man's confusion of mind is directly and faithfully expressed at these political levels. And national leaders are elected to administer capitalism. They need know nothing of science and technology but they must soon learn that they must "export or explode," "expand or die," "range the world for more markets," and so on. And science, law, medicine, philosophy, music, arts, anthropology, religion, etc. must all be used to serve the economic aims and material needs of the prevailing ruling class, be it peacetime or wartime, prosperity or depression.

And, in passing, Sir Mark, what "action" have you in mind to which you would "awaken (your) fellow-man"? How would you "avert" war?

Our man of science continues: "The churches with their dogmas based on revelation, which become more fixed and unchangeable with time, have opposed the growth of natural knowledge." And with this statement socialists have no quarrel, but this is a lull before the storm, for he now drops his most discordant clangor — discordant because notes of error are sounded together with notes of truth:

> "Exactly the same picture, almost a mirror image, is seen beyond the border of Soviet Russia. Marxism, allegedly founded on science and technology, but actually based on the uncertain foundation of limited Victorian knowledge, has become as dogmatic as any religion. The non-scientist Stalin took it upon himself to interpret advancing knowledge to make it fit the out-of-date pattern. He went further and, because it was convenient to believe that acquired characteristics could be inherited and agriculture thereby revolutionized rapidly, he promulgated the dogmas of Lysenkoism..." and so on in this strain.

Socialists can broadly accept Sir Mark's views on these technical matters and accord him the respect due him even though we feel that we have heard it all before, somewhere. Even Nikita Khrushchev cuts Stalin for cat's meat on many similar matters (after the latter's demise). But let us sift the statement for the errors.

MISCONCEPTS OF SCIENTISTS

What Oliphant seems not to know is that Stalin also falsified the Materialist Conception of History. In the "Communist" text book, "A History of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.," a standard reference written by Stalin and used everywhere by Communists for 20 years before Stalin died, we are informed that "Communism didn't need capitalism to precede it. It could have come any time." This, Sir Mark, is equivalent to saying that mammals didn't need the preceding life forms. They could have arrived at any time. But neither Stalin, nor anyone else, can get rid of capitalism with the stroke of a pen, even if the desire was there. And there is nothing to indicate that Stalin was not aware that, by changing the meaning of the word socialism and using it to denote the Russian economy, he was acting the role of head apologist for Russian state capitalism.

Now let us look more closely at the views of Sir Mark on this subject. We find that he easily dismisses Marxism and dismisses any further need, either for himself or for anybody, of ever studying the matter, by telling us that "...Marxism (was) actually based on the uncertain foundation of limited Victorian knowledge." Our scientist knows full well that on the same foundation of the last century many laws were formulated, never before clearly known. And these same laws still hold. For example, Ohm's law of electricity still is valid. Darwin's laws of organic evolution as set out in his epoch-making works have never been shaken. Sir Mark refers to Boyle's law of gases and it is still valid. And what about the discovery that **all forms** of energy, heat, light, sound, magnetism, human mental and physical energy, and so on, are basically all of the same nature, i.e., natural physical energy? This discovery still holds good.

So, also, standing unshaken, in spite of all the unprecedented violence and rage that capitalism's hired prize-fighters can launch against it, is Marx's Labor Theory of Value and laws of social and economic evolution.

But to go into this a little further: When studying Darwinism we begin with pigeons and trace patiently as many as possible of the peculiarities of breeding and cross breeding. Pigeons were Darwin's "unit of investigation." The same applies to electrical studies. Faraday using a galvanic cell, some wire and a magnetic compass, discovered laws of electricity. The same tale applies to a multitude of 19th century investigations.

Marx also used a "unit of investigation." This was a unit of wealth of capitalism. It was a "commodity." **A thorough study of this leads to the discovery and formulation of economic laws which today are as valid as the aforesaid laws of electricity, evolution, gases and other physical sciences,** all of which were developed on the "uncertain" foundation of limited Victorian knowledge.

By inference, one of the many things learned by students patient enough to apply themselves to a serious study of "Capital" is that modern Russia is subject to the same laws as every other capitalist country. For there we see the familiar basis of capitalist society, wage-labor engaged in producing commodities, itself a commodity for sale on the market. The only part of this wealth produced by the Russian laborer to which he has access is directly proportional to his wages — and no more! Just as it is here! And its complement, capital, i.e., wealth used to create more wealth with a view to profit.

That Stalin strived and Khrushchev still strives to slow down the evolution of social institutions is, as Sir Mark expresses it, "exactly the same picture, almost a mirror image" of every country in the world because the primary laws — the economic laws — are likewise identical in every capitalist country. And it is, in the final analysis, the material interests of capitalist society which force individual leaders to chase mirages in a vain attempt to solve their problems.

But Oliphant, it appears, gleans his information on social conflicts from newspaper headings. We are told that:

> "When solutions (to social problems) *are* sought, they are in general dictated by group interests or unreasoned prejudices of a religious, personal or political interest."

Hitler, it seems, was bad because he had personal ambitions to rule the world. Likewise with Stalin and Khrushchev and the same with leaders of striking labor unions. He does not comprehend that personalities, religious decrees, political policies are but the trimmings as it were, camouflaging the underlying struggle to survive under the increasing tension of competition for markets. Witness the American President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev, both globe trotting, exposing their personal peculiarities and expounding their political philosophies, but all the time plugging hard for markets for their exportable capital. A dam here, a steel rolling mill there, and a naval base somewhere else. Modern carpet baggers, as it were, peddling their wares on the doorsteps of the world.

Sir Mark wouldn't measure the capacity and output of an electrical generator on the religion of the country where it was operating, nor on the personality of its premier, nor yet on the political system of the country. Nor is buying and selling of commodities in this way influenced. Cheapness consistent with utility is the keynote. Nations trying to undersell one another out of world markets is the cause of the strife. Even those organizations set up to maintain "Peace and Justice" are pulverized into small pieces in the cold wars between the great nations and combines of nations.

APPLYING SCIENCE TO SOCIETY

When Sir Mark deals with children he shows a great deal of understanding of their "... questioning, eager approach to the world." He should use these methods himself when attempting to unravel the thread through the labyrinth of economics. He should not allow himself to accept blindly misleading twaddle such as when he approvingly quotes Anatol Rapoport:

(Cont. on page 21)