hot irons. They have been forced to lick up their own excrements. Their genital organs have been crushed. Their eyes have been poked out. They have been buried alive and some, after the fashion of the Roman brutes, the White Guards have crucified. Locked to chains, which in themselves would be a burden for a strong man, they have lain in filthy cells for months awaiting the execution that was to release them from their misery. The tortures of the Inquisition have been repeated upon the defenseless Hungarian proletariat.

Legality is thrown to the winds as far as the White Guard is concerned and anyone that is suspected of being in sympathy with the communists is subjected to the vilest treatment. Even those that in no way were connected with the political movement have been arrested and imprisoned and sometimes executed. As an example one woman was arrested and, as far as present advices go, is still in jail for being guilty of clerking in a store under the Soviet regime. Workers who have tried to carry funds to Hungary for the purpose of helping the relief work there have been captured and many have died in prison while others have been tortured most cruelly to force them to confess that they belonged to a communist conspiracy. Even the young children of communists that have been executed or imprisoned have also been arrested.

That the United States does not vibrate with a protest against these outrages is a tribute to the intelligence and class consciousness of the American workers that we can well be ashamed of. Not content with standing idly by while the Great American Democracy grasps the bloody hand of the Finnish White Guard in brotherly recognition we must witness the repetition of the performance in the embrace of the counter-revolutionary Hungarian government. A blot has been placed upon the escutcheon of America that can not and will not be removed except by a working class government.

November 28th, 1820, one hundred years ago, in Barmen, Prussia, was born Frederick Engels the co-worker of Karl Marx. The story of his life until his death in London, August 5th, 1895, is an inspiration to all thinking socialists. The son of a manufacturer he was the partner in a business at Manchester, England, from 1860 to 1869. Although not proletarian in origin he early took up the fight of the working class and took part in the revolutionary movement in Baden in 1848. He spent most of his time in London and was the most intimate comrade of Karl Marx and assisted him so much in his work that it is impossible for the student to think of one without the other. Together they co-operated in the organization of the International Workingmen's Society for Belgium, Italy and Spain. With Marx he wrote the "Communist Manifesto" in 1848 and he also edited Marx's "Capital." Independently he has given great works to the socialist movement. His book "The Condition of the Working Class in England" shows how far he had independently advanced towards the materialistic conception of history before association with Marx. Perhaps the best known of his works is "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," which has become very well known since the Russian Revolution. In it Engels has given the movement a correct analysis of the origin and development of the political state. Lenin in his "State and Revolution" quotes liberally from this book and therefore many people have come to know of it. Socialist students in America, however, have been familiar with the work for years.

It was written by Engels with the assistance of notes left by Marx. Few works in socialist literature are of equal importance with the "Origin of the Family" and recent developments have accentuated its value.

Of equal importance with this book is another by Engels, "Landmarks of Scientific Socialism." Extracts of this have been published under the title of "Socialism Utopian and Scientific." Unfortunately this polemic against Duhring has been injured somewhat by the translator. Few works give such a profound understanding of the socialist philosophy as "Landmarks" and it will live for all time as a monument to Engels.

As time goes on, and the movement progresses, socialists becoming more studious will more fully appreciate the great worth of Engels and more frequently seek inspiration and guidance from his work.

The Proletarian

Published Monthly at
174 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

DECEMBER, 1920

No. 3

Oil Is King

By John Keracher

During the development of capitalism, certain groups of capitalists have dominated and certain commodities have assumed dominant importance. In the early days of the system it was the Merchant Capitalists that led their class. When machinery was invented and the modern industrial form of production developed, then the Industrial Capitalist held sway.

With further expansion, the need for access to large sums of ready money to swing enterprises speedily, gives the bankers great importance. Powerful banking institutions have made their appearance, controlled by the modern group of capitalists, the Finance Capitalists.

This latter group, because of the nature of their operations, and the vast amount of money-capital at their disposal, acquires a viewpoint that is not limited by national boundaries. Their "internationalism" has for its aim the exploitation of workers in any part of the world. The race, color, creed or nationality of the workers they exploit makes no difference to them as long as profits come pouring in.

In the old days of the Merchant Capitalist, their wealth was realized through the carrying trade. The products of the West were exchanged for those of the East. A continuous flow of trade went on between Europe and Asia. While this is still to a great extent the case, the chief source of their wealth today is the direct exploitation of labor in all parts of the world through the control of natural resources. Tea plantations in China and Ceylon, rubber plantations in Africa, gold and diamond fields, coal, iron, copper, and other minerals necessary to modern methods of social production, all contribute their share of profits to the modern capitalist-imperialist.

At different stages in the development of the capitalist system, certain individual commodities assume great importance. In the early days of this country, corn was the chief commodity, but with the extension of the cotton growing plantations, due to the many uses to which cotton could be put together with the invention of the cotton gin, then cotton became king.

The days of "king cotton" were the days of chattel slavery and the rule of the southern plantation aristocracy. The production of cotton, tobacco, sugar, and other commodities, through the exploitation of vast armies of chattel slaves, was then the chief mode of wealth production in the United States. The rise of the North just prior to the civil war, was the rise of the modern industrial form of production, which was given a great impetus by the invention of machinery. It was then that the products of the soil, no matter how important, had to give way before the great mineral products from the bowels of the earth, such as coal, iron, copper, etc.

The combination of coal for smelting and iron for the manufacture of steel brought on another important epoch in the development of capitalism, the period in which we are now living. From the close of the Civil War down to our time, steel has been the king of commodities. It has entered into the rails that girdle the earth with a network of railroads. It has furnished the chief building material for the

modern battleship and the ocean liner, the framework of the modern skyscraper, bridges and mighty engineering undertakings of all descriptions, as well as that highly complex monster, the modern machinery of production.

But to give life and action to this modern monster of steel, fuel must be fed into it in abundance. Coal has, until recently, been the only practical fuel, and in fact still forms the bulk of the fuel used in the capitalist world. A new mineral with properties that coal does not possess is rapidly forging to the front. A mineral that, the possession or non-possession of which in sufficient quantities, will decide the fate of nations, and perhaps of empires. This new fuel is oil.

The United States has the greatest oil resources, and it has been American capitalism that has introduced its uses into all parts of the world. The highly combustible properties of oil, discovered through improvements in refining, make it the speed-fuel par excellence. The automobile, aeroplane, and submarine, the fastest appliances in peace and war, are all oil-driven. The modern battleships are being converted into oil-burners, and it is only a matter of time until all ships, and perhaps railroad trains, will be driven by this wonderful product of the earth.

The future of this commodity, more than even its present extensive and important uses, is compelling the capitalist class of the world to struggle for its possession. The supremacy of the great powers is so dependent upon oil, that it is playing an important part at this time in the readjustment of world affairs.

The French and British, in dividing the spoils of the Great War, had to take oil resources into consideration. In their partition of Turkish territory they show conclusively that the control of oil is their chief consideration, if not the actual reason for being there in the first place. The British are trying to amalgamate into a subject state, three districts, Basra, Bagdad and Mosul. This latter district, the most important because of its oil resources, was at first conceded to the French, but by a later agreement it was turned over to Britain on condition that the French would get 25% of all oil in Mesopotamia.

That the British Government has long been aware of the importance of getting control of oil territories, is demonstrated by the manner in which they protect and dominate the oil combine of Great Britain. This combine is known as the Royal Dutch-Shell Combine, and has holdings in many parts of the world, such as at Sarawak (British India), Rumania, Egypt, United States, Venezuela, Trinidad, and Mexico. By bringing the different concerns together under one head it puts the British oil interests in a strong position. In the early part of 1914 the British government bought for the sum of £2,200,000 the controlling interest in the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. It appears that a Hollander named Deterding is the official head of this combine. The original business was carried on from The Hague, Holland, but was transferred to London. Deterding is now a British subject. The Royal Dutch-Shell Combine is the result of the amalgamation of the Shell Transport and Trading Co., of London, the Royal Dutch (for-

merly of Holland), the Anglo-Persian, and the Mexican Eagle Oil Co. (S. Pearson & Son of London).

It will be observed from the data already given that the British control is mostly in the nature of concessions outside of the Empire. In fact the British Empire has only two per cent of the world's oil supply within its borders. The United States has nearly two-thirds under its control, sixty per cent being within the United States itself. The struggle is not confined to competition between these rival oil groups over the markets, but equally for development and extension of new fields.

In "*The Independent*" for September 25th, 1920, there is an article entitled "Planning for Tomorrow," by Otis Smith, director of the United States Geological Survey, in which he shows that this country is no longer "independent." "The great expansion of American industry today," he says, "brings us face to face with an insatiable demand for raw materials that may exceed the domestic supply, for even the United States, most favored of nations in the abundance and variety of minerals, is not independent of other continents. The Federal Geologist in his investigation of raw material requirements of a war program was led far beyond our national boundaries and so it happens that as a by-product of its war work the Geological Survey has now in press a 'World Atlas of Commercial Geology.' This production in its original form was prepared for the Peace Conference and now planned for the desk of the business man as well as of the college student, will exhibit graphically the distribution of mineral wealth over the entire surface of the earth.

"No longer is it sufficient to know America only; the world view of the raw material situation is necessary if we are to build safe our industrial structure. * * * Industrial strategy that plans future campaigns must provide at the front adequate supplies of both materials and energy. But to determine what will be adequate tomorrow is itself a major problem in statecraft. * * * In a nation whose industrial progress is by leaps and bounds the look ahead must be a long one. * * * Just now the American problem is both a fuel and a power problem—demand continues to increase faster than the supply."

The Political Horizon

The 1920 Presidential elections now being ancient history, it is a fitting occasion to check up things political so that we may see where we stand, and if possible peep into the future.

The election of Warren G. Harding to the presidency was above all else a decisive repudiation of Wilsonism. The American voter is proverbially short of memory, but the Republican landslide proved that many remembered that they voted for Wilson in 1916 because "He kept us out of War"—they have some slight remembrance also of a certain draft law and other blessings of the past four years.

It is unnecessary for us to comment on the futility of voting for Harding to "get even" with Wilson. That millions of voters did this indicates an appalling lack of political understanding. The repudiation of Wilson does not, however, mean an endorsement of the policies of Harding, though the victorious Republican party and those whom it represents are likely to make the mistake of thinking that because Harding received the largest vote and greatest plurality in the history of American politics, that the masses are satisfied and contented.

These opinions and remarks of the director of the United States Geological Survey are very significant. It amounts to an admission that this country has definitely abandoned its policy of "splendid isolation."

The Geological Survey is part of the Department of the Interior. The name of that department, even, is now out of keeping with its functions as it appears to be a department that is confined no longer to the interior conditions of the United States.

Capitalism has long since gone into its imperial stage and the leading countries of the world are now dominated by its policy. Capitalist imperialism does not always have to conquer with armies. Money bribes and other means are used to control foreign resources and markets.

America's international financiers of the Morgan type enter every field where there are prospects of profits. Friendly governments are supported, and unfriendly ones reached and won over by one means or another.

All in all, oil is playing a most important role. Mexico is supposed to have unlimited resources not yet tapped. Many of the political troubles there are the result of foreign capital reaching out for further control.

The Carranza government on January 31st, 1917, adopted a constitution, the main provisions of which called for heavy taxes on foreign companies and the development of the nation by the Mexican government itself. At that time "The Association of Oil Producers in Mexico" was formed, also the "Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico." This latter title is almost humorous—American Rights in Mexico? J. P. Morgan was chairman of that "American Rights" bunch!

Well, Carranza is dead and a successor is in his place, friendly to foreign interests, and oil production will likely be uninterrupted for some time to come in Mexico.

More oil and still more oil will be the call and quest of capitalist powers from now on. The struggles, open and hidden, that are now going on for control of this combustible commodity may lead to an explosion that will put the World War in the shade. The complete control of all natural resources and means of production by society as a whole is the only solution.

The pre-election campaign was very tame. Little effort was made to arouse enthusiasm; the usual campaign promises and issues were conspicuous by their absence. It seemed as if some unseen power had decided in advance what the result should be; the candidates, like actors in a play, went on with their parts while the audience looked on listlessly.

Wilson's promised "solemn referendum" is over: It was solemn only in that it very much resembled a funeral. Capitalist democracy in America is dead, and that stench in the nostrils only means that before long the corpse must be buried. The only thing lacking is an efficient corps of "gravediggers."

Whither Are We Drifting?

From a purely organizational viewpoint the movement is in a deplorable condition. Every socialist organization that has come into being has failed utterly to weld the masses into a cohesive working body. There are many thousands of sincere communists in the country who are unattached, simply drifting. They are disgusted, dis-

couraged and skeptical. Many have transferred their activities into the unions and are doing excellent work in that hitherto neglected field.

Considered from the standpoint of quality, the movement is today in better condition than ever before. There is less shouting and ranting, more sober thinking. The number of classes for the study of socialist principles is increasing. On every hand we hear expressed the need for education. Gradually it is dawning upon the workers that there is no royal road to freedom and that if they are to be successful in their struggle for power they must be equipped with the knowledge and training which they now lack.

How long the present condition will continue we do not know. Sooner or later the tide will turn and a communist party with a policy and program suited to American conditions will make its appearance. It will be based not upon the mistaken notion that the function of a working class party is to create a revolution, but upon the correct proposition that the function of such a party is to organize, educate and train the workers in preparation for the time when they will be called upon to lead the way out of the shambles of capitalism into a new and better world.

That Great Socialist Victory

Although complete official election figures have not been published as yet, it appears certain that the Socialist Party candidates received the largest vote ever cast for that ticket. The party organs claim a total of two million votes, which is probably an exaggerated estimate. The people who voted for Debs and Stedman are not socialists in the sense that they understand the philosophy of the movement. If they know but little of the philosophy they know even less of the standing of the different parties. They are dissatisfied with existing conditions and want some sort of change; they vote against capitalism rather than for socialism, and they vote the Socialist Party ticket because they have been told that that party is revolutionary.

While the party received the largest vote since its formation in 1901, its actual strength has been greatly reduced through the expulsion and withdrawal of members. The extent to which it has lost the support of the class conscious workers is shown by the fact that in 1916 its membership equalled 50% of the vote for Benson, while in 1920 the membership is about 2% of the vote for Debs and Stedman.

During the campaign strenuous efforts were made to build up the party's membership, but from reliable sources we learn that the effort has not met with success. The workers here, as in other countries, are solidly in favor of going along with the world Communist movement, but with the "leaders" it is otherwise. In order to gain admission to the Third International the Socialist Party would first of all be required to re-write its program, leaving out the yard or so of "immediate demands;" in addition it would be required to remove all opportunists and moderates—rid itself of Berger, Hillquit, Debs, Stedman, Nearing, and the whole motley crew that now controls the organization. But compared with this the old problem of passing a camel through the eye of a needle would be comparatively easy.

The Socialist Party may be expected to remain in existence and exert its pernicious influence on the movement until such time as a rival organization with a clear-cut program drives it from the field.

The Passing of Progressivism

The election of a man of the Harding type is a sure sign that capitalism has entered upon the first stages of

decay. The late lamented Progressive movements, represented the efforts of the more far-seeing among the propertied class to stave off the inevitable collapse.

The passing of "progressivism" called forth many a loud lament from the "radical," "liberal," and labor press. Harding is painted the blackest of reactionaries, and the dear people are warned of the evils that are to come. To us, it is these same "progressives" and "radicals" and "liberals" who are the true reactionaries.

The "progressive" forces that supported Roosevelt and Wilson were made up of those capitalists who favor a "go easy" policy, and behind them stood the small fry of the business world, professionals, farmers, and other groups that have been deprived of their profits and privileges through the concentration of capital. Their idea of "progress" is to return to the good old days when every little fish in the bourgeois pond had an opportunity to get his share of the profits sweated from the workers.

Harding, on the other hand, considers that the centralization of capital and the high development of industry represents the acme of perfection. To him America is the greatest of all countries and "Americanism" the noblest of ideals. Like all representatives of decaying civilizations, he believes that the present order is ordained to continue without change until the end of time, and the policies of his administration will be shaped accordingly. Wilson's slogan: "Make the World Safe for Democracy" will be replaced by the legend "After Us the Deluge!" A. J. M.

Berger on Socialism

Victor L. Berger had great faith in the independent Socialists of Germany. Some time ago he wrote an article about them entitled "Let Us Drop the Revolutionary Jargon" as follows:

"And for the new developments in socialism for models to pattern after we must not look to Russia, but to the independent socialists of Germany, and probably even to the independent socialist party of England."

Now that Mr. Berger has lost faith in the independent socialists of Germany he comes out in the following words:

"Moscow will command, while the German workers are to obey. The will of the minority is to be imposed upon the working classes by force. There is to be only a Communist party under the knout of Moscow. What has Moscow achieved? Forced labor, Famine, War, and Pestilence!

"Strong opposition to the so-called Third International is showing itself in Norway and Sweden. At the general election in Norway the Extremists were routed everywhere, and there is now no 'left' Socialist in Parliament. At the Swedish elections just concluded, the 'left' Socialists lost four of the five seats previously held by them.

"All of these happenings and circumstances will undoubtedly compel a revision of the theory of Marxism in every land. Marxism as preached before—and possibly as understood by Marx himself—has gone into bankruptcy in every country during the war—and particularly in Russia since the Russian revolution.

"Marxism has failed in every crisis. Marxism has always ended either in impotence or impossibility.

"For this reason Marxism will probably have to go the way of St. Simonism, Fourierism, Cabetism, Blanquism, etc.—unless very thoroughly revised."

The above quotation needs no comment. Berger is some socialist! Is he not?

J. KIISHILA.

Bertrand Russell on Bolshevik Theory

By MURRAY MURPHY

Bertrand Russell is an English professor of mathematics, a philosopher of the Neo-realist school, a war-time pacifist, and a Guild Socialist. One would think, therefore, at first blush, that a "radical" of the "intelligentsia" class, as Prof. Russell is, would be admirably fitted to interpret the doctrines of Bolshevism to an eager and curious world. However, it is clear from his series of articles now running in *The New Republic*, entitled "Bolshevik Theory," that the professor-philosopher is, at least on this subject, a very poor interpreter.

The first article (Sept. 15, 1920) deals with Historical Materialism. Prof. Russell attempts, first, to explain what this theory is, and, second, to show to what extent it is true.

His efforts at the first part of his problem are heroic, but absolutely unsuccessful. He reminds one of the young worker who, beginning the study of Socialism with a class on the Materialist Conception of History, called it the "mysterious deception of history." To Prof. Russell it is indeed a "mysterious deception!"

"The name," he says, referring to the Materialistic Conception of History, "does not convey at all accurately what is meant by the theory. It means that all the mass phenomena of history are determined by economic motives." But the Communist Manifesto says, "That proposition is: that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch." Now, as thus phrased, the Materialist Conception of History does not have the crude meaning which Prof. Russell reads into it; it does not restrict all human action to "economic motives." There are thousands of motives in men's minds, a varied and complex ideology in each stage of human progress, but these motives, this ideology, are, in the *last analysis*, based (whether consciously or not makes no difference) on the particular economic organization of the time, modified, of course, by such ideologic remnants as have been inherited from the economic organization of the preceding period.

Again, Prof. Russell goes on to say of historic materialism: "This view has no connection with materialism in the philosophic sense. * * * There is, therefore, no logical connection either way between philosophic materialism and what is called the 'materialistic conception of history.'" (The interested student should read the whole passage, which is too long to quote here.) Now compare with this bald mis-statement the explanation of Antonio Labriola (*Socialism and Philosophy*, p. 23) as to the philosophical implications of Historical Materialism: "And this is historical materialism, taken as a three-fold theory, namely, as a *philosophical method for the general understanding of life and the universe*, as a critique of political economy reducible to certain laws only because it represents a certain historical phase, and as an interpretation of politics, above all of those political movements which are necessary and serviceable for the march of the working classes toward socialism." In another place (p. 77) the same writer says, "On the other hand, some vulgar expounders of Marxism have robbed this theory of its immanent philosophy and reduced it to a simple way of deducing changes in the historical conditions from changes in the economic conditions." To put it even more definitely, we can quote the man of whom Karl Marx said, "This is our philosopher"—Joseph

Dietzgen, who said (*Philosophical Essays*, p. 301): "We are materialists because we do not make of mind a metaphysical monstrosity. * * * Because we Socialist materialists have only one interrelated conception of matter and mind, the so-called mental relations such as those of politics, religion, morals, etc., are to us also material conditions; and material labor and the bread-and-butter question are only in so far regarded by us as the basis, the perquisite and foundation of all mental development as the animal element is prior in point of time to the human one—which does not prevent us from valuing man and his intellect very highly.

"Socialist materialism is distinguished by the fact that it does not undervalue the human mind as the old materialists did, nor over-value it as the German idealists did. It proceeds in its appreciation in a moderate manner and regards both Mechanics and Philosophy from the standpoint of critical dialectics, namely, as interrelated phenomena of the inseparable world-process and world-progress."

Does this look as though Historical Materialism has "no essential connection" with philosophic materialism? The assertion is absurd. It is in keeping with Russell's statement, near the close of his article, that Marx "inherited eighteenth century rationalist psychology from the British orthodox economists." As a matter of fact Marx obtained his education in the German universities, and was much more closely connected with the German philosophers than with the British economists. In his youth Marx was a "Young Hegelian,"—*prima facie* evidence that if Marx developed any sort of materialism, it would certainly be philosophic!

The real meat of the controversy lies in the fact that Marx and Engels very properly emphasized the economic factor as the chief material influence operative in history since the formation of human society. Professor Russell's mistake lies partly in a misunderstanding of the economic basis of historic changes, partly in an attempt to separate this economic theory from the philosophy of which it forms a part.

This philosophy is not, as Prof. Russell said, "due to Marx," but has been elaborated by a number of scientific socialists, among them being Marx, Engels, Labriola, Lafargue, and Dietzgen, all of whom should be read by those who wish to get a correct understanding of it. Incidentally, students should bear in mind what Prof. Russell evidently forgot,—the reminder of Labriola: "Marxism is not, and will not be, confined to the writings of Marx and Engels. The name stands even now as a symbol and compendium of a many-sided tendency and a complex theory."

To return to Prof. Russell's article we find that after asserting that historical materialism has nothing to do with philosophic materialism, he declares that socialists merely *suppose* that it is based on philosophic materialism! "The dogmatic character of Marxian communism," he says, "finds support in the supposed philosophic basis of the doctrine; it has the fixed certainty of catholic theology, not the changing fluidity and sceptical practicality of modern science." This is sheer nonsense. No proper use of the word "dogmatic" can apply to Marxian Communism, which is dialectic in method and evolutionary in conception, critical of itself and of the systems it opposed. It eagerly accepts the discoveries of science, and stoutly fights reaction in thought and literature as well as in politics. Prof.

Russell offers no proof of the "dogmatic" character of Marxism; he merely asserts it, thus following the advice of that charlatan, Era Elbertus, who said,—“If an opponent defeats you in an argument, all is not lost; you can still call him names.”

We now come to the second part of Prof. Russell's discussion of this subject, in which, after misrepresenting this "Bolshevik theory," he endeavors to show that the twisted doctrine which he calls historical materialism does not prove true in practice. The result is rather amusing.

To begin with, he tries to give the appearance of great impartiality by stating that the theory is true in at least one case: "It is industrialism," he says, "rather than the arguments of Darwinians and Biblical critics, that has led to the decay of religious belief in the urban working class." Now a Marxian would never make so sweeping an assertion,—would never be so "dogmatic." The arguments of Darwinians and biblical critics played a very large part in the overthrow of religious belief; industrialism, although by its nature it discouraged church-going, rather tended to develop the psychological state of mind favorable to the reception of the new ideas.

Prof. Russell seems also to confuse "bourgeois ideology" with bourgeois morality. If he were more familiar with Marxism he would know that bourgeois moral codes are only a part of bourgeois ideology; bourgeois ideas of the state, of patriotism, of law and order, of liberty ("not license"), of freedom of contract, of art, etc., etc.,—all these are a part of bourgeois ideology. How true is the proverb—"A little knowledge is a dangerous thing!"

Where Professor Russell really shines, however, is in his treatment of "non-economic factors." It will be remembered that he began by limiting Historical Materialism to purely economic factors, a serious mistake. This, however, enables him to dilate on non-economic motives, "the neglect of which," he says, "has led socialists most astray." His error here is two-fold: first, he seems unaware that other material influences besides the economic one come under the head of Historical Materialism; second, he is totally ignorant of the fact that Historic Materialism admits and takes cognizance of *all* motives in human action,—mental, moral, religious, nationalistic, whatnot,—only going back of these non-material influences to the material causes of which they are the reflex. As a rule these material causes, although embedded in man's racial or sexual nature, or in his geographic or climatic environment, are basically economic in character. For instance, Prof. Russell speaks of nationalism as a non-economic factor, and upbraids socialists for failing to take account of it!—whereas socialists have been dealing with this piece of "bourgeois ideology" for half a century. Nationalism is always a strong feeling in the capitalist class of any country, whether of the young American capitalists of 1776 who inflicted their ideology on the common people in winning a war that gave them free reign to exploit the domestic proletariat in peace and quiet, or in the rising young Irish capitalists who wish the same opportunity in their own land. Now we must not here fall into such naive crudities as that of Prof. Russell who said, relative to the workers who fought in the war,—“According to Marxian orthodoxy they were misled by cunning capitalists who made their profits out of the slaughter.” Marxian "orthodoxy"—a false and wholly misleading term—does not teach any such thing. To be sure, some capitalists are doubtless cunning and unscrupulous, but the majority are perfectly sincere in their professions of patriotism, willing to risk their lives for their country. The point that socialist philosophy would make here, then, is, first, that these moral and patriotic ideas are, unknown to the individual, based in the last analysis on the economic nature of social rela-

tions; and, second, that whether the capitalists intentionally deceived the workers or not, the result is the same—the proletariat act contrary to their own interests. Religious and patriotic teachings, therefore, no matter how sincerely given, tend as strongly toward the continued enslavement of the workers as though made with that express intention. In this sense the proletarians *are* "dupes,"—at least every worker who becomes emancipated from bourgeois ideology feels that he has somehow been made a fool of during his past life. The number of those who are reaching this stage is increasing very rapidly, despite Prof. Russell's vaunted non-economic factor—"nationalist instinct." And it may be pointed out in passing that Russian capitalists seemed to lose their nationalist instinct very readily as soon as the triumph of Bolshevism interfered with their practice of exploiting wage-labor.

Prof. Russell concludes by re-iterating his original misinterpretation of Marxism: "The materialist conception of history, in the last analysis, requires the assumption that every politically conscious person is governed by one single desire, the desire to increase his own share of commodities; and, further, that his method of achieving this desire will usually be to seek to increase the share of his class, not only his own individual share." Of course Historical Materialism requires no such assumption at all. It recognizes that every individual's mental and temperamental make-up is very complex, that hereditary instincts and tendencies interact with the environment in determining his motives under all circumstances. It maintains, however, that these motives go back more or less remotely to material, particularly economic, influences at work within the society of which he is a part. Explaining thus dialectically the social phenomena around us, Historical Materialism is entirely free from the "rigidity" charged by Bertrand Russell.

The new "radical" daily of Oklahoma City, *The Leader*, constructed by Socialists and financed by labor unions and others more generous than alert, has as one of its features, Arthur Brisbane's column, "Today," appearing in the Hearst newspapers. Newdick, the editor, had a position during the war in the labor conciliation department of the Secretary of War's office.

The Labor Revolt in India

By BASANTA KOOMAR ROY

Friends of Freedom for India, 7 East 15th St., New York, 10c

This little book on the labor situation is especially interesting at this time in view of the conditions in India. Facts showing the industrial revolution which has taken place since 1905 and closely following that revolution, the growth of unionism, will be interesting to students of history.

The miserable conditions of the workers, their efforts to obtain better wages and conditions, and the extreme measures used by the British authorities to put down these efforts by imprisonment and massacre, are vividly portrayed. The state there, as elsewhere, uses its full power when the profits and privileges of the master class are in jeopardy.

Considerable data on the population and natural resources of India are contained in this work, and despite its nationalist viewpoint it should be in the library of every student of social conditions.

International Notes

By John Keracher

Russia With the completion of three years of Soviet rule comes news of the defeat of the czarist General Wrangel. Driven from the mainland into Crimea his army is attempting to hold the seven mile wide Isthmus of Perekop, while further east Red troops have landed on the Crimea at Kardzhanaia in the rear of the foe. This driving out of their last enemy forces, leaves the Soviet Government in a strong position. Peace having been effected with Poland and the other border states, practically nothing stands in the way of the Bolshevik Government and contact with the outer world. Trade relations are now rapidly being established with different nations through their Minister for Foreign Trade, Leonid Krassin, who is operating from London. The trade is simply the exchanging of the products of Russia for the manufactured commodities of other countries; gold in sufficient quantities is being deposited in dependable foreign banks which can be drawn upon by the shippers of commodities into Russia, in the event that there is a trade balance in their favor. The gold deposit is in the nature of an emergency or guarantee fund. It appears that the Soviet representatives have placed orders with German firms for \$100,000,000 worth of locomotives. Representatives have gone to other countries, such as Italy, where cargoes of coal, oil and other materials have arrived from Russia.

A trade agreement has been drawn up between the Soviet representatives and Great Britain, subject to ratification. Passages 8, 9 and 10 read as follows: "The Russian Soviet Government hereby declares that it recognizes its liability to pay compensation to British subjects in respect of goods supplied or services rendered to it or the former government of Russia, or to Russian citizens, for which payment has not been made owing to the Russian Revolution. The detailed mode of discharging its liability, together with all other questions with regard to the liability of each of the parties towards the other party or its nationals shall be regulated by the treaty referred to in the preamble.

"The British Government makes a corresponding declaration.

"In consideration of the declaration in the preceding article the British Government hereby declares that they will not take or encourage any steps with a view to attach or to take possession of any gold, securities or commodities (not being articles identifiable as the property of the British or of any Allied Government) which may be exported by Russia in payment for imports or as security for such payments, on the ground of any claims against Russian citizens or against the Russian Soviet Government, or against the former government of Russia.

"The Russian Soviet Government undertakes to make no claim to dispose in any way of funds of the late Russian Government in London. The British Government gives a corresponding undertaking as regards British Government funds in Petrograd."

The above quotation will show the reader that the proposed trade agreement is of a very comprehensive character, and if put into working operation, it will help greatly to decrease the suffering of the Russian people throughout the winter. The cessation of hostilities throughout Russia will open up a new course of development. Having fought a successful war under a heavy handicap, we can look to the new proletarian power to fight an economic war against

world capitalism in general. The carrying on of all industry under the control of the government; the elimination of anarchy in production; the centralization of all production and exchange will make it possible for the proletarian state to compete successfully with, if not actually undersell all competitors. The return of peace which we have been from time to time assured would be the end of the Communist Government, may be the real beginning of their power.

Certain we are that surprises are in store for the capitalist imperialists when the economic power of Russia is pitted against them.

Late reports relate of the total destruction of the Wrangel army. The Red forces have overrun the whole of Crimea and its chief port, Sebastopol, has been captured.

This wonderful success, according to the reports, was the result of extensive use of gas, also the freezing of the Sivash or Putrid Sea. The Bolsheviki were able to land an army on the northeast shore of the Crimea and strike the retreating forces of reaction. Wrangel escaped on a French ship with a small portion of his troops, but the bulk of his army has been captured or destroyed.

Comrade Tchitcherin, Commissar of Foreign Affairs for the Soviet Government, has warned the British Government that any aid to Wrangel in his escape will be regarded as a hostile act. In part his note reads as follows: "Information from various sources gives us reason to believe that the intention is entertained of utilizing British vessels to transport Gen. Wrangel and the goods he seized from southern Russia to other countries. It can not be denied that participation of the British fleet in the movements of insurgents fighting against Russia would constitute a hostile act on the part of the British Government towards the Russian Government, and a violation of the assurances which the British Government has given us on this subject on various occasions. The Russian Government expects that the British Government will abstain from all acts of this kind, from which the Russian Government would draw inevitable conclusions." It will be interesting to note the British Government's attitude on this question.

At the same time formal announcement is made in the House of Commons that trade relations are about to be opened between England and Russia.

France It is rapidly dawning upon the French bourgeoisie that "perfidious Albion" has picked the choicest plums at the peace table. Clemenceau's policy of exacting large indemnities from the defeated Teutons, indemnities that may never be paid, is now proving weak alongside of the British policy of land grabbing, especially the taking possession of the German colonies. Their feelings towards Britain are becoming tense, particularly since the latter power has begun a policy of rapprochement towards Germany by renouncing the right to confiscate German property in Great Britain. Exchange of commodities, the strongest tie between nations in the modern world, is what Britain is after. She is seeking to establish commercial relations that will give Britain a German market for surplus products and obtain in exchange those commodities which Germany is adept in producing. Her great commercial rival crushed, she can afford to be liberal. France, conscious of her smaller population and fearful of a rehabilitated Germany is watching the new advances of John Bull with

jealous eyes. In Germany the feeling towards France becomes evermore bitter. The keeping of colored troops in the occupied regions and the charges brought against them of excesses against women and children is adding to the hard feeling already existing. To keep French industries going it is necessary to import large quantities of coal from Germany, England and America. Germany furnishes to the detriment of her own industries, the largest portion of the coal imported; Britain comes next. Strikes, such as the recent one in Britain have therefore a great effect on economic affairs in France. Should similar troubles break out in Germany it will go even harder with French industrial life.

Egypt In the January *Proletarian*, I explained the attitude of Britain towards Egypt. The crafty Lord Millner had been sent out with a staff of experts to frame a constitution for the Egyptians in the interests of Great Britain. Since then it has been announced to the world that Egypt henceforth will be a free and independent nation, etc. Under the cloak of Democracy and seeming friendliness Britain carries on her policy of Imperialism, unless in cases where stern necessity compels her to throw off the mask and let loose her murder machines upon the native population as in the Amritsar affair in India.

The following quotation is from my January article. "Millner's Mission will no doubt succeed in the usual British way of framing a scheme similar to the recent Persian one, granting the Egyptian people the absolute and inviolable right to tie a rope with their own hands, around their own necks. Then Britain can announce to the world as did their Embassy at Washington in September last, 'Great Britain has carefully avoided destroying the sovereignty of Egypt.'"

Evidently this constitution framing has not been sufficient to bulk the masses to sleep, for recent Cairo despatches tell us that as a result of the anti-British riots last spring, powerful labor organizations have arisen in Egypt with 100,000 members in Cairo, a proportionate group in Alexandria, and 10,000 workers organized at the Suez Canal. These workers are now demanding concessions threatening that if they are not forthcoming they will tie up all shipping and traffic at the Suez Canal.

These labor unions and a new Socialist Party are said to be connected with the Third International and are making arrangements to translate revolutionary literature into Arabic. It looks as if the alien capitalists who dominate the economic life of Egypt are in for a merry time of it. Such are the fruits of capitalist development, parasites and profits on the one hand and revolutionary proletarians on the other.

Great Britain When the coal miners of Great Britain decided by referendum vote to go on strike, it was in opposition to the opinions of their leaders, but once the decision was made, the solidarity of the whole organized body was apparent. The railroad men and the transport workers soon manifested their unity with the miners and sent an ultimatum to the government which showed clearly that they would come out in support of the miners. The strike, though short lived, was strongly political in character, presenting a conflict with the government rather than with the mine owners. The demand of the men was for two shillings a day increase in their wages. The government was willing to concede this and force the owners to pay the increases but insisted that the miners produce more, claiming that with a hundred thousand more workers in the coal industry, the output is 47,000,000 tons less per year than the output of 1913. The cost in wages before the war was \$1.54 per ton and now is \$5.52. The

miners on the other hand claim that the increased cost of living makes it necessary for them to have the higher wage.

The men further claim that the industry clears six million pounds sterling per month and that the government gets nine-tenths of that amount in the form of taxes on the output. The other tenth is what is left for the owners of the mines. Assuming for the sake of argument that these figures are correct, and they are just as likely to be as the figures of the government or the mine-owners, then it will be seen that the larger portion of the surplus exploited from the coal mine workers is used up by the government to help furnish food, shelter and clothing for a standing army and a formidable navy as well as a regular army of public officials and non-producers of all sorts, whose chief function in life is to help hold down the working class and maintain the supremacy of a parasite master class. Many of the miners are beginning to learn that their sweat and toil furnishes the sinews of capitalist imperialism, with its black-and-tans in Ireland and its regiments and naval units in many parts of the world. It no doubt is coming home to the British working class in general that they not only furnished the cannon fodder in the Great War but also the surplus wealth their masters caused to be squandered in that gigantic slaughter-fest.

To meet the successful onslaught of the miners, the British masters are threatening to use oil wherever possible and to import coal from China where it is produced so cheap by native labor that, even with the expense of transporting, they claim they will be able to sell it as cheap. However, it seems that the miners have had a complete victory in their labor dispute. The ruling class on the other hand was not slow to seize the occasion to pass an "emergency" law, giving the government power to use very drastic means in the event of a nation wide tie-up of industry in the future. It seems to the writer that something in the nature of a military dictatorship is contemplated with the complete suspension of civil government.

In such an event the "talking shop" at Whitehall will be shut down and the administration of affairs turned over entirely to the War Office. With labor disputes in which millions of workers are engaged and a guerilla warfare going on in Ireland, the ruling class of Britain and their "democratic" government are far from having a tranquil time. The death of the Mayor of Cork, Terence MacSwiney, at Brixton Prison, after 74 days hunger strike, has intensified the feeling against the British government on both sides of the Atlantic.

Another feature in the general situation is the great number of unemployed. A demonstration of those jobless workers took place recently. It was led by fifteen mayors of London boroughs, and made its way towards the residence of the Premier, Lloyd George. The parade was forcibly broken up by the police, but not before it had broken 150 windows in the War Office and other buildings. These manifestations of class conflict are but proof of the fact that capitalism in Britain, and elsewhere, is no longer capable of carrying civilization forward. Proof of the fact that the time is not far distant when the producing masses must replace it by social control.

Germany The trend of events in Germany at the present time shows clearly that the present government cannot hope to survive much longer. The financial chaos into which they are sinking deeper and deeper can only result in their fall. Allied policy, particularly that of France, as previously pointed out in these columns, is to a very great extent responsible for the hopeless financial conditions that are gradually undermining the capitalist administration in Germany.

In desperation they have been obliged to increase the volume of paper money in circulation until its purchasing power is almost nil. A professor by name of Cassel is credited with saying, "Petty schemes for temporarily bolstering up their credit is merely a waste of time." Europe's day of reckoning in this bad business of forcing Germany to print more and more paper money with which to pay her debts is about to dawn. Perhaps it will be deferred several months, but the great mass of paper money can be used only as long as the German peasants are willing to accept it in payment for their crops. When they refuse then the collapse is near at hand.

The support of the masses of the people is gradually being lost by the present government. Even the social-

democratic elements are switching over to the support of the Communist opposition.

At Halle, the Convention of the Independent Socialists has stirred the nation. A feature of this convention was the four-hour speech by Zinovieff, the chairman of the executive committee of the Third International. Reports of the convention indicate that it was a stormy one, resulting in the indorsement of the Third International by the Independents, who of course will lose or expel the temporizing elements and reactionary leaders.

Thus a very strong political opposition to the Government, proletarian and revolutionary in character, now confronts the capitalist government which together with the hopeless economic conditions and financial breakdown now threatens the life of capitalism in Germany.

Our Pilgrim Fathers

Three hundred years ago a shipload of saints landed on the eastern seaboard. There was nothing unusual about the circumstances under which they arrived, as emigration to the "New World" from most European countries had been going on for more than a hundred years when the Pilgrim Fathers landed in 1620.

Many expeditions from the "Old World" arrived about that period, but it so happened that some of the descendants of the Pilgrims became rich and, in the usual snobbish fashion, began tracing their pedigree. They found that their forebears had come over on the Mayflower, and that the voyage, like all others of that period, had been marked by great suffering and privation. Like most "history" the story of the Mayflower has improved with much re-telling, and the virtues of the Pilgrim Fathers have become part of the folk-lore of the country, and occupy an honored place beside the famous historical George Washington and the cherry tree incident. So many people now claim descent from the saintly Pilgrims that the old Mayflower must have had greater carrying capacity than our modern trans-Atlantic liners to accommodate the great throng of illustrious ancestors.

At Plymouth, England, there was recently held the tercentenary celebration of the sailing of the Mayflower with its liberty-loving company. Some of America's noblest and England's fairest grand dames and gentlemen participated in the festivities. Much was said in praise of those noble souls who fled from oppression and dared so much in the cause of liberty. Newspaper reports said the only thing that marred the proceedings were the reports of the terrible state of affairs now existing in Ireland.

In many cities in New England preparations have been made for celebrating the tercentenary of the landing at Plymouth Rock. It was at first intended to have a nationwide celebration, but, due to "certain circumstances" this has been postponed until next year. (Perhaps the Irish will be brought to heel by then).

We wonder if in the speeches that will be made will there be any mention of the sailing of the "Soviet Ark"? It is a long page in history from the landing of the Mayflower to the sailing of the Buford; yet an interesting history—it is the history of capitalism in America.

The halo of virtue and honesty that has been thrown around the Pilgrims makes excellent stuff with which to fill the minds of unsuspecting school children. Distance lends enchantment, and the stories of their noble character and love of freedom have become so mellowed with age

that it is almost sacrilegious to lift the curtain of time and take a closer look at the foundation of American liberty.

The class struggle came over on the Mayflower, just as it has on every voyage from the "Old World" before or since. The expedition was a capitalist undertaking, the company being made up of two classes—the Merchant Adventurers who financed the venture and the Planters who made up the bulk of the passengers. The agreement between the Merchants and the Planters was that the proceeds of the Colony, after deducting living expenses, were to be divided equally between the Planters and the Merchants. But after preparations for the voyage were well under way and the Planters (the workers) had disposed of their belongings, the Merchants insisted upon a change in the agreement. William Bradford, the second governor of the Colony, relates that serious grievances arose over this change in the original agreement. The new proposal was that the Planters should serve the Colony for a period of seven years and that at the end of that time all improved land and half of the property in the Colony should go to the Merchants. In his history of the Colony, Bradford publishes letters showing the complaints of the Planters. One Planter in a letter to a friend warns of the conditions that existed, saying: "But there is in this some mysterie, as indeed it seems there is in the whole course. Whereas diverse are to pay in some parts of their moneys * * * they refuse to do it till they see shipping provided or a course taken for it. Neither do I think there is a man who would pay anything if he had again his money in his purse." He goes on to explain that the Planters are virtually enslaved to the Merchants. "And let this be borne in mind, that the greatest part of the Colony is likely to be employed constantly, not upon dressing their own land and building houses, but upon fishing, trading, etc. The same consideration of common employment constantly by the most is good reason not to have the two days in a week denied the few planters for private use, which yet is subordinate to common good. Consider also how much unfit that you and your likes must serve a new apprenticeship of seven years, with not a day's freedom from labor."

The histories of the period show clearly that it was something more material than love of liberty that actuated those who promoted the enterprise. In the quaint, puritanical language of the period, Bradford tells of the strong desire to accumulate "worldly goods." To be sure, their prosperity was always dependent upon the "will of God" and their hopes for greater wealth were preceded by "if God give a blessing" and so forth.

The Pilgrim Fathers have been held up as examples of men who were free from the mundane struggle for worldly goods, and never is there mentioned the fact of a struggle between upper and lower classes. But a reading of the "History of Plymouth Colony" shows that such was not the case. The life of the Colony, like that of any social group based on private property, expressed its particular form of class conflict.

The newspapers have been editorializing the virtues of the Pilgrims. One leading journal tells us that "Teachers should brush up on the facts of the old, old story of self-sacrifice, loyalty to conscience, moral courage and devotion to high ideals embodied in this imperishable event, dwelling upon them with loving iteration, that no youthful mind shall escape the fruitful inspiration."

In this the reader will recognize the usual method of promoting servility and devotion to capitalism. By holding up to the future wage-slaves this exaggerated story of thrift and devotion to work, they paint a picture of long-suffering and patience and servile contentment with their lot as being the highest virtues in life.

" * * * it is suggested that there should be equalization of agricultural and industrial labor wages, which, it is declared, can be accomplished only by lowering industrial wages or increasing farm wages."

Th'ellyuhsa!

From an exchange we learn that the h. c. l. is being felt in Darkest Africa. It is reported that a first-class wife now costs six arrow-heads instead of four, as formerly.

Soviet Medical Relief

The medical relief for Soviet Russia is proceeding in good shape. Under the auspices of the national committee and local committees, meetings have been arranged in all of the important cities of the country for the purpose of raising funds to send medical supplies to Russia.

The Soviet Medical Relief Committee, through its purchasing agent, the Commercial Department of the Soviet Government Bureau, has shipped to Soviet Russia up to November 1st, 1920, medical supplies to the value of \$36,580.12. Steps are being taken to purchase some modern fully equipped ambulances and it is hoped that in the next few weeks it will be possible to ship a sufficient number of these to supply each of the largest cities with one.

Arrangements are being made by the committee to purchase anti-typhoid vaccine which is badly needed in the hospitals of Soviet Russia, as well as in the former war zones, where the retreating enemies have left hundreds of thousands of people sick with typhoid. This disease alone has claimed more victims in Soviet Russia than all other contagious diseases put together.

The physicians and nurses in Soviet Russia are applying superhuman efforts to eradicate the ghastly inheritance of war and blockade. It is up to us, living in more fortunate circumstances, to contribute all we can to help the Russian comrades to wash off the stains of blood and disease inflicted on them through endless war against them fathered by the counter-revolutionaries of the world.

The enemies of Soviet Russia have shown their ability to make the Russians suffer endless misery and privation. Let us show that the friends of Soviet Russia are equally persistent in their efforts to do away with this misery.

Class Nature of Politics

The common habit of the average individual is to look upon politics as the business of running the government to the best interests of the whole. While glaring instances of political corruption tend to make him believe that a certain few enter politics for personal advantage, yet the real function of Government is to impartially hand out "justice" to all members of society and to administer the affairs of the country to the best interests of all. This view is one which has been carefully fostered by those in power in order to hide the existence of classes in society, which classes directly arise out of the economic fabric known as Capitalism.

Despite all the cries of "equal opportunity" and "equality before the law," the fact remains that the vast gigantic instruments of modern production belong by the right of private property to a small number in society, and that 65% of the population," to quote the report of the Commission of Industrial Relations, "own but 5% of the wealth of the country." How can one conceive of equality between these two classes?

Nominally, there is equality before the law, but what is the nature of the law of the land and for what purpose does it exist? The fundamental tenet on which capitalist legality is based is the right of private property—freedom of the individual to own and personally profit from land, mills, mines or other means of wealth production that other members of society must have access to in order to live. The Government, therefore, is but a machine for administering private property—for preserving and extending the privileges of the possessing class.

One great difference between social classes of today and of former epochs is the fact that the possibility of an individual leaving his class and entering another was indeed remote in bygone days. Class position was determined by birth, and certain honors and privileges attached themselves to a blue-blooded individual even though reduced to penury. Today, however, the possession of wealth is the sole standard of classification. The laws of inheritance, lucky speculation, etc., may suddenly elevate one to the ranks of the dividend-reapers. Classes, today, therefore, are not so rigid as to the individuals composing them, but the class institution is part and parcel of the economic system. So long as private property exists, employer and employee are indispensable to each other, which means that wealth and privilege for a few can only exist at the expense of the many.

Property holders are not agreed as to the manner of administering the business of the country, because property is not all of the same kind. While all are united in one front against the class they profit from, yet among themselves the battle for more privilege goes on. In the early days of capitalism, industrial capitalists, landed proprietors, and financial capitalists all fought among themselves to seek mastery of the powers of Government, in order to shift the burden of taxation on to other groups and to pass measures beneficial to themselves. Today, however, the financial capitalist is foremost. The line between land and industry is not nearly so distinct; the same interests control both forms of property. The political conflict is now expressed in a battle between the two leading banking houses.

The lower section of the capitalist class, the small fry, find themselves ground down by the monopolistic privileges of the big money kings, and their economic position is expressed by reform parties aiming to wipe out the excessive profits of those above them, and to secure a more uniform condition. They are usually against war, for their interests do not extend outside the home country, and stand for

government ownership, seeking for a more economical administration of things.

The farmers represent another, though small, group in the system of production, and because their economic position is different, their political aims are also different. What they are concerned about is low freight charges, government bank credit, transportation facilities, and government help in fighting parasites, etc.

The largest class in capitalism, the class of wage-earners, is, despite its size and economic importance, politically inarticulate, as far as its class interests are concerned. What little political interest it manifests is over issues that can only benefit their economic masters. The awakening is slow, but social forces are resistlessly working to instil class-consciousness in the mind of the worker. The

anarchy and waste of the competitive system of production, resulting in over-production every few years, with unemployment, disease and war in its train—all these factors condemn the capitalist system to oblivion. The institution of private property and of “free competition” in the means of livelihood, is unable to take care of the needs of society. The working class will have to replace private property with collective property in order to collectively enjoy the fruits of their labor. Therefore, the economic antagonism becomes a political one, and the goal is the power of the state, the power of Government, (which the capitalists now control) in order that the working class interests may be properly served.

A. C.

The Marxian Law of Value

“The Great Contradiction” has been written of, and discussed, more than any other phase of Marxian economics, and while all these discussions are very interesting, nothing new has been added by the critics since Boehm-Bawerk wrote his memorable book, “Karl Marx and the Close of His System.” It is not our intention to analyze everything the critics have to offer in objection to the law of value, but rather to analyze and make clear, and to bring to our readers a little undersanding of Marxian economics. If we have succeeded in arousing the reader's interest so that he will undertake to study Marx's “Capital” our work is amply rewarded.

Let us put the problem before us, and then work out the solution. In present day society, there are many and diverse kinds of business. There are many capitalists, and these men realize that in normal times no matter in what particular enterprise they invest their money they usually get the same result, the same amount of return on the investment. Whether the enterprise in which he has invested his money is divided in

$$80C+20V$$

or whether it is invested in an enterprise where the composition is

$$60C+40V$$

or whether he has invested his precious cash in an enterprise consisting of

$$95C+5V$$

as a rule, the results are the same.

If the exploitation in each of the above instances is 100%, and assuming that the whole of the constant passes into the finished product, we would then have in the first instance

$$80C+20V+20S=120.$$

Exploitation 100% ; total value 120 ; profit on investment 20%.

In the second instance we would have

$$60C+40V+40S=140.$$

Exploitation 100% ; total value 140 ; profit on investment 40%.

In the third instance we would have

$$95C+5V+5S=105.$$

Exploitation 100% ; total value 105 ; profit on investment 5%.

If commodities exchange at their value, then in the first instance the product would exchange for 120 ; in the second for 140 ; in the third for 105. The profit in the first would be 20% ; in the second 40% ; and in the third 5%.

The person who does not understand the Marxian law of value would be compelled to say, that if these three capitals of 100 each, each show the same profit, that is an average rate, which in this case would be 65 divided by 3 equals 21 2-3%, then it cannot be that commodities exchange at their value, and furthermore, if in the last instance where the surplus is only 5, and the capitalist receives a profit of 21 2-3%, then profits do arise from somewhere else than from the variable portion ; and therefore would be forced to acknowledge that it is not labor alone which creates wealth, but that something else enters into it.

We will now examine the Marxian solution. In the first place, we must always remember that the capitalists, as a rule, are not Marxians. The primary and important thing to the capitalists is the profit. If the profit in a certain industry is above the average, the capitalists will venture with their money into such industries, until by competition, the profits are driven down to the average. If the profit in a certain industry is below the average, competition will be less keen in that line, until the profit rises to the average rate.

Let us take five different capitals, as per the following :

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Capitals	Rate of Ex- ploitation	Surplus Value	Rate of Profit	Used Up C	Value of Commodities	Cost Price
1.	80C+ 20V	100%	20	20%	50	90	70
2.	70C+ 30V	100%	30	30%	51	111	81
3.	60C+ 40V	100%	40	40%	51	131	91
4.	85C+ 15V	100%	15	15%	40	70	55
5.	95C+ 5V	100%	5	5%	10	20	15
Total	390C+110V		110	110%			
Average	78C+ 22V		22	22%			

Here in column A, we have the capitals, each of a different composition. In column B, the rate of exploitation, which is alike for the five capitals. In column C, we have the surplus value. The rate of profit is shown in column D. Column E shows the used up portion of the constant which is transferred to the finished commodity. Column F shows us the value of the commodity. This is made up of the used up C plus the V plus the surplus, so that in capital 1 it would be 50 used up C plus 20V plus 20 surplus. Column G gives us the cost price of the commodity to the capitalist, which consists of the used up C plus the V, which in capital

1 is 70. Taking column A and adding up the constant we get 390; adding up the variable gives us 110. 110 is 22% of the total of 500. The total surplus value is also 110. The average composition of the five different capitals is 78C+22V. If the rate of exploitation is alike in each of the five industries, say 100%, then we have

$$78C+22V+22S=122.$$

An average rate of profit of 22%.

While it is quite difficult to follow the above chart, it really should not deter the reader from giving it his close attention. If he has followed the explanations carefully, the following one will be easily understood, and the apparent contradiction will be found to be no contradiction at all.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Capitals			Used Up C	Value	Cost Price of Commodities	Price of Commodities	Rate of Profit	Deviation of Price of Price from Value
1.	80C+20V	20	50	90	70	92	22%	+ 2
2.	70C+30V	30	51	111	81	103	22%	- 8
3.	60C+40V	40	51	131	91	113	22%	-18
4.	85C+15V	15	40	70	55	77	22%	+ 7
5.	95C+ 5V	5	10	20	15	37	22%	+17
				422		422		

Here we have the same five capitals, shown in column A. We have shown the average rate of profit of these five capitals to be 22%. The value of the commodity in capital 1 is 50 used up C plus 20V plus 20 surplus, a total of 90. But our capitalistic friend, through the lack of competition in this field, it being one of the industries where the rate of profit is below the average, adds on to the cost price which is 50 used up C plus 20V equals 70, the average rate of 22, and hence the price of this commodity on the market is 92, showing the price of this commodity to be 2 above the value. The value of the commodity in capital 3 is 51 used up C+40V+40S=131, but the rate of profit being high in this industry, and the competition therefore keen, Mr. Capitalist is enabled to only extract the average rate of profit, and the price of his commodity will be forced down to 51 used up C+40V+22, which gives us a total of 113, and Mr. Capitalist will have to sell his commodity 18 below its value. Making the same analysis of each of the five different capitals, we find that in three instances commodities are sold above their value, and in two instances below their value. If we add up the three in which the commodities sell above their value, 2+7+17, we get a total of 26 sold above value. Adding up the two in which the commodities sell below their value, -8+ -18 we get -26; the one cancels the other. If we add up column D we get the total value of the commodities in the five industries 422, and if we add column F we get the total price 422, for which the commodities exchange, therefore, it necessarily follows, that commodities do exchange at their value, which in this instance is 422. The prices of individual commodities fluctuate around the figures in column F, and individually do not sell at their value, but the total commodities exchange at their value. The capitalist engaged in an industry where the rate of profit is high is forced by competition to yield part of his surplus which he has extracted from his laborers to the capitalist engaged in an industry where the rate of profit is low. In other words, each capitalist receives his aliquot part of the total capital invested in each country no matter where he puts it.

The above analysis is simple, after all, and does not, in any way violate the law of value, but to the contrary, it would be an impossibility to solve the problem without the Marxian analysis.

That this solution does not satisfy the critics goes with-

out saying, but the important proposition to be considered is not whether it suits the critics, but whether it violates the law of values. In our next installment we shall take up the "falling tendency of the rate of profit" and show how this is brought about, by virtue of the law of value. A phenomenon which every economist knows of, but does not explain, and does not even make any attempt to explain.

Karl Marx Tried and Acquitted for Inciting People to Armed Resistance

Karl Marx traveled a rough road with his "Neue Rheinische Zeitung" (Gazette). That paper was a nightmare to the German Government, reactionaries and Liberals. The paper and Marx were denounced by them for his brilliant defense of the Paris Insurrection in June, of 1848 and the paper was suspended for six weeks only to appear with a bigger circulation than ever. After that Marx published at the head of his paper an appeal to the people to refuse to pay taxes and to meet force by force. The paper was twice prosecuted. At the second trial Marx, Schapper and Schneider were charged with "Inciting the people to armed resistance against the Government and its officials." Marx made a brilliant defense and at the close a jurymen, in behalf of his colleagues, thanked him for "the instructive lecture he had given." The accused were unanimously acquitted by the jury. The paper was finally suppressed and Marx again exiled by the Government in 1849. Freligrath wrote for the last edition his celebrated revolutionary poem:—"Farewell of the Rhenish Gazette." The paper appeared, printed in red. The poem reads as translated by Earnest Jones:

*When the last of crowns like glass shall break,
On the scene our sorrows have haunted,
And the people the last dread "Guilty" shall speak,
By your side ye shall find me undaunted.
On Rhine or on Danube, in word or deed,
You shall witness, true to his vow,
On the wreck of thrones, in the midst of the freed
The rebel who greets you now.*

Books Received

Broken Shackles, by John Gordon; Dorrance & Co., Philadelphia.

A Great Iniquity, by Leo Tolstoy; Heubsch, Inc., New York.

Patriotism and Responsibility for the War, by Georges Demartial; Huebsch, Inc., New York.

100%, by Upton Sinclair; Sinclair, Pasadena, Calif.

The Brass Check, by Upton Sinclair, Pasadena, Calif.

"Soft words may win a woman's love or soothe a maiden's fears,

But hungry stomachs heed them not, the belly has no ears."

—Patrick McGill.

Every science has been an outcast. All the altars and all the thrones united to arrest the forward march of the human race. The kings said that mankind must not work for themselves. The priests said that mankind must not think for themselves. One forged chains for the hands, the other for the soul.

—Bob Ingersoll.

Lenin vs. Kautsky

By ERN REEN

(Continued from last issue)

"Democracy," Lenin explains, "is a state which recognizes the rule of a majority over a minority." There are different kinds of democracy, and Lenin draws a sharp line between "bourgeois democracy" and "proletarian democracy." "It is obvious that one cannot speak of pure democracy so long as different classes exist. One can only speak of *class* democracy. Kautsky shamelessly gives attractive airs to bourgeois democracy by suppressing such acts as are committed by the most democratic and republican bourgeoisie of America and Switzerland against strikers.... Mr. Kautsky has forgotten that the protection of minorities is extended by the ruling party in a bourgeois democracy only to the other *bourgeois* parties, while on all serious, fundamental issues, the working class gets, instead of 'protection of minorities,' martial law and pogroms.... But Kautsky does not understand this truth, because he has forgotten how to put the question: Democracy for what class? If he starts from 'pure' (?) democracy and simply says: Without equality of all citizens there can be no democracy, one has to ask the learned Mr. Kautsky the question: Can there be any equality between the exploiters and the exploited?" (Proletarian Revolution, p. 23-26).

Kautsky did not answer this question asked by Lenin once before in "The State and Revolution." Neither does he answer it in his latest book, "Terrorism and Communism." Having proved the importance of democracy, Kautsky takes up the question of dictatorship. "Taken literally, the word signifies the suspension of democracy. But taken literally, it also means the sovereignty of a single person who is bound by no laws." The fact that "the dictatorship of the proletariat" is a dictatorship of a class and not of a person proves, Kautsky asserts, that Marx in speaking about dictatorship did not use the word in its literal sense.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat was for him (Marx) a condition which necessarily arose in a real democracy because of the overwhelming numbers of the proletariat...." Therefore "dictatorship as a condition must not be confused with dictatorship as a form of government." (Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p. 45). "This is ridiculous nonsense," Lenin answers, "Marx himself speaks not of a form of *government*, but of a form or type of *state*." (Proletarian Revolution, p. 21).

Kautsky is much worried over the proletariat being divided into various groups: "The dictatorship of one of these parties is no longer in any sense the dictatorship of the proletariat, but a dictatorship of one part of the proletariat over the other." (Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p. 46).

Allowing Kautsky's logic an all-sided application, we may reason: Because the bourgeoisie in America split into various parties (as Republican, Democratic, Committee of 48) and because one party usually gains control, it is no longer in any sense the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but a dictatorship of one part of the bourgeoisie over the other. The striking switchmen and miners, driven into submission by the police clubs, can now sigh with relief—the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie has been repudiated. Kautsky is trying to prove that dictatorship is unnecessary by the example of the Paris Commune (which, he claims, "has been the only great defeat suffered by the European proletariat"), where none of all the sections represented exercised a dictatorship over the other. A democratic proletariat will have no use for a dictatorial tyranny. Its rule will be founded on the general confidence, bred on the conviction that the proletariat has acquired the strength and capacity to free itself.... "Why then do we need dictatorship?"

Lenin quotes Marx in reply: "In order to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie; in order to inspire the reactionaries with fear; in order to maintain the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie; in order that the proletariat may forcibly suppress its enemies!"

This is the function of the proletarian state. Obviously it could not exist with "pure democracy" being preserved at the same time. The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary in order to protect the working class in its final struggle with the exploiting class, which "though defeated, is not yet destroyed and still enjoys the advantages of education, of habits

of organization and management, knowledge of all the secrets of administration, etc., while the majority of exploited, on the other hand, even in the most advanced and the most democratic bourgeois republics are cowed, frightened, ignorant, unorganized."

As a preacher of pure democracy, Kautsky could not neglect the misfortunes of the Constituent Assembly. He is indignant: "Before they came into power, the Bolsheviks had demanded, and for a period even violently demanded, the Constituent Assembly, chosen by 'universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage.'" But later, on December 7th the All-Russian Executive Committee of Soviets discovered a defect in the elections to the Constituent Assembly.... A resolution was passed, that the Soviets were given the right to recall the members of the Constituent Assembly on the demand of more than one-half of the electors.... this at that time represented the widest interference with the Constituent Assembly that has been made.... But it was becoming ever clearer that the election had not given the Bolsheviks the majority. Then on December 26th Lenin discovered that the Soviet republic represents not only a higher form of democratic institutions but it is also the sole form which renders possible the least painful transition to socialism.... It is only a pity that this knowledge was arrived at after one had been left a minority in the Constituent Assembly. (Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p. 69).

Lenin answers: "Kautsky quotes my third thesis on the fundamental question whether the Bolsheviks were of the opinion, before the election to the Constituent Assembly, that the Soviet Republic was of a higher type than the bourgeois republic, and whether they say so to the people. But he does not quote the second thesis which ran as follows: While demanding the summoning of a Constituent Assembly, the revolutionary Social-Democracy has repeatedly since the very beginning of the revolution of 1917, emphasized the view that the Soviet Republic is a higher form of democracy than the ordinary bourgeois republic with a Constituent Assembly.... He has thus once more avoided the theoretical side of the question. Is it, or is it not, true, that the bourgeois democratic parliamentary republic is a lower form than a republic of Soviet type? This is the essential question, and Kautsky has avoided it." (Proletarian Revolution, p. 51).

One might ask: Knowing that a parliamentary republic is a lower form than a Soviet republic why did the Bolsheviks convoke the Constituent Assembly? Lenin does not give a direct answer, but he fully discusses a similar question. Explaining why the Bolsheviks supported the demands of the backward peasantry for equalized land tenure, Lenin says: "Having overthrown Tsarism and militarism, the peasantry was dreaming about 'equalized' land tenure and no power on earth would have been able to kill this dream of the peasantry.... The proletarians were saying to the peasants: We shall help you to attain this 'ideal' form of capitalism but by doing so, we shall demonstrate to you its inadequacy, and the necessity of passing to the social tillage of the land." (Proletarian Revolution, p. 103).

No doubt that was also the reason why the Bolsheviks not only violently demanded from Kerensky, but later themselves carried out the task of calling together the Constituent Assembly. There were people in Russia who believed that by means of the Constituent Assembly better results could be obtained than otherwise. It was necessary to show them the fallacy of their belief. The Assembly was allowed to convene and in one day it displayed very clearly its reactionary character. It was becoming the center of counter-revolution and surely could not be allowed to proceed with its noble work.

But Kautsky argues: "The Soviets cannot take the place of the Constituent Assembly. The Soviets are an important phenomena as fighting organizations of a class. Only as such are they of any value. The Bolsheviks ignorant of it proceeded to make an organ of government of the Soviets." That has been done, Kautsky is convinced, merely for the purpose of "disenfranchising the great masses of the people." As compared with general suffrage, vote by occupation has a tendency to narrow the outlook of the electors. By these means the So-

viets are used for the purpose of strengthening the Bolsheviks' dictatorship under the name of "dictatorship of the proletariat."

Lenin emphasized several times that the disfranchising of the bourgeoisie was due to peculiar Russian conditions. "One must study the question of the restriction of the franchise in the light of the specific conditions of the Russian revolution and the specific cause of its development. But it would be rash to guarantee in advance that the impending proletarian revolution in Europe will, all or for most part, be accompanied by a restriction of the franchise in the case of the bourgeoisie. This may be so. But it is not absolutely necessary for the establishment of a dictatorship." (Proletarian Revolution, p. 39).

As to the argument that the Soviets must not become organs of government, Lenin ironically remarks that this has been borrowed by Kautsky from Martoff. Martoff spoke about Russian conditions and claimed that Russia as a backward country was not yet ripe for Soviet government. Kautsky takes the theoretical side of the dictatorship of the proletariat in general and he "cannot argue directly that Europe is not yet ripe for proletarian revolution." The Constituent Assembly is indispensable to Kautsky's mind, and the Soviets overstepped their proper field of activity and usurped the power, which by justice ought to belong to a parliament. He entirely neglects the fact that this question has been fully discussed by Marx and Engels, in whose name he condemns the tactics of the Bolsheviks and that Marx and Engels seem to disagree with Kautsky. He repeats the mistake of our English comrades who claim that "Soviet" is a Russian word for "Parliament" and nothing else. They ought to take notice of Lenin's remarks that Soviets were built after the example of the Paris Commune and then think over the explanation given by Marx in "The Civil War in France." (C. Kerr & Co., p. 43).

"...The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead of continuing to be agents of the central government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes, and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable agent of the Commune. So were the officials of all other branches of the administration..... Public functions cease to be the private property of the tools of the central government. Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the state was laid in the hands of the Commune." Lenin puts special emphasis on the distinction between "a working, executive and legislative body" on one side and "parliamentary" on the other. He analyses the question in detail in "The State and Revolution."

The premature revolution provoked by the Bolsheviks shows signs of complete failure. Kautsky is sure of that, as in spite of being in power for nine months the Bolsheviks did not succeed in establishing Socialism yet. It is Kautsky who expects to pass "at once" from capitalism to Communism (Capitalist production must be transformed "at once" into socialist production when the time is ripe. See "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," p. 92). The Bolsheviks never cherished any illusions of that kind. They always knew that a transition period was inevitable. The transition period, the proletarian state, they did succeed in bringing about and that is all that is possible for the proletariat to do under present conditions.

Kautsky also sees signs of failure in that "the Bolsheviks promised the people prosperity, but instead, after nine months, they are obliged to explain how the general poverty arises." That is an old argument. It has been repeated for the last year by all bourgeois reactionary papers. Probably the masters of America and Europe who finance the blockade and the military attack on Soviet Russia could explain to Kautsky's satisfaction the causes of starvation in Russia. But to this argument Kautsky adds one of his own. "This is all very true," he says, (that the difficulties of the Russian workers were due to sabotage of the middle class, the permanent counter-revolutionary revolt of the ex-officers, the consequences of war....), "but it does not indicate anything else than that the conditions are not ripe." (Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p. 94).

Now we know when the conditions are ripe: It is when the capitalist will agree to give up their privileges peacefully and will not attempt to suppress the rising revolutionary proletariat. Lenin remarks, "the truth is that in every serious revolution a long, obstinate, desperate resistance of the exploiters constitutes the rule. Never, except in the sentimental Utopia of Mr. Kautsky, will the exploiters submit to the decision of the exploited majority without making use of their advantages in the last desperate battle."

To conclude, Kautsky cites the anti-socialist actions taken by the Bolsheviks when they ordered the workers to seize the

factories and run them for their individual benefit, and when they divided land among the peasants instead of transforming it into state property. It is hardly necessary to tell the American workers that Kautsky is mistaken: The Russian factories are not being run for the benefit of individual groups of workers. Lenin says: "On August 5th when numerous decrees about the nationalization of factories in Russia had been issued transferring all factories to the public ownership of the republic and no single factory had been appropriated by the workers, on that August 5th Kautsky, on the strength of an obviously dishonest interpretation of a sentence in a speech of mine, was suggesting that in Russia the factories were being handed over to individual workers; and after that Kautsky at length continues to chew the cud, repeating that the factories must not be handed over to individual workers. This is not criticism but the method of a lackey to the bourgeoisie who was paid by it to libel the workers' revolution." (Proletarian Revolution, p. 110).

The question of agrarian problems is of great interest. That problem is one of the most difficult to solve in all countries, and whether the Bolsheviks in Russia apply a correct solution is very important. We have quoted one passage on equalized land tenure. Lenin illuminates this question in the "Proletarian Revolution." During the first stage of the revolution the middle class took fright and retreated before performing its task of completing the bourgeois revolution, leaving that to the proletariat. Then the Bolsheviks still needed the support of the peasant class as a whole.

"If the Bolshevik proletariat had attempted at once, in November, 1917... to do without the temporary union with the peasantry as a whole, had attempted to do without the necessary concession to the middle peasantry, it would have been a Blanquist distortion of Marxism, an attempt of the minority to impose its will upon the majority, a theoretical absurdity and a display of ignorance of the fact that a common peasant revolution... could not in a backward country be turned into a socialist one, without a whole series of transitions and successive stages." (Proletarian Revolution, p. 97).

In a speech delivered at the first All-Russian Conference on the work in Villages (Soviet Russia, Feb. 7th, 1920, p. 138), Lenin develops his theory: "We say to the middle peasant that there will be no attempt to force a transition to communal economy. In the socialist sense it will be possible to act only by force of successful examples. We can and must begin trying to influence the middle peasant only with examples, to show him the advantage of communal economy." The facts testify to the success of the "influence by example." In two years Soviets established 2399 agricultural Soviet enterprises and 5961 rural communes and associations with more than seven million acres of land already in the hands of Soviet agricultural communes. (Soviet Russia, July 3rd, 1920, p. 648). Every one knows that problems of that kind cannot be settled in a few months. Kautsky himself understands it, except when he is talking of Soviet Russia. In his latest book, "Terrorism and Communism," Kautsky speaks with whole-hearted approval of the Paris Communists tendency to study problems before trying to solve them. He cites one example when Jurd, requested by the Commune to create a better institution to take the place of the pawn-shops replied: "Create an institution! Easy to say, but we need time to familiarize ourselves with the problem, before creating something new." Kautsky calls that "remarkable prudence." But the fact that the Bolsheviks did not introduce socialism in nine months is called "a complete failure." It is true, Lenin admits, they made mistakes. But it was necessary to make mistakes in order to learn not to make them. Kautsky could help the proletarian revolution by a scientific Marxian criticism. Instead, he misrepresents the facts, repeats the accusations borrowed from the bourgeois reactionary papers, and to the great delight of his worshippers ignores the arguments of his opponents, and in addition, boasts that he is thoroughly investigating the arguments of "both sides." It might not be his fault that "both sides" happen to be anti-Bolsheviks. Since the publication of Kautsky's book much information has come to light which we did not have before, thanks to the democratic protection enjoyed by the workers of all capitalist countries. These facts prove that many charges made by Kautsky against Soviet Russia were false. Such were the charges of general anarchy, individual dictatorship, incapacity of the Bolshevik leaders and their being Utopians. Certainly, Kautsky himself has learned something from experience since then, we could expect. How much he learned he displays in the latest gem produced by his talent, "Terrorism and Communism." There he repeats the old arguments and again ignores Lenin's replies and tells lurid stories about the horrors of the Red Terror.

Veblinism and Marxism

Of late many periodicals subscribing, or purporting to subscribe, to the principles of Marxism have devoted much space to the publication of Prof. Thorstein Veblen's views upon current socio-economic problems. While it is true that few contemporary scholars have rendered equally important contributions to the literature of historical materialism, these journals, either explicitly or by innuendo, invariably lead the reader to believe that the social philosophy of the inimitable author of the "Theory of the Leisure Class," etc. is quite consonant with that of Marx.

That this is not so, Veblen very plainly set forth as early as 1905-6 in a series of characteristically ingenious lectures anent "The Socialist Economics of Karl Marx and His Followers," delivered to the students at Harvard University. These are contained in volumes twenty and twenty-one of the Quarterly Journal of Economics, and have recently been reprinted without revision in book form, together with a number of the author's essays under the caption "The Place of Science in Modern Civilization."

Beginning with a very flattering tribute to the genius of Marx, among other eulogies, he makes the unqualified assertion that "there is no system of economic theory more logical than that of Marx" and to which he later alludes as "the socialism which alone inspires hopes and fears today," Veblen then proceeds to elaborate in some detail upon the major tenets of Marxism. In the course of this somewhat discursive resume he effectually, and with characteristically Veblenian irony, dismisses the objections of the hostile critics of Marx from Boehm-Bawerk down (or up) as wholly shallow and inconclusive.

Continuing, he subjects the Marxian ideology to an independent criticism of his own which proceeds, in the main, along lines of psycho-physical generalization. Claiming that the Marxian hypothesis is in many respects quite out of harmony with the findings of scientific psychology and at variance with even the facts of history, he advances the contention that the later psychology nowhere affirms the existence in society of an instinctive insight that can be invariably counted upon, after the manner of the Kantian categorical imperative, to irresistibly urge it and the social forces, in which humanity lives, moves, and has its being, to converge toward the attainment of that classless economic regime which forms the ne plus ultra of scientific socialism. On this head he pertinently observes in "The Instinct of Workmanship" that "History records more frequent and more spectacular instances of the triumph of imbecile institutions over life and culture than of peoples who have by force of instinctive insight saved themselves out of a desperately precarious institutional situation."

It is not altogether improbable, Veblen conjectures, that the proletariat may remain wholly oblivious to the Marxian consummation (so devoutly to be wished) and lending themselves to the imperialistic designs of their parasitic rulers (vide the late unpleasantness) sink their force in the broad sands of patriotism. Modern psychology, he avers, does not bear out the view that the tenor of social evolution is affected, or in any manner determined, by the premeditated logic of human thought applied to social problems, but

rather by that of sentiment and the mechanical force of hereditary instinct, which, under the stress and strain of events, does not invariably actuate individuals, singly or en masse, to "carry on" in the best interests of their class. In proof of which the assertion is made that "those nations and civilizations which have failed and decayed, as all known nations and civilizations have done, illustrate the point that, however reasonable and logical the advance by means of the class struggle may be, it is by no means inevitable."

The contention that the proletariat may never question and eventually challenge the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is not peculiar to Veblen alone. It has been frequently brought forth with much flourish by many leisure-class apologists who sought to put it over by a more or less shrewd use of taxonomy. Conspicuous among these artful dodgers in America is Prof. E. R. A. Seligman of Columbia University, who, in his otherwise excellent handbook "An Economic Interpretation of History" attempts to refute the prediction that the emancipation of the proletariat is writ on the program of history by pointing to the then contented and un-class conscious psychology of the working class. In the domain of social psychology this point is ably stressed by W. Trotter in his instructive study "The Instinct of the Herd" in which the author adduces psychological and biological data pointing to the probability that the masses may be induced by a ruling class to lend themselves to designs which would ultimately lead to their extinction.

In refutation it is sufficient to call attention to the status of Soviet Russia today, the Hungarian and Italian episodes of recent date, the Spartacan outbursts in Germany, etc., all of which unmistakably points to the impending revolutionary crisis in the bourgeois world at large, and more strikingly that the progress of the workers is actually proceeding along the lines anticipated by Marx and his school.

Slater.

Debs is quoted in a recent interview as having declared that for mankind he would shed his blood, but that in no cause would he shed another's blood. A would-be martyr and pacifist or what?

Announcement

We are able to supply the following books in any quantities desired:

The Proletarian Revolution, by Lenin, 40c
The State and Revolution, by Lenin, 40c

Price to dealers on application

We also wish to announce that we are able to supply a limited number of bound volumes of *The Proletarian*. Volume No. 1 and No. 2 are bound separately.

Price \$3.25 per volume.

Cash accompanying order.