

From Sea Squirt to Capitalism to Communism

I

The Sea Squirt (tunicates or ascidians) may not seem like much, just a blob of material that traverses its aquatic world by ejecting water as a propellant, yet it has both male and female reproductive organs (hermaphrodite), a spine, and a brain, all the features that placed it in the phylum Chordata along with humans.

A particularly interesting feature of the Sea Squirt that may be useful in understanding some of the more mysterious qualities in humans is that in the course of its life (it may live up to 30 years) it undergoes a process of *metamorphic retrogression* -- its early life is governed by a complex organism which gradually transforms and simplifies itself into a final adult state.

The most important requirement of the creature's early life is to locate a place that will fit its needs for the rest of its life. The brain's sole purpose is to assist in finding that permanent home after which it no longer has a useful function and is eaten by the organism. Having the brain perform essential features of development along with the spine, central nervous system, etc. rather than being a commanding presence introduces a novel understanding of development and life. Instead of a brain having that leadership/authority we have a shared process of learning and doing that incorporates the entire organism. This is said to be a form of *embodied cognition*.

Initial researchers in the theory of embodied cognition attempted to maintain a continuity within our immediate so-called primitive ancestors in our phylum. This led to new perspectives of our cognitive capacity the most significant being *situated cognition*, that is, *cognition that is about, entwined with, and time locked to unfolding events in the immediate physical environment*. But human cognition in this theory would be locked in particular time slots and be reduced to a false evolutionary reductionism. Human cognition cannot be bound to survival in immediate real-world situations. If that were true we would have no history. *Instead, an essential feature of human cognition is the capacity to decouple from the present environment and represent situations and ideas that are of the past, the future, the physically distant, the imaginary, the generalized, or the abstract.*

[Part of a publisher's summary of - Margaret Wilson, in [Handbook of Cognitive Science](#), 2008.]

"The [embodied cognition](#) movement tries to reconcile this apparently multiple qualities (duality and unity) of human experience by means of analyzing the ways in which the body may affect cognition: supporting, sustaining, shaping, etc. Mind and body cannot be separated because cognitive agents think with the body. Mind, as a separate entity, is in the eye of the beholder. This chapter contends that the mind-body problem is not a problem of minds and bodies in the world—that is, a physical problem of interaction—but simply an artificial, conceptual problem for philosophers/scientists. The way to come out of the problem is to realize that minds and bodies are not separate entities, but what are separate are the mental concepts used in thinking about them; that is, what most thinkers use to think about minds and bodies as ontologically fully separate entities. However this way of thinking is misleading. Minds can be reduced to bodies because they are simply processes that run on them."

Taking the view that there is something of significance in the concept of embodied cognition, and that all the divisions discovered by philosophers and physical scientists are dead ends, I will illustrate how the notion of embodied cognition should work in our contemporary world when societal upheavals lead to a liberated 'embodied' cognition.

II

When Marx said that the ideas of the ruling class are the ruling ideas he meant that within the dominant class (capitalists) reasoning and ideas as capitalists are formed and constrained by the systemic requirements of capitalism itself. As for the ruled class, it must submit to the master class in commodity production or other forms of wage/salary labor, elsewhere in the not directly commodity producing areas of education, arts, science, politics, etc. they are free to accept or reject whatever enters their range of interests. Those outspoken critics of the system risk experiencing a break with family and friends because of fear of the consequences that relations with an enemy of the system may entail. And more broadly being a known opponent of the system will affect ones employment and eligibility for social benefits, etc. But at least revolutionaries in the productive class will know where they stand in the 'master-slave' relationship and have the mind/brain fluidity to

examine and organize a revolutionary opposition. As for those of the ruling class they are pulled into the machinery of capital by that invisible hand, not to be 'liberated' except by system collapse, or revolution.

III

We live in a world of chaos, strife and crisis. The masses neutralize their mind and selves in order to construct shabby forms of livable existence. Capitalism is in a permanent state of crisis, but like a body with a fatal illness it incorporates various cures only to have sickness unto death return in more dangerous forms. The hazards for the continuing existence of this system are all the more dangerous because its sickness is now manifestly incurable. Capitalism in its essential form of production for sale has completed its life cycle. A market economy in which practical use value is incidental to its *raison d'etre* is a dead end for the advancement of our social system. Human intelligence and ingenuity has reached a state where it can provide the essential needs of all humanity but existence under the domination of a parasitic system makes doing so impossible. One wonders how a capitalist can look at himself in a mirror without being disgusted by what he sees. That doesn't happen because they are as socially brain dead as their system that recycles the horrors of starvation and strife it is practice.

Perhaps the clearest example of the present debased state of American capitalism is that its state system permits capitalist companies to increase their wealth by simply repurchasing their own stock and distributing capital gains. This naked act of intra-company theft that only enriches capitalists, and to a much lesser extent the middle class with enough excess income to invests in funds, breeds such hatred in the working class that it was outlawed in 1934 following the Great Depression only to be revived in 1982 to recover from the late 70's depression and widespread bank collapses, even though banks were insured. Forty years later there is little chance of repurchases or dividends being curtailed because the capitalist congenital greed mindset must be fed even if profits are made with artificial ingredients.

The all consuming crises have presently been cast aside due to the war in Ukraine. The unabated mindset of the system has now caused so much damage to the environment and life on earth that a solution to at least some of the damage is already near the 1.5C point where its effects can be halted before they take hold. But a 'Doom Loop' is forming with assets being shifted from efforts reversing the use of global warming pollutants to repairing the growing damage by capital's rape of the earth.

Having undermined the effectiveness of its brand of capitalism that enabled the US to dominate the economies of the world it must now fall back on the massive power of its military forces stationed around the world. Thus we have one arm of its military might, along with elements of its Nato gang, involved in a war in Ukraine fronted by a puppet state that if victorious would open up Russia, with its many independent national groups, to fresh areas of exploitation. Most commentary regarding capitalism ignore or belittle the clear necessity for the system to open or takeover the economies of other countries in order to shift their excess capital from the circular dead end of market profit at home to where it can bring in real economy profit and foreign domination. There is never 'enough' for capitalism, it must grow and destroy or die. And being conveniently brain dead, don't expect any rationality, or mercy.

The ideal outcome of the war is that the Nato gang suffers a crushing defeat. That will certainly not happen. It also should be made clear that the side we support are not the 'good guys.' We don't support the continued existence of capitalism anywhere, but all countries have the right of national independence -- real independence, not the sort that exists in Ukraine, or for that matter, today's Iraq or Libya. When the nominally independent government of Iraq sought to negotiate an agreement with Iran that would lessen the internal conflict between the Shi'a and Sunni Islamic sects the US bombed the negotiating party when it landed killing 10, including 5 Iraqi's as if they were so many roaches under their feet. Iraq, like many other nations with imperialist installed regimes, will one day fight for and win genuine independence.

Evidence of the cold-blooded viciousness of American imperialism is an every day occurrence. Hopefully the US and its allies and flunky states will suffer a defeat on the order of what Vietnam achieved in 1973.

IV

The United States is not only the world's greatest liar in frequency but also in magnitude as the following can attest to -- The Russian intervention in Ukraine to prevent the rooting of Nato at it's back door is according to their main enemy --

"a mere fig leaf used by Russian President Vladimir Putin to mask what former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and former Defense Secretary Robert Gates [recently called](#) "his messianic mission" to "reestablish the Russian Empire," in a Washington Post opinion piece. Fiona Hill, a presidential adviser to two Republican administrations, has [deemed](#) these

views merely the product of a “Russian information war and psychological operation,” resulting in “masses of the U.S. public... blaming NATO, or blaming the U.S. for this outcome.”

The real Putin was a Lt. Colonel in the KGB when the USSR collapsed. About as quickly as he could get out of his official dress he joined the bourgeoisie as a valued assistant to Anatoly Sobchak, the mayor of St. Petersburg, where in his ten years of service he managed to convince the new ruling elite that he would make a fine president in the interests of the new bourgeoisie. He was elected to that office in late 1999.

Unlike our one-party duopoly where no candidate outside of the leadership clique can win the presidency. Russia actually holds multi-party elections although (as in the US) no party outside of the Russian ruling clique will ever achieve the right to govern via electoral process. In 1996 Gennady Andreyevich Zyuganov, head of the Communist Party of Russia, won the electoral vote, but western agents in Russia, there to teach their new recruits the intricacies of a bourgeois democratic authoritarianism, had Zyuganov ruled out because someone who refers to himself as a communist is never a good fit under capitalism. It is OK to have a communist party -- the US even has one -- <https://www.cpusa.org/> -- as long as it is rarely seen or heard -- this for a political organization no more radical than a labor party.

Presidential terms in Russia are now 6 years. **Medvedev**, from the same party, served between Putin's electoral victories. In the 2018 election the candidates were **Vladimir Zhirinovsky** (Edelstein) and anti-Semitic who claimed that the Jews provoked their own slaughter. He said such things even though his father was a Jew who emigrated to Israel. Thus, just like in the US, Russia welcomes crackpots. **Ksenia Sobchak**, the daughter of Putin's boss as mayor of St. Petersburg. She is a liberal of the **Navalny** type who tried to get him to participate in her electoral run since he had not qualified as a candidate. He refused knowing full well her minimal vote count would show his proclaimed popularity to be a fiction. **Sergei Baburin** of the ultra-nationalist All-Peoples Union. He served in Afghanistan and as a member of the Supreme Council voted against the dissolution of the USSR. An ultra-nationalist who has the support of the far right. A typical 'Marxist' Stalinist. He is a member of the Russian Duma and a rector of the Russian State University of Trade and Economics. Normally **Genady Zyuganov** is normally the candidate of the Russian Communist Party but chose not to in this election. His replacement is the millionaire **Pavel Grudin**. He made his fortune as a director of an agriculture cooperative selling land it owned to developers near Moscow. A perfect fit for American politics. **Maxim Suraikin** of the Communist of Russia Party. A committed Stalinist of the old

school, he calls for the resurrection of the USSR. As for Stalin's crimes of the 30's. They had nothing to do with Stalin who actually tried to stop them. **Boris Titov** a businessman of the Growth Party served as business ombudsman under Putin. **Grigory Yavlinsky** the 'liberal' leader of the opposition. Founder of the Yabloko Party who when he had a meeting with Putin members of his party demanded his resignation.

Electoral results: Vladimir Putin - 75.0 pct, Pavel Grudinin - 13.3 pct, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy - 6.3 pct, Ksenia Sobchak - 1.4 pct, Grigory Yavlinsky - 0.8 pct, Sergei Baburin - 0.6 pct, Maksim Suraikin - 0.6 pct, Boris Titov - 0.6 pct * Source: Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation

Thus we see in the above that Russian politics is almost identical to the mass of political garbage that we have in the United States, while technically more democratic in that there are actual opponents. Putin naively believed that good relations were possible now that he shared the belief that capitalism was best for Russia and the world. Putin did everything possible to become a partner in the American led gang of capitalist exploiters only to be rejected.

Here is a summary from mainstream American media of Putin's efforts to develop a practical *and peaceful relationship with other capitalist nations*.

Ironically, there would be one exception to the next two decades' worth of rising tensions over NATO's eastward expansion that followed: the early years of Putin's presidency, when the new Russian president defied the Russian establishment to try and make outreach to the United States. Under Putin, Moscow reestablished relations with NATO, finally [ratified](#) the START II arms control treaty, and even [publicly floated](#) the idea of Russia eventually joining the alliance, inviting attacks from his political rivals for doing so. Even so, Putin continued to raise Moscow's traditional concerns about the alliance's expansion, [telling](#) NATO's secretary-general it was "a threat to Russia" in February 2001.

"[I]f a country like Russia feels threatened, this would destabilize the situation in Europe and the entire world," he said in a [speech in Berlin](#) in 2000.

Putin softened his opposition as he sought to make common cause with then-President George W. Bush administration. "If NATO takes on a different shape and is becoming a political organization, of course, we would reconsider our position with regard to such expansion, if we are to feel involved in the processes," he [said](#) in October 2001, drawing attacks from political rivals and other Russian elites.

As NATO for the first time granted Russia a consultative role in its decision-making in 2002, Putin sought to assist its expansion. Then-Italian President Silvio Berlusconi made a “personal request” to Bush, according to an [April 2002 cable](#), to “understand Putin’s domestic requirements,” that he “needs to be seen as part of the NATO family,” and to give him “help in building Russian public opinion to support NATO enlargement.” In [another cable](#), a top-ranking U.S. State Department official urged holding a NATO-Russia summit to “help President Putin neutralize opposition to enlargement,” after the Russian leader said allowing NATO expansion without an agreement on a new NATO-Russia partnership would be politically impossible for him.

This would be the last time any Russian openness toward NATO expansion was recorded in the diplomatic record published by Wikileaks.

In a leaked 2007 cable William Burns, then Ambassador to Russia and now head of the CIA warned of Russia's fear of encirclement.

Putin summarized Russia's issues with Nato at the 2007 Munich assembly.

I think it is obvious that NATO expansion does not have any relation with the modernization of the Alliance itself or with ensuring security in Europe. On the contrary, it represents a serious provocation that reduces the level of mutual trust. And we have the right to ask: against whom is this expansion intended? And what happened to the assurances our western partners made after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact? Where are those declarations today? No one even remembers them. But I will allow myself to remind this audience what was said. I would like to quote the speech of NATO General Secretary Mr Woerner in Brussels on 17 May 1990. He said at the time that: “the fact that we are ready not to place a NATO army outside of German territory gives the Soviet Union a firm security guarantee”. Where are these guarantees?

All fell on deaf ears. In 2014 there was the US engineered coup in Ukraine that set up a puppet Neo-fascist regime. There was considerable opposition to the coup especially in the predominately Russian areas of Ukraine. Shelling and other acts of war led to 14,000 deaths.

Three months before the invasion, Ukraine and the United States signed an updated Charter on Strategic Partnership “guided” by Bush’s controversial Bucharest declaration, which both deepened security cooperation between the two countries and supported Ukraine’s membership aspirations, viewed as an escalation in Moscow.

Shelling slackened a bit in the month before the Russian intervention. In February it began again and increased gradually. Biden kept announcing that Russia will invade. And Russia kept saying that had no intention to do so. Finally on the 16th Biden repeated his declaration knowing full well that shelling was about to increase by massive proportions. Russia could no longer submit to such an insulting blatant act of aggression. They had to intervene not only to halt the slaughter but also to stop what was to come next -- Nato bases in Ukraine now close enough to easily engage in the standard course of imperial nation breaking. Besides the destabilization actions promoting ethnic turmoil, the enemy will have missiles so close to the core of Russia that counter measures would likely fail.

As it stands now, Russia is largely in control of the predominantly Russian ethnic regions, and elections were held to make them part of Russia. Russian forces are on the verge of taking a key corridor for the movement of Ukraine forces to the south. The death count is high among both sides but probably twice the numbers for Kiev -- both Ukrainian and the numerous foreign mercenaries. Poland revealed what happened to its first contingent of 5000. One third dead and the rest out of combat. It went so far as to inquire about the arrangement of graves in the manner of Arlington National Cemetery. Mercenaries from as many as 40 other nations are fighting on the Kiev side. Nothing is acknowledged so numbers are unknown but, judging by Poland, totals must be in the tens of thousands. Instead of a war of big Russia against little Ukraine, it is a war of Russia against forces several times its size.

China has done nothing except making the standard peace proposals. It apparently hasn't even stated that Russia is correct in judging a Nato fortress on its border a threat -- this as the US opens military installations all around China, including on Taiwan which it has acknowledged is a part of China.

As Nato increased the supply of weapons, including the most advanced that they never expected to be required, they had the insulting nerve to threaten China if they did the same to assist Russia. Not only should China provide

military assistance, but they should send a small Chinese military force near the border hostilities. Then Poles and others can live the experiences written of in Witkiewicz's *Instability*. The communists are at the gate - prepare yourselves for what you deserve.

China just released an official statement on the resolution of the Ukraine crisis. Reading it is like consuming a huge bowl of very bad pablum. It's like a child's wish list for Xmas presents. China is neutral on Russia's concern about Nato creating a Ukraine fortress for subversive practices inside Russia. US has already set up itself in China - Taiwan. If it wants to get the island back without risking nuclear annihilation it has to lose all the nonsense about Marxism and communism, put a few 'reds' in prison and face the world as capitalist to capitalist.

V

The Great Depression of the 1930's was the worst economic crisis experienced by American capitalism. The Civil War was a positive crisis in that it eliminated the antique artifact of feudal slavery to the great advantage of capitalism. The financial crisis brought about a strike wave and due to the weak position of capitalism a great deal of unionization leading to several decades of relative prosperity for workers. Save for the outbreak of WW 2 the crisis of capitalism may have developed into a pre-revolutionary situation.

The US entered the war after the Japanese attack and it was broadly popular because of the brutal war crimes of their European and Asian enemies. The war and postwar decades were enormously prosperous for American capitalism. It experienced a small proportion of the casualties and none of the destruction. The world, except for the communist states, practically begged for American exploitation. That period concluded with the American defeat in Vietnam and the full recovery of competitor nations.

The slack period of the 70's and 90's came to an end with the rapid collapse of the Stalinist nations. They expected the same opening up for American exploitation as the postwar era. But that didn't happen because, while these nations weren't communist, they also weren't your standard capitalists. The old bureaucrats were determined to keep much of the assets of the country under their control so that their personal interests will be served along with

national interests. The West was at first enthusiastic about using the highly skilled and disciplined workers (and low paid) to yield enormous profits.

They were so blinded by profits that they helped to create advanced capitalist states out of their old enemies. The loss of profits from commodity trading led to non productive market and monetary ventures as a source of wealth which were a major cause of the 2008 financial crisis. The mess created by that disaster is still with us but there appears to be renewed investment in domestic commodity production in order to give them the independent strength required to counter the political and economic strength of the main ex-Stalinist states.

All the above amounts to an account of the irreversible entropic decay of capitalism. Overarching examples of other threats to human existence are instant nuclear annihilation, the slower process of environmental annihilation, and masses of humanity dying as they flee areas of the earth made unlivable by decayed and dying forms of capitalism. But our social systems are not from nature, they are of our own making. It is imperative that we extract the positive accomplishments of human ingenuity from the moldy remains of capitalism and implant them in an environment of a social system that will advance the quality of life of humanity individually and collectively.

VI

Early in 1905 a young monk by the name of Gapon was agitating among Petersburg workers in order to organize a movement that would improve their living conditions. An Okrana agent encourage him to draw the workers into a government managed workers organization. He agreed and soon organized a large group of workers that would march before the Winter Palace. Troops organized around the palace opened fire killing hundreds. This was the event, to be followed by several more uprisings that was to end centuries of royal rule, and then a capitalist interregnum, twelve years later.

Trotsky was a prominent and effective leader of a revolution that did replace capitalism in Russia with basis for a workers democracy. Here are some of his observations on the making of revolutions -- *The Proletariat and the Revolution* -1905:

To move towards a revolution does not necessarily mean to fix a date for an insurrection and to prepare for that day. You never can fix a day and an hour for a revolution. The people have never made a revolution by command.

A revolution:

depends upon the volume and the revolutionary compactness of the masses, upon the atmosphere of popular sympathy which surrounds them and upon the attitude of the troops which the government moves against the people.... We ought to do all at our command to make the army detach itself from absolutism at the time of a decisive onslaught of the masses.

The masses have increasingly experienced the harmful effects of a dying system:

We ought to take hold of the current of popular excitement; we ought to turn the attention of numerous dissatisfied social groups to one colossal undertaking headed by the proletariat, – to the National Revolution."

Militant mass protests may bring out the armed forces. Do not desist because:

Only hopeless idiots or avowed scoundrels dare to shoot at a living target. An overwhelming majority of the soldiers are loathe to serve as executioners; this is unanimously admitted by all correspondents describing the battles of the army with unarmed people. The average soldier aims above the heads of the crowd.

All efforts ought to be made to concentrate the bitterness, the anger, the protest, the rage, the hatred of the masses, to give those emotions a common language, a common goal, to unite, to solidify all the particles of the masses, to make them feel and understand that they are not isolated, that simultaneously, with the same slogan on the banner, with the same goal in mind, innumerable particles are rising everywhere. If this understanding is achieved, half of the revolution is done.

Written January 20 [1906]-- 11 days after Bloody Sunday - Priest [Gapon] peacefully leads masses to the Winter Palace -- 5000 killed and wounded.

The events of January 9th have given us a revolutionary beginning. We must never fall below this.

The Soviet was constituted on October 18th [1907]; its session was interrupted by a military detachment of the government on December 3rd.

The Soviet organized the masses, conducted political strikes, led political demonstrations, tried to arm the workingmen. But other revolutionary organizations did the same things. The substance of those two dates the Soviet lived and struggled.

[It's main weapon was a political strike of the masses -- The purpose of which is to disrupt industry and the government and create anarchic conditions that favor a seizure of proletarian power. At the same time it must take care that anarchic conditions don't capture the proletariat. The more government and industry are immobilized, the more room the proletariat has to assume those responsibilities. The Soviet failed after 50 days because it was an urban uprising in a mainly rural country.]

Experience has shown that a Soviet is not possible or desirable under all circumstances. The objective meaning of the Soviet organization is to create conditions for disorganizing the government, for "anarchy," in other words for a revolutionary conflict. The present lull in the revolutionary movement, the mad triumph of reaction, make the existence of an open, elective, authoritative organization of the masses impossible.

After a quiet interlude, class tensions grew leading to another mass demonstration outside of the Winter Palace. The Tsar ordered his cossacks to open fire on the protesters. They refused and the Tsar abdicated.

Trotsky writing from New York March 1917:

Nicholas has been dethroned, and according to some information, is under arrest. The most conspicuous Black Hundred leaders have been arrested. Some of the most hated have been killed. A new Ministry has been formed consisting of Octobrists, Liberals and the Radical Kerensky. A general amnesty has been proclaimed.

All these are facts, big facts. These are the facts that strike the outer world most. Changes in the higher government give the bourgeoisie of Europe and America an occasion to say that the revolution has won and is now completed.

But the revolution continued:

Luckily for Russia and Europe, there is another face to the Russian Revolution, a genuine face; the cables have brought the news that the Provisional Government is opposed by a Workmen's Committee which has already raised a voice of protest against the liberal attempt to rob the Revolution and to deliver the people to the monarchy.

A constituent assembly was being formed. Forces on the left were discussing the formation of their own or at least be well represented in the new assembly

Trotsky March 30, 1917 --

The question of chief interest, now, to the governments and the peoples of the world is, What will be the influence of the Russian Revolution on the War? Will it bring peace nearer? Or will the revolutionary enthusiasm of the people swing towards a more vigorous prosecution of the war?

This is a great question. On its solution depends not only the outcome of the war, but the fate of the Revolution itself.

The further progress of the revolutionary struggle in Russia and the creation of a Revolutionary Labor Government supported by the people will be a mortal blow to the Hohenzollern because it will give a powerful stimulus to the revolutionary movement of the German proletariat and of the labor masses of all the other countries. If the first Russian Revolution of 1905 brought about revolutions in Asia – in Persia, Turkey, China – the Second Russian Revolution will be the beginning of a powerful social-revolutionary struggle in Europe. Only this struggle will bring real peace to the blood-drenched world.

No, the Russian proletariat will not allow itself to be harnessed to the chariot of Miliukov imperialism. The banner of Russian Social-Democracy is now, more than ever before, glowing with bright slogans of inflexible Internationalism.

Trotsky hastens on to Russia. From a Russian newspaper report of his first public address.

Trotsky On The Platform In Petrograd

(From a Russian paper)

Trotsky, always Trotsky. Olgin

Since I had seen him the last time, he has been advanced in rank: he has become the chairman of the Petrograd Soviet. He has succeeded Tchcheidze, the wise, sober leader who has lost the confidence of the revolutionary masses. **He holds the place of Lenin, the recognized** leader of the left wing of Social-Democracy, whose absence from the capital is due to external, accidental causes.

It seems to me that Trotsky has become more nervous, more gloomy, and more restrained. Something like a freezing chill emanates from his deep and restless eyes; a cool, determined, ironical smile plays around his mobile Jewish lips, and there is a chill in his well-balanced, clear-cut words which he throws into his audience with a peculiar calmness.

He seems almost lonesome on the platform. Only a small group of followers applaud. The others protest against his words or cast angry, restless glances at him. He is in a hostile gathering. He is a stranger. Is he not also a stranger to those who applaud him and in whose name he speaks from this platform?

Calm and composed he looks at his adversaries, and you feel it is a peculiar joy for him to see the rage, the fear, the excitement his words provoke. He is a Mephisto who throws words like bombs to create a war of brothers at the bedside of their sick mother.

He knows in advance which words will have the greatest effect, which would provoke the most bitter resentment. And the more extreme, the more painful his words are, the firmer and stronger is his voice, the slower his speech, the more challenging his tone. He speaks a sentence, then he stops to wait till the storm is over, then he repeats his assertion, with sharper intonation and with more disdain in his tone. Only his eyes become more nervous, and a peculiar disquieting fire is blazing in them.

This time he does not speak; he reads a written declaration. He reads it with pauses, sometimes accentuating the words, sometimes passing over them quickly, but all the time he is aware of the effect and waits for a response.

His voice is the voice of a prophet, a preacher:

Petrograd is in danger! The Revolution is in danger! The people are in danger! ...

He is a stranger on the platform, and yet—electric currents flow from him to his surroundings, creating sincere though primitive enthusiasm on one side, on the other anger and spite. He opens vast perspectives before the naive faithful masses:

Long live an immediate, honest, democratic peace!

All power to the Workmen's Councils! All the land to the people!