



THE PROLETARIAN



IN TRIUMPH STILL WAVES

THE EDITOR'S CORNER

The Iron Heel of Capitalism has descended upon another champion of the working class. C. M. O'Brien, organizer for Local Rochester has been seized by the authorities to be deported from the country. This ruthless action should be met with a firm response by the workers. These repressive efforts must be fought to the bitter end and no one should hesitate in lending aid to the comrades of Rochester in giving battle in behalf of Comrade O'Brien.

Comrade O'Brien has been, and is, one of the most useful members the workers' movement in America possesses. His deportation or imprisonment would be a distinct loss to the cause. To those who have had the pleasure and benefit of O'Brien's acquaintanceship we need not speak of his value to the movement. To those who know him not we can only say that his history is one of unswerving loyalty and devotion to the cause. With a smiling face and grips loaded with literature, he has carried the message of real socialism into every nook and corner of the state of Michigan. To him is due a great deal of the credit for making Michigan a stronghold of socialism. He came to us with a long record of years of service to the cause. Many would have broken before the hardships he has faced. His record is unique in that he is one of the all too few workers who have entered capitalist parliaments carrying the message of real socialism, to return with it uncontaminated by the reactionary influences. In Rochester he has performed a great service to the movement and aided in establishing one of the best locals in the United States.

The comrades there now find themselves overwhelmed and need assistance in saving O'Brien for the movement. The capitalists must be shown now, as in the past, that we will not sit idly by while they deport or imprison our comrades. Rochester has sent out an appeal for aid. Will you do your share? Whatever sacrifice you may make to help in this case will be small compared with the sacrifices O'Brien has already made for the cause of working class emancipation.

Quick action is needed. Do your share! Do it now!

Send funds to Louis Stark, treasurer of Local Rochester, 580 St. Paul Street, Rochester, N. Y., or to this office.

ZAGREB (Jugo-Slavia).—In the recent elections the Communist Party swept the country, electing a majority of the officials in the seven largest cities and in most of the small towns. In Belgrade they elected the Mayor and 30 out of the 40 city aldermen. Approximately one-half of the National Assembly are Communists. The party is as yet unable to take over the control of the nation because of the large number of foreign troops quartered in the important centers. In Zagreb itself two regiments of French Colonials (negro) are stationed. The Communist Party is affiliated with the Third International and demands the immediate dictatorship of the Proletariat, the confiscation of the large estates, and the establishment of a Soviet republic in Jugo-Slavia.

For some years Robert Minor has been more or less prominent in "radical" circles, and reputed one of the country's leading anarchists, of the Kropotkin type. Before that, he was a socialist, of the sentimental sort. But Minor went to Russia and saw things which disturbed him mightily. On his return, he toured the country lecturing, and it was apparent to those who heard him that he was "hedging"—that he did not fully indorse the actions of the Soviet Government. But, for all that, he felt that despite its shortcomings the Soviet was a proletarian government and as such entitled to his active support.

Then something happened. Someone presented him with a copy of Lenin's book, "The State and Revolution," and after reading it, he bought himself a copy of Engel's book, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State." Then it was that he realized for the first time that anarchism is a conservative and even reactionary philosophy, and that he, and not the Bolsheviki, was in the wrong.

It is not often that a man of Minor's prominence announces from the house-tops his error, and publicly repudiates his former utterances. Such action commands respect. In his article in the October "Liberator" Minor has done the intellectually honest thing and performed a real service to the movement in this country. It is to be hoped that Minor will not cease his studies with "The Origin of the Family." There are many other good socialist books that we can recommend to him to complete his education.

One of the many illustrations of the character of the S. P. of A. which we have had was furnished in the "job at all costs" efforts made by the five ousted Assemblymen in New York to be seated following their re-election. One of these, DeWitt, in his plea states that during the war he had sold Liberty bonds and worked in an ammunition factory for the government and that he had been as patriotic as many of those who now assailed his political aims.

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

NOVEMBER, 1920

No. 2

In Triumph Still Waves

By DENNIS E. BATT

Three years ago this month the capitalist world was startled by the news of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia. Class conscious workers everywhere were overjoyed. Like a sun the revolution arose out of a dark night of capitalism. The revolutionary movement of the world took inspiration from the Russian comrades and arose out of the debris of the collapsed Second International. At once the Russian Revolution stood as a challenge to the abstract ideals of the capitalist phrase-mongers of the world. With one sweep the veil was torn from capitalist hypocrisy and it was revealed in all its hideousness. The "liberty loving" peoples of the earth immediately commenced a war upon the Russian workers. "Self-determination" was not for them. Interference in their internal affairs became the order of the day. Capitalist nations could not permit the organization of a workers' republic unmolested. Under one pretext and another invasions were made of Russian territory. "Democratic" troops were sent to protect "imaginary" war supplies at Archangel. While at the same time Czaristic Kolchak was supported in the East as a warrior for "liberty." Although mouthing most beautiful phrases about liberty and freedom the statesmen of the Great Powers lent aid and comfort to every reactionary that seemed likely to gather sufficient following to put up a fight against the Russian Government. Allied gold was thrown to the support of would-be leaders in Archangel, Siberia, Crimea, the Baltic region, Poland, and in fact, everywhere that there appeared to be the slightest chance for the success of their criminally reactionary ambitions.

One by one these reactionary movements have been disposed of. The Allies were driven out of Archangel ingloriously defeated. Kolchak has met his just deserts at the hands of his former followers. Dennykin, with his dictatorial ambitions, is hardly a memory. Yudinitch threw himself in vain upon the armed workers and peasants of Russia. The Red Army stood as a bulwark against all of the efforts of international reaction. The wonderful defensive war that the workers of Russia have carried on will stand as an imperishable memorial to their great courage and ability.

Nor are their achievements to be measured alone by military success. Even in their darkest hours when hardest pressed by international capitalism they have found time, through their leaders, to dwell upon the finest theoretical points of socialist tactics. While defending themselves against the brutal attacks of reactionary armies they have also been able to repel the insidious attacks of socialist traitors in all lands. Many calling themselves socialists have taken issue with their tactics and worked, sometimes unconsciously and sometimes consciously, with the capitalists in their efforts to discredit the Soviet Government in the eyes of the working class of the world. True, they did not wait for the alarm clock of evolution to arouse them from their slumbers. True, they have attempted

a workers' government in a country that was backward in economic development, and for that some have criticised them. But the criticism has been unfounded. Rather should we praise our Russian comrades for grasping Opportunity by the forelock and in some cases making their opportunities. To them the socialist movement has not been a mere debating club but a living, fighting organization with the purpose of doing something more than the mouthing of phrases. They have caught the spirit of the movement and made of it a living, fighting thing that has struck terror into the reactionaries of the world.

All this has not been done without the greatest of efforts and sacrifices. The gains of the Russian Revolution have been purchased at great price. Millions of workers have paid with blood and suffering, hunger and privation for the success of the Proletarian Revolution. The food conditions of the country have been terrible. Black bread and tea has been their ration since the beginning of the revolution and before. Medical supplies have been so short that it has been impossible to give more than the most primitive of treatment to those that are diseased or wounded. Industry is in such a shape that the most common of the necessities of life are wanting. But our Russian comrades have learned how to suffer. Their courage of steel has been tempered in the fires of revolution and has been found without a flaw. Soldiers of the Red Army are this day lying in the hospitals of Russia with old copies of "Pravda" serving as bandages upon their bleeding wounds. Upon the operating tables with a courage unsurpassed in the annals of human history they are having limbs amputated and other major surgical operations performed without any drugs to dull the pain. With the sweat of agony upon their brows they must lay and watch the surgeon saw with a carpenter's ordinary implement upon their bones. Nor has their marvelous courage broken in the face of this terrible suffering. With the words of their beloved "International" upon their lips they impatiently await the time when they will again be physically able to take up the struggle in defense of the revolution.

The counter-revolutionary press of the world continually points to this suffering in Russia as evidence of the failure of the Soviet Government but such is not the case. There exists no other government upon the face of the earth that could face the tremendous task that the Workers' Government of Russia has faced and survive. Never have such conditions faced any government, much less a new government such as the Soviet. At the time of the assumption of political control by the Soviets the entire economic structure of Russia had collapsed. Factories were at a standstill. The railroads were disrupted and rolling stock out of commission and the people of Russia were already starving. Bled white by greater losses than any other

nation suffered during the World War, Russia was in a state of chaos. This was the superhuman task that the Soviets were called upon to face and they have measured up nobly to the task. They have performed miracles of organization and won to their support the great mass of the people. Medicines were never a product of Russia. Her supplies were always imported and here again is evidenced the responsibility of the Allied Nations of the world for the suffering in Russia. The blame for conditions rests not upon the incompetency of the Soviet Government but squarely upon the criminal blockade imposed by England, France and the United States upon our Russian comrades. There the responsibility lies and words will not explain it away. History will nail George, Clemenceau, Wilson and other Allied statesmen where they belong, upon a pillory of scorn from which all the prayers of their priests and words of their apologists will not redeem them, while our Russian comrades have already won for themselves an imperishable place in history's hall of fame.

The situation is still critical in Russia. Some successes have recently been recorded for the revolution, but all is not yet over. The Poles with their imperialistic ambitions have bitten the dust and have

found a generous peace at the hands of their conquerors. One more reactionary remains to be dealt with at the present time. He is now the pet to be succored and bolstered up in his opposition to the Soviet. However, his days are numbered. This the Allies already realize and are looking about for another adventurer to organize an "All-Russian" government. The French General Staff is "concerned" about the effects of the Polish peace upon Wrangel's position. The Red Army is massing in the south to crush, once and for all, this adventurer and his band of followers. The ultimate outcome is assured.

Who will be the next champion of counter-revolution in Russia we do not know. Of this much, however, we are certain—the capitalist governments of the world will go on backing these counter-revolutions as long as the workers of the respective countries permit them to do so. Perhaps the workers of the world will wake up too late to save the Proletarian Revolution in Russia, but it is still a long way from being crushed. Behind the screen of allied censorship and lies, fostered by reactionaries, we can still see the banner of the Soviet Republic held aloft by the might of the workers and peasants and we know that it "in triumph still waves."

The Return to Supernaturalism

As the scepter begins to slip from it, the old bourgeois society is growing reactionary, is reaching out for weapons it formerly scorned. There is a marked change of front towards science and the supernatural.

This changed attitude is strikingly reflected in the article entitled "The First Works", by Basil King, in the July *Cosmopolitan*. The article consists, largely, of alleged revelations given by the spirit of a famous man whose real name the writer avers that he is not at liberty to reveal.

The views of the distinguished spook are reactionary. He declares that man has neglected a sacred trust, and, on this account, all nature has gone wrong. The following utterances are a bijou:

Evil having once taken root in the heart of man, he proceeded to misuse...all the living creatures of God with which he found himself surrounded.... He abused the animals, subjecting those of the pliant nature to the yoke, and causing the fiercer to rebel. Thus began the age-long battle between man and beast, whereby man drove the beast into the wilds and caused the gulf of terror to divide those two equally loved creations of God. That which man was given to help he oppressed and repulsed, thus delaying by thousands of years the development which the animals would have acquired by his guidance and co-operation. The animals, thrust back on themselves ran wild and produced evil—whole species whose mission, apparently, is only to take part with destructive forces."

In this palaver, the proven scientific fact is ignored that the lower animals overran the earth aeons before man appeared; that these animals were equipped for attack and defense with their natural weapons and armor; that terrific combats were waged in the animal world, that there were carnage and slaughter ages before the first primate stood erect.

In the same article the writer mentions with approval that formerly devastating storms, earthquakes, and plagues were regarded as instruments of divine vengeance, that they were legally styled "acts of God."

As far as "The First Works" is concerned, modern science is thrown on the junk heap. There is an obvious purpose to discredit evolution, to hark back to enslaving dogmas that science has shattered, to shackle men with old time superstitious fear of natural phenomena.

The write-up is not unique of its kind. Others of the same stripe are current in various periodicals.

In "The Slayer of Souls", a serial by Robert W. Chambers, that has been running in Hearst's, New York in the grip of the blizzard is casually mentioned as "smitten by God."

There's a reason for this unscientific propaganda. He that flies may read.

Formerly, the bourgeois society joined hands with science. As Anton Pannekoek ably explains in his "Marxism and Darwinism," there were two reasons for the line-up. In the first place, the truths of evolution met with approval because there was plainly an evolution of society as well as an evolution of the physical world. The doctrine of evolution confirmed the bourgeois order.

Then, again, science was dealing smashing blows to old traditions, superstitions, dogmas, that feudalism had been using as supports.

Feudalism was superseded, yet it was trying, by hook or crook, to keep itself alive as long as possible. It discredited science. It had disgraced, imprisoned, murdered, scientists. It leaned on its efficient, well-organized, loyal church (the Catholic church) which was using its thundering voice of authority to keep the masses in subjection.

Of course the bourgeois society ranged itself on the side of science, and, of course, its leaders were skeptical in religion. Monarchists brought forward the infidelity of men like Tom Paine as an argument against republics. The name of God was ruled out of

the Constitution of the United States.

Now, we're under different stars. Capitalism, in turn, has fulfilled its mission, and is no longer efficient. The mighty machines are here. The method of production and the political system are again swearing at each other. To bring harmony out of the present chaos, a new social order is called for.

The bourgeois society is in its death grapple with the proletariat. It is looking around for all sorts of weapons, barricades, temporary defenses.

It is subtly discrediting evolution, for evolution no longer takes its part. Instead, evolution confirms the rule of the proletariat, and the old society isn't keen to have the rule of the proletariat confirmed. It wants to put over the idea that the present order, with capitalist republics, is the last word in human society.

In its desperate straits, the old system calls on religion, on the influence of the supernatural for aid.

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be.

The devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

Only, "the devil" in the doggerel (though unrepentant) presumably feared a taste of his own brimstone, a dip in his own fiery lake. The bourgeois society (which will not get well) fears—the proletariat.

It would be glad enough to put the fear of the wrath of God, or of earthquakes—or something—into the hearts of the wage-workers.

For instance, if the Italian workingmen, who are giving their masters so much trouble, could be made to feel that the recent quakes in their distracted peninsula were "acts of God", visitations of divine vengeance on them for their rebellion, they could be kept in subjection much more easily.

So the tocsin has sounded. The supernatural, once scoffed at by leaders of the bourgeoisie, is now treated with respect, enlisted as an ally. Spiritualism is boosted (the article by Basil King illustrates this). Even the humble ouija board has its place.

Mighty efforts are put forth to revivify the churches. Priestcraft is a whip over the people. Pulpits are making an ideal platform for reactionary propaganda. Even communion Sundays are marked by diatribes against radicals.

Right in line are such attempts as the interchurch movement (now defunct); the big centenary fund of the Methodist church, with the large quota of conversions assigned even to small rural churches; the Baptist drive for the million dollar fund, and for the million tithing signatures.

In harmony with other efforts to increase the drawing power of the church is the increased reliance on ritual; the strange new tolerance, on the part of churches formerly Puritan, for the seductive appeal of forms, gowns, and musical selections of the kind formerly associated with the Catholic (or feudal) church. A glance at the Easter week programs of some of these churches is most illuminating.

The intentions of the church are loyal, it knows the voice of its master (capitalism), and can be depended on in every crisis. The best organized church of all, the Catholic church—which has survived feudalism, and adapts itself to capitalism as need requires—is exerting all its remaining strength. Nevertheless, the church, as a whole, is a broken reed. Its vitality is necessarily being sapped, for it is closely bound up with the life of the present order.

The interchurch movement has collapsed, leaving large numbers of churches so deeply in the hole, financially, that their work is in danger of being seriously crippled. In spite of the centenary fund, the Methodist church is falling behind, numerically.

The bourgeois themselves took power from the church in the early days. They clipped its wings, divested it of authority.

Yet, no matter how powerful, it could not stay the flood. Nor can dikes be set up by promoting occultism, and the fear of the supernatural, outside of the church.

The bourgeois society has outlived its usefulness, and is now trying to prolong its life beyond the allotted span. It is fighting for time, against evolution; and the individual, or the social order, that attempts to stem the irresistible tides of evolution, is predestined to failure. It is like trying to sweep back the mighty Atlantic with a broom.

FRANC CONNER.

Lenin's Letter to the Austrian Communists

*From "Die Rote Fahne," Vienna, August 31, 1920
Translated by John Schachinger*

The Austrian Communist Party has decided to boycott the elections to the bourgeois-democratic parliament. The recent Second Congress of the Communist International came to the conclusion that participation of Communists in the election to the bourgeois-parliament is the correct tactic.

According to the communication of the delegates of the Austrian Communist Party, I have no doubt that the decision of the Communist International stands above the decision of one of their affiliated bodies. There is no doubt whatever that the Austrian Social Democrats, these traitors to socialism, who sided with the bourgeoisie, will rejoice on this occasion over the decision of the Communist International, which is contrary to that of the Austrian Communist Party. But this malicious joy of such gentlemen as the Austrian Social Democrats and their like minded Schiedmanns, Noskes, Albert Thomases and Gompers, will not be minded by the class conscious workers.

The servility of Mr. Renner is sufficiently revealed and the indignation of the workers of all lands against the heroes of the Second or yellow International is growing and spreading more and more.

The Austrian Social Democrats in the bourgeois parliament, as well as in all their other "working spheres" and their press, behave themselves as petty bourgeois democrats, capable only of moving to and fro without a principle, governed by their absolute dependence upon the capitalist class. We communists go into the parliament to use it as a tribune, to expose the thoroughly decayed capitalist system by which the workers are deceived.

An argument of the Austrian Communists against the participation in the bourgeois parliament deserves more attention. This argument is thus: "The parliament has for the communists only importance as a tribune of agitation, we in Austria have the Arbeiterrat (Workers' councils) as a tribune for agitation. Hence we renounce participation in the elections to bourgeois parliament. In Germany there is no Arbeit-

errata to amount to anything. Hence the German Communists follow a different tactic." I hold this argument is incorrect.

As long as we have not the power to disperse this bourgeois parliament we must work from within and without. As long as any considerable number of workers—not only proletarians but also semi-proletarians and peasants—have confidence in the bourgeois-democratic institution of deception we must expose this fraud from this very same tribune which the retarded working masses consider authoritative and lasting. As long as we Communists have not the might to take hold of the powers of the state and cannot carry out the election of working people alone—their councils against the bourgeoisie—as long as the bourgeoisie has the state powers in their hands and can draw to the elections all the different classes of people, we are obliged to participate in the elections for agitation among the proletarians, as long as the workers are deceived in the bourgeois parliament with phrases like "Democracy," as long as all kinds of corruption is covered, and the bribery of the particular "smart set," such as writers, jurists, deputies and so forth, is carried out in such a vast manner as in the bourgeois parliament, we Communists are obliged to remain in this institution—which expresses the will of the people so called and actually covers the fraud of the rich—and expose this fraud unmercifully. Expose each case as we did Renner and Co. when they sided with the capitalist against the workers.

The relations between the bourgeois parties and factions expose themselves more often in the parlia-

ment, which reflects the classes in the bourgeois society. Hence it is the task of the Communists within the parliament to educate the people, to tell them the truth in regard to classes and parties, landowner and peasant, rich farmer and tenant farmer, trust-capitalists and employes and so forth. All this is necessary for the proletariat to know so that it can learn to understand the low down and refined tricks of the bourgeoisie, so that it learns to influence petty bourgeois masses and non-proletarians. Without this "knowledge" the proletarians cannot successfully accomplish the task of proletarian dictatorship. Even then, in its new position, in a different form, in a different sphere, will the overthrown class continue policies of stupefying the farmers, bribing and intimidating their employes, to hide their egoistic and dirty effort by their phrases of democracy.

No, the Austrian Communists will not be intimidated by the malicious joy of the Renners and their ilk. The Austrian Communists will not fear to stand open and earnest by the Communist International and will prove that they acknowledge its discipline. We are proud that we are to decide the big questions of the struggle of the workers for their liberation, by submitting to the discipline of the revolutionary proletariat, making allowances for misunderstanding of the workers of the different countries. With their knowledge and will, and action (not only with words like Renner, F. Adler, O. Bauer) will the unity of the class struggle of the workers for Communism in the world be realized.

The Return to Normal

The dominant question in proletarian circles this month is the slowing-up of industry. Each day brings news of increased unemployment and wage reductions. Indications point to a return to pre-war conditions, with a standing army of unemployed, soup kitchens, crime waves, and keen competition for jobs. The leading financial journals complacently inform us that there is nothing alarming in the present situation, that it is "merely a return to normal times."

It is hardly to be expected that the "prosperity" that came with the war would continue indefinitely. In 1914 the country was on the verge of an industrial panic which was relieved when the demand for war materials of all sorts furnished an outlet for the products of American industry. In the two years following the signing of the armistice, production has continued apace in America, Japan and also in these industrial countries not directly involved in the conflict. The tremendous non-productive consumption has ceased and the man-power previously engaged in the theatre of war has been recruited into the industrial army.

According to Raymond Radelyffe, an English economist, with the exception of a few basic commodities such as coal and iron, the world market is actually glutted. Farrow's Bank Magazine (England) reports that Japan has no market for her silk and as a result a serious panic is impending. Several large Japanese banks interested in the silk industry have failed. This in turn negatively affects the international network of

capitalism. The unemployment situation in England is, if anything, more serious than ever. Similar reports come from other capitalist countries.

From the "Times Annalist" we learn that the automobile industries are working at barely fifty-nine per cent of their normal capacity, and many thousands of men have been laid off. It is reported that the number of unemployed in Detroit alone is approximately 100,000, with similar conditions in other automobile centers. The inter-dependence of modern industry is such that this lay-off has automatically affected allied industries, and so further glutted the labor market. This glutting of the labor market will, of course, result in keener competition for jobs with its inevitable reduction in the price of the commodity labor-power.

* * * *

"While more noise is being made now about falling commodity prices, the recent developments . . . represent merely a continuation of a liquidation process which began some months ago. The further this liquidation progresses the nearer we are to the end of it; yet it cannot be said that the end is definitely in sight" says the Magazine of Wall Street.

This "liquidation process" was inaugurated some months ago by the Federal Reserve Board when it adopted a policy of shutting down on the extension of credits. In consequence, many enterprises, dependent on credit, have been compelled to reduce their working force, and, in some cases, to suspend operation en-

tirely. Those industries, struggling to maintain themselves in the face of unfavorable credit conditions, have been forced to unload their stocks at reduced prices in order to realize ready cash. The general fall in prices which resulted means a considerable reduction in profits which in turn acts as a deterrent in industry and still further augments the unemployment crisis.

Quite naturally, the action of the Federal Reserve Board is resented by the manufacturing interests. The leading manufacturers journals are complaining bitterly, and assert that there is grave danger of a "banker's panic" similar to that of 1907.

"It is probable," says the Magazine of Wall Street,

"that the heaviest of the business liquidation is now past. There will be some further cleaning up to be done this year, with a further decline of commodity prices and a probable increase of failures over the turn of the year, but the Spring should bring a turn toward more active business conditions."

This is hardly to be considered cheerful news for the workers, for while it is likely that the winter will see a considerable reduction in certain commodities, there will also be a marked reduction in wages, and considerable unemployment. Under capitalism, when it rains soup, the workers are furnished with a fork.

A. J. M.

Lenin vs. Kautsky

By ERN REEN

State and Revolution—*Lenin*.
Collapse of the Second International—*Lenin*.
The Dictatorship of the Proletariat—*Kautsky*.
The Proletarian Revolution—*Lenin*.
Terrorism and Communism—*Kautsky*.

Karl Kautsky has for many years been considered the world's leading authority on Marxian socialism, and occupied a prominent place in the Second International. His influence was great; the stand he took on important questions has been reflected throughout the world by the workers' organizations that follow his leadership. To Kautsky's influence Lenin accredits the "collapse of the Second International" and the anti-socialist position taken by many socialist organizations in Germany and elsewhere since the beginning of the World War.

Hence it is only natural that on Kautsky's attitude toward the world crisis Lenin concentrates his attention, and against Kautsky he directs the most bitter attacks of his analytical mind.

The controversy between Lenin and Kautsky did not originate with the November Revolution, when the Bolsheviks took over State control in Russia. "Kautsky is not an accident," says Lenin, "but a social product of the contradictions inherent in the Second International." The controversy had to begin as soon as these contradictions began to manifest themselves. This was before the split of the Russian Social-Democratic Party into two factions, Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Although in the discussions that took place at that time Kautsky occasionally expressed views opposite to those of Plechanoff and other Menshevik leaders, in general he always leaned to their side, and accepted their position with the outbreak of the war. The Menshevik position was that of reformism and opportunism. The greatest mistake of the Mensheviks, Lenin finds, was in their inability to understand the nature and function of the State. To the analysis of the State he devotes the book written before the Russian Revolution, "The State and Revolution."

A thorough Marxian, Lenin in his writings quotes profusely from Marx and Engels, showing how their theories have been distorted by the opportunists. In his "State and Revolution" he sets forth the Marxian concept of the State, which we will summarize briefly:

The State is an instrument of oppression of one class by another. It first appeared when society split into classes—when there was needed a power standing apparently above society, which would be able to control the conflicting interests of the different groups. This power finally took the shape of the State. The State, then, is an expression of irreconcilability of class contradictions. As it arose from the necessity of holding in check the opposition of the classes, and at the same time from the very collisions between the classes, it naturally became the State of the most powerful, the economically dominant class. With the aid of the State the economically dominant class established itself as the politically dominant class.

Thus the State has not existed forever. At a certain stage of economic development the division of society into classes was inevitable, and this division gave birth to the State. Human society is rapidly approaching a stage in its development in which class divisions will be wiped out, and with the passing

of classes there will be no further need for the State and it too will disappear. During the process of passing away, the State must undergo several changes; the bourgeois State must be transformed into a proletarian State, and the proletarian State gradually dies out. Engels' words about the dying out of the State, Lenin emphasizes, relate to the last stage, the proletarian State. The bourgeois State cannot die out; it must be destroyed.

There seems to be considerable misunderstanding on the part of many comrades as to the meaning of the term "destruction" in connection with the "bourgeois State." Many believe that the theory of the destruction of the State is anti-Marxian and anarchistic. But, as Lenin points out, this term was used repeatedly by both Marx and Engels (especially in the "Civil War in France"). Superfluous as it may seem, we must explain that "destruction of the bourgeois State" does not mean the dynamiting of government buildings, the assassinating of officials. It means "destruction of the *bourgeois character*" of the State. Marx and Engels use the same expression in relation to private property when they say that "the development of industry has destroyed petty artisans' property" and that "the theory of the Communists may be summed up in a sentence: abolition of private property." "We have abolished private property on land," says Lenin ("Proletarian Revolution," p. 100). No one would understand Marx and Lenin as advising the destruction of material things such as houses, cars, roads, etc. Only those think so, who use the term "property" in a vulgar sense. "Property" is a social relation. So land is land and not property. It becomes property only when some one takes possession of it. Property is distinguished by ownership, and ownership means that between the members of society there has been established a relation by which individuals or groups of individuals can have the sole possession of some things. This social relation can be destroyed, for instance, all rights to ownership can be abolished; then land ceases to be property. This is what Lenin means when he says "We have abolished private property."

The State is also a social relation. The strength of the prisons, the force of the armed bodies of men, the power of the courts, these are the expressions of the State, but do not in themselves constitute a State. A State is distinguished by the use of all these forces by one class in society for the suppression of other classes. If it is a feudal class which is dominant, the State is a feudal State. It may also become a bourgeois State or a proletarian State. The social relation which characterizes a certain form of a State can be destroyed, as for instance the relation between the classes in society, which makes the bourgeois class the ruling one. Lenin calls this the "destruction of the bourgeois State," and explains clearly when he says:

"The Commune (Paris) would seem to have replaced the broken machinery of the State 'only' by a fuller democracy: the abolition of the standing army and the transformation of all officials into elective, revocable agents of the State. But as a matter of fact this 'only' represents a gigantic replacement of one type of institutions by others of a fundamentally different order...." This was necessary because "the particular power of suppression of the proletariat by the capitalist class,

of the millions of workers by a handful of rich, must be replaced by a particular power of suppression of the capitalist class by the proletariat. It is just this that constitutes the destruction of the (bourgeois) State as such." ("State and Revolution," pp. 42, 22).

Quoting Marx, Lenin emphasizes the lesson Marx took from the French revolution. "All changes perfected this (State) machinery instead of breaking it..." and "the Commune proved that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." "It must break it, destroy it" explains Lenin.

The place of the destroyed bourgeois State is taken by a proletarian State. The State becomes then "the proletariat organized into a ruling class." Another name for it is "the dictatorship of the proletariat." The proletarian State, the same as other forms of the State, is an organ of suppression, but this time of the exploiting class. Enforcing its dominance, the proletariat will establish its proletarian democracy, which is a higher type of democracy than that of the bourgeois. When the bourgeois class is entirely abolished, the classes in society disappear and democracy (democratic State), having no further function to perform, dies out.

These are the principles of Marxism upon which Lenin built his theory of the proletarian revolution. It is the betrayal of these principles that made Kautsky and others of his kind "funkeys of the bourgeoisie." The distortion of Marxist principles by the Mensheviks was criticized by Lenin many years ago. "The germs of misunderstanding (of the teachings of Marx) were apparent in his pamphlet on 'Socialism and Anarchism,'" Lenin says of Plechanoff. The same is true in regard to Kautsky. Plechanoff and Kautsky both explain the difference between Anarchism and Socialism in that "Anarchists do not recognize the State, and Socialists do." According to Engels and Marx, on the other hand, all Socialists recognize that the State must disappear, but the anarchists think they can step over directly from the bourgeois State into a socialistic commonwealth, while socialists know that between capitalism and communism there is a transition period, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Also, the question of the revolution was misunderstood by Kautsky. But the Second International preferred not to discuss this question at all, to kill it by silence. Kautsky ended in a complete betrayal of socialist principles for, as Lenin explains, the "collapse of the Second International means not the interruption of the Socialist parties of the warring nations... but the scandalous betrayal by a majority of the official Social-Democratic Parties of their convictions.... Only those fail to see this reason, who do not wish to see it."

How does Kautsky justify his betrayal? To be sure, he does not attempt to apologize, for his actions harmonize with his convictions. He explains that his position with regard to war was correct because (1) the war has been waged in the interest of the people; (2) that for Germany it was a defensive war; (3) that this war was not purely imperialistic but also a national war; and (4) that the organization of the Social-Democratic Party had to be preserved (even at the price of its principles to the Junkers).

To prove the first point, Kautsky quotes Marx's references to the wars of 1854, 1871, 1876-7 and 1889 and tries to convince the workers that this war was also a war for the liberation of the small nations. What small nations were defended by the Kaiser, Kautsky does not tell. Surely it was not Serbia, whose "struggle against Austria represented the only national element in the present war," as Lenin points out. The question of "defense" has been much discussed. While the democracies of the Entente Alliance defended themselves against Prussian militarism, the Central Monarchies were saving civilization from Russian Tzarism. Kautsky forgets that Russian Tzarism had changed much since the time when Marx preached a holy war against the Eastern bulwark of reaction. The true leaders of the German workers, Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and F. Mehring explain in the "Junius Pamphlet" (p. 71) "The Russian Tzarism is no longer the product of Russian conditions; its roots lie in the capitalist conditions of Western Europe and the relationship is shifting from decade to decade." Lenin emphasizes this: "The Basle Resolution (passed in 1912 and signed by Kautsky) does not speak of a revolutionary war. It deals with such wars as the present one, waged by both groups of the warring powers in the interests of the capitalist imperialism and dynasties."

With bitter sarcasm Lenin mentions Kautsky's plea for the preservation of the organization. "If the tactics of the Russian and Serbian socialists deserve recognition, then it is not only unlawful but even criminal to justify the opposite tactics of powerful parties: such as the German, the French and

others. By means of an expression such as 'practical consequences,' which is purposely wanting in clearness, Kautsky has veiled the simple truth that the big parties took fright at the prospect of having their organizations dissolved and their leaders arrested by the Government.... Each time the political situation becomes strained, the government of the freest bourgeois country will not fail to threaten the dissolution of legal organizations, seizure of funds, arrest of leaders and other 'practical consequences' of the kind. Should we acquit the opportunists on that account as Kautsky does?" Lenin tells what should have been done: "The legal organizations had to be supplanted by illegal without the surrender of a single legal position." War cannot be justified from a working class point of view in spite of the efforts of Kautsky and Plechanoff.

Supporting the war, Kautsky necessarily had to disapprove of revolution and to refuse to notice the presence of a revolutionary situation in Europe in 1914. Lenin enumerates the symptoms of that situation:

(1) The ruling class found it impossible to retain its domination intact... and the masses understood that it became impossible for those at the top to continue their old policy; (2) want and suffering were experienced by the oppressed classes in a more intense degree than ordinarily; (3) the causes indicated compelled increased activity among the masses.

But a revolutionary situation does not necessarily bring a revolution. In addition certain "subjective" factors are needed. "Even in times of crises governments do not tumble down of their own accord, but require a force to overthrow them." This force could be supplied only by the organized proletariat, and the leaders, instead of pointing the way to the masses "lulled them to sleep by jingoism."

The theory of "Ultra Imperialism" developed by Kautsky is an example brought by Lenin as to what jingoism might lead to. "The wars," says Kautsky, "may bring about a strengthening of the weak germs of ultra-imperialism.... If things come to such a pitch, if agreement between nations and disarmament becomes a fact, together with a lasting peace, then the worst of the causes which before the war were tending more to bring about the moral downfall of capitalism may disappear. (Quoted by Lenin in "Collapse of the Second International" p. 27). There is hope for capitalism to perpetuate its existence, Kautsky discovers, and afraid to miss the great possibility, he is proving to the capitalists that it does not pay to fight and shed blood for the possession of Egypt and other colonies, for "the aspirations of capital can be best attained, not by coercive methods of imperialism, but by those of peaceful democracy." To which Lenin replies: "Does not this amount to a vulgar appeal to the financiers to renounce imperialism?"

.... In his pamphlet 'The Road to Power' Kautsky recognized that under capitalism contradictions were becoming more acute and a new revolutionary period was drawing nigh.... Now when the war came and these contradictions became more acute, Kautsky, instead of inciting the working class to rebel against slavery, consoles it by quoting whole rows and columns of figures to prove the possibility of capitalism without colonies and pillage, without wars and armaments.... Kautsky has prostituted Marxism in an unheard-of manner...."

On Kautsky and his "handful" Lenin puts the blame for the failure of the workers to take the necessary action to prevent and later to stop the war. The strength of the masses lay in their organization and the betrayal of the "political center left the masses without an organization, without a single will, that made their struggle with a powerful terrorist military organization of the centralized states a slow and a difficult process."

A seemingly very strange thing occurs in Kautsky's arguments: He attempts to justify his own position in supporting the war by citing the attitude taken by the socialist-chauvinists of the other warring countries. Pointing to the fact that his action was similar to that of such "great" authorities as Plechanoff, Guesde, Vaillard and other shining lights of the Second International—and hence cannot be wrong—he triumphantly declares "I am not going to defend myself, but... Vaillant and Guesde, Hyndman and Plechanoff!" Martoff, a Russian counterpart of Kautsky returns the compliment by pointing out that his support of the war is correct because patterned after that of the "great" authority, Kautsky. "How can this be opportunism," he asks, "when Guesde, Kautsky, Plechanoff".... have done likewise! "These authorities," says Lenin, "find it very convenient to quote each other and to cover up each other's 'sins' in friendly fashion on the principle of one dirty hand washing the other."

Evidently the "right" of Plechanoff and Guesde to defend

"their" country means that Kautsky's country is the aggressive one, what deprives Kautsky of all excuses for his position. The "right" of Kautsky to defend "his" country ought to undermine the foundation under the feet of Plechanoff and Guesde. Still they all point at the "authority" of the "enemies" of "their" country.

One might say, that the arguments were only about the "right and duty of true internationalists to defend their country" and not about whose country is right and whose wrong. That would be a narrow explanation. The apparent absurdity of these arguments is of an important significance. Here was clearly marked the division line between two sides in the coming struggle of a new, unprecedented kind. A new phenomenon forced into the background the controversy about the war. The Russian Revolution and the creation of a proletarian state united against it the opportunist elements. The social jingoes had to forget their nationalities and to combine their forces for the defense of the international capitalism. Then in the panic of reconciliation they had to make use of the "right and duty of internationalists to defend their country" for the mutual justification of their positions.

It is characteristic, that in his pamphlet "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat" Kautsky neglects all the charges made against him by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Lenin. It may be that he found it inconvenient to mention Lenin's arguments or he may have learned from his military friends that the best method of defense is an offensive, and without looking behind he rushes into a bitter attack against Soviet Russia and the Bolshevik tactics. "The present Russian revolution is the clashing of two distinct methods, that of democracy and that of dictatorship," he declares. "The socialist party which governs Russia today gained power in fighting other socialist parties." Here Lenin points out that by calling the non-Bolsheviks in Russia, the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries, "socialists," Kautsky has been guided by their names and not by their actions in the revolution.

But fortunately dictatorship does not yet reign in "our" (Kautsky's) party, the opposition is not yet being "forcibly suppressed" and Kautsky still is able to "thoroughly test the arguments of both sides" and to express his opinion "freely." To that he proceeds: "Socialism as a means of emancipation of the proletariat without democracy is unthinkable * * * But democracy is quite possible without socialism * * * A pure democracy is even conceivable apart from socialism * * *" Of course, he admits, pure democracy might be impossible for the time being, but at least some democracy is necessary. Without it the emancipation of the proletariat remains a Utopia.

Democracy finds one of its expressions in universal suffrage, which must be non-discriminatory, i. e. that people do not vote in separate sections. "Democracy," Kautsky repeats, "signifies the rule of the majority, but not less the protection of minorities." As democracy guarantees freedom of expression (the kind people enjoy in all democratic countries, America for instance) it assists in the development of the proletariat, which under the protection of democracy attains maturity and introduces socialism.

"On these grounds, I anticipate that the Social Revolution of the proletariat will assume quite other forms than that of a middle class revolution and that it will be possible to carry it out by peaceful, economic, legal and moral means, instead of by physical force, in all places where democracy has been established." (Dictatorship of the proletariat, pg. 37.)

So convincingly does Kautsky speak about democracy that one almost forgets that all these interesting arguments have been discussed and answered by Lenin in "The State and Revolution" before Kautsky wrote his "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." But Kautsky takes no trouble to reply to Lenin. The arguments put up by Lenin and later emphasized by him in "The Proletarian Revolution" deserves some consideration at least, especially as Kautsky does not tell us what his democracy is.

(To be continued in next issue.)

The Great Steel Strike

By William Z. Foster

Huebsch, Inc., New York, \$1.00

Foster in his new book, "The Great Steel Strike," has given us an excellent picture of that struggle. With an easy style seldom found in books by "labor men," he has graphically portrayed the contest from start to finish. In an impersonal manner he has related the facts. We can draw our own conclusions.

Facts showing the repressive function of the state are ably set forth and prove conclusively that the government of the United States is no different than that of any other country when it comes to protecting the interests of the capitalist class. The Steel Strike, the same as others that have preceded it, again demonstrates the necessity of the workers gaining control of state powers. Foster, with his syndicalist leanings, neglects to draw this conclusion.

Frankly, Foster admits the defeat of the workers in the combat and courageously urges the preparations for another fight. Undoubtedly he is correct. The Steel Industry must be organized. In the work of re-organization of the forces disrupted by the struggle the workers must be guided by the experiences of the past. The short-comings of the organizations which conducted the strike are revealed and the defeat stands as an indictment of the A. F. of L., its form, and its methods.

The traitorous conduct of the heads of certain international unions is worthy of notice. The executive officers of the International Union of Steam and Operating Engineers were guilty of trying to stab the movement in the back. "Just as the strike was about to begin President Snellings and Secretary Comerford sharply condemned it by letter and through the press, urging their men to stay at work upon the flimsy pretext that the President's industrial conference would attend to their interests." Also "right in the face of this general movement (of organization) the Amalgamated Association made a bid for separate consideration by the steel companies." Under instruction of a convention, President Tighe of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers wrote to Judge Gary endeavoring to secure a separate settlement for the Association, appealing to Gary's patriotism, etc. Gary politely rejected his offer although pleased to receive it. Naturally he was pleased to receive notice of such weakness within the ranks of the workers.

The difficulty of co-ordinating the many units involved in the struggle is clearly manifested. The clumsy craft organization could not be wielded efficiently and defeat was the result. The most noticeable thing of the whole matter was the lack of class consciousness of the organizations participating. Built up on a capitalist ideology, with bargaining for wages as their sole and only aim, they could not marshal sufficient strength to win such a titanic struggle.

The remedies that Foster suggests are another matter, and one cannot so easily indorse them. Whether it is good policy for the radicals to get into the A. F. of L unions is a debatable question. One thing, however, is certain; the workers must be educated to a better understanding of their class position. That must be done before there can be any hope of ridding the International Unions of their reactionary and treacherous elements.

(This Book can be obtained from this office)

A FABLE.

"Twenty Cents," said a Worker who called himself Class Conscious, "is a Lot of Money for a Mere Magazine." And he went to the Movies. And he paid Four Bits for a seat—without a Murmur. And all he brought away with him was a Headache.

(Apologies to Plebs.)

International Notes

By John Keracher

Italy The Italian strikes have practically come to an end, and the workers through their "Confederation of Labor" have relinquished to the capitalists the industries which they had seized. I said in last month's issue that the Italian workers were putting the wagon before the horse in "taking the industries first." Still there was a possibility of permanently holding them if they got control of the state power. A split in the ranks of the Socialist party of Italy is one of the results of the conflict. In their conference at Milan the Socialists have adopted the program of the Third International which carries with it the expulsion from their ranks of the moderate leaders. Those deputies who were responsible for the policy of compromise have been expelled; Serrati, the editor of "Avanti," having disagreed with the decision, resigned.

The capitalists, due to pressure by the premier, Giolitti, accepted a settlement on the basis of co-operative control; the workers and employers are to manage jointly the industries, at least such is the theory of the "settlement."

Giolitti thinks the problem is solved. He says, "Now, I rejoice to say, work is generally being resumed, factories have been evacuated and the men are co-operating with the owners and the technical staffs to set things going once more. We thus have succeeded in satisfactorily settling one of the worst economic conflicts in industrial history without grave losses and have initiated, which is more important, better feelings between employers and men. In addition, we may congratulate ourselves on having solved this problem in accordance with the spirit of the age, and I firmly believe the present arrangement to offer a greater justice to Italian workers probably has postponed the advent of Socialism in Italy for a century and certainly for 50 years."

The significance of the above statement is the admission of the inevitability of socialism. It is, as he says, but a postponement, but his fifty years estimate may turn out to be less than fifty weeks. One thing is certain, and that is that two classes whose economic interests are in contradiction to each other cannot "co-operate" very long. The financial situation of the country is in a very bad way; their financial state, as in most of the European countries at present, is giving much trouble. During the first half of 1920 their imports were much in excess of their exports. No doubt this adverse balance of trade has increased during the past few months. However, every class conflict has its lessons, and the chief one for the Italian workers and those who have observed the conflict is that the proletariat is powerless so long as the state is in the hands of the master class.

Poland The armistice between Soviet Russia and Poland, to all appearances, opens the way to peace. That the Russian Government is giving the Polish Imperialists more concessions than they deserve is undeniable, and further it must be admitted that it is under duress that these concessions are made.

Russia needs peace more than does any other

country, yet the Poles, despite recent advancements on the military field, have not forgotten the close call made upon their capital by the Red Army. The Poles are therefore quite as anxious as the Russians to avoid the hardships of a winter campaign.

The terms of settlement give the Poles 80,000,000 rubles and a liberal amount of territory. Their attitude towards Lithuania is aggressive, to say the least. The proposed corridor between that country and Russia will work out, in the long run, to the disadvantage of the Poles as it will keep alive a hostile feeling between themselves and the Lithuanians, just as the corridor through Germany to Danzig is already threatening to cause them trouble in that direction. It will be interesting to watch the attitude of the Polish working class towards the Capitalists who can no longer raise the cry of invasion.

Ireland The conflict which is now raging in Ireland seems further than ever from settlement, in fact it is taking on more and more the nature of guerilla civil warfare. The assassination of police officials and soldiers seems to be the favorite tactic of the Sinn Feiners. Reprisals on the part of the soldiers and the forces of "law and order" leads in turn to more assassinations. The whole affair is a complicated struggle of class interests. The Sinn Feiners, whose policies are held by the vast majority of the Irish people, are for entire separation, with the right to run Ireland, and it is their economic interests which the movement expresses.

The right of self-determination of peoples is an impossibility for the bourgeoisie who are divided into different national groups and in economic conflict with one another. That is why the British Government can find no solution for the trouble in Ireland. It would be worth quite a bit to the capitalist class of Great Britain if they could arrive at some permanent settlement with their bourgeois brothers on the other side of the Irish Sea.

But Separation—what would it mean to them? Lloyd George knows. He points out that it would mean two armed camps watching each other across the Irish Sea. If the "Republic of Ireland" decided upon conscription, as would most likely happen, Ireland would have an army of 500,000 against England's 100,000. Furthermore, a capitalist rival in the world market would spring up, probably backed by "Irish-American" capital. Preferential tariffs would be arranged between the United States, France, and other countries to the detriment of British capital. Other possibilities, such as the colonies deciding to become independent republics like Ireland would then be, and in fact are, the spectres which haunt British Imperialism and which makes it impossible for them to relinquish their hold on the Irish wild cat.

Twenty miles north of Dublin a small town named Balbriggan has recently been the scene of these outbursts. District-Inspector Burke was killed and his brother, Sergeant Burke, wounded by Sinn Feiners. Reprisals followed by auxiliary police recruits, several large mills belonging to Sinn Fein capitalists and about

30 homes were burned down. Two civilians were killed, and many wounded and taken to Dublin hospitals. This is but a typical instance of many such outbursts which have taken place, and show every indication of continuing. The Irish trouble could best be brought to an end by the whole working class of the British Isles gaining control of the State power and abolishing the economic conditions which otherwise make a real settlement impossible.

India The wide-spread unrest in the Indian Empire is rapidly connecting itself with the general unrest thru-out the Moslem world. The application to Mesopotamia of the Indian Office policy and the sending of Indian native regiments there to hold down another subject people is adding oil to the smoldering fire of revolt.

India is a land of great natural resources. A land, it is said, in which famine was unknown before British occupation. When Capitalism raised its head in that unhappy land, famines soon made their appearance. During the period of British military rule and Capitalist exploitation of the Indian People, millions have died from starvation and from disease which was brought about by undernourishment.

Here are a few figures compiled by the "Friends of Freedom for India" which show conclusively that the production of India is enormous. India's production, in round numbers, of rice is 36,000,000 tons; wheat, 10,000,000 tons; Rape and mustard, 1,000,000 tons; ground nut, 1,000,000 tons; sugar cane, 3,000,000 tons; cotton, 4,000,000 bales; jute, 9,000,000 bales; tea, 400,000,000 pounds, etc., etc. Her production of manganese is valued, in round numbers, at \$8,000,000; petroleum, \$6,000,000; gold, \$11,000,000; coal, \$23,000,000."

This vast quantity of product exploited from Indian labor is mostly exported in the interest of British Capitalists. The wages paid are probably the smallest in the world, furnishing a starvation existence to the workers who are engaged in this production. A railroad strike has been going on for some time in the Punjab district. The workers of Bombay by means of mass meetings have raised funds to aid them in their struggle.

The Punjab is the center of anti-British activities and a revolutionary movement which is rapidly becoming more than nationalistic in its character. The toiling masses have felt the weight of Capitalism and the industrial centers are naturally the most revolutionary. Ever since the Amritsar massacre the working people have been in a state of insurgency. About 18 months ago, at Amritsar, in the Punjab district of India, General Dyer, the military commander of the district, led his troops into a public square where a huge mass meeting of workers was being held without his consent. The openings to this square were at the corners. There he posted his men and ordered them to fire and kept them at it until their ammunition ran out. The result of firing upon that unarmed mass meeting was the death of 400 men, women and children. Thousands were injured, not only from the cowardly attack, but from the panic which ensued. This stupid act of intimidation has intensified the feelings of the masses a thousandfold. Strikes are in progress at present in every large city, and labor organizations which hardly existed before are now growing by leaps and bounds.

The conditions under which the Indian workers

labor, and the degree to which they are exploited is not well known in the western world. In a pamphlet published in England entitled "Labor in India," John Scurr, its author, makes some interesting statements and gives figures which throw light upon the causes of the Indian revolt. He says: "Despite their suffering, the one thing which impressed me during my visit to India was the awakening of the laboring classes. The echoes of 'labor unrest' in the west have been heard in the eastern bazaar, and organization is raising its head. The Indian workman has been vilely treated in the past. He has been overworked, underpaid, and badly housed, and for his docility and his pains he has been denounced as inefficient. The employers have cared nothing for his welfare; in fact, the attitude of the average employer of labor in India, whether European or Indian, is similar to that of the English employers in the eighteenth century. * * * The wealthy merchant careers along the streets of Bombay in his Daimler or Rolls Royce, whilst the goods he is dealing in are transported in the two-wheeled bullock cart, with the center of the load far above the axle, and never in equilibrium. Yet with all the inefficiency great fortunes are made where machino-facture has come in."

The author then cites a list of dividends paid in June, 1919, ranging from 40 per cent to 120 per cent on invested capital. The original shares in the concerns referred to run from 100 to 1,000 rupees and have gone up to prices varying from 251 to 9,500 rupees. The working week in the cotton mills is 72 hours. The sweepers get less than one cent an hour, and the average worker gets two cents per hour. The mass of the workers live in single room shacks, in many cases 15 to 20 people live together and sleep upon the floor.

The same writer says: "Small wonder that the Bombay workers revolted and in January, 1919, a spontaneous strike took place, although the men were organized. Of the 266 cotton mills in India, 86 are located in Bombay, and they employ 120,000 people. Soon over 100,000 were on strike. The usual thing happened. A conflict took place between the strikers and the police, in which several of the former were killed and wounded." Such is the general state of affairs in the cities, but, of India's enormous population, eighty per cent live upon the land. The struggle for existence, handicapped by foreign and home exploitation, is intense, to say the least.

A sequel to the Amritsar affair was the founding of the Hunter Commission of inquiry, and the dismissal of Dyer from the army. The British House of Commons passed a vote of disapproval of his conduct by 232 to 131, a comfortable way of trying to cover up their policy in India. The House of Lords, on the other hand, defended the actions of the general by a vote of 129 to 89. This weak white washing of the action of General Dyer, together with the sending of Indian troops into Mesopotamia, not to speak of the general sufferings of the exploited labor, is liable to kindle Indian unrest into open rebellion against British rule.

The Marxian Law of Value

To understand anything, and particularly economics, we must view things in their movement. We must realize that evolution takes place in society as well as elsewhere, and the reason the Marxian critics do not understand Marx is because they fail to view things thus.

For the defender of capitalism it becomes necessary to deny the validity of the law of value, for once admitting the correctness of the law, it would also be necessary to admit that capitalism is merely a passing phase in the march of civilization. The absurdity of maintaining that capitalism is a permanent institution cannot be better illustrated than in showing how some people maintain that view of slavery.

In the year 1859, one prior to the election of President Lincoln, a lawyer from the south, O'Connor, spoke in New York City as follows: "Now gentlemen," he said amid great applause, "nature itself has assigned this condition of servitude to the negro. He has the strength and is fit to work; but nature, which gave him the strength denied him both the intelligence to rule and the will to work. Both are denied him! And the same nature, which denies him the will to work, gave him a master, who should enforce this will, and make a useful servant of him in a climate to which he is well adapted, for his own benefit and that of the master who rules him. I assert that it is no injustice to leave the negro in the position into which nature placed him; to put a master over him; and he is not robbed of any right, if he is compelled to labor in return for this, and to supply a just compensation for his master in return for the labor and the talents devoted to ruling him and to make him useful to himself and to society."

The same ideas that were expressed in that speech dominate the critics of Marx. They cannot escape them. The wage laborer, like the slave, must have a master. Thus, having a master, it is not only fair, but quite proper, to compel the wage laborer to produce his own wages, and also the wages of superintendence, a compensation for the labor of ruling and superintending him, "a just compensation for his master in return for the labor and talents devoted to ruling him and to making him useful to himself and to society." To hold on to these views, and to seek for the permanency of capitalism, they must invent some way of showing that profits do not come from surplus values created by the laborers, because, forsooth, if the idea should ever dawn upon the laborers how this is accomplished, capitalism would not last much longer.

Let us now proceed to an analysis of the law of value. Our friend, the capitalist, in order to do any business at all, must furnish the tools, machinery, building, materials, etc., for the laborers to work with. Assuming that he has a total capital of 100 cash, we will assume that he uses 80 of it with which to purchase the tools, machinery, materials, etc. After he has accomplished this feat, exchanged his 80 cash for 80 worth of materials, tools, machinery, etc., he has not yet made any profit; he has not yet made any

progress in the production of surplus values. Instead of his 80 cash, he has 80 in materials, tools, etc. He is no poorer or richer than he was before. All he has done is to exchange his 80 cash for 80 in materials, tools, etc. He is quick to perceive that something else remains to be done before he is enabled to get any profits out of his enterprise. So he takes his other 20 and invests it in purchasing labor power. In other words, he takes 20 of his capital with which to pay wages to the laborers whom he has hired. What has occurred now? He has set his laborers to work his machinery and turn his material into commodities which he can sell. As soon as the laborers have finished their work, the wealth of our young capitalist has increased, that is, he now has more wealth than he had before the process of manufacture began. The laborers he has hired to work have produced wealth in excess of what they received as wages. If the laborers have produced twice as much wealth as they received as wages, they have produced a total wealth of 40, 20 of which the laborers received as wages, and 20 which Mr. Capitalist pockets for his troubles. To make it a little more simple, we will now use the Marxian formula. That portion of wealth which the capitalist invested in machinery, tools, materials, etc., Marx designates as the "constant" portion, and that invested in purchasing labor power he designates as the "variable" portion. We then have the following:

$$80C+20V=100.$$

After the laborers have performed their function in this transaction we then have

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

A total wealth of 120.

This was very simple. Where before the process of laboring, our budding capitalist had a total wealth of 100, after the process of working, he finds himself in possession of total wealth of 120. Now you don't have to be very bright, or be blessed with an overabundance of intelligence to discover where that additional 20 of wealth came from. It came from that portion of the wealth invested by the capitalist in the variable portion and not until Mr. Boehm-Bawerk, or Mr. Mallock, or Mr. Masyrick, or Mr. Skelton show us that the additional wealth of 20 came from the constant portion of his total invested capital, will we discard the Marxian law of value. If we desire to stick to the facts in the case, we are necessarily driven to the conclusion that the surplus came from one portion alone, and not from the other. The peculiar feature about all criticism of the law of value is that the critics do not criticise this formula of Marx; they have no objection to offer to it at all, but somehow or other, they do not know exactly how, the profits arise from something entirely different, and again in our desire to learn where these profits do come from, the writings of these various men fail to give us anything definite.

To be sure of our ground we will look at this again. The 80 cash exchanged for machinery, tools, materials, etc. has produced no additional wealth. He has merely exchanged 80 cash for 80 of tools, machin-

ery, materials, etc. But the moment he invests the 20 in purchasing laboring power additional wealth is produced. After the process of laboring is finished we have:

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

Exploitation 100%; profit on total investment 20%.

From the above you can draw many conclusions by making a further analysis. If the capitalist should be able to exploit the laborers only 50% instead of 100% we would then have

$$80C+20V+10S=110.$$

Exploitation 50%; profit on total investment 10%. On the other hand if the exploitation should be 200% we would then have

$$80C+20V+40S=140.$$

Exploitation 200%; profit on total investment 40%.

This analysis explains the cry of the capitalist for efficiency and greater production, because the greater the production, the greater the surplus, and the greater the surplus the greater the profit. It does not necessarily mean that the greater the surplus and the greater the profit, the more for the worker; in fact, it usually means the reverse. It must be understood, however, that the greater the exploitation, the more capital will be needed for the constant portion, because the greater the production the more material will be consumed, but this will represent only a small portion of the whole invested in constant.

Going a little further into this, we run across another peculiarity, which becomes apparent at once, and that is that the greater the proportion of variable to constant, the greater the surplus. For instance, if a manufacturer exploits his laborers 100% we have

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

but if he is able without investing any more in constant, but increases his variable to twice the former amount, then we have

$$80C+40V+40S=160.$$

Exploitation 100%; profit on total investment of 120 33⅓%.

Here we notice that if Mr. Capitalist has two shifts instead of one, without increasing his exploitation, Mr. Capitalist has been enabled to increase his profits, and after he has discovered this, there is of course nothing to prevent him from putting on three shifts, increasing the amount of the variable again, and reaping some more profits. The fact that it is demoralizing to work at all hours of the night, does not deter him at all, in fact, in the course of time, to meet the growing competition he is forced by the

very process to do this, as Marx predicted he would do. Our capitalistic friend is forced to do this by the very nature of the ugly thing, and though he would like to do otherwise, he cannot help himself.

Drifting into the analysis a little further, another peculiarity comes to the surface. To illustrate, we will again use the Marxian formula, because it is so simple, and yet so confounding to the critics.

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

Exploitation 100%; profit on total investment of 100 20%, but supposing our friend, the capitalist, goes into some other line of business where the composition of his capital would be different, say

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

the exploitation would still be 100%, but the profits would be 40%.

An increase of 100% in the profits, without an increase in the exploitation. From this it would appear that the capitalist who invests in a venture where the proportion of the variable to the constant is high, pockets more profits than the capitalist who has invested in an enterprise where the reverse obtains. If the Marxian law of value is correct, then this must be true. But the thing is a bit more complicated than that. There is such a thing in capitalist society known as the average rate of profit, and in actual affairs of business it really makes no difference in what enterprise Mr. Capitalist sticks his money, the returns are practically the same. Let us assume that the total of the constant passes into the finished product. Then in the first instance we would have

$$80C+20V+20S=120 \text{ total value.}$$

in the second instance we would have

$$60C+40V+40S=140 \text{ total value.}$$

In the first instance the total value would be 120, in the second 140. If the commodities exchange at their value, it would seem that there could not be an equal rate of profit; and if there really is an equal rate of profit, then commodities cannot exchange at their value. This is quite plain.

Here is the point where the Marx critics wax jubilant. But when we apply the analysis a little further, their jubilation is short lived. There is an equal rate of profit, and commodities do exchange at their value, and the analysis will also show how the equal rate of profit is brought about, something which the critics could not do, and have not been able to explain as yet. The apparent contradiction is solved not in contradiction of the law of value, but by virtue and because of it. In the next installment we shall delve into this mystery.

A Retrospect

By Frederick Engels

(Continued from the January-February Proletarian)

Universal suffrage had long existed in France, but had come into disrepute through the misuse the Napoleonic government had made of it. After the Commune there was no labor party in existence to make use of it. In Spain, too, it had existed since the republic, but in Spain it was always the custom of all the real opposition parties to refrain from voting. And in Switzerland, too, the experiences with

universal suffrage were anything but encouraging for the labor party. The revolutionary workingman of the Romance countries had become accustomed to look upon the ballot as a snare, as an instrument of oppression manipulated by the government. In Germany it was different. The Communist Manifesto had already proclaimed the winning of universal suffrage, of democracy, as one of the first and most important tasks of the militant proletariat, and Lassalle had taken up

this point again. And when Bismark saw that he was forced to introduce the franchise as the only means of getting the masses interested in his plans, our workman at once took the matter seriously and sent August Bebel into the first constitutional convention. And from that day on they have used the ballot in a manner that has repaid them a thousand fold, and has served as an example to the workmen of all countries. They have transformed the ballot, in the words of the program of the French Marxians, "de moyen de duperie, qu'il a ete jusqu'ici, en instrument d'emanipation"; from a menace of jugglery, which it has been heretofore, into an instrument of emancipation. And if universal suffrage had offered no other advantage than to allow us to count ourselves every three years; and by regularly certified and unexpectedly rapid increase in votes to raise in equal degree the confidence of the workers and the terror of their opponents, and thus to become our best means of propaganda; and to inform us exactly as to our strength and as to that of all opposing parties, and thereby give us a standard of proportioning our activity such as could not be equalled; and to save us both from untimely hesitation and from untimely rashness; if that were the only benefit which we derive from the franchise, even then it would be enough and more than enough. But it has done far more. It gave us in election campaigns an unequalled opportunity to come in contact with the masses where they still stood aloof from us, and to force all parties to defend their views and actions before all the people against our attacks; and it also opened to our representatives in parliament, a forum from which they could talk to their opponents in parliament as well as to the masses outside with an entirely different tone of authority and freedom from what they could use in the press and in meetings. What good did the anti-Socialist laws do the government and the bourgeoisie so long as the election campaigns and the Socialist speeches in parliament were continually nullifying it?

Moreover, with this successful use of the ballot, a wholly new method of proletarian warfare had gone into effect, which was rapidly extended. It was found that the political institutions, by means of which the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is organized, afford further handholds by which the working class can attack these very institutions. The party took part in the elections for state legislatures, aldermen and industrial courts and contested against the bourgeoisie for every office in the filling of which a sufficient number of the proletariat had anything to say. And thus it happened that the bourgeoisie and the government came to a pass where they feared the lawful activity of the labor party far more than its unlawful activity; it dreaded the results of an election more than those of a rebellion. For here, too, the conditions of the struggle had materially changed. The old style rebellion, the street fight with barricades, which down to 1848 gave the final decision everywhere, had become decidedly antiquated.

Let us harbor no illusions on this point; an actual victory of a revolt over the military force in a street fight, a victory as between armies, is a thing of the rarest occurrence. Moreover, the insurgents had seldom aimed at this. Their only object was to soften the troops by moral influences, such as in a conflict between armies of two warring countries would be of no effect at all, or at any rate in a far smaller degree. If this plan succeeds the troops refuse to obey orders,

or the officers lose their presence of mind, and the revolt is successful. If this plan does not succeed, nevertheless, even in case the military is fewer in numbers, the result shows the superiority of their better equipment and training, of the unified leadership, of the well-planned arrangement of forces and their discipline. The most that an insurrection can attain in real tactical action is the scientific construction and defense of a single barricade. Mutual support, the disposition and utilization of reserves, in short the assistance and co-operation of the separate divisions, which is indispensable for the defense even of a single district, to say nothing of the whole of a large city, is very imperfect, and for the most part wholly unattainable; concentration of forces upon a vital point is out of the question. A passive defense is the characteristic form of the struggle. The attack will extend here and there to occasional sallies or flank movements, but only as exceptions, for as a rule it will be confined to occupying the positions abandoned by the retiring troops. Then, further, the military is supplied with artillery and with completely equipped and trained battalions of pioneers which the insurgents in almost all cases wholly lack. No wonder, therefore, that even those barricade fights which were conducted with the most heroic bravery, as at Paris in June, 1848, at Vienna in October, 1848, and at Dresden in May, 1849, ended with the suppression of the revolt as soon as the officers of the army, unhampered by political considerations, fought according to purely military principles and the soldiers remained trustworthy.

The numerous successes of insurgents down to 1848 are due to very manifold causes. At Paris, in July, 1830, and in February, 1848, as also in most of the Spanish street fights, there stood between the insurgents and the military a citizens' guard, which either sided directly with the revolt or by its lukewarm and hesitating attitude caused the regular troops also to waver, and in addition to that, furnished the insurgents with arms. Wherever this civil guard at the start took a stand against the revolt, as in June, 1848, at Paris, the insurgents were defeated. At Berlin, in 1848, the people won partly through an important addition of fresh forces during the night and on the morning of the 19th of March, partly on account of the fatigue and lack of care suffered by the troops, and partly on account of the hesitation of the authorities. But in all cases where a victory was won it was because the troops mutinied, or because the officers were lacking in determination, or because their hands were tied.

Therefore, even in the classical period of street fighting, the barricade was more of a moral than a material force. It was a means for breaking the loyalty of the army. If it accomplished this, the victory was won; if not, the cause was lost.

Even in 1849 the chances were already poor enough. The bourgeoisie everywhere had gone over to the side of the governments; "culture and property" greeted and treated the troops marching out against the insurgents. The barricade had lost its charm. The soldiers no longer saw behind it the "people", but only rebels, rioters, plunderers, "dividers-up", the outcasts of society; the officers had in time become skilled in the tactical forms of street fighting; they no longer marched out straight ahead and unprotected against the improvised breastworks, but went around them through gardens, courts and houses. And this course,

with a little skill, was successful in nine cases out of ten.

And since then many things have changed and all to the advantage of the military. Though the large cities have become larger, so also have the armies. Paris and Berlin have not quadrupled since 1848, but their garrisons have been increased more than that. By means of the railroads these garrisons can be doubled in twenty-four hours, and in forty-eight hours can be expanded into gigantic armies. The weapons of these enormous hosts are incomparably more effective than formerly. In 1848 they had only the smooth bore, percussion-cap, muzzle-loader; today the small calibre magazine breech-loader, which shoots four times as far, ten times as accurate, and ten times as fast as the other. At that time they had only the comparatively ineffective solid balls and cartridges of the artillery; today the percussion shells, a single one of which is sufficient to demolish the strongest barricade. At that time the pick of the pioneer for breaking through walls; today the dynamite bomb.

On the other hand, for the insurgents, all the conditions have become worse. A revolt with which all layers of the population sympathize can hardly come again. In the class struggle all the middle layers of society will probably never rally around the proletariat so exclusively that the reactionary party which rallies to the bourgeoisie will almost disappear. The "people" therefore will always appear to be divided, and thereby a powerful lever is wanting which was so exceedingly effective in 1848. Even if more trained soldiers are found on the side of the insurgents it will be so much more difficult to arm them. The hunters' and sportsmen's guns from the retail stores, even if the police should not have rendered them unserviceable by removing part of the lock as a precautionary measure, cannot by any means compete with the magazine gun of the soldiers even at close range. Up to 1848 a man could manufacture the necessary ammunition himself out of powder and lead; but today the cartridge is different for every gun, and only in one particular is it alike everywhere, viz., in that it is a technical product of large scale industry, and therefore cannot be prepared extempore, and therefore the most of the guns are useless so long as one has not the ammunition specially fitted for them. Finally the new districts of the great cities have been laid out with long, straight, broad streets, as if made with special reference to operations with modern cannons and small arms. The revolutionist would be insane who would deliberately select the new workingmen's districts in the north and east of Berlin for a barricade fight.

Does the reader now understand why the ruling classes are so anxious by all means to get us where the rifle cracks and the saber slashes? And why they today accuse us of cowardice because we do not straightway betake ourselves to the street, where we are beforehand certain of a defeat? And why they so passionately beseech us to be good enough to play cannon fodder just for once?

These gentlemen are wasting both their prayers and their dares for nothing and less than nothing. We are not so green as all that. They might just as well ask their enemy in the next great war to follow the line formation used by Frederick the Great, or the formation in columns of entire divisions à la Wagram and Waterloo, and that, too, with the old flintlock gun in the hand. As conditions have changed for warfare, so not less for the class struggle. The period of

sudden onslaughts, of revolutions carried out by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where the question involves the complete transformation of the social organization, there the masses themselves must be consulted, must themselves have already grasped what the struggle is about and what they are to stand for. This is what the history of the last fifty years has taught us. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long and persistent work is needed, and it is just this work that we are now doing, and that, too, with a success which drives our opponents to despair.

In the Latin countries also people see more and more that the old tactics have to be revised. They have everywhere followed the German example of using the ballot and of winning every position which is accessible to them. In France where the ground has been broken up for over 100 years by revolution upon revolution, where there is not a single party which has not furnished its share of conspiracies, insurrections and all other revolutionary doings; in France, where, as the result of this condition, the government is by no means certain of the army, and where the circumstances generally are far more favorable for an insurrectional venture than in Germany;—even in France the Socialists are coming to understand better and better that no enduring victory is possible for them unless they first win the great mass of the people;—that means there the peasants. Slow propaganda work and parliamentary activity are recognized there, too, as the next task of the party. The results were not lacking. Not only has a whole string of municipal councils been captured; even in the Chamber of Deputies there are fifty Socialists, and these have already overthrown three Cabinets and one President of the Republic. In Belgium last year the workingmen forced the granting of the electoral franchise and won in a fourth of the voting districts. In Switzerland, in Italy, in Denmark, yes, even in Bulgaria and Roumania, the Socialists are represented in Parliament. In Austria all parties are agreed that our entrance into the imperial council can no longer be prevented. We are bound to get in, that is certain; the only question yet is, by what door? And even in Russia whenever the celebrated Zemskij Sobor shall be assembled, that national convention which young Nicholas is trying in vain to prevent, we can count on it with certainty that we shall be represented there too.

It goes without saying that our foreign comrades do not relinquish their right of revolution. The right of revolution is after all the only actually "historical right", the only right upon which all modern states without exception rest, including even Mecklenburg, whose revolution of the nobility was ended in 1755 by the inheritance agreement,—that glorious charter of feudalism which is still in force today. The right of revolution is so irrefutably recognized in the public consciousness that General von Boguslawski out of this popular right alone derives the right of forcible usurpation which he justifies on behalf of the Emperor.

But whatever may happen in other countries, the German social democracy occupies a particular position, and hence has at least for the present a particular task. The two million voters which it sends to the ballot box, together with the young men and the women who, as non-voters, stand behind them, constitute the largest and compactest mass, the decisive corps of the international proletarian army. This mass furnishes already over a quarter of the votes cast;

and it grows unceasingly, as shown by the elections for the Reichstag, for the separate state legislatures; for the municipal councils and for the industrial courts. Its growth goes on as spontaneously, steadily, and uninterruptedly, and at the same time as quietly as a process of nature. All the efforts of the government against it have shown themselves to be futile. We can today count on two and a quarter million voters. If that keeps up, we shall by the end of the century win the greater part of the middle strata of society, both small tradesmen and peasants, and shall become the determining power in the land before which all other powers must bow down, whether they want to or not. To keep this growth going uninterruptedly until of itself it overtops the prevailing system of government, is our chief task. And there is only one means by which this steady increase of the militant Socialist forces in Germany could be momentarily checked and even set back for a time, viz., a conflict with the army on a large scale, a blood-letting like that of 1871 at Paris. In the long run this would be overcome. Take a party which runs up into millions and all the magazine guns of Europe and America together would not be sufficient to shoot it out of existence. But the normal development would be checked, and the end of the conflict would be delayed, prolonged and accomplished with heavier sacrifices.

The irony of history turns everything upside down. We, the "revolutionists", the "revolters," prosper far better by lawful measures than by unlawful measures and violence. The law and order parties, as they call themselves, go to ruin under the legal conditions which they themselves have established. They cry out in despair with Odilon Barrot; "la legalite nous tue, lawfulness is killing us;" while we, under this lawfulness are getting firm muscles and rosy cheeks and are the picture of eternal life. And if we do not so completely lose our wits as to let ourselves be drawn into a street fight just to please them, then there remains nothing else for them to do finally except to break down this lawfulness themselves, which has proved so disadvantageous to them.

For the present they are making new laws against revolts. Again everything is turned upside down. These anti-revolts fanatics of today, are they not themselves the revolters of yesterday? For example, did we conjure up the civil war of 1866? Did we drive the King of Hanover, the electoral Prince of Hesse, the Duke of Nassau from their legitimate and hereditary lands, and then annex these countries? And now these smashers of the German confederation and of three grace-of-God crowns complain about revolt! Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes? Who could permit Bismark's worshippers to complain about revolting?

Meanwhile let them pass their anti-revolt laws, and make them still more stringent; let them turn the whole criminal code into caoutchouc; they will accomplish nothing except to furnish new proof of their impotence. In order to get at the social democracy effectively they will have to take entirely different measures. The social democratic revolt, which just now finds its greatest advantage in observing the laws, can only be checked by counter-revolt of the law and order party which cannot exist without breaking the laws. Herr Roessler, the Prussian bureaucrat, and Herr von Boguslawski, the Prussian general, have pointed out to them the only way by which perhaps they can yet get even with the workingmen who will

not let themselves be enticed into a street fight, breach of the constitution, dictatorship, a return to absolutism, regis voluntas suprema lex! Courage, therefore, gentlemen, no lip-puckering will answer here; you have got to whistle!

But do not forget that the German empire, as well as all the small states composing it, and in general all modern states, are the product of a treaty; a treaty first of the princes among themselves, second of the princes with the people. If one side breaks the treaty, the whole treaty falls, and the other side is then no longer bound either.

It is now 1600 years ago, almost to a year, that likewise a dangerous revolutionary party was carrying on its work in the Roman empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state. It denied absolutely that the will of the Emperor was the supreme law; it was fatherlandless, international; it spread out over all parts of the empire, from Gaul to Asia, and even beyond the limits of the empire. It had for a long time worked underground and in secret, but for some time past it considered itself strong enough to come out openly into the light. This revolutionary party, which was known by the name of Christians, also had a large representation in the army. Whole legions were Christian. When they were ordered to attend the sacrifice ceremonies of the established heathen religion to perform the honors of the occasion, the revolutionary soldiers carried their impudence so far that by way of protest they stuck into their helmets peculiar emblems—crosses. Even the customary floggings by the officers, with the cat-o'-nine tails of the barracks, were fruitless. The Emperor Diocletian was no longer able to look quietly on while order, obedience and discipline in his army were being subverted. He took hold energetically while there was yet time. He issued an anti-Socialist,—or rather, an anti-Christian—law. Assemblies of the revolters were forbidden, their meeting halls closed or even torn down, the Christian emblems, crosses, etc., were forbidden the same as red handkerchiefs in Saxony. Christians were declared incapable of holding state offices, and could not even become lance corporals in the army. As they did not yet have at that time judges so carefully trained to observe a "respect for the person," as contemplated by Herr von Koeller's anti-revolt bill, the Christians were forbidden outright to resort to the courts at all. This exception law also proved ineffective. The Christians tore it down from the walls with contempt, yea, it is said that while the Emperor was in Nicomedia they set fire to the palace over his head. He revenged himself by the great persecution of Christians which took place in the year 303 of our era. It was the last of its kind; and it was so effective that seventeen years later the majority of the army consisted of Christians and the next succeeding monarch of the whole Roman empire, Constantine, called by the priests the Great, proclaimed Christianity as the state religion.

(Being the introduction to Marx's Class Struggles in France. Translated by Marcus Hitch. London, March 6, 1895.)

Judge in Detroit to candidate for citizenship: "Did you ever carry concealed weapons or attend meetings at the House of the Masses?"

"I notice that the opinions of the man who argues with his fists are always respected."—Moleskin Joe.