created by the profit system. You can't hammer out horseshoes without an anvil, and the capitalist can't hammer out profits without a supine working class. Blame or praise is out of place in either case. Every virtue is not reposed in the proletariat; every vice is not epitomised in the bourgeoisie.

While it is true that much of the "superiority" of the master class is nothing but sham, artificiality and vulgar display; a great part of its "culture" the spurious excrescences of snobbery; its vaunted "leadership" due to the accidents of birth and hereditary privilege, it is also true that it represents the modern leisure class. In every society since civilization began the leisure class has been the patron and guardian of the arts — music, drama, science, painting, literature, architecture. Wherever servitude exists the only ones who can cultivate and enjoy the arts of noble living are those with wealth and leisure. It was so in the slave empires of antiquity, in the feudal states of medieval Europe and it is so today. These are bourgeois attributes that it is outrageous to condemn. These are part of the good, the usable materials of capitalism that must be salvaged for the new society, when, for the first time in human history the common man shall come into the cultural heritage of all the ages.

W. C. CURREY

THE PROBLEM OF EMPLOYMENT

We are hearing too much of the "problem" of unemployment nowadays, and no capitalist government, whatever its label, has a solution except on terms of war or forced labor camps. When the working class becomes conscious of its status, and realizes its power to achieve its true social level, there will be no unemployment problem. What will be aimed at will be the abolition of employment. For unemployment means the inability to find a master who will concede part of created wealth to the man who created it. Employment, that status which seems so desirable to the unenlightened, is simply the ability to find a master who owns or controls sufficient wealth to be willing to exploit a wealth creator who owns nothing but energy. From which it follows that both employment and unemployment are capitalist problems, neither of which will be problems in a socialist economy.

To employ a man or thing is to USE that man or thing for a specific purpose to the advantage of the user, not to the advantage of the man or thing used. In a socialist economy no one will be a user of men; all will be users of things. This will only become an actuality when a sufficient number of common people decide it is time for society to be operated by and for the whole people.

The machinery already exists, in the form of the political franchise; that which is yet to be developed is the understanding of the victims of the current system. This understanding is necessary; the idea that capitalism will collapse and throw the power into the hands of any party or group that happens to be on the spot is a pipe dream. Capitalism is groggy on its feet, but it is far from collapsing, and there are many twists and turns it can yet take to maintain itself in power. The first fifty years of this century have demonstrated that **laissez faire** is by no means the only road that capitalism can travel. The same fifty years have also demonstrated that roads will be taken as conditions impel, regardless of the effect on common humanity. The introduction of socialism is, then, to be a deliberate conscious process, not a mere picking up of wreckage when the system crashes. That is why education is so essential.

But if there will no "employment" in a socialist economy, what will people do and how will goods be

produced? Perhaps the simplest examples are such groups as amateur gardeners, musicians, and hobbyists of all descriptions, who are happy in producing social wealth and beauty, and who cannot be classed as "employed" —they are not being "used" by an employer, a profit-seeker, an exploiter or investor. This need only be carried into other fields to see the essential simplicity of a society devoted to meet the needs of the individuals composing it. For instance, it is not difficult to imagine a person enjoying the hobby of baking pastry not for a money market, not for an employer, but just because people like his product and will consume it with pleasure, a pleasure that is equalled by his own pleasure in producing it. Would not the baker think that a desirable kind of society? And the farmer who produced the wheat, and the transport workers who conveyed, would they not be happier in their work, knowing that the bread they are helping to produce would be eaten by those who needed it? That they are not merely "employed" to produce for a profit market, producing things that must be denied to those who need bread but lack the RIGHT to eat it?

Where is the pleasure to a logger who fells trees and knows nothing of their further fate or destination, save only that the employer is amassing wealth and the consequent ability to grab yet more trees and exploit yet more men? But if that logger knew that the logs were to be used in building homes for his family and his neighbors' families, and that the neighbors in turn were producing the bread and the boots and the radios that he and his family could use — what then would be his attitude towards society? He would no longer be "employed;" he would be doing his share towards producing community wealth — HIS wealth in common with his fellowmen, to be used by him and his fellows as human beings and members of society; not as "customers" at the mercy of an alien class of owners.

Suppose that people reached the conclusion that human beings could be happier if they were doing things that add to the pleasures and comforts of **people** — just common **people** instead of spending weary and interminable days in factories making gadgets to catch the eye of the 10 and 15 cents shoppers who crave a little color and brightness in their lives, but are denied anything but the cheapest and tawdriest of commercial "ornaments"? Suppose the people determined that boys and girls have faculties and abilities that should be encouraged, and that it is better for boys and girls and society that violin lessons, painting, bulb growing, wood-working, model-building and a hundred other creative activities should be free to them, than that they should trudge up and down streets in all weathers delivering daily papers. Is there any reason why the violin teacher, the arts instructor and others of skill and teaching ability should be less happy if they are free to contribute of their best, instead of being bound to the wheel of "costs" and payments and the plea of "can't afford it"? The teacher would be pleased to impart his art, the student would be happy in learning what he really wants to learn; the teacher and the child and all society would be richer, happier, and more inspired to develop their powers to higher and yet higher levels. Is there a single valid reason against the creation of such a free society?

Food produced to be eaten; houses built to live in; skills developed to enjoy; society so organized that there need be no square pegs in round holes; neither employers nor employed; "wages" and "profits" terms for antiquarians to ponder over and marvel at; wars and depressions interesting historical records of a former stage of society noted for its mechanical advancement and its social barbarism. Why not?

When do we start? That is for the common people themselves to say; they can have the opportunity **now.**

WEAVER