

onomic interests, as illustrated in the civil war of the United States.

Meighen, in one of his election addresses said that people had not read or if they had read history misunderstood it if they maintained that free trade was a farmer policy. I think we can safely say he didn't understand the dominant economic factor in history when he utters such stuff as that.

If we look at history we find the manufacturers of Britain were Free Traders while the other countries were Protectionists. If we look back at the farmer of Britain he is a protectionist while the Canadian farmer is a Free Trader! How do we account for this contrary opinion of these classes in the two countries? The Capitalists of Britain discovered that the corn law increased the living of the worker and fought for its abolition which realized a reduction in wages. Britain, being a country that depended on foodstuffs from abroad, had to have it, tariff or no tariff. The farmer could add the price of the tariff to the home grown corn as long as the tariff remained. The landowning class could collect more ground rent and therefore he was interested in a tariff. The worker only receiving in wages what it takes to live, it was to the economic interest of the individual capitalists of Britain to have free trade not only for cheap foodstuffs but also for cheap raw material.

The Canadian Farmer being an exporter of foodstuffs and a purchaser of machinery which is produced abroad, has no need of protection on either corn or machinery. He wants cheap machinery and he is not met with competition from abroad in agricultural produce.

We find the agriculturalists of Italy shouting for a tariff because of foreign competition and the manufacturers also wanting a tariff on machines, but not on food stuffs.

Therefore we see how to analyze the different motives of different countries in regard to their tariff policies, once we grasp the Marxian method of looking at history.

I pointed out how the various interests expressed in the peaceful methods of penetration of foreign lands, when the textile industry was the dominant class in government, how we entered the iron stage of capitalism with the war as a consequence, and now we have entered into the phase of a combination of iron and oil because oil is the dominating fuel used in the engines of warfare on land, sea and air.

No matter what the so called Great Men will agree about at Washington, when the economic conditions change, as they are constantly changing, the attempt to reconcile the economic antagonisms of the various nations will once again break out in force, unless the workers are intelligent enough to grasp the situation and steer the State Ship to harbor of Socialism and Communism, there to be dismantled and replaced by an executive of the workers, not to govern but to administer things, and in conclusion, while we have been treated to the visit of these Great Men let me quote Professor Seligman on this subject. I endeavored to show its weakness in our first lesson. Seligman says:

"The effects ascribed to great men are often largely the result of forces, of which they were only the chance vehicles. Caesar erected the Roman Empire but the empire would undoubtedly have come ultimately without Caesar.

"Napoleon for the time transformed the face of Europe, but the France of today would in all probability have been in its essentials the same had Napoleon never lived. Washington and Lincoln assuredly exercised the most profound influence on their time, but it is scarcely open to doubt that in the end the Revolution would have succeeded though Washington and Lincoln had never existed. While his appearance at a particular moment appears to us as a matter of chance, the great man influences society only when society is in need of him. If society is not ready, he is called, not a great man, but a visionary failure . . . the great man can permanently succeed, only if the social environment is ripe."

When Seligman deals with various historians he says:

"That Rousseau was not a profound historical

scholar is to put it mildly. Others, like Leasing in his "Education of Humanity," and Herder in his "Ideas on the Philosophy of History" were too much under the domination of the theistic conception to give much impetus to a newer movement of thought, even although Herder in Germany and Ferguson in Scotland may be called in some respects a forerunner of anthropological investigations.

"Huxley as well as many of the German writers has pointed out that Kant in his "Idea of Universal History," anticipated many of the modern doctrines of evolution, but even Kant was not sufficiently emancipated from the theology of the age to take a strictly scientific view of the subject."

"Hegel's "Philosophy of History" is too subtle for general acceptance and reached the high water mark of the "Idealistic Interpretation." Benjamin Kidd's "Religious Interpretation of History," even in the modified form, has found few adherents.

"The political interpretation of history which can be traced back to Aristotle is a result of putting the cart before the horse. Political change has been repeatedly shown as but a secondary phenomenon. With the failure of these attempts of a more or less idealistic nature, the way was prepared for the physical interpretation which is associated with Buckle. Buckle failed to explain the distinction of wealth that had been advanced a decade before by another writer who was destined to become far more famous and influential.

"Karl Marx enjoyed some qualifications which were denied to Buckle. Buckle was indeed well abreast of the foreign as well as the English literature on history and natural science, but his economic views were well in accord with those of the prevalent school in England. These principles so completely lack the evolutionary point of view as to preclude a historical treatment of society.

"Karl Marx, on the other hand, possessed the philosophical and scientific equipment of a German University graduate, but found himself in direct and unqualified opposition to the teaching of the professional economists. While Buckle contented himself with pointing how the physical forces affect production of wealth, Marx addressed himself to the larger task of showing how the whole structure of society is modified by the relations of social classes and how these relations are themselves dependent on antecedent economic changes."

He then gives an outline of Marx and the other thinkers of his time like Feuerbach who exerted a profound influence.

P. 23. "Marx was not at first specially well versed in natural science, the naturalism of Feuerbach combined with the conception of process in the dialectic of Hegel led Marx finally to the theory 'that all social institutions are the result of growth and that the causes of this growth are to be sought not in the idea, but in the material conditions. Greece and Roman history is to be explained in the light of this fact.'

"It was Marx too, who first disclosed the economic forces which were chiefly responsible for the political changes of the middle of the nineteenth century and finally, why Marx had originally devoted comparatively little attention to primitive civilization, we know now that in his manuscript notes he applied his doctrine in a suggestive way to the very stages of social evolution. These notes are used by Engels in his "Origin of the Family."

"Marx has made good their main contention with Morgan's whose importance was not recognised until Marx and Engels took the matter up (meaning "Ancient Society.")

P. 77. "In Greece and Rome and in the Teutonic Races of the middle ages this transition is a matter of record, but no one before Morgan and Engels had been able to explain it intelligently."

That is the expression of Professor Seligman on the ability of Karl Marx and, remember, he says he is no Socialist.

I heard one professor say that the Marxian theory was on the shelf covered with dust but at discussion time I tackled his philosophy with that of Marx and pointed out that Marx's works were being taken down off the shelf and the dust removed.

Fellow-workers: If I have aroused some interest in these lessons on history to encourage the removal of the dust by taking down Marx's work from the shelf, my endeavour and toil has not been wasted.

Yours in the movement,
Peter T. Leckie.

FOUR YEARS' ACTIVITY OF THE MOSCOW REVOLUTIONARY TRIBUNAL.

A member of the "Isvestia" staff had an interview with Smirnow president of the Moscow revolutionary tribunal who made the following communication on the four years' activity of the Moscow revolutionary tribunal:

In the period of 1918-1921 750 cases were heard in public sitting (162 in 1918, 194 in 1919, 236 in 1920 and 164 in the first eight months of 1921). In all 2882 persons were accused of whom 580 were acquitted and 2402 sentenced.

In 1918 24.2% of the accused were sentenced for counter-revolution, in 1919 only 14.4%.

In 1918 29.8% were sentenced for speculation and profiteering; in 1920 53.7% for the same offence.

During four years 76.3% of all accused were sentenced for abuse of office, counter-revolution and speculation and only 23.7% for other offences, such as counterfeiting, brigandage, fraud and embezzlement.

It is interesting to examine the social position of the accused (the pre-revolution social position of course). There were: clergymen 16, merchants and manufacturers 265, home workers and artisans 80, members of the free professions 249, state employees and soldiers 211.

Employees in commerce and industry: brain workers 580, workers 523, peasants 183, without any particular profession or employment 95.

This shows that only 29.4% of the accused belong to the proletariat.

As to penalties, the sentences were:

Death by shooting	178	7.4%
To be confined in concentration camps	216	9.0%
To forced labor with deprivation of personal liberty	1036	43.1%
To forced labor with deprivation of personal liberty	177	7.4%
To conditional imprisonment	476	19.8%
To other penalties	319	13.3%
Total	2402	100.0%

Of the 178 sentenced to death, 10 were sentenced for counter-revolution, 46 for abuse of office (30 for bribery and corruption), 74 for robbery, 14 for speculation and 34 for divers crimes (murder, counterfeiting, banditism, fraud, embezzlement).

The majority of the accused were sentenced to compulsory labor. The accused whose sentences came under the heading "other penalties," were mostly sentenced to public censure, loss of the right to occupy public posts, loss of political rights, confiscation of property, expulsion from the territory of the R. S. F. S. R.

The death sentences of the Moscow Tribunal were not all executed, and many compulsory labor sentences were reduced in term.

The amnesties softened the punishment of 887 convicts, 239 of who went entirely free, 102 sentenced to compulsory labor with deprivation of personal liberty got compulsory labor without deprivation of liberty, the term of 379 prisoners was reduced to five years and 167 prisoners got reductions of one-third, one-half and two-thirds of their terms respectively.

Among the prisoners whose term was reduced to five years there were many who had been sentenced to ten, fifteen and twenty years' compulsory labor.

—Rosta Wien

NOTE CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Send all mail to—

P. O. Box 710

Vancouver, B. C.

(Exchanges please adjust to suit)

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MARXIAN SOCIALISM
BOOK I.—By H. RAHM
50 cents per copy; \$3.50 per 10.