

## The Tariff

THE Canadian Manufacturers' Association is out on a crusade for new, or high tariff, and with the usual hypocrisy of business, seeks to bolster up profit-getting with altruistic platitudes, and, of course, to prove the identity of interest of capital and labor. What is this tariff business? What concern is it of ours, and of what benefit to the workers?

Capitalist production is primarily for profit. To the capitalist class, that is the be all and end all of production. It is of no intrinsic moment to the capitalist what is produced nor how it is produced, how it is used, or if it is used at all. Capitalism will manufacture anything—steam engine or tractor, tanks or poison gas, freighters or submarines. It will farm anything from grain to babies; clothe society in shoddy; dwarf its mind with deceit; blacken ambition with treachery,—provided only that profit, profit, profit, can be realized at the end of the trail. It will find in its philosophy, an ethic for every aggression; a sanction for every immorality; a justification for every crime; a plea for every degradation.

But to the tariff business.

Since capitalist production is for profit, then, the wider is its field of operation, the greater will be the volume of profit. Each individual—each group of capitalists—struggle against every other group, to extend their business operations, to eliminate their rivals from the market, to monopolize commerce for themselves.

But this rivalry, this capitalist enterprise, narrows down the available market exactly in proportion to the intensification of production. The nations of the world, is the market of the world. And as these nationals are struggling together in an internecine fight for commercial supremacy, it follows that any weapon of advantage to any one competitor in this merciless war for survival shall be adopted, indeed, must be adopted. For once in the fight, there is but one ending—signal victory, or signal defeat. That is why Spain has become a back number, why Holland has lost her "greatness," why Kultur has fallen into disrepute, why France is now hurrying on desperately to ruin, and why "democracy" is draped, in the various symbols of "old glory."

Such a weapon is the tariff. The capitalist class of any nation seeks to exploit the national resources exclusively to their own advantage. The capitalists resent all intrusion into "their" domain, and, as far as circumstances will permit, deny their competitors access to the opportunities of exploitation.

In countries like Canada where the resources are undeveloped, where the native capital is small, where neither business organization nor industrial efficiency is so highly perfected and coordinated as in old established nations, and where in consequence, capitalist concentration has not yet become the powerful syndicate of trust operation, it is impossible for the capitalists of such a nation to compete successfully in the open markets of the world. Hence, to save the resources for their own profit, the capitalist operators impose a duty on all or on particular commodities entering their ports. Hence they hope to exploit the "home market," to make foreign investment pay toll to them, and to dump whatever surplus may be produced, on the world market on an equality with better organized competitors.

Such is the daydream of the bourgeoisie. But all action has its reaction, and the stoutest tariff yields to the stubborn laws of competition. For in spite of fate and monopoly, capitalist nations must trade to live, must expand their trade if they would survive, must allow goods in, in payment of goods sent out, and if their tariff imposts seriously restrict the activities of their rivals, ultimately do they hamper themselves. If imports are greatly in excess of exports, the fact finds a swift reflex in (adverse) exchange, which itself acts as a tariff, bringing industry to a stoppage. If exports greatly exceed imports, then, in ordinary circumstances, all the sooner does capitalist production reach its inevitable stagnation. In reality, the business of commerce is the business of traders. They balance their books, and

figure their paper wealth, under the laws of exchange, through which they must operate. And tariffs go high, or go low, on or off, as interest and necessity determine, and as conditions warrant. In practice there are all sorts of differentials, all kinds of compromise, and ever changing front of tariff. Because, as regards the tariff, there is an ever changing front of capitalist exigency, brought about by its own development, and so too as regards the preferentials, because, all nations in modern commerce are interlocked and interdependent, and the irrevocable necessities of imperialistic expansion force capital into an ever more omnipotent concentration—and at the same time, into an ever more inevitable negative of itself. Hence tariffs and their contradictions: their opponents and protagonists.

But the "home market" is by no means the objective of capitalism, nor can it serve capitalist necessity. Concentration is the nemesis of capital, and in effect, great concentration is intensive exploitation. Therefore, since capitalist production is commodity production, by the terms of that production the producers, the workers, receive for their production the value of their labor power, i.e., receive wages, sufficient to reproduce labor power in efficiency for the operation of capitalist industry. But the value of this labor power is far less than the value of the commodities which labor power creates. Thus it is impossible for the producers to buy back what they have produced. Thus is the home market dead to the capitalist. And as this produce must be sold to realize the profit it contains, it must be exploited. The more intensive is the exploitation the more efficient the industrial organization. The more exclusive the field of operations of a single group of capitalists, — nation or empire, the greater is the potential volume of profit. This is why capitalist exchange must continually expand. The question of the tariff is a question of a particular group of exploiters. To the laborer, whose one commodity—labor power—is bartered as a commodity, in terms of the market, and so converted into profit, tariff or no tariff matters not to him, and is absolutely of no advantage to him.

Labor has but one interest: the abolition of the wage system. With the abolition of capital, and therefore of classes, society will attain indentity of interest. For, when it achieves economic freedom, i.e., the ownership and control of the means of life—society achieves all. That is the prime interest of labor; that is its historic task, and only through labor can it be realized.

## What the Dictatorship Is.

COMRADE TYLER wishes to know what the Dictatorship is, or what it means. Does it mean the Dictatorship of a minority?

In the only country where it is in force, namely, Russia, that is just what it means.

Does the working class have to employ such measures?

That depends on circumstances. In Russia they or the conscious minority that hold power, have to employ such methods or be swept away. Granted.

Can a Socialist society be built up on this foundation?

That still remains to be seen. If Russia had the opportunities that peace would provide, we would be better able to tell. It is on the cards, that a genuine working class control of the workshops could function; but again, the influence of the large swarms of peasantry with their reactionary ideas, and control of agriculture, would render this difficult.

If Russia has to struggle along alone, then it is quite likely a system of government ownership of industry will eventually come about.

Further, F. S. F. never claimed we would get Socialism by the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

But power will be held only by the Dictatorship, till conditions stabilize.

If by Socialism Comrade Tyler understands working class ownership and control of land and industry, then we will agree, that can never be, till the mass of the toilers want it.

Comrade Tyler should surely understand that Bela Kun, Levien, and Liebknecht were forced by circumstances into the positions they occupied, and are not therefore to be condemned for the tragic failures of the premature uprisings. That they were premature and foredoomed is granted, and hence the warning in "The Proletarian" that Comrade Tyler mentions, against such attempts. But we must bear in mind that those very attempts have been mighty forces in shaping men's minds.

But has mankind learned any other way?

Bela Kun himself is on record as saying:

"The Hungarian Revolution was premature only in the sense that only a small portion of the workers were Communists."

"But, only by Revolution, does the working class become Revolutionary."

There you have the statement born of actual experience. Again, let me remind Comrade Tyler that as Lenin has pointed out:

"When Marx made the statement about a possible peaceful transition from Capitalism to Socialism in England and America, militarism and bureaucracy, as we know them, did not exist. Now they do, in both countries, due to monopolism bringing forth imperialism."

In view of the admissions made here, why do I then support the Russian Dictatorship, may be asked.

Because, as stated before, the Bolsheviks were pushed into power by the very logic of events. They beat the reactionaries to it.

Whether they can achieve "Socialism" or not is immaterial, I do not claim they can—alone.

Their chief object (and will you deny that this is true, or was it not worth all the labor and pain?) was the securing of a centre for a tremendous world propaganda, and the consequent acceleration of the world revolution. That they are succeeding in this is incontestable. Why, our enemies alone have been forced into advertising Bolshevism, Communism, and so on, to an extent undreamed of three years ago. Perhaps it would have been wiser to have wired the S. P. G. B. for advice first, ere taking such desperate chances; but we must excuse them that oversight.

Russia at that particular time afforded a golden opportunity for seizing power, and most emphatically the action has been justified.

The other countries mentioned were in a far less favorable situation, and the propaganda was not so much advanced, as was the case in Russia.

It may be asked then, if the masses in Russia do not desire the Bolshevik rule now (if that is the case), does it not show that their education was neglected?

By no means: for an illiterate population, full of slavish instincts, they have fought the good fight remarkably well. Let Comrade Tyler reflect on the terrible hardships they have endured, and compare the Russian workers with his fellow slaves in our democratic lands, and still they come out best. Their morale and trust in their leaders may be breaking, but we have yet to be shown.

And will Comrade Tyler tell us just what the Bolsheviks should have done? Or what they should now do? Would the Russian slaves have been better off if the "great incident" had never happened?

If Comrade Tyler wishes to delude himself that opposition to the rule of the workers will be limited to "raving," he is to be pitied. Unfortunately, it is much easier to play upon prejudice and passions than to carry on education of the kind in need. And that is just where the ruling class shines. Right here in Washington we find full page ads. in a newspaper calling for war on the I. W. W., by all loyal Americans, and Comrade Tyler can figure out for himself just what such things can lead to.

True, we will fight to maintain democratic procedure, but it is very probable that a situation will arise where the democratic wings of the workers are clipped, and the propaganda forced underground as is the case already here, in the U. S., with some organizations.

"Whenever the working class desires Socialism, we will get it." Will we?

Believe me; it takes more than desire to achieve victory over a ruling class. If four-fifths of the slaves desire Socialism, and only one-fifth are determined to get it, that minority would have to establish

(Continued on page 8.)