

# WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of  
CURRENT  
EVENTS

Official Organ of  
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY  
ECONOMICS  
PHILOSOPHY

Number 814

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., MARCH 1, 1920

FIVE CENTS

## Armenia

ARMENIA is receiving a good deal of attention just at present both from the French and English governments, and from the charity organizations which make it their special business to try to cover up the sores which the recent war has left running.

But now what about Armenia? Why should the English and French governments have a special policy towards this insignificant stretch of rocky hills and barren valleys? Why should these governments agitate to have Armenia erected into a state, independent of the Sultan's rule? Some people tell us that it is to save the Christian Armenians who have for many years suffered from the cruelty and barbarity of their Turkish oppressors. This is the reason actually given by preachers and editors who take upon themselves to interpret the wherefore of State policy.

However, while such a line of reasoning might be considered a good argument to a Sunday school class, it does not at all satisfy men who know something about the world and the forces which are active in bringing about changes in it. In fact, the religious argument that is offered for public consumption today is altogether refuted by the policies of the various European powers towards Turkey and the Near East for the last century. For this reason one can neglect this seemingly plausible argument in trying to indicate the character of the forces which have been active in shaping the policy of the British and French governments toward Armenia.

As Armenia is a part of the domain of the Sultan, one cannot approach to an understanding of the Armenian question except through understanding the peculiar position of Turkey in European politics. Turkey has probably caused more grey hairs among European diplomatists than any other country on the globe. It is not without reason that the Sultan has been called "The Sick Man of Europe." But what has made the Sultan the sick man? Turkey's troubles are primarily due to its uncongenial geographical situation. Occupying the territory at which Europe and Asia touch hands, it lies in the zone where the lines of expansion of the great European powers converge. The point at which two opposing forces converge will have to stand a good deal of pressure, proportionate to the energy behind the forces. Thus it was that the expansion of Russia southward and of England eastwards, during the middle period of last century, produced such pressure at Constantinople that the reaction caused the Sultan to adopt measures towards his Christian subjects which aroused a storm of indignation among the very people whose craving for empire was upsetting his mental equilibrium. As we know, Russia wanted Constantinople, but England was opposed to this, fearing lest the Czar might seize the Suez Canal, and thus cut off England's shortest trade-route to India. Moreover, if the Czar obtained Constantinople he could as easily as not prevent all British expansion in Asia, and to this fate enterprising British investors could not dream of submitting. Hence in the Crimean War and again in the troubles of the 70's, we find England using her influence and her power to protect the barbarous Turk against the designs of the Czar. Now it is a curious fact that England's solicitousness for the integrity of the Turkish Empire ceased after she had induced the Sultan to cede Cyprus to her, and also after the decision of the other European powers in the Berlin Treaty compelled Russia to push her expansion eastward across Siberia, in other words, after the Russian menace in southern Europe had been obviated.

After 1878, a golden age of British expansion in Asia ensued. During this period English diplomats

seemed to preserve a serene calm towards the Sultan. They were evidently well satisfied with the outcome of the arrangements made at the Berlin Conference. This state of mental repose, however, received a rude shock when it became apparent, in the opening years of this century, that German capitalism had peacefully penetrated Turkey, and had gained an enormous influence over the Sultan; indeed, had really made him one of its puppets. The completeness of the control which German capitalism had gained over the Sultan's government and the vigor with which it pushed this advantage so as to gain a foothold in western Asia, made it clear that this new menace to British supremacy in western and southern Asia was of a nature which made the Russian menace of last century sink into insignificance. It compelled English diplomats to re-examine the policy pursued at the Berlin conference, and they have invariably found that a big mistake was made. Some critics even go so far as to say that England should have allowed Russia to take Constantinople. Lord Salisbury has characterized the British policy of '78 as "putting the money on the wrong horse"—meaning of course Turkey. Since then, the idea has gained ground among British diplomats that Constantinople should, after all, be made into an international port. This seemingly liberal and cosmopolitan view has its roots deeply buried in the stress of untoward circumstances.

The fact is that the south-eastern direction of development of German capitalism made British supremacy in western and southern Asia appear very precarious. The Germans had two projects which especially seemed planned to overthrow British power. The one was the Bagdad railway which made a bee-line toward India, and would, if it had been completed and successfully operated, have enabled the German capitalists to offer the British serious competition, both on the markets of India, and of the South Sea Islands. This line, however, was never completed as planned because the British government would not allow its promoters to secure a terminus on the Persian Gulf. The other project was a railway running down through Palestine and to the Suez Canal. This line was always considered an extremely serious menace by the British, and, without doubt, whetted the bitterness that existed between the London and Berlin governments.

From a military point of view, the building of this line was a strategic move. For a comparatively small force of soldiers could, by its means, be shipped down to the Suez and stationed along its banks, and once stationed there could hold a comparatively large force at bay. Moreover, towards a land force thus placed, the attacks of a fleet would prove almost worthless. To combat such a tactic England's double-strength navy would be of no considerable consequence.

The situation just before the war broke out was something after this fashion. Turkey was a camping ground for German capitalism, the Sultan its political puppet, and Constantinople an outpost from which two steel fingers had been projected; the one had been thrust at the very heart of British supremacy in Asia, and the other threatened to cut Britain's main artery of communication with the markets of the Orient. Now with this situation in mind it is easy to understand the wherefore of the disastrous Gallipoli expedition, and the anxiety of the British government for the successful termination of the Palestine and Mesopotamian expedition. It was not to wrest Jerusalem from the infidel hands of the Turk, nor to regain Armenia from the barbarous rule of the Moham-

medan, that one expedition was sent from Cairo to Jerusalem and the other from India to Bagdad. but it was simply to ensure that these two lines of railway should not be left in hands which would use them against British interests in the future.

Now with the conclusion of the war comes the question of the disposition of the Sultan and his dominion. He has proven such a pliable tool in the hands of the enemies of British imperialistic interests, that the British government would like to turn him out of Europe altogether and let him seek dominion elsewhere. Besides this government wants Constantinople—the gateway between Europe and Asia—turned into an international port, in the hope that this may prevent any nation in the future turning this city into an outpost from which to send threatening expeditions against British spheres of influence and territory in Asia. But to turn the Sultan from the Porte at this moment is a rather dangerous thing to do, because of the none too kindly attitude of all the Mohammedans towards the British government. There is a possibility that the Mohammedans both in India and elsewhere might rise in revolt should their Caliph be ousted from his seat of power, both in the church and the state. This compels another course to be pursued—namely that of walling in the Sultan and clipping his wings so to speak.

It is here that the Armenian policy of the British and French governments comes into play. As this policy is somewhat involved, and as the conflict existing between the two governments has not had time to come to the surface yet, no one can say with any degree of certainty what final shape this policy will assume, but still we can get a glimpse of what the effect on British interests will be if Armenia is finally severed from the Turkish Empire. A glance at a map shows the strategic position of Armenia. It cuts clean across the western peninsula of Asia from north to south, touches the Mediterranean just east of the Island of Cyprus, and commands the approach from Europe to both the Bagdad and Anatolia railways. So a state could not be better located than is Armenia for the purpose of making a Chinese wall out of it. This it is that, in the opinion of the writer, the British government wants to make of Armenia. Behind this wall British interests can expand and entrench themselves as never before, because they will be comparatively safe from such insidious rivalry as threatened them twice previously. Moreover, by placing a trusty sentinel on guard they need not fear any enemy or rival except the one who possesses the physical force required to storm the wall and force his way in. But it will become doubly difficult for a rival to do this if Constantinople is made an international port, or the Dardanelles an international strait. Thus by its Armenian policy the British government is trying to kill two birds with one stone.

It was with some interest the writer picked up and read today's paper, as it contains two announcements which indicate that the above speculations are not altogether fanciful dreams. One announcement has it that the Allied Supreme Council has decided to allow England to control Mesopotamia and Syria—new sections to the wall—and the other, that a British syndicate has secured a concession from the Persian government for the building of an important railway, the building of which will enable the Caspian gate to be fortified and closed to the outside world—entrenching British capitalism in the east.

(Continued on page 2)

# The Science of Socialism

By H. M. Bartholomew.

ARTICLE No. II.

## WEALTH-PRODUCTION: VALUE.

To apply the law of causation to the Social Problem, and in so doing, to ascertain its solution, it is essential that we examine the methods of wealth-production under which we work and have our being.

The beginning of any such analysis, involves a knowledge of the term "wealth." Perhaps there is no term used in the science of political economy which has been more misunderstood and which has been more abused than the term wealth. Yet the term as used by the economist is the very essence of simplicity. He defines wealth as an accumulation of useful commodities—houses, clothes, food, boats, and so on. The ownership of such a supply of useful articles constitutes the possessor, whether an individual or a nation, as the owner of wealth. It is in this sense that the word wealth is employed in this and the following articles.

How is this wealth produced? Is the supply of wealth produced adequate to the needs of the people in the world? How can wealth be most economically produced from the standpoint of social needs? These are questions of the greatest possible import, and it is the endeavor of the writer in this and the next two articles to answer these grave, fundamental questions.

We find—do we not?—that in modern society, these useful articles, such as boots and hats, are produced or made, with a view, not to their use by those who create them, but for the purpose of exchange upon the open market. Both workers and employers look to the general market as they produce cups and saucers, food and clothing. And the wealth of our present society consists in a vast accumulation of these commodities or wares, which all possess an exchange value.

What is this exchange value? By what means are the exchange-values of various commodities regulated?

It is a matter of singular note that all economists of standing are agreed as to what constitutes value. Let us see what some of these great thinkers say upon this important point.

Sir William Petty says:

"Let another man so travel into a country where is silver, there dig it, refine it, bring it to the same place where the other man planted his corn, coin it, etc., the same person all the while of his working for silver gathering also food for his necessary livelihood and procuring himself covering, etc., I say the silver of the one be esteemed of equal value with the corn of the other. . . . From whence it follows that the price of a bushel of this corn be an ounce of silver."

Adam Smith says:—

"The real price of everything, what everything really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it. . . . It is natural that what is usually the produce of two days or two hours labour should be worth double of what is usually the produce of one day's or one hour's labor."

Benjamin Franklin tells us that:—

"Trade in general being nothing but the exchange of labor for labor, the value of all things being justly measured by labor."

Ricardo amplifies the statement of Adam Smith, and tells us:—

"That this is the foundation of the exchangeable value of all things, excepting those which cannot be increased by human industry, is a doctrine of the utmost importance in political economy. If the quantity of labor realized in commodities regulate their exchangeable value, every increase of the quantity of labor must increase the value of the commodity on which it is exercised as every diminution must lower it."

Last of all John Stuart Mill states that of "the component elements of the cost of production," the "principal of them, and so much the principal as nearly the sole, we found to be labor."

All these great thinkers in the scheme of political economy are agreed that the exchangeable value of any given commodity is determined by the quantity of human labor which that commodity embodies.

But all these economists mention labor as the measure of exchangeable value—and there they stop. They do not tell us WHAT labor.

Take the case of two operatives who are engaged in the production of boots. One of them is a skilled artisan, but possesses the old-fashioned tools which

obtained a century ago, whilst his confrere works with the very latest boot making machinery which has been invented by science. When finished, both pairs of boots are exactly the same. It is absolutely impossible to tell one from the other. And yet the boots made by the operative who has had at his command the latest labor-saving machinery, have embodied in them one-half the quantity of labor. That is to say, the boots made by the old-fashioned operative contain, beyond all question, twice the amount of labor that the pair made by the modern worker contains.

Let us follow these boots upon the world's market. Both are equally well made, and it necessarily follows that they possess precisely the same exchange value in relation to other goods on the market. In other words a purchaser of these boots does not inquire as to how they were made, for both pairs are the same to him. The value of both pairs of boots is the same, and we find therefore, that, despite the INDIVIDUAL TIME taken in their production, the exchangeable value is determined by the quantity of labor embodied in a pair of shoes when human labor has at its command the latest labor-saving tools and machinery.

It is clear, then, that the INDIVIDUAL TIME taken to produce does not determine the value of a pair of boots, but the quantity of socially necessary labor required to produce each pair at the time they are offered for exchange. The quality of the labor being identical, and the product similar, the actual value in exchange of any two articles is dependent upon the general average amount of social human labor-power used in creating a precisely similar article.

What is true in regard to two articles which are similar, is just as true, and applies with equal force, to articles which are dissimilar—boots and hats, guns and books. Boots and hats are produced through the application of labor power to land with the aid of capital, and the value of the commodities, upon the markets of the world, will be determined by the quantity of the social human labor power of which each is the embodiment.

So that we see that every workman, when he applies his individual labor-power to the production of a given commodity, embodies therein a definite quantity of social human labor, and that it is this quantum of social human labor which determines the value of that commodity in relation to other articles.

It will be noticed, too, that value is a relative quantity. Like weight, we cannot tell what value is in the abstract. The value of an article as expressed in social human labor-power, can only be determined when it is brought into relation with another commodity. Social human labor measures for us the value in exchange upon the world's markets of commodities relatively to one another. If more of such labor be embodied in a commodity it becomes, on the average, of greater value in exchange with the quantum of social human labor-power embodied in them. On the other hand, less labor embodied in any commodity, constitutes, on the average, less commodities which remain stationary in regard to value.

This relative value is best expressed through the employment of a medium of exchange—and in modern society this takes the form of money.

The average man, when he thinks of the value of an article, usually thinks of that value in terms of dollars and cents. Indeed, he does not speak of the value of a commodity, but its market price.

Dollars, pounds, shillings, francs, marks, roubles—these are the equivalents of price today. And the average man and woman know little, if anything else, of the value of a commodity than its money-price.

But gold and silver, the common medium of exchange, are useful commodities, and their value is likewise determined by the quantum of social human labor power which is necessary to their production. They exchange, that is, on exactly the same basis as

all other commodities on the world's markets. Moreover, their value varies according to the ease or difficulty with which they are procured. Plenty means, on the one hand, ease of attainment or a relatively small quantity of human labor in its production; whilst scarcity, on the other hand, implies difficulty of attainment or the need for the expenditure of a greater quantity of social human labor power.

Gold and silver, then, are socially useful commodities and can be employed as the media of exchange, as the standard of price, because, they in themselves, are the socially recognized incarnations of human labor power. Indeed, price is but the money name of value, and money becomes the convenient expression of value by virtue of the fact that they are the embodiments of certain quantities of social human labor power.

Karl Marx says on this point:—

"As the measure of value it serves to convert the value of all the manifold commodities into prices, into imaginary quantities of gold: as the standard of price it measures those quantities of gold. The measure of values measures commodities, considered as values; the standard of price, measures, on the contrary, quantities of gold by the unit quantity of gold, not the value of one quantity by the weight of another. In order to make gold a standard of price a certain weight must be fixed upon as the unit. . . . But only in so far as it is in itself a product of labor and, therefore, potentially variable in value, can gold serve as a measure of value."

But labor, in itself, possesses no value. Labor as labor has no more value than weight as weight. If men are employed, as they were in the French Revolution, simply to dig holes that they might have the pleasure to fill those holes up again, there is no creation of wealth and, de facto, no creation of value. Labor, in such a case, possesses no value.

It follows, therefore, that labor measures value. And when it is embodied in such articles it becomes, only when it is embodied in socially useful articles, as we have seen, the sole basis and measure of the exchange value of these commodities.

Our brief analysis has brought us round to the point where we can obtain a better view of the present economic system. We are able to comprehend the better the true function which is performed by the worker as a creator of wealth.

We now realize that the wealth of a nation, comprising as it does, an accumulation of socially useful commodities, is the product of the labor of the members of that community, and that the value of those manifold commodities, is determined by the quantity of social human labor power of which they are the physical embodiments.

Those of my readers who follow me through this somewhat dry-as-dust abstract disquisition, will be repaid by the flood of light which this abstract investigation throws upon the economic problem which trouble us to-day. The Science of Socialism as propounded by the Marxists takes its stand upon the fact that labor is the only producer of wealth. That it is by the application of human labor power to land and capital that wealth can be created, and that the commodities which go to make up the wealth of a nation are exchanged on the markets of the world according to the value embodied in them by the quantity of social human labor power which is necessary to their production.

(Next article: "Wealth-Production—Capital.")

## ARMENIA.

(Continued from page 1)

In conclusion, and so as to connect up the ideas, the writer wishes to point out that in the great historical movements that have led up to the present situation in western Asia, it is the economic factor which has supplied the chief and prime motive power. Other factors such as religious and humanitarian idealism have also played a role, but a secondary role,—the role of awakening enthusiasm among the idealists who have no direct material benefit to gain from the conquest of territory and markets; and also, more particularly of securing that passive acquiescence of the populace, which amounts to a justification of the government's policy, without which no official feels safe in involving his government in imperial conquest and disputes abroad. This fact accounts for the prominence given to "The Call From Armenia" in the newspapers at the present time.

C. M. C.

# The Oriental Problem in B. C.

THE Board of Trade conference in Vancouver is endeavoring to scare the life out of us with "their" problem of the Orientals in B. C. When the introduction of Oriental Labor was considered desirable to fight the labor problem some years ago, this august body of citizens did not talk of the "threat of the Oriental penetration." What then has caused the alarm?

In an editorial in the Vancouver World, of February 6th, we find that the labor difficulty was solved O.K. "But the penetration continues in a larger and more menacing form." In fact this menace is in the form of a threat—a peculiar form of threat—a threat to buy something. Isn't that a peculiarly alarming situation? Who is scared by this threatened purchase—the sellers—oh, no—every citizen!! All the elements of a problem and one disturbing factor eliminated this time, viz., labor. The editorial continues: "The best known fruit ranch in the province is threatened with purchase and subdivision under Japanese auspices. The subject no longer concerns labor alone, but has become of vital urgency to every citizen."

On another page of this same newspaper the Japanese Consul denies that such a threat has been made in the way of buying the Coldstream Ranch, the property referred to. Maybe the owners of the property in question are none too pleased with the final outcome of the "threat to purchase," as the question of who pays the price so long as it is paid naturally does not worry the business man. The menace of course is "Japanese" capital, and it's threat to certain small interests in the Province.

This subject which has become of vital urgency to every citizen is selected simply to show the hypocritical method of presentation characteristic of the small trader who always wants to "hide his light under a bushel"—i.e., the real problem as it affects him. How does he proceed? We must consider the sections of the community that have to be interested. First of all there is the "labor" element to whom the Oriental question has always been a bugbear. The shortsightedness of employers in the past in connection with immigration regulations are therefore trotted out, but, it is asserted that labor has triumphed over this difficulty "by ruthless pressure against firms and individuals who employed the Asiatic." There you see now how the problem "no longer concerns labor alone." It has been solved on paper and the Asiatic laborer is non est in B. C.!! Yet in the close of this same editorial we find references to an unsettled immigration agreement with Japan.

The next bunch to be considered are of a variegated hue and as the editorial writer evidently could not find the social categories the residue of democracy comprised—"the people" in general were to be interested. What can we interest them in?—their superior civilization, hygiene, religious traditions and "the flow of our national life," and the conclusion of the comparison is that "the two races cannot co-exist in a national sense." Surely, they must be worse than the Bolsheviks. It is admitted the Japanese have certain virtues—such as frugality and industry, which of course is also what we desire amongst "our" people, i.e., our working people. The Japanese Consul referring to the "alleged Japanese menace" by a presentation of facts shows the absurdity of the claims of superiority, and he evidently knows full well that those who write comparisons of Japanese standards of living are always taking the lower standard of the Japanese laborer. The concern over the hygiene conditions in railroad construction camps, logging camps, and mining districts did not disturb our virtuous citizens so long as they were not compelled to live under such conditions.

The question that is kept in the background is the "property" envy of the little business man, and the same concern over the Japanese did not develop in California until the "frugality and industry" of the Japanese ranchers began to be felt by the native ranchers. The Japanese laborer here is exploited under the wage system just the same as his superior Anglo-Saxon brother, and if any syndicate can ex-

plot his energy to better advantage on the land not only will Japanese capitalists be looking for him but also the Canadian capitalist. The "white hopes" who look likely subjects for the same process to the critical eye of the employer will not be overlooked. Even in the issue of the "World" referred to, appears a news item to the effect that Hindus are employing "white men" in B. C.

Such are the problems (?) of Democracy with their "inferior race" twaddle.

...H. W.

## The Use of the Vote

PERHAPS no wider views exist among radicals than on the question of the vote. The simon-pure industrial-actionist emphatically has no use for it, and many who call themselves political-actionists, but who are merely parliamentarians, consider the vote to be the only possible revolutionary weapon. The Marxian Socialist is a revolutionary political-actionist, and to him the vote is only one form of political action, but nevertheless a very essential one.

An act is political if its purpose and effect are political; that is, if the laws of the country or the form of government are changed thereby, and in the latter case, the act would be revolutionary. When the peasants of England in 1381 rose in revolt against their feudal lords and marched en masse before the king, demanding release from personal obligation to their lords and recognition of their status as "freemen," their act was certainly political, and when the king acceded to their demands, they had won a sweeping political victory, notwithstanding the fact that not a single vote was cast on the question.

If we analyze the origin and significance of the vote, we will find it much easier to appreciate its value. There was a time in human society when differences of opinion were invariably settled by physical combat, and the winning side forced its desires upon the weaker faction. But later, this system of head-cracking often gave way to the less exciting method of head-counting, and the losing side if hopelessly outnumbered, was content to abide by the result. Thus we see that the vote is merely a measure or expression of strength.

Naturally, one would suppose that when a man is voting he knows what he is voting about and certainly that he is voting for his own benefit. So that in any country today where the working-class comprise nearly the whole of the population, and the propertied class but a small fraction, we should wonder why everything is not done and run for the convenience and pleasure of the many, for have they not the strength to enforce their desires? The truth is, they have no desire to be other than they are, or at any rate the notion prevails that there is equal opportunity for all, and that a man needs only to be thrifty and persevering to come out on top. Only a few comparatively are class-conscious, and only a few of these really understand the underlying causes of social development, and know the forces which the workers as a class will have to overcome to establish themselves as rulers of society.

The Marxian Socialist holds that the capitalists maintain their position principally by means of organized power, i.e., the State, and that such power is supplied by members of the working class, and is available only through the ignorance of that class. Destroy that ignorance, substitute therefore a realisation of the class nature of capitalist society, and the workers then constitute a force which practically nothing can check.

We must remember that every capitalist country was virtually compelled to give the franchise to the proletariat in order to insure its support, but so cleverly and insistently have the bourgeois intellectuals preached the gospel of "democracy" and of equality of opportunity that the vote has always been used by the workers to advance the interests of some section of the class above them, instead of their own. It is therefore the first object of Marxists to give the worker that knowledge by which he can make intelligent use of the franchise.

"But," we hear someone say, "do you suppose the capitalists will let themselves be voted out of

business? Long before that point arrives, they will have withdrawn the franchise from the workers."

"Let them do it," we say. They would face a dilemma just as terrifying as they face today in regard to the recognition of Soviet Russia: to make peace with Russia means the speedy spread of her Communistic principles, but to make war on her very possibly means the revolt of their own working class. It is inconceivable that any capitalist government (even the U. S.) would be so foolhardy or so short-sighted as to long check the political expression of the working class, even if it assume a class-conscious aspect: they would only be proving the shallowness and empty pretense of their democratic forms.

In the process of awakening the proletariat, political campaigns and elections are of invaluable aid. The election of candidates who are thoroughly under the control of the party, as are the Socialist deputies recently elected to the Italian parliament, enables the workers to more publicly dissect and expose the hypocritical nature of all capitalist institutions. Mass action may sound very alluring as advocated by some so-called Communists, but the Marxist sees no particular benefit in stirring the mob to action. If the knowledge is possessed by a sufficient number of workers they will need no stirring; and in the meantime, while the number of clear visioned workers is small, educational methods are the only ones that enable us to make any progress.

A.C.

### CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

C. Mc.M. Smith, Conn. ....	\$2.00
R. Gardner .....	.70
J. A. K. ....	1.50
Gus Johnson .....	5.00
A. R. Mosely .....	.90
H. H. Mreffield .....	1.00
C. M. C. ....	1.00
A. Miller .....	2.00
John Loitz .....	1.00
J. Wright, per R. Sinclair .....	5.00
R. Green .....	1.00

Total 12th to 25th February, inclusive.....\$21.10

### "CLARION" NEWS AGENCIES.

The "Western Clarion" is on sale at:—  
 W. Love, Hastings St. E., Vancouver, B. C.  
 Columbia News Stand, cor. Hastings and Columbia Streets, Vancouver.  
 John Green, Carall Street, Vancouver.  
 News Stand, B. C. E. R. Depot, New Westminster.  
 Alexander News Stand, 204 Eighth Avenue West, Calgary, Alta.  
 S. Feigleman, 421 St. Lawrence Bldg., Montreal, Que.  
 Frierman and Baranowski, 12 Ontario St. E., Montreal, Que.  
 R. Gardner, Eagle Hill, Alberta.  
 Onward Book Store, 196 Gold St., Buffalo, N. Y.  
 Raymer's Old Book Store, 1330 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.  
 Viking Book Store, 264 Bay Street, Port Arthur, Ont.  
 Raymer's Old Book Store, 1317 Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.

## Labor Defence Fund

Send all money and make all cheques payable to A. S. Wells, B. C. Federationist, Labor Temple, Vancouver, B. C.

Collection agency for Alberta: A. Broatch, 1203 Eighth Avenue East, Calgary, Alta.

Central Collection Agency: J. Law, Secretary, Defence Fund, Room 1, 530 Main Street, Winnipeg, Man.

### CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Name ..... has removed from ..... to .....

## Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,  
and Current Events.

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of  
Canada, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.  
Phone Highland 2583.

Editor ..... Ewen MacLeod

Subscription, 20 issues ..... \$1.00

**815**

If this number is on your address label your  
subscription expires with next issue. Renew  
promptly.

VANCOUVER, B. C., MARCH 1, 1920

### EDITORIAL

#### HELPING RUSSIA.

WE read daily of "peace" with Soviet Russia, and, if we would have it, this peace is to be instituted "in view of the sore need of the Russian people."

The League of Nations, which represents 31 out of 32 Powers associated in the war, resembles a giant association of the lame, the halt, and the blind. With all its troubles, not the least of which is the threadbare economic condition of Central Europe, Russia is its greatest worry.

A month ago we read that free entry of goods into Russia was to be permitted, and that limited trading through the Russian Co-operatives was to be "encouraged." Since recognition by the Supreme Council, of the Soviet Government, was withheld, much worry was caused as to how the details were to be worked out, and, as one paper had it, "the best plan is to leave it to the Soviets."

Although British trading with these co-operatives has already commenced through the Scottish Wholesale Co-operative Society, the "details" have been well attended to by the Soviets, and we see their work in the recent Murmansk coast and southern Russian victories for the Red armies. All of which causes a further reconsideration of the question, and demonstrates that poor Russia really needs help.

As we well know, M. Lenin has long since tendered peace proposals. And now comes the latest, in what definite terms we do not know, but in terms more rigid, we expect, than those sent through Mr. Bullitt on the 14th March, 1919. A peace proposal on behalf of Soviet Russia has been received by Captain (or is it Colonel?) James O'Grady from Maxim Litvinoff, the Bolshevik emissary. Whereas former peace proposals made on behalf of Russia to the Allies were hidden from public knowledge, we are actually informed of this in advance by the press.

Truly, Russia is pulling us all her way.

And now that the military anti-Soviet program of the Allied Governments has been destroyed, not by their good-will but by the Red armies, we have discovered that "as no anti-Bolshevik organization exists any longer, Soviet Russia is now Russia." But our cautious diplomats have decided to send a delegation to Russia, commissioned to "enquire" into conditions. No peace, they say, can be formulated, nor official recognition of the Soviet Government be maintained until they are assured that the Bolshevik "horrors" have ceased.

We know, and of course they know, that in this they are trying further to gauge the strength of the Soviets. But here it is interesting to note that in the past few years capitalism in her dying agonies has exterminated some fifteen million able bodied men in bloody battle. And in Russia itself, the executions and atrocities committed by Czecho-Slovaks and Russian counter-revolutionaries assisted and maintained by the Allies, are pointed examples of Allied holiness of purpose.

British interest in Russia's welfare is quite sound, however. We cannot do better in dealing with the present proposals to "help the Russian people" than quote Sir Francis H. Barker, chairman of the executive committee of the Russo-British Chamber of Commerce, who, presiding at the eighth monthly dinner of the British Russia Club, said:

"We wish success to Admiral Kolchak and General Denikin, and I think I cannot do better than raise my glass and ask you all to drink to the health of Admiral Kolchak, General Denikin and General Yudenich. . . . Russia is a great country. You all know, because you are intimately connected with it in your business, what the potentialities of Russia are, whether it be from the point of view of manufacture or the point of view of mineral wealth, or any other thing, because Russia has everything. . . . Now this is a country we ought to help."

The references to Kolchak, Denikin and Yudenitch are happily a little out of date, but the eye of Sir Francis sees profit in Russia, and the cessation of its production there is the chief horror of which the Soviets can be guilty.

#### SECRETARIAL NOTES.

The many letters of congratulation we have received on the reappearance of the "Western Clarion," are taken as a tribute to the sound educational policy the paper has pursued in past years. We hope to be able to continue the policy and will try to merit, in our turn, the kind words. Many suggestions are offered, good and otherwise, as to the best method of presenting the case for the worker, to him. It is our intention to make the paper bright, readable and instructive, and after all this, understandable. It should have in it something educational that will strike the understanding of the worker in every branch of industry, including our farmer friends, who have a point of view of their own on their own problems.

We conclude in this issue Comrade Harrington's able and instructive book review commenced in last issue, and while it is altogether unorthodox to have book reviews continued from one issue to another, lack of space prevented its presentation in full in 813.

A section of the Appendix to the second edition of "Red Europe," written by Comrade Bennett on "Militarism" (as effecting Soviet Russia), is presented in this issue. Other sections to the appendix are: "Anti-Bolshevik Lie Factories," "Education," "The Children," and "Industry."

"Sabotage," by Prof. Veblen, will be completed next issue. The pamphlet will be sold at five cents per copy, or twenty-five copies for one dollar, post paid.

The "Here and Now" paragraph in this issue shows an increase over last. This does not include individuals who have sent their own subs., but is meant for the guidance of those whose efforts are devoted to increasing the "Clarion" circulation. Comrade Bennett again heads the list, and in consequence wins the premium book-prize offered by Local (Vancouver) No. 1. What is it this time, Bill?

The circulation is inclined to drop a little, owing to our being unable to locate many of the subscribers on the old list. The C. M. Fund looks rather unhealthy this time. Please note.

There is no reason why the "Clarion" should not meet such a ready acceptance as would enable us to issue weekly. There is no other paper of its kind on this continent, free from advertising matter, that so consistently maintains a sound educational policy.

Local (Vancouver) No. 1 will hold their ninth anniversary celebration of the Paris Commune of 1871, in the Lester Court, Vancouver, on the 18th March, 1919, at 9 p.m. Supper and dance, tickets \$2 each.

## The Final Question

IN these eventful times, when the old order is giving place to the new, there are many voices crying to make the path straight, many devices to maintain the dying regime.

The aftermath of war has brought capitalist society face to face with the contradiction of social production and individual ownership, overwhelmed it with the unsolvable riddle of harmonizing social necessity with class privilege. Everywhere we see the master class frantic with helplessness, frenzied with impotence, mouthing the shibboleths of tradition, to avert the invincible march of the world pro-

cess,—ludicrous as priestcraft exorcising the devils of disease. Everywhere we see the crumbling of ancient structures, Europe devastated, crushed with atrocity and broken on the wheel of the world mart; Asia a whirlpool of revolt; America a crimson centre of reaction. Production is everywhere limp and halting; nowhere can profit be found. Peoples perish in the midst of plenty while Imperialism battles for gain. Famine credits are doled out to maintain the spark of bare life, till a reconstruction of exploitation is accomplished. And lost production and increased credits intensify the fight for existence, sharpen the class-struggle, drive society nearer the verge of primal necessity. Aptly, the Sun of Capital sets in lurid war.

When world production reopens, at no distant date, it must be for the needs of the people. There can be no increased production for gain, because no market can be found to absorb the product, and without a vastly increased production—even as measured by pre-war standards—the capitalist world cannot endure.

Further credits must be advanced to "save" Europe. More credit can but decrease still further European exchange; still further depreciate currency; intensify an already desperate struggle for existence; hamper an already restricted commerce; heighten, widen, deepen, the irrevocable anomalies and contradictions of capitalist production.

And America, "the democratic," is the sole source of credit. If America refuses credit, the various European nations, economically ruined; stricken with abject misery, unsupported by the intricate mechanism of international capitalism, by various methods and devious ways, will be driven rapidly into their one remaining salvation—anarchic production for immediate necessities. And America must follow. For in capitalist production, no country can stand or fall alone.

On the other hand, if American credit is extended to Europe, and even if financial wizardry can temporarily stabilize exchange, production will still be stifled under the thick blanket of credit; distress will become more acute, misery more widespread, living conditions more desperately intolerable, prices will continually rise till the whole system, in a panic of high finance, collapses in ruin.

But the inevitable cannot be leashed to the wheels of capital. The ever expanding social forces motivated by the capitalist economic, cannot be stayed by capitalist restrictions. The capitalist form and method of political society, has passed its zenith of expansion. No longer can it serve the purposes of society; no more can it be the arbiter of destiny.

Capital is not as the eternal hills. It reflects but the interest of a moment. It is but a phase in the evolution of society; an episode in the march of man, from the accidental unvisioned combinations of primitive society, to the reasoned adaptations and complex organization of the social commune. The power of class; the weapon of privilege; the law of property; these cannot be reformed or reconstrued away. Functioning as the expediences of class-rule, designed to the exigencies of class necessity, its dissolution can only be the concomitant of the utter negation of its law of property.

Reforms are but the index of social decay. They bear eloquent witness of changes in production, they point the inevitable conflict between the social forces and the mode of production, and foreshadow the coming supremacy of a new social order.

Amongst the confusions of change, the orgies of conflicting interests, the idealisms of visionaries, there is but one issue of moment—the issue between capital and labor. It is not "lo here or lo there," this reform or that, fiscal policies, political parties, industrial cooperation. These are but effects, the mere quivering of the leaves of the Upas tree of capital. The question is infinitely simpler, the answer day clear, the import more tremendously vital to that overwhelming majority who bow so pathetically to the joke of tradition, who toil and enjoy not, who create and have nothing.

It is the question of social destiny. Is labor to be the beneficiary of its toil, or continue the thrall of property? Is capital to perpetuate its exploitation, or society control its means of life? Is it to be wage-slavery or economic freedom? Capitalism or Socialism? All other questions are illusions, mist-like, trembling in ever changing hue and form over the reality of social movement.

R.

## BOOK REVIEW.

(A Group of Essays by Famous Writers—B. W. Huebsch, New York—141 pp.)

(Continued from last issue.)

THIS is the average concept of the State. The oaths required by the State are fruitful of perjury and are a source of national corruption. In fact in religion, in commerce, in usury, in every branch of human affairs the fussy old women (or as you say why libel the women), the fussy old fools, who comprise the governments of every country and all the ages have simply clogged the avenues of progress and poisoned the wells of truth.

Read what Buckle, the darling of the bourgeoisie, has to say. Tommy Metcalfe and Gideon Robertson can take note; also Perry, of the late R. N. W. M. P.—

"In the same meddling spirit, and with the same mistaken notions of protection, the great Christian governments have done other things still more injurious. They have made strenuous and repeated efforts to destroy the liberty of the press, and prevent men from expressing their sentiments on the most important questions in politics and religion. In nearly every country, they, with the aid of the church, have organized a vast system of literary police, the sole object of which is to abrogate the undoubted right of every citizen to lay his opinions before his fellow-citizens. In the very few countries where they have stopped short of these extreme steps, they have had recourse to others less violent but equally unwarrantable. For even where they have not openly forbidden the free dissemination of knowledge, they have done all that they could to check it. On all the implements of knowledge, and on all the means by which it is diffused, such as paper, books, political journals and the like, they have imposed duties so heavy that they could hardly have done worse if they had been the sworn advocates of popular ignorance. Indeed, looking at what they have actually accomplished, it may be emphatically said that they have taxed the human mind. They have made the very thoughts of men pay toll. Whoever wishes to communicate his ideas to others, and thus do what he can to increase the stock of our requirements, must first pour his contributions into the imperial exchequer. That is the penalty inflicted on him for instructing his fellow-creatures. That is the blackmail which government extorts from literature and on receipt of which it accords its favors and agrees to abstain from further demands. And what causes all this to be more insufferable is the use which is made of these and similar exactions, wrung from every kind of industry, both bodily and mental. It is truly a frightful consideration that knowledge is to be hindered, and the proceeds of honest labor, of patient thought, and sometimes of profound genius are to be diminished, in order that a large part of their scanty earnings may go to swell the pomp of an idle and ignorant court, minister to the caprice of a few powerful individuals, and too often supply them with the means of turning against the people resources which the people called into existence."

Emerson was neither scientist nor an historian. He might be termed a philosopher by many of his enemies and is worshipped by the cultured bourgeoisie as the "Sage of Concord." He was a devoted admirer and disciple of Carlyle, and expresses the great man theory. The State, we ought to remember, he tells us in his "Essay on Politics," though its institution existed ere we were born is not aboriginal. All laws were made by men like ourselves and in the main can only last a brief period though those of a Cromwell may last longer and those of a Paul or a Plato for all time, only those "who built on these built for eternity." The Masque of Anarchy. "Ideas." Capital I. Never-the-less the man whom Boston would give her fame as a beanery to have had born there, was not a fool, said things that required courage, intelligence and learning to say and sometimes mocks and sometimes shocks the kneelers at his shrine.

"Every actual State is corrupt. Good men must not obey the laws too well." "A nation of men unanimously bent on freedom or conquest can easily confound the arithmetic of statistics and achieve extravagant actions out of all proportion to their means." "However we must renovate the State on the principle of right and love."

Thoreau is another of the illustrious dead which Boston envies Concord. He lived alone at Walden Pond for a couple of years, and while he had many other eccentricities, the refusal to pay a road tax of one dollar landed him in jail. His essay commences with the title which in a country made safe for democracy ought to be banned:—"On the Duty of Civil Disobedience." He sees in the State the same fussy and futile person we had in Buckle with the added element of mischievousness, and so far as the effects of their actions the members of the government should be "classed and punished with those

mischievous persons who put obstructions on the railroads." Thoreau was opposed to the war in Mexico (1847) and also to chattel-slavery, so he refused to assist it by paying taxes. He said that "when a whole country is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army and subjected to military law, I think it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize."

Apparently the United States government has not changed much these many years, for Thoreau asks "why does it always squeal before it is hurt?" "Justice" and "truth" are very much in evidence albeit as common, not as proper nouns, and we read that "there will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power from which all its own power and authority are derived and treats him accordingly."

Same old trouble in the same old way; the individual must be supreme! But Thoreau's essay is worth reading at that.

We now come to Spencer, next to Marx, the great-thinker of the nineteenth century. His first book, "Social Statics," was published when he was about thirty, some of it he saw fit to repudiate in later years, which, by the way, caused Henry George, of Single Tax fame, to make a complete idiot of himself in his book "A Perplexed Philosopher." The extract given in the book under review is omitted from Spencer's later book. It deals with "the right to ignore the State."

Of course we must be mindful that we are not reading Spencer at the full light of his powers. We may digress a little to relate what Spencer's later views were. His autobiography, written at the ripe age of seventy-five tells us that he considers himself "more tory than any tory and more radical than any radical." He believes in the words of the song "There's a good time coming." It now seems to me the good time is far distant. But he makes a startling discovery, as on more than one occasion he fails to make the most of it. He had observed that in his own political views he was oftener prompted to action rather by feeling than reason; notwithstanding certain well-reasoned courses of action when called upon to act, reason gave way to feeling; he assumes from this that the employing class must and does when possessed of power utilize that power in their own interest; and it further follows that should the employed class ever become the powerful class it must, despite all reason, utilize that power in the interest of its class.

Here we find Spencer with "the class struggle," and he fails to connect. He makes the most lame and impotent conclusion that "human nature must be much better than it at present is before a much higher civilization can be established."

Well, in the essay before us he affirms the right of the individual to ignore the State in any secular as in any religious matter. The "individual" is allowed today to determine whether he will associate with a church and that same privilege should be extended to association with the State.

All these things should come to pass because of the "law of equal freedom" and the "moral right" of the "individual." Spencer might have violated a "moral law" amongst authors when he removed this essay from his last edition of "Social Statics." It cannot be said that he was ashamed of his attitude toward the State, for he maintained that throughout, and if he was not ashamed of the jumble of metaphysics, he had reason to be. However, he does not desire to press his conclusions at present (1850) so he says, "Let not any be alarmed. Many changes are required before the imperfect State becomes harmonious with perfect law." So say all anarchists.

Of Tolstoy we need only say that Christ takes the place of "moral right and equal freedom." His essay is also worth while. It is entitled "An Appeal to Social Reformers." He does not, however, understand the function of the State. He assumed, as do the others, that a struggle exists between the State and the people. He brings to his task knowledge which is lacking in all the others except Kropotkin, and aside from the abstractions of freedom and justice, he makes the fatal mistake of venturing to prophecy. Man can never by force displace the State. "Think," he says, "only what enormous and splen-

did mental powers are now spent in the service of the State,—which has outgrown its time—and in its defence; how much youthful and enthusiastic effort is spent on attempts at revolution in an "impossible" task which has been accomplished to one which has never been accomplished, "to that which alone affords the possibility of good social life—to their inner self-perfection."

Wilde, the villain of the piece, speaks through an extract from "The Soul of Man under Socialism." As an example of excellent English it is worthy of study. It contains some striking phrases, as "To the thinker, the most tragic fact in the whole French Revolution is not that Marie Antoinette was killed for being a queen, but that the starved peasants of La Vendee voluntarily went out to die for the hideous cause of Feudalism." "Whenever there is a man who exercises authority, there is a man who resists authority."

He also brings Christ to the feast, and the "Individual." Altogether a fine book and a book which shows the great heroes of Flunkedom to be in revolt against the doctrines of their devotees. But not one of them, aristocrat, historian, philosopher, aesthetis, scientist, novelist or poet realizes that the State as an institution for making slaves love honor and fight for their slavery is the most astounding social phenomenon of all time.

J.H.

## Hard Times

TO earn a living at all is quite a problem under Capitalism, but what makes the uncertainty much worse is the periodical recurrence of "hard times" otherwise known as crises. In agricultural countries like Canada, crop failures are a source of hard times by creating a relative—but not a real—surplus of goods; as the shortage of cash among the farming class incapacitates them from buying the usual stocks off the manufacturers' or distributors' hands, thereby causing a fictitious overabundance. But, in countries mainly industrial, absurd as it may seem, the worst of hard times results from too much wealth in society, from a real overproduction, when the surplus of goods cannot find a sale in this, our present system of production that aims at making monetary profit instead of usefully supplying human needs. This state of things, in its turn, arises from the planlessness that inevitably accompanies the capitalist system of production. Since 1825, when the first general crisis broke out, hard times has become a permanent feature of modern society. As Engels remarks, the crisis brings out sharply the contradiction between the social production of wealth by great factory-armies of workers, and the private appropriation of that wealth by the small capitalist class. Again, that which ordinarily effects the circulation of commodities—MONEY—becomes a hindrance to their circulation during hard times when everyone needs money to live or run their business, and few possess it in the requisite quantities: all is head-over-heels confusion, for it means that the mode of production has rebelled against the mode of exchange. These crises clearly prove the Capitalist Class to be unable to further direct its own social powers of production; and it is the mission of the Working Class to seize the industrial and governmental helm and thereby relieve society from the effects of capitalist selfishness and incapacity. No capitalist knows exactly how much of his product comes to market nor how much of it at all is needed, and the crises appears as the contrast between the harmony and organization of production in the single factory, as compared with the general anarchy and planlessness of production in society as a whole. In short, in modern society, we reach the absurd position, that the product rules the producers! The solution of the problem lies in making the appropriation, and also the distribution of wealth equally as social as is the present method of producing the wealth itself—which solution necessitates the Socialist, in place of the Capitalist, organization of society. Many people curse the Money Monopoly as the prime evil. It is but a surface-sore resulting from that deeper impurity, the Capitalist System of Production itself, which the progressive elements of all nations are determined shall be substituted by the intelligent regulation, foresight and planfulness of the Socialist Republic.—"Progress."

# On the Study of Economics

At no other period in history has an interest been taken by the producing class to acquaint itself with the forces and laws that operate in human society equal to that evinced at the present time.

Whatever else may have resulted from the recent great war, affecting the social position of the world's workers, we can find some consolation in the intellectual development that has followed in its wake. From all industrial centres the world over, comes the gratifying news of a growing educational movement absorbing the energies of thousands of our class who are desirous of acquiring a knowledge of the world they live in especially in regard to the manner in which they obtain their bread and butter.

In Canada, the socialist movement has been particularly fortunate in the past in having Marxian students who possessed the necessary qualifications for an explanation of history and economics, and those who have graduated from this school can always be depended upon to give a proper account of themselves wherever they happen to be located. In other countries, where the soil has not been cultivated with the same assiduous care, the results of this new "renaissance" may not be so pleasing. Especially is this true of cases where labor unions and other bodies have enlisted the support of university professors to teach their classes and obviously instil the ideas prevalent in these seats of learning instead of the scientific conclusions of the socialist economists. Nevertheless, even in such instances, the desire to know, is a healthy sign of the times and must eventually terminate in disaster for the mouthpieces of capitalist interests.

Political economy is not by any means an ancient science. In those early days when thinkers labored in the laboratory and cell to compile and disseminate information on physics, astrology, and alchemy, none of them made any attempt to develop a knowledge of Political Economy. In Grecian and Roman societies little attention was paid to analyzing the methods of producing and distributing wealth. In his peregrinations into the realms of thought, nature, and society, Aristotle made some observations on the manner in which nations, communities, and individuals secure those things necessary to their existence, maintenance, and improvement. But the condition of society at the time in which he lived prevented anything of importance being discovered in this field. Grecian society was a chattel slave society. The existence of rich and poor, of owners and producers, was regarded as a stable condition which had never changed. In this state a concept of value was impossible. Such a concept involved a realization of the labor embodied in commodities and, further, the reduction of all energy used in production to common human labor in the abstract. Then, the narrow confines of the ancient world market; the absence of exchange to any great extent due to a lack of incentive; and the fact that capital, with the retinue inseparable from it, had not yet made an appearance left the study of wealth production and distribution an impossible one to develop.

During that period in the history of Western Europe known as the Middle Ages, little advancement was made in this science. Agriculture was at this time the only important branch of industry and, even here, the old three-field system which prevailed for centuries was not conducive to stimulating the invention of labor-saving machinery; of better methods of tilling the soil; or scientific processes of production. While the economic field remained in this condition nothing startling could be expected in the science that concerned itself with observing the facts regarding the manner in which mankind secures its livelihood, and drawing such conclusions from these facts as the evidence warranted. In many ways the modern industrial state is easier to understand than that of the Middle Ages, although in its nature it is infinitely more intricate than the feudal form. This access to a knowledge of its mechanism is due to the fact that an abundance of material is available to enable us to study it.

In Medieval England the economic conditions had attained a fairly high degree of complexity. The old manorial reports convey the information that

many classes and social groups performed economic functions even in the rural districts. There was always the Lord of the Manor with his personal officials and retainers. The villeins, cottars, and bondsmen, bound to their superior through ties of dependence, mutual rights, and obligations; the Roman Church, possessing large tracts of land, and really functioning in many ways as a state within a state; the gold merchants and, later on, their successors, the craft guilds whose functions were primarily economic and who enjoyed many privileges of a political character. These classes and groups constituted a little world of their own which, even to this day, has never been satisfactorily explained. No one has yet clearly portrayed the functions of the merchant guilds regardless of the exhaustive researches of Dr. Gross and others. Only guesses are made as to their importance and the reasons for their final collapse. The extent to which the Catholic church owned land and controlled political activity are still problems that await a definite solution. Just what proportion of the industrial population belonged to the craft guilds, and how complete was the control of these guilds over their members during the different periods of feudalism, still lies in the domain of doubt. We know in a general way, due to the efforts of modern students, that many laws, rules and regulations accompanied the development of medieval society, but just how static or elastic these were in practice is still a moot question. Taking it all in all the mechanism of that period is a complicated one which has not been adequately analyzed as yet. Without knowing a great deal more of the history and social gearing of that age, our study of the productive processes of feudalism could not bring us to the stage of a science. Only fragments of knowledge were obtained, and the compilation of statistics so vital to the ruling class of today was carried on to a very limited extent.

Nothing less than a revolution in the mode of producing and distributing wealth was required before these scattered fragments, gathered during the Middle Ages, could be properly arranged and constructed into a science. This revolution was made possible by the great geographical discoveries of the 15th and 16th centuries, which made imperative an extension of commerce beyond the confines of the then known world, and gave a new incentive for the introduction of labor saving machinery that could keep this world market supplied with the commodities required. This great change necessitated a more thorough study of industry and commerce. As mercantilism grew into manufacture, and this in turn made way for modern industry, the scientific enquiry made rapid and resolute advance.

The establishment of a school which concerned itself with the intricacies of wealth production, bringing some kind of order out of the chaos and confusion that reigned can be first seen in the Physiocrats. As the title implies, they accepted the theory that nature leads the members of society to understand and follow their own interests and that all individuals possess the same natural rights. The social union they regard as being a contract between persons to further the interests of the group even if such action involved the limitation of natural freedom on the part of some individuals. The knowledge that human history was a series of bitter, relentless struggles between classes with conflicting interests, and that as each faction succeeded in assuming the dominant position its wishes were inflicted on the rest of society through the instrumentality of its institutions, was not yet possible at this stage of social development. But they did see in the machinery of the state a power which was detrimental to the major portion of society, i.e., to the third estate, which was striving for political recognition and condemned any action on the part of the state authority which overstepped the boundary of what they considered a necessary interference to fulfil the terms of the "contrat sociale."

The lack of industrial growth is emphasized in the partiality of the physiocratic school for nature and agriculture. Feudalism was a class system in which the interests of landed proprietors were paramount and, naturally, any reforms contemplated by the discontented elements of the population were direct-

ed to a readjustment of land ownership. The economic analysis of the Physiocrats proclaimed that the excess of the mass of agricultural products over their cost of production constituted the annual addition to the wealth of the community and permitted its expansion in a progressive and civilized direction. The positions of manufacturer and merchant were fairly well defined and, while their usefulness to society was granted, it was claimed that their income was derived solely from the surplus products of the workers in the fields and mines. Commerce, too, they pointed out, contributed nothing new to the mass of wealth already accumulated, being merely a handling on a larger scale of the products already in existence. As with the other economists of the classical school they considered that the production of surplus value was the means of identifying the productive laborer, but insisted that surplus value could only be derived from agriculture and, therefore, made its appearance only in the form of rent. This school no doubt exerted some influence in France and other countries, and in some respects its conclusions were much nearer being correct than those of Smith and others who succeeded them.

A rapidly developing industrial system supplied the requisite material for further observations on the economic field. Of course, Political Economy was at this time essentially a bourgeois science. With the growth of manufacture, and the means of transportation, and the consequent decay of the power previously possessed by the landed proprietors, the bourgeoisie manifested themselves as the revolutionary class and any analysis which they would attempt of the social system of the time could only be expected to be stamped with their own class interests. They had to establish a premise from which to move and, not understanding the historic character of the field they studied, this premise was accepted as a fact which required no further elucidation. They made no attempt to prove their supposition that the new system was a natural one, and that private property in the means of production was quite in conformity with, and a symbol of, human liberty. Like Plato, Socrates, etc., they could not get behind the class system that surrounded them and obtain a proper perspective of social development. One thing that can be said to the credit of the classical economists is that they tried to make an impartial study of wealth production, which was easily possible as long as the class struggle was as yet undeveloped. The conflict lay between the two factions of the ruling class, the landed aristocracy, who did not die a sudden and violent death, but for many years, especially in England, continued to occupy an important position in the affairs of state, and the rising class of merchants and manufacturers who were rapidly assuming control of economic power, but whose lack of intellectual attainments prohibited an entrance to the realm of politics.

In such a condition as this, the chief aim of the bourgeois economists was to belittle the importance of the opposing class, and justify their own pretensions to the dominant position. The aristocracy had become an incubus on the body politic and must be swept aside, and who was to take their place but the new industrial faction? Industry was still in a crude state, that of the partnership or joint stock company, and as the members of the new class actively participated in managing and superintending all the details of commodity production they could obviously lay claim to being a very necessary factor on the industrial field.

With the complete triumph of the bourgeoisie in France and England, the class struggle was narrowed down to a contest between the two separate and distinct classes of owners and producers. There were no subsidiary factions to obscure the issue and, naturally, the conflict of interests between master and worker became ever more apparent and vital. The unbiased attitude of the scientist must now be discarded, and no matter who the economists were who supplied the rulers with the definitions and classifications of things pertaining to production and exchange, it requires no strain on the thinking apparatus to see that they are all apologists for and supporters of the present form of class society. Their object is not to explain to the working class how their labor power applied to natural resources and machinery of production makes possible all the wealth in society today, and that when these workers come to realize the importance of their position

(Continued on page 7)

## The Military Situation

By William Bennett—From "Red Europe" Appendix, 2nd Edition.

The beginning of the summer of 1919 saw the complete organization of the revolutionary armies. The Red Guards, who had so nobly withstood all the vicious attacks of the counter-revolutionary groups till that time, lacked the cohesion and organization necessary for the successful consummation of any strategic efforts. They passed into history having written their name in letters that will never fade, and the groups of which they were composed formed the basis from which has been built up the all-conquering armies of the Soviet Republic, a fighting machine which has no counterpart in modern history.

May, 1919, opened with a ring of bayonets, a "cordon sanitaire," surrounding the Workers Republic from Archangel in the north to Perm in the east. Military forces of all the nations who had been engaged in a life and death struggle with Germany "that liberty might not perish from the earth," faced the new armies of the Bolsheviki on thirteen battlefronts. Kolchak in the Urals, and Denekin in the south, presented the greatest problems in the field for the strategists in command of the Red Armies.

The campaign was opened, like most other campaigns, by the press. The British Press agency sent broadcast over the world the cheering information that Kolchak was steadily advancing; that the ultimate defeat of the Soviets was well in sight; Moscow would soon be captured, and these vile and sacreligious ghouls subjected to the condign punishment they so richly merited.

But alas for human hopes! The news items were concocted. The writers guessed and—were bad guessers. After six weeks of "steady advance," Winston Churchill, that sinister shadow in English political life, was compelled to admit in the British House of Commons that "the condition of Kolchak's armies was a hopeless one, disastrous in fact." The truth about the matter could no longer be hidden, and the "glorious advance" proved to be an unprecedented retreat of over a thousand miles. From that day on till his final collapse, Kolchak steadily retreated, being followed by the Reds, in what has been described as the longest pursuit in military history, from the Volga to Lake Baikal.

The attempt on the part of Yudenich to capture Petrograd in the fall was one of the worst military ventures ever undertaken. Urged on by the British representatives and supplied by them with supplies of every description, the forces under this drunken Tsarist met with ignominious defeat, not a vestige being left for a possible reorganization. The whole affair was pulled off for political effect rather than military advantage, and the facts of the case do not admit of any result other than the expedition met with.

Denekin, who operated from a base that Lloyd George referred to as "a backyard somewhere near the Black Sea," was the last recipient of Allied support, and the end of all their hopes of a military decision over the forces of the Bolsheviki. Denekin took all the supplies the Allies sent him and immediately sold them to the Jewish traders who hung on the fringe of his army. He placed his dependence on great bodies of cavalry, and by this means was able to advance into the heart of the government of Tula, within two hundred miles of Moscow. The disruption of his communications by the Reds and by the populations of the occupied territories, secured for him the same fate that had befallen Yudenich and Kolchak, and as his armies, driven by the Bolsheviki as chaff is driven by the wind, withered and died so withered and died the hopes of the bondholders of Imperial Russian Loans.

Military history shows the working of the processes of evolution to much better advantage than many of the other activities of the human animal. The changes in the makeup of the soldier so that he may conform to the needs of his tools (weapons), the alteration in the strategy and tactics of war, make the realization of this a simple matter.

With every change in the variable factors of warfare, topography, equipment and will-power, new problems are presented and new strategy developed. With the invention of gunpowder and the consequent perfection of siege artillery the long sieges of the Middle Ages gave way to rapid and violent actions. Time, which is a major consideration, was gained at the expense of men and materials. With these changed conditions a readjustment of the strategy and tactics of the trade became necessary. The recognition of this fact made Napoleon Buonaparts one of the greatest soldiers of all time, and gave him the dominating position he held in Europe at the beginning of the 19th century. Studying the changes that had taken place in the weapons of war and understanding them, he was able to inflict defeat on all occasions on the Austrians, who were his immediate competitors, and who were still swayed by the wornout theories of Frederick the Great.

So with the Bolsheviki, a new strategy has been developed, not by the general staff, but from the bottom. The change has not been in weapons or equipment, as they are using the same paraphernalia as in the Great War for freedom (?) just concluded (?). The officers who organize and plan the movement of the Red armies have no improvements in accoutrement or technique over their fellow craftsmen in Britain, France or Germany. They fought the 1919 campaign on the strategy of so-called "interior lines" first outlined by the

Napoleonic staff-officer, Jomini, and developed with much success by the brains of the German war machine.

In these respects, without detracting in any way from the work of the Commander in Chief Kamenyef or Generals Brussilof, Evarts and the other brilliant officers associated with them, nothing new has been developed. The novel conditions of this war are to be found operating outside of and beyond the control of the general staff, but always working in its favor. This is in the people themselves, who of set purpose join the forces of the enemy to desert at moments of crisis. Capt. F. Moore, late of the Intelligence Dept. A. E. F. (Siberia), writes as follows in Hearst's:

"The Allies in Siberia have been surrounded by an army without uniforms or other visible military equipment, without any apparent machinery of organization. This army has the ability to vanish without being missed, to reassemble when and where it chooses, to set up a front if it so desires, or, if it sees fit, to dissolve again, concealing itself once more under the wings of the very host which is seeking to overcome it. Moreover it is to a very large extent an army of passive resistance. During the winter just past this vanishing army entered the cities occupied by the Allies, and in the guise of refugees or "loyal" Russians, received food, clothing and shelter. Under the protection of the Allied guns it spent the period of bitter cold weather in comfort, perfecting its plans for the on-coming spring, carrying on its propaganda of hostility against the interventionists and mingling with the troops which had come half way round the world to render it harmless. The Bolsheviki are operating with a strategy of organized disorder. . . . It is safer to go over to Kolchak than to be captured by him—safer to vanish in his army, to be concealed in the very ranks of the enemy and to be fed and clothed by him temporarily, than to stand up and fight."

A friend of the writer, who was in Siberia with the Canadian A. M. Corps questioned many Russians as to their presence in the Kolchak army. When they discovered that he, too, was a Bolsheviki, they unburdened themselves and explained that Kolchak had money, food, arms, all these things in fact that the Red army needed. When they had eaten their fill and felt good and lusty, and been trained in the work of soldiering, they would desert to their own army and take with them guns, rifles and ammunition. This was their work for the Social Revolution. The press despatches of the last six months prove that they carried out their plans.

Every critical moment of the campaigns of the so-called "Russian Government" forces was marked by mass desertions to the Bolsheviki. Kolchak suffered on many occasions, Denikin lost most of the equipment he had not already sold, some of his British tanks being used to drive Yudenich into hiding in Esthonia. If the press reports are to be credited, half of Yudenich's army deserted at the gates of Petrograd, going over to the Reds.

This line of action is only possible among Communists. It does not conform to the bourgeois conception of "honor," but grows out of the social organization prevalent in Russia, and is a further proof of the Materialist Conception of History formulated by Engels and Marx; that the forms of the social, political, the juridical institutions obtaining in a particular society are conditioned by the economic basis of the system; military forms are as much subject to this law as are all other arts.

This mass desertion on the part of the Russian workers and peasants is not to be confused in any way with the desertions of the mercenary troops of the armies of the European States that participated in the Thirty Years War. These were hired mercenaries of all nationalities, Scotch, Finns, and Germans mostly, each man fighting for his own hand, with no interest further than his wages, and moving from one side to the other as the emoluments appeared to be greater or less. The growth of standing armies made this condition impossible, but there is no military genius, no incumbent of the war colleges or the military academies who can devise a counter-move to the change in the factor of "will-power" interjected into the art of war by the "ignorant and illiterate" Russian workers. No move that is, short of utter annihilation. This is more than the capitalists, callous and brutal as they have proved themselves to be, are able to do. Annihilation may overtake the capitalist class with no loss to anyone but themselves, but to exterminate the working class would mean the end of the race. Society, which is greater than the capitalist class, will not allow this to take place, so that there is NO counter move to save the master-class from the implications of the new strategy of the proletariat.

Maxim Litvinoff could say with confidence at Copenhagen, when speaking of peace proposals: "We understand from Mr. Lloyd George that he wishes us to deal first with Kolchak and Denikin, and that is exactly what our Red Army is doing, and doing successfully." ("Manchester Guardian," December 20th, 1919.)

The war is almost over. From the Pacific to the Gulf of Finland and the shores of the Black Sea the sway of the Russian Workers is undisputed. They have conquered. British stupidity and French impetuosity have proven useless weapons when opposed to proletarian genius, and imperial capitalism is now tasting the bitter fruits of defeat. Capitalism has the choice today of recognising the Soviet government or not. It matters not what the choice may be, the result will be the same, the downfall of the system. Speed the day!

Dear Comrades:—

I see by the "Clarion" that the Farmers' Platform is the subject of criticism by our comrades. Well, as a document purporting to lead to the abolition of farm slavery, the less said about it the better. But the duty of the Socialist is to understand these movements; and without compromise, consider them as opportunities to be made the best use of he possibly can.

The Grain Growers' locals count among their members many who hold no illusions regarding said platform. The decision of the Alberta farmers to regard themselves as a class movement is a hopeful sign. The point of the whole thing is this: In the farmers' locals it is possible for the Socialist to keep the scientific viewpoint to the fore in many of the discussions. Also there is a good deal of real democracy in the way the meetings are carried on, and in the fact that the delegates are usually charged to vote as the local decides. Many men get on their feet and express their opinions in these meetings that if left alone would not expend an ounce of thought in a year. The S. P. of C. has not been able to reach many of these men, yet for various reasons, but they are being reached by comrades who see the main chance.

If we as Socialists believe in Evolution, and we do, we must be willing to let the farm-slave evolve our way. Though he may seem slow to the impatient, he is advancing. We must consider the nature of the farmer's environment. He, perhaps more than any other class, has been the victim of bourgeois propaganda. Further, the way in which he is exploited has made him distrustful of even his nearest neighbors.

When the farmer wants anything he wants it right away, and if the farmers' platform does not lead him into the promised land, I believe you will find him going farther. The movement is emancipating him to a great extent from the twin flunkies of capitalism, Grit and Tory.

On an average, I suppose it takes at least three years to make a good useful Socialist. I know it took longer than that for me. Can we expect the farmers, most of whom have only heard that Socialism is some kind of "dividing-up scheme," to fall over themselves to join us immediately? I think not.

Let every Socialist who can, throw himself into the farmers' movement, and by helpful criticism and hard work turn said movement into an excellent recruiting ground for Reds. It would surprise many of the dogmatic comrades if they could know the way the ground is really being prepared in the despised farmers' movement.

Thanking you for the space, I am, yours in the scrap,

"ANOTHER SOIL SLAVE."

### HERE AND NOW.

Geo. Paton, \$3; Jack Hutton, \$2; S. J. J. K., \$2; Mrs. Griffiths, \$6.50; Bob Sinclair, \$30.50; C. M. O'Brien, \$5; W. Bennett, \$40; Sid. Earp, \$2; A. Emery, \$3; A. Mathieson, \$14; L. B. La Marche, \$5; Gus Johnson, \$5; J. A. McDonald, \$2; J. F. Maguire, \$24; J. Bone, Emmett, Idaho, \$1; Wiley Orr, \$5; J. Stevenson \$2; R. Taylor, \$4; J. Blair, \$1; P. Wallgren, \$2. Above list from 12th to 25th February, inclusive.

### ON THE STUDY OF ECONOMICS

(Continued from page 6.)

in producing the necessities of life they will lose no time in abolishing the system that holds them in slavery. Not quite! They are concerned with finding out the best means for capitalists, both as individuals and as a collectivity in the form of states or nations, to secure interest on their capital and accumulate wealth. As Marx has well said: "in place of disinterested enquirers, there were hired prize-fighters."

It was this extension of science beyond the interests of parasitic coupon clippers, who cannot lay claim to performing any useful function in modern society, and into the composition of commodities; how their values are determined in use and exchange; how an accumulation of them comprises the wealth of human society; and how those who produce them live in a state of perpetual poverty while their owners can revel in luxury, that caused the revolution in Political Economy associated with the names of Marx and Engels.

J. A. McD.

## On the Nature and Uses of Sabotage.

(Continued from last issue)

Without some salutary restraint in the way of sabotage on the productive use of the available industrial plant and workmen, it is altogether unlikely that prices could be maintained at a reasonably profitable figure for any appreciable time. A business-like control of the rate and volume of output is indispensable for keeping up a profitable market, and a profitable market is the first and unremitting condition of prosperity in any community whose industry is owned and managed by business men. And the ways and means of this necessary control of the output of industry are always and necessarily something in the nature of sabotage—something in the way of retardation, restriction, withdrawal, unemployment of plant and workmen—whereby production is kept short of productive capacity. The mechanical industry of the new order is inordinately productive. So the rate and volume of output have to be regulated with a view to what the traffic will bear—that is to say, what will yield the largest net return in terms of price to the business men in charge of the country's industrial system. Otherwise there will be "overproduction," business depression, and consequent hard times all round. Overproduction means production in excess of what the market will carry off at a sufficiently profitable price. So it appears that the continued prosperity of the country from day to day hangs on a "conscientious withdrawal of efficiency" by the business men who control the country's industrial output. They control it all for their own use, of course, and their own use means always a profitable price.

In any community that is organized on the price system, with investment and business enterprise, habitual unemployment of the available industrial plant and workmen, in whole or in part appears to be the indispensable condition without which tolerable conditions of life cannot be maintained. That is to say, in no such community can the industrial system be allowed to work at full capacity for any appreciable interval of time, on pain of business stagnation and consequent privation for all classes and conditions of men. The requirements of profitable business will not tolerate it. So the rate and volume of output must be adjusted to the needs of the market, not to the working capacity of the available resources, equipment and man power, nor to the community's need of consumable goods. Therefore there must always be a certain variable margin of unemployment of plant and man power. Rate and volume of output can, of course, not be adjusted by exceeding the productive capacity of the industrial system. So it has to be regulated by keeping short of maximum production by more or less, as the condition of the market may require. It is always a question of more or less unemployment of plant and man power, and a shrewd moderation in the unemployment of these available resources, a "conscientious withdrawal of efficiency," therefore, is the beginning of wisdom in all sound workday business enterprise that has to do with industry.

All this is matter of course and notorious. But it is not a topic on which one prefers to dwell. Writers and speakers who dilate on the meritorious exploits of the nation's business men will not commonly allude to this voluminous running administration of sabotage, this conscientious withdrawal of efficiency, that goes into their ordinary day's work. One prefers to dwell on those exceptional, sporadic, and spectacular episodes in business where business men have now and again successfully gone out of the safe and sane highway of conservative business enterprise that is hedged about with a conscientious withdrawal of efficiency, and have endeavored to regulate the output by increasing the productive capacity of the industrial system at one point or another.

But after all, such habitual recourse to peaceable or surreptitious measures of restraint, delay, and obstruction in the ordinary businesslike management of industry is too widely known and too well approved to call for much exposition or illustration. Yet, as one capital illustration of the scope and force of such businesslike withdrawal of efficiency, it may

be in place to recall that all the civilized nations are just now undergoing an experiment in businesslike sabotage on an unexampled scale and carried out with unexampled effrontery. All these nations that have come through the war, whether as belligerents or as neutrals, have come into a state of more or less pronounced distress, due to a scarcity of the common necessities of life; and this distress falls, of course, chiefly on the common sort, who have at the same time borne the chief burden of the war which has brought them to this state of distress. The common man has won the war and lost his livelihood. This need not be said by way of praise or blame. As it stands it is, broadly, an objective statement of fact, which may need some slight qualification, such as broad statements of fact will commonly need. All these nations that have come through the war, and more particularly the common run of their populations, are very much in need of all sorts of supplies for daily use, both for immediate consumption and for productive use. So much so that the prevailing state of distress rises in many places to an altogether unwholesome pitch of privation, for want of the necessary food, clothing, and fuel. Yet in all these countries the staple industries are slowing down. There is an ever increasing withdrawal of efficiency. The industrial plant is increasingly running idle or half idle, running increasingly short of its productive capacity. Workmen are being laid off and an increasing number of those workmen who have been serving in the armies are going idle for want of work, at the same time that the troops which are no longer needed in the service are being demobilized as slowly as popular sentiment will tolerate, apparently for fear that the number of unemployed workmen in the country may presently increase to such proportions as to bring on a catastrophe. And all the while all these peoples are in great need of all sorts of goods and services which these idle plants and idle workmen are fit to produce. But for reasons of business expediency it is impossible to let these idle plants and idle workmen go to work—that is to say for reasons of insufficient profit to the business men interested, or in other words, for reasons of insufficient income to the vested interests which control the staple industries and so regulate the output of product. The traffic will not bear so large a production of goods as the community needs for current consumption, because it is considered doubtful whether so large a supply could be sold at prices that would yield a reasonable profit on the investment—or rather on the capitalization; that is to say, it is considered doubtful whether an increased production, such as to employ more workmen and supply the goods needed by the community, would result in an increased net aggregate income for the vested interests which control these industries. A reasonable profit always means, in effect, the largest obtainable profit.

All this is simple and obvious, and it should scarcely need explicit statement. Is for these business men to manage the country's industry, of course, and therefore to regulate the rate and volume of output; and also of course any regulation of the output by them will be made with a view to the needs of business; that is to say, with a view to the physical needs of these peoples who have come through the war and have made the world safe for the business of the vested interests. Should the the business men in charge, by any chance aberration, stray from this straight and narrow path of business integrity, and allow the community's needs unduly to influence their management of the community's industry, they would presently find themselves discredited and would probably face insolvency. Their only salvation is a conscientious withdrawal of efficiency. All this lies in the nature of the case. It is the working of the price system, whose creatures and agents these business men are. Their case is rather pathetic, as indeed they admit quite volubly. They are not in a position to manage with a free hand, the reason being that they have in the past, under the routine requirements of the price system as it takes effect in corporation finance, taken on so large an overhead burden of fixed charges that any appreciable decrease in the net earnings of the business will bring any well-managed concern of this class face to face with bankruptcy.

(Concluded in next issue).

## Literature Price List

(Watch this List for Changes.)

- Communist Manifesto. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.  
 Wage-Labor and Capital. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.  
 The Present Economic System. (Prof. W. A. Bonger). Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.  
 Capitalist Production. (First Nine and 32nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. I. Marx). Paper, single copies, 50c; cloth, single copies, \$1.00; cloth, 10 copies, 75c each.  
 Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.  
 Slave of the Farm. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.  
 Manifesto, S. P. of C., single copy, 10 cents; 25 copies, \$1.50.  
 Red Europe. (F. Anstey, M.P.). Single copies, 50c. Ten copies or more 30c each.  
 The Story of the Evolution of Life. (T. F. Palmer). Single copies, 10c.  
 Evolution of Man. (Prof. Bolsche). Single copies, 20c; 25 copies, \$3.75.  
 The Nature and Uses of Sabotage (Prof. T. Veblen). Single copies 5 cents, 25 copies \$1.  
 Red Heart of Russia. (Bessie Beattie). Per copy, \$2.00.  
 Ten Days that Shook the World. (John Reed). Per copy, \$2.00.  
 Six Red Months in Russia. (Louise Bryant). Per copy, \$2.00.

(All above post free).

- Ancient Society. (Morgan). Per copy (postage 14c extra), \$1.50.

Supplies to Locals.

- Dues Cards, per 100, \$1.00.  
 Letterheads, per 100, 60c.  
 Platforms, per 100, 50c.  
 Constitutions, per 100, \$1.50.  
 Receipt Books, Warrant Books, various prices.  
 Quarterly Report Forms, free.  
 Western Clarion Sub. Cards, free.

Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

## PLATFORM Socialist Party of Canada

We, the Socialist Party of Canada, affirm our allegiance to, and support of, the principles and programme of the revolutionary working class.

Labor, applied to natural resources, produces all wealth. The present economic system is based upon capitalist ownership of the means of production, consequently, all the products of labor belong to the capitalist class. The capitalist is, therefore, master; the worker a slave.

So long as the capitalist class remains in possession of the reins of government all the powers of the State will be used to protect and defend its property rights in the means of wealth production and its control of the product of labor.

The capitalist system gives to the capitalist an ever-swelling stream of profits, and to the worker, an ever-increasing measure of misery and degradation.

The interest of the working class lies in setting itself free from capitalist exploitation by the abolition of the wage system, under which this exploitation, at the point of production, is cloaked. To accomplish this necessitates the transformation of capitalist property in the means of wealth production into socially controlled economic forces.

The irrespressible conflict of interest between the capitalist and the worker necessarily expresses itself as a struggle for political supremacy. This is the Class Struggle.

Therefore, we call all workers to organize under the banner of the Socialist Party of Canada, with the object of conquering the political powers, for the purpose of setting up and enforcing the economic programme of the working class, as follows:

1. The transformation, as rapidly as possible, of capitalist property in the means of wealth production (natural resources, factories, mills, railroads, etc.) into collective means of production.
2. The organization and management of industry by the working class.
3. The establishment, as speedily as possible, of production for use instead of production for profit.