

masses an understanding of those terms that will make them active agents for good in the liberalization of the world.

I am a simple man and always "fall for" a plausible argument. I was enchanted with Lippmann and felt that, in spite of himself, he was still almost a Socialist. And now that he sits in the War Department it seems to me that, in occasional devices of the popular press, I can still see his fine benevolence guiding the injections of associations into current shibboleths. For instance, it interests me to see how the meaning of the term "counter-revolution" is being improved. "Counter-revolution" used to mean a movement to restore a deposed reactionary government, and in this sense the word has been used with respect to the situation in Russia after the Revolution of last winter. But when the newspapers now express a fear of "counter-revolution" in Russia, what do you think they mean? Their fear is that the "counter-revolution," backed by Lenin and Trotzky, may be successful; that the "Pro-German" Maximalists may deprive the "revolutionary" bourgeoisie of the fine fruits of democracy! The power of words to change is great, indeed, and the power of Lippmann to guide their changes is great also.

But, of course, it may be men of much smaller stature than Lippmann who are passing out the word what to do with the term "counter-revolution." C. D.

## Our Old Masters and Their Modern Substitutes

By FRANZ MEHRING.

The course pursued from the outset of the world war by the party leadership (parliamentary group, National Committee, National Executive Committee, etc.), based on the well meant but nevertheless gratuitous assumption that it was supported by the majority of the rank and file, is characterized by obvious simplicity. War is war; war is a question of national existence; the working class must waive independent action in favor of national existence and without a will of its own must sacrifice class interests to be taken in tow by the ruling class.

But there is one point on which the advocates of this policy are not agreed. Some, like Cunow, etc., set up the claim that they are THE Marxians in contradistinction to us poor souls with our petrified lifeless formalism. The others, however, such as Scheidemann, are quite emphatic in denying the importance of scientific research, thus conveniently disposing of Lassalle, Marx, Engels, etc.

The latter were deluded into believing that learning and knowledge are fundamental to political management. Lassalle said that political conviction was possible only on the rock-solid foundation of scientific realization. Mere sentimental inclination was not sufficient, being by its nature a product of circumstances, temperament, moods, and therefore transitory. Marx wrote in 1850, when the "practical" persons in the Communist Union ridiculed his unpractical system of study: "I usually spend from 9 in the morning to 7 in the evening in the British Museum. Naturally, the democratic simps don't have to go to that much trouble. Why should they worry their heads about this historical and economic material, these favored sons? It is all so self-evident, they always tell me. Simple as can be! in these simple-minded heads." Which shows clearly that whoever