bank signs a nicely engraved note transfer it into wealth.

It is astounding that every voter in America does not protest vigorously against this greatest of all legalized robberies. Our money system is a debt making system. A debt compounding system. It was designed for that purpose. It is nothing short of legalized robbery. The same is true of land titles. We are wasting our time over technicalities and seeing our nation rot.

Every year sees the wealth and land titles concentrating into private hands, as well as debts increasing at the rate of 14,000 million dollars annually and we go on oblivious to an approaching industrial collapse.

I do not care what the individual decides in regard to this discussion what I am interested in is to save our Nation from the hell of another industrial breakdown and to abolish the cause which is inevitable under the profit system.

* * *

Comrade Landis

Socialism is a name given to a system of society, a science. And its characteristics like those of all other sciences are well known to those who formulated or developed it, and those who have been sufficiently interested in socialism to give it thought and study.

The word "socialism" is not patented, anyone can discourse authoritively on socialism and say anything about it. The socialist label has been attached to the foulest of capitalist forms including Nazism, Fascism and Bolshevism. The word "socialism" has more than two hundred definitions; in the maze of all these contradictions of terms, is it not the part of wisdom that we turn to authoritive sources for our information and definitions pertaining to this science? We socialists feel that Karl Marx and Frederick Engels who grappled with the formulations of this science and established its sound scientific basis are more capable and reliable than Webster, to tell us what socialism is.

If we consider Marx's inspiring admonition to the working class "Workers of the World Unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to gain," it should be sufficiently clear to any intelligent working class person that under socialism the world would be one unit and humanity one people. Then if we will analyze Marx's Revolutionary watch-word "Abolition of the Wages System" we can easily understand that socialism must be a moneyless, commodityless society. Will my friend please tell us if the wages system is abolished, what purpose money and banking could serve?

DO MORALS ENTER THE QUESTION?

Mr. Talbott is highly indignant and considers it not moral for individuals to hold title to property such as land, minerals or to extract tribute by virtue of ownership of the means of life. What Mr. Talbott still has to learn is that it is the prerogative of the capitalists to determine the code of morals that shall prevail in their economic society and unless Mr. Talbott belongs in the select group he may just as well keep his moral views to himself as to attempt to reform the gentry.

Socialists are not primarily concerned with moral issues but with historic science. The capitalist class has had a useful function to perform. They, aided by the poverty stricken rabble overthrew the feudal aristocracy and revolutionized an agricultural, peasant economy into an industrial society. They have performed wonders but they have long since degenerated into a useless, parasitical group and it is high time they were thrown off the backs of those they exploit. It is not **immoral** for the capitalists to own and control the means of life, but it is antiquated and as long as private, corporate and/or state ownership exists side by side with social production, the vast majority of the population must remain propertyless and the world must be periodically convulsed with depressions and wars. Let's be scientific and organize for socialism.

Mr. Talbott tells us that we are not discussing the question as to whether or not Marxian socialism has ever been put into practice in any State. He then goes on to argue that it must exist in Russia because in that country there are no private titles to land, no privately owned banks or money lenders or privately owned industry. He states that these things are **common property** in Russia. What he doesn't explain is just why the vast majority in that country apparently prefer to work for wages and go without many necessities of life, let alone luxuries, while a small class of surplus-value eaters live very comfortably without engaging in useful work. This is a strange way for people to act who share in "common" the ownership of the means of life.

Property in the Soviet Union is not commonly owned but belongs to the state which like all other states is the instrument of a minority economic class which it uses to keep itself in power. Under socialism, there can be no state but **an administration of affairs.** It can make no material difference to workers whether the exploitation they suffer is carried on by individual capitalists, corporations, etc with state sanction and protection for the exploiters or directly by the state for the benefit of individual bond holders. This is Russia's "socialism" and Mr. Talbott is welcome to it. We want no part of it. Although, in his following point he declares that "no man can create a million dollars of wealth in a lifetime" . . . and . . . "A nation cannot have millionaires without reducing many to poverty and dire want" he has obviously never heard of the fact that Russia also has millionaires, such as Berdebekov, who received a public citation from Stalin during the war for buying a million rubles worth of Soviet War Bonds.

We warn the workers that nothing short of the complete abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism will solve their problems.

Government ownership, control and operation of socialized or nationalized industry, land and credit in the production and distribution of commodities with forced labor and regimentation under a ruthless dictatorship do exist in Russia and it is not socialism but the most cruel form of capitalism.

PROBLEM IS EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Talbott argues: "all cannot be constantly employed because all products cannot be purchased off the market." But what of it? The working class can not be considered as well-off just because it may happen to be working. It is not **unemployment** which causes poverty, but **employment** itself — wage-labor — the fact that wages must be based upon the average quantity of worldly things needed to keep a worker and his family. And in proportion to what he produces, this quantity constantly diminishes. Surpluses then pile up and we have depressions and wars. The solution that government ownership advocates suggest is that the state take over all or industry and put everyone to work, **even if it means oversized armed forces.** (We should like to point out though that even in the Soviet Union there has been a percentage of unemployment. It has been fashionable of course, to refer to these unfortunates as "Fascists", "Trotskyist", "Kulaks" and so on. Perhaps the word today is "Titoists".) But all this is neither here nor there. The problem that confronts society today is employment for wages, not unemployment and the cure is to **do away with wages,** not try to put everyone to work for **wages.**

TALBOTT'S BANKING PHOBIA

Mr. Talbott's main phobia, however seems to be the system of banking used in the U. S. He apparently is obsessed with funny-money theo-