cases rested on statements obtained by such methods.

The statements which were admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for three, four, and five months. They were confined between four walls, with no windows, and no opportunity of exercise. Two meals a day were shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families or any minister or priest during that time.

This *solitary confinement* proved sufficient in itself in some cases to persuade the Germans to sign prepared statements. These statements not only involved the signer, but often would involve other defendants.

Our investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him, and beat him with rubber hose. Many of the German defendants had teeth knocked out. Some had their jaws broken.

All but two of the Germans, in the 139 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was *Standard Operating Procedure* with American investigators.

THE PROGRESSIVE, Feb. 1949.

THOUGHTS ON THINKING

ARTICLE IV

You may have noted that the title to this little series is "Thoughts on Thinking." Thomas Edison once remarked that the human animal will resort to any extremity to avoid the painful necessity of thought. If this be true you will form the opinion that a treatise on ordinary thinking should be painful enough, but thoughts on thinking is like salt in a wound or rheumatism with St. Vitus dance, not to mention such classical metaphors as heaping Ossa upon Pelion or spreading butter on bacon. But painful though it be, we all have to go through the motions of thinking every once in a while, and if this frail propensity is given sufficient encouragement a merciful anaesthesia is eventually developed. Socialists are prone to degenerate into besotted addicts of the vice, which seems to be their distinguishing characteristic and differentiating mark from the commonalty of men, and I even suspect some of the more hardened habitues actually get a kick out of the unnatural practice.

But these fellows who call themselves scientific Socialists, and are forever cudgelling their brains and worrying us over abstruse problems, must be spinning a pretty thin yarn when they try to make us believe that history, philosophy, biology, and so forth, are vital concerns of the working class. What is Materialism? What is idealism? What is Philosophy? And above all, what is this outlandish thing called Dialectical Monism, with its antithesis, thesis and synthesis, and its quarrel with formal logicians over such unintelligible things as laws of identity, contradiction and excluded thirds? What have we to do with such abstract, highbrow matters, anyway? Aren't we Socialists solely interested in smashing capitalism and converting the machinery of production to the common use and benefit? So long as we understand the cold fact of labor's exploitation and are prepared to demolish the system which makes it possible, striving meanwhile to establish the socialist commonwealth, what more is required of us?

The answer is — *plenty!*

Practically all newly recruited comrades are apt to become impatient at this business of making a revolution and to deprecate the emphasis placed on sound theoretical knowledge. The *reason* for study is not always made manifest. The blame for this attitude is more often to be laid on some of our literature than on the inappreciativeness of the young

Socialist. A treatise on the dialectic should point out the utility and applicability of the method to the everyday affairs of life, and link it up as an indispensable adjunct to purposive class action. The *connections* between theory and practice, principles and party, truth and tactics, doctrine and propaganda must be clearly shown. When the connections are hazy and ill-defined the new student finds little incentive to penetrate the deeper phases of socialist thought, and if he does bravely essay an attempt, often finds himself lost in a maze of words about seemingly irrelevant theories.

So if you have been wondering why all this time has been taken working up to the main subject, namely, the dialectic method, the writer's effort to achieve elementary clarity has been the reason. Little is to be gained by launching into philosophic abstractions before the approaches to those subjects have been rendered reasonably clear. This can only be done by making brief synopses of the more essential elements of scientific Socialism, and proceeding thence to a consideration of the more involved.

How better could we start than by inquiring what it is that gives Socialism its scientific nature? Socialists were in existence long before Marx and Engels formulated the laws of social development and propounded the theory of the class struggle. These early dreamers of a better world were called Utopians, from Utopia, a mythical land of idyllic perfection. Like their modern successors these earnest yearners for the Millenium could hardly be classed as true revolutionists. They were men of high ideals and lofty characters, sensitive to the cruelties, abuses and inequalities of the society in which they lived. In that respect they were not essentially different from Socialists of this day. But it was their reaction to such conditions, the remedies they proposed and the mental attitude they assumed towards society and the world at large, which stamped them as distinctively non-scientific.

The Utopians could clearly see the existing social evils, but knew not where to find their true explanation. They believed human nature to be a constant factor and the bedrock of the social structure. Men were reasonable beings who needed but to be convinced of the justness of a proposition, and forthwith, the world could be moulded nearer to the heart's desire. The method of the Utopian was to search his own consciousness, wherein was believed to exist an innate, a priori knowledge of the absolute Right, True, Good and Just, and from such soul scrutinizing would emerge fantastic schemes for social betterment, not necessarily related to existing facts in the real world. Then, having worked out a sublime plan in accordance with the prompting of Justice, Righteousness and Divine Guidance, all that remained to be done was to appeal to the Better Natures of men, especially of the Better Classes, and the evident Goodness of the revelation would induce right thinking men to renounce oppression, relinquish class prerogatives and joyfully usher humanity into the Brotherhood of Man.

Many of these elaborate projects were put to the test of actual experiment, usually as isolated undertakings outside the main body of society but they all foundered on the rocks of impracticability. Their roots were not nourished by the soil of actual society. They appeared not as an evolutionary outgrowth of existing flesh and bone, sweat and blood, human relations, but as an artificial creation, imposed from without, and were, as we now know, predestined to certain failure.

Socialism became scientific from the time it gave up the methods of wool-gathering, metaphysical speculation; when it ceased looking inward on the soul, and started gazing outward on the soil; when it chose for its weapon the keenest tool of empirical science — the *inductive method.* Science is concerned with one class of things — one only — *facts.* It deals with actual, tangible *things;* with demonstrable, verifiable *facts;* with the world as it is, not as it "ought to be." From the infinite variety of