

THE INDICATOR

History :: Economics :: Philosophy :: Current Events

Vol. 1 No. 1

VANCOUVER, B. C., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1919

FIVE CENTS

What Is Capital?

By Jerome K. Jerome.

I am not an authority on Political Economy. Not to put too fine a point upon it, I am not at all sure that I even understand it. I doubt if I could explain offhand the origin of Capital. I gather that it happened long ago, and even since there seems to have been trouble about it. I remember an election meeting in a manufacturing town. The speaker, a gentleman who seemed to feel the heat, was full of vigor. "You can't do without capital," he said. There came a voice from the back of the hall: "No; but we can do without you, old man." Since then I have heard the argument stated pro and con, with more elaboration, but never, as far as I have been able to judge has it got beyond that bald and simple point. I have been told by way of crude example, adapted to my intelligence, that the first Capitalist was probably the first man who made a spade. This agricultural implement he probably lent, or "rented," at so much an hour, paid in the currency of the period; sea-shells or crocodiles' teeth, one supposes. So far, I understand the thing. But suppose the gentleman to whom that first capitalist had lent his shovel, instead of returning it with thanks and the agreed number of beads, had hit that "Capitalist" over the head with it, and had afterwards buried him. "The rule of Right and Justice" dates, I gather from November last. It had not been established in that rude age. I see no impossibility of such an incident having occurred. Who was the Capitalist, then? History would suggest that this argument has got to be considered: Who are the Capitalists? Those who make the shovels, or those who, by force or cunning, get possession of the shovels?

In Pennsylvania

(From "The New Republic.")

THOSE who have applauded the liberal use of State Constabulary for the breaking up of strikers' meetings in Western Pennsylvania have plenty of proof, if they will see it, that this method of maintaining the peace is not only high-handed but ineffective. Defense of clubbing tactics rests on a belief that mass meetings can in that fashion be prevented from turning into mobs. But what is the actual record of events in the present strike? In Ohio, there have been few cases of meetings broken up, during the first week of the strike—and there have been fewer riots and disturbances of any sort than in any other section of the steel country. All of the worst riots have come in the Pittsburg district—and that is just where the State Constabulary have been most active. In the towns along the Ohio River the con-

"The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice"

—and Stephen Leacock, Professor of Economics

By C. K.

CHAPTER the seventh, and, we believe, the last, of "The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice," by Professor Leacock appears in "The Daily Province," of Saturday, Oct. 11. In it, Mr. Leacock sets forth his plan whereby society may be saved from chaos and destruction. And by "society," it is well to note, Mr. Leacock obviously means the present economic system. He seems quite unable to perceive the difference between the social organism and the method of production and distribution of use-values, which may at any given period be its economic basis. That he is very keenly aware of the manifold defects of the present social order is quite plainly apparent. It is difficult to imagine how any intelligent school boy, after reading the professor's remarks on this subject, can avoid the obvious inference that those economic inequalities upon which he dwells so often are the inevitable outcome of a system of production for profit instead of for use. Yet the professor misses this point entirely. It is such intellectual lapses as this, which give us cause for doubting his sincerity.

His plan of salvation is in effect nothing more or less than an extension of State Control. In his own words, "the government of every country" "ought to supply work and play (pay?) for the 'unemployed, maintenance for the infirm and aged,' 'and education and opportunity for the children.'" We would be greatly interested to hear what

trast has been unmistakable: comparative free speech and order on the western side—suppression and disorder on the east.

The truth of this fact is put in another way by the statement of an officer of the Carnegie Steel Company, speaking officially for the Steel Corporation. "Where the State Constabulary have not been active," he says, "the strike has made headway." "One of the reasons why the strike was so widespread at Youngstown was that the police protection was not good." When you couple this statement with the fact that in Youngstown, the first week of the strike has been marked by extraordinary order, what does it mean? Simply that it is naive to believe that the first duty of the State Constabulary in the present strike is to preserve order. In Youngstown, the strikers could state their case unmolestedly to their fellow-workers. The strike was immediately successful. It was also without disorder. In the Pittsburg district, the clubbing of meetings didn't prevent riots—but it did succeed temporarily in holding back the strike. And that was what was wanted.

essential difference Mr. Leacock imagines he can see between this and that system of State Control which in a previous article he so vigorously denounced under the impression that it was Socialism. It is such glaring inconsistencies as this which compel us to question Mr. Leacock's fitness for the task of saving the social structure.

Most of his time, Mr. Leacock appears to be living in a bygone age. Not to put too fine a point upon it his intellectual process is distinctly antiquated. He is confronted with certain unhealthy symptoms affecting the present social structure. His method of remedying them appears for the most part to take the form of insisting that these things must not happen again. The government should do this and it should do that. We are reminded of the old lady, a relic of the Victorian era, who, being greatly shocked by certain aspects of the recent war, expressed her astonishment that the government did not do something to stop it.

Mr. Leacock appears to be quite ignorant of the fact that even governments are powerless in the face of economic laws. Somewhere else he has something to say regarding what he refers to as "supposedly" immutable economic laws. He does not appear to consider them immutable. We beg to differ on this point. We would point out to Mr. Leacock that what we call economic laws are indeed immutable. But they are not immutable because we call them laws. On the contrary we call them laws because we have discovered them to be immutable. Consequently, to assert that a law is not immutable is a contradiction in terms and is sheer nonsense. If we agree in calling on an animal possessing certain characteristics a bird, to say that an animal possessing those characteristics is not a bird is absurd. A given complex of material conditions must invariably and inevitably give rise to certain results. A given economic basis such as the present system of production for profit must invariably and inevitably give rise to material conditions which result in certain effects some of which Mr. Leacock has noted in his remarks upon the economic inequalities of the present social order. And, if our observation of economic phenomena has been correct, so long as that given economic base is present so long will those certain effects manifest themselves. That is what is meant by an economic law and neither the government nor Mr. Leacock can alter it.

Once this point is understood, it will be quite obvious that Mr. Leacock's suggestion that the governments do this or that is merely an attempt, to palliate the unhealthy

symptoms in the social structure and falls very far short of striking at the root cause of the disease. The inference can not be made too plain. **The fundamental cause, or to state it scientifically, the efficient cause, of those "bitter inequalities" in the present social structure, to which even Mr. Leacock can not shut his eyes, is the present economic basis of production for profit.** So long as production for profit remains the economic basis of society, so long will those "bitter inequalities" continue to manifest themselves, the government and Mr. Leacock notwithstanding.

The chapters of the Unsolved Riddle abound with statements which suggest rather than assert that Mr. Leacock is under the impression that men make their economic systems in accordance with their ideas of what is right and just. As a matter of fact the exact contrary is the case. Our ideas of what is right and just are very largely determined by the methods by which we are compelled to furnish ourselves with the means of life, or, in other words, by the economic system which forms the basis of the society in which we live. Ideas are the reflexes of material things. Abstract ideas are the reflexes of the relationships between material things. First, the material things or the relations between material things, then the ideas to which they give rise.

It is true Mr. Leacock has more than once admitted that a change in the methods of production and distribution has caused a corresponding change in men's ideas, but, if he perceives the principle therein involved, what does he mean by such statements as: "If the Kingdom of Socialism were opened tomorrow, there are but few fitted to enter," or again "Social betterment must depend at every stage on the force of public spirit and public morality that inspires it?" And again, what does he mean when he speaks of that "individualism that we have hitherto made the basis of the social order?"

It is true that we have discovered some time since, that a certain degree of individualism is indeed the basis of the present social order. It is also true that those who ride on the crest of the present social order, and consequently regard it as a most desirable state of affairs, are very prone to the idea that individualism is a right and proper basis for an ideal social structure. But if Mr. Leacock intends to convey the impression that society deliberately and consciously adopted individualism as its basis, then may we be permitted to point out to him that he is entirely in error. The fact of the matter

(Continued on Page Four)

The Farmer Question

(Contributions under this heading not necessarily endorsed.—Edit.)

THE history of the Socialist movement in Canada has been chequered with discussion on the standing of the farmer. Whether he can be considered a worker and a subject for Socialist propaganda, or whether he must be considered as a capitalist whose interests are diametrically opposed to the working class; has been, in this country, a question of some importance; owing to the large number of farmers.

It is my purpose to briefly review this discussion and point out the relative importance, in my opinion, of the different arguments brought forward.

It has been asserted by one writer that the farmer is a capitalist, an employer of labor for the purpose of obtaining surplus value or profit, and consequently that he should be "let alone," that workers should not waste time and money on those whose interests force them to oppose any change in the social structure. Let us see, first, whether there is any truth in this.

I do not think I need use up much space on the above argument. For those who have lived on the farms, or have seen how the farmers live and work; "behold," "look at them" will be sufficient to show that there are the rich farmers, poor farmers and "comfortably fixed" farmers, but that the great majority are toiling slaves. It is to these that I am writing.

In all sections of industry where individual skill and competitive effort is a factor, there are those who are exceptionally well-fitted for their work, and who forge ahead of their competitors, it is however, not with individuals that we are dealing, but with aggregations.

I think I am within bounds when I say that the majority of those who till the soil are receiving, skill for skill, no more than the wage-workers. This being the case, the farmer, as one of the cogs in the wheels of production, must be reckoned with when a change in the social order is brought about. His state of mind is therefore of importance to the wage-workers in the factories, the mills, mines and workshops.

We come now to a more serious part of our task, viz.—what is the cause of the poverty of the farmer, one argument is; that he is a marginal producer; that is, that either by using out-of-date machinery, or methods, or by not farming a large enough tract of land, or by not raising the kind of farm produce that is most suited to the land he uses, he is wasting his labor, and is on the margin of production.

It is asserted that all commodities sell at their value, farm produce included, so the only explanation possible, is that the farmer is a marginal producer. But here we come to the question, how can the average farmer be on the margin? The average is the centre, therefore it can not be the margin. Marginal producers can not possibly be average producers.

But it must be borne in mind, that just as one farm may yield a greater

amount of produce for equal labor than another, so one country may yield a greater amount of produce than another for equal labor, also it must be borne in mind that though a tract of land may not be as suitable as another for one kind of produce, it may be more suitable for another kind.

The farmer needs no help to decide what crops are the most suitable for the land he is working, he is an expert in that line. His experience and interests force him to raise the crops that he can raise in competition with other growers, still there are undoubtedly individuals who are marginal producers and there may be groups of farmers who can not avoid being marginal producers, because of location and quality of the land they work. In the raising of wheat and oats (and these are the staple crops of Western Canada) I think I may assert with safety that Canada can compete with other countries. If she can do this it is proof that the average Canadian farmer is not a marginal, but an average producer.

I would here like to again point out that the value of a commodity is determined, not by the cheapest method of production but by the average method, I want it to be thoroughly understood that the value of anything is found, **when supply and demand are equal**, by taking the whole mass of commodities of one kind, and the whole labor used in producing this mass, and dividing the labor by the number of commodities. To make a simple illustration; suppose in any particular year there is 1000 million bushels of wheat raised, and in the production of this amount there is expended, including time spent in making machinery that is used up, twine, etc., 1000 million hours, then each bushel of wheat would be worth one hour, and if each hour produced one dollar, on the average, in the gold mining and refining industries, then one bushel of wheat would be worth one dollar. (The figures are used merely for illustration.)

The fact that tractors can be used to a limited extent in farming, and that an exceptionally large tract of land can be formed so as to produce, wheat say, at a low labor cost, does not lower the value of the wheat to a greater extent than the proportion of the world's supply that is produced by that method.

For example, suppose of the assumed world's supply of wheat for one year, 1000 million bushels; 950 million bushels is raised on small farms, with little but horsepower, and its average cost is 950 million hours, or one hour per bushel; and suppose the other 50 million bushels are raised on large farms with improved methods, etc., and its cost is cut down to 25 million hours or one-half hour per bushel; then the value of the whole of the world supply would be, 950 million bushels at one hour per bushel, 950 million hours; 50 million bushels at one-half hour per bushel, 25 million hours; total 1000 million bushels valued at 975 million hours, or decimal 975 of one hour for each bushel. Taking our former figures with regard to gold as an

example we have 97 1-2c per bushel as the value of the 1000 million bushels. Though one part was raised by a more expensive method than the other, the social exchange value is the average cost in labor time, and then that cost reckoned by the universal measure of value; gold.

Though I run the risk of boring some of my readers by my reiteration, it seems necessary to repeat that the value of a commodity is determined not by the cheapest method of production but by the average method. The fact that some clever individual could produce the world's supply of, wheat say, at a fraction of the present cost, does not alter the fact that wheat is produced by man under existing conditions, and it is the cost under existing conditions that determines its value, not what someone thinks, the cost should be.

Now we have another consideration with regard to value, which must not be forgotten. It will be remembered that I said above, that the value of a commodity is determined by dividing the whole of the labor expended, by the number of the commodities on which that labor is expended **when supply and demand are equal**.

We all know that some producers expend more than the average amount of labor on a commodity, and some less. Some farmers may be forced to expend more labor than the average, by reason of having more stone or brush on their land than the average, or being farther from a market, etc. For many reasons some farmers may not be using their time and energy to the best advantage, and so, as society will declare arbitrarily, will be wasting their labor.

I am sure there are many students of economics who understand the above, to whom it has not occurred, that just as the individual may waste his labor, so the whole of the producers of a given commodity may waste their labor, not because they are producing "unscientifically" but because they are producing what society does not need; too much; and society can only afford to use up, store and waste this excess of commodities if it can get them at a lowered price.

When a commodity is over-produced, society declares arbitrarily, through the law of supply and demand, that the producers have been wasting their labor to the extent that they have over-produced, so we have lowered price; and this lowered price is an expression of a lowered value; but only in a broad sense. So if the value of farm produce is so low, under normal conditions that the farmers are poverty-stricken, it is not because they are marginal producers but because they are over-producers.

True instances of marginal producers are the bootmaker in competition with the factories; and all other small manufacturers and makers, who compete with the large up-to-date concerns. These concerns are themselves able to easily supply the market without the small man.

Here we have a very different proposition to the farmer. The large

concerns can easily supply the whole of the commodities needed, and so their method sets the value. The small man is not a necessity, what he supplies is like a drop in a thousand gallons. But the economist has a very different proposition where the small farmer is concerned. The great bulk of farm produce is produced on small farms, the small farmer is a necessity. The large farms are hardly out of the experimental stage, and the tractor, so far as my experience and observation goes, is seldom used except for breaking and threshing. On farms of 640 acres where an engine is owned, I have seen the ploughing done by horses. Why? Because it could be done cheaper. The horses have to be kept anyway as the engine will not do all their work. The traction engine on the farm is an imperfect machine, its use does not materially affect the value of farm produce. This is a sweeping statement, but from broad observation and enquiry, I believe that it is correct.

If then it is correct that the farmer's poverty is due to over-production, why does he not produce less supply, and the price rise to value and allow demand to catch up to under the condition of an equal supply and demand? The answer, in my opinion, is simple. There has been, and still is, an over-supply of labor-power on the world's market. Part of this over-supply has flowed into the farming industry (carrying along with it the ideology of the wage-worker, namely a "living-wage,") this has caused a chronic over-supply of farm produce, and a reduction of price to a point where society can stomach all the produce, and the average farmer can get a living for himself and family, and an average rate of interest on the money invested in means of production, (horses, farm buildings, machinery, tools, etc.) Whoever is the real owner of these things, gets the interest or profit.

During the war, and since, when supply and demand became equal, and then there became an actual shortage of farm produce of many kinds, the price rose to "equitable" value, or value under equal supply and demand, and then would have risen above to a considerable extent had not the government stepped in and eliminated competition at the "demand end." Should capitalist domination continue, for a few years, a fall in the price of farm produce to the pre-war level or nearly so, is, in my opinion an absolute certainty.

Now fellow farmer, I have been as brief as possible, I have not dealt with the "collector" and his "sins," or the grade mixer. If you have grasped the theory I have tried to briefly expound, you will be able to assign to these gentlemen their relative importance. I am afraid I am taking up too much space as it is, but hope our editor will allow me a little more yet.

We farmers are not called upon to be the prime movers in changing this system for one more suited to the development of the race. For that task we are not well suited. Our mode of life and work, does not weld us together, and force us to be aggressive in this matter. To the wage-workers, the proletariat, belongs the work of inaugurating a new order of society, for that task

(Continued On Page 3.)

THE FARMER QUESTION.

(Continued from Page Two)

they are well fitted. But we, as members of the great working class, as necessary cogs and wheels in the machinery of production, are called upon to sanction, and even second their endeavor. To fit ourselves for this mission is our duty to the race to which we belong, to humanity. Therefore, we must understand that our interests are bound up with the interests of our class, the working class. A form of society, a system that will free the world from unemployment, that will give to the wage-worker, the full product of his labor, that will take from the capitalist the power to exploit and rule, will free the farmer from his arch-enemy, the capitalist, and his economic enemy, the out of work wage-workers, who continually flood his field of production, making a chronic oversupply of farm produce which keeps prices down, as explained above.

It will be noticed that though there is a difference of opinion among Socialists as to where and how the farmer is exploited, there is no difference of opinion as to the remedy. We all agree that the farmer is being exploited and that organization and co-operation of all the workers, is the remedy.

In an article in a former issue, the writer makes the statement in effect, that there would be no oversupply if all had the amount of food they need. I do not know whether this is correct or not but I am very sure, if it is not, that there would be no difficulty in persuading the surplus farmers to go back to some other occupation, providing they had security and assurance of a comfortable "living." Many of us do not exactly love the farms or the life, and if society decides that it is necessary that we remain on the farms and do our best to provide the world with the raw material for the manufacture of food, we must be compensated for our labor equally with any other worker, no matter whether nature rewards our labor with a lavish or a stingy hand.

Read and study fellow farmer, don't let the fact that you have to hire help to get in your seed, or to take off your crop, for which you are charged more than you think you should be, warp your judgment and make you a traitor to your class, and a tool of your enemy, the capitalist. Wages, (the price of labor-power) are set by supply and demand, just as the price of any other commodity is set. When men were plentiful in 1913, I have seen good men getting as low as 50c a day, and I never knew a farmer pay more than he had to, because the wage was too little. It is not the avarice of the men which sets the price of labor-power (though all want as much as they can get,) but an economic law.

The capitalist system is the cause of all our troubles. Systems, like other forms of life, are born, grow, come to maturity and decay. We are living in an epoch when a system is decaying, and are privileged to live at a time when a new system is being born.

Read and study, so that the new form of life may be ushered into existence with as little pain as possible. Pain there must be, to the

The Materialistic Origin of Three Pillars of Modern Society

PROFESSOR Edward Jenks in his "Short History of Politics," states that there is no political institution of greater importance, none has been the subject of greater controversy, than the institution of property. "There is none, therefore," he says, "more fit for the application of the 'historical method' which knows no prejudices and admits no passions, but simply relates facts."

Around this institution of property, the central pillar of class societies, the political activities of society may be said to have raged for ages. Contrary to the opinions of many people, property is not coeval with man. Our historical method of enquiry shows that there was a time when neither land nor other means of existence were personal property, but were instead owned in common. Certain savage tribes in the hunting stage of development even today illustrate this, in that the individual only appropriates to himself his personal adornments, clothing and certain weapons. All the members of the tribe share in the proceeds of the day's chase and camp and live together. This restricted idea among savages, ancient and modern, of what should be personal property is the result of their material environment. Hunting and fishing, when the implements of the chase are crude and undeveloped, can only be practiced jointly. Also the savage is surrounded by such perpetual danger from both real and imaginary terrors that he can not exist in a state of isolation.

However, wherever man has advanced into the pastoral stage, the conditions of this kind of life produce a change in the ideas of property. The rudimentary idea of the savage hunter undergoes a development. The necessities of life are more plentiful and more certain. The individual can produce more than is absolutely essential to his existence. "The continued association," says Jenks, "of the herdsman with his cattle and sheep, his perception of the increased advantages which can be derived from them—their hides, wool and milk—strengthen the relationship between him and them. In this stage moveable chattels, (i.e., "cattle") may fairly be said to have reached the stage of property, even of individual property. But so also

human race as a whole, but the pain may be lessened if all the tissues of the live part of society, the working, the producing class, will bend their energy to the task before them and give to their children and their children's children, a system that is alive, healthy and vigorous. Shall we be doing our duty to our children if we oppose the inauguration of a system that is for their well-being, that is necessary to their very existence? Shall we tell them "when the fight is over and the battle won," that we did all we could to prevent the system ever being born, and that instead of educating ourselves and others for the great change, we were among those who refused to be educated, were among the tissues which had to decay along with the decaying system? H. F. S.

must wives, children and slaves. As we have seen, the perception of the value of human labor leads to a desire to appropriate it." In those times the chief appropriation took the form of chattel slavery. Here we reach a new stage which marked a most profound and radical departure in social evolution. Individual property underwent an extension, and slavery, and probably permanent marriage became two of our great institutions.

It is a common idea that the beginnings of society was in the family, but such is not the case. Enquiry has shown that the primitive form of association was the tribe, or more correctly speaking the "pack," as it seems to have resembled more nearly a hunting than a social organization. It was the tribe of later times, which we generally have in mind, which was a federation of class and families.

The earlier form of social unit was what is known as the totem group, which is found universally among savages. The sexes live apart and the unmarried individuals of one totem group may not marry within the totem, but with those of another totem which is fixed upon in accordance with the rules of an elaborate system of relationship. When a man marries, he marries the whole of the women of her totem. Thus all the men of one totem are the husbands of the whole of the women of another totem, of the same generation. It is conjectured that this system grew up out of the desire to prevent the marriage of near relations.

The introduction of the domestication of animals, however, broke this system down and brought in the Patriarchal order and the separate family. Human labor became of value in the sense that it could produce more than was necessary for its subsistence. The tasks of breeding and tending cattle, sheep and goats, by the men, and by the women of spinning wool, milking and making butter and cheese showed this. And a man who has been very successful in cattle rearing requires a number of hands to keep his herds in order.

Permanent marriage is one of the essential features of patriarchal society. To quote Professor Jenks again: "By superficial writers, its appearance is often attributed to some vague improvement in morality or taste. Unhappily the facts point to a much less exalted origin, viz., the desire of man to secure for himself exclusively the labor of woman and her offspring. If the change had come about from exalted ideas of morality, we should probably have found two features in the new system—(1) equality of numbers between the man and the woman; (2) free consent to the marriage on both sides. It is notorious that just the opposite are the facts of the patriarchal system, at any rate at its earlier stages. Polygamy or plurality of wives, is the rule; and while the husband is not at all particular about the conduct of his wife with other men, he is intensely strict about appropriating the whole of her labor; and all

her offspring, no matter who is the real father, belong to him. Again, the ancient forms of marriage by capture, and marriage by purchase, point irresistibly to the conclusion that the woman had little or no voice in the matter. . . . In patriarchal society, the father of a round dozen of strong and well-favored daughters was considered a rich man.

"Slavery arises from the practice of keeping alive captives taken in war instead of putting them to death. In savage days, wars are usually the result of scarcity of food and result in the killing and eating the members of a stranger 'pack.' But, with the increasing certainty of food supply, resulting among other benefits from pastoral pursuits, cannibalism becomes unnecessary, and captives are carefully kept alive, in order that they may labor for their captors. . . . Slavery is an ugly thing, but it is better than cannibalism. Again, however, we notice that the upward step was due, not to exalted morality, but to practical convenience. Morality is the result, not the cause, of social amelioration."

To return to the institution of property. "As soon as we arrive at the agricultural stage we are at the brink of a great development of the idea of property in land. The pastoralist regards his 'country' much as the hunter. . . . There is yet no individual right in land, for the land is still regarded only as pasture and hunting-ground; and there is no need of partition for these purposes. But the agriculturist soon forms new ideas. As each new improvement in cultivation makes land more valuable, the clan, or the family, or the man who made the improvement, becomes less willing to see it pass into the hands of others, less willing to move on to other land on which less labor has been expended. And so agricultural land became appropriated to the clan amongst whose members it was periodically interchanged; and, finally, even this redistribution ceased, and the family, ultimately the individual, became permanently associated with a specific piece of land.

"This is a long step, but it is still far from bringing us to the modern notion of private property in land. All that we have arrived at is that the same man may go on year after year plowing the same piece of land, and it may be, his children after him. But that would not satisfy the landowner of the present day." Landlordism has other features which will be dealt with later.

Thus we see that the conditions for change in society is a change in the manner in which men procure their livelihood; each stage of economic development having its corresponding setting of ideas, social institutions and customs; and that social progress and well-being is involved in the development of the means of production.

News is desired on the organizing of educational classes and on their progress. Drop us a line. We hear that Victoria and Prince Rupert have commenced or are about to do so. What about other places?

The Indicator

A Journal of History, Economics,
Philosophy and Current Events

Published every Week By the
Socialist Party of Canada.

401 Pender St. E., Vancouver, B. C.

Editor.....C. Stephenson

Subscriptions to "The Indicator,"
20 issues \$1.00

SATURDAY.....OCTOBER 18, 1919

THE steel workers' strike in the United States, makes brave copy for the press. Plots, conspiracies, bombs, anarchists, red propaganda, Bolshevism, R-Revolution. Everything that would satisfy the esthetic taste of a people who take a morbid delight in being terrified.

"Give 'em circuses," said a low-brow student of human nature, and skin 'em alive, while you are doing it, no doubt was implied. Like President Wilson, most of us have single track minds, being unable to think exhaustively on a subject without giving it undivided attention. One subject, the high cost of living, threatens to draw attention to some fundamentals of the capitalist method of production itself. Hence, the suggestion of an approaching terror of unknown character and magnitude may act as a counter-attraction. Protesters and enquirers into the cost of living problem will feel discouraged on the insinuation being made that they are but camouflaged emissaries of social disorder.

How stands the situation on this steel workers' strike then? The employees of the Steel Corporation demanded the right to organize, and on their behalf, Organizer Fitzpatrick of the American Federation of Labor, requested an interview with Mr. Gary, head of the corporation, to discuss the matter. True to the old time policy of his corporation, he turned the request down, refused absolutely to consider the matter. He has refused to consider the matter with anyone. He and the group of employers in the Industrial Conference now sitting in the States, are blocking the attempt of the labor group to have the conference intervene in the dispute. He objects to his employees organizing, even while he sits in the Industrial Conference around the same board as the accredited representatives of organized labor. He is also one of the most violent advocates of the immediate signing of the Peace Treaty without amendment. And yet in that treaty is the following clause: "The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers." A jewel of the first water is Mr. Gary's consistency. It is 100 per cent. United States Steel Corporation. His denial of that right to his employees is the issue of the strike. They desire to organize, so that their delegates may sit in conference with the employers representatives and discuss one day's rest in seven, and the abolition of twenty-four-hour shifts, and an increase in wages as these aliens express it "to guarantee American standards of living."

But Mr. Gary shouts, Bolshevism! And his cohorts of press agents, all

over the continent, take up the cry. Well: So far as we are concerned, we thank them for popularizing the word.

The "New Republic" of New York, is a bourgeois journal of liberal tendencies, and it is one of the few solitary voices raised in criticism of Mr. Gary and his policies. We quote the following from its October 1st issue: "Had Mr. Fitzpatrick declined to confer with Mr. Gary, he would have been denounced from one end of the country to the other as a firebrand. But Mr. Gary can decline to confer with the representative of a very large section of his men; he can refuse to arbitrate even to discuss; he can bluntly repudiate all the known methods of peaceful adjustment, and so far as one can judge from the press, few voices are raised to brand him for what he is: an inciter of violence, a provoker of industrial war, an industrial barbarian. . . . Calculating that the unions may not be strong enough to win this time, relying on enormous war profits to tide him over, knowing that the men's organization is immature, trusting to his automatic control over public authority in the steel districts, exploiting the fevered and panicky condition of the public mind he has deliberately chosen to provoke the strike now because he thinks he can smash the union. He has not taken one step to avert the strike. He has not made one move for peace. . . . He has distributed guns, suppressed meetings, refused a hearing. He wants this strike and he wants it now, because he thinks he can win and have a few more years of absolute power in his industry. After that—well Mr. Gary is not looking ahead." . . . And much more to the same point. The New Republic has one of its editors covering the ground in the steel districts and continues its attack on Gary in the issue following the one quoted from. This editor says "In the misrepresentation of motives it is perhaps the 'foreign element' that has suffered most. Who was it brought the 'foreign element' to Pittsburg, if not the United States Steel Corporation itself? It is not hard to remember days when the Steel Corporation advertised 'Men Wanted, Foreigners Only Need Apply.' Foreign labor was plentiful then. Why did the Steel Corporation want it? Because it was cheap; because, with religious and racial differences it was thought that the 'foreigners' would not easily unite; and because, therefore, they would serve as a bulwark against unionization. Today, fighting off standards accepted in every civilized community, the companies turn on these men for the wholesale importation they are themselves so largely responsible for and insult them with insinuations, not once, so far, substantiated by the fact."

Mr. Gary and his associates in the steel trust are in the limelight for the time being as playing the capitalist game. The support given him in the press of every city, town and village in the land, and the way in which it is villifying the workers, shows Gary as the hero and hope of the capitalist world.

NOTICE TO READERS

As soon as we receive sufficient subscriptions for the "Indicator" to comply with Postal regulations, from points outside the Vancouver mail-

ing district, we intend to apply for the mailing privileges granted to newspapers and periodicals. Between two and three hundred are required. Should these privileges not be granted, obligations will be fulfilled at the usual postal rate, or if this is found not possible, the subscription money will be refunded.

THE INEXPLICABLE FOREIGNER

The foreigner has hitherto been held to be the evil genius of labor unrest. The Vancouver "Sun," however, now comes out with a variation. Under the caption "Paid Agitators in Camps" it says in part. "It (the agitation) was giving the foreigner a better chance, for he was not so susceptible to the influence of agitators having the interest of the dollar at heart and knew that a stoppage of work means a stoppage of pay also." The English-speaking worker thinks his pay goes on when he isn't working. We don't think.

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Vancouver Local No. 1, S. P. of C., has commenced its winter season of Educational Classes. On Sunday, at 3 p.m., the first class on economics was held. The text book used was "Wage-labor and Capital," by Marx. Some 70 or 80 attended, and a brisk and interesting discussion showed the interest taken by the class in the subject.

On Wednesday evening, at 8 o'clock, the class on history was opened. The text book chosen was H. De. B. Gibbin's "Industrial History of England." Owing to the expense of this book which is \$1.50, it was decided to allow those who wished, to purchase it on the installment plan. The leader of the class, Comrade Harrington, gave a review of various theories and methods of presenting history and compared them to the materialistic method of the Marxian School, which gives more prominence to the economic factor than the other schools. He showed that class struggles in society were the instruments of political progress and that these arose out of the economic structure of society.

Discussion followed upon the opening address. Next week, the class commences the study of the text book.

All are asked to attend these classes. There is no distinction made between race, color, creed or sex. All are welcome. No questions asked. Just walk in and sit down. One hour and a half is given to reading and discussing the text book, and the last half hour to general discussion. Anyone is free to take part in the discussions. The classes are held at the hall, 401 Pender Street East, corner of Dunlevy avenue and Pender street.

"The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice"

(Continued From Page One.)

is that hitherto the material conditions—by which we mean all the contributing factors and circumstances—have been such as to promote and develop different social structures of which individualism more or less has been the basis. We will not deny that in this process men's ideas have

played a part. But theirs has been but a small part of the whole and should by no manner of means be regarded as a dominant or determining factor. Furthermore, for Mr. Leacock's enlightenment, we will venture to assert that those material conditions which are largely the outcome of the present economic basis must inevitably, and very shortly, give rise to a new social structure of which Socialism as opposed to Individualism will be the basis. And it will come,—this new social order—we would beg Mr. Leacock to note, not merely because we desire it, nor will it delay its coming because Mr. Leacock is not ready for it, but it will come because the material conditions will make it necessary.

Mr. Leacock is obviously very much concerned with saving the essence of the basis of the present social structure. In this he, unconsciously perhaps, but nevertheless, definitely aligns himself with the governing class. There is a striking similarity between the ideas of the sociologically inclined members of that class from Plato up to the present day. Plato's "Republic" was frankly and outspokenly a slave state. The slaves were to be as well treated as was possible, that is to say they were to be allowed as full a measure of life as was compatible with the interests of those who governed them, and lived on the proceeds of their labor. But it was obviously as impossible for Plato as it is for Professor Leacock to conceive of a society in which there should not be an economically enslaved working class to do all the necessary productive labor and to submit to be governed by those who lived on them and in some inexplicable manner held themselves to be superior. In short, as a spokesman for the working class has somewhere expressed it, the attitude of such bourgeois reformers as Professor Leacock, is that "they are willing, when driven to it, to do almost anything—except get off our backs."

It may perhaps be imagined, by some who have observed the quite touching manner in which Mr. Leacock writes of those who suffer under the "bitter inequalities of the present system, that he is genuinely concerned over the unhappy lot of the work-class, but unfortunately does not perceive the real root cause of their distress. We must confess to being a little skeptical of this, especially when we read such sentences as the following: "The hardest capitalist that ever gripped his property with the iron clasp of legal right relaxes his grasp a little when he thinks of the possibility of a social conflagration." This suggests to us that Mr. Leacock knows quite well wherein lies the efficient cause of our social ills. And the fact that he nowhere makes more than the merest passing reference to this point, suggests furthermore, that he is in no mood to have it altered. Indeed he goes so far in one instance as to state that; "the private ownership of land is one of the greatest incentives to human effort that the world has ever known. It would be folly to abolish it even if we could."

Perfectly true, professor, only too true! It certainly is "one of the greatest incentives to human effort." And so is private ownership of the means of production. And so is the

(Continued on Next Page)

"THE UNSOLVED RIDDLE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE"

(Continued from Preceding Page)

lash over the backs of slaves. And so is the threat of starvation. And so is a pistol held to your head. They are all of them mighty efficient "incentives to human effort." And of course, because of that, it would be folly to abolish them. Is it possible that Mr. Leacock really thinks he can impose upon his readers with such argument? No: It is quite obvious that the good professor has no real consideration for the lot of the working class. On the contrary, all he is concerned about is lest those capitalists whom he concerns to be too grasping should spoil the graft for those who would be content with less.

In the middle of a discussion of vital social problems, Mr. Leacock finds time and space to introduce to the extent of one whole column—nothing other in the whole wide world than the Malthusian Theory. The good Mr. Malthus has long since passed away from this vale of tears. But, even so, he survived any passing interest that scientific circles may have bestowed upon his theory, as affecting society, by a good many years. Why on earth Mr. Leacock should have conceived it worth while to dig up this rotten corpse and parade it in his columns, it is entirely beyond us to imagine. However, it may be taken as another indication of the regions wherein Mr. Leacock's mind delights to dwell.

Mr. Leacock devotes some little space to the question of shortening the hours of labor. He admits that ten hours is too long. With a fine magnanimity he admits further that eight hours is too long, and, without committing himself any more than he judges to be wise, he strives to convey the impression that, by his method of social legislation, the average hours of labor may eventually be reduced to four or five. Whether Mr. Leacock really imagines this to be possible under the present system, or is merely holding it out as a sort of elusive bait we do not know. But we do know that, for all that he is a professor of economics, any entrepreneur, any "captain of industry," can confidently assure him that what he suggests is, under the present system, utterly impossible. The modern captain of industry knows quite well the exigencies of the system under which he operates. And he speaks truly when he says that the only thing which can save the present economic structure from collapse, is increased production. Now, granting that the reduction of hours from twelve or more, to ten, and in many cases to eight, has been accomplished with little if any restriction of output, it is quite obvious that there must be a point at which any further reduction of working hours, under the present system, can not be made without lessening production. And, while we are not prepared to assert that that point has been reached in the eight-hour day, we will confidently assert that, if any such progressive reduction of hours as Mr. Leacock suggests were attempted, long before his elusive goal of a four or five-hour day were reached, the nation attempting it would be hopelessly bankrupt. Consequently, we may be quite sure that no capitalist government would ever

The Theory of the "Materialist Conception"

Summarized from Kautsky.

THE Sciences of Philosophy, Law, History, Political Economy was for the rising bourgeoisie before the French Revolution in the first place a means of fighting the ruling powers, social and political, which opposed them and had their roots in the past. It was found necessary to give greater attention to the history of the past in which the feudal institutions had had their beginnings.

All histories were then, as with those histories written for the multitude today, taken up with the great man or with the relation of the extraordinary. The extraordinary man, the extraordinary event, such as wars or revolutions, alone seemed worth relating. The big man was the motor-power in history; in the feudal period the king, the military commander, the religious founder and the priests. In the eighteenth century these very men were branded by the bourgeois intellectuals as the authors of all the evil in the world, and the philosophers on the other hand as legislators and teachers as the only real authors of progress. As, however, the capitalist method of production developed and created the world market there were produced a network of highly complicated connections which involved the gathering together of statistics. Observation of these statistics disclosed the operations of laws governing the actions of great masses of men. It was seen that the determining element in the alterations of human action was always a material change usually an economic one. For instance, the decrease and increase of crime, of suicides, marriages shown to be dependent on the price of corn. Enquiry in other directions also pro-

tolerate such an experiment. We are inclined to believe that Mr. Leacock is quite well aware of these facts. If he is not then, he is indeed more ignorant, even in his own particular field of study, than we had suspected.

In the matter of industrial unrest we are indebted to Mr. Leacock for this gem: "The industrial world is restless, overstrained and quarrelsome. It seethes with furious discontent, and looks about it eagerly for a fight. It needs a rest. It should be sent, as nerve patients are, to the seaside or the quiet of the hills. Failing this, it should at least slacken the pace of its work and shorten its working day." If this was written by Stephen Leacock, writer of funny stories, we declare it to be humor of the most exquisite. If, however, it was penned by Stephen Leacock, professor of economics, as a serious contribution toward the solution of the Riddle of Social Justice, all we can say is that it is the most awful bloody nonsense.

On the subject of child welfare, Mr. Leacock has this to say: "The moment that we get away from the idea that the child is a mere appendage of the parent . . . we pass a new milestone on the upward path of progress. It should be recognized in the coming order of society that every child of the nation has the right to be clothed and fed and trained irrespective of its parent's lot." We would be willing to wage that

(Continued on Page Eight)

gressed. The History of Law, Comparative Philology, or the study of the growth and relationship of various languages and Ethnology, the science which treats of the varieties of the human race, all of them departments of the great science of history, found in the material which they worked up, not the extraordinary and the individual but the everyday and common place described. But for that very reason can history trace with certainty a line of continuous development. And, the more her material grows, the more is it possible to compare like with like, the more it is discovered that this development is no chance, but according to law. The material which is at our disposal, is on the one side facts of the technical arrangements of life, on the other of law, custom and religion. To them the law controlling this means nothing else than to bring techniques into a causal connection with the legal, moral and religious conceptions without the help of extraordinary individuals or events.

Besides all these new sciences, there is finally to be mentioned a further change in the writing of modern history. The French revolution came to the fore so clearly as a class-struggle, that not only its historian must recognize that, but a number of historians were inspired to investigate in other periods of history the role of the class wars, and to see in them the motive forces of

human development. The classes are, however, again a product of the economic structure of society, and from this spring the antagonisms, therefore the struggles of the classes. What holds every class together, what divides them from other classes, determines their opposition to men, is the particular class interests, a new kind of interest, about which no moralist of the eighteenth century had any idea whatever school he might belong to.

With all these advances and discoveries which certainly often enough were only piece-meal, and by no means quite clear, by the time of the forties in the nineteenth century all the essential elements of the materialist conception of history had been supplied. They only waited for the master who should bring them under control and unify them. That was done by Engels and Marx.

The materialist conception of history is not only important because it allows us to explain history better than it has been done up to now, but also because it enables us to make history better than has hitherto been done.

Study history by the aid of this method. Form history classes in conjunction with economic classes. The two sciences are complimentary and inseparable from each other. They throw a search-light around so that we see clearer for them the way of social progress.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

On this column, question on economics will be answered briefly. Students will, however, bear in mind the limitations involved in brevity. No subject can be satisfactorily explained or defined in such a manner. At best, such answers can but serve as guides.

What are wages?

What is labor-power?

What is Value?

What is Capital?

What is Money—Next Issue.

What is Wealth—Next Issue.

What are Wages?—Wages are the price of labor-power. Like all other commodities on the market, its price is determined by the state of supply and demand. This market price fluctuates around the value of labor-power which is determined by the value of food, clothing and shelter, etc., necessary for the subsistence of the laborer and for the perpetuation of sufficient of his kind to meet the needs of the capitalist method of production.

What is Labor-power?—It is the capacity or power of the laborer to produce wealth. The laborer sells his labor-power to the capitalist as a commodity. All values the working class produce over and above their wages are known as surplus values. These go to the capitalist class as rent, interest and profit, etc.

What is Value?—It is a social relationship existing between commodities in that they are products of social labor. Value in exchange of a commodity is determined by the socially necessary amount of labor-time involved in its production.

What is Capital?—It is that part of wealth used to exploit labor in

order that an increase of capital may result from the exploitation. Land may be capital. Articles of consumption and raw materials may be capital if used for the above purpose, but not otherwise.

The condition for capital is a propertyless working class, having no other means of existence than by selling its labor-power.

Exploited labor is the source of capital.

What is Price?—It is the monetary expression of value and fluctuates around value in obedience to the law of supply and demand. The fluctuations tend to cancel each other when observed over a period of time, so that the final result is that commodities exchange with each other equal value for value.

SOVIET RUSSIA

LONDON, Oct. 18.—Up to the present hour the British authorities have received no confirmation of the entry of Gen. Yudenitch's forces into the suburbs of Petrograd Thursday. The belief was expressed that Gen. Yudenitch's men had not advanced so far as the former Russian capital.

A Bolsheviki wireless message from Moscow today reports that Premier Lenine received an Afghan delegation in that city on Oct. 15. This would appear to dispose of the recent reports regarding Lenine, one of his assassination and another of his imprisonment. Helsingfors correspondent of the Daily Mail gives details to show that the anti Bolshevik troops have not yet crossed the railroad running between Gathina and Pskov. He intimates that various rumors now current are due to financial speculators. He says a brisk business is being done on the bourse by a crowd which is "bulling" rubles.

Ten Minutes' Talk With the Workers

(From the Glasgow "Socialist," Sept. 4.)

Scientific Management and "Lost Time."

THE problem of how to avoid or prevent "lost time" in the labor process is probably one of the oldest and most anxious worries of our employers. The reason for this is obvious, though you may not have given the matter the attention it deserves. Having obtained, ready to hand, plant and materials to work upon, the next concern of every employer is not only the number and class of workers he requires—though that is very important—but how he can utilize such labor-power that he purchases to the best possible advantage for profitmaking. For him "time is money," every minute of the working day that is not used up being a dead loss. You may not have noticed it, but recently there has been a bold attempt made to grapple with this problem in such a manner as to provoke the least resistance from our side. They call it "scientific management," but that is only a fancy name for efficient exploitation, and certainly you have no reason to be ashamed of any ignorance you may have on the subject, since many of our so-called leaders have been duped with it—assuming, of course, that they are not in league with our employers, which is certainly hard to disbelieve about a number of them. The methods of this scientific management abounds with apparent contradictions. We see instances of lavish expenditure on what appears to be in a useless direction, while we find its advocates excelling our most ardent trade unionists in the advocacy of shorter hours, as, for example, Lord Leverhulme with his six hours a day, etc.; in fact, in a hundred and one ways our "scientific managers" display quite a paternal interest in our welfare.

A Vital Problem for Capital.

The one vital problem, however, which in reality is the pivot of all our various "reform" movements is the question of "lost time." Quite recently a Yankee firm in the Pittsburg area made some observations on "lost time" through accidents of every kind, such as personal negligence, mismanagement, faulty plant, structural defects, etc., and reckoned that the lost time ran into scores of years—and therefore considerable profits—every year. And so they started a "safety first" campaign.

During the war the Government of this country appointed a committee to inquire into the matter here, with the assistance of expert medical advice. When it was found that there was a considerable percentage of time lost before breakfast, and that this was most apparent in shops which started at six a.m., then the mercenary motives of our employers took a turn in the direction of generosity and the 47-hour week was imposed on us.

Then again, as you know, there is always a few minutes expire before we get into our swing, especially where handcraft still prevails, but it has been observed that, where suitable, the use of electricity in starting machinery works wonders in this direction. But not only have they reckoned on the time lost in starting, they have also observed that much time is lost near stopping time—for washing hands, etc. That is why the foreman is always buzzing about just on the gong.

I do not know whether you are an ex-service man or not, but it might interest you to note that employers are beginning to kick, even against the wounded Tommies, who have gone back to industrial life carrying with them the ailments and maladies of the battlefield and who are unable to keep regular time.

As one medical expert, writing on the subject recently, said: "Their apparent bad example affects others and lowers the tone (!) of the factory."

Eldorado As a Solution.

Another cause of "lost time" is reckoned to be bad housing, in as much as dirt, insanitary conditions and congested surroundings wears down the fitness of mind and body, making us unable to either go the pace or keep it up. Arising out of the housing problem is the dilemma, especially in

big cities, of providing housing accommodation in suitable surroundings and yet not too far from the factory or workshop. This is got over in a way by municipal trams or railway "zone tickets," but the recent tendency is to build the workshop in the vicinity of suburbia. In this latter respect it is now no uncommon sight to find a factory nestling among trees and flowers in an apparent atmosphere of quiet and peace, with nice, clean rows of "workmen's" houses arranged on the garden city principle. Small wonder there comes the desire to escape the squalor and misery which still surrounds most places of employment; the impulse being "to get a job there."

You may have managed to "get there" only to be disillusioned with the presence inside of the same old game of rate-cutting, hustle, etc.—all of which belies the external surroundings.

It is in this way, however, that scientific management seeks to solve its dilemma of attaining high profits with a devitalized, dispirited, and inefficient wage-slave. I hope I have said enough to indicate to you what is the impulse behind all our modern "reform" movements. You can now see the basis of all this modern craze for shorter hours, welfare work, better housing accommodation, national medical supervision, rapid municipal or local transport, etc.

The Golden Collar.

These conditions and "improvements for labor" are all directed at making us more efficient workers, and turning enhanced profits out of our manufactured cheerfulness. It is a case, however, of swapping the iron collar for a golden one, which, however well burnished, is nevertheless a tougher metal to break than the former, and in this respect is a good investment for our employers.

What you would be well advised to get fixed in your mind, however, is this: that though this apparent consideration for our physical, mental and moral welfare is all to the good as far as it goes, there is no reason for assuming that the relations between our employers and ourselves, i.e., relations of antagonism, are in any way altered at bottom. "Scientific management" today is a business proposition. It is the studied effort of far-seeing employers to combine increased output with a contented wage-class. But though all these improved conditions of health, scientific technique in the workshop and paternal interest in our welfare may even be accompanied with an increased money wage, that is no reason for believing the tale that the interests of the masters and men are identical. Nor on the other hand is the deception of "improved conditions" an argument against scientific management. The root of the evil—and you would be well advised to stick a pin here—lies not in the instrument itself, but the use it is put to.

If things were differently arranged and instead of resting upon profitmaking for a class their prime consideration was social well-being, then the saving of "lost time" and beneficial effects generally of scientific management would rebound to the commonwealth. To accomplish that is the great task of the labor movement. T.B.

WOLVES TEAR EACH OTHER.

Looks as if Lenin would win through yet, for last week the press hostility to the expenditure upon the dirty war upon Russia grew suddenly into a yell. The Daily Express, the Daily Mail, the Rothermere organs, the Saturday Review and the Spectator all at it, and even puffing up at the end of the procession, hoping his conversion is not too late, old Bottomley himself. He says he "can not keep silent any longer;" the Government has "no mandate for the Russian war . . . we have neither the men nor the money for this wild and hopeless adventure." Big Business and High Finance are really getting scared, and soon there will be no demand for General Navvy Ward's photo in "Society Bits," and Winston will be drawing his unemployed benefit.—From "Forward," (Glasgow.)

THE PRESS OF THE COUNTRY.

How It Seeks to Kill Free Thought, Free Speech and Constitutional Action.

By Jerome K. Jerome.

Nine-tenths of the press of this country is in the hands of a small group of rich men who mean to rule the nation. It is the press that has killed constitutional action. The press seeks to kill free thought—to kill free speech. And it is succeeding. It has monopolized to itself all the sources of information. It stands between the thinkers and the people. It will not allow anybody but itself to be heard. It poisons the mind of the people with false information. It suppresses facts that it does not wish the people to know. It doles out to them, only such "news" as it considers good for them. It colors the truth for its own purposes. It dresses up lies in plausibility. It is the press and not Parliament that rules England today. Parliament only registers its decrees, and the Government is nothing but its tame executive. No politician who wishes to succeed dare flout its commands. It makes and unmakes Cabinets. The Public Service is its plaything. The press itself in its turn is ruled by the Capitalists. It depends for its existence upon the great advertisers. In its turn it is the instrument of the great financial interests and their aristocratic dependents. The press is the enemy of the people. It has usurped the entire authority of the country. Exempt from all responsibility, with neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned, it has become the most dangerous despotism that Democracy has ever been called upon to face. The press of today exercises the same vicious tyranny that in the Middle Ages was exercised by the church: the tyranny over men's minds. It rules by the same weapons: lies and humbug.

The press in every country has got the people down. And until its power is broken it will hold the people down. It uses the ballot-box as a conjuror uses his magic rod. The people may put in what they think. What comes out of it is what the press chooses. The politicians are its humble courtiers. Behind its screen of falsehood and suppression the moneyed interests work their will. It has become the fortress of reaction, and there is no power within the Constitution that can hope to make a breach in its defences. The power of the platform can only be exercised with its permission. It has bought up the pen and permits of no new enterprise. Here and there a people's paper continues a precarious existence. Lacking capital, lacking advertising support, its influence is confined to narrow limits. It is the abuse of its power by the press that is driving the thought and energy of the country to the conviction that if the people are ever really to rule, methods will have to be found that are not likely to obtain the approval of the press.

CONFIRMED.

Lord Loreburn is the first of the elder Liberal statesmen to publish his views upon the origins of the war. Lord Loreburn's book derives special significance by reason of his long and intimate connection with the Liberal Party. He was a member of the Cabinet during that fateful time when English diplomacy was blindly rushing this country into obligations which would eventuate in a European war. His book is scathing indictment of the foreign policy of Sir Edward Grey, and strengthens the position of those who have maintained that the secrecy as well as the tendency of British pre-war diplomacy had placed ministers in a position from which there was no retreat when events reached the culminating point five years ago. Lord Loreburn says: "We entered upon the war to which we had been committed beforehand in the dark, and Parliament found itself unable, at two hours' notice, had it desired to extricate us from this fearful predicament. We went to war, unprepared, in a Russian quarrel because we were tied to France in the dark." It is significant that Lord Loreburn's book has been practically boycotted by the daily press, with one or two exceptions.—Labor Leader, (London.)

CHORUS OF CONDEMNATION

(From the "Daily Herald.")

A few months ago we alone in the daily press attacked and exposed Mr. Churchill's Russian Gamble; but so thoroughly have we awakened the public to the facts that now the chorus of condemnation is taken up by almost all the leading papers:—

"Observer."—"Clearing up the Russian mud-dle."

"Sunday Chronicle."—"The plain fact is that our people are in no mood for any grandiose campaign in Russia, even for the purpose of saving our friends."

"Sunday Times."—"The Government policy in Russia has been conducted throughout on lines which only Mr. Micawber could approve."

"Sunday Pictorial."—"In trying to 'save' Russia, we are risking the ruin of Britain." Our costly and wholly ineffective Russian adventure."

"Sunday Express."—"The evacuation of the Archangel Expedition will, we hope, still be accomplished, but there are other military activities elsewhere, and public confidence in Mr. Churchill's capacity or trustworthiness as Secretary of State for War has been utterly destroyed."

"Times."—"Russia is one blot upon the Government's record."

"Daily News."—"The policy of fomenting civil war in Russia."

"Daily Express."—"This obviously futile, costly and disastrous war in Russia."

"Manchester Guardian."—"The Russian gamble."

"Daily Mail."—"The North Russian matter has planted on the public mind a firm belief that there has been a lack of straight dealing, and that official assurances can not be accepted at their face value."

OUR LITERATURE.

The Communist Manifesto, at the rate of \$8 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

Slave of the Farm . . \$6 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

The Present Economic System, by Professor W. A. Bonger . . \$6 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific . . Single copies 15 cents. \$13 per 100.

Wage Labor and Capital . . \$8 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

Capitalist Production, being the first nine chapters of Vol. I. Marx's Capital . . Single copies, paper cover, 50 cents; cloth bound, \$1.00.

"Industrial History of England," By H. De B. Gibbens—\$1.50.

Evolution of the "Idea of God," by Grant Allen, 45 cents by post.

Postage Paid.

Make all Money Orders payable to C. Stephenson, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

A statement of the theories and conclusions of Scientific Socialism.

\$6 per 100 10c per Copy
Postage Paid.

Propaganda Meeting, Empress Theatre, corner Gore avenue and Hastings street, Sunday, 8 p.m. Doors open at 7:30 p.m.

DO YOU WISH FOR AN AUDIENCE?

Articles are desired on the Socialist philosophy, or on current events interpreted in the light of its principles. Send them in.

Nationalization of Land---Futility Exposed

(From the "Socialist Standard," London.)

Due, in part at any rate, to the demand of the Miners' Federation for the nationalization of the mines, there has grown up lately an extension of the old demands for nationalizing various properties and industries. The old unsupported assertions are trotted out with all the acclamation attaching to new discoveries, while a new organization has been added to the list of those advocating these policies.

By far the most favorable subject for nationalization has been the "land." Prominent among the organizations having the nationalization of the land for their object are the Land Nationalization Society, which proposes a form of purchase of the land, and the Society for the taxation of Land values, which advocates the taxation of land values ultimately up to 20s. in the £. Now a new organization has been formed called "The Commonwealth League," having for its object—

"The Foundation of a Commonwealth based on the establishment of the common right to the land by the payment by each landholder of the economic rent, which is the commercial value of the site he holds."

As there is no practical difference between taxing land values and calling upon the landholders to pay "economic rent" to the State, it is somewhat curious that the two prominent Liberals who are respectively president and secretary of the new league—Mr. R. C. Lambert and Mr. R. L. Outhwaite—should have formed the new organization. Moreover, in their paper, "The Commonwealth," they are full of praise for the Independent Labor Party and the resolution that body's conference passed at Huddersfield at Easter, that "demands the Socialization of the land as the very foundation of the co-operative commonwealth, and calls upon the Government to make it the permanent and inalienable possession of the community."

The stupidity and ignorance of demanding the "socialization" of the land while leaving the capitalist system in existence generally is only equalled by the crazy clause calling upon a capitalist government to make the land the possession of the whole community, although, be it said, these things are quite in accord with the confusionist and misleading policy of the I.L.P. Yet if the founders of the Commonwealth League are so strongly in favor of the attitude adopted by the I.L.P., why did they start a new organization? Why did they not join the I.L.P. straight away? Or do they wish to add to the confusion already existing?

In any case, the proposals are worth examining again as many workers believe that the taxation of land values, or the taking of the "economic rent" by the State will benefit their class. It sounds very plausible to say that as the land is "the gift of nature it should belong to the community," and many are led to believe that the proposals mentioned would bring about the desired result. Let us examine the matter a little closer.

Both "economic rent" and "land values" mean the same thing in the proposals of the above-mentioned organizations, though the spokesmen of the Commonwealth League nowhere define their phrase "economic rent." A simple illustration will help one to understand the principle behind this phrase.

When the War Office decided to take over a certain tract of agricultural land at Cippenham, near Slough, for the erection thereon of a motor repair depot, some agricultural experts objected to the action because, they said, the land was the most fertile in the district, while nearer London was land of practically no agricultural value that the War Office could have taken. The decision of the War Office to retain the land at Cippenham is strong evidence that the experts were right, but what was meant by their objection?

Simply this. That if the same amount of labor-power, machinery, seed, etc., were used upon equal areas of these two pieces of land—say upon an acre of each—the resulting crop would not be equal in quantity or even in qual-

ity. If we suppose that under these conditions the land at Cippenham would yield 30 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the other land would only yield 20 bushels, then Cippenham land would be said to have yielded an "economic rent" of 10 bushels per acre. The same principle applies if the land is required for other purposes—as sites for factories, business offices, or dwelling houses. Thus it is easily seen that a site close to a railway, a river, or a canal will, other things remaining equal, be more suitable and economical for a manufacturer to erect his works upon than a site that would require a large amount of road haulage to and from the works. The saving effected by building the works on the former site would represent the "economic rent" of that site. The "Land Values" that it is proposed to tax are exactly the same portions of wealth covered by the term "economic rent." To put the matter in a phrase, "The economic rent of any piece of land is the difference between the natural properties of that piece, either in fertility or situation, and that of the poorest piece in demand."

How is the amount of this difference arrived at? By competition. To quote the words of one of the Commonwealth League's leaflets, "He (the landholder) will pay what another would be willing to pay for the privilege of using the piece of common property he holds."—"The Vision and the Realization."

We are told that this method "will throw the land open for all." Quite true—if we add who are able to pay for it, as it will be the highest bidder who will hold the land, exactly as he does now. When a large estate in the country is up for sale it is not the landless agricultural laborer who bids for it. Nor when a town site is sold, as that of Lord Berkeley, it is not a slum-dwelling worker who buys it, but a Sir Marcus Samuel.

In other words, no one will be allowed access to the land under the Commonwealth League's method unless they can pay the market price for its use, under the name of "economic rent."

This is just the situation that prevails today, as there is plenty of land available for those able to pay the market price for it. But, it will be objected, at present this price goes into the pockets of private individuals, whereas under the League's scheme it would go into the "common fund." Yes, but what common fund? To this the answer is: The fund required to meet the social expenses of the community. But how are these met now? By the rates and taxes. Thus the final result of the appropriation of "economic rent" or "land values" is to reduce the amount paid for rates and taxes from other sources.

As a class the workers are not concerned with taxation under capitalism. Out of the total wealth, which they produce by applying their labor power to the materials given by nature, they receive on an average about enough to keep them in the working condition that the masters' interests demand. Obviously they have no margin left over out of which to pay either taxes or economic rent. It is thus clear that it is the masters who must pay these expenses in the form of rates and taxes, and it is they who would obtain any benefit that might result from the application of "economic rent" to these expenses.

The method might not please the section of the master class who are solely, or mainly, landholders, but it would undoubtedly be beneficial to the industrial or commercial capitalists, and is really the ideal capitalist form of taxation.

We see, therefore, that the claims of the Commonwealth League with reference to the great benefits and freedoms that will flow to the working class by the taking over by the State of "economic rent" is a sheer figment of the imagination, while the real object lying behind their project—so strongly supported by the I.L.P.—is to shift as much as possible of the burden of taxation on to the shoulders of the landlords, whom the industrial capitalists often look upon as being merely "sleeping partners." So far as the workers are concerned it is another "red herring."

We may deal with other forms of nationalization in a future article. J. FITZGERALD.

Capitalism and the Counter-Revolution

A Series of Six Articles.

This series of articles by Walton Newbould are taken from a pamphlet published by the Workers' Socialist Federation, 400 Old Ford Road, London, E.3. Price 3d. (Editor "The Indicator.")

EXPLANATORY FOREWORD.

This pamphlet is largely a reprint of four articles which appeared in the "Workers' Dreadnought" in the Autumn of 1918, and which were written about six weeks prior to the German Revolution and the signing of the Armistice. Hence, a number of the references may appear to be out of date; others may make clearer the reasons for the failure of the Spartacus movement to bring off their counterpart of the November Revolution in Russia. The purpose of the compilation of the four articles, together with a lengthy addendum, as a pamphlet is to give permanence and further publicity to a Marxist examination of certain important issues of immediate and practical significance that have been given all too little attention by the revolutionary elements in this country.

London, June, 1919. J. T. W. N.

I.

IT is now some seventy years since the European proletariat made its gallant but unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the governing classes of the great States of Western and Central Europe. With the exception of one or two minor incidents towards the close of the French Revolution this was the first effort of the workers to challenge and to contest the sovereignty of the state systems which had grown up on the ruins of feudalism. The Continental proletariat of the towns was not then sufficiently strong or class-conscious to achieve success and was betrayed by the upper and lower elements of the capitalist class as soon as these saw the direction in which their victory was likely to carry them.

They withdrew from the side of the workers, whose mass action alone had made it possible for them to overawe the executive power of the landed and mercantile classes (in the latter case we refer to the money merchants of Paris,) and if they did not ally themselves directly with the reactionary forces, they followed such a policy as to enable those to reconquer authority. The Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary and the Kings of Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, and their fellow-princeings returned to power, but with a recognition dawning in the minds of their statesmen, at any rate in Prussia, that they must set themselves at the head of the Nationalist Party, attach to themselves the capitalist interests, and adopt an internal and external policy calculated to further what those elements conceived to be to their advantage. The success of the Tudors and the failure of the Stuarts in England was not lost upon the Hohenzollerns. At the same time, in Germany, more even than in this country, the landed aristocracy became involved in the capitalist system, owing to the preponderating importance in German industry of the brewing and distilling industries and of the Krieg-industrie, or armaments manufacture, having its foundations in iron and coal mineral lands. The alliance of the industrial magnates and the landowners was cemented and

(J. T. WALTON NEWBOULD, M.A.)

flourished under the highest and most interested patronage of the Kaiser himself. The German Empire became an enormously powerful political organization of these closely inter-connected economic interests. The feudal state in Germany was overhauled and re-organized scientifically on a more colossal plan. Extensively and intensively, the control of the State over the people was reinforced. Antagonism to the reactionary political regime of Kaiserism has had, moreover, to encounter in Germany the same kind of economically impelled desire for expansion as has come to affect the workers of Britain and the U. S. A. consciously or subconsciously, the proletarians in all highly developed capitalist countries have responded to the subtle influences of capitalist production for sale, of capitalist zeal for export trade. This impulse is natural, because in the modern economy vast requirements of the people can only be supplied from without the frontiers of the country, and, at the same time, once the market becomes congested with commodities, production must fall away and employment at remunerative wages be restricted. The workers are living within the framework of capitalist society, and the more completely they are enmeshed in that system the more must they struggle, not necessarily with intelligence, to improve their lot. So long as the capitalist class can direct them to what it may or may not believe to be the cause of all these misfortunes, viz.: the organized capitalists of other lands, great numbers of the workers will seek that mode of escape, or acquiesce in the order to march and to fight. The modern state, the modern "executive committee of the capitalist class," is a terrible monster, against whom rebellion seems useless and is useless, unless a high degree of solidarity and determination can be assumed among a large proportion of the workers, not only in one area or one country, but all over the world of capitalist production and government.

The German workers, in so far as they were Socialists, before the war were organized much more for a political struggle against a reactionary political system than for industrial warfare against economically powerful groups of capitalists. The German trade union movement was, largely, the child of the Socialist movement of politicians and political theorists. German capitalism developed at a prodigious rate. It pursued an enlightened policy toward its workers, aided by a paternal government which, at the same time, made it plain to the trade unionists that the Army was always in reserve to assist in the maintenance of public order, the order of the Junker-Industrialists. In Germany there did not arise the kind of advanced Labor Movement that appeared in every country where industrial capitalists fought out their battles with their

workers face to face and without too frequent interference on the part of the State. When war broke out there was no industrial unionism of any vigor in Germany. At the same time there does not appear to be any revolutionary movement of action in the army. The one man who might, and, in my opinion, would have been likely to bring about a revolutionary movement of action in Germany was Liebknecht. He was not obsessed by theory; he was for ever attacking; he had vigor; he had enthusiasm; he had the spirit of adventure. He was not an academician, a journalist, a would-be statesman. He was an agitator, and the impression he made on me as he talked of our plan of attack on the Armaments International, was of a man who would never be so happy as when he was hitting, hitting, hitting his enemy. He felt intensely about his work, but he was the happy pugilist rather than the earnest Tolstoyan or eminently respectable advocate of Socialistic Pacifism prevalent in this country. He could have fired the imagination of the working men where Bernstein and probably Kautsky would never have touched them. Liebknecht is in prison and there does not appear to be any one else upon whom his mantle has fallen. If there is, we must conclude that the circumstances of war and the law of military service prevent him from arousing his fellows.

The magnificent organization of the State for maintaining the civilian life of the country; the thoroughness of the police regime; the fear of Clemenceau, "the Tiger," and his more suave-tongued colleagues across the waters, hold the German proletariat in impotence. In Austria-Hungary, where the native bureaucracy is less capable, where economic development and political organization have not brought so strong a State into existence, and where capitalism is not so cunningly controlled as in Germany, there is a seething mass of revolutionary material. Hunger is more pronounced, and the need for expansion is far less felt owing to the low economic cultivation of industry in the Dual Monarchy.

Yet, for all the seeming hopelessness of a revolutionary upheaval in Germany or a successful outbreak in Austria-Hungary, the chances are that the reactionary elements in Germany may be overthrown by those capitalists, mainly the financial gang who are so influential in New York and in London, despite their temporary eclipse, an eclipse that there is reason to believe is not so real as apparent, and that a political settlement will be established in Berlin, which many advocates of Wilson's American-Democracy will immediately hail as the spiritual counterpart of their own "dollar civilization." The present directors of the German military system will be "shanghaied." Germany will be admitted to the League to Enforce Peace, and the "best features" of her bureaucratic and military discipline will be com-

mingled with those of Britain and the U. S. A. as the armed and official guarantees of the new constitution appropriate to the political counterpart of international production!

The U. S. A. will be the arbiter of the world, and Europe, at any rate, will be perfectly safe for the Democracy for which Washington fought; the Fathers of the Republic agitated their shrewd old lawyer brains; such sterling and self-sacrificing Union-men as Commodore Vanderbilt and Pierpoint Morgan labored to make safe with their chartered coffin ships and their antiquated carbines; and for which finally, Wilson, through rhetoric Schwab and Vanderlip, by steel and dollars, spread to the four corners of the earth.

(To Be Continued.)

"THE UNSOLVED RIDDLE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE"

(Continued From Page Five)

if the professor had discovered any such statements as these in any book written by a Socialist, he would have cried about from the housetops that the Socialists wanted to destroy that thrice sacred institution, the family. We will, however, content ourselves with drawing Mr. Leacock's attention to the fact that the coming order of society has already recognized the right of every child to be clothed, fed, trained and educated, irrespective of any consideration whatsoever. Mr. Leacock may obtain the fullest information on this subject by consulting a little pamphlet entitled "Education and Art in Soviet Russia." Is it possible, we wonder, that Mr. Leacock had these facts in mind when he referred, in a former chapter, to "the unspeakable savageries of Bolshevism?"

In this concluding paragraph, Mr. Leacock asserts that "The safety of the future lies in a progressive movement of social control, alleviating the misery which it can not obliterate." This is the professor's last word on the subject of social justice and we are again compelled to differ with him. Those who suffer under the "misery" to which he refers, are sick and tired of a social control which can do no better than hint at a dim and distant future wherein their lot shall not be quite so miserable. They are turning their eyes and centering their hopes on a new method of social control which aims at the obliteration of the miseries which beset them. This new method of social control is economic. We quote from a statement by Nicolai Lenin of the Russian Soviet Republic, to Colonel Raymond Robbins, of the United States Red Cross: "This system is stronger than yours, because it admits reality. It seeks out the sources of daily human work-value and, out of those sources, directly, it creates the social control of the State. Our government will be an economic social control for an economic age. It will triumph because it speaks the spirit, and releases and uses the spirit of the age that now is."

We will leave this thought with Professor Leacock. It may set him thinking.

C. K.