beginning to see how tremendous our job is." This tremendous task in a capitalist world would be easily solved in a sane society. With only the general well-being to be considered, slums would be immediately cleared and in its stead would be erected the most modern and comfortable homes that society could produce. And segregation and discrimination would no longer exist. It would be just as simple as all that.

C. R.

RACE AND NATIONALITY

We have given, as far as it is possible to give at the time of writing, a picture of what science understands by the word race. To go further than that would be to go beyond the point where the scientist, himself, is prepared to go. By approaching the subject from another angle, however, it is possible to obtain a clearer picture. Let us adopt this "negative" approach and explain what race is *not*.

Probably the most common of all errors is the assumption that race is identical with nationality. Reference is frequently made to the "British race," the "German race," the "Japanese race," and so on, in the belief, we must presume, that the existence of certain frontier lines and political boundaries determines the racial make-up of the people living within them. This belief is utterly false. To talk for example, of the "British race" is to render the term devoid of all meaning. The inhabitants of Great Britain possess all manner of varying physical chracteristics. They vary through the widest extremes of coloring from very fair to very dark; in stature they range from very tall to very short; they are straight-haired and wavy-haired; thin and thickset; long-headed, medium-headed and broad-headed; their eyes may be brown, blue, yellow or green; in short, they constitute a great mixture, a "hotch-potch" of different racial types.

"Thus from a mixture of all things began
That heterogenous thing, an Englishman."

DANIEL DEFOE,
"The True-born Englishman."

It is only necessary to take a very cursory glance at British history to see the truth behind the gibe of Defoe. During its history, Britain has received all kinds of peoples, and all of these, whether they arrived as invaders, immigrants or refugees, have left their mark upon the present population. Most of these peoples have been thoroughly absorbed into the general population, but small "pockets" of individuals bearing closely similar characteristics to the Prospectors, a people who spread into Europe over two thousand years ago, still exist in Wales, as well as in other countries to remind us of our mongrel ancestry. The investigators who traced back the ancestry of Charles Darwin found it to include at least twenty-nine different lines of European stock ("History and Social Intelligence," H. E. Barnes, page 225). Even disregarding the changes that must have taken place before the arrival of the men belonging to the New Stone Age, Britain has been the place of settlement of the Iberians, the "Beaker" people, Celts, Romans, Saxons, Angles, Jutes, Danes, Norsemen, Normans, Jews (of varying physical types), and periodic influxes of European exiles of whom the Walloons and Huguenots are best known. Many thousands of Huguenots settled in England as late as the 17th century. Nor should it be forgotten that these peoples were well mixed racially before they arrived here.

The same process has gone on, probably on an even greater scale, in most of the other countries of Europe. Unlike the British Isles, whose geographical position made it less liable to the threat of invasion, Europe was, for centuries, open to the encroachments of invaders, particularly from the East. What applies to Europe, applies in great measure to the other continents.

Race and nationality are not identical terms. United States nationality, as is well known, is acknowledged by people of many varying racial stocks. The same is the case with Canada, Mexico, all the Central and South American republics, Russia, China, Japan; in short, with every nation in the world.

—*from* "THE RACIAL PROBLEM"
(S. P. G. B.)

THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

The Socialist Labor Party is running candidates in the 1948 presidential election campaign. Since the campaign of 1892 this organization has appealed to the American working class to support its program for what it terms socialism, or the "industrial republic of labor."

The correctness of its policies must stand or fall on the soundness of the theories upon which it bases its existence. Is the S. L. P. worthy of support at the polls in November? Does it have a platform that signifies a basis for a free society? The World Socialist Party of the U. S. contends that the S. L. P. starts off with an erroneous concept of what constitutes a socialist society, and that its program is not merely worthless to the working class in their struggle for emancipation, but actually hostile to such interests. Because of this we see no more reason for the working class to support that organization than they have to vote for Truman, Dewey, Wallace or any of the other candidates that now seek their votes.

THEORIES AND HISTORY

According to a leaflet issued by the S. L. P. entitled: "Socialism — Champion of Civilized Principles," the party was organized originally in 1876 and "reorganized on its present scientific basis in 1890." This statement is not altogether true, for in its first presidential campaign of 1892 it came out for "government ownership of public utilities, progressive inheritance and income taxes, universal and equal suffrage, free education, municipal home rule, abolition of child labor, employers' liability legislation, and the secret ballot. It also proposed to reconstruct the federal government by abolishing the presidency and the Senate and setting up an executive board to be elected and subject to recall by the House of Representatives." (Basic History of the United States: Beard; p. 331).

We strongly suspect that Mr. Peterson, the party's perennial national secretary doesn't like the rattle of that particular skeleton in the closet-full of S. L. P. skeletons and is trying to push it back farther than it belongs. Just where the connection is between the above platform and the S. L. P. since 1900** would be hard to find. For since the beginning of the 20th Century that party has continually denounced the advocacy of reforms, even though it seems to be forever petitioning Congress for the redress of wrongs against the working class, committed by that body in the interests of the class it represents.

In other words, the S. L. P. attacks reforms on the one hand, while on the other it seeks to instruct the capitalist class on how to operate their legal apparatus. And it incidentally regards itself as an authority on the Constitution of the U. S., which might give it the right to offer such advice.

Furthermore, under the tutelage of professor De Leon, it became by 1905

**Chas. Madison in his Critics and Crusaders, states: "At the party's convention in 1900 he (De Leon) was instrumental in eliminating from its platform all immediate demands . . ." (p. 475).